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The aim of this thesis was to examine the current relevance of brand personality and the way it generates impacts on consumers’ purchase intentions. The thesis adopts a quantitative approach, using a self-administered questionnaire the form of an online survey to gather data. Participants were asked questions regarding their preferred brands. The sample includes 227 people of 41 nationalities all over the world, with a nearly equal gender ratio of 53% female and 45% male.

In the end, the result confirms the concept of brand personality is still considered relevant to consumers nowadays. It also recognizes brand trust as one of the key factors supporting the impacts of brand personality of consumers’ purchase intentions. With these findings, the author suggests more research should be done on consumers’ perception of brand personality in different parts of the world. It will also be interesting to see how consumers’ purchase intentions change once facing a foreign brand personality profile.
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1 Introduction

With the growth of globalization, international trading, and the impacts of online communication, people nowadays have access to more information and product choices than ever. For instance, in Italy only, consumers get to choose from 14 different pasta brands, excluding store brands that belong to their local supermarkets (The Statista Portal 2017). It is estimated that there are more than 900 product brands being sold in Lidl supermarkets around the world (Open Food Facts). Therefore, in the absence of having exceptional products or outstandingly lower prices, most companies have to face difficulties in standing out from the current crowded yet continuing to grow marketplace. Fortunately, owing to this situation, consumers have also grown to be more brand–conscious and developed a sense of loyalty to their favorite brands over time. Hence, more focus has been placed on branding and building brand-consumer relationships (Holland 2017).

In 1901, James Walter Thompson first published "The Thompson Blue and Red Books of Advertising" to give the earliest explanation of modern-day "branding" concept and pieces of advice for companies to differentiate their products. Since then, the focus was shifted from having an enormous marketing budget to building a strategic personality to the brand and creating emotional connections to the audience (Holland 2017). In other words, companies have started to put more emphasis on creating a strong sense of brand recognition for themselves and delivering personal meanings to their consumers. The matter is even more crucial in the current digital era when people are growing to be more socially conscious than ever before. Consumers no longer pay attention to information about the brand itself, but more about how the brand answers to their personal values and beliefs (Holland 2017). Therefore, marketers have shifted their attention from promoting the functional aspects of the product to building strong consumer – brand relationship (McEnally & Chernatony 1999, 9).
As brands become more vulnerable to public opinions, mass marketing has gradually lost its impacts on the target audience (Barwise & Farley 2005, 70). Nowadays, it is advisable to approach potential consumers in a personalized and interactive way. Therefore, over the years, more focus has been put on understanding consumers' perspectives and developing the bond between brands and their target customers (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successfully Introducing Really New Products</td>
<td>Customers and Consumers</td>
<td>Marketing Metrics and Performance Measures</td>
<td>E-business/E-commerce/Impact of Internet</td>
<td>Assessing Marketing Productivity (Return on Marketing) and Marketing Metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Orientation</td>
<td>Innovation and Really New Products and Markets</td>
<td>Understanding the Customer Experience</td>
<td>Metrics/Measuring Marketing Performance</td>
<td>Brands and Branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationships</td>
<td>Information Technology and New Media</td>
<td>Marketing and the internet</td>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>Managing Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Engineering and Empirical Generalization</td>
<td>Global Marketing</td>
<td>Managing Brands: Brand Equity, Product Management</td>
<td>Collecting and Using Marketing Knowledge</td>
<td>Understanding Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Use of Information</td>
<td>Management Use of Information and Market Research</td>
<td>Marketing Innovation: Creating Customers, Creating Really New Products</td>
<td>New Product/Innovation</td>
<td>The Role of Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Equity and Product Management</td>
<td>Brand Equity and Product and Brand Management</td>
<td>Market Knowledge Management</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Collecting, Interpreting, and Using Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Marketing Science Institute Priorities 1994–2004 (Source: Lehmann 2002)

One of the most valuable aspects of a brand is that it carries a symbolic value and creates chances for consumers to express themselves. Hence, in order to generate an intimate relationship between companies and their customers, brand personalities were brought into use (McEnally & Chernatony 1999, 9). Marketers have learned to incorporate these human-like characteristics to a brand, based on the emotional values that a company carries and its customers' lifestyles. Having this specific human image, many brands have managed to create a special bond between the company and its customers that is similar to an interpersonal relationship between people (Fournier 1998, 343 – 373). This, in turn, results in a higher degree of loyalty and tolerance from the consumers' side (ibid, 343 – 73). In other words, it is expected that once the sense of loyalty and
emotional bonding are established, consumers will be more forgiving towards the brand and come to its defense. Preceding researches also point out that people tend to be more receptive towards messages that align with their self-images and allow them to express their identities (Aaker 1996, 173 – 174; Moon 2002, 322).

In line with prior literature on this matter (Biel, 1993; McCracken, 1986; Sirgy, 1982; Sirgy et al., 2000), it is suggested that brand personality can generate positive impacts on consumers’ purchase intentions. The topic was recently taken into account again by Fan & Tian (2017, 22 – 33) when they pointed out that people often rely on obtainable indicators such as a brand’s image to make decisions whenever there’s a lack of information to compare between products. Having said that, despite having a large amount of prior research, very few studies actually demonstrate how brand personality influences consumers' purchase intentions (Keller 2007, 96). In addition, due to the impact of fast-paced globalization and technological advancement, nowadays, consumers are exposed to an overflow of information every day from companies all over the world. Meanwhile, many research on brand personality was conducted over a decade ago. This raises the question of their relevance in today's market scene.

In regard to the above-mentioned concerns, this research is conducted to examine the current relevance of brand personality and the way it generates impacts on consumers’ purchase intentions. The research is built to provide answers for these following questions:

- Do consumers acknowledge brand personalities?
- How does brand personality create impacts on purchasing intentions?

Owing to these research questions, the following objectives are determined:

- To examine the existence of brand personality concept in consumers’ perceptions nowadays
- To analyze the possible impact of brand personality on consumers’ purchase intentions
• To create a specific framework demonstrating the impact of brand personality on consumers’ purchase intentions
• To determine the key factors supporting the impact of brand personality on consumers’ purchase intentions
• To carry out research with a diverse sampling group on the topic of brand personality

Development of the thesis
This thesis is divided into 8 parts. Following the first Introduction chapter, the thesis continues with an overview of previous theoretical findings regarding the topic in question. This Literature Review chapter is used to provide critical knowledge for the construction of the theoretical framework and navigate the thesis' implementation. After that, the author demonstrates how this thesis is carried out in the Methodology chapter. Information about the research approach, data collection method, as well as data analyzing procedure, can be found in this chapter. All key findings of this research are presented in the Result chapter. Then, using collected data from the survey and theoretical knowledge from the previous literature review, the author demonstrates her interpretation of the results in the Discussion chapter. Hence, this chapter delivers all answers for the research questions as well as points out other noteworthy findings from the survey. Finally, the author gives a recap of the whole thesis in the Conclusion chapter, as well as pointing out some noticeable limitations of the thesis and suggestions for future research. Figure 2 demonstrates an overview of this thesis' structure.
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SUGGESTIONS

Figure 2 Structure of the Thesis
2 Literature Review

2.1 The concept of brand and brand equity

By definition, a brand is "a name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of these, that identifies the maker or seller of a product or service" (Kotler & Armstrong 2013, 245). According to Knapp (2000,7), a product or service needs to have a distinctive attribute in its consumers' mind in order to be considered a "brand". It is not without a reason that companies put effort into building and enhancing their brands. A strong brand delivers a set of values to its customers, including functional value, experiential value, and symbolic brand value (Keller 1993). In other words, for consumers, choosing well-known brands is a way of cutting down the decision-making process and getting a guarantee on the quality and reliability of a product or service. Therefore, having a well-defined brand is greatly desirable, as it has a strong influence on the target customers' emotions and buying behavior (Millman 2012, 6).

In his book "Brands & Advertising: How advertising effectiveness influences brand equity", Franz en (1999) describes brand equity as all assets and liabilities that belong to the following categories: brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality, and brand loyalty. Later on, Rosenbaum-Elliot (2007) gives elaboration on the brand equity formation process from the consumers' perspective. He states that (1) the customers' awareness and (2) emotional associations to a brand lead to (3) the learning and attitude formation, which results in personal preferences for that brand and creates (4) brand loyalty (ibid, 93). As demonstrated above, consumers choose known brands to reduce the decision-making process and perceived risks. When evaluating a brand, consumers often rely on a summary impression that reflects their knowledge and formed attitudes towards the brand over time. Therefore, according to Rosenbaum-Elliot, Percy, & Pervan (2007, 92), brand equity is equivalent to a "formal system", which people use to avoid having to constantly make decisions about everything. In a study in 2015, Asgari and Hoseinabadi (2015, 13) point out that having good brand equity results in positive impacts on a company, especially in its customers’ purchasing intention.
Out of four components of brand equity, the consumers’ brand association is stated to be very crucial for a brand’s long-term success (Keller, 1993; Temporal, 2010). The more difficult the decision is, the more consumers rely on their emotional associations with the brand (Rosenbaum-Elliott, Percy, & Pervan 2007, 70). In elaboration, when either personal rewards or serious consequences are expected from the usage of a product or service, emotional associations play an important part on a consumer's final purchasing decision (ibid, 97). These emotional associations are described as "mental brand equity", which is categorized into 3 components, including product meaning, symbolic meaning (or brand personality), and perceived quality (Franzen 1999). According to Phau & Lau (2000, 54-69), a distinctive set of brand personality traits helps to build favorable associations in consumers' perception, which will eventually enhance the company's brand equity.

2.2 Brand personality

According to Aaker (1997, 347), brand personality is described as a set of personality traits that associate to a brand. In his article on Harvard Business Review, Levy (1959, 117 - 124) implies that the concept also includes demographical information such as age, gender, and class. Despite the debate in its definition, many researchers agree that aside from products’ physical attributes and benefits, brand personality is a major component of a brand’s image, as it demonstrates the “soul” of the brand (Diamantopoulos et al., 2005; Ouwersloot & Tudorica, 2001). Most often, brands try to study and imitate their target customers’ behaviors and characteristics to build their own personalities (Temporal 2010, 37). This is because, as indicated by Hess (1995), people often engage with brands that portrait similar personality traits with them. This statement is later backed up by Rajagopal and Sanchez (2004, 233 – 247), stating that people initially view brands on the basis of human-like dimensions, and later on extend it to the corporate domain. Therefore, it is recommended that brands should build a powerful, irresistible, and relatable personality in order to create a strong and emotional relationship with their customers. Temporal (2010, 31) demonstrates this process as similar to human relationships, in which people are
drawn to individuals who have charismatic characters and make others feel good to be around.

2.2.1 Brand personality drivers
Consumers can form their perceived brand personality for a company in several ways, using either product-related drivers or non-product related drivers, or a combination of both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Related Drivers</th>
<th>Non-Product Related Drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>User imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>Spokesperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrity Endorsers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution Channel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Brand Personality Drivers (adapted from Batra, 1993; Aaker 1996, 145-146)

According to McCracken (1989, 79), the primary driver of brand personality is user imagery, which is defined as a set of human personality traits associated with a company’s typical users. There are two types of users mentioned in this definition, including the typical user (those who often use the product), and ideal users (those appear on the brand’s advertisements). He explains that as part of the possession rituals, people can distinguish cultural categories such as class, age, gender, status, occupation, and lifestyle from a product (ibid., 79). Therefore, "user imagery" has a direct impact on consumers' perception of a brand. Later on, in his book "Strategic brand management", Temporal (2007, 69) mentioned that brand personality is also driven directly from the company’s CEO, employees, spokesperson, and celebrity endorsers. One prime example of this case is Virgin Airlines, whose personality is largely formed by CEO Richard Branson and its employees' image.
Aside from the direct associations, a person’s perceived brand personality can be formed indirectly from product-related features such as name, packaging, price, attributes; as well as non-product related features like symbol, country of origin, advertising style, and distribution channel (Batra et al., 1993; Aaker 1996, 145 - 146). For instance, the Swedish brand Absolut Vodka is viewed as humorous and witty mostly because of its advertising style, specifically the famous "Absolut World" campaign. The brand's minimalistic yet funny and creative advertisements have greatly helped to form its personality to the audience. All in all, it can be said that brand personality represents a company’s values, culture, and perceptions of its employees (Keller & Richie 2006, 76).

2.2.2 The Brand Personality Scale
Many researchers in the past have suggested different models measure brand personality, including the NEO model (McCrae & Costa, 1989), the Big Five prototype (John, 1990), and the Adjective Check List scales (Piedmont, McCrae, & Costa, 1991). However, these models are not general enough to apply on a variety of brands, as they were constructed based on personality traits perceived by consumers of specific brands.

In 1997, Aaker presented the Brand Personality scale to improve antecedent works' limitations. The framework is developed based on the previous Big Five human personality structure by John O.P (1990). In elaboration, Aaker conducted a chain of experiments, where she had 631 participants to rate 37 brands of different product categories on 114 personality traits. The final result indicates that brands have five distinct personality dimensions, including “Excitement, Ruggedness, Sincerity, Sophistication, and Competence” (Aaker 1997, 352). These dimensions are attained from 15 facets of brands, which can be deconstructed into 42 personality traits. The Brand Personality Framework is presented in Table 2.
Being the first person to develop a generalizable and robust scale, Aaker has successfully bridged the gap between human personality characteristics and brand personality traits. For instance, out of five dimensions, Sophistication and Ruggedness are not similar to any human personality dimensions in the Big Five concept. This suggests that these two dimensions help brands to influence their audience in different ways by showing people dimensions that they desire (Aaker 1997, 353). Therefore, based on the scale, practitioners can further explore how these brand dimensions help influencing consumers’ preferences and emotions towards the brand. The findings are later on retested to prove the scale's reliability and validity when applying on different product categories.

One of the major boundaries in Aaker’s brand personality scale is its applicability in different cultural backgrounds (Temporal 2007, 69). In other words, when applying to other cultures, the scale needs to be adjusted so that it fits the social background. For instance, the Ruggedness dimension needs to be replaced by Peacefulness in Japan (Aaker et al. 2001, 492 – 508). This is because the personal meanings of a brand vary across cultures, depending greatly on its social meanings (Ligas & Cotte 1999, 609 – 614). Therefore, Aaker's brand personality scale requires many culture-specific studies to justify the scale before applying in other cultures than the United
States of America (Anandkumar & George 2011, 34). In their article, Sweeney and Brandon (2006) also pointed out another limitation of Aaker’s framework, which was that it only contains positive dimensions, yet leaves out negative attributes that a brand might have. This can result in practitioners not having a full picture of the brand’s personality when using the scale (ibid, 639 – 663).

Having said that, Aaker’s brand personality scale is the first valid and feasible attempt to measure a brand's personality traits. The framework has been used as the foundation for many succeeding studies on the topic. According to Austin et al. (2003, 77 – 93), Aaker’s brand personality scale performs best when being applied across diverse product categories. Therefore, as the current research doesn't focus on a specific product category or industry, this scale is still considered a valid and reliable framework to apply.

2.2.3 Impacts of Brand personality
As discussed above, brand personality is considered the representative of a company’s culture, values as well as the characteristics of its shareholders, which makes it distinctive and relatively difficult to replicate. Due to its originality, this set of human-like characteristics is expected to help a brand to set itself apart from other competitors in the market (Pantin-Sohier 2004, 21). Therefore, brands are recommended to use their personalities as sustainable advantages for product differentiation and positioning strategies (Ang & Lim 2006, 39).

In his research, Sirgy (1982, 288) suggests that brand personality is one of the most important factors that create an impact on consumers' preferences. Reasons being, as brand personality is built by linking a company's image with human-like emotions and characteristics, it can capture many aspects of actual human personality (Kim et al., 2018, 95). This statement is, later on, backed up by Biel (1993, 67 – 82), who points out that consumers are likely to develop emotional ties to brands with relatable personality traits. It is commonly known that people do not react rationally all the time, but rather rely greatly on their instinct and experience to make decisions to avoid dealing with mistrust and confusion (Temporal 2010, 31). Therefore, the
emotional tie that consumers have with a brand will create positive impacts on their trust level and loyalty towards the company (Solomon 2009).

Brand personality also showcases positive attributes that consumers aspire to and encourages them to associate with these traits (Aaker 1996, 173 – 174). For instance, Nike promotes fitness and active lifestyle, which eventually captures the attention of people who share the same interests or desire the same ideal image. Having a set of well-built brand personality traits helps companies to communicate their values more effectively to the target audience (ibid, 174). Thus, developing "a clear and distinctive" brand personality has become essential knowledge for marketing practitioners (Yaverbaum 2001, 20).

2.3 Brand trust

Trust is defined as a person’s "confidence in other's goodwill", which can also be considered as part of the consensual ideology (Ring & Van de ven 1994, 91). This confidence exempts from information that a person receives from his exchange partner in challenging situations and their possible consequences (Hiscock 2001, 32). It has been proven that economic benefits can be achieved once relationships are built on trust, as all involved parties head toward a problem-solving approach rather than bargaining for their own interests (March & Simon, 1958). Therefore, trust is the central value of a consumer-brand relationship as it enhances confidence and decreases perceived risks that innate in people (Fournier, Dobscha and Mick 1998, 42 – 51). In other words, brand trust is considered one of the main ingredients to create the bondage between a brand and its consumers. Having said that, explicit studies on the "brand trust" concept are rarely to be found due to the lack of unified measurement, which derives from the diversity of research views on "trust" (Chung 2008, 4). For example, when applying economists' points of view, trust is considered calculable, in which they believe that people make personal assessments of all probabilities and chooses the scenario that entails the lowest potential risks (Williamson 1993, 485). Meanwhile, for sociologists, trust is viewed as a collective
attribute of a society, meaning it is affected by people's relations with others rather than their individual states (Lewis & Weigert 1985, 968).

In the marketing field, on the other hand, trust is more associated with the competency aspect of the consumer-brand relationship (Morgan & Hunt 1994, 23). For marketers, "brand trust" can be generally interpreted as consumers' willingness to entrust a brand with achieving a certain goal using its marketed functions (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001, 82). Delgado – Ballester (2004, 257) added that brand trust demonstrates consumers' confidence in the brand's reliability as well as its intentions when there arise possible risks for consumers. In other words, for an average consumer, brand trust plays an important role in deciding to take risks when making a purchase decision. Reasons being, brand trust includes the degree to which a product can meet consumers' expectations (viability dimension) as well as the level of dependent that consumers have towards the brand (intentionality dimension) (Delgado – Ballester 2003, 11 – 12). Therefore, it is suggested that people's tendency to trusting a brand's quality is crucial for building the consumer-brand relationship and sustainable growth for the company (Chung 2008, 4).

Brand trust has been proven to have positive effects on brand loyalty, as trust strengthens the bond between a brand and its consumers (Morgan & Hunt 1994, 31). People often tend to trust brands that they believe to have a positive and credible image, as well as possess honorable personality traits (Hiscock 2001, 32). This is because the more trustworthy a brand appears to its audience, the more people are convinced it will fulfill their expectations. In this context, the expectation is defined as the confidence that consumers obtain from the advertised attributes of a product or service before making purchase decisions (Evrard 1993, 54). In addition, according to Ryu and Feick (2007, 84 – 94) having positive word-of-mouth can greatly affect purchases and protect brands from negative news. Hence, brand trust affects positively on consumers' intention of making continuous purchase of the product or service and encourage their attitudinal loyalty towards the brand (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001, 90). Kania (2001) added that familiarity is another factor that helps increasing brand trust, except when the person already has a negative view of the
brand. In this context, familiarity implies the level of direct and indirect experiences that a consumer has with a specific product or service (Alba 1987, 411). Experiences allow consumers to compare their expectations and the brand's performance in real life, thus enhance their trust in the company (Mitchell et al. 1998).

In the light of more recent researches, it is also implied that maintaining constant interactivity between brand and consumers is crucial for the development of brand trust (Lee 2005, 176). Trust is viewed as a positive outcome of frequent customer brand engagement, especially for brands with a strong emphasis on virtual communities (Tsimonis & Dimitriadis 2014, 337). This is because online customer review has become a market phenomenon and taken a crucial role in consumers' purchasing decision process. A research from Chevalier and Mayzlin (2003, 354) reveals that positive online reviews have a great impact on Amazon.com and BN.com. Dellarocas (2003, 24) also conducted a study that shows how gaining positive or constructive feedback of the company itself from consumers helps building the brand reputation. By getting people leaving their thoughts and recommendations for future improvements, the brand is generating a positive image for itself, which in turn improves consumers' attitude towards the brand and increases brand trust (Vahdati & Nejad 2016, 19). Therefore, it is suggested that brand trust has a predictive role in explaining future purchase intentions (Yoon 2002, 61)

2.4 Brand Loyalty

As mentioned above, one possible outcome of maintaining consumers' brand trust is brand loyalty, which is described as the degree to which buyers choose to purchase products of a specific brand and reject other options available in the market (Unurlu & Uca 2017, 674). In other words, brand loyalty is viewed as the level of attachment that a person has for a brand, which is reflected through his attitude and repetitive purchase behavior (Liu et al. 2012, 924; Ural 2009, 124). Studies on brand loyalty often focus on analyzing certain concepts to examine consumers' perspectives, such as the brand's perceived value, consumers' keenness to purchase, and the impacts of
price on buying decisions (Kautish 2010, 81). However, while these elements provide valuable inputs, the emotional connection between consumers and brands should also be taken into account. In their research, Ballester and Aleman (2001, 1244) pointed out the crucial role of psychological connection and commitment in determining consumers' loyalty. In this instance, it is believed that by developing an enduring relationship, companies can encourage consumers to form dispositional commitments towards the brand (Ramaswami & Arunachalam 2016, 772).

In general, there are two types of brand loyalty concepts: behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty (Day 1969, 29 – 35). The initial definition of brand loyalty was directed with more emphasis on the behavioral aspect, which measures consumers' loyalty by using calculative indicators such as repeat purchase frequency, brand's perceived value, and word-of-mouth marketing (Luo et al. 2011, 2167). However, in 1994, Dick and Basu published a pioneering article that introduced attitudinal dimension into brand loyalty studies, which implied that brand loyalty should also be measured based on consumers' attitudes towards the brand and tendency to repurchase (Dick & Basu 1994). Since then, the topic of brand loyalty has widely received more attention from researchers and the general public.

According to the behavioral loyalty concept, changes in consumers' purchase behavior is the ultimate result of brand loyalty (Dekimpe et al. 1997). Researchers who support this concept believe that the degree to which a consumer is committed to a brand should be measured based on purchasing frequency, as it indicates the brand preference (Fournier & Yao 1997, 452). For that reason, many studies on brand loyalty use a company's actual sales results in a certain time period as the key measuring of consumers' loyalty towards the brand (Taskin & Akat 2012). This leads to a growing interest in studying consumers' behavioral loyalty, especially among marketers, as it often results in accelerating sales volume and higher revenue (Dawes et al. 2015, 428). However, prior researches have indicated that behavioral loyalty is often encouraged by external factors such as high switching costs and price (Empen, Loy, & Weiss 2015; Dawes et al. 2015, 430). In their research, Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004, 290) also pointed out that consumers would likely to switch
brands if there were better alternatives available in the market. Reasons being if
driven only by behavioral loyalty, consumers often make a purchase based solely on
utilitarian or symbolic purposes (Hollebeek et al. 2014, 14). Therefore, contrary to
the wide preference of marketers, focusing on developing consumers' behavioral
loyalty will most likely result in only short-term success for the brand.

Owing to the limitations of behavioral loyalty concept, in 1994, Dick and Basu
published their first research supporting the concept of attitudinal loyalty, which
emphasizes that consumers’ favorable attitude towards the brand is required when
defining loyalty (Dick & Basu 1994). In other words, attitudinal loyalty is viewed as
the commitment and devotion that consumers have towards a brand. Researchers
who support attitudinal perspective believe that consumers' cognitive process while
making a purchase decision is the prime evidence of their loyalty. Reasons being
consumers' attitudinal loyalty is driven by their brand value and overall satisfaction
(Rubio et al. 2015, 686). In their study, Taşkin and Akat (2012, 136) suggest that once
consumers identify themselves as loyal to a specific brand, they will have a higher
desire to pick that brand as their first preference. Hollebeek et al. (2014) also imply
that consumers who make purchases with attitudinal perspectives often seek for
hedonic values. However, with the absence of behavioral loyalty, it is unlikely that
companies can translate only attitudinal loyalty into profit (Watson et al. 2015, 794).
Therefore, instead of supporting one concept over another, many recent studies
rather take a multidimensional approach, which indicates that both behavioral and
attitudinal dimensions need to exist simultaneously for consumers loyalty to occur
(Gupta, Schivinski, & Brzozowska-Woś 2017, 204).

Considering the current competitive business landscape and challenging economic
situation, the importance of consumers' loyalty for brands is undeniable. Due to its
effectual nature, brand loyalty often translates into a reduction of marketing costs
and an increase in customer retention rate (Chauhuri and Holbrook 2001, 91). This is
because once consumers identify themselves as loyal to a certain brand, they often
develop deep favorable commitments towards that brand, which cultivates their
repeated purchase behavior despite marketing efforts from other competing brands
Brand loyalty also leads to higher perceived value for the brand, which encourages loyal customers to pay premium prices for products from their preferred companies (Jensen & Drozdenko 2008, 117).

2.5 Theories of the “self”

It is commonly known that each person has his own self-conception. This results from a long-term process of observing one’s behaviors, the way other people react to one’s behavior, and the relation between one’s action and others’ (Swann 1987, 1039). People form their self-conceptions since the early stages and work their way to strengthen these conceptions, which reflect greatly in their behaviors (ibid, 1039). When it comes to the impact of brand personality on the concept of self, previous researches have introduced many issues and concepts on this topic. From precedent studies, Self-concept, Self-congruity, and Self-expression have proven to have a direct impact on consumers’ brand preferences. These issues are crucial factors to prove brand personality’s ability to enhance brand equity (Phau & Lau 2000, 57).

2.5.1 The Self-concept

The core idea of the Self-concept theory is that people's behaviors are likely to vary depending on the situation and their relations to others (Schiffman, Kanuk, & Hansen 2007, 147). For instance, a person might have different behaviors when he is at school, at work, with his parents, or among friends. Therefore, according to Markus and Nurius (1986), it is more accurate to assume that each person possesses multiple selves rather than just a single identity. Researchers in the field of psychology has recognized a variety of different self-images in consumers behavior. According to (Schiffman, Kanuk, & Hansen 2007, 148), the four most common self-images are presented as follow:

- Actual self-image: the way people see themselves
- Ideal self-image: the image people would like to see in themselves
- Social self-image: the image people believe they are perceived by others
- Ideal social self-image: the image people would like to be perceived by others
Each individual self-image is unique and imprinted to the person's background, perception, and experience (Schiffman, Kanuk, & Hansen 2007, 147). Once the self-concept is developed, people are more likely to seek information and perform actions to confirm their self-conceptions (Swann 1987, 1039). Similarly, it is believed that consumers' self-image has major impacts on their behavior (Dolich 1969, 80 – 84). In his research, Sidney Levy (1959, 120) pointed out that brands are symbolic objects, whose meaning can be used to structure a consumer’s self-concept. Thus, it can be concluded that consumers are likely to have a higher preference for brands that match their self-image or showcase the image that they would like to present to others.

Having said that, as most people often have to balance between multiple selves, it is not advisable to use self-concept as a constant to develop brand personality. In 1986, Markus and Kunda presented the malleable self-concept, which indicates that consumers’ self-concept is dependent on physical factors and social surroundings. From their research, it is suggested that based on current settings, people develop their working self-concept from the core self-conceptions. In other words, consumers’ self-concept is contemporary and vary through different time period or social situations (Markus & Kunda 1986, 865).

### 2.5.2 The Self-congruity

The concept of Self-congruity implies that people often strive to reaffirm their self-schema by choosing confirmatory situations and companions (Phau & Lau 2000, 58). It is believed that people view products as symbolic objects to themselves and those around them. Therefore, achieving congruence between the symbolic image of the product and one's self-image enhances the chances of positive perceived value for the brand and ultimately ownership of that product (Kassarjian 1986, 413).

By definition, self-schema is one’s cognitive generalization about himself, which evolves from past experience and influence the process of getting self-related information in a social context (Markus 1977, 64). Hence, based on the congruence
theory, consumers tend to have a preference for brands that share the same
personality and image with their self-concept (Geyer, Doston and King 1991, 129 –
135). For instance, if a person is identified as having bold and daring characteristics,
he is most likely to choose brands that promote this image, which also means having
alike personalities. Phau and Lau (2000, 58) described this phenomenon as similar to
how a person creates his personal network, in which people with common
personality traits and shared self-image tend to become friends. Therefore, it is
implied having a stable and congruent personality with target customer helps brand
strengthening their relationship with consumers and improving overall performance
(ibid, 58).

In his research on the relationship between self-concept and consumer behavior,
Sirgy (1982, 289) presents how self-congruity influence consumers’ purchase
motivation. He indicates that consumers’ purchase intention will be highest if the
purchase brings about positive self-congruity. In other words, when the product has
a positive perceived image and is served to sustain a consumer’s positive self-image,
the purchase is most likely to happen. Sirgy (1982, 289) also adds that as brands are
symbolic objects, possessing products from a strong, elite brand is also considered a
way for people to make personal statements. Therefore, consumers are also highly
motivated to purchase products that help them reach their ideal self-image.

2.5.3 The Self-expression
It is commonly known that people have certain desires to express themselves
through all means within their capabilities. According to Swann (1987, 1039),
consumers often use brands as instruments for self-expression, which results in their
positive attitudes towards their favorite brands. By choosing a brand, a person is
believed to be sending messages about their identities to others (Catalin & Andreea
2014, 104). This is because one’s self can be extended to his possessions as well as
objects that he identifies himself with (Belk 1989). Thus, Keller (2008) believes that
one of the greatest characteristics of a brand is its ability to allow consumers to
express their self-image. Through the process of developing a reliable set of
personality traits, a brand humanizes itself and demonstrate the type of person it
would be in real life (Kapferer 1997). As consumers choose brands on the basis of people they would want to socialize with, the choice transforms itself into an act of self-expression (McEnally & Chernatony, 1999).

Consumers are becoming more aware of the brands' function as an instrument to project their values to other individuals. In their research, Escalas and Bettman (2005, 2003) pointed out that a majority of consumers use brand-user associations to develop their self-identity and express themselves to others. This is because by possessing a branded product, consumers are translating all perceived value and emotions associated with the brand. For instance, one might perceive a Polaroid camera user a young, laid-back and aesthetic person, while a Sony camera user might seem more professional and attentive. Therefore, according to Fournier (1998, 345 – 346), brand predilection is the result of sociological factors, as the need for self-expression derives from one's social interactions with other people. Kim and Aimee (2003, 379) suggested that when being put in a large social group, a person tends to highlight his individuality by making choices in a certain pattern, which in turn forms his identity in the current context.

Aside from expressing self-identity, it is also suggested that people tend to protrude their ideal self-image or lifestyle through brand choices (Catalin & Andreea 2014, 105). The purchasing of high-end products is a prime example of this hypothesis. Consumers of luxurious brands purchase a certain not only for its compatibility with their self-images but also for the social statement that the product is associated with (ibid, 104). As a result, the choice of brands has also become one of the most important factors to develop a customer’s social identity (Catalin & Andreea 2014, 106).

2.6 Purchasing Intentions

2.6.1 Definition and Application
For many years, purchasing intentions has become a topic of interest for researchers since it is closely related to consumers’ buying behavior (Goyal 2014, 11). Bagozzi and
Burnkrant (1979) described the term as a person's behavioral tendency to a product or service. Lacoeuilhe (1997) later elaborates this definition by explaining purchase intention as the probability of purchasing a product or service that a consumer has for a particular brand. In other words, purchase intention is a consumer's willingness to buy a certain product from a brand, which can be influenced by many external and internal factors (Marketing and Strategy Terms). For instance, after being exposed to an advertisement, a consumer might develop an interest in a product. However, this does not necessarily mean that the person has an intention to purchase the product, as there are many other factors involved in the evaluation process. Fishbein and Aizen (1975) described this as "a subjective inclination" that a person has towards a product or service, and considered it as one of the key elements to study consumer behavior. Therefore, purchase intention can also be viewed as the process to analyze and forecast consumer behavior (Lin & Lin 2007, 123 – 124).

It is commonly known that people's decision-making process does not always base on rational and objective thoughts. Rather, a person often subconsciously uses his emotion and intuition to decide, especially when there is a time limit to reach a decision (Deppe et al. 2005, 413 - 414). Sinclair (2007) also indicates that consumers not only don't have a rational and consistent approach to their decision-making process, they also don't follow any historical economic patterns. Therefore, making a forecast on future purchasing trends of consumers is a challenging task for many companies in the world. Having said that, previous researches have pointed out that purchase intention is one of the most crucial factors that affect consumers' buying decision (Bilal & Ali 2013, 19). The positive relationship between consumers' purchase intention and their behavior was first mentioned by Ajzen (1991) in his research "The theory of planned behavior". He explained that intentions are indicators of the extent to which people are willing to try performing certain behavior and how much effort they are willing to invest in that behavior (Ajzen 1991, 181 – 183). Later on, when applying the theory of planned behavior on the health industry, Conner and Sparks (2005) found out that consumers with high purchase intentions most likely to take action when they are exposed to the product or service.
again (170 – 214). This finding is also backed up by Tirtiroglu & Elbeck (2008), indicating that there is a positive relationship between high purchase intention and the possibility of purchasing a product or service.

Based on these findings, purchase intention is often used as a dependent variable in many types of research on consumers' buying behavior (Bilal & Ali 2013, 19). Moreover, consumers' purchase intention has been considered one of the main inputs for marketing managers to estimate future sales. In their research, Jamieson and Bass (1989, 336) pointed out that around 90 percent of many market research companies' clients spend great attention on measuring consumers' purchase intention and use this information to determine future strategies. There are, however, many researchers who cast doubt on the extent to which purchasing intention affects consumers' buying behaviors. Namias (1959) believes that although the tie still exists, purchase intention is not the perfect predictor of purchase behavior. Based on his study, Namias indicated that people with negative intentions to buy a product actually ended up buying it. Whereas people with positive purchase intentions can still be affected by their financial situation and economic confidence, which might result in not buying the product (Namias 1959, 29 – 30). There are also a few cases when consumers didn't have intentions to make a purchase but ended up doing so because of unpredictable events. Morwitz, Steckel, & Gupta (2007, 359 – 360) mentioned this as situations when consumers are motivated to make a purchase due to certain conditions.

2.6.2 Factors affecting Consumers’ Purchasing Intentions
When evaluating different aspects of a product that affect consumers' purchase intention, both intrinsic attributes and extrinsic attributes are taken into account. By definition, intrinsic attributes refer to physical characteristics of a product, such as features, performance, reliability, durability, etc., whereas extrinsic attributes are external cues, such as brand equity and price (Zeithaml 1988). While it is debatable whether one attribute has a stronger impact than the other, Richardson (1997, 388 – 404) suggested that when studying about purchase intentions, extrinsic factors should receive more attention. This statement is supported by many researchers.
According to Aaker (1991), one of the major factors composing consumers' buying intention is their positive feelings towards a brand. Later on, Lijander et al. (2009) carried out a study to investigate consumers' buying behavior in the fashion industry. The study concluded that extrinsic factors such as perceived quality and perceived values have direct impacts on a consumer's purchase intention. Tharmi and Senthilnathan (2011, 15) also backed up this statement by indicating that having strong brand equity would likely result in positive consumers' purchase intention. Of all components, brand personality has been proven to create significant impact on consumers' intention to purchase a product or service. Alireza Motameni et al (2010) pointed out that consumers tend to develop loyalty to brands with strong and distinct sets of brand personality traits. Kim et al (2011) added that brand personality also helps build up stronger brand preference towards consumers. These factors have been proven by Kheiri et al. (2011) to have great impact on consumers' purchase intention. In addition, as mentioned in the previous section, brand personality helps create an emotional bondage between the company and its customers, which results in greater trust level towards the brand (Solomon 2009). This also adds up to the consumers' purchase intention towards a brand, as people tend to choose brands that they consider having lower perceived risks (Bouhlel et al. 2011, 212 – 218).
3 Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

3.1 Theoretical Framework

In the light of prior studies, it is suggested that there is a supportive relationship between brand personality and purchase intentions. Brand personality is viewed as a mean of differentiating products that belong in the same category, which raises trust and fidelity in consumers (Fournier 1998). In their study, Motameni et al. (2010) also pointed out that having a strong set of brand personality traits can generate significantly positive impacts on consumers' brand loyalty. As both factors are related to consumers' attitudes and perceptions of the brand, it is proven that brand trust and brand loyalty generate positive impacts on consumers' buying intentions (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001, 90; Bouhlel et al. 2011, 212–218). Brands also create chances and environment for consumers to express themselves and strengthen their self-identities. By developing a strong set of brand personality traits, brands can aspire consumers to associate themselves with these characteristics (Aaker 1996, 173–174). In his research, Sirgy (1982) indicated that when the possession of a product is viewed as creating positive self-congruity, consumers' purchase intention will most likely raise high. He also added that people are highly motivated to purchase a product that can help them achieve their ideal self-image (ibid., 289).

There have been a few studies on brand personality and its impacts on consumers' purchase intentions. Wang and Yang (2008) conducted a study on the relationship between country of origin, brand personality, and purchase intention in the Chinese auto industry. They concluded that consumers have a higher tendency to buy a product if the brand has a positive brand personality (ibid., 469). This finding is in line with Bouhlel et al. (2011) results in their research on the current topic in the case of mobile marketing. They found out that creating a set of human-like characteristics for a company can make the brand more appealing, especially when there's an emphasis on sincerity and competence (ibid., 218). Romero and Gomez (2013) pointed out that for Mexican consumers, out of five personality dimensions developed by Aaker (1997), the most significant predictor of consumers' purchase
intention is Excitement, followed by Sincerity. Also, they implied that for young Mexican consumers, the Competence dimension carries a negative impact, as it does not fit their personalities and lifestyles (ibid., 472). Another study that focuses on the effect of each personality dimension on purchase intention was carried out by Riyas and Herath (2016) in Sri Lanka. Similar to the previous study, the research suggests that while Excitement and Ruggedness have positive impact on purchase intention, the other dimensions don’t seem to deliver the same result (ibid., 53 – 54). Although the above – mentioned studies provide valuable information, their theoretical framework does not fit the purpose of this research. Therefore, using the knowledge gained from the literature review, the author develops a new framework to serve the current research.

A theoretical framework is defined as the "logically developed, described and elaborated network" of supportive information from antecedent literature that is relevant to the current research problem (Sekaran & Bougie 2009, 68). Based on antecedent literature, a theoretical framework for the relationship between brand personality and purchase intention can be built as follow. (See Figure 1)
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Figure 4 Theoretical Framework
3.2 Hypotheses

In regard to the above-mentioned theoretical framework, this research proposes six hypotheses to study the possible impacts of brand personality on consumers' purchase intentions. The first three hypotheses involve the relationship between brand personality and brand trust, brand loyalty, and consumers' self-concept. The later three hypotheses look into how consumers' purchase intention is affected by brand trust, brand loyalty, and self-concept.

**Brand Personality and Brand Trust**

As previously explained, brand trust is defined as the level of confidence that consumers have on a brand in fulfilling its marketed functions (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001, 82). Since people often depend greatly on their instinct when making decisions (Temporal 2010, 31), it is important for brands to gain a sufficient level of "trust" from their current customers as well as develop a trustworthy image towards their targeted audience. Therefore, considering the main purpose of brand personality is to help brands creating connections with their customers, previous studies suggest that brand personality might have a positive impact on brand trust. For instance, Hiscock (2001, 32) believes that consumers tend to trust brands that possess credible images and honorable personality traits. In addition, Clemenz et al. (2012, 62) claim that companies can greatly enhance their perceived values by building a credible image for their brands. For these reasons, the author forms the first hypothesis as follow:

*Hypothesis 1: Brand Personality is positively related to Brand Trust*

**Brand Personality and Brand Loyalty**

Following the first hypothesis, since brand loyalty is considered as one of the possible outcomes when maintaining consumers' trust (Unurlu & Uca 2017, 674), it would be interesting to investigate the relationship between brand loyalty and brand personality. According to Bairrada et al. (2019, 4), brands that portray an outstanding set of human personality traits are more likely to be protected from negative information and hold a better chance of retaining customers. Reasons being, thanks
to the symbolic benefits that these human-like characters bring about, brands can develop long-lasting, human-to-human bonds with their frequent customers (Kim et al. 2011, 448 – 458). This enhances the emotional connection between a person and a brand, which can more likely draw out a sense of loyalty within that person towards his or her preferred brand. Lin (2010, ) also points out that "competence" and "sophistication" personality traits have a positive influence on consumers' attitudinal loyalty. Therefore, the author hypothesizes as follow:

_Hypothesis 2: Brand Personality is positively related to Brand Loyalty_

**Brand Personality and Self-Concept**

According to Martesen and Gronholdt (2004), when facing a difficult decision without having access to an immediate solution, people often tend to rely much more on their emotional evaluations than using plain rationality. Later on, this statement is supported by Das (2015,18) when he concluded that most often, consumers don't evaluate a brand solely based on its functional quality, but also in regard to its symbolic aspects such as individual recognition or self-congruity. In other words, brands that bring about means of self-expression and help customers making strong statements of their presence are often more appreciated by the general public. Hence, it is of great interest for marketers to understand how to effectively build and maintain a brand's symbolic value.

In regards to the previous Literature Review chapter, the author suggests that brand personality contributes greatly to helping consumers to express and enhance their self-concept. Reasons being, as brand personality is built by linking a company's image with human-like emotions and characteristics, it can capture many aspects of actual human personality (Kim et al., 2018, 95). To put differently, this means the more distinctive and self-expressive a brand presents itself, the more attractive it will appear to its target audience. Therefore, the third hypothesis is presented as follow:

_Hypothesis 3: Brand Personality is positively related to Self-Concept_
Purchase Intentions and Brand Trust

For a quick recap, in this research, "consumers' purchase intention" refers to the extent to which people are willing to try for certain behavior and how much effort they are willing to invest in that behavior (Ajzen 1991, 181 – 183). To put differently, it is the result of a consideration process made by consumers before deciding on paying for products and services. For that reason, there are many factors that can affect the purchase intention of consumers.

In 2001, Chaudhuri and Holbrook listed brand trust as one of the factors that can create impacts on consumers’ purchase intentions (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001, 90). They explained that it is because the more trustworthy a brand appears to its audience, the more capable it seems to perform and deliver expected results; hence encourages consumers to choose the brand instead of other options available in the market (ibid, 90). Tharmi and Senthilnathan (2011, 15) also supported this finding by indicating that having strong brand equity would likely result in positive consumers’ purchase intention. Being the key component of a consumer-brand relationship (Rajapogal 2009, 4), it is possible that brand trust has an impact on consumers’ purchase intentions. Therefore, the author proposes a hypothesis as follow:

*Hypothesis 4: Brand Trust has positive effect on Purchase Intentions*

Purchase Intentions and Brand Loyalty

As mentioned above, brand trust has a relatively strong tie with brand loyalty, as it creates a positive impact on consumers' perception of a brand and encourages their loyalty towards that brand (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001, 90). For that reason, it is interesting to see if Brand Loyalty also has an impact on consumers’ purchase intentions.

In 2008, Vogel et al. (2008, 100) discovered a positive relationship between brand equity and purchase intention. They explained that by constructing and maintaining a positive attitude towards the brand, brand equity helps enhancing consumers' satisfaction and loyalty, which in turn encourages them to continue choosing the brand for their needs (ibid, 100). This finding is, later on, backed up by Malik et al.
(2013, 168) when they concluded that consumers often feel more confident in making a purchase after identifying themselves as loyal to a certain brand. Driven by the same question, Marike et al. (2017) included the relationship theory between market loyalty and consumers' purchase intentions in their research. The study, which was carried out in South Africa with around 280 millennials participants, provides evidence for a positive relationship between the two mentioned variables (Marike et al. 2017, 15). Based on this evidence, the author would like to carry out a similar test to see if the result maintains the same for a more diverse group of participants. Hence, the fifth hypothesis is presented as follow:

**Hypothesis 5: Brand Loyalty has positive effect on Purchase Intentions**

**Purchase Intentions and Self-Concept**

Lastly, the research also looks into possible impacts of human’s self-concept on their purchase intentions. As explained in previous chapter, the self-concept theory depicts that people’s behaviors are likely to vary depending on the situation and their relations to others (Schiffman, Kanuk, & Hansen 2007, 147). The four self-images include “actual self-image, ideal self-image, social self-image, and ideal social self-image” (ibid, 147). Therefore, referring to the self-congruity theory, it is expected that consumers are likely to be influenced by their self-images when paying for certain products or services, depending on their goals.

Studies on the relationship between self-concept and consumers' purchase intentions had been conducted several times in the past. Sirgy (1985, 195 – 206) was among the first to confirm the self-congruity theory, stating that consumers are more likely to make a purchase when both of their actual-self and ideal-self are satisfied. In specific, people tend to have a more favorable attitude towards a brand whose public image appears to match their self-images. Aizen (1991, 179 – 211) believes that consumers' purchase intentions are partially influenced by the possibility of self-presentation through the purchase. For instance, people who purchase luxury products are not only paying for their practical benefits, but also for the social status that the products bring about (Yang et al. 2018). This statement is, later on, backed
up by Graeff (1996, 481 – 499) when he stated that most often, consumers choose a certain product or brand to express their self-images.

Having said that, most above-mentioned researches were conducted more than a decade ago. Considering many societal changes past years, questions may arise on the reliability of self-congruity theory. The study by Yang et al. in 2018 shows that consumers' purchased intentions are still influenced by their self-express desire when it comes to luxury products. With this result, the author would like to examine the topic in a broader product range. Hence, the final hypothesis of this study is present as below:

*Hypothesis 6: Self-Concept has positive effect on Purchase Intentions*
4 Methodology

This chapter indicates how the current research is carried out by justifying the chosen methodology, research designs, and validity of collected data. It begins with the reasoning behind the chosen research methods. Then, the author provides a rationale for the approach of the research as well as the theoretical background of the research design. After that, the data collection process is presented. Finally, the section covers how the data is analyzed and demonstrates its validity.

4.1 Research Methods

According to Valli (2015, 10), the quality of a research's results depends heavily on the compatible of the research objectives and its chosen method. In general, there are two types of research methods commonly used in academic research: Qualitative and Quantitative.

Qualitative method collects people's opinions to interpret phenomena and its meaning to the society in question (Denzin & Lincoln 2005, 3). As a result, qualitative research is not as structured and numerical dependant as a quantitative method (Lichtman 2006, 8). Instead, the qualitative approach puts more emphasis on gathering data regarding human behaviors. According to Lichtman (2006, 8), the primary purpose of qualitative research is to provide insights into human experience. Bryman and Bell (2015, 59) describe the method as "exploratory research with an interpretive position". For this reason, most researchers that choose qualitative methods are more interested in the meaning and interpretation of phenomena, and no so much about testing a hypothesis related to the subject (Hollway & Jefferson 2000, 2). In other words, qualitative research often results in an in-depth understanding and description of the subject in question.

Quantitative method, on the other hand, uses measurable data in a systematic way to examine phenomena and explain its statistical relationship with other variables.
presented in the (Muijs 2010, 1). For that reason, quantitative research depends heavily on statistical standards (Goddard & Meville 2001). Bryman and Bell (2015, 45) describe quantitative research as “the collection and analysis of numerical data”. Generally speaking, researchers that apply quantitative methods need to collect measurable data related to their chosen variables, then analyze, and present numerical results as proofs of their conclusions regarding the questioned research problem (Johnson & Christensen 2008, 24). Due to its characteristics, quantitative research is mostly used to explain or predict phenomena based on the relationship between different measurable variables (Bensenane 2016, 51). Conclusions of quantitative research most often used to verify or unverify the questioned hypothesis.

The current research aims to examine the causation relationship between brand personality and consumers' purchase intentions. To serve the purpose of this research, the author has built a theoretical framework based on previous literature. Therefore, given the above information about two research methods, the author believes it is best suited to apply a quantitative method for the current study.

4.2 Research Approach

There are two research approaches that are widely used in most research projects, namely deductive approach and inductive approach (Saunders et al. 2009, 124). Deductive approach means researchers would firstly build a preliminary hypothesis using existing theories, then test that hypothesis with their collected data (Wilson 2010, 7). On the other hand, inductive approach means researchers would develop their final theories based on the result of the data analysis (Saunders et al. 2009, 124). Therefore, the choice of using either approach is mainly based on the research questions and nature of the research topic (ibid, 127).

Based on given information, the author chooses to follow deductive approach for the current research. Reasons being, the main objective of this research is to test the
possible role of brand personality in the causation of consumers’ purchase intentions. In addition, according to Saunders et al (2009, 125), deductive approach is best for explaining the relationship between different variables using quantitative data. Hence, deductive approach appears to be most suitable for this research.

4.3 Data collection

According to Bryman and Bell (2015, 11), one of the deciding factors of a research is the data collection process. Researchers need to gather and analyze an adequate amount of valid data in order to produce justifiable results and conclusions of the study.

In general, there are two types of data sources: primary data and secondary data. For this research, the author uses both data sources to examine the hypothesis and draw final conclusions. Documentary secondary data is mainly used in the literature review part of this research, as it often has higher quality than the primary data collected solely by the author (Saunders et al. 2009, 268). It provides theoretical knowledge and prior findings of the topics in question, including brand personality and purchase intentions as well as related variables such as brand trust, brand loyalty, and self-concept. This theoretical background is used to build a conceptual framework for the study and provide guidance for the data collection process. To collect documentary secondary data, the author mostly rely on information services such as Google Scholar, SSRN, and EBSCOHOST to search for journals and articles. The author also gathers crucial information from Marketing and Branding books using the university library and other Internet.

Research Questionnaire

In order to collect primary data, the author uses self-administered questionnaire, which is a data collection technique that requires respondents to answer the same questions in a decided order (deVaus 2002). The questionnaire is conducted using Google Form. During the course of 7 days, the author sent out the questionnaire to
multiple groups on Facebook in order to create diversity for the final results. The questionnaire consists of 24 questions (see the Appendix):

- 4 demographic questions
- 5 questions regarding Brand Personality
- 4 questions regarding Brand Trust
- 6 questions regarding Brand Loyalty
- 2 questions regarding Self-Concept
- 3 questions regarding Purchase Intentions

According to Saunders et al. (2009, 362), Robson (2002) believes that researchers should use standardised questions, which can be interpreted the same by all participants in order to generate most valuable results from surveys. Hence, for this research, the survey is built using pre-examined questions from previous academic works. Due to the lack of research resources and time limitations, the author believes this is the best way to ensure the standard and generability of the questionnaire.

The author uses a seven-point rating Likert scale as the basis measurement for all responses of the survey. First, respondents are instructed to rate the first brand that comes to their minds on the extent to which each of these personality traits, including “sincere”, “exciting”, “sophisticated”, “tough”, and “competent” describes the brand to them. Then, to measure the level of brand trust, respondents are asked to rate the four following statements: “I trust this brand”, “I rely on this brand”, “This is an honest brand”, and “This brand is safe” (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001, 87). Brand loyalty is measured by a six-item set of statements, which was collected from a study by Fullerton in 2005 and Algesheimer, Uptal, and Herrmann’s research article published within the same year. In addition, respondents are asked to give their opinions on two statements indicating the congruity between the brand and their self-concept. These statements are taken from Manokhina and Melpignano’s research in 2018. Lastly, in order to measure consumers’ purchase intentions, a set
of three statements developed by Wang et al. (2013) are used in the survey. All questions and their mentioned sources can be viewed in the Appendix section.

4.4 Data Analysis

Due to its numerical nature, quantitative data needs to be processed and analysed in order to produce useful information and deliver meaningful results (Saunders et al. 2009, 414). Thus, for this research, after collecting results from the online survey, the author used SPSS software to turn given data into comprehensible information and further analyse to generate answers for the research questions.

The first step of the analysing process is to input collected data from the survey to SPSS spreadsheets and start coding. Owing to the main objective of this research, the author identify four independent variables as “Brand Personality”, “Brand Trust”, “Brand Loyalty”, and “Self-Concept”; whereas the dependent variable is “Purchase Intentions”. As explained in previous section, each variable is measured using a group of pre-defined items in the survey. Thus, in SPSS, these variables are presented as composite variables, whose values are equal to the average value of their groups. Then, the author ran a descriptive analysis to generate an overview of retrieved data. Table 3 includes features of key variables in the research. A complete version of this Descriptive Analysis can be found in Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Personality</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0467</td>
<td>.99117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3789</td>
<td>1.58801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0385</td>
<td>1.30791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7217</td>
<td>1.45678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0984</td>
<td>1.44162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Descriptive Analysis
After having a general description of the research’s data, the author continued running a Correlation Analysis to examine possible relationships between variables in the dataset (see Table 7). This analysis also indicates the strength of a relationship and how each variable correlate to one another. In Karl Pearson’s Correlation, the connection between two variables is measured from -1 to 1. If the correlation does not exist, the Pearson value will be presented as 0. If the variables have a positive relationship, the Pearson value will be presented as a positive number. Conversely, if the variables have a negative relationship, the Pearson value will be presented as a negative number.

Aside from Pearson’s Correlation Analysis, the author also performed a Linear Regression Analysis of the variables to examine possible causal relationship (see Table 8). For this research, “purchase intentions” is identified as a dependant variable, whereas independant variables are “brand trust”, “brand loyalty”, and “self-concept”. Linear Regression Analysis provides further information about the impacts of above-mentioned independant variables on consumers’ purchase intentions, as well as the significance level of each independant variable. In elaboration, the further away the regression coefficients value (or B value) is from 0, the greater impact an independant variable has on “purchase intentions”.

4.5 Reliability of the research

One major concern of all researchers in the data collection stage is to ensure their research’s credibility. This means putting great attention to the credibility and validity of the research design.

The reliability of a research is defined as the extent to which its data collecting method and analyzing process generate consistent results (Saunders et al. 2009, 156). In other words, if reliability is high, the results will not change regardless of external factors' influence. On the other hand, without a well-grounded research
design, the whole research findings will be impaired. Easterby-Smith et al. (2008, 109) summarized all prospects of a research's reliability into three following questions:

- Will the measures yield the same results on other occasions?
- Will similar observations be reached by other observers?
- Is there transparency in how sense was made from the raw data?

To strengthen the current research's reliability, the author has adopted research questions from previous verified academic works. However, as Raimond (1993, 55) pointed out, there hardly exists an absolutely perfect way to conduct a research. Random errors may occur when the survey is designed, when the research is carried out, and when participants give an answer to the survey. Therefore, it is vital in this stage to assess the study's reliability in order to ensure its credibility. According to Mitchell (1996, 199-207), there are three most common ways to assess reliability, including re-test, internal consistency, and alternative form. For this study, the author decided to test the internal consistency of collected data using Cronbach’s Alpha in order to assess the research's reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha is calculated using SPSS software, in which reliability is scored from 0 to 1 with 1 being the ultimate value. Kline (2000, 13) demonstrates this rating system as follows (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Internal Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha \geq 0.9$</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.7 \leq \alpha &lt; 0.9$</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.6 \leq \alpha &lt; 0.7$</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5 \leq \alpha &lt; 0.6$</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &lt; 0.5$</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Cronbach’s Alpha rating

After calculating the Cronbach’s Alpha of all indexed variables, it can be confirmed that the data is consistent and valid, as all variables yield Cronbach’s Alpha values
above 0.7. Table 7 presents all indexed variables and their corresponding Cronbach’s Alpha values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Personality</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intentions</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Reliability Statistic
5 Research Results

This chapter showcases all main findings of the study and results from the data analysis phase. This information is crucial for the next "Discussion" chapter of this research. The chapter starts with a brief presentation of the survey's sample, which is to demonstrate the cultural diversity and competence of collected data. Then, all major statistical results, which were processed by SPSS, will be displayed and further explained in correspond to the research questions. As mentioned in the Introduction chapter, this study has two major research questions:

- Do consumers acknowledge brand personalities?
- How does brand personality create impacts on purchasing intentions?

Therefore, this chapter will be navigated to answer these questions. Detailed records of all statistical results and the survey itself can be found in the Appendix.

5.1 Respondents’ Demographics

Over the course of seven days, the survey received 227 respondents. The sample consists of 121 female respondents (53%), 102 male respondents (45%), and 4 respondents that prefer not to indicate their genders (2%).

![Figure 5 Gender distribution of respondents](image-url)
Out of 227 respondents, the largest age group is people between 18 – 25 years old, which makes up 68% of the total sample size. The survey also received 55 respondents (25%) aged from 26 to 35 years old, and 16 respondents aged from 36 to 60 years old (7%) (see Appendix). As for the nationality distribution, the majority of respondents are Vietnamese (15.9%), followed by American (8.4%), German (7%), French (6.2%), and Dutch (5.7%) (see Appendix).

In addition, when it comes to the cultural diversity that was aimed for in the beginning, the survey received 106 respondents (43%) from European countries, 88 respondents (35%) from Asian countries, 42 respondents (17%) from American countries, 7 respondents (3%) from Australian countries, and 5 respondents (2%) from African countries.

5.2 Consumers’ awareness of Brand Personality

To examine consumers' brand personality awareness, the author asked participants to think about the first brand that appears in their minds before doing the survey. The rationale behind this request is that the chosen brand will either be very familiar
to the person or holds a really strong brand identity; thus creates a solid ground for participants to answer upcoming questions about the brand. After that, participants were asked to rate the relevancy of their chosen brands to five human-like personalities, using the 7-point Likert scale. A detailed record of these questions can be found in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Personality</strong></td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0467</td>
<td>.99117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Descriptive Analysis - Brand Personality

As seen in Table 6, the average score given by 227 participants of the survey is 5.0467, which can be translated to a positive result when using the 7-point Likert scale. The Standard Deviation value is also considerably low, which indicates that most answers are very close to the average number.

In addition, the author also asked participants two questions regarding their Self-Concept in order to examine the extent to which people perceive their chosen brand as a human. As seen in Figure 4, the majority of participants gave positive answers to both questions.
On that account, it can be implied that, though not significant, there exists acknowledgment of brand personality among consumers. Many people also consider brands as resemblance themselves, or someone they would like to become.

5.3 Impact of Brand Personality on Purchase Intentions

As cited in the Literature Review chapter, this research studies the possible impact of brand personality on consumer's purchase intentions through six hypotheses:

- H1: Brand Personality has a positive relationship with Brand Trust
- H2: Brand Personality has a positive relationship with Brand Loyalty
- H3: Brand Personality has a positive relationship with Self-Concept
- H4: Brand trust has a positive effect on Purchase Intentions
- H5: Brand loyalty has a positive effect on Purchase Intentions
- H6: Consumers' self-concept has a positive effect on Purchase Intentions

To test these hypotheses, a correlation analysis is conducted among all mentioned variables using SPSS software. The result of this analysis is presented below (see Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand Personality</th>
<th>Self-Concept</th>
<th>Brand Trust</th>
<th>Brand Loyalty</th>
<th>Purchase Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Correlation Statistics
First and foremost, based on the data, it's worth to point out that the theoretical framework is agreed and confirmed by participants of this research. As seen in Table 7, all involved variables are shown to having positive relationships with one another.

According to the survey's result, Brand Personality is indicated to have positive relationships with all three variables of the study. Brand Loyalty has the highest correlation score ($r=0.603$), following by Brand Trust ($0.569$) and Self-Concept ($r=0.489$). This confirms our H1, H2, and H3 that Brand Personality is positively related to Brand Trust, Brand Loyalty, and consumers' Self-Concept.

Brand Trust is also presented as having a relatively positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention ($r=0.667$). This positive relationship is in line with the survey's result, as nearly 60% of participants agree that they can trust the brand they chose. Most participants also believe buying products from their chosen brands is a safe investment. Having said that, when being asked about the brand's honesty, a high percentage of participants chose to remain neutral (see Figure 8).

Out of three variables, Brand Loyalty appears to have the most positive relationship with consumers’ purchase intentions ($r=0.906$). Based on results from the survey, more than 60% of participants stated that they will most likely spread positive word-
of-mouth and recommend the brands to other people because they believe the brands deliver great value (see Appendix). Having said that, statistics show great reluctance from participants when identifying themselves as "loyal" to the brands. As seen in Figure 9, an outstanding number of participants "strongly disagree" to the statement, which is uniquely observed throughout the whole survey.

![Figure 9 Brand Loyalty Statistics](image)

Similarly, Self-Concept also appears to have a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention. As seen in Table 7, the correlation between self-concept and purchase intention is shown as positive ($r=0.611$). Results from the survey also show that consumers are more likely to have a strong impression for brands that they believe represent themselves (see Figure 10).

![Figure 10 Self-Concept Statistics](image)
Owing to above-mentioned results, a regression analysis is performed to provide more detailed insights into possible causal relationships between each variables and consumers’ purchase intentions. The author also wants to have closer look into the significance of these variables’ impacts on purchase intentions. Results from the regression analysis are presented as below (see Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Concept</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Regression Statistics

As seen in Table 8, the regression analysis delivers a somewhat different conclusion to the previous correlation analysis. In elaboration, only the "Brand Loyalty" variable (β = 0.883, p-value < 0.01) is proven to have causal relationship with "Purchase Intention". In other words, Brand Loyalty is proven to have a positive effect on consumers' purchase intentions, hence confirms H4. Meanwhile, the impact of both "Self-Concept" variable (β = 0.015, p-value > 0.05) and “Brand Trust” variable (β = 0.018, p-value >0.05) are shown to be insignificant upon "Purchase Intention". To put differently, based on these results, both H5 and H6 are denied. Therefore, it can be stated that only Brand Loyalty has positive impacts on Consumers' Purchase Intentions.
6 Discussions

Following the previous chapter, this Discussion section showcases the author’s interpretation and explanation for all presented results. The aim of this chapter is to provide answers for the research problems, which questions the actual effectiveness of promoting brand personality, specifically its impacts on consumers' purchase intention in the current time. With that research problems, two questions arise for this study:

- Do consumers acknowledge brand personalities?
- How does brand personality create impacts on purchasing intentions?

In order to answer these questions, the author took a quantitative approach, in which an online survey is conducted to investigate the topic. As stated before, one of these research’s objectives is to measure the level of acknowledgment that brand personality concept has on consumers nowadays. On the ground of these objectives, it is imperative to note that the research isn't constrained to a specific group of nationality or race. On the contrary, the author believes that having a diverse sample will deliver more precise and inclusive results to the topic in question. Hence, the survey was sent to many people with different demographic backgrounds in the hope that the yielded results would be as culturally diverse as it could be. In the end, as mentioned in the previous chapter, 227 people of 42 nationalities fully participated in the online questionnaire.

6.1 Consumers’ Awareness on Brand Personality

Overall, the results show that, to some extent, an average consumer does associate familiar brands with different human personality traits. Most often, these brands are preferred for being "competent", "sophisticated", and "exciting". Meanwhile, both "sincere" and "tough" personality dimensions are hardly used by consumers to describe their preferred brands. Later on in the survey, many participants also demonstrated their unfavouring attitude towards the "sincere" dimension when it comes to their chosen brands. This suggests that while the concept of brand
personality is accepted by the general public, it is harder for dimensions such as "tough" or "sincere" to come across consumers' perception when referring to a brand compared to other personality groups. One possible reason is that an average consumer might have a hard time believing in a tough, or especially sincere image that a company portrays itself to be. On the other hand, since this study focus on familiar brands, it is also possible that consumers prefer brands featuring traits such as "competent", "sophisticated", and "exciting" more than the other two personality dimensions.

6.2 Impacts of Brand Personality on Consumers’ Purchase Intentions

As presented in the initial theoretical framework, this research proposes that brand personality can influence purchase intentions by generating brand trust, brand loyalty, and enhancing consumers’ self-concept. However, after analyzing the results, only brand loyalty is proven to create meaningful impacts on consumers’ purchase intentions. In other words, based on this result, consumers are believed to have higher purchase intentions once they start having a sense of loyalty towards the brand.

Nonetheless, it is worth noticing that both brand trust and consumers' self-concept appear to have a positive relationship with purchase intentions. Perhaps, this is because brand loyalty is a highly possible outcome of enhancing consumers' trust and self-concept, especially in the case of brand trust. Once customers develop a trusting foundation and feel related to a specific brand, they have a higher tendency to identify themselves as loyal to the brand than other competitors in the market. Hence, it can be said that brand trust and self-concept play a supporting role in the causal relationship between brand personality and consumers' purchase intentions. With the existence of brand trust and self-concept, consumers are encouraged to have a strong commitment to a brand, which creates positive impacts on their purchase intentions.
Another interesting finding that should be mentioned here is the noticeable reluctance from participants when being asked if they identify themselves as loyal to the chosen brand. As shown in the previous Results chapter, a large number of participants chose to completely disagree with the statement. A similar situation happened when participants were asked to rate their chosen brands' honesty, where "neutral" became the most popular answer. In whole, both of these statements are a direct affirmation of people's certainty towards a certain brand. Hence, perhaps this event shows that even with a certain level of commitment, people often try to avoid giving an affirmative statement regarding a company's integrity and trustworthiness.
7 Conclusions

In the end, this research has achieved its main objectives, which are proving the relevance of brand personality in current time and presenting the way it influences consumers' purchase intentions. To obtain this outcome, the author took a quantitative approach for the study, using a self-administered questionnaire to collect primary data, alongside valuable secondary data retrieved from previous research on this topic.

After analyzing the results, this research confirms that consumers nowadays do acknowledge the presence of personality profiles carried by familiar brands in the market. People also show a slight preference towards some traits over the others, specifically "competent", "sophisticated", and "exciting". This result has contributed contemporary information to the topic, as not much research about brand personality's acknowledgment was made in recent years. The research also confirms that brand personality has a positive impact on consumers' purchase intentions. In elaboration, having a strong brand personality profile helps to encourage and to build up consumers' trust in the brand, which eventually influences their purchase intentions. These findings help future researchers and marketers to have a better understanding of how brand personality can impact consumers' buying behavior.

In addition, the significance of this research also lies in the cultural diversity of its participants. Although brand personality has received great attention from both business and academic worlds, not many previous studies provide a multicultural picture of its impacts on consumers. In regards of the research objectives, which aim to justify brand personality's awareness and its impact on current consumers' purchase intentions, having a diverse group of participants can yield a more inclusive result for the study. Therefore, these findings may serve as useful information for future researchers who seek a multicultural perspective on brand personality.
8 Limitations of the research and future suggestions

Though yielded relatively sufficient results, there are a number of limitations observed by the author while making this study. First and foremost, due to the limitation of time and resources, the author did not convert variables used in the online survey into their local meaning for each region. Hence, with the diversity of participants, there can be cases in which participants from different countries provide different answers due to their own interpretation of the survey, which may affect the final result. The author believes that in the future, it will be interesting to have specific studies on the perception of consumers in different parts of the world regarding brand personality.

Secondly, with the lack of access to the recent literature on the topic, some information used in the literature review stage, which is the foundation of this research theoretical framework, might be outdated. This restricted the options available for the author when constructing the theoretical part of the research, which may impact the relevance of the research outcome.

In addition, this research examines the impacts of brand personality on purchase intentions using participants' familiar or preferred brands. This leaves a favorable attitude from participants, which may influence their answers in the survey. Therefore, it will be interesting to see how people’s purchase intentions might be impacted by a foreign brand personality profile.
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## Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7797</td>
<td>1.44361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.3172</td>
<td>1.39716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7533</td>
<td>1.20872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0396</td>
<td>1.52942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.3436</td>
<td>1.71562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrandPersonality</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0467</td>
<td>.99117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.3877</td>
<td>1.61832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.3700</td>
<td>1.86836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfConcept</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.3789</td>
<td>1.58801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4978</td>
<td>1.39333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.4273</td>
<td>1.84769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7533</td>
<td>1.50836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.4758</td>
<td>1.43997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrandTrust</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0385</td>
<td>1.30791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8899</td>
<td>1.65664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.8370</td>
<td>1.92672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0749</td>
<td>1.74950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.2687</td>
<td>1.66777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL5</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0088</td>
<td>1.55998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL6</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.2511</td>
<td>1.96506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrandLoyalty</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7217</td>
<td>1.45678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.7401</td>
<td>1.37562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7181</td>
<td>1.81190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.8370</td>
<td>1.74347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurchaseIntention</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.0984</td>
<td>1.44162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British/Welsh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Would you describe the brand as "sincere"?
2. Would you describe the brand as “exciting”?
3. Would you describe the brand as “competent”?
4. Would you describe the brand as “sophisticated”?
5. Would you describe the brand as “tough”?

Aaker (1996)

### Brand Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2 Nationality of respondents
| Brand Trust | 1. Do you trust this brand?  
  2. Do you rely on this brand?  
  3. Do you think the brand is honest?  
  4. Do you think this brand is a safe choice? | Chaudhuri & Holbrook (2001) |
| Brand Loyalty | 1. Is this brand your first choice?  
  2. Do you seek for an alternative of this brand?  
  3. Do you say positive things about this brand?  
  4. Do you recommend this brand to other people?  
  5. Do you think this brand brings good value to your money?  
  6. Do you consider yourself loyal to this brand? | Fullerton (2005); Algesheimer, Uptal, & Herrmann (2005) |
| Self-Concept | 1. To what extent does this brand describe yourself?  
  2. To what extent does this brand describe who you would like to be? | Manokhina & Melpignano (2018) |
### Purchase Intentions

1. Will you purchase products from this brand again?
2. Will you encourage other people to purchase from this brand?
3. Will you choose this brand over other brands in the market?

---

**Wang et al. (2013)**

### Appendix 3 Research questionnaire

### Appendix 4 Age distribution of respondents
The impacts of Brand Personality on Purchase Intentions

Hi there,
Thank you so much for participating in this survey :) 

* Required

How old are you? *

Your answer

What is your nationality? *

Your answer

What is your gender? *

- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say
- Other:

Please write down the first brand that comes to your mind *

Your answer

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSc7p3yLRlNQ7S0wqXIBwV5zWIf5FjPKsLz2SIE55LzkWy75w/viewform
The impacts of Brand Personality on Purchase Intentions

* Required

Please rate the following statement about the brand

Would you describe the brand as "sincere"? *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

Would you describe the brand as "exciting"? *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

Would you describe the brand as "competent"? *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

Would you describe the brand as "sophisticated"?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree
The impacts of Brand Personality on Purchase Intentions

* Required

Please rate the following statement about the brand

I trust this brand *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

I rely on this brand *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

This is an honest brand *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

This brand is a safe choice *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

BACK NEXT
The impacts of Brand Personality on Purchase Intentions

* Required

Please rate the following statement

Products from this brand will be my first choice *

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

I will not buy products from other brands if this brand is available at the store *

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

I say positive things about this brand to other people *

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree

I will recommend this brand to other people *

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly agree
The impacts of Brand Personality on Purchase Intentions

* Required

Please rate the following statement

I am likely to buy products from this brand again *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

I will encourage people to buy products from this brand *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

I will choose this brand over other brands in the market *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

BACK SUBMIT

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.
### Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfConcept</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrandTrust</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrandLoyalty</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>20.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a.\) Dependent Variable: PurchaseIntention

---

#### Appendix 6 Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BrandPersonality</th>
<th>SelfConcept</th>
<th>BrandTrust</th>
<th>BrandLoyalty</th>
<th>PurchaseIntention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BrandPersonality</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>.489**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelfConcept</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.693**</td>
<td>.661**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrandTrust</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>.693**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.723**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrandLoyalty</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.489**</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PurchaseIntention</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.611**</td>
<td>.667**</td>
<td>.906**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Appendix 7 Correlation Analysis