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Abstract

Purpose:
To review the important brand personality measurement scales and to draw comparisons among them in order to identify their strengths and weaknesses.

Methodology:
The scales included in this study were chosen on the basis of two criteria, either they should introduce a new approach to measure brand personality or should be based on a new conceptual definition of the construct. The selected scales were compared on the basis of their theoretical base, utility and cross-cultural validity.

Findings and Suggestions:
The study reveals that the different scales introduced by researchers to measure brand personality have helped in addressing various criticisms related to brand personality measurement. A comparison of various brand personality scales identified their strengths and weaknesses and the specific contexts where in they will be most suitable. Future works in this field can be carried out incorporating these developments.

Originality/ Value:
Though there have been a lot of studies done in the area of brand personality measurement, no study till date has compared the various approaches used by researchers to measure the concept. This study reviews the existing approaches to brand personality measurement, identifies the commonalities and the base for comparison and develops a comparative framework of brand personality measurement approaches.
1. Introduction

In this modern competitive world, consumers have numerous choices of brands, all of which provide similar functional benefits. Because of competition and innovative technologies, it is now easy for competitors to copy the offerings of its rivals. So, differentiating one brand from its competitors merely based on its functional attributes alone has become almost impossible. Offering symbolic benefits to consumers and thereby gaining an edge over the competitors has become important in this regard. Brand personality plays a crucial role in offering symbolic benefits to consumers. It is of greater importance than other concepts like brand identity since consumers pay more attention to it when brands become more homogeneous [1].

Significance of brand personality in marketing is great since it plays a crucial role in understanding brand choice [2], [3], invaluable in building brand equity [4], helps in increasing consumer preference for and usage of the brand [5], enables the consumers differentiate among the myriad products available in the marketplace [6, 7], and helps the consumer to express his or her own self [8]. The concept is put in the forefront since functional differences among brands are often minimal, and the key to achieving strong brands is ‘bursting out of the clutter’ [6, 9].

By understanding the personality of the brand, managers can manage their brands in a better manner. This can also help them to create insights regarding the problems related with a brand’s personality and possible solutions. Hence measuring brand personality is very important. Different approaches [10, 11, 12, 13 and so on] have been made by various researchers to measure this concept. Though there have been a lot of studies done in the area of brand personality measurement, no study till date has compared the various approaches used by researchers to measure the concept. This paper tries to fill this gap by

1) Reviewing the existing approaches to brand personality measurements – starting from the earliest scale developed by Jennifer Aaker [10] to the most recent developed by Bob Heere [13],

2) Identifying the commonalities and the bases for comparison, and

3) Developing a comparative framework of brand personality measurement approaches.

2. Theoretical Background

The tendency to attribute human characteristics to brands existed in the marketing domain as early as 1950s. Azoulay and Kapferer [14], notices that Martineau [15] used the word to refer to the non-material dimensions that make a store special or to have a character of its own. King [16] quotes the research works of J. Walter Thompson Advertising Agency which indicates that consumers attribute personality characteristics to brands and talk about it. Before 1980s, brand differentiation was mainly on the basis of product performance. But with the increasing number of products which provided almost the same set of functional benefits, it became difficult for marketers to differentiate brands merely on the basis of its performance. In order to overcome this trouble, the advertising agency Ted Bates introduced the concept of Unique Selling Personality following the concept of Unique Selling Proposition created by Rosser Reeves. As a consequence, the account executives started to use a new item called brand personality in their copy strategy. From 1970 onwards every advertising agency started giving a provision for describing brand personality (along with the target, brand promise and the reason why). The use of brand personality originated as a non-product-based definition of the brand: it captured all that was not bound to the product’s use,
performance, attributes, and so on. In copy strategies, brand personality was used as a common practical, but rather loose, word for assessing non-product-based, non-functional dimensions of the brand; it captured the singularity of the source of the product as if it were a person [14].

2.1. Sources of Brand Personality
The major difference in the formation of human personality and brand personality lies in terms of how these perceptions are formed. Human personality traits are inferred on the basis of individual behaviour, physical characteristics, attitudes and beliefs, and demographic characteristics [17]. But in the case of brands, consumers derive perceptions about a brand’s personality through direct or indirect contact with the brand [18, 10]. According to the direct sources of brand personality include the brand’s user imagery, its employees, CEO, endorsers and indirect sources may include product-related attributes, product category associations, brand name, symbols or logo, advertising style, price and distribution channel [19, 10].

2.2. Defining Brand Personality
Brand personality has been defined by different researchers in different ways. Aaker [10] defines it as ‘the set of human characteristics associated with a brand’. Yet another popular definition of brand personality is the one proposed by Azoulay and Kapferer [14]. They define brand personality as the ‘the set of human personality traits that are both applicable to and relevant for brands’. Sweeney and Brandon [11] tried to define brand personality based on Interpersonal circumplex model and defined it as ‘the set of human personality traits that correspond to the interpersonal domain of human personality and are relevant to describing the brand as a relationship partner’. These different definitions on brand personality arise from the attempts of researchers to make the concept more precise and valid.

2.3. Measuring Brand Personality
The product or brand personality measurement research can be traced back to 1960s [20, 21]. Early research studies focused mainly on the relationship between consumer’s self and product personality. For example, Birdwell [20] conducted a study using a compiled list of bipolar items containing appropriate adjectives which described both automobile and human personalities, to understand the relationship between consumers’ perception about their car and their self perception. Another earlier study on product personality was one done by Dolich [21]. It was done with an intention to understand the relationship between the consumers’ actual and ideal self image and personalities of four product categories namely beer, cigarettes, bar soap and tooth paste. The researcher used a scale adapted from human personality scales to study the same. The research works of Malhotra [22] on the construction of a scale which measured self-concepts, person concepts and product concepts and, Karande, Zinkhan, and Lum [23] on brand personality and self concept are noteworthy. Aaker [10] describes two types of brand personality scales used by earlier researchers to study how the relationship between brand and human personality drives consumer preferences. The first one is Adhoc type scales (consisting of traits ranging from 20 to 300). The main limitation was that these scales were developed for specific research studies and also, they lacked a theoretical background. Second type consists of brand personality scales based on human personality scales. The validity of these scales was questioned since the antecedents of both constructs were different. Though some of the dimensions of human personality may be mirrored on brands, the whole cannot occur [24].
Ambroise, Ferrandi and Merunka [25] describe three approaches used by researchers to measure brand personality. The first one is a hierarchical approach used by Aaker [10]. Second, a Lexical approach used by Caprara et al. [26] and the third one, is the direct application of human personality scales to measure brand personality. For example Ferrandi and Valette-Florence [27] applied Saucier [28] human personality scales to brands and the results of their study indicated some congruence between purchasers’ personality and the personality of the brand they purchased.

3. Brand Personality Scales (BPS)

In order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of brand personality measurements, the following brand personality scales have been studied.

1) Aaker (1997) - This seminal work of Aaker is counted to be the first robust, reliable, and valid scale to measure brand personality.

2) Ambroise, Ferrandi and Merunka (2005) - This scale was developed in France, considering two product categories and using Factor analysis to find out the underlying dimensions of brand personality.

3) Sweeney and Brandon (2006) – This is a brand personality scale developed in Australia based on the Inter personal Circumplex model.

4) Bosnjak, Bochmann, and Hufschmidt (2007) - This scale was developed in Germany considering multiple product categories and using a person-centric perspective.

5) Geuens, Weiters and Wulf (2009) - This scale was originally developed in a Belgium cultural context considering multiple product categories. The uniqueness of this scale lies in the fact that, it was the only scale proved to be cross culturally valid.

6) Kuenzel and Phairor (2009) – This scale was developed in Germany to measure the brand personality of an automobile brand.

7) Heine (2009) – This is a scale developed using Repertory Grid Method to measure brand personality of luxury goods.

8) Lee, Soutar and Quintal (2010) – This is a scale developed to measure destination personality using a Best-Worst Scaling (BWS).

9) Heere (2010) – This scale was developed based on a sports brand which yielded a two dimensional brand personality scale.

3.1. Aaker’s scale (1997)

Aaker was the first one to generate a robust, reliable and valid scale to measure brand personality. Her study was in a U.S context. She developed a framework of brand personality dimensions by drawing on research on the ‘Big Five’ human personality structure [29]. The major sources used to generate candidate traits included personality scale used by psychologists, personality scale used by marketers and original qualitative research of personality traits associated with a number of brands. To identify the brand personality dimensions, a total of 631 subjects rated a subset of 37 brands on 114 personality traits. An exploratory principal component factor analysis yielded a five factor structure. The facets of each factor were found by using a principal component analysis and the specific features of each facet were found out using a cluster analysis. The robustness of the structure was proved using a series of factor analysis run on subsets of subjects and reliability was verified using test- retest correlation and Cronbach’s alpha. Aaker’s scale is shown in table 1. It has five dimensions, 15 facets and 42 traits.
A major criticism pertaining to Aaker’s brand personality scale is regarding the loose definition of the construct. Aaker [10] defined brand personality as “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand.” The adoption of such a wide definition has lead to a concept validity problem. The above mentioned definition encompasses everything related to a human being and applicable to brand [14]. Azoulay and Kapferer [14] argue that brand personality is a concept which has close relations with the personality concept in psychology and therefore its definition must also be in line with the same. Psychologists excluded intellectual abilities, gender and social class from their definitions and scales on personality whereas Aaker [10] included many of these. The main problematic items in Aaker’s scale as pointed out by Azoulay and Kapferer [14] includes Competence (which is a cognitive ability and psychologists do not include it in their personality scales), Feminine (Gender is absent from psychology scales of personality and also its meaning is tied to cultures), items related to age and social class. Some other questionable items includes western, small town and so on which belong to the cultural facet in the brand identity prism and brand personality is another facet of the same [14].

Another limitation of the scale generated by Aaker [10] is that it is culture specific or, the five factors identified by Aaker in the case of U.S were not found to be replicable in the case of other cultures. For example Aaker et al. [30] found that Peacefulness replaced Ruggedness in the case of Japan and in the case of Spain only three factors (Sincerity, Excitement, and Sophistication) out of five were found to be applicable. The other two factors in the case of Spain were Passion and Peacefulness. This limitation of Aaker’s scale has led to a large number of culture specific studies. A German brand personality scale was developed by Bosnjak et al. [12], an Italian one was developed by Caprara et al. [26] and a French one by Ferrandi, Valette-Florence, and Fine-Falcy [31] and so on. Discussion on these adaptations is beyond the scope of this study.
Table 1: Brand personality scale developed by Aaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Facets</th>
<th>Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>• Out doorsy&lt;br&gt;• Tough</td>
<td>1. Out doorsy&lt;br&gt;3. Western&lt;br&gt;5. Rugged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Aaker [10]

Austin, Siguaw and Matila [32] in their study entitled ‘A re-examination of the generalisability of Aaker brand personality measurement framework’, found that Aaker’s framework doesn’t generalize the factor structure at the respondent level (for a specific brand or within a specific product category). This issue occurred because Aaker [10] conducted all analysis on data aggregated across respondents instead of measuring the personality of individual brands or aggregating data within a specific product category [32]. Another limitation of Aaker’s scale is that it considers only positive brand attributes. But this need not be the case always. A brand may also be described in terms of negative attributes such as arrogant, calculating, cocky and so on. For effective brand management, one needs a full understanding of the brand personality [11]. The researchers who conducted studies in brand personality measurement tried to address these limitations and came out with various approaches and results which answered many of these criticisms. Some major research works which followed Aaker’s [10] seminal work on brand personality are discussed in the following sections.

3.2 Ambroise, Ferrandi and Merunka’s scale (2005)

Ambroise et al. [25] conducted a study in France to develop a new brand personality scale. The researcher considered four brands for this study and used the items from previously published works on brand personality. The appropriateness of the items was evaluated by a convenience sample of 387 business students on a 7-point Likert scale. Principal component
factor analysis was used with promax rotation. The final result of the study consisted of 12 factors and 33 items. The validity of the scale was proved with the help of a confirmatory factor analysis. The important strength of this scale as compared to Aaker’s [10] scale is that it uses a more strict definition of brand personality. The scale derived from this study is given below.

Source: Ambroise et al. [25]
Figure-1. Ambroise, Ferrandi and Merunka’s brand personality scale (2005)
3.3 Sweeney and Brandon’s scale (2006)

Sweeney and Brandon [11] explored the potential to move from factor analytical model to Circumplex model. The study was conducted in Australia and used three sources to generate items required for developing scale, which included human personality items from Wiggins’ [33] inter-personal adjective scale, items from the Trapnell and Wiggins’ [34] five-factor model and Aaker’s [10] brand personality measures. 32 judges rated the appropriateness of these traits based on the interpersonal definition of brand personality. The results of the study showed that brand personality can be viewed in less wholesome ways than those traits originally proposed by Aaker [10] and that broadly Aaker's [10] brand personality dimensions and the agreeableness, extroversion and conscientiousness dimensions from human personality model are suitable and appropriate for measuring Interpersonal brand personality.

![Source: Adapted from Sweeney and Brandon [11]](image)

3.4 Bosnjak, Bochmann, and Hufschmidt’s scale (2007)

Bosnjak et al. [12] conducted a study in Germany with respect to commercial brands with a person-centric perspective which explored both positive as well as negative human personality dimensions which are both applicable and relevant to brands. The study found that a four factor structure with 20 items could explain the indigenous German brand personality. The dimensions found were drive, conscientiousness, emotion, and superficiality. Of these, the dimension drive has two facets namely excitement and boredom. The use of a person-centric approach has resulted in the emergence of negatively connoted factor, superficiality and the facet, boredom (belonging to the factor - drive). A pictorial representation of the relationships between different factors and facets is given below.
Figure-3. Bosnjak, Bochmann, and Hufschmidt’s Brand Personality Scale (2007)

The various items associated with each factor are given in the following table.

Table 2: Bosnjak, Bochmann, and Hufschmidt’s Brand Personality Scale – Factors and Items (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Superficiality</td>
<td>1. Hypocritical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Arrogant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>1. Good-natured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sentimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>1. Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>1. Excitement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Adventurous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Spirited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Saucy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bosnjak et al. [12]
3.5 Geuens, Weiters and Wulf’s scale (2009)
One of the most recent and notable development in the field of measuring brand personality is the work done by Geuens et al. [35]. They tried to address the criticisms on brand personality scales and come up with a scale which consisted of personality items only. The study considered 193 brands and was conducted among 12,789 Belgium respondents. This study yielded a scale with 12 items and five factors (Activity, Responsibility, Aggressiveness, Simplicity, and Emotionality). The scale was proved to be reliable in the case of between-brand between-category comparisons, between-brand within-category comparisons and for between-respondent comparisons. The scale had high test-retest reliability and cross cultural validity in the U.S and nine other European countries. The uniqueness of this work lies in the fact that, it is the only scale proved to be valid to measure brand personality irrespective of cultural variations.

Source: Geuens et al. [35]

Figure-4. Geuens, Weiters and Wulf’s Brand Personality Scale (2009)

3.6 Kuenzel and Phairor’s scale (2009)
Based on the warning of Austin et al. [32] to apply general brand personality scales to single brands, Kuenzel and Phairor [36] conducted a study based on an automobile brand in Germany. Data for the study was collected from 1170 consumers of the brand using a 5-point Likert type scale, the analysis of which using an Exploratory factor analysis with principal component analysis and oblique rotation yielded a two factor structure with four items describing each factor. The major advantage of this scale lies in its shortness, which can help in reducing respondent fatigue as compared to that of Aaker’s scale [37].

Source: Kuenzel Phairor [36]

Figure-5. Kuenzel and Phairor’s Brand Personality Scale (2009)

3.7 Heine’s scale (2009)
Heine [38] used a qualitative methodology including Repertory Grid Method (developed by Kelly [39]) to develop a scale to measure luxury brand personality. The need for this research lies in the fact that brand personality is a key source of symbolic benefits and luxury brands derive their value mainly from these symbolic benefits. The study was conducted among 31 German millionaires and a content analysis of the data collected through interview revealed that luxury brand personality consisted of five dimensions.

(Figure 6. Heine’s Luxury Brand Personality Scale (2009)

Further Heine [38] states that the dimensions presented above are not independent from each other and that the left hand side of the above figure can be characterised as quiet and the opposite side as rather loud.

3.8 Lee, Soutar and Quintal’s scale (2010)

Lee et al. [40] tried to introduce a new brand personality measurement approach which requires less time to obtain data and that removes some of the response biases. For this purpose, they used a Best Worst Scaling (BWS) technique to measure the personality of three destinations namely France, U.S.A and China based on the perceptions of people from Australia, Germany, Brazil and South Korea. They used personality traits from previous studies on brand personality and, with the help of a partially balanced incomplete block design they collected the most and least descriptive terms for each of the three destinations from the respondents. The results of the study showed that France was seen as significantly more sophisticated, the USA as significantly more rugged and lively and China as significantly more trendy, lively and genuine, than the other destinations. Though the study does not provide a rigid scale to measure brand personality, it introduces a new approach with which we can measure brand personality.

3.9 Heere’s scale (2010)
A study was done by Heere [13] based on the notion that managers can sum up personality traits since they are responsible to a great extent for the creation of brand personality. He used the free listing technique to elicit the adjectives they used to describe their brand. The information gathered from various managers were processed and summarized in to a final set of items which was rated by 224 respondents on a 7 point scale. An exploratory factor analysis of the data resulted in the clustering of adjectives around two factors, namely Game-related (associations that are directly related to elite sport and the emotions resulting from the game) and Event-related (more generic associations related to the event). The event-related factor consisted of adjectives like accessible, warm, cool, and attractive and game-related factor includes adjectives such as proud and exciting.

![Diagram of Brand Personality Dimensions](image)

Source: Heere [13]

Figure-7. Heere’s brand personality dimensions (2010)

4. Summary of Brand Personality scales

The different approaches to measure brand personality are summarized in table-3 consisting of the context (that is, the country wherein the study was done and the number of brands considered for the study), sources of traits (that is, sources used by the researcher to identify the adjectives needed for the study), sample description (that is, the number and type of respondents participated in the study), design and analysis (that is, how the researcher identified the various dimensions of brand personality) and the major findings of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Sources of Traits</th>
<th>Sample description</th>
<th>Design and Analysis</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaker</td>
<td>Study done in U.S</td>
<td>Sources include:</td>
<td>Size: 631</td>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td>- Identified a five dimensional structure with 15 facets and 42 traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>based on 37 brands across multiple product categories</td>
<td>- Personality scales used by psychologists (Big Five model – [29], [41], NEO Model – [48]; Big Five Prototypes – [43], Adjective Check List [44], and Inter-Circumplex Model – [42])</td>
<td>Panel: A national mail panel</td>
<td>- Used an exploratory principal component factor analysis to identify the dimensions.</td>
<td>- The dimensions include Sincerity, excitement, ruggedness, sophistication and competence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-3. Summary of Brand Personality scales
Personality scales used by marketers and academicians ([45], [19], [46], [22], [18], [47])

- Original qualitative research of personality traits
- Traits from a free association test conducted

**Ambroise et al. [25]**

Study done in France considering four brands, namely Pepsi, Coke, Nike and Adidas

| Size: 387 | Two sources were mainly used: |
| Panel: University | - Existing scales which include [30], [26], [27], [31] and |
| Subjects: Business students | - Generation of new items by consumers and experts (using nominal group technique) |

Principal component factor analysis with a promax rotation and confirmatory factor analysis were used for the study.

Found the brand personality to have an order 1 structure with 33 items loading on 12 dimensions. The dimensions found were glamorous, secure, outgoing, sweet, exciting, elegant, mischievous, cheerful, mature, natural, rigorous and reliable.

**Sweeney et al. [11]**

A study done in Australia considering the features of multiple product categories

| Size: 32 | Three sources were used: |
| Panel: Online survey | - Human personality items from Wiggins [33], and items from |
| Subjects: Academics | Trapnell and Wiggins [34] and Aaker [10] |

32 judges rated the appropriateness of a set of traits based on the interpersonal definition of brand personality

- Brand personality can be viewed in less wholesome ways than those traits originally proposed by Aaker [10].
- Study indicated that broadly Aaker's [10] brand personality dimensions and the agreeableness,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bosnjak et al. [12]</strong></td>
<td>Study in Germany based on 13 brands in multiple product categories. Two sources were used - Items created by eliciting attributes with the aid of original qualitative research - Items translated from Aaker’s [10] scale.</td>
<td>Found that indigenous German brand personality scale consists of Four factors and 20 items. The dimensions includes drive, conscientiousness, emotion and superficiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geuens et al. [35]</strong></td>
<td>Study in Belgium considering 20 brands in stage-1 and 193 brands in stage-2 from multiple product categories. Consists of items from - Aaker’s [10] scale - items from Costa and McCrae's revised NEO-PI scale [48], Mervielde's Dutch Big Five version [50], and Saucier's brief version of Goldberg's Big Five markers [28] - Items generated thru brainstorming sections in two focus groups.</td>
<td>A new scale was formulated consisting of 5 factors and 12 items. The five dimensions found were Activity, Responsibility, Aggressiveness, Simplicity, and Emotionalinity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kuenzel: Study done, Traits were, Size: 1170, Exploratory, Further evidence.
### et al. [36]

In Germany based on a popular car brand, traits were taken from Hieronymus’ [49] German brand personality scale and adjectives frequently used in the company’s brand communication.

**Panel:** Company’s national customer database

**Subjects:** Product owners

And confirmatory factor analyses were used to validate the actual structure of the brand personality scale has been found in support of Austin *et al.* [32]’s warning to apply general brand personality scales to single brands.

- Brand personality had a two-dimensional (security and passion) structure having 5 adjectives each.

### Heine [38]

Study in Germany to measure luxury brand personality traits were identified by interviewing 31 German millionaires.

**Size:** 31

**Panel:** Used a snowball sampling approach

**Subjects:** German millionaires - used a qualitative methodology including Repertory Grid Method. Used content analysis of the data to uncover 5 personality dimensions.

- Found that consumers perceive 5 different personality dimensions for luxury brands, namely modernity, eccentricity, opulence, elitism and strength.

### Lee et al. [40]

Study done among people from Australia, Germany, Brazil and South Korea considering three tourist destinations (France, U.S.A and China).

Traits were taken from prior studies of Aaker [10], Phau and Lau [51], Aaker *et al.* [30], Austin *et al.* [32] and Sung and Tinkham [52].

**Size:** 209 to 220 in each country

**Panel:** Online survey

**Subjects:** People from Australia, Germany, Brazil and South Korea

A partially balanced incomplete block design was used and respondents were asked to pick the most and least descriptive terms and best-worst ratio score was calculated to produce trade-off scores.

- Found that destinations differed in their personality - France was seen as significantly more sophisticated, the USA as significantly more rugged and lively and China as significantly more trendy, lively and genuine than the other destinations.

### Heere

Study done Traits were taken from Aaker [10], Phau and Lau [51], Aaker *et al.* [30], Austin *et al.* [32] and Sung and Tinkham [52].

**Size:** 2-stage study

Two factors were found.
in New Zealand and based on a sports brand identified by asking the managers of the organization to use the free listing technique to describe their own brand.

Stage-1 - 5
Stage-2 - 224
Panel: Online survey and questionnaires administered to spectators of a sports event
Subjects: Managers and sports spectators

-- development and evaluation of brand personality associations. Then an exploratory factor analysis to examine schematic associations the consumers had between the different associations

### 4.1. Comparison of Brand Personality Scales

The comparison of different brand personality scales are made on the bases of major theories which back up the measurement approach used by the researcher, strengths, limitations and cross-cultural validity of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Major theoretical bases</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations/Criticisms</th>
<th>Cross-cultural validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaker [10]</td>
<td>- Based on big five human personality structure - Defined brand personality as the set of human characteristics associated with a brand</td>
<td>- Strong theoretical background - First robust, reliable and valid scale to measure brand personality</td>
<td>- Does not strictly adhere to the conceptual definition employed (Austin et al.[32]) - Loose definition of the brand personality construct - Encompasses unrelated aspects of brand identity - Only positive brand attributes are considered</td>
<td>Not valid; As a result, several researchers have adapted the scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambroise et al. [25]</td>
<td>- Defines brand personality as the set of human personality traits associated with a brand</td>
<td>- Uses a more strict definition of brand personality than that of Aaker [10]</td>
<td>- Generalisability of the scale is questioned since the study is based on very few number of brands from two product categories only</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Comparison of Brand Personality scales
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Based on inter-personal circumplex (IPC) model</th>
<th>Defines brand personality as the set of human personality traits that correspond to the interpersonal domain of human personality and are relevant to describing the brand as a relationship partner</th>
<th>Eriches better understanding of personality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney et al. [11]</td>
<td>- Offers more relevance when an in-depth inquiry of brand personality is needed.</td>
<td>- IPC offers detailed information about specific traits, blends of traits, and interpersonal (consumer–brand) interactions</td>
<td>Preliminary and largely conceptual study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IPC offers detailed information about specific traits, blends of traits, and interpersonal (consumer–brand) interactions</td>
<td>- Preliminary and largely conceptual study</td>
<td>Analysis is based on a small sample of judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnjak et al. [12]</td>
<td>- Addresses various limitations of Aaker’s [10] scale</td>
<td>- Between subjects variability in identifying the dimensionality of brand personality was taken into account</td>
<td>Relatively low sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Based on a stricter definition of brand personality</td>
<td>- Negative dimensions are also taken in to consideration</td>
<td>Developed and tested for German cultural context only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Negative dimensions are also taken in to consideration</td>
<td>- Needs to conduct a random sample approach to advance the generalisability of the study</td>
<td>Needs to conduct a random sample approach to advance the generalisability of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Develops and tested for German cultural context only</td>
<td>- Needs to conduct a random sample approach to advance the generalisability of the study</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Needs to conduct a random sample approach to advance the generalisability of the study</td>
<td>- Needs to conduct a random sample approach to advance the generalisability of the study</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Geuens et al. [35] | - Based on big five dimensions to personality  
- Uses brand personality definition of Azoulay and Kapferer [14] | - Restricts brand personality to human personality traits that are relevant for and applicable to brands.  
- Can be used for a variety of studies such as aggregate level across multiple brands of different product categories, different competitors within a specific product category, individual brand level, and cross-cultural studies.  
- Global companies can use the scale to assess the degree to which their brands have a true global personality | - Since the researchers used a data driven method of selecting and retaining items, there is a chance of deleting useful and meaningful items because they were not associated with one of the dimensions.  
- The validity and reliability were studied extensively in Belgium only. In other countries it was done only in a limited manner.  
- Nomological validity should be further investigated. | Found to be cross culturally valid in Europe and U.S |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuenzel et al. [36]</td>
<td>Mainly based on the studies of Aaker [10] and Hieronimus [49]</td>
<td>- Helps to reduce respondent fatigue since it is a short scale</td>
<td>- Limited number of traits were considered for the study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Heine [38] | Based on the Repertory Grid Method (RGM) developed by Kelly [39] | - Provides more relevant dimensions with respect to a specific product category  
- RGM allows describing constructs with a group of words, which enables researchers to decode their varying contextual meanings for different constructs  
- Delivers relevant binary oppositions, which correspond to both the human information processing and the requirements for the design of a brand identity and positioning | - Influenced by subjective interventions of the researcher | Not valid |
| Lee et al. | - Uses | - As there is only one  
- Introduces an | Not |
Aaker’s [10] definition of brand personality - Uses a Best-Worst Scaling (BWS) invented by Jordan Louviere. way to choose something as best (or worst), the method eliminates response style biases - Provides a context to each answer, by asking people to make choices among relevant options that capture their trade-offs approach, not a scale to measure brand personality

Heere [13] - Based on Psychological Meaning strategy of Friedmann [53] - Helps to capture the brand personality associations as well as provides the researchers with valuable insights on both the organization’s ability to represent that particular association, as well as capturing the relative importance of those associations to a particular set of consumers - Study is on a specific product category and the respondents were mainly women, hence generalisability is limited Not valid

5. Conclusion
This study has reviewed nine brand personality scales and compared them on the bases of their theoretical base, utility, and cross cultural validity. Such a comparison can reveal the strengths and weaknesses of each scale and the specific contexts where in they will be most suitable. This will reduce the efforts of future researchers in identifying and choosing the best as well as the most suitable scale to measure brand personality in a specific context.

Further studies are required in brand personality measurement to address questions like the appropriateness of a general brand personality scale to measure personality of a specific brand, to identify the product and service categories for which a general brand personality scale will be suitable and the categories, if any, which require category-specific BPS, to test whether the existing scales can measure the brand personality of a new product and so on.

Some of the scales discussed here have to be tested with respect to their reliability and validity. The cross cultural validity of most of the brand personality scales needs to be checked. Hence future researchers can investigate the applicability of these scales in different cultural contexts and various validity and reliability tests may also be done with these scales. The scope of this study was limited to scales which introduced a new approach to measure brand personality. Hence another study can be done to create an inventory of other noteworthy brand personality scales. This can include category-specific BPS, application of brand personality scales into cultures, non-profit sectors, online contexts and so on. Such a pool of scales can considerably reduce the efforts of scholars to identify the most suitable one for their studies. In the meantime, as a valuable addition to the body of knowledge on brand
personality, this research has provided the brand personality construct with a comprehensive framework to compare brand personality scales.
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