CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

The literature review is the backbone of dissertation, as the consequent analysis and future result is based on the study and application of the literature. This chapter aims at providing an overview of the body of research performed on brand personality and the impact of human personality. It is proposed to discuss different empirical research on brand personality and human personality.

In past two decades, the development of new products has been a popular marketing strategy for many firms. According to the trade publication New Product News, consumer-product companies launch nearly 20,000 new products each year (compared to only 2,689 in 1980). Because of an increase in marketplace competition, this newfound brand proliferation threatens the survival of other recent brands. Brand differentiation is now becoming an important tactic for combating competition in this hostile marketplace. A viable solution for establishing the distinctiveness of a brand is through brand personality. Attaching personalities to brands contributes to a differentiating brand identity, which can make brands more desirable to the consumer.

While positioning the brand, it is important to treat it like a human being with specific characteristics. There are a host of brands out there and if you position the brand in a general manner, it will become a commodity that will get lost in the crowd. The only distinguishing factor you then have is price, which leaves the task of brand identification at the mercy of market forces. A very dangerous proposition, because it effectively gives you very little control. On the other hand, if your brand has a distinctive personality, it will come alive for the consumer and endear itself to him. It will help your consumers in identifying with your brand’s personality traits.

2.2 The Literature

Audrey Azoulay & Kapferer (2003) Advertisers and marketing practitioners have been the first to coin the term ‘brand personality’, well before the academics studied and accepted the concept. Motivation research made popular the use of projective techniques to capture these facets.
Seguela (1982), creative vice president of the RSCG advertising agency, introduced the ‘star strategy’ as the new mode of brand management for mature markets. In mature markets, non-product-based features of the brand start to have a greater effect on consumers’ buying decisions. Seguela recommended that all brands be described along three facets: the physical one (what does the product do and how well does it perform), the character (brand personality facet) and the style (executonal elements for advertising and communication).

Olins (1978), ‘Corporate Personality’ refers to the fact that design is not here to describe a product, but to endow either its brand or corporation with values and non-material distinguishing attributes. In practice, these publications expressed a growing dissatisfaction with an enduring tenet of marketing practice equating the product and the brand; that is, defining the brand by a product’s performance.

SweeHoon Ang and Elison Ai Ching Lim (2006) investigated whether metaphors in advertising have a synergistic or compensatory effect on brand personality perceptions of utilitarian and symbolic products. The effects of metaphoric headlines versus pictures were also compared. In general, brands using metaphors in ads were perceived to be more sophisticated and exciting, but less sincere and competent than those using literal headlines or pictures. Ad attitudes, brand attitudes, and purchase intention were also enhanced with metaphoric advertising. Also their study results showed that brand attitudes and purchase intention were also enhanced with metaphoric advertising. Hence they suggested that metaphors can be strategically used to influence brand personality. In addition, compared with utilitarian products, symbolic products were perceived to be more sophisticated and exciting, but less sincere and competent. It is interesting to note that when metaphors were used for utilitarian products, perceptions of sophistication and excitement were enhanced, whereas sincerity was diluted. The results suggest that metaphors can be strategically used to influence brand personality perceptions particularly for utilitarian products.

1 Audrey Azoulay & Kapferer (2003), Brand Management, Henry Stewart Publications,
4 SweeHoon Ang and Elison Ai Ching Lim (2006), Brand personality: Exploring the potential to move from factor analytical to circumplex models, psychology & Marketing
Jillian C. Sweeney and Carol Brandon (2006)\textsuperscript{5} validated brand personality scale using at circumplex models instead of factor analysis model. In response to limitations of factor analysis based on Aaker scale this study explores the potential of advancing the understanding of brand personality thorough circumplex model which is derived from the fields of social and personality psychology and interpersonal psychiatry. This model is based on the relationship between interpersonal personality traits or emotions and this assists academic and market practitioners in understanding brand personality. In response to the limitations of the factor approach to brand personality, this study explores the potential for advancing understanding of brand personality through a circumplex model derived from the fields of social and personality psychology and interpersonal psychiatry.

Shintaro Okazaki (2006)\textsuperscript{6} conducted a preliminary exploration of online brand personality. This study attempts to identify the brand personality dimensions that American firms intend to create in the mind of online consumers by using "forms of online communications" partially based on Ghose and Dou's earlier study. A content analysis was conducted on 270 web sites created by 64 American brands in the USA, UK, France. A principal component analysis identifies five underlying dimensions of brand personality stimuli: excitement, sophistication, affection, popularity, and competence. The principal forms of online communications consist of stakeholder relations, direct/indirect sales, choice functions, connectedness, orientation, and product positioning. Multiple regression analyses confirm that there are modest but consistent associations between the intended brand personality dimensions and the forms of online communications. This study contributes to the literature by its attempt to classify brand personality stimuli in terms of the cognition versus affection framework.

\textsuperscript{5} Jillian C. Sweeney, Carol Brandon (2006), Brand personality: Exploring the potential to move from factor analytical to circumplex models, Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Venable, Beverly T. et al (2005) 7 investigated the role of brand personality in giving charity. This study develops and refines the measure of brand personality specifically for the nonprofit context. This nonprofit organizations brand personality may influence donor’s likelihood to contribute. This study develops and refines a parsimonious measure of brand personality specifically for the nonprofit context. The researchers conduct a series of six multi-method studies of nonprofit stakeholders to validate the role of brand personality in nonprofit organizations. The results yield four dimensions of brand personality for nonprofits: integrity, nurturance, sophistication, and ruggedness. Thus, current and potential donors ascribe personality traits to nonprofit organizations and differentiate between nonprofits on the basis of the organizations' personality. Hence, nonprofit brand personality may influence potential donors' likelihood to contribute and donate.

Diamantopoulos, Adamantios et al. (2005) 8 identified the impact of brand extensions on brand personality using Aaker's scale. The study indicated that there was no adverse impact on brand personality of core brand as a result of introducing extensions (irrespective of fit). The study offers support for introducing extension for a quality brand without fear of adversely affecting its brand personality.


Harris, Eric G. and Fleming, David E. (2005)\(^9\) identified the human element in service personality information. They studied the role of service personality in services marketing and communication. The study used the five factor model to explain additional variance in perceived personality beyond the brand personality scale. The findings show that the service personality assessments should include measures of the human personality and that perspectives from both employees and customers should be included in service personality assessment. The managerial implications are that employees directly influence customer perceptions of the firm, and managers should be aware of the types of messages that employees send regarding the service and hence select employees who may best fit within the desired service personality. Human resource departments therefore play central roles in the management of service personality, and employee selection devices are especially important when considering which employees may best fit within the desired service personality.

Freling, Traci H. and Forbes, Lukas P. (2005)\(^10\) in their examination of Brand personality through methodological triangulation present that brand personality is connected to many brand associations in consumer memory and access the spreading activation. They have identified that brands with strong positive personalities and also our natural tendency to anthropomorphize on-human objects attract the consumers. In their triangulation the researchers explain the effects of brand personality as “several propitious outcomes accrue to brand with strong favorable personalities”. They also found out from their respondents that the brand personality provides emotional fulfillment that lead to increased loyalty. Citations in consumer memory and accessed through spreading activation the consumers embrace brands with strong, positive personalities because of a natural human tendency to anthropomorphize nonhuman objects.


Su-e Park et al (2005) conducted an exploratory study in Korea on e-brand personality. In their study they explored the feasibility of constructing target e-brand personalities for online services by using three consecutive studies. The results showed that two visual attributes—simplicity and cohesion—are closely related to a bold personality. Three attributes—contrast, density, and regularity—can be used to create a Web site that has an analytical personality. Contrast, cohesion, density, and regularity are closely related to a Web site that is perceived to have a friendly personality. Regularity and balance were expected to be related to the sophisticated personality. It consists of 3 consecutive studies. The 1st study identified four major dimensions of e-brand personality on diverse web sites. The 2nd study used 52 experimental home pages to identify key visual attributes associated with those 4 personality dimensions. The 3rd study explored whether those findings from the 2nd study can be applied in constructing web sites for online services. The results showed that 2 visual attributes—simplicity and cohesion—are closely related to a bold personality. Three attributes—contrast, density, and regularity—can be used to create a Web site that has an analytical personality. Contrast, cohesion, density, and regularity are closely related to a Web site that is perceived to have a friendly personality. Regularity and balance were expected to be related to the sophisticated personality dimension, but no such relation was identified in the 3rd study.

Sung Yongjun Tinkham and Spencer F. (2005) identified brand personality structures in the United States and Korea. In their study a set of global brands was rated on the same personality attributes in the United States and Korea, 6 common dimensions of brand personality and 2 factors unique to each culture were observed. The 2 culture specific factors in Korea were Passive Likeableness and Ascendancy. The 2 unique factors (White collar and Androgyny) that emerged in the U.S sample suggest changing cultural values associated with occupational status and gender roles.

-----------------------------------------------


Helgeson, James G. and Supphellen, Magne (2004) conducted a conceptual and measurement comparison of self-congruity and brand personality. This study was based on Swedish female consumers and it was found that self-congruity and brand personality are empirically discriminant and have positive and independent effects on retail brand attitudes.

Rojas-Méndez, José et al (2004) identified the Ford Brand Personality in Chile. The main objective of this study was to empirically measure the Ford Brand Personality in Chile, using as a framework, the five-dimension Brand Personality scale developed by Aaker (1997). The study was carried out in two mid-sized cities in the central part of Chile. The confirmatory factor analysis of the measurement model and the analysis of the structural model do not provide evidence that the 'ruggedness' dimension proposed by Aaker (1997) was not reliable, nor was it valid. Thus, it shows a weak relationship with the main construct, 'Brand Personality'. Moreover, to achieve good measurement properties, the other four dimensions (excitement, sincerity, competence and sophistication) had to be refined up to a point where there was no problem with combining them to form one higher-order construct, namely 'Brand Personality'.

The refined scales exhibited reliability; and convergent/discriminant validity was supported. Among respondents, three segments were identified: the antagonists, the admirers and the cold-blooded. Marketing suggestions are offered for the positioning of the Ford brand in Chile.

---


Magin, Stephanie et al (2003)\textsuperscript{15} identified the impact of Brand Personality and Customer Satisfaction on Customer's Loyalty. In many different industrial and service providing sectors customer satisfaction is regarded as the key to customer loyalty. However, this relationship is influenced by several other variables, such as the congruent perception of a brand's personality and customer's self-concept, switching barriers or the attractiveness of products and services provided by rival companies. This study examines the relationships between those constructs and provides a structural equation model with latent variables for modeling these complex relationships. The postulated relationships are examined simultaneously in two distinct groups. A survey of 241 adult ISP customers provided data for the analysis. The results reveal the existence of different segments in the Internet Service Providers (ISP) market.

MagneSupphellen and KjellGronhaug (2003)\textsuperscript{16} identified the method of building foreign brand personalities in Russia and the moderating effect of consumer ethnocentrism. Based on a survey of Western brands in Russia, three contributions are offered to the literature on international brand building. First, the Aaker brand personality scale (Aaker1997) was tested in a Russian context. Important similarities and differences between Western and Russian brand personality perceptions were identified. Second, the results show that brand personalities of Western brands also have an impact on brand attitudes among Russian consumers. Third, and most importantly, it is demonstrated that the effect of Western brand personalities is heavily moderated by consumer ethnocentrism. Specifically, only low-ethnocentric consumers are influenced by foreign brand personalities.


**Geason, James Albert (2002)** for his PhD dissertation, in University of Florida identified the brand personality trait marking using non-verbal measurement: The study investigates the viability of using the Self Assessment Manikin (SAM) as a nonverbal instrument for measuring the personality dimensions of agreeableness, surgency and emotional stability as they relate to brand personality. Factor analysis and structural equation modeling were used to test the appropriateness of the scales and the model for the measurement of brand personality. Results were significant and indicate the SAM characters can be used to mark these three personality traits as they relate to brands.

**Ji, Mindy F. (2002)** for her PhD dissertation, in the Texas A&M University identified the brand relational schema which is a cognitive approach to consumer-brand relationships. The objective of this dissertation was to conceptualize the elements of consumer-brand relationships and to test selected elements empirically. The concept of the brand relational scheme (BRS), a cognitive structure that represents regularities in patterns of consumer-brand relatedness, is introduced and developed. Specific research hypotheses are generated to address how the portrayal of a socially appealing brand personality trait in an advertisement impacts the BRS and how a social expressive goal moderates this relationship. Two studies were conducted to test the hypotheses that were framed. The results of the experiments provide general support for the hypotheses and suggest that a brand personality trait appears to play an important role in building consumer-brand relationships. The results show that a less socially appealing trait operates similarly to a socially appealing trait in influencing the accessibility of public self. It does not, however, have any impact on the development of the associations among elements in the brand scheme.

------------------------------------------------------------------

17 Geason, James Albert (2002), Brandpersonality trait marking using non-verbal measurement, Ph.D., University of Florida, 113 pages.

Kim et al (2001) identified the effect of brand personality and brand identification on brand loyalty. This study investigated the effect of brand personality on brand asset management by using the concept of consumers' id The focus was on one important type of high-technology product, the cellular phone. The researchers develop a conceptual framework to explain the effect of brand identification on brand loyalty. The important variables of this framework include the attractiveness of the brand personality, the distinctiveness of the brand personality, the self-expressive value of the brand personality, positive word-of-mouth reports of the brand, and brand loyalty. The empirical results indicated that there are positive relationships between attractiveness, distinctiveness, and self-expressive value of brand personality. These relationships had a statistically significant effect on consumers' identification with a brand. Furthermore, brand identification had a direct effect on word-of-mouth reports and an indirect effect on brand loyalty.

Aaker, Jennifer Lynn et al (2001) conducted a study on consumption symbols as carriers of culture. The study was conducted in United States of America, Japan and Spain. This research argues that the meaning embedded in consumption symbols, such as commercial brands, can serve to represent and institutionalize the values and beliefs of a culture. Relying on a combined emic–etic approach, the authors conducted 4 studies to examine how symbolic and expressive attributes associated with commercial brands are structured and how these structures vary across 3 cultures. Studies 1 and 2 revealed a set of “brand personality” dimensions common to Japan and the United States (Sincerity, Excitement, Competence, and Sophistication), as well as culture-specific Japanese (Peacefulness) and American (Ruggedness) dimensions. Studies 3 and 4, which extended this set of findings to Spain, yielded brand personality dimensions common to Spain and the United States (Sincerity, Excitement, and Sophistication), plus non-shared Spanish (Passion) and American (Competence and Ruggedness) dimensions. The meaning of these brand personality dimensions was discussed in the context of cross-cultural research on values and affect, globalization issues, and cultural frame shifting.

---

Freeman, Dan (2001) for his PhD dissertation in the University of Arizona studied advertising's influence on socio-cultural brand associations. This dissertation develops a new conceptual framework for investigating social information processing, the Controlled-Automatic Meaning (or CAM) Model. This model casts social information in a central role, giving primary emphasis to the mental processes through which consumers draw socio-cultural meanings from the social cues used in advertising. Two studies aimed at providing an initial assessment of the CAM Model are reported. The results from the study provide compelling evidence of the model's utility in predicting and explaining developmental changes in consumers' processing of gender meanings represented in advertising. The second study's outcomes also suggest several promising directions for future research involving the CAM Model.

Venable, Beverly Townsel (2001) in his PhD dissertation in the University of Mississippi extended brand personality to the nonprofit sector. The potential impact of brand personality on an individual's likelihood to contribute to a nonprofit organization was the focus of this research. The results offer new insights to how individuals view nonprofit organizations and how these views influence the likelihood to contribute time, money, and/or in-kind services.

21Freeman, Dan (2001), Advertising's influence on socio-cultural brand associations: A developmental and social information processing approach, Ph.D., The University of Arizona, 370 pages.

22Venable, Beverly Townsel (2001), Extending brand personality to the nonprofit sector: An investigation of the potential impact of brand personality on an individual's likelihood to contribute to nonprofit organizations, Ph.D., The University of Mississippi, 178 pages.
Wysong, Walter Scott, IV, (2000) in their Ph.D. dissertation in the University of Texas at Arlington conducted a conceptualization and investigation of brand personality as a process with implications for brand management. The aim of this dissertation is to investigate brand personality as a process. Specifically, this research explores whether the brand personality antecedents are linked with a brand's personality characteristics. And, if so, do these brand personality characteristics affect consumer attitudes and behaviors. These relationships are illustrated and examined in a model of brand personality. Because different people in different situations consume brands, individual and situational variables were also introduced to the model. An experimental study was conducted to examine the brand personality process using beer as a product category. The results revealed that brand personality is a process as proposed. There was evidence that antecedents influence brand personality characteristics, which influence attitude toward the brand and brand choice. For example, the importance of the image of the brewery positively influenced a beer's sincerity rating, which was positively related to consumer preference and purchase intent. Thus, brand managers wanting to create a beer with a sincere personality might emphasize the image of the brewery in their promotional messages. The results of this research also indicated that situational and individual variables do influence the brand personality process. Specifically, the social visibility of the situation and an individual's brand loyalty affected brand personality ratings.

Judy A Siguaw et al (1999) provided empirical evidence regarding the extent to which restaurant brands such as Wendy's, McDonald's, Burger King, and others, have established clear and distinct brand personalities in the minds of consumers. A well-established brand personality has been shown to result in increased preference and patronage, higher emotional ties to the brands, trust and loyalty.

23 Wysong, Walter Scott, IV (2000), "This brand's for you": A conceptualization and investigation of brand personality as a process with implications for brand managementPh.D, The University of Texas at Arlington, 106 pages.

Strausbaugh, Kirsten Lynn (1998)\textsuperscript{25} for their Ph.D. dissertation in the University of Florida identified a method for assessing brand personality and building brand personality profiles. The current research has applied the Adjective Checklist (ACL) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), modeled after Jung's theory of personality types, in constructing an instrument for brand personality assessment. Consisting of four dimensions, (Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuitive, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving), the model offers a total of 16 possible personality types. Results of paired t-tests and cross tabulation of type, as produced by both the MBTI-based sections and the ACL, validate the instrument as a stable measurement of brand personality. Furthermore, the measurement tool was readily able to differentiate between brands across product categories. Such findings suggest the instrument as a viable, time/cost effective measure of brand personality, grounded in a sound theoretical background.

Aaker, Jennifer Lynn (1995)\textsuperscript{26}for her Ph.D. at Stanford University conceptualized, measured and identified the underlying psychological mechanisms. The purpose of this research is to explore the symbolic role of brands by examining the impact of brand personality on consumer preference. The three specific objectives of the study were to understand the nature and structure of brand personality, to develop a scale that supports that factor structure and that measures brand personality in a reliable, valid and generalizable way and to develop a model that tests the psychological mechanism by which brand personality is hypothesized to operate. To achieve these three objectives, three phases of research were conducted. First, the nature of the construct, brand personality, which is defined here as the set of human characteristics associated with a brand, is examined, and its structure is identified. Specifically, by drawing on the past forty years of research in personality psychology, which shows, that individuals perceive of human personality in terms of five factors (Norman 1963) and by conducting a series of empirical studies, a similar yet distinct structure of brand personality, as perceived in consumers' minds, is identified. Second, a measurement scale, based on this five-factor structure, is developed.

\textsuperscript{25}Strausbaugh, Kirsten Lynn (1998), "Miss Congeniality" or "no more Mr. Nice Guy?" On a method for assessing brand personality and building brand personality profiles, Ph.D., University of Florida, 205 pages.
To establish the validity and reliability of this scale, the scale development procedure outlined in Nunnally (1978), which includes construct definition, content validity, data collection, measure purification, second content validity, item selection, reliability assessment, second measurement purification, validity assessment and norm development, was followed. The results of these analyses showed strong support for the five-factor structure of brand personality, and the Brand Personality Scale (BPS). Finally, a laboratory experiment was conducted to determine how and why brand personality could influence consumer preference. Based on the theoretical foundations in the personality-situation literature, the hypotheses were put forth that consumers prefer brands with personalities that are congruent (vs. incongruent) with the personality traits that comprise one's self-schema (self-congruity) and are elicited by situational norms (situational congruity). In addition, an interactive effect was predicted where the self-congruity effect is stronger when the norms present in a situation are congruent (vs. incongruent) with one's self-schema (self-situational congruity). To further test the Self-Situation Congruity Model, the effect of interactive variables (self-monitoring and product category type), on self and situation-congruity were examined. The results of the laboratory experiment support the majority of the hypotheses put forth by the Self-Situation Congruity model.

**Gian Vittorio Caprava, Claudio Barbanelli and Gianluigi Guido** subjected 1586 adult Italians to describe first perceived personality of their brands randomly selected out 12 brands which they know or use from different market segments. The subjects were asked to use a list of adjectives commonly used to describe human personality, and the researchers concluded that “the traditional repertoire of human personality may serve for constructing brand personality”.

---

Aaker, Jennifer Lynn (1995), Brand personality: Conceptualization, measurement and underlying psychological mechanisms, Ph.D., Stanford University, 342 pages.

Lisa Papanai, Colin Campbell, Robert Ankomah-Opoku, Maria Styven, and Jean-Paul Berthon \(^{28}\) in their study show that biotechnology firms are nonetheless portraying brand personalities online, unintentionally. They studied the biotechnology firms’ communications, since all these firms communicate through a network of organizations and they collaborate on product development projects, the communications of these biotechnology firms should have distinct brand personalities to communicate. In their findings they concluded that the managers of these firms develop and emphasize brand personalities and images in line with the expectations of the industry.

Joachim Zentesa, Dirk Morschettb, and Hanna Schramm-Kleina\(^ {29}\) identified that brand personality is applicable for retail brands. In Germany they studied retailers and found that the brand personality dimensions directly influence the store loyalty of the consumers. They used Aaker’s brand personality scale to assess the personality of retail brand. They also had interesting findings, that the perceived store sincerity and excitement dimensions had strong influence on loyalty.

Bob M. Fennis, and Ad Th. H. Pruyn\(^ {30}\) studied the brand effects on consumer self-perceptions on personality traits with 64 undergraduate’s students of 32 male and 32 female students. They studied the relationship between brand personality dimensions and consumer self-perception of personality traits. Their study was conducted in four different phases and the study proved the congruence of brand personality dimensions and personality traits. The first study showed that brand sincerity had an effect on consumer agreeableness, next study on brand excitement showed the consumer trait of hedonism. In the third study the brand competence showed the effect on consumer sophistication and the last study showed the brand ruggedness had an impact on consumer extroversion.

\(^{28}\) Lisa Papanai, Colin Campbell, Robert Ankomah-Opoku, Maria Styven and Jean-Paul Berthon, Using brand personality to assess whether biotechnology firms are saying the right things to their network. Journal of Commercial Biotechnology (2008:14, 247–255. doi:10.1057/jcb.2008.14; published online 29 April 2008


J. Jo skoBrakus, Bernd H. Schmitt, & LiaZarantonello\(^{31}\) in their study on Brand experience identified that brand experience affects the consumer satisfaction and loyalty. To develop a marketing strategy for goods and service they developed a brand experience scale. The authors distinguish several experience dimensions and constructed a brand experience scale that includes four dimensions: sensory, affective, intellectual, and behavioral. Brand experience is conceptualized as sensations, feelings, cognitions, and behavioral responses evoked by brand-related stimuli that are part of a brand’s design and identity, packaging, communications, and environments. They conclude that brand experience affects consumer satisfaction and loyalty directly and indirectly thorough brand personality associations.

Riza Casidy Mulyanegara, Yelena Tsarenko, Alastair Anderson\(^{32}\) in their study on relationships between consumer personality and brand personality studied fashion products of the youth market. Their choice of youth market was due to the reason that the youngsters because of their age was expected to be motivated to express their personality through fashion products and clothing. Youth viewed clothing as an essential social tool in their lives. Their respondents were 251 undergraduate students of which 150 females and 101 males participated. The authors were able to establish that there was a strong relationship between consumer personality and brand personality viz the “personality dimensions of Neuroticism in male and Conscientiousness in female for the preference for a Trusted Brand”.

---


Maurice Patterson & Lisa O'Malley\textsuperscript{33} in their review of brand, consumers and relationship analyze the result of relationship in marketing and on the anthropomorphisation of brands. In the process of assigning human qualities and personalities projected on brands, the authors in their literature on brand consumer relationships (BCR), highlight on the interpersonal relationships of consumer – brand interaction. To establish the BCR they approach the problem on four major issues, such as the first, relational approach to marketing remain fashionable, second the supposed failure of brand image to provide concrete assistance to brand management, third the brand personality concept and anthropomorphisation of brands facilitate the notion of BCRs through Social Exchange Theory (SET) which is a logical extension of brand personality, the fourth loyalty issue which is of central importance to relationship. They establish that brands have personality and we can treat them like people, and we can have relationship with them.

Eun-Jung Lee, Eun-Young Rhee\textsuperscript{34} in their study developed a conceptual framework of brand personality and its scales on the basis of consumers ’ perception, focusing on understanding the symbolic messages of brands within a specific category that is, in men ’s apparel category in South Korea (within-category brand personality based on consumers ’ perception WCBP-CP). They developed the conceptual framework based both on qualitative and quantitative on a group of 300 respondents between the age group of 18-43of which 80% were male. The study contributed to identify some aspects of symbolic messages of brands. Their study theoretically explored the gap between concept and market practice. And they have concluded brand personality can be effectively used for brand differentiation in the same product category.

\textsuperscript{33} Maurice Patterson & Lisa O’Malley (2006). Brands, Consumers and Relationships: A Review, Irish Marketing Review Volume 18 number1&2,

Anuja Pandey\textsuperscript{35} in his research paper aim’s at identifying the parent brand personalities as perceived by the consumer before going for brand extensions. In the research paper the author identifies that strong brand equity is related to distinct brand personality. The paper explores that before going for any brand extension, it is important to understand the parent brand personalities and thereafter attaching the more desirable brand personalities to the extended brand. To understand brand personality the author used Jennifer Aaker’s brand personality scale (BPS) and measure the brand personality of Dove brand. According to the paper Dove is considered as honest brand and it is also considered to be sincere and real, as it stands by all the advertisement promises. The youth consider Dove brand as Modern with unique qualities, at the same time it is dynamic, contemporary with times and with enduring effect. And hence the author proposes that Dove can go in for a brand extension from soaps to shampoo and deodorant.

Kevin Lane Keller, Keith Richey\textsuperscript{36} has defined - the corporate brand personality as the human characteristics or traits of the employees of the corporation as a whole. Unlike brand personality of product or service the authors identify and construct a corporate brand personality as that will reflect the values, words, and actions of all employees of the corporation. According to the authors a successful 21st century firm must carefully manage its corporate brand personality. The three core dimensions of corporate brand personality and two traits for each dimension that are crucial for marketplace success are outlined as Passionate and Compassionate (Heart), Creative and Disciplined (Mind) and Agile and Collaborative (Body). These traits have an interactive effect such that the effects of one trait can be enhanced by the existence of another.

Yukselekinci and Sameer Hosany \textsuperscript{37} proved that the concept of brand personality can be applied to tourism destination. They extended the Aaker’s scale to gauge personality traits that tourists ascribe to destinations. They identified that characteristics to destinations and destination personality can be described in three dimensions viz sincerity, excitement and conviviality. The third personality dimension, conviviality was new and also specific to tourism destination, which consisted of traits such as friendly, family oriented and charming.

\textsuperscript{35} Anuja Pandey, Understanding Consumer Perception of Brand Personality All India Management Association July 31, 2009.
Lau K and Ian Phau,\textsuperscript{38} selected two symbolic brands from the same product category, the BMW and Volkswagen. In their study they identified that the consumers considered BMW to be a brand of high prestige than the other. The key personality dimensions of BMW were competent, excitement and sophistication. Volkswagen portrayed strong personality dimensions of sincerity, excitement, sophistication and competent.

Francisco Guzmán and Audhesh K. Paswan\textsuperscript{39} studied the brand image across host and home countries using the Aaker’ brand personality scale, on a population of immigrant Mexicans in Dallas USA using two leading Spanish-language television broadcast brands from Mexico—Televisa and TV Aztec, as the focal cultural brands. The results of their study indicated that the association between the brand personality dimensions and the cultural brands from Mexico was stronger among Latinos residing in the Dallas than among their counterparts in Mexico City. This study contributes to brand personality literature and presents an important insight into the brand image of cultural brands from emerging markets.

Qimei Chen, Shelly Rodgers \textsuperscript{40} explored the possibility of a Website Personality Scale (WPS) and validated it through a multi-phase process. They investigated the presence of human and brand personality attributes as well as information characteristics in over one hundred websites. The results of the exploratory analysis suggested that websites have five distinct personality dimensions: Intelligent, Fun, Organized, Candid, and Sincere. The recognition of human and brand personality attributes in websites further suggests parallels between websites and traditional advertising and marketing. If website designs are to be viewed positively by users of those designs, then website planners and designers must determine the personality attributes that are to define the site and, simultaneously, promote that personality to make the site distinct from its competitors.

\textsuperscript{38} Lau K & Ian Phau: Extending symbolic brands using their personality: examining antecedents and implications towards brand image fit and brand dilution, Psychology and marketing 2007, vol 24, issue 5, p424-444.
\textsuperscript{40} Qimei Chen, Shelly Rodgers, Development of an instrument to measure website personality. Journal of interactive advertising, vol 1 fall 2006.
Chingching Chang, 41 National Chengchi University investigated the Impacts of Personality Differences on Product Evaluations on 396 students recruited for this study, from the campus of the university and were paid for their participation. They were randomly assigned to one of two conditions (ads with introvert user portrayals, ads with extrovert user portrayals). Individual differences on introversion/extroversion were measured after subjects were exposed to advertising messages. This study suggests that there are two different ways that subjects' personality orientations may interfere with their processing of advertising information. First, subjects of different personalities are likely to view their environment from different perspectives. Second, subjects' perceptions of the discrepancies between their self-concepts and product images affect their product evaluations. This carries a lot of significance for the marketers.

2.3 Personality: Concept and Measurement

In order to clarify the concept of personality in psychology, which is the very basis of any work on brand personality, we will examine the human personality concept in psychology without going back to the Latin or theological roots of the word ‘personality’. The meanings of which are then manifold in psychology personality is something dynamic and cumulative.

Allport & Odbert (1936) 42 Personality could be defined only in terms of the reactions of an individual towards other people in recurrent interpersonal situations in life. He called the smallest unit of recurrent reactions dynamism. He used that word to describe certain patterns of feelings or behavior and also to describe mechanisms that are the components of the personality. Those dynamisms are quite enduring and accumulate throughout life.’ This definition is quite vague, but it gave way to the trait theory. The importance of defining the concept of personality is crucial insofar as it will influence the theory that will ensue. Allport ‘Personality is the set of relatively stable and general dynamic, emotional and affective characteristics of an individual’s way of being, in his/her way to react to the situations in which s/he is.

41 Chingching cheang, NationalChenguchi University (2001), The impact of Personality differences on product evaluations, Advances in Consumer Research Volume 28, p 26-3

42 Allport, G. W. & Odbert, H. S. (1936), Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study, Psychological Monographs, 47, No. 211.
In most cases, the word does not include the cognitive aspects of the behavior (intelligence, abilities, knowledge). It always deals with the affective, emotional and dynamic aspects. Personality is described in terms of traits. Personality is a clear construct different from cognitive aspects of the person, or from his or her skills and abilities. It is described by traits. The theory of traits is crucial to personality theory insofar as it has enabled the practical application of the theory of personality, the construction of personality scales, and the identification of the corpus of words that define personality.

The first exhaustive published list of terms present in the English dictionary related to personality and was prepared by Allport and Odbert in 1936. Most studies following that of Cattel have converged towards the conclusion that human personality could be ‘summarized’ by a small number of factors (from two to 16). A large number of studies have reached the number five.

Researchers generally agree that personality is “the dynamic and organized set of characteristics of a person that uniquely influences his or her cognitions, motivations and behaviors” (Allport, 1961, p.28; Ryckman, 1997, p.5). Furham (1990) classified personality theories into three schools: (1) benevolent eclecticism describes a long and venerable line of personality theories; (2) partisan zealots present only one theory in which they believe and (3) enthusiastic taxonomists classify theories according to their epistemological origins. Ryckman (1997), who belongs to the third school, categorized personality theories into five perspectives:

(a) The psychoanalytic perspective is biological in nature and based on the particular behaviors that occur (Ryckman, 1997).

(b) The trait perspective assumes that there are “dispositional factors that regularly and persistently determine conduct in a variety of everyday situations” (Furham, 1990, p.923).

(c) The cognitive perspective assumes that people’s personality is never completely determined; people always are changing and always free to reinterpret their experiences in idiosyncratic ways (Ryckman, 1997).

(d) The existential perspective postulates the existence of an innate growth that moves individuals toward realization of their potentialities if environmental conditions are ideal (Ryckman, 1997).
Lastly, the *social behaviorist perspective* assumes that most of our behavior is learned and purposive; we are guided by our motives to attain certain goals (Ryckman, 1997).

**Gordon Allport and H. S. Odbert (1936)** hypothesized that those individual differences that are most salient and socially relevant in people’s lives will eventually become encoded into their language; the more important such a difference, the more likely is it to become expressed as a single word. This statement has become known as the Lexical Hypothesis Allport and Odbert had worked through two of the most comprehensive dictionaries of the English language available at the time, and extracted 18,000 personality-describing words. From this gigantic list they extracted 4500 personality-describing adjectives which they considered to describe observable and relatively permanent traits.

**Raymond Cattell (1946)** used the emerging technology of computers to analyse the Allport-Odbert list. He organized the list into 181 clusters and asked subjects to rate people whom they knew by the adjectives on the list. Using factor analysis Cattell generated twelve factors, and then included four factors which he thought ought to appear. The result was the hypothesis that individuals describe themselves and each other according to sixteen different, independent factors. With these sixteen factors as a basis, Cattell went on to construct the 16PF Personality Questionnaire, which remains in use by universities and businesses for research, personnel selection and the like. Although subsequent research has failed to replicate his results, and it has been shown that he retained too many factors, the current 16PF takes these findings into account and is considered to be a very good test. In 1946 Raymond Cattell used the emerging technology of computers to analyse the Allport-Odbert list. He organized the list into 181 clusters and asked subjects to rate people whom they knew by the adjectives on the list. Using factor analysis Cattell generated twelve factors, and then included four factors which he thought ought to appear.
The result was the hypothesis that individuals describe themselves and each other according to sixteen different, independent factors. With these sixteen factors as a basis, Cattell went on to construct the 16PF Personality Questionnaire, which remains in use by universities and businesses for research, personnel selection and the like. Although subsequent research has failed to replicate his results, and it has been shown that he retained too many factors, the current 16PF takes these findings into account and is considered to be a very good test. In 1963, W.T. Norman (1963), replicated Cattell’s work and suggested that five factors would be sufficient. For the next seventeen years, social psychologists argued that behavior is not stable, but varies with context, so that predicting behavior by personality test was impossible. They further argued that character, or personality, is something humans impose on people in order to maintain an illusion of consistency in the world. Furthermore, Walter Mischel in his 1968 book Psychological Assessment asserted that personality tests could not predict behavior with a correlation of more than 0.3. Around 1980, three developments brought personality research into the modern era: personal computers, statistical aggregation, and the Big Five. Before the advent of personal computers, psychologists wishing to conduct large scale statistical analysis needed to rent access to a mainframe. However, once personal computers become widely available, they could do this work on their desktops. Therefore anybody could easily re-examine the Allport-Odber list. The question remained as to why they would do so, given that it had seemingly already been established that personality was an illusion. It was argued that personality psychologists had considered behavior from the wrong perspective. Instead of trying to predict single instances of behavior, which was unreliable, it was thought that researchers should try to predict patterns of behavior. As a result correlations soared from .3 to .8 and it seemed that “personality” did in fact exist. Social psychologists still argue that we impose consistency on the world, but with statistical aggregation it could be shown that there was in fact more consistency than was once thought.

-----------------------------------------------------------------


Goldberg (1993)\textsuperscript{46} too has observed the robustness of the five-factor model, independently of the results of Cattell. He even thinks that these five broad factors or dimensions can form a framework within which to organise and structure the personality concept.

The five dimensions reflect an individual’s stable and recurrent traits, as opposed to temporary states that are not taken into consideration in the description of an individual personality. Goldberg’s results are supported by another piece of research, which analyses six studies, and shows the robustness of the model unveiled by Tupes and Christal,\textsuperscript{49} with five factors labelled the ‘Big Five’ by Goldberg. The number of dimensions is, however, not confirmed by all researchers.

Despite critiques, the Big Five theory or five-factor model is widely accepted. The five dimensions are often (but not always) labeled OCEAN:

— Dimension O: Openness to new experiences, to imagination and intellectual curiosity. This dimension gathers such elements as the intensity, span and complexity of an individual’s experiences.

— Dimension C: Conscientiousness. This dimension gathers such traits as scrupulousness, orderliness and trustworthiness.

— Dimension E: Extraversion. This dimension gathers such traits as openness to others, sociability, impulsivity and likeability to feel positive emotions.

— Dimension A: Agreeableness. This dimension includes such traits as kindness, modesty, trust and altruism.

— Dimension N: Neuroticism. An individual is said to be neurotic if they are not emotionally stable. This dimension includes such traits as anxiety, instability and nervousness.

Some researchers have shown that each of the five dimensions could be represented by a small number of adjectives that are representative enough of the dimension they load on.

In other words, these adjectives have a high loading on one dimension and a low (or close to 0) loading on other dimensions. These adjectives are named ‘markers’ of the Big Five (Goldberg, Saucier). They have been developed to reduce the length of questionnaires and to avoid respondents’ fatigue. This method enables a psychologist to form a quick evaluation of an individual.

\textsuperscript{46}Goldberg (1993), symposium in Honolulu, reviewed the available personality tests of the day, and decided this Big Five model
2.4 Jennifer Aaker’s brand personality scale

The literature survey on brand personality indicates that the brand personality scale proposed by Jennifer Aaker was used for evaluating the brand personality of a number of brands across categories in various countries. But, this scale was not used for evaluating brand personality of Automobile brands in India. Also, the review highlighted that earlier researches indicated that there is a possibility of link between human personality and brand personality that needs to be investigated. But, none of the researches tried to identify the effect of human personality on brand personality and such a research will immensely help the practitioners in the industry.

The Maruti brand has been the most trusted brand across categories of products for three decades and has been a market challenger for a long time. But, the brand has been losing its market share to other automobile brands. The Maruti brand has been the most recent success in brand building and is among the top ten brands across categories. Also, the literature review reveals that there has been no detailed study undertaken on the brand personalities of these successful automobile brands and the method of building the personality variables into the brand. A study on these automobile brands will help other automobile manufacturers to differentiate their products from competitor brands using brand personality.

Jennifer Aaker developed a framework of brand personality dimensions, which are reliable, valid and generalizable. To identify the brand personality dimensions, a total of 631 subjects rated a subset of 37 brands on 114 personality traits. The results of an exploratory principal components factor analysis suggest that consumers perceive that brands have 5 distinct personality dimensions: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness. The results of a series of factor analyses run on subsets of subjects established the robustness of the brand personality dimensions. In addition, high levels of reliability of the 5 dimensions were established through test – retest correlations and Cronbach’s alphas. Finally, the results of a confirmatory factor analysis relying on 180 subjects, 20 brands in ten product categories and 42 personality traits provided additional support for the stability of the 5 dimensions. In summary, the results of these analyses demonstrate that the framework of brand personality dimensions, as represented by the 42-item Brand personality scale is reliable, valid and generalizable.
Aaker (1997) indicates that her study, as the maiden attempt to develop a measurement scale, is “based on a representative sample of objects, a comprehensive lists of traits and a systematically chosen set of brands across product categories” (p.354). She added that this scale could be used “to compare personalities of brands across product categories thereby enabling researchers to identify benchmark personality brands” (p.354). Conducting a study on the effect of brand personality and brand identification on brand loyalty, Kim et al. (2001) confirmed this hypothesis: the higher the self-expressive value of the brand personality and the higher the distinctiveness of brand personality, the higher consumers will perceive the attractiveness of the brand personality. In other words, there is positive relationship between customer and brand. It also turns out that brand identification has positive effects on word-of-mouth reports, but does not have a significantly direct effect on brand loyalty. Similarly, these investigators also discovered that the attractiveness of brand personality directly affects positive word-of-mouth reports, and indirectly affects brand loyalty.

The following are the meanings of the brand personality items as suggested by Jennifer Aaker(1997)\(^47\).

- **Family Oriented-** The brand is used by family oriented people.
- **Small Town -** People living in villages prefer this brand.
- **Down to Earth -** This brand is used for practical purposes.
- **Sincere -** The brand is fair and just.
- **Honest -** The brand delivers whatever it promises.
- **Real -** The brands promises are based on facts.
- **Original -** The brand is a pioneer.
- **Wholesome -** The brand provides physical and mental satisfaction.
- **Cheerful -** The brands colour and other aspects are bright.
- **Sentimental -** The brand is used for sentimental reasons.
- **Friendly -** The brand provides help like a friend.
- **Trendy -** The brand is fashionable.
- **Daring -** The competitors cannot match the attributes of the brand.
- **Exciting -** The brand arouses the interest of the users.
- **Cool -** The brand gives a cool feeling.
- **Spirited -** The brand is full of life.
Young - The brand helps users to feel young.
Unique - There is no other brand like this brand.
Imaginative - The brand is creative.
Up – to – date - The brand is modern.
Independent - The brands activities are not based on other brands.
Contemporary - The brand incorporates current events.
Reliable - The brand is consistent over the years.
Hard working - The brand works very hard.
Secure - The brand is safe to use.
Intelligent - The brand quickly understands the needs of the consumers.
Technical - The brand is technically advanced.
Corporate - The brand is backed by a reputed company.
Successful - The brand is a successful brand.
Leader - The brand is the market leader.
Confident - The brand gives confidence to users.
Upper class - The brand is preferred by upper class consumers.
Glamorous - The brand improves physical attractiveness of the user.
Good looking - The brand user is a good-looking person.
Charming - The brand is admired by friends and relatives.
Feminine - The brand is preferred by females.
Smooth - The brand usage is smooth.
Outdoorsy - The brand is used not only at home.
Masculine - The brand is preferred by males.
Western - The brand helps user to feel as a westernized person.
Tough - The brand can be used in tough situations.
Rugged - The brand can be used when it is irregular.


2.5 Psychology applied to the brand personality concept

The methodology that led to the five-factor model has been directly borrowed, and sometimes somehow adapted, by some marketing researchers (Caprara et al., Ferrandi and Valette-Florence). Thus if brands, like individuals, can be described with adjectives, the approach used in psychology can be very interesting and relevant to account for a brand personality as perceived by consumers. Indeed, the personality of individuals is perceived through their behaviour, and, in exactly the same way, consumers can attribute a personality to a brand according to its perceived communication and ‘behaviors’. The question is whether the terms that encode personality in language can be applied to brands.
Plummer & Fournier (1994), The existing literature about the relationship between an individual and a brand, about brand attachment or even about the view of a brand as a partner (Aaker et al.), enables one to think that, since brands can be personified, human personality descriptors can be used to describe them. In fact, the adjectives used to describe human personality may not all be relevant to brands. This is where an adaptation is required. Some psychological aspects of humans such as neurotic fatigue, for example, may not be applicable to brands. This need for adaptation has also been suggested by Aaker and Caprara et al.

2.6 Brand personality measurement

Aaker’s work has tried to clarify the concept and build a scale to measure it. To achieve this, she largely followed the psychologists’ steps in their study of human personality. She followed more particularly the studies made by researchers who contributed to the identification of five dimensions subsuming personality (the five-factor model). More specifically, Aaker, and those who replicated or followed her work (Ferrandi et al., Koebel and Ladwein, Aaker et al.), are walking in the steps of the US psychologists, Costa and McCrae, who adopted a lexical approach, and whose personality inventory (NEO-PI-R66, 67) is renowned and has been translated into several languages (see Rolland68 in French, for example). Most recent works on brand personality research are based on Aaker’s global definition of the concept of brand personality as ‘the set of human characteristics associated to a brand’. Aaker explored brand personality on the basis of adjectives (or traits) across brands that cover various product categories. Only three out of those five factors correspond to elements of the five factor model in psychology.

2.7 Analysing the validity of brand personality scales

So far, most of the research on brand personality has focused on external validity: scores of translations have been undertaken by local researchers to assess the ability of the scale to produce its similar five factors in different markets and cultures. It is not because one calls it a ‘brand personality scale’ that it does actually measure personality. This issue refers to a critique of construct or concept validity. As seen above, Aaker defines personality as being ‘the set of human characteristics associated with a brand’.

This definition comes directly from practitioners’ early use of brand personality as a single all-encompassing convenient item in the advertising copy strategy to define all that is not product related. Thus, from the start, although the word ‘personality’ has a very specific meaning in psychology, its use in branding has tended to be rather losing an all-encompassing potpourri. The problem is that all the work subsequent to Aaker’s was based implicitly or explicitly on this definition. Therefore, all these studies share the same flaw in their conceptual basis.

The main problem with the current definition is that it is too wide — it may embrace concepts beyond those of brand personality. Marketing is an applied science that sometimes imports existing concepts from psychology and other areas. The concept of personality has been coined by psychology, and maybe it would be more precise to remain close to the psychological definition of personality. Indeed, by loosely defining ‘brand personality’, it may mean almost everything related to a human being and applied to brands.

Whereas psychologists have worked over the years to exclude intellectual abilities, gender and social class from their personality definitions and scales, adopting Aaker’s loose definition of brand personality may mean that their results are ignored, and the term ‘brand personality’ is used to designate ‘any non-physical attribute associated with a brand’, including intellectual abilities, gender or social class. If Allport dedicated a whole chapter (as in most theoretical handbooks dedicated to the study of personality) to concept definition and to the problems related to it, it is because the step of definition of the concept is tricky and very long. He examined a large number of definitions and rejected them because he found them too vague or incomplete (hence meaningless). He then proposed a definition of his own. Without claiming to solve the debate among psychologists concerning the definition of personality, it is possible to delineate quite precisely what is included in, and what is excluded from, the concept of personality in psychology and would be advisable to do this in marketing for the brand personality concept.
2.8 The core items of the scale

The current scale of so-called ‘brand personality’ encompasses dimensions conceptually distinct from the pure concept of personality. The items in the scale will now be analysed.

The item ‘competence’ Aaker’s (1997) scale holds ‘competence’ as a major factor or trait among the five identified. Competence refers to a know-how (in the case of brands), or to an ability to carry out something properly. The definition of personality in psychology does, however, exclude any item related to abilities or cognitive capacities. Most psychologists exclude intelligence — as a cognitive ability — from their personality tests. Note that the adjectives ‘productive’, ‘well-organised’ and ‘(intellectually)efficient’ are descriptors of personality (McCrae and Costa), but they do not relate to cognitive ability. These items are applicable to brands, but not in the framework of brand personality: they are relevant to fields such as organisation studies, control of organisations or strategy. These items are therefore applicable but not relevant. This point cannot be made if there is no strict prior definition of the brand personality concept as suggested in this paper. The item ‘feminine’ for the item-generation step, Aaker added some items related to gender, social class and age. She bears out her choice by quoting,

Levy (1959), wrote: ‘researchers argue that brand personality includes demographic characteristics such as gender [which may be all the more true in the languages wherein there is a neutral pronoun to talk about inanimate] age, and class’. By following this advice, one can find the personality of the brand itself (source of the product) and the personality of the purported receiver or target, as portrayed in the brand’s advertising. Another problem is that the item ‘feminine’ is a facet of Aaker’s model, although gender is absent from psychology scales of personality. In addition, more often than not, ‘feminine’ is a value judgment. Its meaning is tied to the culture.
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The items related to social class. The authors think that to integrate items related to age and social class is also problematic. Indeed, if Levy talks about age and social class, he never explicitly says that they are relevant to brand personality. He simply explains that those items are part of the imagery associated with typical users of the brand (user imagery). He states that an age and a social status could be imbued to a brand through its typical users. This argument is significant of a conceptual lack of distinction between the personality of the brand (the sender) and the person to whom the brand seems to be speaking, the person who is being addressed (the receiver) (Kapferer). Merging both dimensions introduces confusion and hinders proper brand diagnosis and implementation. These arguments support the authors’ belief that without a strict definition of the concept, and without the methodological stage of evaluation of items, the measurement of brand personality may become a ‘ragbag’. Some other questionable items some authors (Davies et al.) have tried to replicate Aaker’s study in the UK. In their replication, they found that the items ‘Western’, ‘small town’ and ‘feminine’ accounted a lot for the low reliability scores of their study.

2.9 Gap in literature and need for the study

Brand personality literature indicates that the brand personality scale proposed by Aaker in evaluating the brand personality of a number of brands across categories in various countries is valid. But this scale has not been used in Madurai city to study the brand personality of automobiles specifically Maruti swift passenger car. The earlier literature and researches have proved the link between the human personality and brand personality. Hence the research to identify the impact of human personality on the brand personality of Maruti Swift will immensely help the practitioners in the automobile industry. Maruti brand has been a trusted brand with seventeen brands under its umbrella for nearly three decades and is also the market leader with a strong presence across length and breadth of the country. In spite of stiff competition in the segment Maruti Swift had a waiting period and customers were willing to wait and take delivery of the vehicle. This makes this brand more successful and a study on the brand personality will help the marketing managers to refine their strategies in positioning and in differentiating this product Maruti Swift in Madurai city from the competing brands.
For the next few years, the changing zeitgeist made the publication of personality research difficult. Social psychologists argued that behavior is not stable, but varies with context, so that predicting behavior by personality test was impossible. They further argued that character, or personality, is something humans impose on people in order to maintain an illusion of consistency in the world.

Furthermore, Walter Mischel (1968) in his book asserted that personality tests could not predict behavior with a correlation of more than 0.3. Around 1980, three developments brought personality research into the modern era: personal computers, statistical aggregation and the Big Five. Before the advent of personal computers, psychologists wishing to conduct large scale statistical analysis needed to rent access to a mainframe. However, once personal computers become widely available, they could do this work on their desktops. Therefore anybody could easily re-examine the Allport-Odbert list. The question remained as to why they would do so, given that it had seemingly already been established that personality was an illusion.

It was argued that personality psychologists had considered behavior from the wrong perspective. Instead of trying to predict single instances of behavior, which was unreliable, it was thought that researchers should try to predict patterns of behavior. As a result correlations soared from .3 to .8 and it seemed that “personality” did in fact exist. Social psychologists still argue that we impose consistency on the world, but with statistical aggregation it could be shown that there was in fact more consistency than was once thought.

---
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In 1981 in a symposium in Honolulu, four prominent researchers (Lewis Goldberg, Naomi Takamoto-Chock, Andrew Comrey, and John M. Digman) reviewed the available personality tests of the day, and decided that most of the tests which held any promise seemed to measure a subset of five common factors, just as Norman had discovered in 1963. In psychology, the Big Five personality traits is the classification of a person’s personality into the categories of neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. The ‘Big Five’, as they are called, are five broad factors or dimensions of personality traits discovered through empirical research (Goldberg, 1993). The Big Five are a descriptive model of personality, not a theory, although psychologists have developed theories to account for the Big Five. The Big Five personality traits can be summarized as follows:

**Openness to experience** - Appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas; imagination and curiosity (vs conservatism).

**Conscientiousness** - A tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement (spontaneousness vs planned behaviour).

**Extraversion** - Energy, surgency, and the tendency to seek stimulation and the company of others.

**Agreeableness** - A tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others (individualism vs cooperative solutions).

**Neuroticism** - A tendency to easily experience unpleasant emotions such as anger, anxiety, depression, or vulnerability (emotional stability to stimuli).

The items under each of the five dimension of human personality were given as follows: These traits are sometimes referred to as the OCEAN model of personality because of the acronym composed of their initial letters. They are often measured as percentile scores, with the average mark at 50%; so for example, a Conscientiousness rating in the 80th percentile indicates a greater than average sense of responsibility and orderliness, while an Extraversion rating in the 5th percentile indicates an exceptional need for solitude and quiet.

---
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One of the most significant advances of the five factor model was the establishment of a taxonomy that demonstrates order in a previously scattered and disorganized field. For example, as an extremely heterogeneous collection of traits, research had found that "personality" (i.e., any of a large number of hypothesized personality traits) was not predictive of important criteria. However, using the five-factor model as a taxonomy to group the vast numbers of unlike personality traits, psychologists Barrick and Mount used meta-analysis of previous research to show that in fact there were many significant correlations between the personality traits of the five-factor model and job performance in many jobs. Their strongest finding was that psychometric Conscientiousness was predictive of performance in all the job families studied. This makes perfect sense, insofar as it is very difficult to imagine any job where, all other things equal, being high in Conscientiousness is not an advantage.

Ever since the 1990s when the consensus of psychologists gradually came to support the Big Five, there has been a growing body of research surrounding these personality traits. (see for instance, Robert Hogan's edited book "Handbook of Personality Psychology" (Academic Press, 1997)

The existence of each one has been verified by cross-cultural research demonstrating that they exist in individuals outside of Western nations, and all show an influence from both heredity and environment.

Twin studies such as those of Kerry Jang (Journal of Personality, 64, 577-591) suggest that these effects are roughly equal proportion. A person's ratings on the five factors has been found to change with time, with Agreeableness and Conscientiousness increasing, while Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness generally decrease as a person ages. Sexes show differences in Big Five scores across cultures, with women scoring higher in both the Agreeableness and Neuroticism domains. (The mere fact that sex differences have been found does not by itself demonstrate that the sexes are innately different in personality, although that is a possibility). Individuals also differ when viewed by the order of their births.
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Frank J. Sulloway has mounted evidence that birth order is correlated with personality traits: firstborns are statistically more conscientious, more socially dominant, less agreeable, and less open to new ideas compared to laterborns. Note that this effect is very small and confounds family size with birth order. Recent work has also found relationships between Geert Hofstede's cultural factors, Individualism, Power Distance, Masculinity, and Uncertainty Avoidance, with the average Big Five scores in a country. For instance, the degree to which a country values individualism correlates with its average Extraversion, while people living in cultures which are accepting of large inequalities in their power structures tend to score somewhat higher on Conscientiousness. The reasons for these differences are as yet unknown; this is an active area of research.