

**THE BRAND-PERSONALITY OF THREE  
CATEGORIES OF DRINKS IN AUSTRALIA**

**Johan Liang<sup>1</sup>**

**Wai Jin Lee**

School of Marketing, Curtin Business School  
Curtin University of Technology

**2010008**

**Editor:**

**Associate Professor Ian Phau  
School of Marketing**

**MARKETING**

**INSIGHTS**

**Working Paper Series  
School of Marketing**

**ISSN 1448 – 9716**

**<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author:**

Ian Phau  
School of Marketing, Curtin Business School  
Curtin University of Technology  
GPO BOX U1987  
Perth, WA 6845  
Australia  
Tel (+61 8) 9266 4014  
Fax (+61 8) 9266 3937  
Email: [Ian.phau@cbs.curtin.edu.au](mailto:Ian.phau@cbs.curtin.edu.au)

## **THE BRAND-PERSONALITY OF THREE CATEGORIES OF DRINKS IN AUSTRALIA**

### **ABSTRACT**

This study focuses on the 42 traits of brand personality (Aaker 1997) of nine drink brands spanning across three drink segments – fizzy drink, mineral water and energy drink, and measure the congruity of the brands' personalities (five dimension) to the consumer (drinker) of those brands.

Based on the results, excitement is the point-of-parity for fizzy drink and energy drink while sincerity is the point-of-parity for mineral water. Other four brand personalities can become the point-of-difference for each brand in each drink category. Using these results, a better understanding of brand personalities of each brand in customer minds can be used to improve marketing communication more effectively and give the right message to the right target market.

Future research should be done on such fields and sectors as restaurants, food, other fast moving consumer goods and the like and include a wider sample audience, spanning across different geographical borders. Implication for conceptual, methodological and managerial also discussed in this study.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Brands which are mainly focusing on the products and/or services and their complementary functional benefits are no longer being upheld as the strategic way of being different and competitive in the market (Austin et al. 2003; Ramaseshan and Tsao 2007; Bao and Sweeney 2009; Barrena and Sanchez 2009). Symbolic meanings are often used as the foundation to forming a brand's position in the market (Novak and Lyman 1998; Halliday 1996; Aaker 1997; Keller 1998; Foscht et al. 2008). As such, creating meaningful and distinctive brand personalities in the minds of consumers are of primary interest (Austin et al. 2003; Keller 1993, 1998; Ligas 2000; Park et al. 1986; Park and Srinivasan 1994; Ang and Lim 2006; Ekinci and Hosany 2006; Opoku et al. 2006; Sweeney and Brandon 2006). The utility of brand personality as part of an overall positioning strategy can affect consumer perceptions so much better than other communication strategies (Burke 1994), especially so within the same product category where brands can share similar functional attributes (Halliday 1996). As such, this creates both points-of-parity and points-of-difference. Specifically, according to Anderson et al. (2006, p. 94), "points of parity are elements with essentially the same performance or functionality to those of the next best alternative; whereas points of difference are elements that make the supplier's offering either superior or inferior to the next best alternative." These elements help in laying the foundation for the organization to establish and build on sustainable brand equity (Schembri 2009), differentiating a brand in a competitive field and establishing competitive superiority over competing brands (Keller et al. 2002).

Often, there are three different types of benefits that brands provide – functional, experiential and symbolic benefits (Park et al. 1986; Keller 1993, 1998; Ramaseshan and Tsao 2007). The problem-solving capacity of a brand is the brand's functional benefit, whereas experiential benefits involve the sensory pleasure or the cognitive arousal that a consumer derives from using a brand (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004). Symbolic benefits, on the other hand, are the signals that depict what the brand says about the user of that particular brand to the user and to others, in which it can be based on the image of a reflected stereotype or typical user of the brand (Sirgy 1986; Sirgy et al. 1997; Grohmann 2009) and/or the personality of the brand itself (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004). Hence, by consuming a particular brand, a consumer can portray and communicate to others the type of personalities they are or want to be seen as, subsequently enhancing and uplifting their own self-image and

psychological well-being (Aaker 1996; Graeff 1996; Grubb and Grathwohl 1967; Keller 1993; Underwood et al. 2001; Grohmann 2009).

Also, consumer behaviour researchers have proposed that brand personality is a vehicle of consumer self-expression and can be instrumental in helping consumers express their actual self (Belk 1988), ideal self (Malhotra 1988), or specific aspects of the self (Kleine et al. 1993). Thus, this is consistent with the symbolic meaning of consumption, where consumers utilize brands to build and sustain their identity (Fiske 1989; Kassarian 1971) and to experience emotional satisfaction (O'Donohoe 1994). Levy (1959) argued that consumers are not functionally oriented and that their consumption behaviour is substantially affected by the "symbols" used to identify goods, primarily the image portrayed by products and brands. This notion has received much support whereby scholars concurred that individuals often use symbolic brand meaning for personal-expression (Grohmann 2009) and social communication (Belk 1988; McCracken 1986; Zinkham and Hong 1991).

There are a couple of reasons why consumers enjoy symbolic meanings that are associated with brands that portray distinct personalities (Lau and Phau 2007). From a social ecology perspective, the symbolic meaning associated with the personality of a brand provides consumers with the opportunity to portray the "self" that s/he wants to reveal (Belk 1988; Grubb and Hupp 1968; Grubb and Grathwohl 1967; Solomon 1983). This permits consumers to compensate for their inadequacies or inconsistencies that they find in their actual selves in comparison to their desired selves (Elliot 1997). From a psychological perspective, consumers can build relationships with brands that are "humanized" by advertisers (Fournier 1998; Grohmann 2009; Keller and Lehmann 2006). These relationships permit consumers to evaluate a product on an equal basis (Solomon 1983). As such, consumers will show a strong desire to build relationships with brands that project personality that they are comfortable with, as though they are interacting with someone they like (Aaker 1996; Phau and Lau 2001; Keller and Lehmann 2006).

There is strong empirical evidence to support the personality-brand congruence concept (e.g. Mulyanegara et al. 2009; Phau and Lau 2001; Tsu Wee 2004; Mulyanegara and Tsarenko 2009), in which it has been found that for a brand to be successful and competitive, it must create perceived attributes that are the same as those of the consumers'. However, there has been very little research done on the market of drinks and how different brands of drinks are marketed differently based on

personality dimensions, taking into account the congruency of such brand personalities and those of the consumers' (Siguaw et al. 1999; Lau and Phau 2007). For example, previous studies which focused on the literature of brand personality have included those relating to: brand extension of symbolic brands – BMW and Volkswagen (Lau and Phau 2007), brand user-imagery congruence of clothing apparel brands (Parker 2009), prediction of brand preferences in the fashion market (Mulyanegara and Tsarenko 2009), impact on brand equity via sales promotion on laptop and coffee brands (Valette-Florencia et al. 2009), impact of congruence of product, brand, company, and consumer image on purchase intention in the automobile market (Wang et al. 2009), effects of the brand concept on the relationship between brand personality and perceived quality for toothpaste, jeans, airlines, shampoo, hotel, and watches (Ramaseshan and Tsao 2007), and creation of brand personality through brand associations for sunglasses (Hayes et al. 2008). Therefore, our study is based on this very gap in the literature to identify and provide empirical evidence to determine the extent to which drink brands establish clear and distinct brand personalities in the minds of consumers and how consumers form purchase decisions based on the congruency of their own self-image to that of the consumed brand.

The structure of the study is as follows: first, it presents a detailed literature review on brand personality and self-congruity theory; then, a description of the brand personality scale developed by Aaker (1997), development of research objectives, research methodologies, analysis and discussion of results, and finishes off with implications and limitations of the study.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Brand Personality**

Brand personality is defined as the set of human characteristics or traits that consumers attribute to a brand (Aaker 1997; Azoulay and Kapferer 2003; Grohmann 2009). Typical examples of brand personality include the characterization by consumers of Oil of Olay as upscale and aspirational; Absolut vodka as cool, hip and contemporary (Aaker 1997; Plummer 2000). Associating human personality characteristics with a brand is possible because people anthropomorphize whereby they transfer human characteristics to inanimate objects on a regular basis (Bower 1999; Boyer 1996; Grohmann 2009; Keller and Lehmann 2006). Typical examples

include animating a “pet rock” or when one references an object, such as a motor boat, by saying “she is a beauty” (Parker 2009).

Giving consumers something to relate to that is vivid, alive, and more complete than what is portrayed by the core offering is the core element of brand personality (Upshaw 1995). Therefore, having a strong, favourable brand personality can increase consumer preference and usage (Sirgy 1982; Kim 2000), result in favourable product evaluations (Wang and Yang 2008), foster feelings of comfort and confidence in the minds of consumers (Biel 1993), improve levels of loyalty and trust (Fournier 1994 and 1998; Hess et al. 2007; Brakus et al. 2009), creates brand equity (Keller 1993), and serve as a basis for brand differentiation amongst the many different brands in the market in which unique positioning strategies are developed (Keller 1993 and 2003; Crask and Laskey 1990; Plummer 1984; Biel 1993). Besides, brand personality can also enhance consumer attachment to a brand through their investment of personal meaning (Levy 1959; Sung et al. 2005; Grohmann 2009), assist marketers in developing the emotionally interpreted attributes of brands (Landon 1974), and enhance the favourability of a brand’s image (Phau and Lau 2001; Sutherland et al. 2004). Also, brand personality influences brand recognition, brand beliefs such as perceived quality (Ramaseshan and Tsao 2007), and brand associations (Freling and Forbes 2005). Moreover, brand personality has an impact on a number of important marketing concepts that Keller (2003) includes in his brand equity model (Valette-Florence et al. 2009), such as brand-consumer relationships and brand attachment (Sung et al. 2005) or brand trust (Hess et al. 2007).

Formation of a brand personality is subject to the various sources that Aaker (1997) categorises as “direct” and “indirect” sources. Brand user image is one of several “direct” variables that contribute to the formation of a brand personality (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004).

The “direct” sources of formation of a brand personality are person-based in which they include not only the set of human characteristics associated with a typical brand user but also the human characteristics of such individuals as company employees, company CEO, brand endorsers, spokespersons (Aaker 1997; Helgeson and Supphellen 2004) and family members (Parker 2009). Through this, the personality traits of the people associated with the brand are transferred to the brand (McCracken 1989; Aaker 1997; Grohmann 2009). McCracken (1989) and Grohmann (2009) observed that personality traits can be transferred to a brand through user imagery

presented in advertising. For example, user imagery can be projected in advertising by employing a presenter or spokesperson (McCracken 1989; Rossiter and Percy 1987), or by projecting actors or models using the product and/or placed in settings or situations that stimulate a feeling, picture, or mood the advertiser wishes to associate with using the product (Aaker 1996; Grohmann 2009). Besides human personality characteristics, such human demographic characteristics as age, gender and social class also contribute to the formation of a brand personality (Levy 1959; Aaker 1997; Grohmann 2009). For example, due to distinct user imagery, Virginia Slims tends to be thought of as feminine while Marlboro tends to be perceived as masculine (Grohmann 2009); whereas Apple is considered to be young while IBM is older due to the relative recency of which the two brands entered the market (Aaker 1997).

On the other hand, the “indirect” sources of formation of a brand personality involve all the brand-related decisions made by the manager (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004). These decisions include decisions regarding the product itself, its price, its promotion, its distribution (Aaker 1997; Helgeson and Supphellen 2004), as well as the product-related attributes, the product category associations, brand name, symbol or logo (Batra et al. 1993; Aaker 1997; Parker 2009).

Hence, it can be seen that brand personality is a broader, more inclusive concept than the image of a typical brand user that is congruent in the assessment of self-congruity (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004). Therefore, as mentioned above, the image of a typical brand user is one of several “direct” sources of the formation of a brand personality (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004). Also, the formation of a brand personality takes into account the “indirect” sources as mentioned (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004). In general, human characteristics associated with a brand are drawn from many possible sources, resulting in a global perception of a brand as if it has an enduring human like personality (Parker 2009).

### **Self-congruity**

Self-congruity theory proposes that part of consumer behaviour is determined by an individual’s comparison between the image of themselves and the image of a brand, as reflected in a stereotype of a typical brand user (Sirgy 1986; Sirgy et al. 1997; Aaker 1996; Grohmann 2009). Further, Biel (1993, p. 73) placed particular emphasis on the user component as a significant source of imagery, stating “perhaps the strongest contributor (to brand image) is the impression people have of the brand’s



users.” The findings from this area of research indicate that consumers often have a tendency to choose products and retail brands that have higher rather than lower levels of congruity (Sirgy 1985; Sirgy 1986; Sirgy et al. 1997; Grohmann 2009).

According to Sirgy (1982), there are four major types of self-congruity – actual self-congruity, ideal self-congruity, social self-congruity, and ideal social self-congruity. The differences between these four types of self-congruity concepts are in reference to the degree of congruity between a typical brand user stereotype and the different facets of self: the present self-concept (actual self-congruity), the ideal self-concept (ideal self-congruity), the self-concept as perceived by significant others (social self-congruity), and, finally, the self-concept as ideally perceived by significant others (ideal social self-congruity) (Helgeson and Supphellen 2004).

There are two major constructs to the theory of self-congruity – self-image and brand image (Parker 2009). To study the congruity phenomenon, these two image perceptions are measured and then the difference or distance between them is determined through standard calculations (Gould 1991; Graeff 1996; Sirgy 1982 and 1986; Sutherland et al. 2004; Grohmann 2009). Self-image refers to the way in which one perceives him/herself to be as an individual, called a self-perception (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967; Graeff 1996). Self-image is a multidimensional perception of one’s self that changes from situation to situation, and is made up of at least two major dimensions – the “real/actual-self” and the “ideal-self” (Aaker 1999; Gould 1991; Graeff 1996; Sirgy 1982 and 1986; Sutherland et al. 2004). As mentioned above, the “real/actual-self” is one’s perceptions of the self as now experienced whereas the “ideal-self” is one’s perceptions of the self as an imagined ideal, the image of the self as one desires to be (Grubb and Grathwohl 1967; Rogers 1959; Sirgy 1982).

The brand congruence concept within the branding context postulates that, through an extension of self-congruity theory, “the greater the congruity between the human characteristics that consistently and distinctively describe an individual’s actual or ideal self and those that describe a brand, the greater the preference for the brand (Malhotra 1988; Sirgy 1982).

Consumers link strong, favourable, and unique associations to a brand if they favour the brand image (Keller 1998). Therefore, consumers’ perception of an image of a brand can be on direct experience with the brand, as well as through promotion of the brand, and even through observation of the type of people who use the brand or times when the brand is best used (Patterson 1999). Besides, different values or traits can be

reflected through the association of the brand and certain types of people (Parker 2009). Further, by choosing certain brands, individuals can communicate to others or themselves the type of person they are (actual self-congruity) or the type of person they want to be (ideal self-congruity) (Keller 1998). Therefore, brand image is built in the memory of the consumer and is delineated by the perceptions and associations held in the memory of consumer (Keller 1998). One important part of this perception for brand image is the symbolic concept of brand personality (Parker 2009), whereby brand personality is considered as a subset of brand image (Aaker 1996; Biel 1992; Keller 1993), due to personality expression being a key dimension in representing the image of symbolic brands (Bhat and Reddy 1998; Keller 1993; Grohmann 2009).

### **The Brand Personality Scale**

Aaker (1997) developed a framework aimed at capturing the key dimensions of brand personality, recognising and acknowledging the importance of brand personality to marketers. She also acknowledged the significance of these theoretical underpinnings in her introduction when she stated that it was her objective to overcome the limitations of previous research by drawing on research of the “Big Five” human personality structure to develop a theoretical framework of brand personality dimensions.

The proposed framework is a standard, universal way to measure brand personality where a rigorous set of procedures were employed to develop and evaluate the scale. She started by gathering a list of traits used to measure the human personality in psychology and marketing studies, which was then followed by a qualitative study in which she asked respondents to identify all of the traits that were on top of mind when thinking about specific brands. Through these procedures, 309 preliminary discrete traits were generated, which were then reduced to 114 based on respondents’ ratings of how descriptive the traits were of brands in general.

A series of nationwide studies were then conducted in which Aaker asked consumers to rate how well the traits described each of 59 brands that were carefully chosen to represent various categories of products and services. Amongst the brands that were chosen to be tested were food-service and lodging brands, which included McDonald’s, Marriot, and Holiday Inn. Five underlying dimensions of brand personality were identified using several complex statistical procedures to analyse the results generated in these studies. These dimensions were named as (1) competence,

(2) sincerity, (3) excitement, (4) sophistication, and (5) ruggedness. The 42 traits used to measure these 5 dimensions are shown in Appendix 5.

### **Objectives**

The purpose of the research is to determine the brand personalities of nine drinking products and apply the theory of congruency onto the context of this study. Specifically, based on the literature review, the following aims of this research have been established:

1. To determine the personalities of the nine drinks brands examined in this study.
2. To determine the degree of personality congruence between the drink brands and the consumers.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Survey instruments were developed based on Aaker's 5-dimension, 42-item brand personality scale. In addition to university students, this study also employs members of the general public in making up the sample population. As such, the respondents of this study are ecologically valid as they are of different demographic profiles which all have access to the drink brands mentioned and examined in this study, and are representative of the population in the beverages industry.

### **Applied Brand Personality**

We look to apply Aaker's (1997) brand personality approach in identifying key points of differentiation between brands within and across the three drink categories. Data were collected from 393 respondents. Students of a major university in Australia were used as part of the sample population in this study because **(a)** students are made up of different ethnic groups across different cultural backgrounds within and outside Australia and **(b)** students are one of the most important target markets in the beverages industry. Each student was given 6 sets of questionnaire of which they had 2 weeks to complete. They were asked to complete one of the 6 sets and the remaining 5 sets were asked to be given to friends and family to be completed. In return, the students were given unit credit points.

Each respondent was first asked to rate 3 different brands of drinks in 3 different categories of drinks – fizzy drink, mineral water and energy drink, with one brand in each category, and with which the ratings were done based on Aaker's 5 dimensions of brand personality. Then, the respondents were asked to think of the personality of a

consumer who would consume the drinks and give ratings accordingly based on Aaker's 42 traits of brand personality. This is to identify if there is congruity between the personalities of the brand and the consumer. A seven-point, Likert-type scale was used to record the students' responses where 1 = not representative at all and 7 = very representative. The order of the drinks within each category appeared was rotated so as to reduce order bias, hence the 6 sets of questionnaires where there were 3 drink categories and 3 brands in each category, making the total of 9 brands of drinks.

### **Brands**

The brands chosen for this study were top-of-mind brands in the market. These drink brands could be easily accessed and obtained within the university compounds, never mind the market(s) beyond the boundaries of the university.

The top three major drinks in the fizzy drink category chosen for this study were Coca-Cola, Pepsi and Solo. Mount Franklin, Cool Ridge and Evian were chosen for the mineral water category while Red Bull, Mother and V were chosen for the energy drink category.

Also, one thing to note in this study is that respondents' experiences with the brands were not considered, which was in contrast to Sigauw et al.'s (1999) study where the authors specifically asked respondents not to rate the brands that they had not had any experience with. In this study, however, picture aids were provided as an information cue for respondents, and regardless of their experiences with the brands, the respondents were asked to rate the brands accordingly with respect to the picture aids given in the survey. In addition, as mentioned earlier, the nine drink brands were of great exposure to the residents in Australia as the products were marketed and advertised nationwide. Hence, there seemed to be an assumption that the respondents would, at least, have seen or heard about the brand(s), and coupled with that knowledge, together with the aid of the picture aids provided, ratings to the brand(s) would be given accordingly by the respondents

## FINDING AND ANALYSIS

### TESTING ON FIVE DIMENSIONS

To test for differences brands on each of the five personality dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness), multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) will be applied.

<b>Table 1</b>							
<b>Personality profiles of three fizzy drink categories</b>							
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>				<b>Strongly Agree</b>		
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Sincerity				S P C			
Excitement				S P		C	
Competence				S P C			
Sophistication			S	P C			
Ruggedness				S C P			

Note: S = Solo; P = Pepsi; C = Coca Cola. Statistically significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) are depicted in the figures by drink initials in highlight (separated from other beverages' initials). The initial for drinks that are not statistically significantly different on a dimension are plotted next to one another. The numbers of respondents were as follows: Coca Cola, 132; Pepsi, 128; and Solo, 131.

The correlation, p-value from Levene Test, MANOVA test and Post Hoc Test for fizzy drink categories can be seen in Appendix 1.

Within fizzy drink categories, Coca Cola is perceived as being more sincere, exciting and competent than the other two brands (see Table 1). Solo is seen as being the least sincere, competent and sophisticated of the three brands. The only other point of significant differentiation among the three fizzy drinks is on the competent dimension. As far as our respondents are concerned, none of these fizzy drinks has created a brand personality that distinguishes one fizzy drink from the other two on the trait of ruggedness.

<b>Table 2</b>							
<b>Personality profiles of three mineral water categories</b>							
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>				<b>Strongly Agree</b>		
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Sincerity				CR E	MF		
Excitement			CR MF E				
Competence				CR E MF			
Sophistication			CR	MF E			
Ruggedness			MF CR E				

Note: MF = Mount Franklin; CR = Cool Ridge; E = Evian. Statistically significant

difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) are depicted in the figures by drink initials in highlight (separated from other beverages' initials). The initial for drinks that are not statistically significantly different on a dimension are plotted next to one another. The numbers of respondents were as follows: Mount Franklin, 131; Cool Ridge, 129; and Evian, 131.

The correlation, p-value from Levene Test, MANOVA test and Post Hoc Test for mineral water categories can be seen in Appendix 2.

Among mineral water categories, Mount Franklin is perceived as being more sincere and competent than the other two brands (see Table 2). Cool Ridge is seen as being the least competence and sophisticated of the three brands. As far as our respondents are concerned, none of these mineral water drinks has created a brand personality that distinguishes one mineral water drink from the other two on the trait of excitement and ruggedness.

<b>Table 3</b>							
<b>Personality profiles of three energy drink categories</b>							
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>				<b>Strongly Agree</b>		
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Sincerity			M V RB				
Excitement				M V RB			
Competence			M V RB				
Sophistication			M V RB				
Ruggedness				V RB M			

Note: RB = Red Bull; V = V energy drink; M = Mother. Statistically significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) are depicted in the figures by drink initials in highlight (separated from other beverages' initials). The initial for drinks that are not statistically significantly different on a dimension are plotted next to one another. The numbers of respondents were as follows: Red Bull, 131; V, 128; and Mother, 131.

The correlation, p-value from Levene Test, MANOVA test and Post Hoc Test for energy drink categories can be seen in Appendix 3.

Within energy drinks categories (see Table 3), Red Bull is perceived as being more sincere, exciting, competent and sophisticated while Mother is seen as being the least sincere, exciting, competent and sophisticated of the three brands. There is no significant difference among three brands on the trait of ruggedness although Mother has the highest mean.

For purposes of examining differences across categories of drinks, we compared the means of the ratings for the three brands of drinks within each category, with the result shown in Table 5. According to Table 4, the results indicate the dominant personality for each drink category that can be the point of parity for each category.

<b>Table 4</b>		
<b>Fizzy Drink Brand Mean</b>	<b>Mineral Water Brand Mean</b>	<b>Energy Drink Brand Mean</b>

Sincerity (4.2123)	<b>Sincerity (4.7775)</b>	Sincerity (3.7366)
<b>Excitement(4.7545)</b>	Excitement(3.7161)	<b>Excitement(4.8670)</b>
Competence (4.6317)	Competence (4.5473)	Competence (4.3325)
Sophistication (4.0026)	Sophistication (4.5064)	Sophistication (3.7724)
Ruggedness (4.2890)	Ruggedness (3.4143)	Ruggedness (4.5217)

<b>Table 5</b>							
<b>Personality profiles of three category of drinks</b>							
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>				<b>Strongly Agree</b>		
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Sincerity			E	F	M		
Excitement			M		F	E	
Competence				E	M	F	
Sophistication			E	F	M		
Ruggedness			M		F	E	

Note: M = Mineral Water; E = Energy Drink; F = Fizzy Drink. Statistically significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) are depicted in the figures by drink categories initials in color (separated from other drink categories' initials). The initial for drink categories that are not statistically significantly different on a dimension are plotted next to one another. The numbers of respondents were as follows: Fizzy Drink, 391; Mineral Water, 391; and Energy Drink, 391.

The correlation, p-value from Levene Test, MANOVA test and Post Hoc Test for three categories of drinks can be seen in Appendix 4.

Overall, the three drink categories are differentiated to the greatest extent on the sincerity dimension. As one might expect, mineral water drinks are perceived as being the most sincere, followed by fizzy drinks and energy drinks.

While sincerity is the only distinctive characteristic that our respondents identified for mineral water drinks, mineral water are perceived to be more sophisticated but less exciting and less rugged than the other two drink categories. Moreover, energy drinks are viewed as being less competent than the other two drink categories. Additionally, fizzy drinks are perceived to be the most competent than the other two drink categories.

## **TESTING THE CONGRUITY BETWEEN THE DRINK PERSONALITY AND THE DRINKER PERSONALITY**

To test the congruity between the drink brand personality and the drinker personality, paired samples t-test will be used. The test also will be focusing in the dominant personality for each brand that has congruity personality with the drinkers.

### **FIZZY DRINKS**

#### *Coca Cola*

From all five dimension of brand personality, excitement has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.659$ ) and others have medium or weak positive relationship.

Dominant brand personality of Coca Cola is *excitement*.

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.4773)	Sincerity (4.4040)	0.480	S(0.000)
<b>Excitement (5.3485)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.9508)</b>	<b>0.659</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Competence (5.0909)	Competence (4.4211)	0.445	S(0.000)
Sophistication (4.4394)	Sophistication (4.0852)	0.329	S(0.000)
Ruggedness (4.2727)	Ruggedness (4.5293)	0.184	S(0.035)
Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.4773)	Sincerity (4.4229)	0.451	NS(0.653)
<b>Excitement (5.3485)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.9601)</b>	<b>3.913</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Competence (5.0909)	Competence (4.4444)	5.243	S(0.000)
Sophistication (4.4394)	Sophistication (4.1061)	2.369	S(0.019)
Ruggedness (4.2727)	Ruggedness (4.5515)	-1.830	NS(0.070)

Based on paired samples t-test result, it shows that sincerity and ruggedness personality from Coca Cola will be transferred to the drinker but the dominant personality of Coca Cola (excitement) and other two personalities will not. The reason why the dominant brand personality of Coca Cola will not affect the drinkers because Coca Cola brand is too famous brand in customer minds as majority of customers must know what Coca Cola brand is so the personalities of Coca Cola is not distinctive in consumers' mind.

### *Pepsi*

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.1250)	Sincerity (4.2142)	0.644	S(0.000)
<b>Excitement (4.6406)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.5631)</b>	<b>0.692</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Competence (4.6328)	Competence (4.1051)	0.448	S(0.000)
Sophistication (4.0469)	Sophistication (3.7209)	0.540	S(0.000)
Ruggedness (4.3438)	Ruggedness (4.4047)	0.561	S(0.000)

From all five dimension of brand personality, excitement has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.692$ ) and others have strong or medium positive relationship.

Dominant brand personality of Pepsi is *excitement*.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.1250)	Sincerity (4.2081)	-0.884	NS(0.378)
<b>Excitement (4.6406)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.5639)</b>	<b>0.801</b>	<b>NS(0.425)</b>
Competence (4.6328)	Competence (4.1076)	4.261	S(0.000)
Sophistication (4.0469)	Sophistication (3.7266)	2.613	S(0.010)
Ruggedness (4.3438)	Ruggedness (4.4016)	-0.528	NS(0.599)

Pepsi also has excitement as their dominant brand personality in fizzy drink category because Pepsi always compete with Coca Cola with the same image in their



advertising. The difference is the dominant brand personality of Pepsi will be transferred to the drinkers following by sincerity and ruggedness based on paired samples t-test results but Coca Cola is not.

### Solo

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.0305)	Sincerity (4.1580)	0.554	S(0.000)
<b>Excitement(4.2672)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.0993)</b>	<b>0.560</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Competence (4.1679)	Competence (3.6957)	0.410	S(0.000)
Sophistication (3.5191)	Sophistication (3.3282)	0.446	S(0.000)
Ruggedness (4.2519)	Ruggedness (4.3354)	0.475	S(0.000)

From all five dimension of brand personality, excitement has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.560$ ) and others have medium positive relationship.

Dominant brand personality of Solo is *excitement*.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.0305)	Sincerity (4.2207)	-1.856	NS(0.066)
<b>Excitement(4.2672)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.1797)</b>	<b>0.847</b>	<b>NS(0.399)</b>
Competence (4.1679)	Competence (3.8346)	2.955	S(0.004)
Sophistication (3.5191)	Sophistication (3.4936)	0.214	NS(0.831)
Ruggedness (4.2519)	Ruggedness (4.5053)	-2.001	S(0.047)

The paired sample t-test results indicate that the dominant brand personality of Solo will be transferred to the drinkers.

## MINERAL WATER DRINKS

### Mount Franklin

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
<b>Sincerity (5.1756)</b>	<b>Sincerity (4.6476)</b>	<b>0.281</b>	<b>S(0.001)</b>
Excitement (3.7557)	Excitement (4.1497)	0.399	S(0.000)
Competence (4.7634)	Competence (4.6017)	0.331	S(0.000)
Sophistication (4.6794)	Sophistication (4.4487)	0.315	S(0.000)
Ruggedness (3.3282)	Ruggedness (3.8369)	0.422	S(0.000)

From all five dimension of brand personality, ruggedness has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.422$ ) and others have weak positive relationship.

Dominant brand personality of Mount Franklin is *sincerity*.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
<b>Sincerity (5.1756)</b>	<b>Sincerity (4.7078)</b>	<b>3.707</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Excitement (3.7557)	Excitement (4.0333)	-2.288	S(0.024)
Competence (4.7634)	Competence (4.6039)	1.346	NS(0.181)
Sophistication (4.6794)	Sophistication (4.3855)	2.242	S(0.027)
Ruggedness (3.3282)	Ruggedness (3.6351)	-2.274	S(0.025)

The dominant brand personality of Mount Franklin is not transferring to the drinkers based on the result of paired samples t-test. The reason why there is no congruity between the brand and the drinker for dominant personality because Mount Franklin is too famous brand as well similar to Coca Cola brand as both brands are under the same company (Coca Cola Amatil).

### *Cool Ridge*

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
<b>Sincerity (4.4961)</b>	<b>Sincerity (4.5336)</b>	<b>0.434</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Excitement (3.4961)	Excitement (3.8287)	0.484	S(0.000)
Competence (4.3023)	Competence (4.3615)	0.347	S(0.000)
Sophistication (3.9070)	Sophistication (3.9423)	0.450	S(0.000)
Ruggedness (3.4419)	Ruggedness (3.9338)	0.393	S(0.000)

From all five dimension of brand personality, excitement has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.484$ ) and others have medium or weak relationship.

Dominant brand personality of Cool Ridge is *sincerity*.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
<b>Sincerity (4.4961)</b>	<b>Sincerity (4.5455)</b>	<b>-0.371</b>	<b>NS(0.711)</b>
Excitement (3.4961)	Excitement (3.8450)	-2.911	S(0.004)
Competence (4.3023)	Competence (4.3661)	-.0464	NS(0.644)
Sophistication (3.9070)	Sophistication (3.9483)	-.0315	NS(0.754)
Ruggedness (3.4419)	Ruggedness (3.9411)	-3.762	S(0.000)

Cool Ridge also has sincerity as their dominant brand personality in mineral water category but the dominant personality will be transferred to the drinkers based on paired samples t-test.

### **Evian**

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.6565)	Sincerity (4.2851)	0.554	S(0.000)
Excitement (3.8931)	Excitement (4.2975)	0.531	S(0.000)
Competence (4.5725)	Competence (4.6591)	0.539	S(0.000)
<b>Sophistication (4.9237)</b>	<b>Sophistication (4.8712)</b>	<b>0.564</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Ruggedness (3.4733)	Ruggedness (3.6561)	0.706	S(0.000)

From all five dimension of brand personality, ruggedness has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.706$ ) and others have medium relationship. Dominant brand personality of Evian is *sophistication*.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
Sincerity (4.6565)	Sincerity (4.2894)	3.318	S(0.001)
Excitement (3.8931)	Excitement (4.2984)	-3.527	S(0.001)
Competence (4.5725)	Competence (4.6531)	-0.703	NS(0.483)

<b>Sophistication (4.9237)</b>	<b>Sophistication (4.8651)</b>	<b>0.510</b>	<b>NS(0.611)</b>
Ruggedness (3.4733)	Ruggedness (3.6611)	-1.823	NS(0.071)

Evian has sophistication as their dominant brand personality which it will differentiate Evian brand from other mineral water brands. The dominant personality will be transferred to the drinkers based on paired samples t-test result.

## ENERGY DRINKS

### RED BULL ENERGY DRINK

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
Sincerity (3.9313)	Sincerity (3.7018)	0.499	S(0.000)
<b>Excitement (5.1069)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.9201)</b>	<b>0.561</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Competence (4.6489)	Competence (4.2517)	0.471	S(0.000)
Sophistication (4.0611)	Sophistication (3.6338)	0.327	S(0.000)
Ruggedness (4.5267)	Ruggedness (4.7909)	0.316	S(0.000)

From all five dimension of brand personality, excitement has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.561$ ) and others have medium or weak relationship.

Dominant brand personality of Red Bull is *excitement*.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
Sincerity (3.9313)	Sincerity (3.6995)	2.001	S(0.048)
<b>Excitement (5.1069)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.9174)</b>	<b>1.568</b>	<b>NS(0.119)</b>
Competence (4.6489)	Competence (4.2570)	3.168	S(0.002)
Sophistication (4.0611)	Sophistication (3.6361)	2.977	S(0.003)
Ruggedness (4.5267)	Ruggedness (4.7863)	-1.769	NS(0.079)

Red Bull has excitement as their dominant brand personality and it will be transferred to the drinkers based on the paired samples t-test results.

### V Energy Drink

Dominant brand personality of V Energy Drink is *excitement*.

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	Significant/not
Sincerity (3.7969)	Sincerity (3.6797)	0.484	S(0.000)
<b>Excitement (4.8984)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.7578)</b>	<b>0.521</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>
Competence (4.3828)	Competence (4.0191)	0.293	S(0.001)
Sophistication (3.8594)	Sophistication (3.5599)	0.392	S(0.000)
Ruggedness (4.3828)	Ruggedness (4.5891)	0.271	S(0.002)

From all five dimension of brand personality, excitement has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.521$ ) and others have medium or weak relationship.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
Sincerity (3.7969)	Sincerity (3.6797)	0.991	NS(0.323)
<b>Excitement (4.8984)</b>	<b>Excitement (4.7578)</b>	<b>1.182</b>	<b>NS(0.239)</b>

Competence (4.3828)	Competence (4.0191)	2.821	S(0.006)
Sophistication (3.8594)	Sophistication (3.5599)	2.218	S(0.028)
Ruggedness (4.3828)	Ruggedness (4.5891)	-1.434	NS(0.154)

V energy drink also has excitement as their dominant brand personality in energy drink category. Based on the paired samples t-test, the dominant personality will also be transferred to the drinkers.

### Mother Energy Drink

Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	Correlation	p-value
Sincerity (3.4848)	Sincerity (3.3896)	0.656	S(0.000)
Excitement (4.5985)	Excitement (4.6336)	0.676	S(0.000)
Competence (3.9697)	Competence (3.8170)	0.602	S(0.000)
Sophistication (3.4015)	Sophistication (3.2957)	0.577	S(0.000)
<b>Ruggedness (4.6515)</b>	<b>Ruggedness (4.6977)</b>	<b>0.494</b>	<b>S(0.000)</b>

From all five dimension of brand personality, excitement has the strongest relationship ( $r=0.676$ ) and others have medium relationship. Dominant brand personality of Mother is *ruggedness*.

Paired Sample t-test			
Brand Mean	Drinker Mean	t-test value	Significant/not
Sincerity (3.4848)	Sincerity (3.3974)	0.864	NS(0.389)
Excitement (4.5985)	Excitement (4.6357)	-0.335	NS(0.738)
Competence (3.9697)	Competence (3.8258)	1.315	NS(0.191)
Sophistication (3.4015)	Sophistication (3.3056)	0.797	NS(0.427)
<b>Ruggedness (4.6515)</b>	<b>Ruggedness (4.7152)</b>	<b>-0.469</b>	<b>NS(0.640)</b>

Mother has ruggedness as their dominant brand personality which it can be used to differentiate Mother brand among competitors in energy drink category. The dominant brand personality of Mother will be transferred to the drinkers as well based on paired samples t-test results.

### DEVELOPING A PERSONALITY

A comparison of brand personality profiles reveals that the points of differentiation seem to correspond with the emphases of the drinks' marketing communication, the nature of products, the quality of products and their overall performance in the market. Based on the limited sample, it indicates that brand personality can be an effective means to differentiate one brand of drink from another and some brand of drinks have done this strategy well. However, the findings of this study also provide concrete evidence to indicate that the majority of brand of drinks do not effectively

use brand personality as a means of brand differentiation, and much improvement is needed.

## **Five Dimensions of Brand Personality**

### **Point-of-Parity**

Based on the table 5 and table 4, excitement and ruggedness dimensions can be used as the point of parity for energy drinks. Additionally, excitement and competence can be used as the point of parity for fizzy drink. In another hand, sincerity and sophistication can be used as mineral water drink's point-of-parity.

### **Fizzy Drink**

Within fizzy drinks categories, Coca Cola has the strongest points of differentiation on the dimensions of sincerity, excitement and sophistication. Coca Cola has been the number-one fizzy drink brand for long time and this dominance may well be driving respondents' perceptions that it is the most competent brand of the three brands examined.

On the other hand, our respondents perceived Solo to be the least sincere, sophisticated and rugged among the three brands. It shows that Solo has the lowest rank in customer mind so Solo needs to improve their marketing communication and increase more awareness about what Solo brand is about. Additionally, Solo needs to focus on one brand personality such as sophistication (recommended) to create point of differentiation from other two brands because Pepsi and Coca Cola are weak in sophistication dimension. For example, Solo can create premium products or create innovative advertising with sophistication image. Excitement should be out of the list for Solo to develop because Coca Cola and Pepsi have strongly dominated excitement brand personality.

Pepsi does not have distinctive differentiation with Coca Cola and Solo in the ruggedness dimension but Pepsi has significant differentiation in the competence dimension. It shows that Pepsi also needs to improve their marketing communication and focus on one brand personality especially ruggedness (recommended) to create point of differentiation with other two brands because Pepsi has the highest means in the ruggedness dimension.

### **Mineral Drink**

Within mineral water drink category, Mount Franklin and Cool Ridge have sincerity as their dominant brand personality and sophistication is the dominant brand personality of Evian. Mount Franklin has the strongest points in sincerity and competence but Cool Ridge has the weakest points in competence and sophistication points. There are no distinctive differentiations among three brands in excitement and ruggedness dimensions. It shows that Mount Franklin has sincerity as their point of parity in mineral water drink category and competence dimension as its point of differentiation from other two brands. In another hand, Evian does not have any significant differentiation in all brand personalities so Evian must improve their marketing communication and focus on sophistication to create point of differentiation and sincerity as its point of parity. Cool Ridge needs a lot of efforts to improve their marketing communication to increase their awareness and create a point of differentiation in the customer minds.

### **Energy Drink**

Within energy drink category, Red Bull has the strongest points in sincerity, excitement, competence and sophistication while Mother has the weakest points in sincerity, excitement, competence and sophistication. V energy drink does not have distinctive differentiation with other two brands in any brand personality dimensions. It shows that Red Bull has good marketing communication in the market so Red Bull brand name will be the strongest brand association in customer minds for energy drink category while V energy drink and Mother need to have to improve their marketing communications to increase their awareness and create their point of differentiations. Mother should focus more on ruggedness as point of differentiation because Mother has already done a lot of advertising with masculinity characteristic to show ruggedness personality in Mother brand. V energy drink can focus on competence personality to create point of differentiation because V energy drink has done a lot of sales promotion and advertising that show how competence V energy drink in the market and V energy drink also has competitive price in the market to penetrate the market.

The findings of the current study suggest that all nine brands of drinks have the potential to improve their positioning by directing marketing efforts to establish strong brand personality association among customers. The choice of personality dimensions would be up to each brand managers even we have given some

recommendations that brand managers can consider to implement it but the personality should logically emphasize the brand's positioning strategy.

### **Congruity of Drink Personality and Drinker Personality**

Greater congruity between the human characteristics that consistently and distinctively describe an individual's actual or ideal self and those that describe a brand is, the greater the preference for the brand (Aaker 1997; Malhotra 1988; Sirgy 1982). Therefore, it is essential for marketing managers to create brand personalities that consumer can relate to, those that describe an individual – who s/he is, or those that personify the ideal personality for consumers – who s/he wants to be. For example, create an advertising where the actors are consuming the drink and show the dominant brand personality (depend on the brand of the drink) will transfer into the drinkers from consuming it. As such, this example is consistent with that of McCracken's (1989), Rossiter and Percy's (1987), where the use of actors, or other sorts of celebrities or personalities, is aimed at stimulating consumers' association with the brand (Aaker 1996; Grohmann 2009).

### **Fizzy Drink**

Within fizzy drink categories, Coca Cola, Pepsi and Solo have excitement as their dominant personality but only Pepsi and Solo have congruity between their dominant brand personality and drinker personality. There is no congruity for Coca Cola brand in customer minds because Coca Cola is 'too famous' brand in the world.

These findings also indicate that excitement is the point-of-parity in fizzy drink category.

### **Mineral Water**

Within mineral water category, Mount Franklin and Cool Ridge have sincerity as their dominant personalities while Evian has sophistication as its brand personality. Cool Ridge and Evian have their dominant personalities congruent with their drinkers' personalities. Mount Franklin does not transfer the brand personality into the drinker personality because it also a 'too famous' brand in Australia that it becomes 'common brand' in consumer minds so there is no brand image transfer into the drinker. These findings also indicate that sincerity or sophistication can be the point-of-parity in mineral water category.

### **Energy Drink**

Within energy drink category, Red Bull and V have excitement as their dominant brand personalities while Mother has ruggedness as its dominant brand personality. Red Bull, V and Mother have their dominant brand personalities congruent with the drinker personalities. These findings also indicate that excitement or ruggedness can be the point-of-parity in energy drink category.

### **Conceptual Implication**

A new concept is introduced in this study whereby the congruency between the personalities of a drink brand and those of a consumer is measured. In Siguaw et al.'s (1999) study, the authors did not measure the congruency of personalities between the drink brand and the consumer, instead they examined consumers' perceptions of the brands that were examined in their study. As such, this study extends that concept by not only determining the brands' personalities in the minds of consumers, but also identifying if there was a congruity between a drink's personality and that of the consumer's. Scholars from various disciplines (e.g. psychology, anthropology, and consumer behaviour) support this notion because consumers often purchase products with symbolic brand meaning for personal-expression and social communication (Belk 1988; McCracken 1986; Zinkham and Hong 1991).

### **Methodological Implication**

As opposed to the data collection methods adopted by Siguaw et al. (1999), an improvised method is introduced here in this study whereby students are each given 6 sets of questionnaires in which they will have to complete one and give out the remaining five to their friends and family. As such, the sample population is more representative of the total population hence generalization can easily be made. In other words, the sample population is more representative and valid for the purpose of this study as it represents the ecological population in which the respondents are the population (consumers) in the right environment (category).

### **Managerial Implications**

Several managerial implications can be identified in this study. First, brand managers can determine the effectiveness of their advertising strategies by assessing the



successfulness of image transfer from the drink brand to the consumer. This event highlights the congruency between the personality of the drink brand and the consumer. Besides, points-of-parity and points-of-difference also play an important part in this equation. Therefore, it is essential to first achieve points-of-parity with regards to the offerings of competitors' and then adding more value by creating something superior, something that is different from the others.

Instead of being a "me-too" product in the market, a distinctive brand personality infused in a product can come in handy and be a source of competitive advantage by means of differentiating itself from the rest of the pack (Keller et al. 2002), whereby the personality is one that consumers want to portray and can relate to, hence the creation of competitive advantage over competitors.

### **Limitations of the study**

Several limitations can be identified in the study. As the study was focused on testing congruency between the personalities of the nine drink brands and those of consumers, generalization cannot be made onto other fields or sectors as the scope of this study may not be applicable. Hence, future research should be done on such fields and sectors as restaurants, food, other fast moving consumer goods and the like.

Also, due to the nature of the products covered in this study, where they are of low-involvement and low-risk, consumers may not be as particular and attentive as if they were in the process of purchasing high-involvement and high-risk products, which include such categories as automobile, real estate and luxury goods, where they would be engaged in extensive search for information and comparing prices, attributes, benefits, and functions of brands/products.

Besides, food products are considered as low-involvement goods, largely due to the food costs, which represent a relatively small share of personal or household income (Bell and Marshall 2003), and the nature of them being regular purchase items (Beharrell and Dennison 1995; Grunert et al. 1996; Steenkamp 1998; Costa et al. 2003). In this instance, drinks are complementary of food products; hence they too are of low-involvement goods.

Finally, the sample population is only based in an Australian state, hence the limited geographical coverage of the nationwide population. Future research studies should include a wider sample audience, spanning across different geographical borders, as it will reinforce the validity of the results.

## REFERENCES

- Aaker, J. L. 1997. Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research* 34: 347 – 356.
- Aaker, J. L. and S. Fournier. 1995. A brand as a character, a partner, and a person: Three perspectives on the question of brand personality. In Kardes, F.R. and M. Suhan (editors). *Advances in Consumer Research*. Association of Consumer Research, Provo, UT 22: 391 – 395.
- Aaker, D. A. and E. Joachimsthaler. 2000. *Brand Leadership: The Next Level of the Brand Revolution*. Free Press, New York.
- Aaker, D. A. (1996), *Building Strong Brands*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Anderson, J.C., J. A. Narus and W. Van Rossum. 2006. Customer value propositions in business markets. *Harvard Business Review* 84(3): 91 – 99.
- Ang, S.H. and E. A. C. Lim. 2006. The influence of metaphors and product type on brand personality perceptions and attitudes. *Journal of Advertising* 35(2): 39-53.
- Austin, J. R., J. A. Siguaw, and A. S. Mattila. 2003. A re-examination of the generalizability of the Aaker brand personality measurement framework. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 11(June 2003): 77 – 92.
- Azoulay, A. and J.N. Kapferer. 2003. Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality? *Brand Management* 11(2): 143-155.
- Bao, J. Y. E. and J. C. Sweeney. 2009. Comparing Factor Analytical and Circumplex Models of Brand Personality in Brand Positioning. *Journal of Psychology and Marketing* 26(10): 927 – 949.
- Barrena R. and M. Sanchez. 2009. Using Emotional Benefits as a Differentiation Strategy in Saturated Markets. *Journal of Psychology and Marketing* 26(11): 1002 – 1030.
- Batra, R., D. R. Lehmann, D. Singh. 1993. The brand personality component of brand goodwill: Some antecedents and consequences. In David A. Aaker, A. Biel, eds. *Brand Equity and Advertising*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, 83-96.
- Beharrell, B., and T. J. Dennison. 1995. Involvement in a routine food shopping context. *British Food Journal* 97: 24–29.
- Belk, R.W. 1988. Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research* 15: 139–168.

- Bell, R., and D. W. Marshall. 2003. The construct of food involvement in behavioural research: Scale development and validation. *Appetite* 40: 235–244.
- Benezra, K. 1998. Brands: Restaurants. *Adweek* 39 (May): 34.
- Bhat, S., and S. K. Reddy. 1998. Symbolic and functional positioning of brands. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 15: 32–43.
- Biel, A. 1993. Converting Image into Equity, in *Brand Equity and Advertising*, edited by David Aaker and Alexander Biel. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 67 – 82.
- Biel, A.L. 1992. How brand image drives brand equity. *Journal of Advertising Research* 32: 6–12.
- Birdwell, A.E. 1968. A study of influence of image congruence on consumer choice. *Journal of Business* 41: 76-88.
- Bower, B. 1999. When stones come to life: Researchers ponder the curious human tendency to view all sorts of things as alive. *Science News* 155: 360 – 362.
- Boyer, P. 1996. What makes anthropomorphism natural? Intuitive ontology and cultural representations. *Journal of Royal Anthropology Institute* 2: 83-97.
- Brakus, J. J., B. H. Schmitt and L. Zarantonello. 2009. Brand Experience: What Is It? How is It Measured? Does it Affect Loyalty? *Journal of Marketing* 73(May 2009): 52 – 68.
- Burke, B. 1994. Position, personality, not price, should frame consumer messages. *Brandweek* 35: 36 – 65.
- Cebzynski, G. 1998. Style and Tone over Sales? Ads Serve Variety of Purposes. *Nation's Restaurant News* 32 (June): 16.
- Costa, A. I. A., D. Schoolmeester, M. Dekker, and W. M. F. Jongen. 2003. To cook or not to cook: A means-end study of the motivations behind meal choice, in *New insights into consumer-orientated food product design*, edited by A. I. A. Costa, Wageningen: Ponson & Looyen, pp. 167–198.
- Crask, M. R. and H. A. Laskey. 1990. A positioning-based decision model for selecting advertising messages. *Journal of Advertising Research* 30(3): 32 – 38.
- Dolich, I.J. 1969. Congruence relationships between self images and product brands. *Journal of Marketing Research* 6: 80 – 84.
- Duncan, T. 2005. *Advertising and IMC*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Ekinci, Y. and S. Hosany. 2006. Destination personality: an application of brand personality to tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research* 45(2): 127-39.
- Elliott, R. 1997. Existential consumption and irrational desire. *European Journal of Marketing* 31: 285–296.
- Fiske, J. 1989. *Reading the Popular*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Foscht, T., C. Maloles III, B. Swoboda, D. Morschett and I. Sinha. The impact of culture on brand perceptions: a six-nation study. *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 17(3): 131 – 142.
- Fournier, S. 1994. *A Consumer-brand Relationship Framework for Strategic Brand Management*, doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Fournier, S. 1998. Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research* 24: 343–373.
- Freling, T. H. and L. P. Forbes. 2005. An examination of brand personality through methodological triangulation. *Journal of Brand Management* 13(2): 148 – 162.
- Gould, S.J. 1991. The self-manipulation of my pervasive perceived vital energy through product use: an introspective-praxis perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research* 18 (September): 194 – 207.
- Graeff, T.R. 1996. Using promotional messages to manage the effects of brand and self-image on brand evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 13: 4-18.
- Grohmann, B. 2009. Gender Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research* 46(February 2009): 105 – 119.
- Grubb, E. L. and G. Hupp. 1968. Perception of self, generalized stereotyped and brand selection. *Journal of Marketing Research* (5): 58–63.
- Grubb, E.L. and Grathwhohl, H.L. 1967. Consumer self-concept, symbolism, and market behaviour: A theoretical approach. *Journal of Marketing* 31:22 – 27.
- Grunert, K. G., A. Baadsgaard, H. H. Larsen, and T. K. Madsen. 1996. *Market orientation in food and agriculture*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Halliday, J. 1996. Chrysler brings our brand personalities with '97 Ads. *Advertising Age* (September 30): 3.
- Hamstra, M. 1998. Sandwich Leaders Tap Bolder Flavours in Shifts Away from Low Price Points. *Nation's Restaurant News* 35 (June): 108 – 112.

- Hayes, J. B., B. L. Alford and L. M. Capella. 2008. When the goal is creating a brand personality, focus on user imagery. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal* 12(1): 95 – 116.
- Helgeson, J. G. and M. Supphellen. 2004. A conceptual and measurement comparison of self-congruity and brand personality: The impact of socially desirable responding. *International Journal of Market Research* 46(Quarter 2): 205 – 233.
- Hess, S., H. Bauer, S. Kuester, and F. Huber. 2007. In brands we trust: Marketing's impact on service brand personality and trust. *European Marketing Academy 36th Conference Proceedings; 2007. May: 22– 5, Iceland.*
- Hogg, M. K., A. J. Cox, and K. Keeling. 2000. The impact of self-monitoring on image congruence and product/brand evaluation. *European Journal of Marketing* 34(5/6): 641.
- Kapferer, J. N. 1998. *Strategic Brand Management*. 2nd edition. Kogan Page, London and New York.
- Kassarjian, H.H. 1971. Personality and consumer behavior: A review. *Journal of Marketing Research* 8: 409–418.
- Kay, M. J. 2006. Strong brands and corporate brands. *European Journal of Marketing* 40(7/8): 742–60.
- Keller, K. 1993. Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing* **57**: 1–22.
- Keller, K. L. 2001. Building customer-based brand equity. *Marketing Management* 10(2): 14 – 19 .
- Keller, K. L. 2003. Brand synthesis: The multidimensionality of brand knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Research* 29: 595 – 600.
- Keller, K. L. and D. R. Lehmann. 2006. Brands and Branding: Research Findings and Future Priorities. *Marketing Science* 25(6): 740 – 759.
- Keller, K. L., B. Sternthal and A. Tybout. 2002. Three questions you need to ask about your brand. *Harvard Business Review* 80(9 September): 80-89
- Keller, K.L. 1993. Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, **57**, pp. 1–22.
- Keller, K.L. 1998. *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

- Kim, H. 2000. Examination of brand personality and brand attitude within the apparel product category. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management* 4(3): 243 – 252.
- Kleine, R. E., S. S. Kleine and J. B. Kernan. 1993. Mundane consumption and the self: A social identity perspective. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 2: 209–235.
- Klink, R. R. 2003. Creating meaningful brands: the relationship between brand name and brand mark. *Marketing Letters* 14(3): 143–57.
- Landon, L.E. 1974. Self concept, ideal self concept, and consumer purchase intentions. *Journal of Consumer Research* 1: 44-51.
- Lannon, J. 1993. Asking the Right Questions: What Do People Do with Advertising?, in *Brand Equity and Advertising*, edited by David Aaker and Alexander Biel. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 162 – 176.
- Lau, K. C. and I. Phau. 2007. Extending Symbolic Brands Using Their Personality: Examining Antecedents and Implications Towards Brand Image Fit and Brand Dilution. *Psychology and Marketing* 24(5): 421 – 444.
- Levy, S. J. 1959. Symbols for sale. *Harvard Business Review* 37: 117 – 124.
- Ligas, M. 2000. People, products and pursuits: exploring the relationship between consumer goals and product meanings. *Psychology and Marketing* 17: 983–1003.
- Malhotra, N.K. 1988. Self-concept and product choice: an integrated perspective. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 9: 1–28.
- McCracken, G. 1986. Culture and Consumption: A Theoretical Account for the Structure and movement of Cultural Meanings of Consumer Goods. *Journal of Consumer Research* 13 (June): 71 – 84.
- McCracken, G. 1989. Who is the celebrity endorser? Cultural foundations of the endorsement process. *Journal of Consumer Research* 16(3): 310–21.
- Mulyanegara, R. C. and Y. Tsarenko. 2009. Predicting brand preferences – an examination of the predictive power of consumer personality and values in the Australian fashion market. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management* 13(3): 358 – 371.
- Mulyanegara, R. C., Y. Tsarenko and A. Anderson. 2009. The Big Five and brand personality: Investigating the impact of consumer personality on preferences

- towards particular brand personality. *Journal of Brand Management* 16(2009): 234 – 247.
- Novak, E. and M. Lyman. 1998. *Brand Positioning: The Art of Retying Connections*. The Electricity Journal (November 1998), Elsevier Science Inc.
- O'Donohoe, S. 1994. Advertising uses and gratifications. *European Journal of Marketing* 28: 52–75.
- Ogilvy, D. 1983. *Confession of an Advertising Man*. Dell, New York.
- Opoku, R., R. Abratt and L. Pitt. 2006. Communicating brand personality: are the websites doing the talking for the top South African business schools? *Journal of Brand Management* 14(1/2): 20-39.
- Park, C.S. and V. Srinivasan. 1994. A survey-based method for measuring and understanding brand equity and its extendibility. *Journal of Marketing Research* 31: 271–88.
- Park, C.W., B. J. Jaworski and D. J. McInnis. 1986. Strategic brand image-concept management. *Journal of Marketing*, 50, pp. 135–145.
- Parker, B. T. 2009. A comparison of brand personality and brand user-imagery congruence. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 26(3): 175 – 184.
- Patterson, M. 1999. Re-appraising the concept of brand image. *Journal of Brand Management* 6: 409 – 426.
- Phau, I. and K. C. Lau. 2001. Brand personality and consumer self-expression: Single or dual carriageway? *Journal of Brand Management* 8: 428–444.
- Pitt, L. F., R. Opoku, M. Hultman, R. Abratt, and S. Spyropoulou. 2006. What I say about myself: Communication of brand personality by African countries. *Journal of Tourism Management* 28(2007): 835 – 844.
- Plummer, J. 2000. How personality makes are different. *Journal of Advertising Research* 40: 79–83.
- Plummer, J. T. 1984. How personality makes a difference. *Journal of Advertising Research* 24(6): 27–31.
- Plummer, J. T. 1985. How personality makes a difference. *Journal of Advertising Research* 24(6): 27 – 31.
- Ramaseshan, B. and H. Tsao. 2007. Moderating effects of the brand concept on the relationship between brand personality and perceived quality. *Journal of Brand Management* 14(6): 458 – 466.

- Rogers, C.R. 1959. A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A Study of a Science* 3, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, pp. 184-256.
- Ross, I. 1971. Self-concept and brand preference. *Journal of Business of the University of Chicago* 44: 38- 40.
- Rossiter, J. R. and L. Percy. 1987. *Advertising and promotion management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Schembri, S. 2009. Reframing brand experience: The experiential meaning of Harley-Davidson. *Journal of Business Research* 62(2009): 1299 – 1310.
- Scott, L. M. 1994. Images in Advertising: The Need for a Theory of Visual Rhetoric. *Journal of Consumer Research* 21 (September): 252 – 273.
- Siguaw, J. A., Mattila, A. and Austin J. R. 1999. The Brand-personality Scale: An Application for Restaurants. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 40(3): 48 – 55.
- Silverstein, M. J. and N. Fiske. 2005. *Trading Up*. Penguin Group Portfolio, New York.
- Sirgy, J. 1982. Self-concept in consumer behaviour. *Journal of Consumer Research* 9 (December): pp. 287 – 300.
- Sirgy, J.M., D. Grewal, T. F. Mangleburg, J. Park, K. Chon, C. B. Claiborne, J. S. Johar, and H. Berkman. 1997. Assessing the predictive validity of two methods of measuring self-image congruence. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 25(3): 229-41.
- Sirgy, M. J. 1979. Self-concept in consumer behavior. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Massachusetts.
- Sirgy, M. J. 1980. Self-concept in relation to product preference and purchase intention. In V. V. Bellur, ed., *Developments in Marketing Science*, Vol. 3. Marquette, Mich.: Academy of Marketing Science.
- Sirgy, M. J. 1981. Introducing a self-theory to consumer personality research. *JSAS, Catalog of Selected in Psychology*, Ms. 2250, p. 33.
- Sirgy, M. J. 1985. Self-image/product image congruity and consumer decision-making. *International Journal of Management* 2(4): 49–63.
- Sirgy, M.J. 1986. *Self-congruity: Toward a Theory of Personality and Cybernetics*, Praeger Publishers, New York, NY.



- Solomon, M. 1983. The role of products as social stimuli: A symbolic interactionism perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research* 10: 319–329.
- Steenkamp, J. B. E. M. 1998. Dynamics in consumer behaviour with respect to agricultural and food products, in *Agricultural marketing and consumer behaviour in a changing world*, edited by B. Wierenga, A. Van Tilburg, K. Grunert, J. B. E. M. Steenkamp, and M. Wedel, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 217–230.
- Sung, Y., and S. F. Tinkham. 2005. Brand personality structure in the United States and Korea: Common and culture-specific factors. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 15(4): 334–350.
- Sutherland, J., S. Marshall, and B. T. Parker. 2004. Real, ideal, and undesired self concepts and their effects on viewer preferences: who do you love? Paper presented at the American Academy of Advertising, Baton Rouge, LA, March.
- Sweeney, J.C. and C. Brandon. 2006. Brand personality: exploring the potential to move from factor analytical to circumplex models. *Psychology and Marketing* 23(8): 639-63.
- Tsu Wee, T.T. 2004. Extending human personality to brands: the stability factor. *Brand Management* 11(4): 317.
- Underwood, R., E. Bond, and R. Baer. 2001. Building service brands via social identity: Lessons from the sports marketplace. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 9(1): 1 – 12.
- Upshaw, L. 1995. *Building Brand Identity: A Strategy for Success in a Hostile Marketplace*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Valette-Florence, P., H. Guizani and D. Merunka. 2009. The impact of brand personality and sales promotions on brand equity. *Journal of Business Research* (2009): 1 – 5.
- Wang, X., and Z. Yang. 2008. Does country-of-origin matter in the relationship between brand personality and purchase intention in emerging economies? Evidence from China's auto industry. *International Marketing Review* 25(4): 458–474.
- Wang, X., Z. Yang and N. R. Liu. 2009. The Impacts of Brand Personality and Congruity on Purchase Intetnion: Evidence From the Chinese Mainland's Automobile Market. *Journal of Global Marketing* 22(2009): 199 – 215.

- Wildermuth, E. 1994. The Value Wars leave More Casualties than Victors. *Nation's Restaurant News* 28 (February): 28.
- Zinkham, G.M. and J. W. Hong. 1991. Self-concept and advertising effectiveness: A conceptual model of congruency, conspicuousness, and response mode. *Advances in Consumer Research* (18): 348 – 354.

## Appendix 1

### FIZZY DRINK

#### Correlation between five brand personalities in fizzy drink category

	Sincerity	Excitement	Competent	Sophistication	Ruggedness
Sincerity	1				
Excitement	0.516**	1			
Competent	0.575**	0.655**	1		
Sophistication	0.532**	0.504**	0.611**	1	
Ruggedness	0.328**	0.417**	0.364**	0.387**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F value	p-value
Sincerity	2.562	0.078
Excitement	0.371	0.690
Competent	2.769	0.064
Sophistication	0.626	0.535
Ruggedness	0.632	0.532

#### MANOVA Test

Dimension	F-value	p-value
Sincerity	3.548	0.030
Excitement	18.565	0.000
Competence	15.370	0.000
Sophistication	12.692	0.000
Ruggedness	0.131	0.877

From **Post Hoc test** (Gabriel), it shows that:

Dependent variables	Drink Category	Comparison	p-value
Sincere	Coke	Pepsi	0.138
	Coke	Solo*	0.035
	Pepsi	Solo	0.934
Excitement	Coke	Pepsi*	0.000
	Coke	Solo*	0.000
	Pepsi	Solo	0.116
Competence	Coke	Pepsi*	0.019
	Coke	Solo*	0.000
	Pepsi	Solo*	0.017
Sophistication	Coke	Pepsi	0.098
	Coke	Solo*	0.000
	Pepsi	Solo*	0.013
Ruggedness	Coke	Pepsi	0.974
	Coke	Solo	0.999
	Pepsi	Solo	0.947

\*. Post Hoc Test is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

## Appendix 2

### MINERAL WATER

#### Correlation between five brand personalities in mineral water category

	Sincerity	Excitement	Competent	Sophistication	Ruggedness
Sincerity	1				
Excitement	0.319**	1			
Competent	0.653**	0.482**	1		
Sophistication	0.540**	0.464**	0.593**	1	
Ruggedness	0.156**	0.476**	0.233**	0.186**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F value	p-value
Sincerity	3.215	0.041
Excitement	0.234	0.792
Competent	3.055	0.048
Sophistication	0.541	0.583
Ruggedness	0.918	0.400

#### MANOVA test

Dimension	F-value	p-value
Sincerity	7.607	0.001
Excitement	2.615	0.074
Competence	3.517	0.031
Sophistication	17.489	0.000
Ruggedness	0.299	0.741

From **Post Hoc test** (Gabriel), it shows that:

Dependent variables	Drink Category	Comparison	p-value
Sincere	Mount Franklin	Cool Ridge*	0.001
	Mount Franklin	Evian*	0.013
	Cool Ridge	Evian	0.761
Excitement	Mount Franklin	Cool Ridge	0.367
	Mount Franklin	Evian	0.818
	Cool Ridge	Evian	0.073
Competence	Mount Franklin	Cool Ridge*	0.026
	Mount Franklin	Evian	0.616
	Cool Ridge	Evian	0.324
Sophistication	Mount Franklin	Cool Ridge*	0.000
	Mount Franklin	Evian	0.432
	Cool Ridge	Evian*	0.000
Ruggedness	Mount Franklin	Cool Ridge	0.918
	Mount Franklin	Evian	0.844
	Cool Ridge	Evian	0.998

\*. Post Hoc Test is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

### Appendix 3

#### ENERGY DRINK

##### Correlation between five brand personalities in energy drink category

	Sincerity	Excitement	Competent	Sophistication	Ruggedness
Sincerity	1				
Excitement	0.433**	1			
Competent	0.603**	0.619**	1		
Sophistication	0.523**	0.384**	0.568**	1	
Ruggedness	0.286**	0.509**	0.462**	0.382**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

##### Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F value	p-value
Sincerity	0.649	0.523
Excitement	0.704	0.495
Competent	2.328	0.099
Sophistication	2.065	0.128
Ruggedness	0.424	0.655

##### MANOVA Test

Dimension	F-value	p-value
Sincerity	3.041	0.049
Excitement	3.224	0.041
Competence	7.361	0.001
Sophistication	6.105	0.002
Ruggedness	0.935	0.394

From **Post Hoc test** (Gabriel), it shows that:

Dependent variables	Drink Category	Comparison	p-value
Sincere	Red Bull	V	0.853
	Red Bull	Mother*	0.049
	V Energy Drink	Mother	0.260
Excitement	Red Bull	V	0.663
	Red Bull	Mother*	0.035
	V Energy Drink	Mother	0.362
Competence	Red Bull	V	0.363
	Red Bull	Mother*	0.000
	V Energy Drink	Mother	0.064
Sophistication	Red Bull	V	0.659
	Red Bull	Mother*	0.002
	V Energy Drink	Mother	0.056
Ruggedness	Red Bull	V	0.847
	Red Bull	Mother	0.892
	V Energy Drink	Mother	0.433

\*. Post Hoc Test is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

## Appendix 4

### DRINK CATEGORY

#### Correlation between five brand personalities in three drink category

	Sincerity	Excitement	Competent	Sophistication	Ruggedness
Sincerity	1				
Excitement	0.304**	1			
Competent	0.601**	0.546**	1		
Sophistication	0.554**	0.355**	0.586**	1	
Ruggedness	0.156**	0.517**	0.326**	0.242**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F value	p-value
Sincerity	0.447	0.640
Excitement	4.049	0.018
Competent	0.048	0.953
Sophistication	1.556	0.211
Ruggedness	1.524	0.218

#### MANOVA test

Dimension	F-value	p-value
Sincerity	48.207	0.000
Excitement	66.896	0.000
Competence	4.559	0.011
Sophistication	23.180	0.000
Ruggedness	54.634	0.000

From **Post Hoc test** (Tukey), it shows that:

Dependent variables	Drink Category	Comparison	p-value
Sincere	Fizzy Drink	Mineral Water*	0.000
	Fizzy Drink	Energy Drink*	0.000
	Mineral Water	Energy Drink*	0.000
Excitement	Fizzy Drink	Mineral Water*	0.000
	Fizzy Drink	Energy Drink	0.561
	Mineral Water	Energy Drink*	0.000
Competence	Fizzy Drink	Mineral Water	0.687
	Fizzy Drink	Energy Drink*	0.010
	Mineral Water	Energy Drink	0.090
Sophistication	Fizzy Drink	Mineral Water*	0.000
	Fizzy Drink	Energy Drink	0.093
	Mineral Water	Energy Drink*	0.000
Ruggedness	Fizzy Drink	Mineral Water*	0.000
	Fizzy Drink	Energy Drink	0.094
	Mineral Water	Energy Drink*	0.000

\*. Post Hoc Test is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

*Appendix 5*

**The five dimension of brand personality**

The five dimensions at the head of the column comprise the traits listed below, as identified by: Jennifer L. Aaker, “Dimensions of Brand Personality,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 34 (August 1997), pp. 347 – 356.

<b>Competence</b>	<b>Sincerity</b>	<b>Excitement</b>	<b>Sophistication</b>	<b>Ruggedness</b>
Reliable	Down-to-earth	Daring	Upper-class	Outdoorsy
Hard-working	Family-oriented	Trendy	Glamorous	Masculine
Secure	Small-town	Exciting	Good-looking	Western
Intelligent	Honest	Spirited	Charming	Tough
Technical	Sincere	Cool	Feminine	Rugged
Corporate	Real	Young	Smooth	
Successful	Wholesome	Imaginative		
Leader	Original	Unique		
Confident	Cheerful	Up-to-date		
	Sentimental	Independent		
	Friendly	contemporary		