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.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
CHAPTER III
BRAND PERSONALITY

3.1 Introduction

Branding has its origin from “2250BC in Indus valley through 300 BC in Greece”. Moore and Reid\(^55\) describe that brand plays two important roles. First role of brand is “as conveyer of information (origin and quality) regarding goods and /or services to both consumer and also importantly channel member. In addition brands act as a conveyer of image or meaning (status/power, value and/or personality)”.

Branding in 1960 was defined by American marketing association as “A name, term, sign symbol or design or a combination of them which is intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or a group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors”.

Brand Management has been very crucial for the marketing managers and some of the key brand management words that are used often in literature are Brand architecture, audit, community, culture, equity, essence, extension, genealogy, icon, identity, image, loyalty, personality, positioning, relation, revitalization, strategy, stretch, co-branding, employee branding, living the brand, product brand, service brand and viral branding.

The complex brand management is simplified by Heding et.al\(^56\) as “seven school of thought”. They identify the seven approaches as

“The economic approach: the brand as the part of traditional marketing mix
The identity approach: the brand as linked to corporate identity
The consumer based approach: the brand as linked to consumer association
The personality approach: the brand as human like character
The relational approach: the brand as a viable relationship partner
The community approach: the brand as the pivotal point of social interaction
The cultural approach: the brand as a part of broader cultural fabric

\(^{55}\) Karl Moore and Susan Reid (2008), The birth of brand, 4000 years of branding, Business history, Vol 50 issue 4, p419-432

\(^{56}\) Tilde Heading, Knudtzen, Bjerre (2009), Brand management research, theory and practice, Routledge Newyork, London.
Further Heding et.al overview brand management in three different stages through two paradigms shifts.

They explain that the first paradigm as the “positivistic” explained in the first stage with “company/sender focus”. In this stage they explain the brand as owned by the company and the communication is on similar lines. In the second stage they explain “human/ receiver focus” where the consumer is studied in detail and the human perspective plays a crucial role.

The second paradigm as explained by them is the “constructivist” where culture and community play a crucial role. The third stage is explained by the study of the community approach as the “anthropological research into the so called brand communities”. The cultural approach is the study of branding where “brand is seen as artifact”.

3.2 Brand personality

The term BRAND PERSONALITY was coined by advertisers and market practitioners, well ahead of the academics. P.Marutineau in 1958 used to refer the “non material dimensions” that make a store special. S.King writes that “people choose their brands the same way they choose their friends. In addition to the skills and physical characteristic, they simply like them as people”. Plummer wrote of a soft drink as being sensuous.

The Brand personality frame work in brand management focuses on how and why people choose brand with personalities (Plummer 1985). Also it studies how imbuing brand with personality can be a power tool to create brand equity. The assumptions theories and methods of brand personality is constructed with the study of human psychology, personality research and consumer behavior (Heding 2009). In the study of consumer behavior various researches has focused on how brand personality enables consumers to express “self” through the symbolic use of brand personality (Betman 2005)\textsuperscript{57}.

Brand personality is a “common denominator that can be used across different national cultures as a way to differentiate the brand from other brand in the same product category” (Helgson 2004)\(^{58}\).

Brand personality is constructed on the premise that “need for identity and expression of self is the key driver of the consumption” of a brand (Aaker 2001). So apart from the physical and functional characteristics of a brand, customers consume brands due to the symbolic benefits.

“As a result, the symbolic nature of brands can be understood at the same level as the utilitarian nature of brands, which tends to be captured by models that are generalizable across product categories (e.g. multi attribute model Fishbein and Azen 1975). Therefore like the multi attribute model, which sheds insight into when and why consumers buy brands for utilitarian purposes, across category frame work and scale can provide theoretical insights into when and why consumers buy brand for self expressive purpose”(Aaker1997).

Brand personality is an emotional driver which bonds between the brand and the consumer because it help consumer to “see” themselves in the brand.(Phau 2001). The basic assumption thus in the personality approach is of a reciprocal and human like exchange between the brand and consumer.

![Brand Personality Diagram](image)

Figure 1 – Brand Personality

\(^{58}\) Helgson J.G. and Supphellan M. A conceptual and measurement comparison of self congruity and brand personality: the impact of socially desirable responding, Journal of International Marketing research, volume 46, issue 2, P 205-553.
Brand personality introduces a strong bond between the brand and the consumer, based on the consumer use of the brand personality for the construction of self (Govers 2005). Brand personality starts a process of social identification between brand and the self of the consumer. The nature of brand-consumer exchange is interactive and dyadic (Govers 2005). The symbolic benefits are evaluated by the consumer based on the extent to which they contribute to the construct and expression of identity.

3.3 Crafting - Brand personality

To create a strong brand personality the brand managers have to create a mix of perpetual reality from the consumer perception. The brand managers should reflect the way in which the consumer feel about the brand rather than the expression the company constructs (Kapferer 2008).

The key constructs of brand personality are personality, expression of self and congruence between brand personality and consumer self. Personality has its roots from the cognitive and social psychology. The expression of self is studied in consumer behavior along with the study of psychology and construction of identity. The brand –self congruence is the study of social psychology and focus on social identification process (Heding 2009).

![Diagram of consumer-self - Brand-congruence]
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3.4 Brand Identity, Brand Image and Brand Personality

Kapferer (2008)\textsuperscript{60} defines brand identity as a brand’s meaning as put forward by the firm. It is the way a company wants to present its brand to its target groups. Brand image, on the other hand, is the consumers’ perception and interpretation of the brand’s identity (De Pelsmacker, Geuens, & Van den Bergh, 2007). Academics typically conceptualize brand identity and image as multi-dimensional constructs of which brand personality is an important component. Keller (2008), for example, defines brand image as consisting of (1) user profiles, (2) purchase and usage situations, (3) personality and values, and (4) history, heritage and experiences. Aaker and Joachimsthaler (2000) organize brand identity elements around four perspectives: (1) the brand as a product, (2) the brand as an organization, (3) the brand as a person, and (4) the brand as a symbol.

Building on the constructivist school of theorizing about communications, Kapferer developed a brand identity prism in which he considers a brand as a speech flowing from a sender to a receiver (Kapferer, 2008)\textsuperscript{61} He argues that the brand identity dimensions physique (i.e., physical features and qualities) and personality (i.e., human personality traits) picture the sender. The identity dimensions reflection (i.e., image of the target group) and self-image (i.e., how the brand makes consumers feel) depict the receiver. The dimensions culture (i.e., values) and relationship (i.e., mode of conduct) form a bridge between the sender and the receiver.

Although several brand identity frameworks exist, most researchers share the opinion that brand identity (and brand personality) is best understood from the sender-side and brand image from the receiver-side perspective. It is important to make this distinction between sender and receiver, and each of the composing elements of brand identity, not only theoretically, but also in practical measurement instruments (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). Otherwise, among other things, brand and user personality get mixed up leading to unclear directions to take action in case of a gap between the desired and the perceived personality.

Figure 3 – Kapferer’s Brand Identity Prism

---

Azoulay & Kapferer, The new strategic brand management, 2003, pp. 151
Indeed, user imagery often is not in agreement with brand personality (Keller, 2008)\(^{63}\) Plummer (2000, pp. 82)\(^{64}\), for example, found that consumers perceive the stereotypical user of Oil of Olay as “a pretty, down-to-earth, solid, female citizen”, whereas the brand personality of Oil of Olay is more upscale and aspirational.

In sum, a first reason to focus on personality traits only in a brand personality scale is that brand identity frameworks become useless if no appropriate measurement instruments exist for each of its components. Secondly, results are no longer interpretable and become meaningless if, for example, a measurement instrument mingles sender and receiver characteristics. Further, consumers use brands with a strong brand personality to build relations with (Fournier, 1998)\(^{65}\) and to show their own personality. If a brand personality scale would resemble a human personality scale, it is easier for brand managers to translate consumer research into the most appropriate actions to create the “right” brand personality in view of their target group.

Advertisers and marketing practitioners have been the first ones to coin the term brand personality, well before the academics studied and accepted the concept. As early as 1958, P.Martineau used the word to refer to the non material dimensions that make a store special, its character. People choose their brands the same way they choose their friends in addition to the skills and physical characteristics, they simply like them as people. Plummer speaks of Orangina soft drink as having a sensuous personality. In addition, motivation research made popular the common use of projective techniques to capture these facets: for instance, it has become a classic to make use of metaphors in focus groups, where consumers are asked to speak of their brands as if it was a person, a movie star, an animal, …


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 performance. A typical example of that was the famous Unique Selling Proposition, USP, the term created by Rosser Reeves, the advertising man author of Reality in Advertising (1961) a title which, in and of itself, unveiled the vision of a brand as a product with a plus. In the late eighties, realizing that with growing copies, and the abundance of similar products, it was more and more difficult to differentiate brands on the basis of performance, Ted Bates, the advertising agency of Rosser Reeves introduced an additional concept: the Unique Selling Personality.

As a consequence, in the famous “copy strategy”, the essential single sheet which summarizes the advertising strategy as related to copy, it became widespread to see a new item to be filled by account executives: brand personality (as substitute to the former item: tone of advertising). In fact, this meant that tone (an executional constant) would not have to be invented but derived from the type of brand one wanted to create, to build and to reinforce.

Starting in the seventies, whatever the client or its advertising agency, all copy strategies did entail a provision for describing brand personality, after having stated the target, the brand promise and the reason why. From this it can be seen that the use of “brand personality” originated as non product based definition of the brand: it captured all that was not bound to the product use, performance, benefits, attributes etc… Interestingly, it was not either a description of the target itself, like when one describes a brand by the lifestyle of its target. In copy strategies brand personality was used as a common practical but rather loose word for assessing non product based, non functional dimensions of the brand: it captured the singularity of the source of the product as if it were a person.

Later, on the researcher side, the brand identity frameworks, always quoted brand personality as a dimension or a facet of brand identity, namely those traits of human personality that can be attributed to the brand. Among other dimensions are the brand inner values (its cultural facet), the brand relationship facet (its style of behavior, of conduct), the brand reflected consumer facet, the brand physical facet (its material distinguishing traits).
At odds with this general conceptualization of personality as one part of brand identity, namely referring to the traits of human personality attributed to the brand, J. Aaker in the process of building a scale for measurement purposes defines brand personality not as a part but as the whole: "the set of human characteristics associated to a brand". However, inner values, physical traits, pictures of the typical user are also "human characteristics" that can be associated to a brand. Hence the risk (if one follows this too global definition) of muddling conceptually and empirically distinct brand identity facets within a single scale of so called “brand personality”.

Lindstrom and Anderson (2000) state that there are “different parameters, which all together create the total consumer perception of the product”.

Lindstrom constructed the brand pyramid which is analogous with Maslow hierarchical pyramid. Here Lindstrom puts brand platform as the basic for the foundation of building brands which is the physical features of the brand. The brand back up is the safety needs, and the achievement of the brand is the customer belonging. The personality in the pyramid depicts the need for the identification self
in the view of the society. The brand role is what is to be achieved or desired to be achieved where the brand identity meets the brand image.

Aaker (1996) defines that the core of brand identity as “the central timeless essence of a brand”. This definition implies that the most important and unique characteristics of the brand are represented by core of the brand identity.

Upshaw (1995) states that brand identity comprises two core components: the positioning and personality of the brand.

![Brand Personality Diagram](image)

3.5 Dimension measuring brand personality

According to Melin brand personality building is based on the idea that consumer choose brands in a similar way as they close fellow human being to socialize.

Further Melin (1997) states, that strong brand loyalty is built by an attractive brand personality, connected to a story and continuous relation between brand and consumer. Mcenally and Chernatory (1999) state “as personality of brand and consumer come together, the value created is in the self expression of the consumer”.

Kim et all (2001) State “the greater the self expressive value & distinctiveness of brand personality are, the greater will be the attraction of the brand personality”.

54
Further they explain that consumers have a tendency to identify themselves as specific groups, called the social identification. The study by Kim et al also proved that the consumers are strongly attracted to brands which have distinct self expressive brand personality.

Aaker developed the BRAND PERSONALITY with 5 key dimensions of the personality of brand.

![Brand Personality Diagram]

Figure 6 Brand personality dimensions.

According to Aaker (1997) there are two types of brand personality scales, the ad hoc scales and the theoretical scales based on human personality traits. Ad hoc scales are those which are derived directly from psychology and had validation problem in the market. Hence Aaker developed a theoretical framework on the basis of the big five human personality structure.

Aaker framework of brand personality are reliable valid and generalizable. Aaker developed this framework with an exploratory principal component factor analysis and found that consumer perceive that the brands on five clear personality dimensions. The test was conducted on 37 brands with 114 personality traits. The reliability of these five dimensions was established though test-retest correlation & Cranach’s alpha. The confirmatory factor analysis provided 42 brand personality scales which are reliable, Valid & generalizable.
The definition of brand personality items as defined by Jennifer Aaker.

### Dimension Sincerity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand personality item</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family oriented</td>
<td>The brand used by family oriented people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>The brand preferred by people living in villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down to earth</td>
<td>The brand used for practical purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>The brand which is fair and just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>The brand delivers whatever it promises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td>The brand promises are based on facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>The brand is a pioneer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesome</td>
<td>The brand provides physical and mental satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td>The brand color and other aspects are bright.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental</td>
<td>The brand is used for sentimental reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>The brand provides help like a friend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dimension Excitement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand personality item</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trendy</td>
<td>The brand is fashionable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>The competitors cannot match the attributes of the brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>The brand arouses the interest of the users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>The brand gives a cool feeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirited</td>
<td>The brand is full of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>The brand helps users to feel young.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>There is no other brand like this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>The brand is creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP-to-date</td>
<td>The brand is modern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>The brands activates are not based on other brands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>The brand incorporates current events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand personality item</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>The brand is consistent over the years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard working</td>
<td>The brand works very hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>The brand is safe to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>The brand quickly understands the needs of the consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>The brand is technically advanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>The brand is backed by a reputed company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>The brand is a successful brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>The brand is the market leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>The brand gives confidence to users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand personality item</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>The brand is preferred by upper class consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorous</td>
<td>The brand improves physical attractiveness of the user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good looking</td>
<td>The brand user is a good-looking person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>The brand is admired by friends and relatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>The brand is preferred by females.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth</td>
<td>The brand usage is smooth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand personality item</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoorsy</td>
<td>The brand is used not only at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>The brand is preferred by males.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>The brand helps user to feel as a westernized person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>The brand can be used in tough situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugged</td>
<td>The brand can be used when it is irregular.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Personality

Personality is a study of human psychology. “Personality could be defined only in terms of reactions, of an individual towards other people in recurrent interpersonal situation in life” (Sullivan). The personality construct in psychology is more towards the segmenting and grouping human’s according to their personality. From the lexical approach of grouping adjectives the personality study (Alport) has grouped and characterized humans on five broad categories. The big five framework helps in identifying human personality traits on identifying the consumer’s personality as extrovert, conscientious, agreeable, neurotic and openness to experience. This personality helps in identifying as how an consumer will react to a particular situation or in general. Also these personality traits help in studying how people interact with others.(Azen).

3.7 Consumer self

The consumer defines the product he/she possess. This definition of consumer is a major factor in the understanding of the consumer self. By studying the pattern of consumer consumption we can identify their needs and drive which makes them to buy and consume (Belk 1988).

“The sum total of all he can call his, not only his body and his psychic power, but his clothes and his house, his wife and children his ancestors and friend, his reputation, his works, his land and yatch and bank account” (Belk 1988). According to Belk modern conceptions of self, material possessions are thought to be an extension of our identity and called “extended self”. Consumers hence tend to neglect old possession and seek new possession, when the old does not fit consumer “self or extended self”.

“It seems an inescapable fact of modern life that we learn, define, and remind ourselves of who we are by our possession. Our accumulation of possession provides a sense of past and tells us who we are, where we have come from and perhaps where we are going” (Belk 1988).
The self is referred to as self on different levels. According to Heding (2009) there are two significant level of self, one at the individual level and the other at social level. In the brand management literature it is referred to as independent (individual) level and interdependent (social) level. The independent level consist of the actual self, desired self and ideal self. The actual self refers to the objective representation of the self. The desired self is what the consumers want to be. The ideal self is the consumer perception of their own ideal self.

According to Heding (2009) “brand contribute to the construct of self in various ways”. They can help the consumer to connect to past or to achieve the desired self or ideal self or the actual self. Hence the self “expressive value and the distinctiveness of the brand personality have a significant effect on how the brand personality is perceived by the consumer”.

Ahuvia (2005) states that “loved objects serve as indexical mementos of key events or relationship in the life narrative, help resolve identity conflicts and tend to be highly embedded in a rich symbolic network of associations”. Consumers use brand to explain their personal stories about his identity, positioning them in relation to culture society and other people.
3.8 Consumer –self – brand congruence

As consumers attribute a brand personality to a brand they start a process of identifying brand that is congruent with their own self images (Helgeson 2004). This process is called brand self congruence. In this process the consumer behavior is determined by the comparison of individual self (actual, ideal, or desired) or interdependent self (social-out group or in group) with the personality of the brand. Hence the consumer can relate the brand personality with his / her individual self or the interdependent self which forms the consumer self – brand congruence.

Heding(2009) explains that the social identification is used to measure how the brand personality matches the consumer self image. Consumers take the cue that the brand evokes either as “prestige and luxury” that activates a sensation of “high status”. The “self congruence using brand personality is a two way process” or “cyclical process”. While selecting a brand, consumer select brand based on the consumer self brand congruence. The brand has to be projected such that the brand personality appeals to the right consumer i.e. match of self - brand personality is to be ensured. If there is mismatch it weakens the brand personality.

3.9 Human Personality Scales

Psychologists define the substance of personality as ‘the systematic description of traits’ (McCrae & Costa, 1987, pp. 81), where traits are ‘relatively enduring styles of thinking, feeling, and acting’ (McCrae & Costa, 1997, pp. 509). After decades of research on a taxonomy of human personality, consensus now rests upon five dimensions that provide a complete description of personality: (1) Extraversion or Surgency (talkative, assertive, energetic), (2) Agreeableness (good-natured, cooperative, trustful), (3) Conscientiousness (orderly, responsible, dependable), (4) Emotional Stability versus Neuroticism (calm, not neurotic, easily upset), and (5) Openness or Intellect (intellectual, imaginative, independent-minded) (John & Srivastava, 1999).
The Big Five theory or Five factor model is labeled O.C.E.A.N.

O : Openness to experience : New experience to imagination & intellectual curiosity
C : Conscientiousness : Self discipline, orderly, trust worthy
E : Extroversion : Openness to other, Sociability, impulsivity, likability to positive emotion
A : Agreeableness : Cooperative, trust, altruist, modest
N : Neuroticism : Not emotionally stable, anger, anxiety

The five dimension of human personality consist the following personality items

**Openness to experience**
- Conventional: Tend to use tried & tested methods
- Inventive: Like to think to do new way of things
- Practical: Practical minded sort of person.
- Curious: Not with Practical ideas.

**Conscientious**
- Organized: Like things to be neat & tidy
- Disorganized: Untidiness
- Orderly: Daily routine
- Disorderly: Takes each day as it comes

**Extraversion**
- Sociable: Likes talking to people at social gathering.
- Silent: More of listening than talking
- Energetic: Playing competitive noisy games
- With drawn: Sitting at home & relaxing

**Agreeableness**
- Competitive: Competitive person.
- Forgiving: To avoid confrontations
- Stubborn: Do not back down in an argument.
- Sympathetic: Listening to other’s problem
Neuroticism

- Calm: To shrug off rudeness
- Tense: Keeps praying on wrong
- Self confident: Keeps going through happenings
- Fearful: To be cautious

The “Big Five” dimensions are a result of analyses of the natural language terms humans use to describe themselves and others (Goldberg, 1993). Although the development of the Big Five was not theory-driven, most important personality constructs as put forward by personality theorists as diverse as Jung, Leary, Guilford, and Eysenk, are integrated in the Big Five structure, which increased trust in the Big Five (Sanz, Gil, Garcia-Vera, & Barrasa, 2008).

The idea to start from all personality terms that can be found in a dictionary stems from the assumption that natural language contains all relevant and salient personality traits (Allport, 1937). Starting from different sets of several hundred personality characteristics, a number of researchers found evidence of five recurrent factors (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1992; Norman, 1967; etc). Although the individual items do not always load on the same factor and the factors are not always identically labeled (Neuroticism/Emotional Stability has appeared as Emotionality and Affect. Openness/Intellect emerged as Imagination, Culture, Rebelliousness, and Unconventionality, and researchers have suggested relabelling. Conscientiousness into Responsibility), the general contours of the Big Five appeared in most (cross-national) studies. The evidence is least convincing for the Openness factor, though (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Initial scales contained as much as 240 (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and 100 (Goldberg, 1992) items. The trend away from overly long scales (Burisch, 1997) and the demand for efficient yet psychometrically sound measures resulted first in a 40-item version (Saucier, 1994), and recently in a 10- (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003; Rammstedt & John, 2007) and 5-item scale (Woods & Hampson, 2005). These ultra-short scales prove to be a reasonable alternative to longer scales, balancing the demands of brevity versus reliability and validity.

With respect to products and brands, humans seem to feel a need to anthropomorphize objects to enhance interactions with the nonmaterial world (Brown, 1991). Consumers also appear to experience no problems in assigning human
characteristics to brands (Aaker, 1997) or to build a relationship with brands (Fournier, 1998). Therefore, it is possible that the Big Five structure also extends to brand personality. In the next section, we review how researchers operationalize personality in current brand personality scales and which factor structures emerged in the past.

3.10 Brand Personality Scales

Aaker (1997, pp. 347) defined brand personality as “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand”. So, in contrast to psychologists, Aaker defines personality in terms of characteristics instead of traits. To construct a brand personality scale, Aaker (1997) started from Big Five items, but completed them with, amongst other, socio-demographic characteristics. Consequently, whereas Big Five researchers deliberately exclude gender and social class (McCrae & Costa, 1997), Aaker does include feminine, upper class, young, etc. Other researchers adopted Aaker’s definition. They admitted that not all of their items are real personality traits, and came up with items such as good-looking, healthy, old, new, heavy, and big (Sung & Tinkham, 2005), or cost-effective and financially stable (Venable, Rose, Bush, & Gilbert, 2005).

By relaxing the definition of brand personality, Aaker’s scale mixes up sender and receiver aspects, and embraces a mix of the different identity concepts. For example, ‘the brand as a person’ from Aaker and Joachimsthaler’s model (2000) is mixed up with ‘the brand as a product’ and the ‘brand as a symbol’. Also with respect to Keller’s framework (Keller, 2008), ‘brand personality’ merges with ‘user profiles’. Considering Kapferer’s identity prism (Kapferer, 2008), Aaker’s scale also pertains to inner values (Culture), physical traits (Physique), and typical user characteristics (Reflection) (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

Aaker (1997) obtained a five-factor structure of which three dimensions relate to Big Five dimensions. Sincerity taps into traits of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Excitement includes items like sociability, energy and activity, just as Extraversion does. Competence captures traits found in Conscientiousness and Extraversion. The other two dimensions, Sophistication and Ruggedness, do not relate to any of the Big Five dimensions.
3.11 The human personality concept in applied psychology

Without going back to the Latin or theological roots of the word "personality" – the meanings of which are then manifold – we observe that the first psychologist who constructed a personality theory was Sigmund Freud. Most important is that Freud and his disciples considered personality to be something dynamic, cumulative, but, above all, they viewed it as being durable and relatively stable over time. Sullivan’s researches have the same lines, especially concerning the definition of personality. Indeed, Sullivan thought that

“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 behaviour and also to describe entities or 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 a way to the trait theory. German studies remain the basics of the field.

The first exhaustive and published list of terms related to personality and present in the English dictionary was done by Allport & Odbert in 1936 (they listed 18,000 terms). Most studies – often replicated – since Cattel until today, have been astonishingly converging toward the conclusion that human personality could be "summarized" by a small number of factors (from 2 to 16). A large number of studies have reached the quite consensual number of five.

The reduction of the number of items has been done on the basis a relevancy criterion: the terms that are taken out are those which are judged obscure, ambiguous, slangy, those that are judgmental or that introduce a gender distinction. The factors are the result of factor analysis, most of the time with a varimax rotation. As Digman explains it in his literature review,

Goldberg too has observed the robustness if the Five Factor Model (FFM), on the basis of his own works, independently of Cattel's results. He even thinks that this five broad factors or dimensions can form a framework that permits to organize and structure the personality concept as it has been studied by researchers such as Cattel, Norman, Eysenck, Guilford, and Wiggins. The 5 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 is all the more confident with his results since another research, which analyzes 6studies, shows the robustness of the model unveiled by Tupes & Christal49, with 5 factors labeled Big Five by Goldberg. However, the number of dimensions is not confirmed by all researchers. Some of them indeed note that the parsimonious configuration of the Big Five Model has weaknesses.

3.12 Psychology applied to the brand personality dimensions.

The methodology that led to the Five Factors Model has been directly borrowed, and sometimes somehow adapted, by some marketing researchers (Caprara, Barbaranelli & Guido, Ferrandi & Valette-Florence). Thus, if we consider that brands, just as 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, we perceive an individual's personality through his/her behavior, 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 our language can be applied to brands. The existing literature about the relationship between an individual and a brand (Plummer; Fournier), about brand attachment or even about the view of a brand as a partner (Aaker & Fournier), enables us to think that, brands being personified, human personality descriptors can be used to describe them. But maybe not all of them, brands being attributed only some of the human characteristics. In fact, the adjectives used to describe human personality may not be all relevant to brands. This is where an adaptation is required.

Some psychological aspects of human beings such as neurotic fatigue for example, may not be applicable to brands. This need for adaptation has also been suggested by Aaker and Caprara, Barbaranelli & Guido.

3.13 Brand personality measurement.

J. Aaker's work has tried to clarify the concept and to build a scale to measure it. To achieve that, she followed most of the time the psychologists’ steps in their study of human personality. She followed more particularly the studies made by
researchers who contributed to unveil the existence of 5 dimensions subsuming personality (Five Factor Model). More specifically, J. Aaker (1997) and those who replicated or followed her work (Ferrandi, Fine- Falcy & Valette-Florence; Koebel & Ladwein; Aaker, Benet-Martinez & Garolera), are walking in the steps of the American psychologists Costa and McCrae who have adopted a lexical approach, and whose personality inventory (NEO-PI-R66,67) is renown, famous and translated in several languages (Rolland68 for French for example).

All those works in marketing are based on J. Aaker’s global definition of the concept: brand personality is “the set of human characteristics associated to a brand” (Aaker). J. Aaker explored the brand personality on the basis of 114 adjectives (or traits) across 37 brands that cover various product categories. She reached a 5 factor solution presented in table 1 presented below. Only three out of those five factors correspond to some factors of the FFM in psychology.

Brand differentiation is now becoming an important tactic for combating competition in the 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. Jennifer Aaker developed a specialized brand personality scale, the five dimensions of the scale being sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness.

In reference to the paradox of personality in marketing, we all have a personality, but we do not know how it is systematically related to our consumer behaviour (Albanese, 1989). However, some have argued that the symbolic use of brands is possible because consumers often imbue brands with human personality traits (termed animism; e.g., Gilmore 1919 as cited in Aaker, 1997). Consumers readily can think about brands as if they were celebrities or famous historical figures (Rook, 1985) and as they relate to one’s own self (Fournier, 1994); this all may be due in part, to the strategies used by advertisers to imbue a brand with personality traits such as anthropomorphisation (e.g., California Raisins), personification (e.g., Jolly Green Giant), and the creation of user imagery (e.g., Charlie girl). Through such techniques, the personality traits associated with a brand, such as those associated with an individual, tend to be relatively enduring and distinct. For example, the personality traits associated with Coca Cola are cool, all American, and real; these traits have been relatively enduring (Pendergrast, 1993) and differentiate Coke from
its competitors (e.g., Pepsi being young, exciting, and hip; Dr Pepper being nonconforming, unique, and fun (Plummer, 1985).

3.14 Antecedents of Brand Personality

Previous research has suggested that a consistency of relationship exist between human characteristics and brands. Consequently, some researchers have postulated some antecedents of brand personality. Levy (1959) identified that brand personality includes demographic characteristics such as gender, age, class, etc. Epstein (1977) indicated that human and brand personality traits share a similar conceptualization. Park (1986) indicated that perceptions of human personality traits are inferred on the basis of an individual’s behaviors, physical characteristics, attitudes and beliefs. Plummer (1985) identified that perception of brand personality traits can be formed and by any direct or indirect contact that consumers have with the brand. McCracken (1989) highlighted that personality traits come to be associated with a brand in a direct way by the people associated with the brand (company employees, CEOs and the brand’s product endorsers etc). Batra et al (1993) identified that personality traits come to be associated with a brand in an indirect way through product-related attributes, product category associations, brand name, symbol or logo, advertising style, price and distribution channel.

The problem stems from the sources that generated the items. As mentioned before, early practitioners took the concept of brand personality to have a global, extended meaning. In this way, the concept covers a variety of separate constructs: the personality itself, but also the values, the reflection of the typical or stereotypical buyer, and so on — all different facets of brand identity. As a consequence, many items of the so-called brand personality scale are in fact measuring classical dimensions of product performance. Recent empirical research by Romaniuk and Ehrenberg demonstrates this point: the authors analyzed the average trait attributions of Aaker’s scale across 12 markets and 118 brands. The brands most associated with the so-called brand personality item ‘energetic’ are energizer drinks; the item ‘sensual’ is most associated with ice cream brands; and ‘up to date’ is attributed most to computers and electronic equipment. In this paper, we argue that one needs to a stricter definition of brand personality, to avoid the present state of conceptual confusion in branding research and to allow brand personality to be a rich and most
helpful concept to understand and manage brands. One should recall that Personality and other concepts used in marketing (such as self, or values) derive from psychology, and should therefore be defined and strictly described in relation to their definition in psychology, although some adaptations seem necessary (Caprara, Barbaranelli & Guido).

To better understand what brand personality is, we first briefly review the roots and history of brand personality. We then look at the existing definition and measurements of brand personality and of personality in psychology, for comparison purposes. Finally, we demonstrate that the existing definition and measurement methodology have led to the construction of scales that do not really measure brand personality but other un-related concepts.

The second type of brand personality scales are those that are more theoretical in nature, but are based on human personality scales that have not been validated in the context of brands (e.g. Bellenger et al., 1976; Dolich, 1969 as cited in Aaker, 1997). Some dimensions (or factors) of human personality may be mirrored in brands whilst others might not. As a result, the validity of such brand personality scales often is questionable, leading researchers to argue that “if unequivocal results are to emerge (in the literature on the symbolic used of brands) consumer behavior researchers must develop their own definitions and design their own instruments to measure the personality variables that go into the purchase decision” (italics in original, Kassarjian 1971, pp. 415 as cited in Aaker, 1997).

It was against this setting that Aaker (1997) developed a brand personality by isolating these distinct dimensions, further treating brand personality as a ‘unidimensional construct’ and demonstrating how different types of brand personalities can be distinguished. This has resulted in the perception that there are multiple ways in which the brand personality construct can influence a consumer’s preference, and has provided investigators tools so that these may be better understood. The following figure highlights Jennifer Aaker’s brand personality scale

3.15 Measuring Brand Personality

To examine how the relationship between brand and human personality may drive preference, Aaker (1997) indicates that two types of brand personality scales can be used. The first types are ad hoc scales, which typically are composed of a set
of traits ranging from 20 to 300 in number. However, though useful, these scales tend
not to be theoretical in nature-often having been developed for the purposes of a
specific research study. As a result, key traits may be missing from such scales.
Furthermore, the traits that are selected often are chosen arbitrarily, which casts doubt
upon the scales’ reliability and validity. The second type of brand personality scales
are those that are more theoretical in nature, but are based on human personality
scales that have not been validated in the context of brands (e.g. Bellenger et al.,
1976; Dolich, 1969 as cited in Aaker, 1997). Some dimensions (or factors) of human
personality may be mirrored in brands whilst others might not. As a result, the validity
of such brand personality scales often is questionable, leading researchers to argue
that “if unequivocal results are to emerge (in the literature on the symbolic used of
brands) consumer behavior researchers must develop their own definitions and design
their own instruments to measure the personality variables that go into the purchase
decision” (italics in original, Kassarjian 1971, pp. 415 as cited in Aaker, 1997).

It was against this setting that Aaker (1997) developed a brand personality by
isolating these distinct dimensions, further treating brand personality as a
‘unidimensional construct’ and demonstrating how different types of brand
personalities can be distinguished. This has resulted in the perception that there are
multiple ways in which the brand personality construct can influence a consumer’s
preference, and has provided investigators tools so that these may be better
understood.

3.16 Critics on Brand personality scales

Aaker’s (1997) stated objective was to “develop a theoretical framework of
brand personality dimensions and a reliable, valid and generalizable scale that
measures these dimensions”. After completing her research, she concluded that all of
these objectives regarding her brand personality frame work, including the
demonstration of generalizability had been attained.

Austin (2003) from his research findings states that it is not entirely clear in
Aaker’s article from what and what the brand personality framework is generalizable.
Although the dire need to embrace any scale that puports to measure brand
personality encouraged academicians and practitioners to accept Aaker’s scale. Austin
in findings from a series of confirmatory factor analysis using a sample of students
that suggest the framework does not generalize to individual brands in a broadly defined product category (restaurants) included in Aaker’s research, nor does it generalize to the analysis of brands aggregated within this product category.

Yuksel (2006) studying on brand personality and its application on Tourism industry states that the penta factorial structure hypothesized by Aaker cannot be fully replicated, in Tourism industry. Instead, the five dimensional brand personality scale needs adaptation when applied to tourismdestinations.

Caprara’s (2001) showed that the five factor structure is not replicated when describing brands. At a higher level of abstraction in the hierarchical organisation of personality characteristics, results supported a two trait solution. He also found that descriptors of human personality convey different meanings when attributed to differnet brands.

Diamantopoulos (2004) states that in cultural contexts the structure of personality attributes associated with commercial brands differ across different cultural contexts.

Such limitations however do not invalidate the use of the psycholexcial approach as a vital tool for studying brand persoanlity and detecting the best adjectives marketers can use to shape their desirable brand personality. This approach allow us to distinguish among the main distinctive “traits” of specific brands and to select words and messages which may most effectively convey and reinforce the competitive characteristics of brands (Capara,2001).

Although some studies on the application and validation of Aaker’s brand personality scale reveal the emergence of culturally specific dimensions the brand personality scale remains the most stable, reliable and comprehensive measure to gauge brand or product personality. The brand personality scale is the most comprehensive instrument for measuring brand or brand personality scale (Ekini 2006).