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*Brand managers are increasingly using brand personality to differentiate and uniquely position their brand without really knowing its effects. This study begins to addresses this gap by examining the effects of brand personality on brand-aroused feelings across the product categories of sport shoes, mobile phones and surf wear. Using SEM to analyse the data from 324 usable surveys, the findings indicate that consumers perceive brand personality and brand-aroused feelings as two separate constructs and that brand personality has a substantial effect on brand-aroused feelings. On the basis of the findings, this study recommends that brand managers consider positioning their brand as original, imaginative, considerate and kind if they want to arouse positive brand feelings.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, there has been increasing interest in brand personality from academics and practitioners (e.g., Aaker 1997; Caprara, Barbaranelli & Gianluigi 2001; Freling & Forbes 2005a; Romaniuk 2008; Sweeney & Brandon, 2006), and the intensity of this interest demonstrates the need to advance its development and investigate its effects. Managers perceive brand personality as a way to develop a sustainable uniqueness in a marketplace proliferated by brands where it is becoming increasingly difficult to come up with branded products that are truly different in the eyes of consumers (Aaker 2003; Sweeney & Brandon 2006). A lack of perceivable differentiation may be contributing to the reason why an estimated 75% to 85% of new brands will fail (Boyle 2003; Kohli & Thakor 1997) or why brands are being commoditized and losing money (Barron 2003). Increasingly, brand personality is used by brand managers as a strategic tool to provide a unique, consistent, and enduring message to consumers (Matthiesen & Phau 2005) and/or as a positioning tool to differentiate brands (Sweeney & Brandon 2006; Rekom, Jacobs & Verlegh 2006), or as a symbolic device to sustain a competitive advantage (Aaker 1997); however, the consequences of brand personality haven’t been empirically determined or tested so while much money is going into the development of brand personality its effects aren’t generally known (Freling & Forbes 2005a).
Along with brand personality being important to brand managers to endure competition and reduce competitor erosion, increasingly so is developing an emotional brand (Aggarwal 2004; Algesheimer, Dholakia and Herrman 2005; Lynch 2004; Thompson, Rindfleisch & Arsel 2006). Called emotional because consumers may form an intimate bond with a brand, a bond that is passionate, similar to the emotional bond a consumer experiences with a close circle of friends and/or family (Aggarwal 2004) and this emotional bond is believed to be based on positive-aroused feelings. Gradually more being realized, the importance of brand personality and developing positive brand-aroused feelings as research in these areas enable brand managers to better develop positioning strategies, integrated marketing communications and build sustainable competitive advantages in the marketplace.

Each in their own right, brand personality and brand-aroused feelings has had limited investigation, and the effect of one on the other hasn’t been examined. Based on evidence from the psychology literature (e.g., Meyer & Shack 1989; Yik, Russell & Suzuki 2003; Watson & Clark 1992), it is likely that brand personality may have an effect on brand-aroused feelings. Brand-aroused feelings refer to a range of specific conscious affective assessments a consumer experiences when encountering a brand, such as feelings of happiness or sadness (Frijda 1991; Scherer 1996). An alternate view, the Interpersonal Circumplex model, incorporates and examines personality and feelings as if they cannot be separated (Sweeney & Brandon 2006). An issue with this viewpoint is that in the branding context, consumers may assess a brand as having a personality, but it is unlikely that consumers may assess whether a brand is happy or sad. Whilst there is general agreement that brands may be perceived to have personalities (Aaker 1997; Romaniuk 2008; Sweeney & Brandon 2006) and consumers experience feelings in response to brands (Escalas, Moore & Britton 2004), there is no evidence to suggest that consumers assess brands to have feelings. Rather, it is likely that brand personality and brand-aroused feelings are related, yet conceptually different constructs. The purpose of this paper is to examine the impact of brand personality on brand-aroused feelings, (1) to determine if they are unique constructs and (2) to determine if brand personality impacts on brand-aroused feelings.
To examine the impact of brand personality on brand-aroused feelings this paper will first address the constructs of brand personality and brand-aroused feelings, followed by the research design, which covers the method, measures and sample design before presenting the results. Following the results will be the discussion, conclusion and implications section, which places the findings in the context of the theory and discusses the implications of the findings for both theory and practice.

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

Brand Personality

Brand personality is a construct that has had considerable attention in the branding literature since Aaker’s seminal paper on brand personality (1997), which claimed that brands may be perceived as having human personalities (e.g., Chang & Chieng 2006; Freling & Forbes 2005b; Rekom et al. 2006). This notion of brands having a personality is based on symbolism and animism theory (Aaker 1997; Fournier 1998; Freling & Forbes 2005b), which suggests that like people, brands may be perceived as having consistent behaviour over time and from this behaviour a personality may be imbued (Aaker 1997; Fournier 1998; Freling and Forbes 2005a; Wee 2004). Brand personality is in the eye of the beholder, and consumers may perceive a brand as a “living entity” with a personality; and this may be based on how a brand is perceived to treat its customers, deliver its marketing communications, package its products, and is committed to being socially responsible (Aaker 1997; Batra, Lehmann & Singh 1993; Venable, Rose, Bush & Gilbert 2005). Brand personality may be inferred from the behaviour of the CEO, employees or customers of a brand, and advertising and other marketplace behaviour (Aaker 1997; Batra & Homer 2004; Biel, 1993; Diamantopoloulos, Smith & Grime 2005; Plummer 1984).

Up till now most of the literature has concentrated on exploring the construct of brand personality (e.g. Aaker 1997; Batra et al. 1993; Caprara et al. 2001; Sweeney & Brandon 2006; Romaniuk 2008), or associating brand personality with the symbolic benefits of a brand (e.g. Aaker 1997; Chang & Chieng 2006; Freling & Forbes 2005b; Plummer 1984; Rekom et al. 2006) or with brand social responsibility (Venable et al, 2005) or determining the difference between fit and personality (Helgeson &
Supphellen 2004; Lau & Phau 2007). Other studies have investigated the antecedents of brand personality (Diamantopoloulos et al. 2005; Johar, Sengupta, & Aaker 2005) or the impact that advertising plays on the development of the symbolic aspects of the brand, including brand personality (Rajagopal 2006) or the impact of facial image and cosmetic usage on brand personality in the cosmetic market (Gutherie 2008). So far the only study that investigates, in part, the emotional impacts of some brand personality traits is Matzler, Bidmon and Graber-Krauter (2006), which found that the brand personality traits of extraversion and openness have an effect on happiness and pleasure that consumers feel toward the brand. This study suggested that future research should concentrate on investigating the impact of all five broad brand personality traits (i.e. openness, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and neuroticism/unstablleness). As mentioned previously feelings aroused by a brand may be positive or negative so it would be of value to investigate the impact that brand personality has on both positive and negative feelings.

Brand Aroused Feelings

Along with brand personality, brand aroused feelings have been receiving growing attention in the domain of marketing (Batra & Homer 2004; Escalas et al. 2004; Gobe 2001; Pham, Cohen, Princejus, Hughes, Mick & Baumgartner 2001; O’Cass & Frost 2002). Crucially, to highlight the importance of brand-aroused feelings, Travis (2000) argues that products are different from brands, because, unlike products, a brand arouses feelings. Travis (2000) argues that how a brand makes a consumer feel is a crucial question, one that brand managers need to understand. Reviewing the literature on brand-aroused feelings much of the research has come from the work of Escalas et al. (2004) and O’Cass and colleagues (e.g. O’Cass & Lim 2001; O’Cass & Frost 2002; O’Cass & Grace 2003), and there seems to be some agreement that the feelings aroused may be characterized as positive, warm or negative (Escalas et al. 2004; O’Cass & Lim 2001). Findings indicate that in response to a brand encounter, a consumer may experience specifically aroused feelings such as delight, happiness, or inspiration, which are generally associated with positive aroused feelings. Alternatively, in response to a brand, warm feelings may be experienced, such as feeling moved, sentimental or warm-hearted. In other cases, a consumer may have negative feelings aroused, such as being offended, disgusted or sad. For
example, in response to an encounter with a brand (e.g. Coca-Cola), the mention of a brand name (e.g. Coca-Cola) or seeing its brand identifiers, such as its symbol, or listening to its jingle, Batra and Homer (2004) found that a consumer might experience positive affective assessments such as happiness and/or pleasure.

Like personality, the notion of aroused feelings has its origins in the psychology literature and a number of academics, for instance, Allik and Realo (1997), Eysenck (1967), Meyer and Shack (1989), Yik et al. (2003) and Watson and Clark (1992) have clearly delineated personality and feelings as distinct constructs, finding that one of the consequences of personality is its effect on aroused feelings. Overall, this body of work indicates that around 40% (or more) of the variance in feelings is accounted for by an individual’s personality. In fact, Meyer and Shack (1989) and Watson and Clark, (1992) argue that the construct of personality should encompass all of the five factors (openness, contentiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism), which contribute to personality, to ensure that the effect of personality on feelings is accurately accounted for – as encompassing some of the five factors is likely to attenuate the results and impact on error.

The idea of personality having an effect on feelings has been carried over into the marketing literature, where researchers such as Mooradian (1996) have investigated the effects of an individual’s personality on the feelings aroused by advertisements. Mooradian (1996) found that personality explained 37% of the variance in positive feelings, 36% of the variance in warm feelings and 44% of the variance in uneasy/negative feelings. Interestingly, Mooradian’s (1996) results are similar to those reported in the psychology literature on the relationship between personality and feelings.

In the context of brands, Smothers (1993), Biel (1993), Aaker (1997) and Wee (2004) suggest that brand personality should arouse feelings. However, there has been no known empirical support for this relationship. The only evidence about the effect of brand personality on brand-aroused feelings has come from marketplace observations. For instance, Smothers (1993) found from his observations that the personality of the brand, Nike, seemed to evoke strong positive and negative feelings. He argued
Nike’s brand personality aroused intense positive feelings of love and devotion; and there were feelings of pride when consumers were able to save their money to buy a pair of Nike Air Jordans. He suggested that the personality trait of achievement was associated with Nike through the connection with Michael Jordan. Smothers (1993) argued that the personality of the brand, Nike, aroused strong negative feelings when consumers were not able to afford Nike products. Consumers are likely to find some brand personalities more appealing than others; if consumers find the personality of a brand appealing, then it is likely that they will experience positively aroused feelings as a response. Alternatively, if they find a brand personality unappealing, they may experience negatively aroused feelings in response. As brand-aroused feelings will vary in intensity, as well as in direction, it is also possible that in response to a brand’s personality a consumer will experience warm aroused brand feelings. Given the findings in the psychology and marketing literature, and suppositions in the branding literature, the argument proposed here is that, in response to a brand’s personality, a consumer will experience brand-aroused feelings. Therefore it is hypothesized that:

\[ H1: \quad \text{that brand personality and brand-aroused feelings are unique constructs} \]

\[ H2: \quad \text{brand personality will have a significant effect on brand-aroused feelings} \]

\[ H2a: \quad \text{positive brand personality traits such as openness, conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness will have a significant positive effect on positive brand aroused feelings} \]

\[ H2b: \quad \text{negative brand personality trait of unstableness will have a negative effect on negative brand aroused feelings} \]

\[ H3: \quad \text{the impact of brand personality on brand aroused feelings will be similar across various product categories} \]

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

To investigate the impact of brand personality on brand-aroused feelings, the method chosen was a survey because the data can be collected quickly, inexpensively, and there is a reasonable degree of sample control (Maholtra & Peterson 2005). To systematically develop the survey measures the Netemeyer, Bearden and Sharma (2003) four-step scaling procedures process was used. The first step
is construct definition and brand personality was defined as a consumer’s unique characterization of a brand in terms of the extent to which he or she assesses that it displays inner-psychological human traits, this definition along with the definitions of each of the five factors that form brand personality are displayed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Five Broad Factors that Form Brand Personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand personality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a consumer’s unique characterization of a brand in terms of the extent to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which he or she assesses that it displays inner-psychological human traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which a brand is assessed as displaying novel solutions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressing original ideas, and using imagination in the marketplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientiousness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which a brand is assessed as displaying organization,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orderliness, and efficiency in carrying out its business in the marketplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraversion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which a brand is assessed as displaying outgoingness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gregariousness and sociableness in the marketplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which a brand is assessed as displaying consideration,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindness and empathy in the marketplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstableness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which a brand is assessed as displaying inconsistency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unreliability or undependability in the marketplace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the definitions supplied in Table 1, the second step searches the literature for appropriate scales and according to Netemeyer et al. (2003) it is important that the items reflect/form the construct definition. While there has been some use of the scale developed by Aaker (1997) these measures were discounted because they measure of a broader array of human characteristics associated with a brand, and are not solely a measure of brand personality. Saucier’s (1994) scale from the psychology literature was used as it measures personality and was a trimmed version of Goldberg’s (1993) scale considered to be one of the most robust measures of personality (given the consistency of findings across a broad array of contexts; Hofstee, Kiers, De Raad, Goldberg & Ostendorf 1997; Hofstee, de Raad et al 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993; Saucier 1992). Given the independence of these five factors in forming personality (see Barrick, Parks & Mount 2005; Digman 1990; Goldberg 2006; Saucier 2002), when assessing brand personality, the weighted score from one of the five factors should not affect the weighted score of another factor. This means that a low weighted contribution from openness does not necessarily indicate a highly weighted contribution from conscientiousness and vice-versa. All of this implies that a brand’s personality will have varying degrees of contribution.
from each of the five factors. The uniqueness of these weighted contributions is what forms a consumer’s unique characterization of a brand in terms of the degree to which it is seen as displaying inner psychological human traits.

Regarding brand-aroused feelings, they were defined as a conscious affective assessment a consumer experiences when encountering a brand. After an extensive search and analysis of the feeling scales in the literature, the scale that appeared to be the most suitable was that developed by Edell and Burke (1987), which includes the factors of positive aroused feelings, negative aroused feelings and warm aroused feelings. The measurable items (i.e. adjectives such as happy, pleasure, warm-hearted, disgusted or sad) reflect the first-order factors (positive, warm and negative). To operationalise the construct of brand-aroused feelings according to Escalas et al. (2004), the adjectives should be scaled to reflect the varying degrees of intensity experienced, from weakly aroused to strongly aroused feelings. Thus, a high score on positively aroused feelings would indicate that it was strongly felt, compared with a low score, which would indicate the positive feeling was felt by the consumer to a lesser degree or not at all.

The third step in measurement and scale development is refining and trimming the measures, this was done via a panel of expert judges, focus groups and a pilot test of the survey retaining a total of 40 items. For brand personality 27 items were retained and included five measures for conscientiousness and extraversion, example items include orderly and outgoing, four items were retained for unstableness and an example item would be erratic. For openness six items were retained and an example item is innovative and for agreeableness seven items were retained and an example item is considerate. For brand-aroused feelings 13 items were retained, which included five measures for positive aroused feelings an example item is happy, four items were retained for negative and warm feelings and example items include: sad, and warm-hearted.

The final step is finalizing the measures and determining the scale. In this study a seven-point lexical scale (Oliver, Angleitner & Ostendorf, 1988) was selected because the reported reliabilities of the
existing scales were good; and according to Viswanathan et al. (2004) seven-point scales sufficiently capture similarities and differences that are meaningful to participants. Lexical scales use alphabetically arranged adjectives and are advantageous, because the degrees to which the scale items load on their factors have been substantiated in prior research, even though in the survey they are placed in alphabetical order (Oliver et al. 1988; Saucier & Goldberg 1996).

Generation Y (18-25 year old) consumers were selected as the sample to survey because there is limited understanding regarding this cohort (Vahie & Paswan 2006), they are different to other generations because they have been exposed to brands from birth onwards as they were born between 1980 and 1994 (Martin & Turley 2004), they are the second largest cohort and account for 28% of the population (McCrindle 2007) and have significant economic and social influence in the marketplace (Wolburg and Pokrwczninski 2001). Focus groups conducted with Generation Y consumers found that mobile phones (Nokia), sport shoes (Nike) and surf wear (Billabong) were important products and brands and that everyone had some degree of experience with them. Thus, for the purposes of generalisability (Raykov & Marcoulides 2006; Volckner & Sattler 2007) these three product categories were chosen to examine the impact of brand personality on brand-aroused feelings.

Following the sampling procedures of Wolburg and Pokrywczynsk (2001), which studied generation Y university students, one class from five Australian universities across three states (NSW, QLD and ACT) were asked to participate. The size of the sample was dependent on the number of students present on the day, and on a pre-arranged day and time the surveys were administered voluntarily to self-identified generation Y consumers in the first ten minutes of class, consumers were given one of three surveys, and the surveys were identical except for the name of the brand.

RESULTS

Returned were 324 usable surveys, 107 for Nokia, 106 for Nike and 111 for Billabong. As the survey instrument used lexical scales (placing the brand personality and brand aroused feeling items in alphabetical order), to assess if brand personality and brand-aroused feelings were separate constructs a Harman’s one factor test was used. Often associated with common method variance, because a
single source of data collection (ie a survey) may contaminate the effects of the exogenous construct on the endogenous, the Harman’s one factor test assesses whether one or more factors are produced (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). The results of the Harman’s one factor test showed no evidence of common method variance, and provided evidence of eight factors, five for brand personality and three for brand-aroused feelings with the initial items loading on their respective factors and together explaining 65% of the variance.

To examine the impact of brand personality on brand-aroused feelings the structural equation modeling technique of PLS (Partial Least Squares) was used as it considers all the path coefficients simultaneously, and enables the researcher to avoid biased and inconsistent parameter estimates for equations (Chin 1998; Fornell & Bookstein 1982; White, Varadarajan & Dacin 2003). To assess the measurement model, according to Johnson, Herrmann and Huber (2006), the factor loadings should exceed .707, the construct reliability should exceed .70 and the average variance extracted should exceed .50. The measurement results were found to surpass the minimum requirement as Table 2 shows that the factor loadings ranged between .72 and .87, the composite reliabilities (CR) ranged between .83 and .93, and the average variance extracted (AVE), which measures the shared variance captured by the construct (Dillon & Goldstein, 1984) ranged between .61 and .74 indicating that the variance captured was reliably measuring the construct purported. Assessing convergent and discriminant validity, Fornell and Larker (1981) argue that the AVE is a useful estimate in assessing convergent validity, and as Table 2 shows the AVE was found to be above .50, convergent validity was supported. Also supported was discriminant validity because the squared multiple correlation between the two constructs was less than either of their individual AVE; indicating that the constructs have more internal (extracted) variance than variance shared between constructs (Fornell & Larker, 1981), a result that further supports H1, the independence of brand personality and brand-aroused feeling constructs.
Table 2: Results for the Measurement Items and their Respective Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct and measurement items</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Construct and measurement items</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness CR=.91; AVE=.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness CR=.93; AVE=.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>37.42</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>48.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>43.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>37.12</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>53.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>20.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>28.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion CR=.89; AVE=.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unstableness CR=.83; AVE=.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>Erratic</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>32.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>Irrational</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>30.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>30.21</td>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>34.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness CR=.90; AVE=.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Feelings CR=.93; AVE=.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>Delighted</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>41.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderly</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>48.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>37.62</td>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>Joyous</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>51.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>44.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Feelings CR=.90; AVE=.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Feelings CR=.87; CR=.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>lonely</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>41.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>Offended</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>08.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm hearted</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CR= Construct Reliability  
AVE = Average Variance Extracted

The structural model results provide evidence supporting H2, the impact that brand personality has on brand-aroused feelings (β=.61; r²=.37; t-value=14.62), indicating that the personality of the brand may explain 37% of the feelings aroused by the brand. When considering the impact of the individual personality factors on positive, warm and negative brand-aroused feelings (H2a and H2b), it was found that openness (t=3.13), extraversion (t=2.51) and agreeableness (t=5.14) significantly impacted on positively aroused feelings. Regarding warm feelings only agreeableness (t=6.69) was found to significantly impact, where as extraversion (t=2.45) and unstableness (t=5.17) significantly impacted on negatively aroused brand feelings. The results find that the personality trait of extraversion, which is the degree to which a brand is, assessed as displaying outgoingness, gregariousness and sociableness in the marketplace, has both a negative and a positive impact on brand-aroused feelings. Alternatively,
conscientiousness, which refers to the degree to which a brand is assessed as displaying organisation, orderliness and efficiency in the marketplace, has no impact on brand-aroused feelings.

The third hypothesis refers to the similarity of the results across the product categories of mobile phones, sport shoes and surf wear. The results were found to be similar for Nike (β=.66; r²=.43; t-value=9.67) and Nokia (β=.63; r²=.40; t-value=9.83). However, the results for Billabong (β=.49; r²=.24; t-value=7.18) appear to be weaker, indicating that brand personality only explains 24% of the feelings aroused by the brand, whereas for Nike and Nokia, brand personality explained 43% (Nike) and 40% (Nokia).

**DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

Putting an end to some of the supposition regarding brand personality, this paper provides evidence that brand personality and brand-aroused feelings are perceived by consumers as separate constructs and that brand personality has a substantial effect on brand-aroused feelings (37%). The results in this study are similar to those conducted on individuals in the domains of psychology and marketing, where personality and feelings aroused were found to be two separate constructs and the impact of personality accounted for between 36% and 44% of the variance in aroused feelings (see Allik & Realo 1997; Meyer & Shack 1989; Mooradian 1996; Watson & Clark 1992; Yik et al., 2003). Given that that the five factors that contribute to brand personality are mostly positive, this suggests that the more positive the personality perceived by consumers, the more likely positive feelings will be aroused. This implies that when consumers encounter a brand and make assessments of a brand’s personality that it is more likely that a consumer will experience positive or warm feelings in response.

This is an important finding because, positively aroused feelings are likely to enable consumers to process information faster and also likely to be predictive of consumer behaviour (Pham et al. 2001). A consumer experiencing a negative feeling may not notice that a brand is a better performer, whereas a consumer with positive feelings toward a brand is more likely to have their positive (or warm) feelings reinforced by information that a product performs better (Pham et al. 2001; Gobe 2001). Also,
previous findings suggest that if a consumer experiences a positive feeling toward an object, be it an advertisement or a brand, then the positive feelings toward that object will have a spill-over or halo effect, and generate subsequent positive assessments (Schwarz & Clore 1996).

Given that brand personality is receiving substantial attention in practice and in academia (Sweeney & Brandon 2006) the results have implications to both of these domains. Firstly, for academia the results presented here provide more clarity to the branding literature as they help us to understand the role that brand personality plays in the nomological network of consumer-based brand assessments, as an influence on the subsequent assessment of feelings. Further, the results add clarity to the literature on brand personality; because the results clearly differentiate brand personality from the construct of brand-aroused feelings. By separating the two constructs, brand personality and brand-aroused feelings it is expected that future research can examine the impact of brand personality and brand aroused feelings on other brands and on other constructs such as brand value, brand loyalty or purchase intentions to gain a fuller picture of the role that brand personality plays in consumer-based-brand-equity models.

Along with the theoretical implications, this research has practical implications for brand managers in brand development and brand positioning as brand managers grapple with trying to uniquely differentiate their brand from a plethora of brands in the marketplace. This research provides evidence of the effects of brand personality and may imbue confidence in brand managers as they develop brand personality communications likely to have feelings aroused. While much money is going into the development of brand personality when previously its effects weren’t known (Freling & Forbes 2005a), this research provides evidence that if brand managers focus their attention on the personality traits of openness and agreeableness that they are more likely to arouse positive feelings in response. The results also demonstrate and recommend cautiousness in developing a positioning strategy using extraversion personality traits (e.g. energetic, expressive, or outgoing) as extraversion impacts on both positively aroused and negatively aroused brand feelings. Of value to brand managers interested in developing a sustainable competitive advantage, are the results of this research which recommend
positioning a brand as displaying novel solutions, original ideas, imagination, consideration, and kindness as these personality traits are likely to be received positively and likely to contribute to long-term success.
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