

Factors Contributing towards Successful Brand Extension

Md. Muinuddin Khan^{*}

Md. Habibur Rahman^{**}

Abstract

Brand extension, which involves introducing a new product under the existing brand name. Brand extension has become a popular new strategy because of its attractive advantages. The strategy of brand extension is a way to capitalize the equity of brands by providing a new source of revenue. However, it can also be a risky strategy. An unsuccessful extension or even a successful extension could cause damage to the original brand. This study will help to the marketing practitioner to make the right decision regarding the consumers' attitudes towards brand extension across different demographic aspects and to identify the factors related with launching a products. Recent research has identified two factors that influence consumer perceptions of a brand extension: brand affect and the similarity between the original and extension product categories. The experiments revealed that brand-specific associations might dominate the effects of brand affect and category similarity particularly when consumer knowledge of the brands is high. In the literature review part details are mentioned about brand extension.

Introduction

Brand extension implies the introduction of new products, in different product category using the same name as is being used for an existing product. The main advantage of a brand extension is that the goodwill is used from an existing brand. If successful, this can save a lot of money, building additional brand stature. The success of a brand extension will largely depend on the existing brand definition and whether it is compelling in the new product/service or market category as a distinctive capability. Brand Extension make use of the reputation of the existing product or services and transfer it to the new products or services in order to increase the sales of both the new products and services, at the same time, promote the existing products. A brand extension is occurred when a firm uses an established brand name to introduce a new product. When a new brand is combined with an existing brand, the brand extension can also be called a sub-brand. An existing brand that gives birth to a brand extension is referred to as the parent brand.

^{*} Professor and Vice Chancellor, ASA University Bangladesh

^{**} Lecturer, Faculty of Business, ASA University Bangladesh

Brand extension can be broadly classified into two general categories:

- Line extension: The parent brand is used to brand a new product that targets a new market segment within a product category currently served by the parent brand. A line extension often involves a different flavor or ingredient variety, a different form or size, or a different application for the brand.
- Category extension: The parent brand is used to enter a different product category from that currently served by the parent brand.

Objectives

The major objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To identify the Factors, influencing successful brand extensions.
2. To verify whether attitudes towards brand extension are varying across different demographic characteristics.

Methodology of the study

Total sample size was 35 of which 20 were male and rest 15 were female, in terms of profession, 12 were student, 16 were service holder, 2 were business person, 5 were housewife. In terms of education, 20 were graduates, 9 were masters, 4 were HSC and 2 were SSC or below. Age-15-30 were 24, 30-45 were 10 and others were 1. Sampling technique used is non-probabilistic in nature; more specifically sample was purposively taken to accommodate a certain number of male and female respondents and different occupational groups. Using a self-administered questionnaire from each respondent collected the data. Data regarding factors influencing successful brand extensions were collected based on 17 variables and the respondents had to give their level of agreement on Five point Likert scales for each statement (1-Strongly agree, 2-Agree, 3-Neutral, 4- Disagree, 5- Strongly disagree) and the data were collected assumed to be interval in nature. Data has been collected from May18 to June 1, 2009. The statistical technique considered like Factor analysis, ANOVA and Cronbach's Alpha for the study. Sample size has been collected from Dhaka-Dhanmndi, Mohammadpur, Farmgate and Shamoli respectively. Among three techniques-APA techniques, Harvard Technique and Chicago Technique; APA technique was chosen for referencing purpose.

Limitations of the study

While conducting the study, the following limitations were found:

1. Applied non-probability sampling technique for each stage.
2. The research has been conducted in Dhaka that does not reflect total population in Bangladesh
3. Due to the lack of text book and previous study in Bangladesh literature review could not be extensive.

Literature Review

1000 years ago, the transaction performed by the barter system, that is exchanging goods against goods. The economy was agriculture based. And cows were counted according to the seal on them. In fact, the word brand is day by day derived from the old Norse word brander, which means to burn as brands were and still are the means by which owners of livestock mark their animals to identify them.

Emergence of national manufacturer brands: 1860 to 1914

In the United States after the Civil War, a number of forces combined to make widely distributed, manufacturer branded products a profitable venture: Improvements in transportation (e.g., rail road) and communication (e.g., the telegraph and telephone) made regional and even national distribution increasingly easy. Improvements in production processes made it possible to produce large quantities of high quality products inexpensively. Improvements in packaging made individual (as opposed to bulk) packages that could be identified with the manufacture's trademarks increasingly viable. Changes in U.S. trademark law in 1879, the 1880 s, and 1906 made it easier to protect brand identities. Advertising became perceived as a more credible option, and newspapers and magazines eagerly sought out advertising revenues. The owners of the firm and their top-level management largely drove the development and management of these brands. For example, the first president of National Biscuit was involved heavily in the introduction in 1898 of Uneeda Biscuits, the first nationally branded biscuit. One of their first decisions was to create a pictorial symbol for the brand, the Uneeda biscuit slicker boy, who appeared in the supporting ad campaigns. H.J. Heinz built up the Heinz brand name through production innovations and spectacular promotions. Coca Cola became a national powerhouse due to the efforts of Asa Candler, who actively oversaw the growth of the extensive distribution channel. National manufacturers sometimes had to overcome resistance from consumer's retailers, wholesalers, and even employees from within their own company. To do so, these firms employed sustained "push and pull" efforts to keep both consumers and retailer happy and accepting of national brands. Consumers were attracted through the use of sampling, premiums, product education brochures, and heavy advertising. Retailers were lured by in-store sampling and promotional programs and shelf maintenance assistance.

Dominance of mass marketed brand: 1915 to 1929

By 1915, manufacturer brands had become well established in the United States on both a regional and national basis. The next 15 years saw increasing acceptance and even admiration of manufacturer brands by consumers. The marketing of brands became more specialized under the guidance of functional experts in charge of production promotion, personal selling, and other areas. This greater specialization led to more advanced marketing techniques. Design professionals were enlisted to assist in the process of trademark selection. Personal selling became more sophisticated as salesmen were carefully selected and trained to systematically handle accounts and seek out new businesses. Advertising combined more powerful creativity with more persuasive copy and slogans. Government and industry regulation came into place to reduce deceptive advertising. Marketing research became more important and influential in supporting marketing decisions.

Challenges to manufacturer brand: 1930 to 1945

The onset of the Great Depression in 1929 posed new challenges to manufacturer brands. Greater price sensitivity swung the pendulum of power in the favor of retailers, who pushed their own brands and dropped non-performing manufacturer brands. Advertising came under fire as manipulative, deceptive, and tasteless and was increasingly being ignored by certain segments of the population. In 1938, the Wheeler Amendment gave power to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to regulate advertising practices. In response to these trends, manufacturer advertising went beyond slogans and jingles to give consumers specific reasons why they should buy advertised products.

Establishment of brand management standards: 1946 to 1985

After World War II, the pent-up demand for high-quality brands led to an explosion of sales. Personal income grew as the economy took off, and market demand intensified as the rate of population growth exploded. Demand for national brands soared, fueled by a burst of new products and a receptive and growing middle class. After World War II, the pent-up demands for high quality brands led to an explosion of sales, the development and management of these brands was largely driven by the owners of the firm and their top level management. A brand may identify one item, a family of items, or all items of the seller. There is so much education to learn and understand about the products and services that we use everyday. Brands are everywhere and everything

Findings of the study

Brief demographic characteristics of the respondents' are shown in the table given bellow.

Gender	Description	Male		Female		Total	
		20		15		35	
		As per questionnaire					
Profession	Description	Student	Service-holder	Business person	Housewife	Others	Total
		12	16	2	5	0	35
		As per questionnaire					
Education	Description	SSC or below	HSC	Graduate	Masters	Total	
		2	4	20	9	35	
		As per questionnaire					
Age	Description	(15-30)		(30-45)		(45-60)	Total
		24		10		1	35
		As per questionnaire					

Factor Analysis

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: In this case the null hypothesis related to the appropriateness of the factor analysis has been rejected. So the data collected by using Likert Scale Method were found to be appropriate for the Factor Analysis.

Sampling Adequacy: The sample adequacy has been proved by statistical value of KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling Adequacy). The value of KMO is .282, which indicates lower sampling adequacy for the factor analysis.

Number of factor extracted: There are basically six methods of determining the number of factors to be extracted. The basic method followed here is *eigenvalue greater than one*, but the cumulative percentage of variance technique by combining all the factors was also taken into consideration.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.063	18.019	18.019	3.063	18.019	18.019	2.181	12.832	12.832
2	2.288	13.460	31.479	2.288	13.460	31.479	2.064	12.144	24.975
3	1.744	10.260	41.739	1.744	10.260	41.739	1.935	11.382	36.357
4	1.603	9.430	51.169	1.603	9.430	51.169	1.764	10.377	46.735
5	1.385	8.144	59.313	1.385	8.144	59.313	1.499	8.820	55.554
6	1.265	7.439	66.752	1.265	7.439	66.752	1.490	8.766	64.321
7	1.161	6.829	73.580	1.161	6.829	73.580	1.369	8.052	72.373
8	1.067	6.278	79.859	1.067	6.278	79.859	1.273	7.486	79.859
9	.772	4.541	84.400						
10	.649	3.820	88.219						
11	.576	3.387	91.606						
12	.509	2.995	94.601						
13	.386	2.269	96.870						
14	.227	1.333	98.203						
15	.163	.961	99.164						
16	.099	.580	99.745						
17	.043	.255	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Here the numbers of the factor extracted were found to be eight, and the cumulative percentage of variance explained by all these eight factors accounts for almost eighty percent (79.85). The first factor can alone explain 18.019% of the total variability. The second factor can alone explain 13.460% of total variability and the first two factors, in combination, can explain 31.479% of the total variability. The third factor can explain alone 10.260% of the total variability and the first three factors, in combination, can explain 41.739% of the total variability. The fourth factor can alone explain 9.430% of the total variability and the first four factors, in combination, can explain 51.169% of the total variability. The fifth factor can alone explain 8.144% of the total variability and the first five factors, in combine, can explain 59.313% of the total variability. The sixth factor can alone explain 7.439% of the total variability and the first six factors, in combination, can explain 66.752% of the total variability. The seventh factor can alone explain 6.829% of the total variability and the all seven factors, in combination, can explain 73.580% of the total variability. The eighth factor can alone explain 6.278% of the total variability and the all the eight factors in combination, can explain 79.859%. In order to clarify the fact that different variables are related to different dimension (factors), the following rotated component matrix can be explained.

Rotated Component Matrix (a)

	Factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
V1			.702					
V2			.711					
V3								.937
V4	.860							
V5							.940	
V6		-.925						
V7	.781							
V8		.643						
V9				.811				
V10					.751			
V11				.710				
V12		.617						
V13	-.617							
V14			.743					
V15						.894		
V16					.778			
V17				.510				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. *Rotation Method:* Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a Rotation converged in 13 iterations.

* Values greater than .40 were retained.

So the first factor is comprised of variable number 4, 7 and 13. The second factor is comprised of the variable number 6, 8 and 12. The third factor is comprised of the variable number 1, 2 and 14. The fourth factor is comprised of the variable number 9, 11 and 17. The fifth factor contains variable number 10 and 16. The sixth factor is comprised of the variable number 15. The seventh factor is comprised of the variable number 5, and the eighth factor is comprised of variable number 3.

Affects of Demographic Characteristics on Customers' Brand Extension Tendencies

Profession

It was found that responses of Bangladeshi customer do not vary greatly in terms of profession. In the case of certain variables (8, 13 and 14) profession was found to be positively influencing to successful brand extension. In variable number 8 and 13 students and businessperson are found to be more positively influencing to the brand extension than other professions; in variable number 14 business people are found to be more constructively influencing to the brand extension than other professions. See the table1 in the appendix part.

Gender

It was found from the study that responses of Bangladeshi customers do not vary greatly in terms of gender. See table 2 in the appendix part.

Education

It was found from the study that responses of Bangladeshi customers do not vary greatly in terms of education. In the case of variable number 10 graduates were found to be positively influencing to the brand extension than others. See table-3 in the appendix part.

Age

It was found from the study that responses of Bangladeshi customer do not vary greatly in terms of age. In the case of certain variables (13 and 14) age was found to be more positive to the brand extension tendency. In variable number 13 and 14 customers whose age are in between 30 to 45 years, are found to be more positively influencing to the brand extension than others. See table 4 in the appendix part.

Conclusions and Recommendations

It has been found that the sample adequacy was low. But the cumulative percentage of variance is higher. Again, the Cronbach's Alpha was low. It was found that the person whose age is in between 30 to 45 years, was found to be more positively influencing regarding the brand extension and the graduates were also found to be significantly positive to the brand extension and the students and the business person were found to be more constructive regarding the brand extension. In This study tribes were not included and for changing the time there may be more variables related to the consumers' characteristics that have some influences on consumer brand extensions for example, age and self-monitoring and involvement. These consumers' characteristics may interact with each other when they affect consumer brand extension evaluations. For example high involvement may be related to high brand knowledge because consumer with high involvement may be willing to learn about the brand, hence store more brand knowledge in their memories. Future research could study more about consumer characteristics factors and about the integrative effects of these factors on consumer fit perceptions in brand extension evaluations. As this study was conducted in the context of Bangladesh, so it might not be applicable for another country.

References

- Aaker, D. A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*, New York: The Free Press, 224 p.
- Aaker, D. A. (1996), *Building Strong Brands*, New York: The Free Press, 380 p.
- Aaker, D. A. & Keller, K. L. (1990), "Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions", *Journal of Marketing*, (January), pp. 27-41.
- Ahluwalia, R. & Gürhan-Canli, Z. (2000), "The Effects of Extensions on the Family Brand Name: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Perspective", *Journal of Consumer Research*, (December), pp. 371-381.
- Boush, D. M. (1993), "How Advertising Slogans Can Prime Evaluations of Brand Extensions", *Psychology & Marketing*, (January/February), pp. 67-78.
- Boush, D. M. & Loken, B. (1991), "A Process Tracing Study of Brand Extension Evaluation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, (February), pp. 16-28.
- Cox, D. F. (1967), "Risk Taking and Information Handling in Consumer Behavior", Boston, A. Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
- Dacin, P. A. & Smith, D. C. (1994), "The Effect of Brand Portfolio Characteristics on Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions", *Journal of Marketing Research*, (May), pp. 229-242.
- Derbaix, C. (1983), "Perceived Risk and Risk Relievers: An Empirical Investigation", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, pp. 19-38.
- Engel, J. F., Blackwell, R. D., & Miniard, P. W. (1990), *Consumer Behavior*, New York: Dryden Press.
- Erdem, T., Swait, J., Broniarczyk, S., Chakravarti, D., Kapferer, J.-N., Keane, M., Roberts J., Steenkamp, J.-B. & Zettelmeyer, F. (1999) 'Brand Equity, Consumer Learning and Choice', *Marketing Letters* 10(3): 301-18.
- Gummesson, E. (1999) *Total Relationship Marketing*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Gundlach, G.T. & Murphy P.E. (1993) 'Ethical and Legal Foundations of Relational Marketing Exchanges', *Journal of Marketing* 57 (October): 35-46.
- Hunter, J. E. (2001) 'The Desperate Need for Replications', *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 28, June, p.149-158.
- Judge, G. G., Hill, R. C., Griffiths, W. G., Lutkepohl, H., & Lee, T. C. (1988). *Introduction to the theory and practice of econometrics (2nd ed)*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Keller, K., L. (2000), "The Brand Report Card", *Harvard Business Review*, (January-February), pp. 147-157.
- Keller, K., L. & Aaker, D. A. (1997), "Managing the Corporate Brand: The Effect of Corporate Marketing Activity on Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions", *Working Paper Report No. 97-106*, May. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Lance, C. E. (1988, June). Residual centering, exploratory and confirmatory moderator analysis, and decomposition of effects in path models containing interactions. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 12, 163-175.
- Milewicz, J. & Herbig, P. (1994), "Evaluating the Brand Extension Decision Using a Model of Reputation Building", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, (1), pp. 39-47.
- Mitchell, V. W. (1999), "Consumer Perceived Risk: Conceptualisations and Models", *European Journal of Marketing*, (1 & 2).
- Nijssen, E. J. & Hartman, D. (1994) *Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions: An Integration of Previous Research*, in Bloemer, J., Lemmick, J. & Kasper, H. (eds.),

- Obermiller, C. (1985), “Varieties of Mere Exposure: The Effects of Processing Style of Affective Respons”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, (June), pp. 17-30.
- Ourusoff, A., Ozanian, M., Brown, P.B. & Starr, J. (1992), “What’s in a Name? What the World’s Top Brands are Worth”, *Financial World*, (September 1), pp. 32- 49.
- Park, C., Whan, M. S. & Lawson, R. (1991), “Evaluation of Brand Extensions: The Role of Product Feature Similarity and Brand Concept Consistency”, *Journal of Consumer Research*, (September), pp. 185-193.
- Perdue, B. C. & Summers, J. O. (1986) ‘Checking the Success of Manipulations in Marketing Experiments’, *Journal of Marketing Research*. Vol. 23, November, p.317-326.
- Rogers, E. M. (1983), *Diffusion of Innovations*, Third Edition, The Free Press.
- Romeo, J. B. (1991), “The Effect of Negative Information on the Evaluations of Brand Extensions and the Family Brand”, In: *Advances in Consumer Research*, (Eds.)
- Schultz, H. (1997), *Pour Your Heart Into It*, New York: Hyperion.
- Sheinin, D. A. (2000), “The Effects of Experience with Brand Extensions on Parent Brand Knowledge”, *Journal of Business Research*, pp. 47-55.
- Taylor, V. A. & Bearden, W. O. (2002) ‘The Effects of Price on Brand Extension Evaluations: The Moderating Role of Extension Similarity’, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 30, No. 2, p.131-140.
- Urbany, J. E., Bearden, W. O., Kaicker, A. & Smith-de B. M (1997) ‘Transaction Utility when Quality Is Uncertain’, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p.45-55.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989). The concept of fit in strategy research: Toward verbal and statistical correspondence. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 423–444.261 R. Echambadi et al. / *Intern. J. of Research in Marketing* 23 (2006) 253–261
- Wernerfelt, B. (1988), “Umbrella Branding as a Signal of New Product Quality: An Example of Signaling by Posting a Bond”, *Rand Journal of Economics*, (Autumn), pp. 458-466.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1981), “How Consumer Evaluation Processes Differ Between Goods and Services”, In: *Marketing of Services*. (Eds.) Donnelly, J. H. & George, W.R. (Chicago), American Marketing Association, pp. 186-189.

Appendices

Table 1: Brand Extension across Different professional groups

No	Statement	Profession	Mean	F	Sig.
V1	If one of my known brand is offering a product in a new product category, I will buy that brand in that given product category.	Student	2.0968	1.365	.261
		Service-Holder	1.9615		
		Business Person	2.8000		
		Housewife	2.3750		
V2	When I am unsure about the brand quality in a particular product category. I usually consider the corporate reputation.	Student	2.1613	1.342	.268
		Service-Holder	2.0000		
		Business Person	3.0000		
		Housewife	2.3750		
V3	I will buy an extended brand, only and if only, the new product category is related to the existing product category.	Student	2.4839	.618	.606
		Service-Holder	2.2308		
		Business Person	2.4000		
		Housewife	1.8750		
V4	In a new product category for me, I will always buy the brand/product of the known company or organization.	Student	2.7742	2.528	.065
		Service-Holder	1.9615		
		Business Person	1.8000		
		Housewife	1.8750		
V5	My idea about the brand quality is basically derived by my exposures to advertisements of that brand.	Student	3.0645	1.226	.307
		Service-Holder	2.5769		
		Business Person	2.2000		
		Housewife	2.5000		
V6	My brand knowledge is influenced by my previous consumption experience.	Student	1.4516	1.430	.242
		Service-Holder	1.6154		
		Business Person	2.2000		
		Housewife	1.5000		
V7	My brand knowledge is influenced by friend, family, and colleagues.	Student	2.3226	1.902	.138
		Service-Holder	2.4615		
		Business Person	2.0000		
		Housewife	3.2500		
V8	When I buy the products, I usually consider the price only.	Student	4.0968	4.233	.008 b
		Service-Holder	3.7692		
		Business Person	2.2000		
		Housewife	3.8750		
V9	I will always consider the country of origin in selecting a brand in a particular product category.	Student	3.2581	1.770	.161
		Service-Holder	2.9615		
		Business Person	2.8000		
		Housewife	2.1250		
V10	I am highly risk taker for a new brand.	Student	3.6452	1.869	.143
		Service-Holder	3.5000		
		Business Person	2.6000		
		Housewife	2.7500		

Cont. Table

Table 1 : (Contd.)

No	Statement	Profession	Mean	F	Sig.
V11	I consider the innovativeness of a new brand whatever the price is.	Student	2.5806	.991	.402
		Service-Holder	2.1154		
		Business Person	2.2000		
		Housewife	2.3750		
V12	I do not consider products benefits rather I consider only the brand	Student	3.8065	.304	.822
		Service-Holder	3.4615		
		Business Person	3.6000		
		Housewife	3.7500		
V13	Quality is the prime consideration to me during buying a product.	Student	1.2581	4.279	.008b
		Service-Holder	1.9615		
		Business Person	2.2000		
		Housewife	1.5000		
V14	I consider myself highly informed to purchase a product.	Student	2.1290	3.413	.022a
		Service-Holder	2.7692		
		Business Person	3.4000		
		Housewife	2.8750		
V15	When I do not know the name of brand, I do not want to buy that.	Student	2.5161	1.274	.291
		Service-Holder	2.5769		
		Business Person	3.4000		
		Housewife	3.2500		
V16	I know how to judge the quality of a product.	Student	2.4839	.424	.736
		Service-Holder	2.5000		
		Business Person	3.0000		
		Housewife	2.8750		
V17	I do not consider corporate reputation in buying a particular brand.	Student	3.5806	1.191	.320
		Service-Holder	3.4231		
		Business Person	2.4000		
		Housewife	3.2500		

a=significant at 0.05

b=significant at 0.01

Table 2: Brand Extension across Different gender groups

No	Statement	Gender	Mean	F	Sig.
V1	If one of my known brand is offering a product in a new product category, I will buy that brand in that given product category.	Male	2.1628	.149	.701
		Female	2.0741		
V2	When I am unsure about the brand quality in a particular product category. I usually consider the corporate reputation.	Male	2.0698	1.322	.254
		Female	2.3704		
V3	I will buy an extended brand, only and if only, the new product category is related to the existing product category.	Male	2.3721	.262	.610
		Female	2.2222		

Cont. Table

Table 2: (Contd.)

V4	In a new product category for me, I will always buy the brand/product of the known company or organization.	Male	2.2791	.027	.870
		Female	2.3333		
V5	My idea about the brand quality is basically derived by my exposures to advertisements of that brand.	Male	2.7442	.011	.915
		Female	2.7778		
V6	My brand knowledge is influenced by my previous consumption experience.	Male	1.5814	.018	.893
		Female	1.5556		
V7	My brand knowledge is influenced by friend, family, and colleagues.	Male	2.3023	2.252	.138
		Female	2.7037		
V8	When I buy the products, I usually consider the price only.	Male	3.7674	.173	.679
		Female	3.8889		
V9	I will always consider the country of origin in selecting a brand in a particular product category.	Male	2.9767	.005	.942
		Female	3.0000		
V10	I am highly risk taker for a new brand.	Male	3.4651	.177	.675
		Female	3.3333		
V11	I consider the innovativeness of a new brand whatever the price is.	Male	2.2791	.630	.430
		Female	2.4815		
V12	I do not consider products benefits rather I consider only the brand	Male	3.6744	.017	.895
		Female	3.6296		
V13	Quality is the prime consideration to me during buying a product.	Male	1.6512	.189	.665
		Female	1.5556		
V14	I consider myself highly informed to purchase a product.	Male	2.5349	.006	.940
		Female	2.5556		
V15	When I do not know the name of brand, I do not want to buy that.	Male	2.7907	.734	.395
		Female	2.5185		
V16	I know how to judge the quality of a product.	Male	2.4419	1.209	.275
		Female	2.7778		
V17	I do not consider corporate reputation in buying a particular brand.	Male	3.5349	1.161	.285
		Female	3.1852		

a=significant at 0.05

b=significant at 0.01

Table 3: Brand extension across different Education groups

No.	Statement	Education	Mean	F	Sig.
V1	If one of my known brand is offering a product in a new product category, I will buy that brand in that given product category.	SSC or below	2.5000	.451	.718
		HSC	2.2222		
		Graduate	2.0256		
		Masters	2.2222		
V2	When I am unsure about the brand quality in a particular product category. I usually consider the corporate reputation.	SSC or below	2.2500	.258	.855
		HSC	2.4444		
		Graduate	2.1026		
		Masters	2.2222		
V3	I will buy an extended brand, only and if only, the new product category is related to the existing product category.	SSC or below	2.7500	.340	.797
		HSC	2.4444		
		Graduate	2.2051		
		Masters	2.3889		
V4	In a new product category for me, I will always buy the brand/product of the known company or organization.	SSC or below	3.0000	1.405	.249
		HSC	1.5556		
		Graduate	2.3333		
		Masters	2.4444		
V5	My idea about the brand quality is basically derived by my exposures to advertisements of that brand.	SSC or below	2.2500	.593	.622
		HSC	2.6667		
		Graduate	2.9231		
		Masters	2.5556		
V6	My brand knowledge is influenced by my previous consumption experience.	SSC or below	2.0000	.804	.496
		HSC	1.7778		
		Graduate	1.5385		
		Masters	1.4444		
V7	My brand knowledge is influenced by friend, family, and colleagues	SSC or below	2.0000	.331	.803
		HSC	2.6667		
		Graduate	2.4615		
		Masters	2.4444		
V8	When I buy the products, I usually consider the price only.	SSC or below	3.0000	1.574	.204
		HSC	3.3333		
		Graduate	3.8718		
		Masters	4.1111		
V9	I will always consider the country of origin in selecting a brand in a particular product category	SSC or below	3.0000	1.995	.123
		HSC	2.1111		
		Graduate	3.2308		
		Masters	2.8889		
V10	I am highly risk taker for a new brand.	SSC or below	2.5000	3.309	.025a
		HSC	2.4444		
		Graduate	3.6410		
		Masters	3.6111		

Cont. Table

Table 3 : (Contd.)

No.	Statement	Education	Mean	F	Sig.
V11	I consider the innovativeness of a new brand whatever the price is.	SSC or below	2.2500	.169	.917
		HSC	2.2222		
		Graduate	2.4359		
		Masters	2.2778		
V12	I do not consider products benefits rather I consider only the brand	SSC or below	3.5000	.229	.876
		HSC	4.0000		
		Graduate	3.5897		
		Masters	3.6667		
V13	Quality is the prime consideration to me during buying a product.	SSC or below	2.0000	1.208	.314
		HSC	1.4444		
		Graduate	1.4872		
		Masters	1.8889		
V14	I consider myself highly informed to purchase a product.	SSC or below	2.5000	1.991	.124
		HSC	2.7778		
		Graduate	2.2821		
		Masters	3.0000		
V15	When I do not know the name of brand, I do not want to buy that.	SSC or below	2.7500	.163	.921
		HSC	2.7778		
		Graduate	2.5897		
		Masters	2.8333		
V16	I know how to judge the quality of a product.	SSC or below	2.2500	.513	.675
		HSC	2.2222		
		Graduate	2.7179		
		Masters	2.5000		
V17	I do not consider corporate reputation in buying a particular brand	SSC or below	3.2500	.531	.662
		HSC	3.0000		
		Graduate	3.5641		
		Masters	3.2778		

a=significant at 0.05

b=significant at 0.01

Table 4: Brand extension across different Age groups

No	Statement	Age range	Mean	F	Sig.
V1	If one of my known brand is offering a product in a new product category, I will buy that brand in that given product category.	15-30	2.0980	.125	.883
		30-45	2.2222		
		45-60	2.0000		
V2	When I am unsure about the brand quality in a particular product category. I usually consider the corporate reputation.	15-30	2.2745	1.068	.349
		30-45	2.0000		
		45-60	1.0000		
V3	I will buy an extended brand, only and if only, the new product category is related to the existing product category.	15-30	2.2941	.076	.927
		30-45	2.3889		
		45-60	2.0000		
V4	In a new product category for me, I will always buy the brand/product of the known company or organization.	15-30	2.3725	.275	.760
		30-45	2.1111		
		45-60	2.0000		
V5	My idea about the brand quality is basically derived by my exposures to advertisements of that brand.	15-30	2.9216	1.644	.201
		30-45	2.3333		
		45-60	2.0000		
V6	My brand knowledge is influenced by my previous consumption experience.	15-30	1.6275	.786	.460
		30-45	1.3889		
		45-60	2.0000		
V7	My brand knowledge is influenced by friend, family, and colleagues	15-30	2.4118	.232	.793
		30-45	2.5556		
		45-60	3.0000		
V8	When I buy the products, I usually consider the price only.	15-30	3.8431	.080	.923
		30-45	3.7222		
		45-60	4.0000		
V9	I will always consider the country of origin in selecting a brand in a particular product category	15-30	3.1569	1.793	.174
		30-45	2.5000		
		45-60	3.0000		
V10	I am highly risk taker for a new brand.	15-30	3.3529	1.039	.359
		30-45	3.6667		
		45-60	2.0000		
V11	I consider the innovativeness of a new brand whatever the price is.	15-30	2.4902	2.106	.130
		30-45	2.0556		
		45-60	1.0000		

Cont. Table

Table 4: (Contd.)

V12	I do not consider products benefits rather I consider only the brand	15-30	3.7451	.952	.391
		30-45	3.5000		
		45-60	2.0000		
V13	Quality is the prime consideration to me during buying a product.	15-30	1.4510	3.388	.040a
		30-45	2.0556		
		45-60	2.0000		
V14	I consider myself highly informed to purchase a product.	15-30	2.3922	3.689	.030a
		30-45	3.0556		
		45-60	1.0000		
V15	When I do not know the name of brand, I do not want to buy that.	15-30	2.7255	.142	.868
		30-45	2.5556		
		45-60	3.0000		
			2.6857		
V16	I know how to judge the quality of a product.	15-30	2.5294	.137	.872
		30-45	2.6667		
		45-60	3.0000		
V17	I do not consider corporate reputation in buying a particular brand	15-30	3.4510	.156	.856
		30-45	3.2778		
		45-60	3.0000		

a=significant at 0.05

b=significant at 0.01