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ABSTRACT
Recent brand extension research has mainly focused on the judgmental effects of similarity between the established brand and the brand extension. This paper extends this research by investigating the effects of characteristics in the extension category. The results suggest that (a) affective commitment towards the incumbent brand in the extension category is negatively related to the intention to purchase the extension, and (b) involvement with the entry category increases purchase intention. Furthermore, price consciousness has a positive effect on preference for product bundling, while similarity and preference for bundling positively influences the intention to buy a brand extension. The results underscore the importance of extension category characteristics for consumer evaluation of extensions.

INTRODUCTION
As managers begin to more fully appreciate the advantages of introducing new products under existing brand names, the number of brand extensions has increased to a point where it now represents between 40% and 80% of all new products (Kanner 1989). In order to capitalize on a brand’s equity, managers are likely to continue introducing new extensions into the market (Barone, Miniard and Romeo 2000). Although managers have a multitude of decisions to make regarding the appropriate marketing mix for their products brand extension managers have only two primary questions to consider: (1) which category to enter and (2) what characterizes the extension category.

Most research has concluded that increased perceived similarity between the parent brand and extension categories leads to more positive evaluations of the brand extensions (e.g., Aaker and Keller, 1990; Boush et al. 1987; Keller and Sood, 2003/4). Although the concept of similarity has been expanded to include the understanding of its antecedents and the role of brand characteristics such as breadth (Boush and Loken 1991), knowledge and particular associations (Broniarczyk and Alba 1994), the focus has remained on the attitude implications of brand-category similarity. Only a limited amount of research has gone beyond the brand-category similarity paradigm, and no more than a few studies have begun to explore the implications of consumer perception of the extension category (Kardes and Allen 1991; Jun, Mazumbar and Raj 1999; Smith and Park 1992). Smith and Park (1992) investigated the effects of the number of competitors present in the extension category, but no effect was found on the evaluation of the extensions. Furthermore, Kardes and Allen (1991) found that brand extensions tend to be rated as more favorable in low perceived quality variability conditions in the extension category than in high-perceived conditions. Finally, Jun et al. (1999) found that high tech brands are judged more positively if there is greater variation in quality among the current brands in the extension category.

The purpose of this research is to explore the effects of different characteristics of the extension category on the evaluation of brand extensions. Based on the literature, it is suggested that at least five types of category characteristics influence the evaluation of brand extensions: (a) bundling, (b) price consciousness, (c) affective commitment, (d) involvement, and (e) perceived knowledge of the extension category. It is also hypothesized—as in past research—that similarity has a positive effect on brand extension evaluations. Data from a survey involving an established car brand extended to a service product-category was used to test the relationships. The paper closes with a discussion of the results, and insights on limitations and future research are offered.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES
The primary purpose of this study is to determine empirically the extent to which the extension category characteristics affect the evaluation of brand extensions. The following discussion provides a rationale for the research hypotheses.

Perceived Similarity
Referent product–extension product similarity (hereafter referred to as similarity) is the degree to which consumers perceive the extensions as similar to other products affiliated with the brand (Smith and Park 1992). The most frequently considered antecedent of brand extensions is the level of perceived similarity between the original and extended brand. Several studies reported that the greater the similarity between the original and extended category, the greater the transfer of positive (or negative) affect to the extended brand (cf.; Aaker and Keller 1990; Boush et al. 1987; Keller and Sood 2003/4). This finding is based on the assumption that consumers will develop more favorable attitudes towards extensions if they perceive high congruence between the extension and the original brand (see Boush et al. 1987 for theoretical discussion). One important reason to include similarity in this study is to test the effects in a “real situation with real consumers”. Second, as similarity has been found to be a major determinant of brand extension evaluations, it is important to include this concept in the model to avoid spurious effects due to lack of an important variable. Therefore, the hypothesis that:

$$H_1: \text{The higher the perceived similarity between the brand extension and the parent brand, the higher the intention to purchase the extension.}$$

Bundling
The bundling of products is a competitive instrument extensively used by marketers. For example, sport shops will often offer a package of both skis and ski boots at a single price, in addition to selling the items separately. Such a strategy, called price bundling (Soman and Gourville 2001), offers the customers a discount on both the skis and the boots when bought in a package compared to buying them separately. The advantage for the customer is a lower price; while the benefit for the shop is that the customers buy both products from the same shop instead of buying skis in one store and ski boots in another. While price bundling is valuable due to the discounted price, product bundling implies increased customer value due to the integral architecture of the bundle (Ulrich and Eppinger 1995). One important motive that makes product bundling appeal to consumers is the convenience of buying separate...
products or services from one single supplier, thus limiting the number of interaction points. Stremersch and Tellis (2002), argue that the term “separate products” is important when defining the notion of bundling. According to their definition, separate products imply that the bundle consists of products for which separate markets exist, because at least some customers want to buy the products separately. According to Stremersch and Tellis’ (2002) framework of bundling strategies, price and product bundles can be divided into three categories—unbundling, bundling and mixed bundling. While an extensive elaboration of this 2x3 classification schema is outside the boundaries of this paper, the distinction between pure bundling and mixed bundling merits comment. A pure product bundle is a package of products that can be bought only in the bundle, and not separately. In contrast, mixed product bundling means that consumers can choose to buy the products separately or in a bundle. The latter kind of product bundling is the center of attention in this study, for several reasons. First, this is a study of a brand extension in which a firm that offers a physical, high involvement product extends into a lower involvement service category. This implies that the products/services bundled confirm to separate products for which separate markets exist. Second, while a pure bundling of products would imply that the products could only be bought in a package, this is a study of a situation where the parent brand can easily be bought without buying the extension, and vice versa. This is also the case for most brand extensions.

While the previous paragraphs illustrate the concept of mixed product bundling, the focal concept in this study is consumer preference for such bundling opportunities, more specifically the effect this has on the intention to purchase the brand extension (see Aaker and Keller 1990, p. 30). There should be several reasons why a preference for product bundling would increase the intention to purchase the brand extension. First, a major motivation to buy a product bundle is convenience (Stremersch and Tellis 2002). Second, bundling an existing product with a brand extension involves assembling a combination of products not previously offered in the market. As such, the bundle itself is new to the consumer. Recall that the success of brand extensions is largely based on the transfer of associations for a product in one category to a new product offered in a separate category. If the parent brand is one associated with affect and liking, the brand extension should benefit from being bundled with the parent brand due to the benefits of bundling alone, but also receive a benefit due to the transfer of affect from the parent brand to the bundle. Thus, the proposition that:

H2a: The consumers’ preference for bundling will positively influence the intention to purchase the brand extension

The arguments outlining H2a might be further advanced to advocate that the similarity between the parent brand and the extension would influence the consumers’ preference for product bundling. Again this study draws on the transfer of liking and affect from one category to another as a basis for brand extensions. Recall that this transfer is more likely to be found under conditions of high similarity (Aaker and Keller 1990). If the consumers evaluate the parent brand as being of high value, and have already developed positive feelings for this brand, the perceived value of a bundle consisting of two products carrying this particular brand is likely to be higher than a bundle consisting of the parent brand and another brand. Hence, due to a pure value perception argument based on the beliefs held about the parent brand, and the transfer of these beliefs to the bundle, consumers are more likely to prefer bundling under conditions of high similarity. Accordingly, the next hypothesis suggests that:

H2b: The consumers’ preference for bundling will be positively influenced by the perceived similarity between the parent brand and the brand extension

Price Consciousness

The next research question suggests that the consumers’ inherent level of price consciousness will have an effect on the preference for bundling. In accordance with Lichtenstein, Ridgway and Netemeyer (1993), the conception of price consciousness is the degree to which consumers focus exclusively on paying low prices. Recall that a price reduction resulting from a bundling of products is defined as a price bundle (Stremersch and Tellis 2002), while the focus of this study is a mixed product bundle. Thus, there should intuitively not be any reason to believe that price consciousness would be related to a preference for this particular kind of bundle. However, for most consumers this theoretical distinction between price and product bundles is only an abstract phenomenon. More likely, consumers possess an experience-based assumption related to the bundling of products that suggests bundling is generally beneficial (Estelami 1999) due to reasons such as: 1) higher convenience, 2) reduced risk, e.g. through familiar brands, 3) lower prices, 4) fewer suppliers to visit and confront in case of product failure, etc. Previous research indicates that the economic savings from bundling is often really substantial, but cases of pure loss due to bundling also exist (see Estelami 1999). However, most consumers assume that bundling is a way of saving money. This implies that for consumers who are concerned about price, bundles should generally be fairly attractive. Hence, the posit that:

H3: Price consciousness has a positive effect on the consumers’ preference for product bundling

Affective Commitment

The notion of commitment has been an important aspect of studies on customer relationships over the last decades (e.g., Gundlach, Achrol and Mentzer 1995). While the literature on commitment generally suggests that the phenomenon exists in different forms (Allen and Meyer 1990), most research has found the affective kind of commitment to be a major determinant of customer loyalty, while the effects of other types of commitment are more unclear (see Kumar, Hibbard and Stern (1994) for a marketing related study including all three forms discussed in the literature). Affective commitment is based on emotions and affective attachments to the commitment object (Porter et al. 1974), and thus, it is grounded on customer partiality and positive feelings for the relationship partner. If a customer’s affective commitment to a brand is high, this should bring about a wish and motivation to continue the relationship. Since this type of commitment does not include any instrumental cost-benefit evaluations, it is derived from the emotional pleasure associated with the relationship partner, and the feelings of fondness developed within the relationship. As such, affective committed parties are inclined to maintain the existing relationship, an assumption extensively supported by previous research (Kumar et al. 1994; Wieselquist et al. 1999). This study argues that consumers whose affective commitment to a supplier is high will be less receptive to a newly introduced product in this category. Regarding the brand extension, this implies that the intention to buy a new product will be lower the higher the level of commitment to an incumbent brand. Accordingly, the hypothesis that:

H4: Affective commitment to a brand in the extension category will negatively influence the intention to purchase the brand extension.
Involvement
Research on consumer involvement goes back to Sherif and Chintril’s (1947) early work. The current view in consumer behavior holds involvement to be a causal or motivating variable influencing the consumer’s purchase and communication behavior. Involvement is defined as: “A person’s perceived relevance of the object based on inherent needs, values, and interests” (Antil 1984, p. 204; Zaichkowsky 1985, p. 342). Involvement is considered an individual difference variable (Laurent and Kapferer 1985), and the comprehensiveness of both purchase decision processes and the processing of communications will vary significantly depending on consumer level of involvement.

The relationship between involvement with the extension category and brand extension evaluation is based on the fact that response differences between highly involved and less involved consumers reflect, to some extent, differences in risk-taking propensity. Highly involved consumers tend to be less risk averse than other consumers. Following from this, a common observation is that individuals high in perceived involvement are more venturesome and more willing to try new brands (e.g., Steenkamp and Baumgartner 1992). Moreover, the level of involvement enables the consumer to pick up news on additional brands in the category faster than less involved consumers. Hence, the familiarity argument and the risk prone argument are given as reasons to advocate that involved consumers will be more inclined to purchase a brand extension than less involved consumers. Thus, the fifth hypothesis suggests:

\[ H_5: \text{The consumers’ involvement in the extension category will positively influence the intention to purchase the brand extension.} \]

Knowledge
There has been a substantial amount of research on personal effects on decision-making in different contexts (see Brucks 1985; Hoch and Ha 1986). In this research, there is an introduction of consumer knowledge of the extension product class as an antecedent to intention to purchase. A rich amount of literature on knowledge in consumer research generally predicts that non-experts are more prone to be influenced by contextual variables than experts (e.g., Rao and Monroe 1988). It is often assumed that experts are more confident in their judgments and thus less susceptible to contextual cues. Drawing on differences in the amount of chronically accessible information as well as different cognitive processes, there would also be a prediction of smaller context effects for experts than for non-experts. Compared to non-experts, experts characteristically possess a rich and well-organized knowledge structure for the specific domain (e.g., Alba and Hutchinson 1987). This plentiful and orderly knowledge structure makes it easier for experts to find connections (matches) between different core brands and extensions. On the other hand for non-experts, only a small amount of information is chronically accessible. Based on these assumed differences in the amount of chronically accessible information, the prediction is that experts are more likely than novices to identify similarities between parent brands and brand extensions. Therefore:

\[ H_6: \text{Knowledge of the extension product category will positively influence the intention to buy the brand extension.} \]

The conceptual model is presented in Figure 1 and portrays the hypotheses in this paper.

METHODOLOGY
The data used to test the theoretical model was collected by means of a survey mailed to 900 respondents. These were randomly drawn from the customer database of a national importer of cars produced by a global manufacturer. Stated differently, all customers throughout the country who had purchased a car of this brand from a brand dealer had the possibility of being included in the sample. The reason this car brand was chosen as the research context was the plan to introduce a brand-specific insurance service directed at owners of this car brand (a brand extension). The insurance was intended to be sold only at the car dealers that sold the parent brand, and the insurance would also be labeled with the car brand (to exemplify: BMW Insurance only sold at BMW dealers). This was also found to be an adequate context, as the brand in question is generally perceived as a high-quality brand (see Aaker and Keller, 1990). Furthermore, the ability to study an original brand not previously extended broadly was positive since previous research has found that the breadth of an established brand has an influence on how brand information is processed, as well as on the evaluation of brand extensions (Kardes and Allen 1991; Keller and Aaker 1992). Of the sample of 900, a total of 255 respondents participated in the study, which corresponds to a response rate of 28.33%. Analyzing late response data did not indicate any non-response bias (Armstrong and Overton 1977).

Measures
The dependent variable was the intention to buy the brand extension. In the literature on brand extensions, consumer response to brand extensions has most frequently been operationalized using attitudinal measures, typically some form of overall evaluation of the proposed extensions (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). For example, Keller and Aaker (1992) used the statement “Overall, I am very positive to extension 1” anchored by “totally disagree” and “totally agree” (see also Broniarczyk and Alba 1994; Keller and Sood 2003/04). This measurement practice was followed using a similar single item measure, although the focus was on purchase intentions.

Among the independent variables, three items measured perceived similarity between the original brand and the extension. Two of the items were based on Smith and Park (1992), and the third item was based on Aaker and Keller (1990). The two items measuring preference for bundling were self-constructed based on definitions offered by extant literature (e.g., Estelami 1999; Stremersch and Tellis 2002), while the four items capturing the customer price consciousness were adapted from Lichtenstein et al. (1993). The three items capturing affective commitment to the incumbent brand in the extension category were adapted from Allen and Meyer (1990), while the category involvement construct was measured with four items adapted from Zaichkowsky (1985) and Laurent and Kapferer (1985). The three measures for category knowledge were based on Park et al. (1994). All constructs were measured with 7-point Likert type scales, anchored by “totally disagree” (1) and “totally agree” (7).

The quest for face validity was a two-stage process, with 3 marketing professors initially reviewing the items. After a revision based on their comments, 20 consumers were asked to answer the questionnaire and comment on anything that was felt to be ambiguous or in other ways not totally understandable. Some minor changes in the wording were made after this procedure.

Construct Measurement Model
The measurement model was tested by use of the structural equation modeling technique in LISREL 8.52. To test only the
specified relations between indicators and latent variables, all constructs was treated as exogenous (Andersen and Gerbing 1988). Throughout this procedure, the single item for intention to purchase the brand extension was given a fixed error term of 0.19. Single item scales are fixed in LISREL, and adding an error term ensures a stronger and more realistic model test (Bagozzi and Yi 1988). The initial tests suggested a total of 5 items for removal to meet the requirements of unidimensional measures. The re-specified model received a satisfactory fit with a Chi square value equal to 106.97 with 70 degrees of freedom (p=0.00). Other fit indices were a RMSEA of 0.045, a NNFI of 0.95 and a CFI equal to 0.97. These test measures all met the requirements of a well fitting model (e.g. Browne and Cudeck 1993).

The reliability of the scales was assessed using three measures proposed by Bagozzi and Yi (1988). First, item reliability was computed as \( \rho_i = \frac{\Sigma \lambda_i^2 \text{var}T}{(\Sigma \lambda_i^2 \text{var}T + \Sigma \theta_{ii})} \), where T is the construct reflected by the item. Second, the average variance extracted for each construct was defined as \( \rho_v = \frac{\lambda_i^2 \text{var}T}{(\Sigma \lambda_i^2 \text{var}T + \Sigma \theta_{ii})} \). Both the item reliability and average variance extracted scores should preferably exceed 0.5. Finally, the composite reliability was assessed by the formula \( \rho_c = \frac{(\Sigma \lambda_i^2 \text{var}T)/[(\Sigma \lambda_i^2 \text{var}T + \Sigma \theta_{ii})]}{1} \). Composite reliability should exceed 0.6 to be satisfactory (Bagozzi and Yi 1988). The reliability measures were generally satisfactory, although with exceptions on some scores. However, as an important aspect of measurement is to capture all facets of the construct (Bollen and Lennox 1991), all the measures were retained in the final measurement model to maintain the theoretical domain of the variables. This decision was also based on the fact that lack of reliability is accounted for in structural equation models (Jöreskog and Sörbom 1982).

The final test of the measurement model was directed at discriminant validity, which can be claimed to be present if no single pair of variables are perfectly correlated within the range of random error (Anderson and Gerbing 1988). According to the correlation matrix, none of the correlations came close to 1 when adjusted for ± 2 standard deviations.

**Structural Model**

Test scores for the structural model are reported in Table 1. With a Chi-square of 110.94 (d.f.=74, p=0.00), a RMSEA of 0.044, a NNFI value of 0.95 and a CFI of 0.97, the statistics of fit indicated that the model satisfactorily reproduced the covariance matrix. As can be seen from Table 1, perceived similarity was found to positively influence both the intention to purchase the brand extension (\( \gamma = 0.30, t=3.55 \)), and the preference for bundling (\( \gamma = 0.38, t=4.67 \)), lending support to H1 and H2a, respectively. Furthermore, preference for bundling was assumed to positively influence intention to purchase the brand extension (H2b). This hypothesis was supported, with test values equal to \( \beta = 0.36, t=4.30 \). In hypothesis 3 it was suggested that price consciousness has a positive effect on preference for bundling, and this hypothesis was supported (\( \gamma = 0.18, t=2.64 \)). Table 1 shows that H4, outlining the negative effect of affective commitment to the current brand on the intention to purchase the brand extension, was supported by the data (\( \gamma = -0.26, t=-3.46 \)). Furthermore, it was proposed that the intention to purchase the brand extension would be positively influenced by category involvement (H5). This hypotheses was supported, with test values equal to \( \gamma = 0.26, t=3.46 \). Finally, hypothesis 6 suggested that category knowledge would positively affect the intention to purchase the brand extension, but this hypothesis was not supported (\( \gamma = 0.11, t=1.41 \)). The squared multiple correlations showed that the model explains 17 % of the variance in the preference for bundling, and 48 % of the variance in the intention to purchase the brand extension.

**DISCUSSION**

Past research on brand extensions has traditionally focused on perceived similarities between parent brands and extensions and
has examined the effects of these factors on evaluations of brand extensions. In this article the focus was on another important dimension, the effects of characteristics of the extension category on consumer evaluations of brand extensions.

The findings suggest that the degree to which consumers are emotionally attached to their currently chosen brand in the extension category might be a barrier to a competitor’s successful entry. Several implications arise from this assertion. First, marketers who plan to extend their brand into a new category should ex ante analyze the level and diversity of incumbent brand commitment and loyalty held by target consumers. Second, the loyalty literature suggests that apparently loyal behavior might not be due to loyalty at all, but might instead be repurchase patterns stemming from habits, convenience, exit barriers and the like (Bloemer and Kasper 1995). Hence, repurchase pattern is not an adequate measure of how protected by consumer loyalty the existing brands are in the extension category, a fact the extending brand managers should take into account when designing an entry strategy for the brand extension. This conclusion might be drawn from the results of this study with regard to bundling.

As discussed earlier, bundling refers to two or more products sold in a package, and specifically the preference for a mixed bundle of products was studied. As expected, the consumers’ preference for bundling increases the intention to buy the brand extension. It is probable that parent brands might use a bundling strategy to recruit customers who possess this preference, given that the parent brand and the extension make a logical bundle. The strength of the parameter estimates in this model suggests that the positive influence of preference for bundling is stronger than the negative effect of commitment to current brand, which further implies that bundling is a favorable strategy. This fact, combined with the strong impact of perceived similarity on the preference for bundling, suggests that the similarity route to extension success should not be underrated. Stated differently, the single most dominating success factor related to brand extensions has been found to be perceived similarity (e.g., Aaker and Keller 1990), and it can be argued that similarity has an additional positive effect through its impact on consumer preference for product bundles.

In accordance with the hypothesis, price consciousness seems to influence the consumers’ preference for a mixed bundle of products. This implies that 1) there are some consumers who will find bundles very attractive due only to an inherent personality trait, and 2) firms might tailor their advertising campaigns in such a way that the economic virtue of the bundle would be signaled to these consumers. Stated differently, due to variation in this personality trait, marketers might gain extra sales by making sure that customers with high price consciousness are be made aware of the bundling option.

It was found in this research that involvement in the extension category affects the intention to buy a brand extension in a positive way. Therefore, marketers should also consider the level of involvement held by consumers in the target segment for a brand extension. When planning to expand into a new product category the competent firm will do its utmost to assess and profile relevant target groups. Standard insight reveals that potential consumers who are involved in and who have a perceived need for the actual product are more likely to buy the extended brand.

Knowledgeable subjects did not have a higher intention to buy a brand extension compared to novices. This finding does not support the arguments that knowledgeable consumers with a rich and well-organized knowledge structure are better at finding similarity between core brands and extensions. Wänke, Bless and Schwartz (1998) argued that this rich and well-organized knowledge structure also makes it easier for experts to find mismatches between different core brands and extensions. The inconsistent results on this issue could imply that perceived knowledge could have both a positive and a negative effect on the intention to buy a brand extension, contingent on the context. Future research should address this issue.

**Conclusions and Further Research**

These findings not only contribute to the growing body of knowledge in the area of brand extension, but also suggest several specific issues that warrant further inquiry. First, the inclusion of the construct of commitment in further studies on brand extensions could produce interesting results. One basic assumption in the
literature is that extensions of well-known and well-liked original brands are advantageous due to transfer of positive affect to the extension. However, it has been pointed out in this study that even a very strong parent brand may find an extension difficult because consumers have an established relationship to a brand in the extension category. Hence, one possible avenue for further studies would be to investigate the different strategies the extension brand could apply to break consumers' relationships to incumbent brands.

Second, other characteristics of the extension category should be investigated in relation to the evaluation of brand extensions. One option would be to study the effects of dominance. This characteristic could be used to explore the effects of brand extensions on categories with stronger dominating brands versus weaker dominating brands (Laurent, Kapferer and Roussel 1995, p. G178).

A third issue for future research would be how a brand extension affects the positions of the original brands in the categories? How do the original brands react to the new (extension) competitor? An interesting avenue for research would be to examine the dynamic processes that the extension undergoes within the extension category.

To conclude, this investigation has produced some interesting contributions to the literature on brand extensions. First, extending a brand into a category where consumers are highly committed to existing brands seems to be more challenging than expected. Thus, other options might prove more fruitful. Second, if the parent brand and the extension can form a natural bundle, a mixed bundle strategy seems to attract both customers with a general preference for such bundles, and also more price conscious consumers. Third, involvement in the extension category was found to effect the intention to buy a brand extension in a positive way, which implies that marketing activities might be successfully directed to the outlets where high involvement consumers are most easily found. Finally, in line with previous research, it was found that similarity had a positive effect on the intention to buy a brand extension. However, extending previous research, it was found that this similarity also increased the consumers’ preference for a product bundle, which in turn was positively related to purchase intentions. As such a new basis has been established on which to advocate the importance of similarity. Accordingly, as some categories are more receptive to brand extensions than others, one should carefully consider which to choose. This article offers some guidelines.
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