

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Marketing Dissertations

Department of Marketing

Fall 12-20-2012

Perceived Brand Age and Its Influence on Choice

Monica D. Guillory

Georgia State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/marketing_diss

Recommended Citation

Guillory, Monica D., "Perceived Brand Age and Its Influence on Choice." Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2012.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.57709/3211157>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Marketing at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marketing Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

Perceived Brand Age and Its Influence on Choice

A dissertation submitted by:

Monica D. Guillory
Georgia State University
mktmdgx@langate.gsu.edu

Committee:

Naveen Donthu, Ph.D. (Chair)
Georgia State University
mktmnd@gsu.edu

Ritu Lohtia, Ph.D.
Georgia State University
rlohtia@gsu.edu

Corliss Thornton, Ph.D.
Georgia State University
cthornton@gsu.edu

Denis Guiot, Ph.D.
Université Paris-Dauphine
denis.guiot@dauphine.fr

PERMISSION TO BORROW

In presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the Library of the University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote from, to copy from, or publish this dissertation may be granted by the author or, in his/her absence, the professor under whose direction it was written or, in his absence, by the Dean of the Robinson College of Business. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for the scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation which involves potential gain will not be allowed without written permission of the author.

Monica D. Guillory

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University Library must be used only in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement.

The author of this dissertation is:

Monica Deliece Guillory
Georgia State University
Department of Marketing
J. Mack Robinson College of Business
35 Broad Street, Suite 1300
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

The director of this dissertation is:

Naveen Donthu, Ph.D.
Kathrine S. Bernhardt Professor
Georgia State University
Department of Marketing
J. Mack Robinson College of Business
35 Broad Street, Suite 1300
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Perceived Brand Age and Its Influence on Choice

BY

Monica Deliece Guillory

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Of

Doctor of Philosophy

In the Robinson College of Business

Of

Georgia State University

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY
ROBINSON COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
2012

Copyright by
Monica Deliece Guillory
2012

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the Monica D. Guillory Dissertation Committee. It has been approved and accepted by all members of that committee, and it has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctoral of Philosophy in Business Administration in the J. Mack Robinson College of Business of Georgia State University.

H. Fenwick Huss, Dean

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Naveen Donthu, Ph.D. (Chair)
Georgia State University
mktnd@gsu.edu

Ritu Lohtia, Ph.D.
Georgia State University
rlohtia@gsu.edu

Corliss Thornton, Ph.D.
Georgia State University
cthornton@gsu.edu

Denis Guiot, Ph.D.
Université Paris-Dauphine
denis.guiot@dauphine.fr

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	5
Introduction	5
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Contributions of the Study	9
Organization of the Dissertation	9
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
Brand Personality	11
Self-Concepts	16
Perceived Personal Age.....	19
Self -Personality	20
Nostalgia Proneness	23
CHAPTER 3: THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL	26
Perceived Brand Age.....	26
Preferred Brand Age.....	30
Attitude towards the Brand	34
The Model and Constructs	36
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY.....	39
Study 1: Free Association Study	39
Study 2: Brand Age Cues and Characteristics.....	40
Study 3: Model Testing.....	44
CHAPTER 5: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	50
Study 1: Free Association Study	50
Study 2: Brand Age Cues and Characteristics.....	52
Study 3: Model Pre-Test.....	55
Study 3: Model Testing	57
CHAPTER 6: IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS.....	68
Discussion	68
Contributions.....	76
Limitations	76
Future Research Directions	77
APPENDIXES	79
Appendix 1: Qualitative Study.....	79
Appendix 2: Survey Introduction	80
Appendix 3: Brand Age Cues.....	81
Appendix 4: Brand Age Characteristics.....	88
Appendix 5: Brand Age Model	96
REFERENCES.....	114

ABSTRACT

Perceived Brand Age and Its Influence on Choice

BY

Monica Deliece Guillory

August 3rd, 2012

Committee Chair: Dr. Naveen Donthu, Ph.D

Major Academic Unit: Department of Marketing

Traditionally, the concept of brand age has been studied only as a component of brand personality. We propose that brand age is an independent construct that can stand on its own. Understanding brand age is potentially critical to a brand management program. When a brand begins to be perceived as older, even with the positive attributes aligned with the idea of traditional and established brands, consumers may begin to move away from the brand. This study defines the concepts of both perceived and preferred brand age. We look at how perceived brand age fits in with our current perspective on branding and can enrich our understanding of consumers' personal preferences.

As there is very little published work in the area of brand age three distinct set of studies were conducted in order to fully understand the meaning of brand age, explicate the construct and understand the antecedents and consequences. The first study involved a group of exploratory studies. The purpose of this initial group of conceptual studies was to explore current consumer understanding and interpretation of the concept of perceived brand age. These studies were used to inform and direct our subsequent research. Our second set of studies explicated the brand age concept. In the first project, we used a Likert scale designed to understand what cues consumers

use to understand the age of a brand. The second project was a semantic differential research study to examine what specific characteristics are associated with younger brands, older brands or are neutral between the two. We also develop and test a model of consumer choice through the exploration of the relationship between perceived brand age and preferred brand age.

The results of our study helped to develop the construct of brand age, and begin the formation of a model to show its influence on choice.

Key Words: Brand Age; Perceived Brand Age; Preferred Brand Age; Branding; Choice

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the culmination of five years of study at Georgia State University. It would not be possible without the support of many individuals, each who each played a unique and significant role. Foremost, I thank Almighty God for both mercy and grace. He has been my constant source of strength, support, wisdom and comfort. “I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me” (Philippians 4:13).

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Naveen Donthu, who chaired and directed my dissertation, Dr. Ritu Lohtia, who was both a mentor and a scholarly role model, Dr. Corliss Thornton, who provided all around guidance, and Dr. Denis Guiot, who gave invaluable feedback and suggestions. I appreciate the time, effort and feedback provided by each committee member.

Many thanks are due to others who supported me along the way including Dr. Pam Ellen, who inspired my interest in consumer behavior; Dr. Harriet Bettis-Outland, who was a safe harbor in the midst of my many storms and always made me feel like I could accomplish what oftentimes seemed like an impossible task. Leah Bovell Swain and Todd Weaver were not only a part of my cohort, but they were true friends and prayer partners. My heartfelt thanks also go to the many friends who supported me through an encouraging word or a dinner out including Sonya Y. Penny and Tracy Hudson.

And last, but certainly not least, I will be eternally grateful to my family who have always believed in me and what I could do. Their prayers, encouragement, concern, love and occasionally financial support have helped me stay focused on being “in the program.” My mother, Elouise Guillory; my brother, Larry Guillory and numerous aunts, uncles and cousins all have my everlasting gratitude and love.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

How do consumers make choices? Economics earliest studies of consumer choice include the idea of personal preferences. Under the behavioral assumptions of consumer theory, all consumers are considered rational decision-makers who will seek to maximize their utility given any budgetary constraints (Silberberg & Suen, 2001). Even as consumer decision-making has evolved passed the idea of rational decision-making, we have retained the idea that consumers will attempt to maximize their happiness through the purchase of goods and services that express their personal preferences (Silberberg & Suen, 2001). Personal preferences can be expressed in many ways. Some examples include brand, brand personality, price, quality, size, and color. In this study, we propose that personal preference can also be expressed in terms of brand age.

We examine the idea of brand age, and attempt to understand what it means in relation to consumer personal preferences. We also develop and test a model of consumer choice through the exploration of the relationship between perceived brand age and preferred brand age.

Traditionally, the concept of brand age has been studied only as a component of brand personality. If we accept the premise that brands are created, grow and prosper, then we must also accept the idea that they also have the potential to die away when they become old and irrelevant (Lehu, 2004). According to the Mintel Global New Products Database, there were over 156,000 new products introduced around the world in 2005 ("New Products Database," 2006). Given the limited shelf space, this means that as some new products survive and even thrive, other products will be left to eventually disappear (Lehu, 2004). In this lifecycle, some brands will be perceived as younger. The concept of a younger brand is often found to be

synonymous with the idea of a contemporary brand. Brands that are viewed in this way are also likely to be considered modern, innovative, fashionable and creative on the positive side. However, they can also be thought of as immature, inexperienced, and overpriced with invasive marketing tactics. On the other end of the continuum will be brands perceived as older. For many consumers this is synonymous with the concept of old, traditional and established. Brands that are viewed in this light are more likely to be thought of as reliable, sophisticated, prestigious and well known. These same brands could also be seen as out of touch and irrelevant when viewed from a negative perspective. Although, there is continuum on which brand age can be understood, most brands are prone to primarily fall into one of these two categories, younger or older.

How long brands will “live” is dependent on many factors including marketing, revitalization efforts, competition, and distribution. However, how long they should ‘live’ is a matter of some debate. Most researchers believe that the end objective for most brands is to exist a long time and get old slowly (Haig, 2003). Others posit that there are situations when a short life span is more appropriate for a brand (Herman, 2000). An old brand does not necessarily mean that a brand is aged or ancient. However, brands are generally considered old as soon as consumers begin to forget about them. Even the strongest leadership brands can fail and die. We see examples of this with brands like New Coke, McDonald’s Arch Deluxe and Sony Betamax (Haig, 2003; Lehu, 2004). Many experts in the field agree that every brand potentially faces dying away if it is not well managed (Berry, 1988; Haig, 2003; Lehu, 2004). This implies that a well-managed brand has the possibility of living indefinitely. While there are others who see the death of a brand as an unavoidable, natural occurrence, that is not necessarily instigated by

managerial incompetence (Ewing, Jevons, & Khalil, 2009). In other words, no matter what a brand manager does, every brand will eventually come to an inevitable end or a “death”.

This study defines the concepts of both perceived and preferred brand age.

Understanding brand age is potentially critical to a brand management program. When a brand begins to be perceived as older, even with the positive attributes aligned with the idea of traditional and established brands, consumers may begin to move away from the brand.

Although, there may be no reduction in their concept of the quality of the brand, and the brand may even still be highly appreciated, the negative aspects associated with an older brand age begin to outweigh the positives. In particular, the ideas of being “out of touch” and “irrelevant” overshadow appreciation for the brand. The brand simply becomes less relevant and therefore is no longer present in the consumer’s evoked set (Lehu, 2004). “Whatever their status, their chronological age, their share of market and/or their share of mind, they can all get old either slowly or quickly” (Lehu, 2004).

A brand can be very aged chronologically, but remain young, vibrant and modern in it’s consumers minds (Lehu, 2004). It is in these cases, that we see the best examples of brand revitalization. There is a plethora of literature on how brands can be revitalized and in essence be made young again. Some of these studies point to the revitalization of a brand through some type of target marketing modification. There are studies that suggest that brands can be revitalized through the promotion of new uses (Wansink & Gilmore, 1999), while there are other studies that demonstrate successful brand revitalization through more effective customer targeting followed by creating distinctive value for that target market (Clancy, 2001). Other studies focus on the importance of the overall marketing strategy as the foundation for revitalization. They include brand evaluation and the crafting of an appropriate story (Brown,

1992), as well as the importance of the fundamental choices of appropriate and efficient marketing strategy choices (Lehu, 2004).

Norman Berry (1988), past president and creative head of Ogilvy and Mather, outlined seven steps to successful brand revitalization. They are 1. Provide quality, 2. Assess consumers' perceptions of quality, 3. Manage the relationship between consumer and brand, 4. Understand the brand's value, 5. Find or create a unique idiosyncrasy, 6. Coordinate the brand revitalization program and 7. Re-launch the brand with a major promotion or event (Berry, 1988). However, what happens when a brand is not or cannot be revitalized? How does this influence consumer choice? What is the effect of brand age? The process of brand rejuvenation can vary, however, first the aging process should be clearly identified and its roots understood (D. A. Aaker, 1991).

Purpose of the Study

This research endeavor aims to add to the literature on branding and brand management by attempting to understand the meaning of perceived brand age. We look at how perceived brand age fits in with our current perspective on branding and can enrich our understanding of consumers' personal preferences.

In this paper, we focus on an explication of the construct of perceived brand age, its antecedents and its consequences. In this vein, we develop a conceptual model based on the constructs of both preferred brand age and perceived brand age. The congruence between these two leads to an attitude towards a brand and eventually brand choice. This study will offer important managerial insights on the role that perceived brand age plays in consumer choice. This will add to the evolving understanding of brand management and brand management programs.

Contributions of the Study

This research makes several contributions to the academic marketing literature. First, it is one of the first empirical studies in marketing to focus on the constructs of perceived brand age and preferred brand age. We seek to add to the literature on branding by offering a definition for perceived brand age and preferred brand age and focusing on the relationship between them. We examine the impact on consumer choice.

Secondly, this study seeks to develop a model that shows the influence of brand age on consumer choice. In this manner, the research is influenced by theory. We look at the current theories of branding, self-concepts, perceived self-age, personality traits and nostalgia proneness to develop a conceptual model for how perceived brand age and preferred brand age influences consumer choice.

Finally, this study will provide important managerial insight into the importance of managing perceived brand age as a part of an overall brand management program. If managers understand how the perception of their product's age influences consumer choice, they are better equipped to develop marketing strategies, which will allow them to maximize their brand management efforts.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. Chapter One has provided a background for the topic and demonstrates the importance of the study. Chapter Two provides a literature review on the topics of brand personality, self-concepts, perceived personal age, self-personality, and nostalgia proneness. Chapter Three presents conceptualizations of the constructs and the corresponding hypotheses to be tested in the dissertation. This culminates in the proposal of a conceptual model. Chapter Four outlines the methodology that is used in the study. The research design is presented for each study, including a discussion of data collection and the pretesting

procedures. Chapter Five outlines the data collection, results and analysis for each of the studies. Chapter Six, concludes the dissertation with a discussion of the results, the contributions and limitations of the study, as well as future research directions.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Brand Personality

A complete review of the literature on branding and brand personality is beyond the scope of this dissertation. However, a review of some of the more relevant studies is in order to begin to understand the concept of brand age. It becomes difficult for a brand to distinguish itself based on functional or utilitarian attributes when the competitive field increases and consumers begin to conceive products to be homogenous. Brand managers then turn to symbolic or self-expressive functions for the positioning and differentiation of their brands (J. L. Aaker, 1997; Keller, 1993; Siguaw, Mattila, & Austin, 1999).

Over the last fifteen years, there has been a proliferation of literature debating the concept of the dimensions of brand personality. This stream of literature follows a seminal article by Jennifer Aaker (1997) developing a scale of brand personality, defined as “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand.” Utilizing 114 personality traits and 37 brands, Aaker developed a framework of the brand personality concept that includes five dimensions of brand personality based on the concept of the Five Factor Model (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1992) of personality traits in humans. These dimensions are competence, sincerity, excitement, sophistication and ruggedness. Traits contained within the competence dimension include reliable, successful, hard working and intelligent. Some of the traits that are associated with the dimension of sincerity are family-oriented, wholesome, sentimental and down-to-earth. The dimension of excitement includes traits such as daring, trendy, unique and imaginative. While the sophistication dimension incorporates the traits of glamorous, charming, feminine and smooth. Finally, the ruggedness dimension includes traits like tough, outdoorsy, masculine and western (J. L. Aaker, 1997). There are a total of 42 traits used to measure the five dimensions.

In her development of a brand personality scale, Aaker makes an intentional decision to include demographics such as age and gender as a part of brand personality (J. L. Aaker, 1997). She justifies this decision based on the assertion by Levy (1959; 1999) that brand personality includes demographic characteristics such as gender, age and class. They propose that these characteristics are inferred from the brand user imagery, employees, or product endorsers directly, and indirectly from other brand associations (J. L. Aaker, 1997; Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003; Sidney J. Levy, 1959; S. J. Levy, 1999). In this study, we argue that just as human age is not included in the human construct of personality, nor should brand age be included in the construct of brand personality. In the conceptualization of a human, there are many demographics, which work together to form a person. Age, personality and gender are a few of these distinct constructs. This same train of thought can be applied to the conceptualization of a brand. Those demographics, which are applicable to a brand should be studied and viewed as distinct constructs. Age would be one of these distinct constructs.

Following the Aaker (1997) study, Siguaw, et al. (1999) applied the brand personality dimensions to the restaurant industry. Their intent was to provide “empirical evidence regarding the extent to which restaurant brands successfully established distinct brand personalities in the minds of consumers” (Siguaw et al., 1999). They conducted a study with college students looking at three classes of restaurants: quick service, casual dining and upscale dining, where they had the participants rate the restaurants on each of the 42 personality traits. They concluded that the points of differentiation for restaurant brand personalities corresponded with the restaurant’s marketing communications, the nature of the products and services offered at the restaurant, and their overall performance. They found Aaker’s scale to be highly reliable in this situation (Siguaw et al., 1999). However, there are other studies, which have found that the

brand personality scale was not fully applicable. Ross (2007) did a study looking at the applicability of brand personality in the context of sports, and in particular the university athletic system. He hypothesized that given that brand personality is a key factor in the management of sports brands, a greater understanding of how brand personality contributes to brand equity is important. He conducted a study with students using Aakers 42 item brand personality scale to assess a university basketball team. He concluded that in the context of the sports industry, there needed to be further development of the scale in order to improve its reliability and validity (Lee, 2009; S. D. Ross, 2007).

Fournier (1998) developed a distinct definition for brand personality as “a set of trait inferences constructed by the consumer, based on repeated observation of behaviors enacted by the brand at the hand of its manager.” In her study examining brand relationships, she provides a framework for better understanding the types of relationships that consumers form with brands. The relationships that are formed are aptly named for human relationships, which we all can understand and/or relate to in some way. They include casual friends, kinships, secret affairs and arranged marriages. She concludes that in our advancement of marketing theory it is critical to understand brands and consumer relationships. She finds that brands “serve as powerful repositories of meaning purposively and differentially employed in the substantiation, creation and (re) production of concepts of self in the marketing age” (Fournier, 1998). If true, it is equally important to understand the concept of brand age, and its influence on our understanding of brands. Ultimately, this will aid in a greater understanding of self-concept and brand congruency, and therefore consumer purchase decisions.

In her review of how relationships provide meaning in a psycho-socio-cultural context, there is a discussion of how prior research has highlighted several broad sociocultural contexts

circumscribing relationship attitudes and behaviors. Age is included as one of the factors that “systematically influences the strength of relationship drives, the types of relationships most desired, the nature and experience of emotional expression in relationships, styles of interacting within relationships, the ease with which relationships are initiated and terminated and the degree to which enduring commitments are sought” (Fournier, 1998). Just as human age is an important driver of relationships, we posit that brand age is an important driver of our brand relationships. The relationship meaning provided by brand age along with brand personality and other factors influences our view of brands and consequently our consumption decisions.

Mulyanegara, et al. (2009) examined whether there exists a significant relationship between consumer personality and brand personality dimensions. They found weak predictive power of consumer personality on brand preferences. However, they did find significant relationships between some of the Five Factor theory dimensions and individual brand preferences (Mulyanegara et al., 2009). They concurred with Belk’s conclusion that consumers use brands to express their actual personality (Belk, 1988; Mulyanegara et al., 2009). From this line of thinking, it would follow that in this same way consumers might use brands to express other dimensions of themselves, such as age.

In his study, Lee (2009) concluded that there does exist a certain causality relationship between consumer personality and brand personality as the consumer’s self-concept. Consumer personality has an impact on consumer choice of brand in that consumers are driven to make choices that match well with their own personalities. Consumers are inclined to purchase a brand that reflects their own individual personality (Lee, 2009).

Johar, et al. (2005) present a framework for the updating of personality trait inferences about branding. In looking at how incoming information is integrated into initial brand

impressions, they demonstrate two different consumer mechanisms for the dynamic process of inference updating, chronics and nonchronics. Chronics are those consumers for whom a personality trait is accessible in their minds. Nonchronics are those consumers for whom a personality trait is not accessible. They conclude that responses to incoming information for consumers will differ, even when initial personality impressions were similar, dependent on whether a consumer is chronic or nonchronic (Johar et al., 2005). Generally, this suggests that brand personality creation is a dynamic process that is only partially controlled by marketers. Consumers also contribute to their own beliefs about brand personality through their individual processing and ability to access personality traits in their memory (Johar et al., 2005).

Azoulay and Kapferer (2003) define brand personality as the traits of human personality that can be attributed to the brand. However, in their article they argue that our current commonly accepted concept of brand personality based on the work of Aaker (1997) is flawed. A significant part of their argument is based on the concept of “personality” in marketing being based on the psychological concept of “personality”. They put forward the idea that in this case, our definition and understanding of personality should be defined and described in relation to its understanding in psychology, with any necessary adaptations (2003). This supports our theory that brand age should not be a part of brand personality, just as human age is not a part of human personality in the psychology literature. Azoulay and Kapferer (2003) recognize brand personality as only one of the dimensions of a larger concept, brand identity. The other dimensions of brand identity include brand inner values, the brand relationship facet, the brand-reflected consumer facet and the brand physical facet. Their objective is to develop a clear and pure definition of brand personality, that is separate from the other human characteristics, which can be associated with the brand (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

In their discussion, Azoulay and Kapferer (2003) posit that if brand personality is truly based on the psychological concept of personality, then it should exclude concepts like intellectual abilities, gender and social class. If we subscribe to their conceptualization of brand personality, then brand age should be a separate concept, just as it is a separate characteristic in human beings. Our most common current use of brand personality is used to “designate any non-physical attribute associated with a brand”. This would include those concepts that are excluded in psychology. They conclude that a more precise and appropriate definition of brand personality is “the set of human personality traits that are both applicable to and relevant for brands” (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

Overall, the brand personality literature links our own personality and preferences with our choices in brands. When companies clearly promote a brand, product or company through use of a brand personality as consumers we will choose a brand that reflects our own personalities (Lee, 2009). In this same way, we posit that consumers will also choose a brand that reflects their own perception of appropriate brand age.

Self-Concepts

Self-concept originally was studied as a single variable and most researchers viewed it as the perception of oneself (Birdwell, 1968; Green, Maheshwari, & Rao, 1969; Edward L. Grubb & Stern, 1971; Sirgy, 1982). The literature evolved into a self-concept theory that is based on the idea that individuals have an idea of who they actually are (the actual self) as well as a concept of who they would like to be (the ideal self) (Dolich, 1969; Sirgy, 1982). Some researchers have added to this idea of self-concept duality by looking at the influence of the perception of others on an individuals' self-concept (social self and ideal social self). Most of these studies conclude

that consumers will make purchase decisions based on their self-concepts (Birdwell, 1968; Dolich, 1969; Green et al., 1969; Malhotra, 1988; Sirgy, 1985).

Birdwell (1968) was one of the earliest researchers to make the connection between self-image and purchase. He defines self-image as “not only one’s physical well being but evaluations and definitions of one’s self as strong, honest, good-humored, sophisticated, reserved, just, guilty, and a thousand other ideas, and it is reflected in every human action, including the purchase of goods and services” (Birdwell, 1968). In his study of automobile ownership and self-concept, he found that there is a significantly high degree of congruity between the way car owners viewed their cars and themselves. Additionally, in examining different car ownership groups, they all had significantly different images of the other car brands. He concluded that automobiles are often extensions of the owner’s image of self (Birdwell, 1968).

Research has also been conducted to test the relationship between consumers’ self-concept and the relevant aspects of their consumer behavior by Grubb and Hupp (1968). They concluded that consumers of a specific brand of a product would hold similar self-concepts to that of other consumers they perceived to use the same specific brand. Likewise, these consumers would hold significantly different self-concepts than those consumers who they perceived to use a competing brand (1968). This is similar to the study conducted by Ivan (1971) that empirically tested the concept that individuals will make purchases that are consistent with their self-image. This can include purchases they believe will enhance or fit in with their own self-perceptions. He found strong support for the idea that consumers will purchase brands of products that are close to their self-concept (Ivan, 1971).

“Marketing strategies that are successful in establishing perceived psychological values for product brands seem to develop product acceptance or rejection by the similarity of these values to the self-concept”(Dolich, 1969). However, Dolich (1969) questioned whether it is the real self or the ideal self, which drives purchase behavior. He concluded that consumers do relate brand symbols to self-concepts, but found no evidence that the ideal self has any greater influence in consumer choice than the real self, as purported in earlier studies (Dolich, 1969).

The concept of situational self-image was introduced by Schenk and Holman (1980). They describe the situational self-image as the meaning of self that a person wishes others to have of them (Schenk & Holman, 1980). As it is situational specific, it includes attitudes, perceptions and the feelings that the individual wishes to cultivate in others about his or her character, and appropriate behavior. They assert that the advantage to using a situational self-image is that it 1. Takes into account the influence of others in the situation, 2. Includes a behavioral component and 3. Acknowledges the potential for many self-concepts, and therefore variations in our brand consumption based on which situational self-image is active (Schenk & Holman, 1980). In other words, the self-concept we use to purchase a brand today may not be the self-concept we use to purchase a brand tomorrow. Our purchases are likely to vary as our active self-concept varies.

Hamilton and Sun (2005) looked at the relationship of consumer self perception and their ideal brand perception within the context of brand image positioning. They concluded that ideal brand image can be assessed and developed when there is available information on the target population’s perceived self-image. These images then can be used to create appropriate advertising messages with value-expressive appeal (Hamilton & Sun, 2005).

The self-concept influence on purchase goes beyond just a brand personality to include product personality. Product personality is the symbolic meaning associated with a physical

product and is described with human personality characteristics. Just as consumers relate to the symbolic meaning of a brand, they can also relate to the product personality, which is also shown to positively influence consumer preference (Govers & Schoormans, 2005). Traditionally, we have looked at brand personality alone as the connection to consumer self-concept. Govers and Schoormans (2005) suggest that the nature of the product itself is as important to the self-concept of the consumer as the personality of the brand.

The preponderance of the self-concept literature leads to a connection between self-concept, and consumption preferences. This can be self-concept that is actual or ideal, real or social. We see the items that we consume as a both an extension and a commentary on ourselves, looking for purchases to confirm our self-reflection.

Perceived Personal Age

Kastenbaum, et al. (1972) introduced three age concepts in response to the question, “How should a person’s age be judged?” The first is personal age. Personal age is an individual’s self-report of his age status, in other words, how old a person seems to be according to themselves. Interpersonal age is the age status of an individual as judged by others. The last concept is consensual age. Consensual age is the degree of agreement between personal and interpersonal age. The closer the congruence between personal and interpersonal age is, the firmer the consensual age. All three of these must be considered in the context of chronological age (Kastenbaum et al., 1972).

Although the sample size of the Kastenbaum, et al. (1972) study was limited, they did come across some interesting preliminary results. They found an overall bias toward a youthward personal age even in the youngest subsample, which was composed of individuals in their 20’s (Kastenbaum et al., 1972). This goes against the traditional wisdom that young people want to

be considered older and mature. As we grow older, there is a greater tendency to communicate a personal age that is much more discrepant from our chronological age (Kastenbaum et al., 1972). We feel much more inclined to embrace our youthfulness, as we grow older. Wilkes (1992) comes to a similar conclusion in his study. He advances the concept of personal age to perceptions of personal age (PPA). His study is consistent with previous ones, which reveal a youth-biased self-concept. Other studies show that the feeling of youth even as one grows older is a universal concept, even in Asian countries where the aged are highly regarded and respected (Barak, 2009; Barak, Mathur, Lee, & Zhang, 2001; Szmigin & Carrigan, 2001).

Barak and Schiffman (1981) introduced the concept of subjective age. Subjective age includes all cognitive and affective representations associated with age and with aging. In consumer behavior, this is defined as cognitive age or self-perceived age. It is a component of the self-concept (Guiot, 2001). Guiot (2001) saw subjective age biases in his study, however he concluded that the cognitive age bias for the senior women in his study was more a result from a feeling of remaining young, rather than an aspiration to actually be younger.

Most of the literature on personal age indicates we as humans, despite culture, are more likely to view ourselves and associate with being younger rather than our chronological age. This youth-based bias has been shown to occur at all ages.

Self -Personality

“Personality is a clear construct different from cognitive aspects of the person, or from his or her skills and abilities. It is described by traits” (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). Traits are an important part of understanding individual personality. The psychology literature has evolved from the 300 representative traits tested by Allport and Odbert (1936) to general acceptance of the Big Five Theory or Five Factor Model (Saucier, 1994). The Five Factor model of personality

has five broad dimensions, which are used to describe human personality. The five dimensions are openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism (emotional stability). Each dimension is composed of correlated specific traits (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1992). These dimensions are presumed to represent the topmost level of a personality hierarchy and to be universal across cultures (Paunonen & Ashton, 2001). They are believed to reflect the “stable and recurrent traits, as opposed to temporary states that are not taken into consideration in the description of an individual personality”. Despite some very legitimate critiques, the Five Factor Model remains widely accepted. (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

The openness dimension refers to openness of experience, to imagination and to intellectual curiosity. The trait distinguishes imaginative people from down-to-earth, conventional people. People who are high on being open to experience are intellectually curious, appreciative of art, and sensitive to beauty. They are more likely to hold unconventional beliefs. This is in opposition to people with low scores on openness. They tend to have more conventional, traditional interests. They prefer the plain, straightforward, and obvious over the complex, ambiguous, and subtle (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992). This is a dimension that gathers such traits as the intensity, span and complexity of an individual’s experiences (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

The conscientiousness domain influences the way in which we control, regulate, and direct our impulses. A high rating on conscientiousness is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement against measures or outside expectations. On the other hand, a low rating on conscientiousness shows a preference for spontaneous rather than planned behavior with a low regard for self-discipline (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992).

This dimension gathers such elements as scrupulousness, orderliness and trustworthiness (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

Positive emotionality is the core of extraversion. This dimension gathers such elements as openness to others, impulsivity, sociability and likeability to feel positive emotions (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). There are seven components identified with extraversion. They are venturesomeness, affiliation, positive affectivity, energy, ascendance, and ambition. These people get charged by interaction with others. Individuals who are low in extraversion can be described as quiet, reserved, retiring, shy, silent, and withdrawn (McCrae & John, 1992).

Agreeableness is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. It includes characteristics such as altruism, kindness, nurturance, caring, and emotional support when one is high in agreeableness. On the other end of the spectrum, when one is low in agreeableness they exhibit characteristics such as hostility, indifference to others, self-centeredness, spitefulness, and jealousy. Disagreeable individuals place self-interest above getting along with others (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992).

Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability. Those who score high in neuroticism are prone to the development of a variety of psychiatric disorders. They are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. These problems in emotional regulation can diminish the ability of a person scoring high on neuroticism to think clearly, make decisions, and cope effectively with stress. Individuals low in neuroticism are not necessarily high in positive mental health, they are simply calm, relaxed, even-tempered, and

unflappable (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992). This dimension includes traits such as anxiety, instability and nervousness (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

The Five Factor Model is widely accepted as a method to enable psychologist and other researchers to form a quick evaluation of an individual (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). As personality is an important part of an individual's self-conception, it becomes a key element in influencing a consumer's brand age preferences when taken in conjunction with other elements.

Nostalgia Proneness

Holbrook and Schindler (1991) define nostalgia "as a preference (general liking, positive attitude, or favorable affect) toward objects (people, places, or things) that were more common (popular, fashionable, or widely circulated) when one was younger (in early adulthood, in adolescence, in childhood, or even before birth)." This builds off the earlier work of Davis (1979) who referred to nostalgia as a longing for the past or a yearning for yesterday. He argued that nostalgia is primarily a reaction to disruptive and anxiety producing events, and acts to restore a sense of continuity across such ruptures (Davis, 1979). As such, he distinguishes three orders of nostalgia. Level M is analytic. It involves an interpretive exploration of questions about nostalgia. Level II is reflective and includes self-conscious investigation of themes that characterize the nostalgic impulse. The last level, Level I, is expressive. It involves the desire to return to the good old days (Davis, 1979; Holbrook & Schindler, 1991).

Rindfleisch, et al. (2000) examined the relationship between nostalgia and materialism and explored their influence on preference and choice. In their two studies, they found an interesting link between nostalgia and materialism that showed that highly nostalgic consumers tend to be low in materialism. This suggests that nostalgia and materialism may be oppositional. Although, they concluded that nostalgia was not predictive of choice or preference, they also concede that

this may be due to the oppositional effect of materialism (Rindfleisch et al., 2000). The “potential unresponsiveness to product categories known for materialistic appeals may be one reason why nostalgia is a poor predictor of product preference and choice (Rindfleisch et al., 2000)” in their particular two studies.

Nostalgia effects can occur for any product that a consumer associates with strong affective experiences (Schindler & Holbrook, 2003). This Schindler and Holbrook (2003) study examines the effects of early experience on consumer preferences in the case of automobiles. Gender differences aside, it supports the idea that both environmental influences and biological influences support the likely development of intense positive emotional product experiences during youth. This also supported the likelihood of showing an age-related preference peak. The results of their study suggest that the influence of nostalgia proneness should be considered for a wide range of products that extend beyond arts and entertainment related goods or the primarily aesthetic (Schindler & Holbrook, 2003).

Wildschut, et al. (2006) conducted seven studies on nostalgia in order to address some fundamental questions and provide a broader perspective on the subject. Their fundamental question for function is “What, if any, are the psychological functions of nostalgia?” They concluded that nostalgia bolsters social bonds, increases positive self-regard, and generates positive affect (Wildschut et al., 2006). If true, as our purchases as consumers reflect our own self-concepts, nostalgia would play an important role in our consumer purchase decisions. They propose that nostalgia constitutes a benign mechanism through which consumers can affirm valued aspects of the self (Wildschut et al., 2006). In words, nostalgia proneness is possibly another element that influences our preferences and consumer choices, as we make decisions based on our own self-reflection.

Nostalgia tends to imbue objects with a symbolic attachment to people and experiences from one's past (Holak & Havlena, 1992). Despite mixed results in the literature concerning the influence of nostalgia proneness on preference and choice, there is a strong suggestion that nostalgic appeals seem to hold promise as a means of eliciting positive consumer response (Rindfleisch & Sprott, 2000).

CHAPTER 3: THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL

Perceived Brand Age

Darpy and Lavesque (2003) define perceived brand age as “a socio-demographic characteristic of the brand, appreciated in a subjective way by the consumer starting from the physical aspect of this brand and the specific role which it holds on the market.” In their work they look at the four dimensions of perceived human age: physical, social, cognitive and psychological (Darpy & Levesque, 2003; Kastenbaum et al., 1972). They determine that both cognitive and psychological factors are difficult to take into account when drawing conclusions in order to make a judgment. Therefore, they develop their scale for perceived age based on the social and physical factors for a brand (Darpy & Levesque, 2003).

The social factors for a brand in their study are equivalent to the social roles that a person can take on in society. Just as a person can be a mother, a daughter and a worker, the social factors exhibited in a brand life include the innovation, the restoration, brand extensions, new uses of the products, and product modifications. They demonstrate brand stability or instability, competency or incompetency and energy or lethargy. A brand can assume any of these potential market roles in the marketplace.

The physical dimension is again similar to a person’s physical dimension, where we use all the attributes of physical appearance, which help us to understand and determine a person’s age categorization. Physical traits in a person could be height, weight, style and look. For a brand this would include elements such as packaging, communications and product design (Darpy & Levesque, 2003). Given their premise that social and physical dimensions help a

consumer to determine brand age, they use this information to develop a new measurement scale for perceived brand age.

Darpy and Levesque (2003) conclude that there are three items that load on each of the two factors, social and physical. Graceful/Disgraceful, Beautiful/Ugly and Aesthetic/Unaesthetic all load on the physical factor, while Visible/Insignificant, Innovative/Traditional and Present/In Withdrawal load on the social factor.

While this approach is valuable for understanding perceived brand age as a construct not unlike that of perceived human age, we believe there may be more value when you use the concept of brand personality in place of the physical dimension. This brings in other important factors, which are not included in their description of the physical dimension of a brand. Some examples might include reputation and quality, both of which would be highly relevant in the case of a brand. Brand personality along with social factors (we use the term market roles) will form the foundation of perceived brand age.

We define perceived brand age, as a consumer's understanding of the age of a particular brand in a specified category. In this circumstance, age represents the length of time that a brand has existed (although age can be viewed across a spectrum of numbers from one on up, consumers most frequently think of brand age as younger or older).

Similarity-attraction theory is used to explain and predict interpersonal liking. It posits that people are naturally attracted to others who are similar to themselves ("Similarity/Attraction Theory," 2008). The research has shown that people prefer to associate with those who share similar attitudes, personalities, physical attributes, and other characteristics (Byrne, 1997). It is believed that this is driven by our need for corroboration that we are not alone in our attitudes or beliefs. It has also been suggested that our preference for others who are similar might be driven

by our desire to understand and even predict behavioral predilections. Knowledge of similar attitudes may help us to predict future behavior. We believe that the similarity-attraction theory extends to our preferences and consumption. Using the similarity-attraction theory framework, we propose a model of antecedents of perceived brand age and preferred brand age and show how that influences consumer choice ("Similarity/Attraction Theory," 2008).

Brand Personality

Azoulay and Kapferer (2003) hypothesize that including demographics such as age as a part of brand personality runs the risk of confounding the personality of the brand with the personality of the targeted consumer as shown in the brands advertising and marketing (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). They also argue that demographics such as gender are value judgments and are based on culture. In this study, we agree that demographics such as age are most likely stand-alone constructs separate from brand personality. However, we hypothesize that brand personality does have an influence on how we perceive the age of a brand. Just as human personality traits give us an idea about a person's level of experience, maturity, creativity and coolness, we expect brand personality traits will help us to judge brand age.

The five dimensions of brand personality are sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness (J. L. Aaker, 1997). The dimensions of sincerity, competence and sophistication are associated with traits that consumers come to recognize and have trust in over time. Some of the traits associated with sincerity include honest, down-to-earth, wholesome, sentimental, original and real. Traits associated with competence include hardworking, secure, technical, successful and confident. Glamour, charm and smoothness are all traits associated with sophistication. These are all qualities that are most commonly associated with experience and substantiation. Experience and substantiation come over time. All three dimensions,

sincerity, competence and sophistication, are strengthened in the consumer's mind over time as they are reinforced.

We propose that:

H_{1A}: Brands that are seen as competent will be perceived to be older.

H_{1B}: Brands that are seen as sincere will be perceived to be older.

H_{1C}: Brands that are seen as sophisticated will be perceived to be older.

The final two dimensions are excitement and ruggedness. Excitement is a dimension that includes traits such as cool, imaginative, unique, contemporary and trendy. These traits clearly speak to what is new and modern. Some of the traits for ruggedness include strength, masculinity, outdoorsy and toughness. These are traits that we associate with striving to achieve the "American Dream". In individualist cultures like the United States of America, traits such as independence and autonomy are highly valued (J. L. Aaker, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). They represent the pioneering spirit and the character to conquer and defeat. These are traits that highly correlate with the traits for ruggedness. In individualist societies, the traits associated with ruggedness represent the pursuit of the "dream", the pursuit of innovation and creation. In other words, they highly correlate with that which is new and modern.

We propose that:

H_{1D}: Brands that are seen as exciting will be perceived to be younger.

H_{1E}: Brands that are seen as rugged will be perceived to be younger.

Market Roles

Social factors (market roles), which contribute to a brand life, include the innovation, the restoration, brand extensions, new uses of the products, and product modifications. Consumers

use this information to convey financial stability, competency and energy in a brand (Darpy & Levesque, 2003). At a broad level of abstraction, the everyday execution of marketing plans and tactics can be construed as behaviors performed by the brand acting in its relationship role (Fournier, 1998). Brands can have varying marketing objectives and thereby varying roles within a category. The objective of a marketing strategy can be to dominate the market through upholding and preserving the current status quo, a category stabilizer. This is a marketing role, which requires time and exposure in order to be successful. Due to the element of time, it is more likely to be associated with brands that are well established and well known with a considerable share of the market. These are likely to be brands that have helped to develop and maintain the current standards in an industry. Another marketing strategy might be to challenge the category status quo, and be an innovator in some way, a category changer. Brands can innovate in terms of the product, the distribution system, the price or the way in which the product is promoted. The concept of changing the category is usually associated with a newness that could imply being “cool” or “hip”.

We propose that:

H_{2A}: Brands that are seen as playing the role of a category stabilizer will be perceived to be older.

H_{2B}: Brands that are seen as playing the role of a category changer will be perceived to be younger.

Preferred Brand Age

Preferred brand age is defined as an evaluative judgment of partiality towards a particular age for a brand in a specified category. In this circumstance, age represents the length of time that a brand has existed (although age can be viewed across a spectrum of numbers from one on up,

consumers most frequently think of brand age as younger or older). This concept is important as it represents a consumer's personal preference, which can be used to make consumption decisions.

When developing personal preferences, consumers are thought to prefer products with images which are congruent with their own self-images (Birdwell, 1968; Dolich, 1969; Edward L. Grubb & Hupp, 1968; Landon Jr., 1974; I. Ross, 1971). They include in their evaluation, what does the brand say about them personally? Is it a validation of who they are? Of whom they wish to be? Of whom others believe them to be? In this study, it is hypothesized that preferred brand age is composed of four factors: self-concept, perceived personal age, self-personality and nostalgia proneness. Self-concept interacts with a consumers' perception of their own personality and perceived age, as well as their level of nostalgia proneness. Consumers use all four concepts to give meaning to a brand's preferred age.

Self-Concepts

Some research has focused on how the personality of a brand enables consumers to express themselves. Self-concept exerts a top-down influence on consumers' lower-order goals like consumption. As consumers, who we are, leads to what we do, and ultimately what we own or purchase (Hamilton & Sun, 2005). What we own, contributes to our understanding of ourselves, sometimes called the extended self (Belk, 1988).

Schenk and Holman (1980) posit that the potential exists for many self-concepts, and therefore there are variations in our brand consumption based on which situational self-image is active. Although there may be one self-concept, which is dominate, we have the possibility for as many different consumption experiences as there are different self-concepts available to us. One possible self-concept is one of stability. This self-concept looks for and values tradition,

reliability, quality and reputation. Another possible self-concept is one of change and innovation. This self-concept associates with and appreciates creativity, modernism and contemporary trends. These self-images will drive our consumer choices, as consumers use brands to express their personalities (Belk, 1988; Mulyanegara et al., 2009).

We propose that:

H_{3A}: Consumers who have a self-concept of stability will prefer older brands.

H_{3B}: Consumers who have a self-concept of change and innovation will prefer younger brands.

Perceived Personal Age

The Self-discrepancy theory is a “general theory relating different patterns of self-beliefs to different kinds of emotional-motivational predispositions” (Higgins, 1987). It states that the difference between the objective self and the subjective self-influences behavior more than any single element. Self-discrepancy theory postulates that we are motivated to reach a condition where our self-concept matches our personally relevant self-guides, *ideal* self and *ought* self representations. (Higgins, 1987). Moschis (1992) suggests that the gap between chronological and cognitive age influences the consumption of products destined to defend self-image because of the self-consistency motive (Guiot, 2001; Moschis, 1992).

Similarity/Attraction theory suggests that people both like and are attracted to others who are similar to themselves ("Similarity/Attraction Theory," 2008). In general, people prefer to associate with others who share similar attitudes, personalities, physical attributes, and a host of other characteristics compared to others who do not (Byrne, 1997). We propose that this theory

would also hold true for consumer's interpersonal likings for products and brands. Consumers will prefer those brands that they perceive reflect characteristics similar to their own.

We propose that:

H₄: The higher the individuals own perceived (human) age, the higher their preferred brand age.

Self-Personality

Mulyanegara, et al. (2009) asserts that personality variables are not strong enough to be reliable predictors of brand preferences. In this same vein, we propose that personality traits alone are not enough to be a reliable predictor of brand age preferences. However, we believe that personality traits do influence a consumer's brand age preference, particularly when viewed in conjunction with a consumer's perceived age, self-concepts and nostalgia proneness.

In their study of age differences in the five factor model, Donnellan and Lucas (2008) conclude that extraversion and openness are negatively associated with age, while agreeableness was positively associated with age. Conscientiousness and neuroticism were either associated with middle age or varied and differing ages. They also found that neither gender nor age were consistent moderators of the age differences (Donnellan & Lucas, 2008). We posit that these human personality characteristic associations will translate in the same way with brand age associations.

We propose that:

H_{5A}: Consumers with high openness personality traits will prefer younger brands.

H_{5B}: Consumers with high extraversion personality traits will prefer younger brands.

H_{5C}: Consumers with high agreeableness personality traits will prefer older brands.

Nostalgia Proneness

Attitude toward the past can be an important determinant of preferred brand age. Davis saw nostalgia as a longing for the past (Davis, 1979). He posited that nostalgic sentiment contributes to one of Western Civilization's greatest continuing struggles; the tension between change vs. stability, innovation vs. reaffirmation, new vs. old and younger vs. older (Davis, 1979). The stronger ones longing for the past becomes, the stronger their preference for those things that remind them of that past.

We propose that:

H₆: Consumers with high nostalgia proneness will prefer older brands.

Attitude towards the Brand

Self-Image/Product Image Congruency

The type of image conveyed by a brand of product has been shown to interact with a consumer's self-concept. This becomes an effect known as the self-image/product image congruity. This congruity, in turn, affects the consumer's product preference and purchase intentions (Sirgy, 1985). It is high self-congruity when the consumer perceives the product user image or brand image to match that of his or her self-image. The opposite generates low self-congruity. The underlying rationale is consumer's cognitive consistency needs. Specifically, consumers have psychological "needs for self-consistency and self-esteem" (Sirgy, 1985).

In this same manner, we hypothesize that preferred brand age is a part of a consumer's self-image. Preferred brand age is driven by self-concepts, perceived personal age, self-personality and the level of nostalgia proneness. The consumers' preference for a brand age is directly related to their own self-image as reflected through these elements. Perceived brand age

is a reflection of product image. The personality of the brand in combination with the role it plays in the marketplace, creates a consumer's perception of the perceived brand age. We predict that congruence between these two images, preferred brand age and perceived brand age, lead to both product preference and purchase intentions.

We propose that:

H₇: The greater the congruency between preferred brand age and perceived brand age, the stronger the positive attitude towards the brand.

H₈: The stronger the positive attitude towards the brand, the more likely the consumer will choose that brand when making a product purchase in that category.

Conversely, if a consumer does not perceive there to be congruency between their self-image, which can be interpreted through their preferred brand age and product preference, which can be interpreted through the consumer's understanding of perceived brand age, this will evoke a more negative attitude towards the brand. Therefore, the consumer is less likely to choose the brand when making a purchase.

The Model and Constructs

The figure below portrays all of the constructs and hypothesized relationships.




Figure 1: Brand Age Model

Brand Personality. Brand personality is the traits of human personality that can be attributed to the brand (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). There are five dimensions of brand personality: competence, sincerity, excitement, sophistication and ruggedness (J. L. Aaker, 1997).

Market Role. Market role is the impressions of productivity and fruitfulness generated by all of the elements which contribution to create the brand life. They demonstrate brand stability, competency and energy (Darpy & Levesque, 2003).

Self-Concepts. Self-concept denotes the “totality of the individual’s thoughts and feelings having reference to himself as an object”. It is a multidimensional perspective. Although the terminology varies, generally, actual self refers to how a person perceives himself; ideal self refers to how a person would like to perceive himself; and social self refers to how a person presents himself to others (Sirgy, 1982).

Perceived Personal Age. Personal age is how old a person seems to himself or herself. It is both a potential function of total functional age and a basis of classification in a consumer’s attempt to modify old behavior (Kastenbaum et al., 1972).

Self-Personality. Personality is conceived as an individual’s unique variation on the general evolutionary design for human nature, expressed as a developing pattern of dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations, and self-defining narratives, complexly and differentially situated in culture and social context (McAdams & Pals, 2006). The big five factors of personality are often labeled as Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. They are presumed to represent the topmost level of a personality hierarchy in which narrower traits and even narrower behaviors represent the lower levels (Paunonen & Ashton, 2001).

Nostalgia Proneness. Nostalgia Proneness is a longing for the past that is comprised of both cognitive and affective components (Davis, 1979; Holbrook, 1993; Merchant, Ford, & Gopinath, 2007).

Perceived Brand Age. Perceived brand age is a consumer’s understanding of the age of a particular brand in a specified category. In this circumstance, age represents the length of time that a brand has existed (although age can be viewed across a spectrum of numbers from one on up, consumers most frequently think of brand age as younger or older).

Preferred Brand Age. Preferred brand age is an evaluative judgment of partiality towards a particular age for a brand in a specified category. In this circumstance, age represents the length of time that a brand has existed (although age can be viewed across a spectrum of numbers from one on up, consumers most frequently think of brand age as younger or older).

Attitude towards the Brand. Attitude towards the brand is the relationship between perceived brand age and preferred brand age. Congruency between the two concepts produces a positive attitude towards the brand, while a lack of congruency produces a negative attitude towards the brand.

Consumer Choice. Consumer choice is the decision to favor one brand over another based on the attitude towards the brand.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

As there is very little published work in the area of brand age three distinct set of studies were conducted in order to fully understand the meaning of brand age, explicate the construct and understand the antecedents and consequences. This chapter describes the research design including the research procedures, sampling plan and the measures that were used in the studies.

The first study involved a group of exploratory studies. The purpose of this initial group of conceptual studies was to explore current consumer understanding and interpretation of the concept of perceived brand age. These studies were used to inform and direct our subsequent research. Our second set of studies explicated the brand age concept. In the first project, we used a Likert scale designed to understand what cues consumers use to understand the age of a brand. The second project was a semantic differential research study to examine what specific characteristics are associated with younger brands, older brands or are neutral between the two. In the third and final study, we tested our hypotheses developed in the preceding chapter.

Study 1: Free Association Study

Research Procedures

The goal of the conceptual study was to gain an initial understanding of consumer's interpretation of brand age and develop an initial list of cues that consumers use to judge brand age. We used focus groups for this study. We felt this qualitative methodology was appropriate for exploratory research. The focus groups allowed us to answer any questions and clarify any issues before collecting data. Additionally, the focus groups allowed us to meet the objectives of this research.

Focus Group Design

Each focus group began with participants receiving a consent form that outlined the purpose of the study, risks, benefits and confidentiality. This was followed by a brief overview and discussion of the concept of brand age. After all questions were answered, participants were asked to write down “at least six adjectives or statements which come to mind when trying to determine a brand’s age” (Appendix 1). The sheets with their lists were collected and participants were thanked.

Sampling Plan

The three focus groups were composed of 10 to 30 diverse participants each, with a total of 93 respondents. One focus group was conducted at a community church within the Atlanta, Georgia area. The other two focus groups were students at a large Southern University within Atlanta, Georgia. All participation was voluntary. Student participants were offered the opportunity to earn extra participation credit in their class. This is a standard incentive to encourage voluntary student participation. There were no incentives provided to participate in the study for community member participants.

Study 2: Brand Age Cues and Characteristics

Based on the feedback from the free association study, two test surveys were developed. One survey was used to test the association of the specific items generated by the free association with the concept of brand age, brand age cues. The other survey was used to test the association of the specific items generated by the free association test with specific brand ages, either younger or older. This was the brand age characteristics study. Both studies were preceded by a pre-test.

Research Procedures

The goal of study two was to further explicate the concept of brand age and identify the cues consumers use to determine brand age. Additionally, we sought to understand those specific items, which more closely identify with either a younger or an older brand. As opposed to our first study, which was exploratory in nature and sought to uncover potential concepts associated with brand age, our second study focused on measuring and testing specific concepts. This research study was both structured and objective in its procedures.

This study used self-administered surveys accessed via an online website. An online service was used to administer the Likert scale questionnaire. An online participant group was chosen to more effectively reach potential participants. Using an online panel allowed participants to take the survey at a time that is convenient for them and increases the likelihood of completion of the survey. The other advantage of using an online questionnaire includes the ability to randomize the order of the items for each survey participant.

There were several pre-tests conducted with small groups of consumers to ensure that the wording was clear, and the items had a common interpretation. We also wanted to make sure that the questionnaire was easy to follow and could be completed in the time frame indicated in the consent form.

Survey Design

The survey was administered by Zoomerang.com, a professional marketing research website that specializes in online research. Since 1999, Zoomerang has provided a powerful, self-service alternative for conducting accurate comprehensive online surveys. A pioneer of online surveys, they provide sophisticated functionality and professional survey solutions. In the middle of our research process, Zoomerang.com was acquired by SurveyMonkey.com. SurveyMonkey.com is now the world's leading provider of web-based

survey solutions ("Zoomerang About Us," 2012). An online panel was chosen to more effectively reach potential participants.

Once landing on the survey site, participants were asked to confirm their agreement to an informed consent statement. The standard consent form outlines the purpose, procedures, risk, voluntary participation and withdrawal, confidentiality and contact persons for the study. Once consent was given, they were invited to proceed to the questionnaire itself.

For the brand age cues survey (Appendix 3), the design ensures that the order of the 36 items is randomized. Participants were first given the following information: *You are most likely familiar with many brands out in the marketplace. These include Apple, Folgers, Disney, Boeing, Tide, Microsoft, Facebook, Sony, IBM, Whirlpool and Hilton to name just a few. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements. Think about how you know the age of a brand.*

Immediately after reading the information, they were asked to answer a series of questions that contained the thirty-six items on the scale. The Likert scale has five degrees of agreement with the attitude expressed in the question (e.g., "strongly disagree", "moderately disagree", "neither agree nor disagree", "moderately agree," and "strongly agree"). They were also asked to provide some demographic information.

In the brand age characteristics study (Appendix 4), we used a semantic differential scale to examine whether specific ideas, which represented brand age in the minds of consumers, were associated with younger brands or older brands. We used a five-point scale. The semantic differential scale was appropriate for this study as it has been established that it can help to determine both direction and intensity of attitudes, helps to develop a comprehensive picture of

what brand age includes and is useful in the case of nouns representing connotative opposites (Mindak, 1961).

Respondents were asked to determine whether a descriptor represented a brand that was younger or a brand that was older. Development of the items in this scale was selected from the content analysis of the initial focus groups, library research, and feedback from other marketing researchers.

The survey design ensures that the order of the 40 statement items is randomized. Participants were first given the following information: *You are most likely familiar with many brands out in the marketplace. Some examples of brands include Apple, Folgers, Disney, Boeing, Tide, Microsoft, Facebook, Sony, Closeup, Whirlpool and Hilton to name just a few. Some of these brands are considered to be young and contemporary brands, while others are considered to be established and traditional brands. Please indicate whether you believe each statement to be an indication of a younger or older brand on a continuum. Think about brands that you are familiar with that you perceive to be younger or older.* Immediately after reading the information, they were asked to answer a series of questions that contained the forty statement items. They were also asked to provide some demographic information.

Upon completion of both surveys, consumers were thanked for their participation. The data was immediately collected and added to the analysis pool by the online research firm. However, because they retain both individual responses as well as collective information we had the opportunity to conduct an analysis of early and late responses.

Sampling Plan

Study two was completed by students at a large Southern University within Atlanta, Georgia. Student participants were offered the opportunity to earn extra credit in their class for

participation. This is a standard incentive to encourage voluntary student participation. For the first part of study two, brand age cues, a total of 126 usable surveys were collected online from a diverse group of students. A total of 121 usable surveys were collected online for the second part of the study, brand age characteristics. This number is sufficient for testing the data.

Study 3: Model Testing

Research Procedures

The goal of study three was to test a model for brand age that would explain (1) the factors that are included in the construct of perceived brand age, (2) the factors that are included in the construct of preferred brand age and (3) if congruency between perceived brand age and preferred brand age will result in a positive attitude towards a brand.

Online surveys were used for this study, because they allowed us to reach a broad and diverse group of participants across the country in an easy manner by simply providing a link to the study. Additionally, online surveys are both a cost-effective and efficient method of data collection.

Survey Design

The survey was also administered by Zoomerang.com, a professional marketing research website that specializes in online research

The survey is structured into ten sections of questions, which range from one to forty-one questions. The sections represent the eight measures: perceived brand age, brand personality, market roles, preferred brand age, self-concepts, perceived personal age, self-personality, and nostalgia proneness. In addition, there is a brief section on choice and a demographics section (Appendix 5). The survey had 113 questions and took approximately 25 – 30 minutes to complete.

Once landing on the survey site, participants were asked to confirm their agreement to an informed consent statement. The standard consent form outlined the purpose, procedures, risk, voluntary participation and withdrawal, confidentiality and contact persons for the study. Once consent was given, they were invited to proceed to the questionnaire itself.

The first section of the questionnaire was the short form of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The Likert scale has five degrees of agreement with the personal beliefs expressed in the question (e.g., “always false”, “mostly false”, “partly false and partly true”, “mostly true,” and “always true”). There were a total of 20 questions.

The second section of the questionnaire measures attitude towards the brand with three questions. The next section of the questionnaire was the 20 item self-report scale for nostalgia proneness. This was followed by the BFI-10, which is a short form of the big five personality scale. The fifth section of the questionnaire was a three question direct measure for preferred brand age. All of these sections used a Likert scale, which had five degrees of agreement with the attitude expressed in the question (e.g., “strongly disagree”, “moderately disagree”, “neither agree nor disagree”, “moderately agree,” and “strongly agree”).

The sixth section of the questionnaire was the Aaker (1997) scale for brand personality. It had 41 questions in the form of a Likert scale, which measured agreement with each brand personality trait expressed in the question (e.g., “not at all descriptive”, “somewhat descriptive”, “neutral”, “very descriptive,” and “extremely descriptive”). This was followed by the scale for market roles, with three questions using the same Likert scale.

The next section of the questionnaire measured perceived brand age with three questions using a Likert scale, which had five degrees of agreement with the attitude expressed in the question. The ninth section was a direct measure for choice with two questions in the form of a

Likert scale, which measures degree of agreement with the feelings expressed in the question (e.g., “all the time”, “most of the time”, “some of the time”, “rarely,” and “never”). The last section of the survey was standard demographics. We requested information on gender, age, marital status, education, ethnicity and income.

Upon completion of the surveys, consumers were thanked for their participation. The data was immediately collected and added to the analysis pool by the online research firm. However, because they retain both individual responses as well as collective information we had the opportunity to conduct an analysis of early and late responses.

Sampling Plan

For study three, we used an online snowballing technique (Appendix 2). As any adult consumer who could access an online website was appropriate for the study, requests to participate were initially sent out to members of three organizations that the researcher was both familiar with and active in, as well as 35 individuals. All of the organizations had an established and active web presence through one of the social medias. The organizations included a secondary boarding school alumni group, a national sorority, and a church membership. The individuals that were chosen were all very active on the internet (checked into email and social media accounts a minimum of three times per day) and possessed extensive online networks (networks of 50 or more individuals through their email or social media account), which they were willing to tap into to encourage others to participate in the study. Participants were encouraged to forward the link for the study to others they felt would be responsive to completing the survey. The only criteria was that individuals be aged 18 or above.

Measures

In this section, the operational definitions of the measured constructs will be reviewed. Multi-item, five-point Likert type scale items were used to measure the constructs. In most

cases, there are existing scales to measure the constructs. In the cases, where the measures did not completely fit the context within the model, the scales were modified appropriately.

Perceived Brand Age

We define perceived brand age, as a consumer's understanding of the age of a particular brand in a specified category. In this circumstance, age represents the length of time that a brand has existed. In the model, perceived brand age is hypothesized to be a combination of brand personality and market roles. We used three questions to directly measure perceived brand age in the survey: (1) Brand X is a younger brand, (2) Brand X is a new brand, and (3) Brand X advertisements target the young.

Brand Personality Brand personality is the traits of human personality that can be attributed to the brand (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). We used the Aaker scale, the measurement instrument most often used for measuring brand personality. It measures five independent dimensions of brand personality: competence, sincerity, excitement, sophistication and ruggedness (J. L. Aaker, 1997). The scale consists of 41 items, which participants respond to in order to indicate the extent to which each trait describes a particular brand.

Market Role. Market role is the impressions of productivity and fruitfulness generated by all of the elements which contribution to create the brand life. They demonstrate brand stability, competency and energy (Darpy & Levesque, 2003). We used the three questions implied in the article to measure market role: (1) Is the brand visible on the market? (2) Is the brand innovative in the market? and (3) Is the brand present in the market? Participants indicate whether they agree with the statements made about a particular brand.

Preferred Brand Age

Preferred brand age is defined as an evaluative judgment of partiality towards a particular age for a brand in a specified category. In this circumstance, age represents the length of time that a brand has existed. Preferred brand age is hypothesized to be composed of four factors: self-concept, perceived personal age, self-personality and nostalgia proneness. We used three questions to directly measure preferred brand age in the survey: (1) I prefer younger brands, (2) I prefer newer brands, and (3) I prefer brands whose advertisements target the young.

Self-Concept For the self-concept scale the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) developed by William Fitts (Fitts, Warren, & Western Psychological, 1996) was used. The TSCS is a well-standardized test originally developed in 1964. It is multi-dimensional in its description of the self-concept. It measures five independent aspects of self-perception: self-esteem, self-criticism, variability, certainty and conflict. The scale consists of 100 self-descriptive items, which participants respond to based on their perception of how applicable the item is to them. The first twenty items on the scale serve as a short form and can be used for a quick summary of self-concept. We used the short form in our study.

Personal Age Perceived personal age has traditionally been measured with a single item phrase. It can be as simple as “Do you feel that you are: young, middle-aged, old or very old?”, “How old do you feel?” or “What age do you feel on the inside?” (Kastenbaum et al., 1972; Markides & Boldt, 1983; Setterson Jr & Mayer, 1997). Although there are more detailed measurements, which include “look” age, “do” age and “interest” age in addition to “feel” age, for our purposes we only are interested in how old a person seems to himself or herself. We modified our measure to be “What age do you feel on the inside?”

Self-Personality Personality was measured using the standardized five-factor model developed and refined by O.P. John and colleagues. The scale measures the degree of Openness,

Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991; John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). The scale consists of 44 self-descriptive items, which participants respond to based on their perception of how applicable the item is to them. There are several short versions of the big five personality scale available. For this research, we use the BFI-10, which is a short form consisting of 10 questions (Rammstedt & John, 2007).

Nostalgia Proneness Nostalgia Proneness is believed to be a potential facet of individual character, a psychographic variable, that varies among consumers regardless of time or age related factors. We used the 20 item self-report scale developed by Morris Holbrook. The statements represent both the high and the low end of nostalgia proneness (Holbrook, 1993).

CHAPTER 5: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter outlines data collection, analysis procedures and results from each study and any pretests. The first project is an exploratory study to explore current consumer understanding and interpretation of the concept of perceived brand age. The second set of studies is an explication of the brand age concept. The final study tests the hypotheses within our model.

Study 1: Free Association Study

Sample Characteristics

During the exploratory study, there were three focus groups used. The sample for this study was comprised of 93 respondents. Participants were asked to write down “at least six adjectives or statements which come to mind when trying to determine a brand’s age”.

The first focus group was composed of 35 marketing students from an advance marketing class. Students ranged in age from 19 – 36. Approximately, 66% were women. Thirty-two usable responses were returned with 112 unique items. Participants in this focus group were incented to participate by earning extra credit towards class participation. The second focus group was composed of 45 marketing students in an introductory marketing class. Students ranged in age from 18 – 42. Approximately, 58% were woman. Twenty-seven usable responses were returned with 80 unique items. Participants in this focus group were incented to participate by earning extra credit towards class participation. The third focus group was composed of 13 adults from a local community church meeting. All participants were African-Americans ranging in age from 26 – 62. Approximately 77% were woman. Thirteen usable responses were returned with 53 unique items. Participants in this focus group were not provided with any incentive to participate in the study.

Results

The results from the free association study provided 226 distinct brand age items (Table 1).

Focus Group Study Original Responses			
Accomplished	Famous Executives	New	Spokesperson
Ad Budget	Fashion	New Age	Stability
Advanced	Financials Impact Market	New to Market	Stable
Advertisements	Fit	Nifty	staying power
Advertising	Flashy	Noise	Stitching Type
Age of People Using	Focus on certain groups	Not Fair	Strength
Ancient	Font	Number of Customers	Structured
Appearance	For Old People	Number of Products	Style
Athletic	Formatting	Obsolete	Style for young generation
Awareness	Frequency of Commercials	Old	Style of Presentation
Brand Owner	Frequency of Hearing about it	Old People Use Product	Success
Brands Length, Depth, and Width	Frequency of Sight	Old-fashioned	Successful
Brightness	Freshness	Online Presence	Symbolic
By my age	Fun	Outdated	Tailored
Casual	Gender	Package Designs	Target Market Age
Categorical	Generational	Packaging	Targeted
Characters/Mascots	Global Presence	Passed from generation to generation	Targeting
Childhood	Group	People talking about it	Tasty
Classic	Guaranteed	People's Knowledge of the brand	Texture
Cloth	Helpful	Picky	Time
Clothing of those in Ad	Heritage	Picture	Time on Market
Color	Hip	Placement	Trademarks
Colorful	Historical	Popularity	Traditional or Modern
Coloring	History	Preference	Traditional
Comfort	Household Name	Prestige	Tradition-oriented
Comfortability	How brand is marketed	Price	Trustworthy
Commercials	How often you see it	Product	Type of Advertisement
Committed to Community	Iconic	Proven	Type of Product
Confidence	Illustration/Pictures	Quality	Unique
Consistency	Innovation	Readability	Unwillingness to change major product
Consumers	Innovative	Recognition	Urban
Cost	Innovativeness	Recognized	Use by Parents
Creativeness	Jingle/Theme Song	Redesigned	Used
Customers	Known around the world	Referral by someone	Useful
Date Established	Known by Sight	relativity	Usefulness
Dated	Legacy	Relevance	Valuable
Dependability	Lettering of Font	Reliability	Vintage
Design	Likeability	Reliable	Visual Aids
Different Products under brand	Location of Products	Reputable	Wealth
Dignified	Logo	Reputation	Website
Diversity	Logo is charismatic and catchy	Responsibility	What it Can Do
Dress	Longevity	Seen on Commercials over time	Where you see it
Durability	Long-lasting	Shape	Who is in charge of brand
Durable	Look	Shiny	Widely Sold Stock
Ease of Use	Look of Product	Showoff	Widespread Distribution
Elderly	Loyal Customers	Simple	WOM referrals
Endurance	Loyalty	Singling Out	Wording
Equality	Mascot	Size	Worldwide
Established Date	Materials	Size of Organization	Year Established
Excellent Customer Service	mature	Slogan	Years of Existence
Expensive	Mission/Purpose	Smelling	Years of Success
Experience	Modern	Softy	Young Age
Experienced	Music	Soothing	Young Sponsors
Fabric	Name	Sophistication	Youth
Face or Body Identified with	Named in Textbooks	Specific	Youth Oriented Models
Fads	National		

Table 1: Focus Group Study Original Responses

This list was reviewed for redundancy and items not associated with the brand age construct were removed. These results were used to develop the brand age cues and brand age characteristics studies. Additionally, this study provided initial insights into consumer perceptions of brand age. Approximately 75% of the items could be classified into one of 13 general categories (Table 2).

<u>Initial Verbiage</u>	<u>Category Group</u>
Brand Awareness/Popularity/Presence/WOM/Recognition/Reputation	Brand Awareness
Packaging/Color/Shape/Size/Look	Packaging
Advertising	Advertising
Design/Creativity	Design
Durability/Endurance/Reliability/Stability	Durability
History/Date Established/Iconic/Classic/Vintage/Experience	History
Innovativeness/Modern/Tech. Savvy/Fashionable/Generational/Relevance	Relevance
Logo/Mascot/Spokesperson/Trademark/Slogan/Marketing	Marketing Package
Name	Name
Target Market/Consumers/Users/Age of Customers	Target Market
Quality	Quality
Executives	Executives
Price/Expensive/Cheap	Price

Table 2: Free Association Study Group Categories

Study 2: Brand Age Cues and Characteristics

Sample Characteristics

The brand age cues study was completed online through a professional research service. There were 159 surveys started, with 126 being validated as complete. The demographics of the sample showed the majority of participants, 60%, were between the ages of 18 – 24. 29% of the participants were between the ages of 25 – 34, with the remaining participants being 35 or older. 60 % of the participants were female. The respondents were ethnically diverse with 33% Caucasian, 8% Hispanic, 36% African-American, 16% Asian and with the remainder opting not to reveal their ethnicity.

The brand age characteristics study was also completed online through a professional research service. There were 120 surveys completed out of 132 started on the website. 58% of the respondents were between the ages of 18 – 24. 29% of the participants were between the ages of 25 – 34, with the remaining participants being 35 or older. 61 % of the participants were female. The respondents were ethnically diverse with 30% Caucasian, 8% Hispanic, 38% African-American, 16% Asian and with the remainder opting not to reveal their ethnicity.

Data Analysis

For the brand age cues study, SPSS was employed to calculate the mean for each question. As a 5 point semantic differential scale was used, we looked for means above 3.5 for agreement that the specific trait was valid to be used to judge brand age. We looked for means below 2.5 for agreement that the specific trait should not be used to judge brand age. Means between 2.5 and 3.5 were neutral.

For the brand age characteristics Study, SPSS was employed to calculate the mean for each question. It was used to measure strong intensity of attitude in one direction or the other. We looked for means below 2.5 to indicate strong belief about younger brand age characteristics. We looked for means above 3.5 to indicate strong belief about older brand age characteristics.

Results

The results from the brand age cues study (Table 3) suggest that only nine out of the thirty-six cues tested showed strength as a significant indicator for brand age. These cues are “I can tell the age of a brand by (1) If I knew it as a child, (2) If my parents used it, (3) How widely it is known, (4) The design of the marketing, (5) How often I have heard the name of the brand, (6) My personal knowledge of the brand, (7) How often I have seen the brand, and (8) It’s reputation.

Brand Age Cues Study		
I can tell the age of a brand by	N	Mean
Question 1: ... if I knew it as a child.	124	4.00
Question 6: ... by if my parents used it.	124	3.97
Question 7: ... by how widely it is known.	123	3.67
Question 8: ... by the design of the marketing.	125	3.53
Question 12: ... by how often I have heard the name of the brand.	122	3.50
Question 6: ... by if my parents used it.	124	3.97
Question 25:... my personal knowledge of the brand.	123	3.97
Question 26: ... by how often I have seen the brand.	123	3.54
Question 29: ... by it's reputation.	124	3.85

Table 3: Brand Age Cues Study

The results from the brand age characteristics study showed the concepts associated with young and contemporary brands include modern, innovative, fashionable, bright packaging, flashy, use of social media, creative marketing, use of current music, “green” in their approach to the environment and use of a younger spokesperson. Concepts associated with an established and traditional brand include reliable, iconic, trustworthy, mature, stable, loyal, widely known, broad distribution, good reputation, prestigious, use of classic music in the advertising, and elicits loyalty from my family and friends. Neutral concepts that were associated with both categories approximately equally include wide distribution, competitiveness, use of a catchy slogan, earning of a high revenue, use of a website, diversity in their marketing, high prices, popular, and runs promotions and discounts (Table 4). Our choices of what concepts to include were based on the results from the free association pre-study focus groups.

Brand Age Characteristics		
A brand that ...	N	Mean
Question 1: ...has a good reputation is a	120	3.86
Question 2: ... others are loyal to is a	120	3.65
Question 4: ... is prestigious is a	117	3.68
Question 6: ... that is modern is a	117	1.98
Question 7: ...is innovative is a	120	2.28
Question 9: ... is widely known is a	119	3.81
Question 10: ... my friends and family are loyal to is a	120	3.74
Question 12: ... is mature is a	117	4.07
Question 13: ... is fashionable is a	120	2.33
Question 14: ...has creative marketing is a	118	2.35
Question 15: ... has bright packaging is a	120	2.43
Question 16: ... uses an older person for their spokesperson is a	120	3.86
Question 18: ... uses classic music in the advertising is a	119	3.83
Question 19: ... markets through social media (Facebook, Twitter, RSS feed) is a	119	2.24
Question 24: ... is trustworthy is a	120	3.79
Question 25: ... is iconic is a	119	3.79
Question 28: ... is flashy is a	120	2.08
Question 29: ... stable is a	120	3.99
Question 32: ..., is quality is a	119	3.50
Question 34: ... is reliable is a	117	3.68
Question 35: ... a younger person for their spokesperson is a	119	2.20
Question 37: ... uses current music in the advertising is a	118	2.25
Question 38: ... is widely available is a	119	3.50
Question 39: ... is "green" is a	118	2.24
Valid N (listwise)	97	

Table 4: Brand Age Characteristics

Study 3: Model Pre-Test

Sample Characteristics

The Model Study Pre-Test was completed online through a professional research service.

There were 198 surveys started, with 107 being validated as complete. The pretest was administered at a large Southern University in Atlanta with students who were eighteen or older. The majority of participants, 49%, were Caucasian. This was followed by Asian 21%, African-American 18% and Hispanic at 9%. The remaining participants opted not to reveal their ethnicity. Gender was split at 50%. The largest age group in our sample was 18 – 24 year

olds who made up 78% of the sample population. 19% of the participants were between the ages of 25 – 34, with the remaining participants being 35 or older.

Data Analysis

For the Model Pretest Study, SPSS was employed to conduct a multiple regression analysis, which was used to do an initial test of relationships in our hypotheses. Before running the regression analysis, scatter plots were completed to test the Assumption of Linearity. This was followed by a correlation analysis.

Results

Based on feedback and our analysis of the results, we made some very significant changes to the final model-testing questionnaire. These changes and updates were made in order to clarify the survey and to better capture the desired data. The first two changes were made to the sections on perceived brand age and preferred brand age. In both sections, there was one reverse order question. In the perceived brand age section, the question is “Brand X is my parent's brand.” In the preferred brand age section, the question is “I use the brands that my parents used.” In the pre-test survey, we found that these two questions were misunderstood by participants. The results from these questions were skewing the data in their relevant sections. After a review, we decided to eliminate both questions.

In the model pre-test survey, the perceived personal age question was “What age do you feel on the inside?” We found that in addition to actual quantitative responses, a significant number of the recipients provided qualitative responses. These ranged from “confused” and “depends on the day” to “awesome” and “middle age”. This question was intended to illicit a quantitative response. We reworded that question to “What age do you feel on the inside (please provide a number)?”

In this same vein, the model pre-test survey included a question about age in the demographic section. The answers were standard age ranges i.e. 18 – 24, 25 – 34, 35 – 44, etc. In a college demographic, because the majority of students are in the same age range, this is not a critical issue. In this study, 78% of the students were between the ages of 18 – 24. However, as we moved the study to a larger demographic, we realized that we could better understand the concept of perceived personal age, if we were able to look at the difference between a respondent's actual chronological age and their perceived personal age. Only collecting an age range prevented us from being able to use this data. We reworded that question to “What is your current age (please provide a number)?”

We did not have income as part of the demographics in the model pre-test survey. This was due to administering the study with primarily college students. However, as we move the study to a larger demographic, we recognized the value in understanding how income might play a role in some of the attitudes. We added income to the demographic section.

Our last improvement to the model pre-test survey was to explicitly add and directly test for the construct of choice.

Study 3: Model Testing

Sample Characteristics

As with the model pretest study, we used an online survey through a professional research service. Respondents were recruited through a snowballing technique with Facebook as the primary communication source. There were 360 surveys started, with 40 being partially completed and 151 being totally complete. 78 % of the participants were female. Unlike our previous studies, the ages of participants were much more diverse. The respondents ranged in age from 21 to 67. The majority of participants, 36%, were between the ages of 35 and 44. 30%, were between the ages of 45 – 54, 21% of the participants were between the ages of 55 – 64, 5 %

were 65 and older, with the remaining participants being 34 or under. The respondents were typically African-American (51%) or Caucasian (38%) (Figure 2). 48% possessed a professional or graduate degree (Figure 3) and 59% were married. There was a wide range in income levels from under \$15, 000 (3%) to over \$200,000 (10%). The largest groups earned \$100,000 to \$149,999 (25%) or \$50,000 to \$74,999 (17%) (Figure 4).




Figure 2: Model Testing Study Ethnicity




Figure 3: Model Testing Study Education




Figure 4: Model Testing Study Incomes

Data Analysis

For the Model Study, SPSS was employed to conduct a multiple regression analysis, which was used to test the relationships in our hypotheses. We also used both scatter plots and

correlation analysis to confirm the basic assumptions underlying regression analysis. The following are the regression equations used in our analysis:

Perceived Brand Age

$$Y = A + BX_1 + CX_2 + DX_3 + EX_4 + FX_5 + GX_6$$

Y = Perceived Brand Age

X₁ = Brand Personality - Competence

X₂ = Brand Personality - Sincerity

X₃ = Brand Personality - Sophistication

X₄ = Brand Personality – Excitement

X₅ = Brand Personality - Ruggedness

X₆ = Market Roles

Preferred Brand Age

$$Y = A + BX_1 + CX_2 + DX_3 + EX_4 + FX_5 + GX_6$$

Y = Preferred Brand Age

X₁ = Self-Concept

X₂ = Personal Age

X₃ = Self-Personality - Openness

X₄ = Self-Personality - Extroversion

X₅ = Self-Personality - Agreeableness

X₆ = Nostalgia Proneness

Attitude towards the Brand

$$Y = A + BX_1$$

Y = Attitude

X₁ = Age Congruency (Perceived Brand Age – Preferred Brand Age)

Choice

$$Y = A + BX_1$$

Y = Choice

X₁ = Attitude

Results

Perceived Brand Age

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between perceived brand age and various potential predictors. Table 5 summarizes the descriptive statistics and analysis results. As can be seen, three of the brand personality scores are positively correlated with the criterion, but are not significant. This indicates that although not significant, brand personality competence, sincerity and excitement are associated with a younger brand age. Brand personality sophistication and ruggedness are negatively correlated with perceived brand age and are not significant, indicating that they are associated with an older brand age.

Variable	Mean	Std.	Correlation with PBA	Multiple Regression Weights	
				B	Beta
Perceived Brand Ages	2.4257	0.67659			
BP - Competence	3.0341	0.75444	0.077	0.005	0.006
BP - Sincerity	2.7816	0.74082	0.029	-0.056	-0.061
BP - Sophistication	2.6124	0.79482	-0.032	-0.098	-0.116
BP - Excitement	2.8411	0.7198	0.087	0.122	0.13
BP - Ruggedness	2.4993	0.79167	-0.067	-0.037	-0.044
Market Roles	3.6847	0.95082	0.242**	0.171	0.241

Table 5: Perceived Brand Age Regression Model

The multiple regression model with all six predictors produced $R^2 = .075$, $F(6, 141) = 1.901$, $p > .05$. As can be seen in Table 5, the market roles had significant positive regression weights, indicating a market role as a category stabilizer will be perceived to be older (Table 6). None of the brand personality predictors contributed to the multiple regression model (Table 7).

Market Roles						
H_{2A}: Brands that are seen as playing the role of a category stabilizer will be perceived to be older.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Supported
Perceived Brand Age	Stabilizer	0.171	p < 0.05	1.901	0.035	
H_{2B}: Brands that are seen as playing the role of a category changer will be perceived to be younger.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Supported
Perceived Brand Age	Changer	0.171	p < 0.05	1.901	0.035	

Table 6: Market Roles Hypotheses

Brand Personality						
H_{1A}: Brands that are seen as competent will be perceived to be older.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Perceived Brand Age	Competency	0.005	P > 0.05	1.901	0.035	
H_{1B}: Brands that are seen as sincere will be perceived to be older.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Perceived Brand Age	Sincerity	-0.056	P > 0.05	1.901	0.035	
H_{1C}: Brands that are seen as sophisticated will be perceived to be older.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Perceived Brand Age	Sophistication	-0.098	P > 0.05	1.901	0.035	
H_{1D}: Brands that are seen as exciting will be perceived to be younger.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Perceived Brand Age	Excitement	0.122	P > 0.05	1.901	0.035	
H_{1E}: Brands that are seen as rugged will be perceived to be younger.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Perceived Brand Age	Ruggedness	-0.037	P > 0.05	1.901	0.035	

Table 7: Brand Personality Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1a – 1e (Table 7) were not supported and we could not show that brand personality lead to a perception of older or younger brand age. However, there was significance with hypothesis 2a and 2b (Table 6) supporting the theory that the market role of a brand,

whether as a stabilizer or as a category changer lead to a perception of an older or younger brand age.

Preferred Brand Age

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between preferred brand age and change as suggested before. Table 8 summarizes the descriptive statistics and analysis results. All of the self-personality predictors and nostalgia proneness are positively correlated with preferred brand age, but only the self-personality trait extraversion is significant. This indicates that although not significant, self-personality openness and agreeableness, as well as nostalgia proneness, are associated with a younger brand age. Self-concept and perceived personal age are negatively correlated with the criterion. As perceived personal age is significant, this suggests as an individual's perceived personal age increases so does their preferred brand age.

Variable	Mean	Std.	Correlation with PrBA	Multiple Regression Weights	
				B	Beta
Preferred Brand Age	2.6723	0.6809			
Self-Concept	35.3129	4.21153	-0.046	-0.01	-0.06
Personal Age	32.8912	12.2436	-0.231	-0.013	-0.236
Self-Personality - Openness	3.7755	0.87426	0.147	0.12	0.154
Self-Personality - Extroversion	3.4932	0.76523	0.253	0.197	0.221
Self-Personality - Agreeableness	3.4116	0.81447	0.088	0.05	0.059
Nostalgia Proneness	3.0713	0.40813	0.054	0.062	0.037

Table 8: Preferred Brand Age Regression Model

The multiple regression model with all seven predictors produced $R^2 = .143$, $F(6, 140) = 3.895$, $p < .01$. Hypotheses 3a and 3b (Table 9) were not supported and we could not show that self-concept, either as stability or change, lead to a perception of older or younger brand age. The same is true for Hypotheses 5a and 5c (Table 11). We were unable to show support for

“Consumers with high openness personality traits will prefer younger brands”, however, it is worth noting that this hypotheses was just over the line of not being significant at .055. The nostalgia proneness hypothesis (Table 12) was not significant and it had an unexpected directionality. Neither the self-concepts, the self-personality traits of openness and agreeableness, nor the nostalgia proneness contributed to the multiple regression model.

However, there was significance with hypothesis 4 (Table 10) supporting the theory that the higher the individuals own perceived age, the higher their preferred brand age. There was also significance with hypothesis 5b, consumers with high extraversion personality traits will prefer younger brands.

Self-Concepts						
H_{3A}: Consumers who have a self-concept of stability will prefer older brands.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Preferred Brand Age	Stabilizer	-0.01	p > 0.05	3.895	0.143	
H_{3B}: Consumers who have a self-concept of change and innovation will prefer younger brands.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Preferred Brand Age	Changer	-0.01	p > 0.05	3.895	0.143	

Table 9: Self-Concepts Hypotheses

Perceived Personal Age						
H₄: The higher the individuals own perceived (human) age, the higher their preferred brand age.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Supported
Preferred Brand Age	Perceived Age	-0.013	P < .01	3.895	0.143	

Table 10: Perceived Personal Age Hypothesis

Self Personality						
H_{5A}: Consumers with high openness personality traits will prefer younger brands.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Preferred Brand Age	Extroversion	0.12	p > 0.05	3.895	0.143	
H_{5B}: Consumers with high extraversion personality traits will prefer younger brands.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Supported
Preferred Brand Age	Openness	0.197	p < 0.01	3.895	0.143	
H_{5C}: Consumers with high agreeableness personality traits will prefer older brands.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Preferred Brand Age	Agreeableness	0.05	p > 0.05	3.895	0.143	

Table 11: Self-Personality Hypotheses

Nostalgia Proneness						
H₆: Consumers with high nostalgia proneness will prefer older brands.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Preferred Brand Age	High Nostalgia	0.062	p > 0.05	3.895	0.143	

Table 12: Nostalgia Proneness Hypothesis

Attitude towards the Brand

We examine the relationship between attitude towards the brand and the congruence of two potential predictors by using correlation and multiple regression analyses. Table 13 summarizes the descriptive statistics and analysis results. Neither perceived brand age, nor preferred brand age were significant. The multiple regression model with two predictors produced $R^2 = .020$, $F(2, 144) = 1.505$, $p > .05$. We were unable to support hypothesis 7, the greater the congruency between preferred brand age and perceived brand age, the stronger the positive attitude towards the brand.

Variable	Mean	Std.	Correlation with Attitude	Multiple Regression Weights		
				B	Beta	
Attitude	2.6565	1.30626				
Brand Age Congruency	-0.2438	0.9317	0.051	-0.19	-0.135	

Table 13: Attitude towards the Brand Regression Model

Attitude						
H₇: The greater the congruency between preferred brand age and perceived brand age, the stronger the positive attitude towards the brand.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Not Supported
Attitude	Brand Age Congruency	-0.19	p > 0.05	2.702	0.102	

Table 14: Attitude Hypothesis

Choice

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between attitude towards the brand and choice. Table 15 summarizes the descriptive statistics and analysis results. Attitude towards the brand is positively correlated with choice and is significant (Figure 5). This provides support for the theory that the stronger the positive attitude towards the brand, the more likely the consumer will choose that brand when making a product purchase in that category (Table 16). The multiple regression model with attitude towards the brand as the predictor produced $R^2 = .343$, $F(1, 149) = 77.802$, $p < .01$.

Variable	Mean	Std.	Correlation with Choice	Multiple Regression Weights		
				B	Beta	
Choice	2.288	1.1978				
Attitude	2.647	1.312	0.586	0.535	0.586	

Table 15: Choice Regression Model

Choice						
H₇: The stronger the positive attitude towards the brand, the more likely the consumer will choose that brand when making a product purchase in that category.						
Dependent	Independent	Coefficient	P-value	F	R2	Supported
Choice	Attitude	0.535	P < .01	77.802	0.343	

Table 16: Choice Hypothesis

CHAPTER 6: IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

This final chapter will discuss the implications of our research and its contribution to marketing. First, we present a discussion of the research and the hypotheses testing. This will be followed by an overview of the contributions of the study. Finally, the limitations and future research directions will be examined.

Discussion

This research examines the concept of brand age, and investigates what it means in relation to brand management and consumer personal preferences. In this pursuit, we review the literature on brand personality (J. L. Aaker, 1997; Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003; Fournier, 1998); self-concepts (Dolich, 1969; Govers & Schoormans, 2005; Sirgy, 1982); perceived personal age (Barak & Schiffman, 1980; Guiot, 2001; Kastenbaum et al., 1972); self-personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992; Saucier, 1994); and nostalgia proneness (Holbrook & Schindler, 1991; Rindfleisch et al., 2000; Wildschut et al., 2006) to develop and test a model of consumer choice through the exploration of the relationship between perceived brand age and preferred brand age. The model was mixed in its support (Figure 6). A major contribution of this model lies in the fact that it creates a sense of awareness about the concept of brand age and its influence on consumption decisions. This is a concept that has not been empirically explored in the marketing literature.

The free association study uncovered some specific ideas and notions that consumers associate with the concept of brand age. Although there were well over 200 distinct ideas associated with brand age, the majority of them fell within 13 categories: brand awareness, packaging, advertising, design, durability, history, relevance, marketing package, name, target

market, quality, executives, and price. In other words, we find that consumers look at all factors surrounding a brand in order to understand the brand age. This is an important point for brand managers. The idea of brand age goes way beyond chronological age of the brand and is much more dependent on the presentation of the brand to the public.




Figure 5: Brand Age Model Support

The data collected from the free association study was used to develop both the brand cues study (Appendix 3) and the brand characteristics study (Appendix 4). The brand cues study helped to identify specific cues that appear to signal brand age to a wide variety of consumers. An important signal of brand age seems to be both familiarity and the environment in which the familiarity is witnessed. Consumers propose that they can tell the age of brand by if they knew the brand as a child; if their parents used the brand; if they heard the name of the brand; if they

had personal knowledge of the brand and by how often they actually saw the brand. This could be a case of “the more that I know about a brand, the more I can tell it’s age”. But, there is also a element of marketing influence included in the results. Other cues that showed strength as significant indicators of brand age included how widely the brand is known, the design of the marketing, and the reputation of the brand. This is an important opening for brand managers. Even if consumers believe they already know all about a brand, there still is an opportunity to influence their idea of brand age through the marketing.

The brand age characteristics study was designed to look at specific characteristics that consumers associate with either a younger brand or an older brand. Although the results were generally not surprising, they provide confirmation that marketing decisions like packaging, music, communication style, spokesperson, media and image are important in assisting a consumers understanding of brand age. There also was a clear suggestion that understanding and associating with current cultural trends were viewed as an indication of being in touch and therefore a younger brand age. These cultural trends included using current music, being “green” in their approach to the environment, and using social media. On the other hand, there was also the clear implication that those things that suggested stability in a brand, also suggested an older brand age. Concepts like iconic, mature, broad distribution, prestigious, loyal and eliciting loyalty from my family and friends are examples. This presents an interesting dilemma for marketing managers. They will want to grow their brand into an iconic established brand that illicit loyalty from consumers and their associates. However, accomplishing this task runs the risk of a brand being seen as no longer relevant, if it is considered older. A very thin line must be walked, balancing the strong establishment of a brand with the need to remain relevant and aware.

The information from all three of these studies helped to develop the brand age model. This next section will discuss the results of the hypotheses testing within the model in more detail. It should be noted that many of the hypotheses were not supported. We theorize that this may be due to the small sample size of the final study. In spite of the small sample size, some insightful results were obtained.

Hypotheses 1: Brand Personality

The data showed that none of the five factors that are the foundation of brand personality had an impact on perceived brand age (Figure 7). Since we saw earlier evidence of the importance of the marketing plan elements for understanding brand age, this may indicate that the concept of brand personality in most consumer's minds is already intertwined into a consumer's understanding of the various marketing elements. Enough, so that brand personality does not stand out as a factor of its own.

Hypotheses 2: Market Roles

The results show support for the theory that the market role of a brand leads to a consumer's understanding of perceived brand age. If a brand is perceived to be playing the role of a category stabilizer, it will be perceived to be older. If a brand is understood to be playing the role of a category changer, it will be perceived to be younger. Just as our social roles as human individuals suggest who we are internally, like our age, I believe that the social roles played by brands (market roles) suggest who they are internally, like their brand age.




Figure 6: Perceived Brand Age Model Support

Hypotheses 3: Self-Concept

Hypotheses 3 proposed that self-concept lead to a perception about preferred brand age. We posit that consumers who have a self-concept of stability will prefer older brands and consumers who have a self-concept of change and innovation will prefer younger brands. Although we did see the directionality we expected in these hypotheses, there was no significance in the results (Figure 8). In our early discussion, we acknowledge that it is likely consumers will have multiple self-concepts that influence their consumer behavior. We also recognize that any of the self-concepts could be activated at any time. If accurate, this difficult in maintaining one specific self-concept may explain the lack of support in the model for either a self-concept of stability or a self-concept of change and innovation.




Figure 7: Preferred Brand Age Model Support

Hypotheses 4: Perceived Personal Age

Hypothesis 4 proposes that the higher the individual's own perceived human age, the higher their preferred brand age. This is almost intuitive as consumers look for some element of themselves in their purchases or some element that reflects who they believe themselves to be. Even if consumers have a youth-based bias, research shows that this can occur at all ages (Barak, 2009; Barak & Schiffman, 1980; Guiot, 2001). Therefore, it is reasonable that as consumers' age, so will their youth-based bias.

Hypotheses 5: Self-Personality

There were three components of self-personality tested in the model: openness, extraversion and agreeableness. Although, there was clearly no support for agreeableness, it is worth noting the hypothesis for openness was just over the line of not being significant at $p = .055$. Just like the extraversion trait, the openness trait was proposed to illicit a preference for

younger brands. By its very definition, a personality that demonstrates openness is open to experience, imagination, and intellectual curiosity. Similarly, the extraversion trait is highly associated with positive emotionality, which includes openness to others (Costa & McCrae, 1992). These are traits associated with youth. It follows that potentially a personality that has a youthward disposition will be attracted to brands that reflect this self-image. Their preference would be for younger brands.

Hypotheses 6: Nostalgia Proneness

Hypothesis 6 was not significant and was not supported in our study. We were unable to make the connection between nostalgia proneness and preferred brand age. However, it is interesting that the directionality for this hypothesis was not what we expected (Figure 9). As we proposed that consumers with high nostalgia proneness would prefer older brands, we expected to see a positive correlation. The negative correlation, indicating that consumers with high nostalgia proneness preferred younger brands, may be due to the proliferation of nostalgia-based advertisement being used today. The use of nostalgia advertising is no longer limited to traditional brands, but is being used to actively market more modern and innovative brands today. Contemporary brands such as these have been conventionally targeting a younger demographic, therefore a younger generation is being aggressively exposed to a stronger sense of nostalgia. This could explain the directionality for this hypothesis.




Figure 8: Nostalgia Proneness Scatter Plot

Hypotheses 7: Perceived Brand Age and Preferred Brand Age Congruency

We were unable to show that the greater the congruency between perceived brand age and preferred brand age the stronger the positive attitude towards the brand. The relationship between attitude and brand age congruency was not significant. It may be that our predictor only moderates the other factors that influence attitude, rather than be direct predictor itself.

Hypotheses 8: Choice

Attitude towards the brand is positively correlated with choice and is significant. This provides support for the theory that the stronger the positive attitude towards the brand, the more likely the consumer will choose that brand during the consumption experience. The regression model suggests that attitude composes 34% of choice. This is supported by other marketing theory that suggests that attitude is a significant factor in making a choice.

Contributions

This study has proposed a conceptual framework for the concept of brand age and its influence on consumer choice. This is one of the first empirical studies in marketing to focus on the constructs of perceived brand age and preferred brand age. Empirical support has been provided for some parts of the brand age model in spite of small sample size.

We contribute to the literature by introducing the concept of perceived brand age and offering a working definition for perceived brand age and preferred brand age, as we examine the relationship between them. We conclude by examining the impact on consumer choice.

This study provides important managerial insight into the importance of managing perceived brand age as a part of an overall brand management program. Brand age is a concept that consumers both recognize and consider during the consumption process. If managers understand how the perception of their product's age influences consumer choice, then they have a better opportunity to develop marketing strategies, which will allow them to maximize their brand management efforts. Additionally, an understanding of the factors, which influence brand age gives managers the opportunity to adjust their marketing in such a way as to maximize the potential influence.

Limitations

One of the limitations in our final study is the small sample size. Given the many strengths of structural equation modeling (SEM) including its flexibility, clean graphical modeling and resolution of multicollinearity (Mackenzie, 2001), it is a preferred methodology to test a model like the brand age model. SEM allows researchers to test a simultaneous series of relationships, which cannot be done in an ANOVA/regression framework without a degree of cumbersome compromising. SEM can be used to analyze overall fit, individual paths, item loadings and residual error. However, the small sample size of our study prevented us from being

able to use SEM. Additionally, although the final study was diverse in terms of income, age and education, the small sample size still limits our generalizability.

Another limitation of our study is use of the snowballing technique in order to recruit respondents. Although, the study was initially sent to a diverse group of individuals in differing organizations, the majority of people who responded to the survey were very similar in education and income and they passed it on to others like themselves. The survey was self-selected and the final sample may not accurately reflect the population as a whole.

Finally, our adherence to one brand throughout the study is a limitation. We consistently used one brand for all of the respondents. The study would be stronger and more generalizable, if we rotated brands and industries.

Future Research Directions

The findings of this study provide some direction for future research. Because we limited our study to one brand in one industry, it is imperative that replications of this study be performed with other brands in other industries. We need to examine the influence of industry on brand age, as well as the strength of a brand. In this same vein, we also need to replicate the study in other countries to review if the concept of brand age is universal, and if it is influenced by cultural factors.

Our understanding of brand age would benefit greatly from the development of both a perceived brand age and preferred brand age scale. In future studies, this would provide a more precise objective measure to more accurately reflect the brand age concept. The conceptualization of a model would be enhanced by further developing the list of traits associated with perceived brand age and using statistical procedures to analyze the data generated to determine the underlying dimensions of perceived brand age.

In the model, several relationships were not found to be significant. In order to continue our understanding of the brand age concept, it is important to continue to both refine and empirically test the conceptual model. As relationships, directions and correlations are confirmed; this will assist brand managers in understanding what factors need to be considered when developing their brand management programs.

Finally, there needs to be more research conducted on how much of an influence brand age has on the consumption process as a whole. Understanding the influence of brand age, will help propel the development of more research.

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1: Qualitative Study

Write down at least six adjectives or statements, which first come to mind when trying to determine a brand's age?

Appendix 2: Survey Introduction

Family, Friends, and Colleagues:

As you may or may not know, I am in the last stages of completing my doctorate degree. As such, I am working on my last research study for my dissertation. I could really use your help. Please complete the following study, which you can access through this link: <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22F8F3MMVZQ/>. If the link does not work, you can cut and paste the web address into your internet browser address bar.

If you know of any adult who would be willing to take the survey, please invite them. I need at least 300 responses. The study takes approximately 20 - 30 minutes.

Thanks for your support.

Dee

Appendix 3: Brand Age Cues



Brand Age Study II

Brand Age Study II

Page 1 - Heading

Georgia State University
Department of Marketing
Informed Consent
Brand Age Study II

Principal Investigator: Dr. Naveen Donthu
Student P.I.: Monica Guillory

Page 1 - Heading

I. Purpose: You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this research is to gather information about cues consumers use to determine the age of a brand. Your participation will be very helpful in insuring that the findings are useful. A total of 150 participants will be recruited for this study. The entire study should take 15-20 minutes of your time.

II. Procedures: You are being asked to participate in a study concerning brands. If you decide to participate, your participation will involve answering a few questions based on your opinion. Students who are participating in this study as a part of the Marketing Subject Pool will receive class credit for completing the study.

III. Risks: In this study, you will have no more risk than you would in a normal day of life.

IV. Benefits: Participation in this study may benefit you personally. You may learn more about branding. Overall, we hope to gain information about the ways in which consumers determine a brand's age.

V. Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal: Participation in this research is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right to drop out at any time. You may stop participating at any time. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Page 1 - Heading

VI. Confidentiality: We will keep your records private to the extent allowed by law. Dr. Naveen Donthu and Monica Guillory will have access to the information you provide. Information may also be shared with those who make sure the study is done correctly (GSU Institutional Review Board, and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP)). We will not use your name on any study records. The information you provide will be on a firewall-protected computers. Your name and other facts that might point to you will not appear when we present this study or publish its results. The findings will be summarized and reported in group form. You will not be identified personally.

VII. Contact Persons: Contact Monica Guillory at 404-413-7655 or mguillory1@gsu.edu or Dr. Naveen Donthu at 404-413-7662 or mktnd@gsu.edu if you have questions about this study. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact Susan Vogtner in the Office of Research Integrity at 404-413-3513 or svogtner1@gsu.edu.

VIII. Copy of Consent Form to Subject: Please print out a copy of this consent form to keep.

Page 1 - Heading

If you consent to participate in this study, please continue by clicking "SUBMIT" below.

Page 2 - Heading

You are most likely familiar with many brands out in the marketplace. These include Apple, Folgers, Disney, Boeing, Tide, Microsoft, Facebook, Sony, IBM, Whirlpool and Hilton to name just a few. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements. Think about how you know the age of a brand.

Page 2 - Question 1 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if I knew it as a child.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 2 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the name of the product.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 3 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the commercials it airs.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 4 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if it offers a guarantee.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 5 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the organization that makes the product.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 6 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if my parents used it.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 7 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by how widely it is known.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 8 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the design of the marketing.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 9 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by it's level of quality.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 10 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by it's competition.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 11 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by it's target market.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 12 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by how often I have heard the name of the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 13 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by it's use of social media (Facebook, Twitter, RSS feeds, etc.) in the marketing.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 14 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if it is reliable.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 15 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if it is unique.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 16 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the mascot used to represent the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 17 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by where it is sold.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 18 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if it is durable.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Heading

You are most likely familiar with many brands out in the marketplace. These include Apple, Folgers, Disney, Boeing, Tide, Microsoft, Facebook, Sony, IBM, Whirlpool and Hilton to name just a few. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements. Think about how you know the age of a brand.

Page 3 - Question 19 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if it is trustworthy.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 20 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the number of people that I know who use the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 21 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the price of the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 22 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the slogan used by the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 23 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if the name is used to represent the whole category.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 24 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the music used in the advertising.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 25 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by my personal knowledge of the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 26 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by how often I have seen the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 27 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the jingle that accompanies the brand in the marketing.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 28 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by how well it works.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 29 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by it's reputation.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 30 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the spokesperson representing the brand.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 31 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the look of the product.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 32 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if it is worldwide.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 33 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the type of promotions used.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**

1 2 3 4 5

Page 3 - Question 34 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by if it has a website.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**

1 2 3 4 5

Page 3 - Question 35 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by the style of it's marketing.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**

1 2 3 4 5

Page 3 - Question 36 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I can tell the age of a brand by it's visual display in the store.

Strongly Disagree **Moderately Disagree** **Neither Agree nor Disagree** **Moderately Agree** **Strongly Agree**

1 2 3 4 5

Page 4 - Heading

The next questions are for classification purposes only. They will only be used to group your answers with others like yourself.

Page 4 - Question 37 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your gender.

- Male
- Female

Page 4 - Question 38 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Please select the category that includes your age.

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 or older

Page 4 - Question 39 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Which one of the following best describes your marital status?

- Single, never married
- Married

- Living with partner
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Prefer not to answer

Page 4 - Question 40 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

What best describes your level of education?

- Less than 9th grade
- Some high school
- High school graduate or equivalent
- Some college
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Graduate or professional degree
- Prefer not to answer

Page 4 - Question 41 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)


Which one of the following best describes you?

- White/Caucasian
- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- Black/African American
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Native American
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Survey Closed Page

Standard

Appendix 4: Brand Age Characteristics



Brand Age Study III

Brand Age Study III

Page 1 - Heading

Georgia State University
 Department of Marketing
 Informed Consent
 Title: Brand Age Study III
 Principal Investigator: Dr. Naveen Donthu
 Student Principal Investigator: Monica D. Guillory

Page 1 - Heading

I. Purpose: You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this research is to gather information about cues consumers use to determine the age of a brand. Your participation will be very helpful in insuring that the findings are useful. A total of 150 participants will be recruited for this study. The entire study should take 15-20 minutes of your time.

II. Procedures: You are being asked to participate in a study concerning brands. If you decide to participate, your participation will involve answering a few questions based on your opinion. Students who are participating in this study as a part of the Marketing Subject Pool will receive class credit for completing the study.

III. Risks: In this study, you will not have any more risks than you would in a normal day of life.

IV. Benefits: Participation in this study may benefit you personally. You may learn more about branding. Overall, we hope to gain information about the ways in which consumers determine a brand's age.

V. Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal: Participation in this research is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right to drop out at any time. You may stop participating at any time. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Page 1 - Heading

VI. Confidentiality: We will keep your records private to the extent allowed by law. Dr. Naveen Donthu and Monica Guillory will have access to the information you provide. Information may also be shared with those who make sure the study is done correctly (GSU Institutional Review Board, the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) and/or the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the sponsor). We will not use your name on any study records. The information you provide will be on a firewall-protected computers. Your name and other facts that might point to you will not appear when we present this study or publish its results. The findings will be summarized and reported in group form. You will not be identified personally.

VII. Contact Persons: Contact Monica Guillory at 404-413-7655 or mguillory1@gsu.edu or Dr. Naveen Donthu at 404-413-7662 or mktnd@gsu.edu if you have questions about this study. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact Susan Vogtner in the Office of Research Integrity at 404-413-3513 or svogtner1@gsu.edu.

VIII. Copy of Consent Form to Subject: Please print out a copy of this consent form to keep.

Page 1 - Heading

If you consent to participate in this study, please continue by clicking "SUBMIT" below.

Page 2 - Heading

You are most likely familiar with many brands out in the marketplace. Some examples of brands include Apple, Folgers, Disney, Boeing, Tide, Microsoft, Facebook, Sony, Closeup, Whirlpool and Hilton to name just a few. Some of these brands are considered to be young and contemporary brands, while others are considered to be established and traditional brands. Please indicate whether you believe each statement to be an indication of a younger brand or an older brand on a continuum. Think about brands that you are familiar with that you perceive to be younger or older.

Page 2 - Question 1 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that has a good reputation is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 2 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that others are loyal to is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 3 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that others are satisfied with is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 4 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is prestigious is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 5 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is sophisticated is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 6 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is modern is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 7 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is innovative is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 8 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is popular is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 9 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is widely known is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 10 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that my friends and family are loyal to is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 11 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that I am personally familiar with is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 12 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is mature is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 13 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is fashionable is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 14 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that has creative marketing is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 15 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that has bright packaging is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 16 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that uses an older person for their spokesperson is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 17 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that uses a mascot is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 18 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that uses classic music in the advertising is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 19 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that markets through social media (Facebook, Twitter, RSS feed) is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 2 - Question 20 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that has a high price is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 3 - Heading

You are most likely familiar with many brands out in the marketplace. Some examples of brands include Apple, Folgers, Disney, Boeing, Tide, Microsoft, Facebook, Sony, Closeup, Whirlpool and Hilton to name just a few. Some of these brands are considered to be young and contemporary brands, while others are considered to be established and traditional brands. Please indicate whether you believe each statement to be an indication of a younger brand or an older brand on a continuum. Think about brands that you are familiar with that you perceive to be younger or older.

Page 3 - Question 21 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that has diversity in their marketing is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 3 - Question 22 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that often runs promotions and discounts is a

Younger Brand 2 3 4 Older Brand

1 2 3 4 5

Page 3 - Question 23 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that has a website is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 24 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is trustworthy is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 25 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is iconic is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 26 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that has a company with famous executives is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 27 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that earns high revenue is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 28 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is flashy is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 29 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is stable is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 30 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that solves a problem for me is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 31 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is a reflection of my style is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 32 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is quality is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 33 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that uses a catchy slogan in the marketing is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 34 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is reliable is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 35 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that uses a younger person for their spokesperson is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 36 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is competitive is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 37 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that uses current music in the advertising is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 38 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is widely available is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 39 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that is "green" is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 40 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

A brand that gives back to the community is a

Younger Brand	2	3	4	Older Brand
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Heading

The next questions are for classification purposes only. They will only be used to group your answers with others like yourself.

Page 4 - Question 41 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your gender.

- Male
- Female

Page 4 - Question 42 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Please select the category that includes your age.

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 or older

Page 4 - Question 43 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Which one of the following best describes your marital status?

- Single, never married
- Married
- Living with partner
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Prefer not to answer

Page 4 - Question 44 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

What best describes your level of education?

- Less than 9th grade
- Some high school
- High school graduate or equivalent
- Some college
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Graduate or professional degree
- Prefer not to answer

Page 4 - Question 45 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Which one of the following best describes you?

- White/Caucasian
- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- Black/African American
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Native American
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Page 5 - Question 46 - Open Ended - One or More Lines with Prompt

Thank you for taking the time to participate in our survey. If you are a student taking this survey for class credit, please type in your full name, the instructor's name and the course you are taking below.

~~/~~ F u l l N a m e _____
~~/~~ I n s t r u c t o r _____
~~/~~ C o u r s e _____

Thank You Page

Thank you for taking the time to complete our survey.

Screen Out Page

Standard

Over Quota Page

Standard

Survey Closed Page

Standard

Appendix 5: Brand Age Model



Brand Age Study IV

Created: March 24 2012, 10:57 AM
Last Modified: April 13 2012, 9:53 PM
Design Theme: Aquarium
Language: English
Button Options: Custom: Start Survey: "Start Survey!" Submit: "Submit"
Disable Browser "Back" Button: False

Brand Age Study IV

Page 1 - Heading

Georgia State University
Department of Marketing
Informed Consent
Brand Age Study IV

Principal Investigator: Dr. Naveen Donthu
Student Principal Investigator: Monica D. Guillory

Page 1 - Heading

I. Purpose:

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this research is to gather information on the role brand age plays in consumer choice. Your participation will be very helpful in insuring that the findings are useful. A total of 300 participants will be recruited for this study. The entire study should take 25-30 minutes of your time.

II. Procedures: You are being asked to participate in a study concerning brands. If you decide to participate, your participation will involve answering a few questions based on your opinion.

III. Risks: In this study, you will not have any more risks than you would in a normal day of life.

IV. Benefits: Participation in this study may benefit you personally. You may learn more about branding. Overall, we hope to gain information about the ways in which consumers determine a brand's age and the role this plays in making consumption choices.

V. Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal: Participation in this research is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right to drop out at any time. You may stop participating at any time. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Page 1 - Heading

VI. Confidentiality: We will keep your records private to the extent allowed by law. Dr. Naveen Donthu and Monica Guillory will have access to the information you provide. Information may also be shared with those who make sure the study is done correctly (GSU Institutional Review Board, the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) and/or the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the sponsor). We will not use your name on any study records. The information you provide will be on a firewall-protected computers. Your name and other facts that might point to you will not appear when we present this study or publish its results. The findings will be summarized and reported in group form. You will not be identified personally.

VIII. Contact Persons: Contact Monica Guillory at 404-413-7655 or mguillory1@gsu.edu or Dr. Naveen Donthu at 404-413-7662 or mktnd@gsu.edu if you have questions about this study. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact Susan Vogtner in the Office of Research Integrity at 404-413-3513 or svogtner1@gsu.edu.

VIII. Copy of Consent Form to Subject: Please print out a copy of this consent form to keep.

Page 1 - Heading

If you consent to participate in this study, please continue by clicking "SUBMIT" below.

Page 2 - Heading

The scale asks you to describe how you feel about yourself. There are no right or wrong answers, so please just describe yourself as honestly as you can. When you are ready to begin, read each statement and decide how well it describes you according to the scale below. Read each statement carefully. Then choose the number the shows your answer. Choose only one number for each statement, using this scale:

Answer 1 if the statement is ALWAYS FALSE

Answer 2 if the statement is MOSTLY FALSE

Answer 3 if the statement is PARTLY FALSE AND PARTLY TRUE

Answer 4 if the statement is MOSTLY TRUE

Answer 5 if the statement is ALWAYS TRUE

Page 2 - Question 1 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am an attractive person.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 2 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am an honest person.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 3 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am a member of a happy family.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 4 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I wish I could be more trustworthy.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 5 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I do not feel at ease with other people.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 6 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Math is hard for me.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 7 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am a friendly person.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 8 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am satisfied with my moral behavior.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 9 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am not as smart as the people around me.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 10 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I do not act the way my family thinks I should.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 11 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am just as nice as I should be.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 12 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

It is easy for me to learn new things.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 13 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am satisfied with my family relationships.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 14 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am not the person I would like to be.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 15 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I understand my family as well as I should.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 16 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I despise myself.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 17 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I don't feel as well as I should.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 18 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I do well at math.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 19 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am satisfied to be just what I am.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 2 - Question 20 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I get along well with other people.

ALWAYS FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	PARTLY FALSE/PARTLY TRUE	MOSTLY TRUE	ALWAYS TRUE
<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Heading

Indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Answer 1 if you DISAGREE STRONGLY

Answer 2 if you DISAGREE A LITTLE

Answer 3 if you NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

Answer 4 if you AGREE A LITTLE

Answer 5 if you AGREE STRONGLY

Page 3 - Question 21 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I like Pepsi-Cola.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 22 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I often drink Pepsi-Cola.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 3 - Question 23 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I recommend Pepsi-Cola.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Heading

Indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Answer 1 if you DISAGREE STRONGLY

Answer 2 if you DISAGREE A LITTLE

Answer 3 if you NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

Answer 4 if you AGREE A LITTLE

Answer 5 if you AGREE STRONGLY

Page 4 - Question 24 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

They don't make 'em like they used to.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 25 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Newer is almost always better.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 26 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

In the future, people will have even better lives.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 27 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Things used to be better in the good old days.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 28 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I believe in the constant march of progress.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 29 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Yesterday, all my troubles seemed so far away.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 30 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Products are getting shoddier and shoddier.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 31 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Compared to our parents, we've got it good.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 32 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Technology change will ensure a brighter future.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 33 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

When I was younger, I was happier than I am today.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 34 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Today's new movie stars could learn from the old pros.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 35 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I must admit it is getting better and better all the time.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 36 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The truly great sports heroes are long dead and gone.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 37 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

History involves a steady improvement in human welfare.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 38 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Today's standard of living is the highest ever attained.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 39 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Sometimes, I wish I could return to the womb.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 40 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

We are experiencing a decline in the quality of life.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 41 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Steady growth in GNP has brought increased human happiness.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 42 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Compared to the Classics, today's music is mostly trash.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 4 - Question 43 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Modern business constantly builds a better tomorrow.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Heading

How well do the following statements describe your personality?

Answer 1 if you DISAGREE STRONGLY

Answer 2 if you DISAGREE A LITTLE

Answer 3 if you NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

Answer 4 if you AGREE A LITTLE

Answer 5 if you AGREE STRONGLY

Page 5 - Question 44 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who is reserved.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Question 45 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who is generally trusting.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Question 46 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who tends to be lazy.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Question 47 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who is relaxed, handles stress well.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Question 48 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who has artistic interests.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Question 49 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who is outgoing, sociable.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Question 50 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who tends to find fault with others.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 5 - Question 51 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who does a thorough job.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 5 - Question 52 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who gets nervous easily.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 5 - Question 53 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am someone who has an active imagination.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 6 - Heading

Indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Answer 1 if you DISAGREE STRONGLY

Answer 2 if you DISAGREE A LITTLE

Answer 3 if you NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE

Answer 4 if you AGREE A LITTLE

Answer 5 if you AGREE STRONGLY

Page 6 - Question 54 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I prefer younger brands.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 6 - Question 55 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I prefer newer brands.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 6 - Question 56 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I prefer brands whose advertisements target the young.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 6 - Question 57 - Open Ended - One Line

What age do you feel on the inside (please provide a number)?

Page 7 - Heading

Indicate the extent to which each trait describes the brand of Pepsi-Cola.
 Answer 1 if it is NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE
 Answer 2 if it is SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE
 Answer 3 if it is NEUTRAL
 Answer 4 if it is VERY DESCRIPTIVE
 Answer 5 if it is EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE

Page 7 - Question 58 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is down-to-earth.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 59 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is family-oriented.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 60 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is small-town.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 61 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is honest.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 62 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is sincere.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 63 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is real.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 64 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is wholesome.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 65 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is original.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 66 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is cheerful.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 67 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is sentimental.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 68 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is friendly.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 69 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is daring.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 70 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is trendy.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 71 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is exciting.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 72 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is spirited.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 73 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is cool.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 74 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is young.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 75 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is imaginative.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 76 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is unique.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 77 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is up-to-date.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 7 - Question 78 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is independent.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Heading

Indicate the extent to which each trait describes the brand of Pepsi-Cola.

Answer 1 if it is NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE

Answer 2 if it is SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE

Answer 3 if it is NEUTRAL

Answer 4 if it is VERY DESCRIPTIVE

Answer 5 if it is EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE

Page 8 - Question 79 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is contemporary.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 80 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is reliable.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 90 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is glamorous.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 91 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is good-looking.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 92 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is charming.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 93 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is feminine.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 94 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is smooth.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 95 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is outdoorsy.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 96 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is masculine.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 97 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is Western.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 98 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is tough.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 8 - Question 99 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is rugged.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 9 - Heading

Indicate the extent to which each trait describes the brand of Pepsi-Cola.

Answer 1 if it is NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE
 Answer 2 if it is SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE
 Answer 3 if it is NEUTRAL
 Answer 4 if it is VERY DESCRIPTIVE
 Answer 5 if it is EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE

Page 9 - Question 100 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is visible on the market.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 9 - Question 101 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is innovative in the market.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 9 - Question 102 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The brand is present in the market.

NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE	SOMEWHAT DESCRIPTIVE	N E U T R A L	VERY DESCRIPTIVE	EXTREMELY DESCRIPTIVE
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 10 - Heading

Indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Answer 1 if you DISAGREE STRONGLY
 Answer 2 if you DISAGREE A LITTLE
 Answer 3 if you NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
 Answer 4 if you AGREE A LITTLE
 Answer 5 if you AGREE STRONGLY

Page 10 - Question 103 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Pepsi-Cola is a younger brand.

DISAGREE STRONGLY	DISAGREE A LITTLE	NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	AGREE A LITTLE	AGREE STRONGLY
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5

Page 10 - Question 104 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Pepsi-Cola is a new brand.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 10 - Question 105 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Pepsi-Cola advertisements target the young.

DISAGREE STRONGLY **DISAGREE A LITTLE** **NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE** **AGREE A LITTLE** **AGREE STRONGLY**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 11 - Heading

Indicate which of the follow statements most closely reflects your feelings.

Answer 1 for ALL THE TIME

Answer 2 for MOST OF THE TIME

Answer 3 for SOME OF THE TIME

Answer 4 for RARELY

Answer 5 for NEVER

Page 11 - Question 106 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Given a choice I select Pepsi-Cola.

ALL OF THE TIME **MOST OF THE TIME** **SOME OF THE TIME** **R A R E L Y** **N E V E R**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 11 - Question 107 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

If Pepsi-Cola is not available, I select another brand.

ALL OF THE TIME **MOST OF THE TIME** **SOME OF THE TIME** **R A R E L Y** **N E V E R**
 1 2 3 4 5

Page 12 - Heading

The next questions are for classification purposes only. They will only be used to group your answers with others like yourself.

Page 12 - Question 108 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your gender.

- Male
 Female

Page 12 - Question 109 - Open Ended - One Line

What is your current age (please provide a number)?

Page 12 - Question 110 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Which one of the following best describes your marital status?

- Single, never married
- Married
- Living with partner
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Prefer not to answer

Page 12 - Question 111 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

What best describes your level of education?

- Less than 9th grade
- Some high school
- High school graduate or equivalent
- Some college
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Graduate or professional degree
- Prefer not to answer

Page 12 - Question 112 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Which one of the following best describes you?

- White/Caucasian
- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- Black/African American
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Native American
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

Page 12 - Question 113 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Which one of the following ranges includes your total yearly household income before taxes?

- Under \$15,000
- \$15,000 to \$24,999
- \$25,000 to \$34,999
- \$35,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to \$74,999
- \$75,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$149,999
- \$150,000 to \$199,999
- \$200,000 and up
- Prefer not to answer

Thank You Page

Thank you for taking the time to complete our survey.

Screen Out Page

Standard

Over Quota Page

Standard

Survey Closed Page

Standard

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing Brand Equity*. Arrial, NY: Free Press.
- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356.
- Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait Names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47(1), i-171.
- Azoulay, A., & Kapferer, J.-N. I. (2003). Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality? *Journal of Brand Management*, 11(2), 143-155.
- Barak, B. (2009). Age identity: A cross-cultural global approach. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 33(1), 2-11.
- Barak, B., Mathur, A., Lee, K., & Zhang, Y. (2001). Perception of Age-Identity: A Cross-Cultural Inner-Age Exploration. *Psychology & Marketing*, 18(10), 1003-1029.
- Barak, B., & Schiffman, L. G. (1980). *Cognitive Age: A Nonchronological Age Variable* (Vol. 8). Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139-168.
- Berry, N. C. (1988). Revitalizing Brands. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 5(3), 15.
- Birdwell, A. E. (1968). A Study of the Influence of Image Congruence on Consumer Choice. *The Journal of Business*, 41(1), 76-88.
- Brown, D. (1992). Breathe New Life Into Your Old Brand. *Management Review*, 81(8), 10.
- Byrne, D. (1997). An overview (and underview) of research and theory within the attraction paradigm. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14(3), 417.

- Clancy, K. J. (2001). Save America's Dying Brands. *Marketing Management, 10*(3), 36-41.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Neo PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Darpy, D., & Levesque, A. (2003). *The Perceived Brand Age*.
- Davis, F. (1979). *Yearning for Yesterday. A Sociology of Nostalgia*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dolich, I. J. (1969). Congruence Relationships Between Self Images and Product Brands. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR), 6*(1), 80-84.
- Donnellan, M. B., & Lucas, R. E. (2008). Age differences in the big five across the life span: Evidence from two national samples. *Psychology and Aging, 23*(3), 558-566.
- Ewing, M. T., Jevons, C. P., & Khalil, E. L. (2009). Brand death: A developmental model of senescence. *Journal of Business Research, 62*(3), 332-338.
- Fitts, W. H., Warren, W. L., & Western Psychological, S. (1996). *Tennessee Self-concept Scale: TSCS-2*: Western Psychological Services.
- Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research. *The Journal of consumer research, 24*(4), 343-373.
- Govers, P. C. M., & Schoormans, J. P. L. (2005). Product personality and its influence on consumer preference. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 22*(4), 189-197.
- Green, P. E., Maheshwari, A., & Rao, V. (1969). Self-concept and brand preference: an empirical application of multidimensional scaling. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 11*(4), 343-360.
- Grubb, E. L., & Hupp, G. (1968). Perception of Self, Generalized Stereotypes, and Brand Selection. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR), 5*(1), 58-63.

- Grubb, E. L., & Stern, B. L. (1971). Self-concept and significant others. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8(3), 382-386.
- Guiot, D. (2001). Antecedents of Subjective Age Biases among Senior Women. *Psychology & Marketing*, 18(10), 1049-1071.
- Haig, M. (2003). *Brand Failures*. London: Kogan Page.
- Hamilton, M., & Sun, X. (05/26/2005 Annual Meeting, New York, NY). *Actual Self and Ideal Brand Image: An Application of Self-congruity to Brand Image Positioning*. Paper presented at the Conference Papers -- International Communication Association.
- Herman, D. (2000). Introducing short-term brands: a new branding tool for a new consumer reality. *Journal of Brand Management*, 7(5), 330-340.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319-340.
- Holak, S. L., & Havlena, W. J. (1992). Nostalgia: An exploratory study of themes and emotions in the nostalgic experience. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 19, 380-387.
- Holbrook, M. B. (1993). Nostalgia and consumption preferences: Some emerging patterns of consumer tastes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 245-256.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Schindler, R. M. (1991). Echoes of the dear departed past: Some work in progress on nostalgia. *Advances in consumer research*, 18(1), 330-333.
- Ivan, R. (1971). Self-concept and Brand Preference. *The Journal of Business (pre-1986)*, 44(1), 38.
- Johar, G. V., Sengupta, J., & Aaker, J. L. (2005). Two Roads to Updating Brand Personality Impressions: Trait versus Evaluative Inferencing. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42(4), 458-469.

- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *Big five inventory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues, 3rd edn., ch. 4: Guilford Press, New York.
- Kastenbaum, R., Derbin, V., Sabatini, P., & Artt, S. (1972). "The Ages of Me": Toward Personal and Interpersonal Definitions of Functional Aging. *The International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 3(2), 197 - 211
- Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *The Journal of Marketing*, 1-22.
- Landon Jr., E. L. (1974). Self Concept, Ideal Self Concept, and Consumer Purchase Intentions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(2), 44-51.
- Lee, J. W. (2009). Relationship Between Consumer Personality And Brand Personality As Self-Concept: From The Case Of Korean Automobile Brands. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 13(1), 25-44.
- Lehu, J.-M. (2004). Back to life! Why brands grow old and sometimes die and what managers then do: an exploratory qualitative research put into the French context. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 10(2), 133-152.
- Levy, S. J. (1959). Symbols for Sales. *Harvard Business Review*, 37(4), 117-124.
- Levy, S. J. (1999). Symbols for sales. *Brands, consumers, symbols, & research: Sidney J. Levy on marketing*, 203.
- Malhotra, N. K. (1988). Self concept and product choice: An integrated perspective. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 9(1), 1-28.

- Markides, K. S., & Boldt, J. S. (1983). Change in subjective age among the elderly: A longitudinal analysis. *The Gerontologist*, 23(4), 422.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, 61(3), 204-217.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1992). Discriminant validity of NEO-PIR facet scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52(1), 229-237.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five factor model and its applications. *Journal of personality*, 60(2), 175-215.
- Merchant, A., Ford, J., & Gopinath, M. (2007). Measuring the Intensity of the Personal Nostalgia Experience: A Conceptual Framework. *Society for Marketing Advances Proceedings*, 48-49.
- Mindak, W. A. (1961). Fitting the Semantic Differential to the Marketing Problem. *Journal of Marketing*, 25(4), 28-33.
- Moschis, G. P. (1992). *Marketing to older consumers: A handbook of information for strategy development*: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Mulyanegara, R. C., Tsarenko, Y., & Anderson, A. (2009). The Big Five and brand personality: Investigating the impact of consumer personality on preferences towards particular brand personality. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(4), 234-247.
- New Products Database. (2006). Retrieved 05/27/2011, from Mintel Global New Products Database <http://www.mintel.com/gnpd>

- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big Five factors and facets and the prediction of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(3), 524-539.
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*(1), 203-212.
- Rindfleisch, A., Freeman, D., & Burroughs, J. E. (2000). Nostalgia, materialism, and product preference: an initial inquiry. *Advances in Consumer Research, 27*, 36-41.
- Rindfleisch, A., & Sprott, D. E. (2000). Special session summary moving forward on looking backward: Advancing theory and practice in nostalgia. *Advances in Consumer Research, 27*, 34-35.
- Ross, I. (1971). Self-Concept And Brand Preference. *The Journal of Business (pre-1986), 44*(1), 38.
- Ross, S. D. (2007). Assessing the use of the brand personality scale in team sport. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 3, 1*(2), 23-38.
- Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-Markers: A Brief Version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five Markers. [Article]. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 63*(3), 506.
- Schenk, C. T., & Holman, R. H. (1980). A Sociological Approach to Brand Choice: The Concept of Situational Self Image. *Advances in Consumer Research, 7*(1), 610-614.
- Schindler, R. M., & Holbrook, M. B. (2003). Nostalgia for early experience as a determinant of consumer preferences. *Psychology and Marketing, 20*(4), 275-302.
- Setterson Jr, R. A., & Mayer, K. U. (1997). The measure of age, age structuring, and the life course. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 233-261.

- Siguaw, J. A., Mattila, A., & Austin, J. R. (1999). The Brand-Personality Scale. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 40(3), 48-55. doi: 10.1177/001088049904000319
- Silberberg, E., & Suen, W. (2001). *The Structure of Economics: A Mathematical Analysis* (3rd ed.): McGraw-Hill.
- Similarity/Attraction Theory. (2008). *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Retrieved from Encyclopedia.com website: <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G2-3045302452.html>
- Sirgy, M. J. (1982). Self-Concept in Consumer Behavior: A Critical Review. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(3), 287-300.
- Sirgy, M. J. (1985). Using Self-Congruity and Ideal Congruity to Predict Purchase Motivation. *Journal of Business Research*, 13(3), 195-206.
- Szmigin, I., & Carrigan, M. (2001). Introduction to Special Issue on Cognitive Age and Consumption. *Psychology & Marketing*, 18(10), 999-1002.
- Wansink, B., & Gilmore, J. M. (1999). New Uses That Revitalize Old Brands. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39(2), 90-98.
- Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Arndt, J., & Routledge, C. (2006). Nostalgia: Content, Triggers, Functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(5), 975-993.
- Wilkes, R. E. (1992). A Structural Modeling Approach to the Measurement and Meaning of Cognitive Age. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(2), 292-301.
- Zoomerang About Us. (2012). Retrieved June 12, 2012, from www.zoomerang.com