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ABSTRACT

The current research examines the effect of several price-related variables on consumers’ judgments of brand extensions. We find consumers’ price expectations of a brand extension are affected by the price of the parent brand (i.e., a brand-specific price factor), the relative price of the parent category in relation to the extension category (i.e., a category-specific price factor), and the heterogeneity of prices in the extension category. We also find the impact of price expectation of the extension is stronger when they are confronted with the actual price of the extension than when they are not.

INTRODUCTION

Previous studies on brand extension have identified the cost and revenue benefits of brand extension primarily in terms of building and communicating strong brand positioning (Park, Jaworski and MacInnis 1986; Aaker 1991), enhancing brand awareness (Aaker 1991) and quality associations (Aaker and Keller 1990), and increasing the probability of trial by lessening product risk. However, few studies (except Taylor and Bearden 2002) have focused on the significance of pricing as it relates to brand extension strategies. Pricing issues should have substantial impact on a brand extension’s actual marketplace performance given the critical role of price in consumers’ estimations of a brand extension’s value (e.g., Thaler 1985). Taylor and Bearden (2002) examined whether the actual price of the brand extension affected judgments of the brand extension’s quality, perceived value, and purchase intentions when the parent and extension categories were similar vs. dissimilar. Although this study is notable in raising awareness of the potential role of the price on brand extension evaluation, a number of additional pricing variables beyond the actual price of the brand extension may affect these judgments even when similarity between the parent and extension categories is controlled. Moreover, these price related variables may affect judgments of the brand extension by affecting a critical variable not examined by Taylor and Bearden (2002)—expectations of the brand extension’s price. However, the price of the parent brand may not directly transfer to consumers’ expectations of a brand extension’s price. The inference formation mechanism may be more complex for price than for other attributes of the parent brand.

The current research identifies and examines the effect of several price-related variables on consumers’ price expectations and subsequently evaluations of a brand extension: (1) the price of the parent brand (i.e., a brand-specific price factor), (2) the relative price of the parent category in relation to the extension category (i.e., a category-specific price factor), and (3) the distribution or heterogeneity of prices in the extension category (i.e., a contextual price factor: the degree of variation in the price of brands in the extension category). In addition, we investigate (4) the impact of consumers’ price expectation of a brand extension on brand extension evaluation when they are confronted with the actual price of the extension.

THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTS AND HYPOTHESES

Expected Price of the Brand Extension and it’s Drivers

A central premise of the current research is that consumers form an expectation of the brand extension’s price. This price expectation is hypothesized as critical, as it is expected to affect consumers’ perceptions of the extension’s quality and its value. In general, past research outside of a brand extension context has shown that consumers do indeed form expectations of a brand’s price. Moreover, price expectations serve as reference prices. A reference price is defined as a price which consumers use as a standard of comparison when evaluating the price of a product (Winer 1988). Considerable research has found that consumers do indeed develop a reference or expected price for a product and then use this price to evaluate the same product at a later point in time or a different product at the same point in time (e.g., Breisch, Krishnamurthi, Mazumdar and Raj 1997).

Since consumers often form reference prices (Winer 1988) and brand extensions are new products that are based on existing brand names, it is reasonable that consumers use generalized price knowledge to form an expectation of the brand extension’s price. If so, it is important to understand how consumers form this price expectation and what marketing relevant variables drive that expectation. Breisch et al. (1997) suggest there are many sources of a brand’s reference price, and that consumers’ knowledge, purchase experience, and contextual factors can all drive its derivation. Since the brand extension is new, however, no price history or past price can be accessed from memory. As such, price expectations should be based on other aspects of price knowledge including those identified below.

The Price of the Parent Brand: In a brand extension context, the parent brand name (Chanel) is a salient information clue to consumers. If activated, price knowledge linked to this brand in memory may also be activated and used as a frame of reference for considering the brand extension’s price. This effect is consistent with prior work that suggests that the parent brand name provide important cues about the character of the brand extension—cues that likely affect their judgment of it (Aaker and Keller 1990; Keller and Aaker 1992; Broniarczyk and Alba 1994). Thus, consumers’ knowledge of (or memory for) the parent brand’s price may serve as a frame of reference that affects expectations of the brand extension’s price. Specifically, consumers should expect that the brand extension’s price is high (low) when the price of the parent brand is similarly high (low) in that category.

Price of the Parent Category (in Relation to the Extension Category): We hypothesize that consumers may also use knowledge of the price of the parent category as a frame of reference for evaluating the price of the brand extension. Consider, for example, that a parent (e.g., a maker of dress suits) decides to extend its name to a lower priced product category (e.g., handbags). From a referent price perspective, this company would be pursuing a “downward price extension” because the price associated with the extension
product category (handbags) is lower than the price of the parent product category (dress suits). Now, consider a parent that plans to extend its name to the same extension category (handbags) but has a different and lower priced parent product (e.g., wallets). From a referent price perspective, this company would be pursuing an “upward price extension”, as the price of the extension product category (handbags) is higher than the price of the parent category (wallets).

If consumers do use the price of the parent category to estimate the price of the brand extension, they may estimate the price of the brand extension to be higher (a) when its parent category is higher in price (designer suits) in relation to the extension category (handbags) than (b) when it is lower in price (wallets) in relation to the same extension category. This effect is consistent with the anchoring and adjustment heuristic (Tversky and Kahneman 1974). According to that heuristic, a number of anchors on the most readily available information and insufficiently adjusts up or down from that anchor in evaluating subsequently received information. With a downward (upward) price extension, consumers may anchor on the comparatively higher (lower) priced parent category and use its price as an anchor in estimating the price of the brand extension. Since adjustments tend to be inconsistent, consumers may not adjust price estimates sufficiently to arrive at the price that might be expected in the absence of such framing. Thus, we expect that:

H1: Consumers expect the brand extension will be higher priced (a) when the parent brand price is high vs. low and (b) when the parent category is higher priced than the brand extension category versus when it is lower priced than the brand extension category (a downward vs. an upward price extension).

Consumers have been found to have price-quality schemas (e.g., Lichtenstein and Burton 1989), and sometimes use price as an indicator of product quality (e.g., Olson 1977). This linkage of price with quality is particularly likely in contexts where consumers have limited knowledge of and experience with the product, as would be the case with brand extensions. Since the brand extension is in essence a new product, schematic and inferential knowledge (as opposed to experience-based knowledge) likely affects their perceptions of the brand. As such, we anticipate that when consumers expect that a brand extension’s price is high, they infer that its quality is similarly high. Since favorable quality judgments affect brand evaluations, expectations of the brand extension’s price should affect evaluations of the brand extension as well. Therefore, we suggest the following hypothesis:

H2: Consumers expect the brand extension will be more favorably evaluated (a) when the parent brand price is high vs. low and (b) when the parent category is higher priced than the brand extension category versus when it is lower priced than the brand extension category (a downward vs. an upward price extension).

In addition to the main effects of the parent brand and parent category price information on consumers’ price expectations of the brand extension, we also expect an interaction effect between the two price information. Specifically, an upward price extension for a high priced parent may yield a conflict between the ‘premium price’ association of the parent brand and the relatively ‘low price’ of the parent category. When there is such a mismatch between the parent category and brand price information, confidence regarding the expectation of the brand extension’s price declines, making consumers less clear about what the price would actually be. Accordingly, the transfer of the premium price image of the parent brand to the price expectations of the extension may be hindered by the parent category price knowledge. However, a downward price extension creates consistency and consequently a synergy between the parent brand and parent category price associations. As such, the transfer of the ‘premium price’ image of the parent brand may be further strengthened by the relatively ‘high price’ information of the parent category. Hypothesis 3 thus proposes that:

H3: The effect of the parent brand price on the price expectations of the brand extension will be greater for a downward than an upward price extension.

Variation of Prices in the Extension Category. We also expect that the effects hypothesized in H1 above are moderated by consumers’ knowledge of the extent to which prices of brands in the extension category vary. Prices in the extension category may be widely varying, as is the case with cars, or relatively narrow in variation, as is the case with cigarettes. Variation along a given attribute (e.g., price) often affects the diagnosticity of that information (Ross and Creyer 1992). Diagnosticity in turn affects the extent to which this information is utilized in making judgments or choices (Slovic and Lichtenstein 1971; Feldman and Lynch 1988). Little or no variation in the price of brands in the extension category renders the price of other brands in the extension category highly diagnostic of the brand extension’s price (e.g., Harley Davidson motorcycles). Consumers can simply infer the brand extension’s price based on the prices of existing brands in the extension category. Given the diagnosticity of this information, consumers should have little to gain by considering other information, such as the price of the parent brand or category (e.g., motorcyclists). In contrast, when brands in the extension category show wide variation, the price information of these brands is no longer useful in gaining insight into the price of the brand extension (e.g., Harley Davidson cars). Consumers must therefore rely on other factors, such as the relative price of the parent category or price of the parent brand, to infer price (Ross and Creyer 1992). Thus, whether consumers rely on the price of the parent category (and/or the parent brand) to derive expectations about the brand extension’s price likely depends on whether price variation in the extension category is wide or narrow. Hence, we hypothesize:

H4: Consumers will be more likely to rely on (a) the price of the parent brand and (b) the price of the parent category to infer the price of the brand extension (the effects proposed in H1) when brands in the extension category show wide vs. narrow variation in price.

The Impact of Actual Price on the Effects of Price Expectation
When consumers learn the extension’s actual price (through information search), they may compare the expected price to its actual price. Price expectation becomes more important as consumers form some judgment of the product’s value in light of any discrepancy between the expected and actual price (Mayhew and Winer 1992; Kalyanaram and Little 1994). Such “transaction value” judgments (Thaler 1985) should make consumer evaluations even better or worse.

Transaction value is conceptualized by Thaler (1985) as the difference between the expected price and the actual price. In other words, when an actual price is given, consumers’ total value perception of a product gets adjusted due to the transaction value, i.e., increases when the actual price is lower than the expected price.
or decreases when the actual price is greater than the expected price.

To illustrate the impact of actual price on consumers’ judgments of the brand extension, consider the following example. First, assume that the expected price of a brand extension is $70.00 in a downward extension condition and $50.00 in an upward extension condition. Accordingly, when the actual price (or transaction value) is not considered, the difference in consumers’ perceived value between the downward and the upward extensions is $20 (=70–50; difference in acquisition values). Now assume that the actual price of the brand extension is given at $40.00. Since the actual price is given, transaction values occur in both upward and downward extension conditions as follows:

Reflecting Thaler’s conceptualization (1985), the brand extension’s transaction value is (expected price–actual price) or:

1. 70–40=$30.00 in the downward price extension condition, and
2. 50–40=$10.00 in the upward price extension condition.

As we can see in the above example, the transaction value in the downward extension condition (i.e., $30) is greater than that in the upward extensions condition ($10) because of the different expected prices (or acquisition values). Consequently, the total perceived value of the extension product in the downward extension condition would increase more than that in the upward extension condition.

This effect is expected regardless of the actual price of the brand extension. If the actual price of the product is $80.00, then the transaction value of the brand extension would be $–10.00 (=70–80) in the downward price extension condition and $–30.00 (50–80) in the upward price extension condition. Accordingly, the total perceived value of the extension product in the downward extension condition would decrease less than that in the upward extension condition.

Therefore, we expect that the effect of price expectation (and the factors that are proposed to influence consumers’ price expectation) on brand extension evaluation will be magnified when the actual price of the extension is provided versus when it is not.

H5: The effect of the expected price of the brand extension on consumers’ evaluations of the brand extension will be greater when the actual price of the extension is given than when it is not.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Design**

The study uses a 2 x 2 x 2 between subjects design manipulating (a) price of the parent brand (high versus low) (b) price of the parent category relative to the extension category (upward versus downward category price extension), and (c) variation in the price of brands in the extension category (wide versus narrow).

**Pretests**

We conducted three pretests designed to develop the stimulus materials and experimental manipulations. Pretest 1 was designed to identify parent and extension product categories that would allow us to manipulate the experimental factors and control for confounding factors. Several criteria were deemed necessary in selecting these categories: (1) we needed parent product categories that were equally familiar to subjects to avoid confusing familiarity with price of the parent category, (2) to control for the effects of similarity, we needed to identify parent and extension product categories perceived as equally similar, (3) to manipulate the upward vs. downward price extension, we needed parent product categories that were either high or low in price level (but not in technology level, etc. to rule out potential confounding effects) compared to the extension product category, and (4) we needed an extension product category that was relatively unfamiliar so as to credibly manipulate variation in price of brands in the extension category (wide vs. narrow) without using two different extension product categories.

Based on an informal interview with a group of students (n=5) and a small sample survey (n=25), we selected car navigation systems as the extension product category, and notebook computers and cellular phones as the parent categories. The former is higher priced than car navigation systems and hence represents a downward price extension. The latter is lower priced than car navigation systems and hence represents an upward price extension.

Pretest 2 was designed to identify appropriate brand names for the parent product categories selected in pretest 1. To avoid confounding effects of quality or other associations with established brand names, we used hypothetical brands (Keller and Aaker 1992). Fifteen students used 7-point scales to indicate how appropriate several candidate names (e.g., Accurus, Logica, Monarch, Netech) were to each parent product category as well as the extension product category (1=not at all appropriate, 7=very appropriate). As a result of that test, Monarch was chosen as the parent brand name.

Information about the price range of brands in the extension product category was provided to respondents in Pretest 3 to manipulate consumers’ knowledge of the price variation in the extension product category. In the wide variation case, brands of car navigation systems were said to vary in price from $300 to $750. In the narrow variation case, they were said to vary from $475 to $625. Both narrow and wide price variations had an average price of $525.

To determine whether subjects perceived the narrow and wide price ranges as different, 20 undergraduate students were randomly assigned to one of the two variation conditions and asked to indicate the degree of perceived variation in price and the result confirmed our anticipation.

**Subjects, Procedures and Measures**

One hundred ninety one business school students were randomly assigned to the eight experimental conditions. Cell sizes ranged from 21-26. Subjects were first given an information sheet about the Monarch parent brand (notebook computer vs. cell phone), its price (high vs. low) and its brand extension context (wide vs. narrow variation in prices among brands). Subjects were then asked to respond to a set of questions that assessed their familiarity with, ownership of, and perceived relevance of the parent and extension categories. They then responded to a set of questions regarding the expected price of the brand extension, their evaluations of it and their perceptions of its quality.

Subjects were asked an open-ended question to indicate their expected prices for the proposed extension. Three 7-point scales were used to indicate the perceived quality of the brand extension. The items were averaged to form a single index of perceived quality (a=.91). Three questions used a 7-point format to assess subjects’ evaluations of the brand extension. The items were also averaged to form a composite measure (a=.89). To control for order effects, two versions of the questionnaire were developed—one with brand evaluations preceding the expected price and perceived quality measures, the other with brand evaluations following these measures.

Subjects were also asked to rate their reliance on a list of information sources described to them in the given scenarios about
the Monarch brand such as the long tradition of Monarch notebook computers, the price of “Monarch” notebook computers compared to other brands, Monarch’s orientation toward quality and innovation, its notebook computers’ performance record, and the customer satisfaction and quality ratings of Monarch notebook computers (e.g., in the downward price extension situations) when responding to the price expectation questions. These questions were asked to determine whether subjects indeed relied on price of the parent in arriving at their expectations of the brand extension’s price.

After several intervening questions, subjects were given information about the actual price of the brand extension (a “Monarch” car navigation system priced at $490 in both upward and downward extension situations). Then, several questions about liking, favorability, and purchase intention were asked to assess subjects’ evaluations of the brand extension. These questions were designed to test H5. The items were again averaged to form a composite measure of brand extension evaluation (α=.91).

Finally, subjects answered several manipulation check questions regarding price of the parent brand, price of the parent category relative to the extension category, and perceived variation in the price of brands in the extension category. Subjects were also asked about the perceived similarity between the parent and the extension categories, perceived technology level of the parent category, the extent to which the brand name fit between the parent and extension categories, product relevance to them, and ownership of the parent and the extension products. Subjects were subsequently debriefed and thanked.

RESULTS

The manipulation check results indicate successful induction of the treatment conditions. To test H1-H4 we conducted a 2x2x2 ANOVA. The univariate ANOVA results are presented in Table 1. Before carrying out the analysis, the effect of question order (i.e., price expectation measure first versus evaluation measure first) was examined. There were no effects for presentation order, nor did presentation order interact with any other condition. Hence the results are pooled across the two presentation orders.

Price Extension Direction:

Regarding H1, the results reported in Table 1 show a significant main effect of parent brand price (F=18.29; p<0.001) and parent category price (F=16.73; p=0.001) on price expectation of the brand extension. Consumers expected a higher price for the brand extension when the parent brand was high priced (M=622.80) than when it was low priced (M=506.86). Consumers also had higher price expectations of the brand extension when a downward (M=621.15) vs. an upward price extension (M=509.90) was used. Thus, H1 is supported. It appears that the price of the parent category plays a role similar to the price of the parent brand.

As suggested in H2, the results reported in Table 1 show a significant main effect of parent brand price (F=26.78; p<0.001) and parent category price (F=15.70; p=0.001) on brand extension evaluation. Thus, H2 is supported.

Consistent with H3, the effect of the parent brand price on consumers’ expectations of the brand extension’s price was greater in the downward vs. the upward price extension condition (F=3.49; p=0.05). Specifically, in the downward price extension situation, the expected price of the extension for the high-priced parent brand (M=705.40) is much higher than that for the low-priced parent brand (M=536.89; t=3.22, p=0.00). In the upward price extension situation, however, the expected price of the extension for the high-priced parent brand (M=543.57) is not that higher than that for the low-priced parent brand (M=475.52; t=1.59, p=0.06).

Extension Product Category Price Variation:

H4 states that the effect of price of the parent brand and parent category on price expectations of the brand extension will be greater when brands in the extension category show wide versus narrow variation in price. This proposed interaction was supported for price of the parent brand (F=4.12; p=0.01), but not for the price of the parent category (F=0.89; p=ns). Thus, H4 was supported only for the price of the parent brand, not the price of the parent category.

Impact of Actual Price on the Price Expectation Effects:

To test H5, first we ran two regression analyses, one using evaluations before subjects were given the actual price and the other using evaluations after they were given the actual price as dependent measures. Expected price served as the independent variable in both analyses. The beta of the after-equation (b=.77; std. dev.=.105; t=7.30) was significantly greater than that of the before-equation (b=.48; std. dev.=.095; t=5.09; t=28.16; p=0.00). The improvement in model fit for the before-equation (R-square=.12) vs. the after-equation (R-square=.22) also supports the greater influence of price expectation on brand extension evaluation when actual price is present. That is, the impact of the expected price on subjects’ evaluations of the brand extensions after learning the brand extension’s actual price was significantly greater than that before learning the brand extension’s actual price.

Since the impact of expected price becomes greater when actual price is given, we also expected the factors that influence consumers’ price expectation of the extension (i.e., parent category price and parent brand price) to have a greater impact on evaluations of the brand extension when the actual price of an extension is present than when it is not. To examine this, we conducted 2x2 ANOVA on before-actual-price evaluation and after-actual-price evaluation measures with parent category price and parent brand price as independent variables. The results show that the main effects of parent category price and parent brand price both increase considerably when an actual price is provided; effect size (eta squared)=.193 versus .062 for parent category price, and .223 versus .113 for parent brand price (see Table 2). These findings further support H5.

DISCUSSION

The results of our study generally support H1-H5. First, our results suggest that in addition to the price of the parent brand, the price of the parent category also plays a critical role on consumers' expectations of a brand extension’s price and their evaluations of the brand extension. Specifically, consumers have higher price expectations and more favorable evaluations regarding a brand extension when the parent category is high (vs. low) priced in relation to the brand extension and when the parent brand is a high priced vs. a low priced brand within the parent category. This finding suggests a different process factor of price expectations for brand extensions as opposed to any new product.

Second, the parent category price moderates the effects of the parent brand price. When the parent category price information is consistent with the parent brand price association (i.e., with downward price extensions), the effect of the parent brand price is strengthened. However, when there is a conflict between the two (i.e., with an upward price extensions), the effect of the parent brand’s price is reduced. This interaction effect between the parent brand and the parent category price factors also suggests that it may
### TABLE 1
ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Parent Category Price (Upward vs. Downward Price Extension)</td>
<td>Expected Price</td>
<td>609.27</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Evaluation</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Parent Brand Price (High vs. Low)</td>
<td>Expected Price</td>
<td>665,272.42</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Evaluation</td>
<td>32.45</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Extension Product Category Variation (Wide vs. Narrow)</td>
<td>Expected Price</td>
<td>3414.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Evaluation</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>Expected Price</td>
<td>126,851.33</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Evaluation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>Expected Price</td>
<td>32,435.78</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Evaluation</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>Expected Price</td>
<td>149,927.50</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Evaluation</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B x C</td>
<td>Expected Price</td>
<td>11,374.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Evaluation</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
ANOVA Results for Extension Evaluation Before and After Actual Price

#### Extension Evaluation before Actual Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta-squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Parent Category Price (Upward vs. Downward)</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Parent Brand Price (High vs. Low)</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Extension Evaluation after Actual Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta-squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Parent Category Price (Upward vs. Downward)</td>
<td>57.62</td>
<td>44.42</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Parent Brand Price (High vs. Low)</td>
<td>69.36</td>
<td>53.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not be likely, for example, for a very low-price car maker to benefit from extending its brand to wallets.

Third, price variation in the extension category moderates consumers’ expectation of a brand extension’s price. The effects of the parent category and parent brand price on consumers’ price expectations are greater when brands in the extension product category show wide vs. narrow variation in price. While price of the parent category exerts a consistent effect on consumers’ evaluations of the brand extension, the price of the parent brand is diagnostic of the brand extension’s price only when products in the extension category show wide vs. narrow variation.

Finally, the results show that the effect of the expected price of the brand extension on consumers’ extension evaluations is greater when the actual price of the extension is given than when it is not. A well-known finding in the pricing literature is that consumers judge the price of a product as favorable or unfavorable in comparison with a reference point (Thaler 1985; Tversky and Kahneman 1981; Kahneman and Tversky 1979). Marketers may do well to suggest a higher reference price (given its linkages to quality and the evaluations of the brand extension as shown here), but have the actual price lower than expected. Such a strategy may further heighten consumers’ evaluations of the brand extension.

Our study provides several strategic tools for increasing consumers’ price expectation of the extension. But, several potential confounding effects need to be considered in the present research. For example, although we have focused on the price variation in the extension category, the parent category (notebook computers and cellular phones in this study) price heterogeneity may also have an impact on consumers’ price expectation of a brand extension. The use of a fictitious brand in our experiment might also have affected respondents’ frame of mind and subsequently the results.
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