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Abstract

Do all Brands have the Green Signal to Go Green? A Study to understand the Impact of Brand Personality on the Acceptance of Green Products

Trusha Dalal
University of Guelph, 2017

Advisor: Dr. Towhidul Islam

Increased conversation about environment-friendly products has lead to more companies and brands trying to enter the green product category. In spite of this, green products face many barriers and consumers have misconceptions about them. This research posits that an effective branding strategy through brand personality can alleviate barriers to some extent. Even though the brand that makes the green products are an important predictor, not enough research has focused how the brand personality and image could impact the purchase intent of the brand. Findings suggest that exciting brands with higher levels of greenness than sincere brands. The mediation effect of brand affect was also studied and it was found that it had a non-significant impact on purchase intention. Findings from the study highlight the importance of brand strategy that needs to be considered in environment-friendly products.
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Introduction

The last couple of decades have witnessed a steady rise in the conversation around environment-friendly products and behaviours. This has been followed by an increase in consumer demand for such products as well. In general, 84% consumers claim that they buy green products at some point in their lives (Ottman, 2011). Millennials who claim that they are willing to pay more for green products has increased from 52% in 2014 to 72% in 2015 (Neilsen Global Survey of Corporate Social Responsibility, 2015). While this is great news for our society and ecology, businesses have benefitted from this as well because it has presented more opportunities for companies and brands to supply these products. For instance, beauty product giant, L’Oreal, bought The Body Shop for $1.1 billion in 2006 because The Body Shop is renowned for its ethical testing of products and using naturally-sourced, fair-trade ingredients (The Body Shop International PLC, 2017). The filing for ‘eco-friendly’ labels has doubled from 2006-2007 to 2016 (Georgetown Environmental Law Review, 2016). Additionally, many Consumer Packaged Goods (CPG) companies claim to make a conscious effort to reduce their carbon footprint and highlight sustainability as one of their key goals for the near future. For instance, the CEO of Unilever, Paul Poleman was quoted saying: “Our ambitions are to double our business, but to do that while reducing our environmental impact and footprint.” (Stern Business School, 2010).

Despite of the companies’ goodwill to fulfill social responsibilities by going green, consumers do not always adore these initiatives. Adoption of green products has barriers at both the firm and the product-level. Concerns of “greenwashing” (e.g. Laufer, 2003) and suspicions that companies inflate their green behaviours to charge a higher price (The Guardian, 2009) have tarnished the credibility of ‘green’. At the product level, negative stereotypes and misconceptions
are frequently associated with “green”, which undermine these products. Many studies have pointed out that environment-friendly products are seen to lack strength, efficacy and power (Luchs et al., 2010) or that buying green means that the consumer is ‘settling’ for the second-best product (Lin et al., 2013) or even that green behaviours are inherently feminine and thus, not for everyone (Brough et al., 2016).

The Neilsen Global Survey of Corporate Social Responsibility of 2015 showed that brands play a critical role in how the environment-friendly products are viewed. Of the eight drivers for purchase of green products identified, four of them were related to the company or brand that made the product, such as “The products are made by a brand/company that I trust”, “The product is from a company known for being environmentally-friendly”, “The product comes from a company known for its commitment to social value” and “The product is from a company known for its commitment to my community”. Marketing literature has focused heavily on product-related drivers for green products and barriers to their adoption but has not focused enough on how the branding strategy (such as brand personality, brand image or associations) of green products could affect their purchase intention. Marketing literature has well-established branding theories, which can be used to understand how the nature of brand could affect the purchase intent. More importantly, can an effective branding strategy help overcome some of the product-related stereotypes which make green products unpopular?

Thus, the purpose of this thesis is to understand what is the role of the brand personality in determining the purchase intention of a green product. Specifically, does a green product benefit more by being marketing under a certain brand personality and if so, what is the reason for this.
The results show that purchase intentions for highly green products with an exciting brand personality are higher than that of sincere brand personalities. This result highlights the importance of a branding strategy in the marketing of green products.

The rest of this thesis is organised as follows: it starts by reviewing literature of the green product category, consumer perceptions of green, brand personality and brand extensions and finally, brand affect. It then goes on to explain the hypotheses and conceptual framework, the methodology, results and then discussing results, followed by the contributions, limitations and avenues for future research.
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This section covers current literature on environmentally-friendly products, brand personality and brand affect. It starts by discussing the consumer perception of green products, factors influencing their purchase and possible reasons for slow adoption. It then goes on to build a case for the importance of branding keeping in mind existing brand personality and posits ways in which it could impact the acceptance of the green product.

2.1. The Green Product Category

2.1.1 Emergence of Green Product Category

The demand for organically grown foods, eco-friendly fibres and other biologically friendly products is consistently increasing; as many as 84% of consumers claim to buy ‘green’ products at some point in their lives (Ottman, 2011). More importantly, most consumers claim that they would always choose an environment-friendly product if it costs the same as the non-green counterpart (Lusch et al., 2010) and some of them indicate their willingness to pay a premium for these products (Trudel and Cotte, 2008). As a result, marketers feel pressure to keep adapting marketing practises to make them more sustainable, reduce the resources they use and seriously take into account pollution and waste management (Kotler, 2011). Moreover, marketers realise that consumers today start to focus on a new dimension to assess brand equity, namely, how well the brand fulfills its social responsibilities (Kotler, 2011). These developments in consumer interests has not only urged marketers to be more socially responsible, but also provided them with the chances to being so, such as developing and introducing green products (Wong et al., 1996; Ottman, 2011).

2.1.2. What makes a product ‘Green’?
Another aspect to be considered is the perceived ‘greenness’ of a green product or what characteristic of a product gives it the label of being green? In other words, the greenness of a green product is the extent to which the effects and benefits stem from the core or peripheral attributes of that product (Gershoff and Frels, 2015). An attribute is seen as central to the product if that attribute is important and relevant to the identification of that product or category (Sloman et al., 1998). Certain attributes are so core to a product or category, that they are considered immutable to that category (Sloman et al., 1998). For instance, roundness is an immutable attribute of wheels because without the quality of roundness, a wheel does not maintain its status as a wheel. However, for a plate, the roundness is mutable attribute and changing this attribute would not necessarily change one’s mental representation of a plate as plates can be of different shapes.

Therefore, if a product has a core attribute which is considered green, then the ‘greenness’ of the product is deemed to be higher (Gershoff and Frels, 2015) because it manages to maintain its green quality through its core green attribute or green features (Sloman et al., 1998). If the green attribute or feature is made more peripheral to the product, then its ‘greenness’ reduces (Gershoff and Frels, 2015). For instance, a ceiling fan which has blades made from recycled material would seen as having higher ‘greenness’ than a fan which uses recycled materials for its electrical wiring because the blades of a fan are a more central feature for identifying a fan in comparison to the electrical wiring used for the fan. In their study, Gershoff and Frehls (2015) manipulated the green feature either as a central or a peripheral attribute which clearly impacted the level of greenness which consumers perceived. This finding was reinforced even when they manipulated the amount of information provided regarding the green feature. When the green feature was central and additional information was provided, consumers saw it as having higher greenness whereas when
A green feature was peripheral and additional information was provided on that feature, it did not make the product seem higher in greenness. For example, when consumers are told that the ceiling fan is made from recycled material and then told that the blades move with higher speed, making the effect of the fan stronger, consumers saw this fan as more green than when they were given additional information about the electrical wiring of the fan enhancing the fan’s performance.

The ‘greenness’ of the product should also extend to the green benefits which consumers perceive the product to have, i.e., a product which is seen as more green would also be perceived as more beneficial to the environment. Arguably then, a product which has higher ‘greenness’ and is perceived to more beneficial to the environment, would also represent the characteristics associated with green products more explicitly than products which are relatively lower on ‘greenness’ (Fazio et al., 1986). Fazio and his colleagues (1986) claim that the activation of an attitude for an object depends on how strongly associations for it have been formed. Therefore, in the case of green products, we can say that a product which has been evaluated as a green product has strong associations of ‘greenness’ and green characteristics which has lead to the product being evaluated as green.

Research on green products and environmental-friendly benefits has been continuously growing. A majority of the research focuses on uncovering what make green products more accepted at the product-level. However, other aspects of marketing the product, particularly the effect branding can have on the marketing of green products needs to be explored further. These brand-related factors could potentially mitigate the barriers associated with green products and help increase their adoption.
2.1.3. Factors and Challenges affecting Adoption of Green Products

According to Wong et al. (1996), consumers’ adoption of green technology depends on three key factors, consumer taste and preferences (i.e., demand), firms and companies’ decisions (i.e., supply) which is responsible for creating and making the products available, promoting and pricing products to match the demand and lastly, government policies and regulations as they have the scope to impact the behaviour of consumers and firms.

Challenges at the Firm-level

Zinkhan and Carlson (1995) identified issues such as false advertising, the absence of clear standards to assess eco-friendly claims made by brands and a general tendency to view corporations as negative, especially on issues such as the environment. Even as early as 1991, a survey by the Environmental Research Association uncovered that 47% of consumers tend to view claims of eco-friendly and green as ‘gimmicky’ and therefore, tend to disregard them. Sociologists and activists (e.g. Laufer, 2003) have written extensively about giant corporations whose environmental claims for their products and manufacturing practices are false, manipulative and constantly skirt ethical laws. Many companies have been accused of deceptive advertising of green products (Frankel, 1992) where brands pose about their green practices but solely with the intention to manage their public profile.

While there is a solid basis to these reports, it has created an additional challenge for most brands to manufacture and market green products. There exists a general sense of skepticism and sometimes, outright dismissal of green products from established firms and brands (Carlson et al.,
Brands in the green product category have to try doubly harder because of the general perception that corporations, only take actions for certain ulterior motives, they are the cause of many issues in society and this makes them question the brand’s intentions and the corporations “switching sides” lacks credibility in the eyes of the consumers (Frankel, 1992). Moreover, poor product performance in the past in being ‘green’ makes it counter-intuitive for consumers to believe in such brands because they feel “mislead” (Medelson and Polansky, 1995).

Other literature also supports this notion that marketing of environment-friendly products is plagued with three key issues namely: consumer cynicism, consumer confusion and low credibility (Carlson et al., 1993). False or confusing labeling of green products leads to anger and estrangement from such products and brands (Frankel, 1992). Apart from what the brand presents outwardly to its consumers, the internal culture of the firm also impacts the perception where firms manufacture and promote their environment-friendly products but do not integrate ‘green’ practices into their corporate culture (Medelson and Polansky, 1995). As a result, there is a lack of consistency in which the firm operates where ‘green’ products are continued to be promoted along with their not-so-green counterparts, the manufacturing of the products and their disposal is not in keeping with ‘green’ practices.

**Challenges at the Product-Level**

Consumers claim that they try to buy green products. They are likely to be more involved and invested in the decision making process for green products, are likely to spend time looking
for information for these purchases because it requires them to use more conscious decision making processes (Thorgensen et al., 2012). For most consumers, choosing a green product requires careful justification. They not only consider the utilities of the product itself but also how beneficial it is to the environment if using this product (Thorgensen et al., 2012). Early adoption of green products and services is also associated with the social visibility of the product and consumers’ need to show that they conscientious (Arkesteijn and Oerlemans, 2005). Individuals who feel responsible for making improvements to the environment are also more likely to buy into green products and services (Ellen et al., 1991).

On one hand, consumers believe that it is important to integrate green products into their lifestyle. However, factors such as inconvenience of product use, limited access and increased personal effort are likely to deter consumers from purchasing and using environmental friendly products or services (Follows and Jobbers, 2000). For example, the use of solar-power water heaters might not be as commonplace as electric heaters because solar heaters might take longer to heat the water or the dependency on the sun’s heat might create uncertainty regarding the process. In addition, green products usually cost more than their non-green counterparts, making price an important limitation to product adoption (Tseng & Hung, 2013). The perceived quality of the green products is also thought to be compromised because they may use ‘green’ raw material instead of the best raw material, i.e., consumers often perceive using green products as a trade-off that they are unwilling to make (Lin et al., 2013).

Brand managers are also of the opinion that it is not only the ‘green’ attribute of the product but also other product attributes such as image, performance, etc. which determine the whether
consumers will choose the green product (Wong et al., 1996). Manufacturers and marketers of green products need to pay attention to how they present the green products - effective and accurate labeling, educating all the stakeholders involved including the distributors and retailers, building infrastructure to ensure the use of green products can be seamless and most importantly, ensure that the claims made about the green characteristics are adhered to (Frankel, 1992). Thus, branding of green products is critical because it also needs to differentiate itself from the clutter and competition - be it its other ‘green’ or non-green competitors. Even as early as the 90s, managers believed that effective branding and positioning statements were critical to create demand for green products. This approach also alleviates consumers’ skepticism about the efficacy of green products (Wong et al., 1996). In the past, appealing solely to a consumer’s environmental concern was not seen as an effective strategy to enhance product adoption. Instead, consumers’ general environmental concern (GEC) only has a weak correlation with the intention to buy green products, and is identified as a distant determinant of purchase intention (Alwitt and Pitts, 1996). It only effects through mediators like consumers attitudes towards the green products, their perception of the consequences of usage, and the particular environmental attributes the product possesses. Recent research suggests that factors such as word-of-mouth and consumers’ past experience with green products could also impact the adoption of new green products in the market (Pickett-Baker & Ozaki, 2008).

In sum, consumers show interest in green products but do not follow through on this. Firms need to show the value of green products to the consumers not only at the product-level but also at the brand level. This could ensure that it is differentiated from its counterparts and overcome some of the barriers associated with ‘green’.
2.1.4. Perceptions and Misconceptions associated with Green Products

When it comes to green products, the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) by Azjen (1991) dictates that consumers who are deliberate, morally-inclined and conscious are more likely to buy green products. This would also imply that the product category of green or environment-friendly products in itself portrays these qualities and characteristics.

A survey conducted in the US in 2001 showed that consumers associated green products with values such as ‘safe’, ‘friendly’ and “protective” (Gildea, 2001). This was reinforced in a more recent study by Luchs et al. (2010), where they found that almost half the respondents noted that green products show traits such as safety, health and gentleness. For instance, they supported statements such as green products are ‘safer for you and your family’, they are ‘better for you’ and that they are ‘more gentle on a person’s body’. However, this study is also instrumental in pointing out the downside of green. Luchs et al. (2010) found that when strength is an important criterion for evaluating a product, consumers do not choose an environment-friendly product and their concern for sustainability becomes secondary. However, this effect is reversed when consumers seek gentleness.

More recent studies have also reinforced this notion. For instance, Brough et al. (2016) consistently find that greenness has a clearly and strongly associated with femininity. By extension, femininity is traditionally associated with values such as being gentle, sensitive and caring (Spence and Helmreich, 1979). Furthermore, caring for the environment represents values
such as nurturance, altruism and cooperation (Brough et al., 2016). This is seen to have its roots in other stereotypes of behaviours such as cleaning, maintenance of family health and food habits being associated with women. As an extension of this, participating in green behaviours is also seen as being more feminine by both genders. Not only are green products and behaviours seen as being more feminine, but even consumers view themselves as being more feminine when partaking in green behaviours. This often discourages consumers, especially men, from participating in green behaviours and buying green products in order to protect their masculine gender identity (Brough et al., 2016).

Moreover, when the male consumer’s masculine identity was affirmed and protected, it lead to a positive predisposition to green. In this study, Brough et al. (2016) asked consumers to donate to green non profit companies. One company was branded in a more masculine manner with bold fonts, darker colours and words with masculine connotations. Male consumers were also more likely to donate to a green nonprofit when the company adopted masculine branding rather than conventional green branding. This finding points to an explicit set of values linked with green products and these often act as barriers to their adoption. More importantly, it shows that effective branding which is inconsistent with preconceived notions of green can be used to overcome these barriers.

Additionally, consumers perceive non-profit, socially-conscious firms to be warm, generous, trustworthy and sincere while lacking in qualities such as efficacy, efficiency and competence (Aaker, Vohs and Mogilner, 2010). In their study, Aaker et al. (2010) found that consumers were more willing to buy from for-profit firms than non-profit firms because they were
perceived to be more capable and effective. Elevating the perceived competency of non-profits required additional help in the form of money priming or celebrity endorsements. While this study is not specifically about green products, the trait of social conscious and doing good is common for both green products and non-profit firms. Additionally, descriptors such as warm and gentle has been applied to green products as well. As a result, similar barriers plague the green product category and similar negative associations are made with the category.

These findings identify important barriers and misconceptions for green products. Both Brough et al. (2016) and Aaker et al. (2010) identified barriers and introduced a new aspect in order to overcome this barrier. This clearly points that it is critical for a new dimension in the marketing of green products to overcome these associations.

2.2. Brand Extensions

According to Keller (2003), more than 80 percent of firms choose to use current brands and extend them to new products and product categories. While there may be some risk involved if the decision leads to a mismatched extension which undoes the established benefits (Martinez and de Chernatony, 2004), the perks outweigh the risks. Firms and consumers both benefit from the established familiarity, knowledge, reputation and image of and associations with the brand, (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Milberg et al., 1997) and it also reduces marketing costs and the likelihood of failure (Keller, 2003). All of these reasons make brand extensions an attractive strategy for firms.
In general, brand extensions are opted for because of the value, associations and perceived quality that the original brand can carry forward to the new product line and will mitigate the risk of buying a seemingly unknown product (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Martinez and Pina, 2010). However, the fit between the perceived fit between the original and extended brand have implications for the attitude to the brand; greater the perceived fit, more positive the evaluation of the extension (Martinez and Pina, 2010) because of which the extension is also seen to be more successful (Vo’lckner and Sattler, 2006). The positive reaction to a perceived fit can be attributed to consumers seeing the new product as more credible in terms of quality, performance and its perceived value to them which makes it more likely for consumers to accept and adopt the new products (Buil et al., 2009).

Consumers need to see how the brand traits are salient to the new product and that they have a role in highlighting the benefits of the new product extensions for the extension to be viewed positively (Vo’lckner and Sattler, 2006). While fit is usually evaluated basis the consumers’ perception of it, firms can attempt to establish the fit at different levels: concrete attributes, abstract imagery or personality traits (Batra et al., 1993; Batra et al., 2010; Park et al., 1991). A successful extension also shows the new product’s ability to include the existing brand associations and brand perception (Buil et al., 2009). This ability actually comes down to whether consumers can imagine the current brand associations as being relevant to the new product. When the brand characteristics is seen to be more relevant, the reaction to the extension is more positive (Park et al., 1991). Perceived fit is seen when the parent brand characteristics are a good fit with the new category that brand enters into (Spiggle et al., 2012).
Specific aspects about the brand are also critical in determining the success of the brand extension. It was found that brand-specific associations can be so dominant in shifting consumer perception that it overshadows the effect of similarity with product category (Broniarczyk and Alba, 1994). Therefore, is it possible that the brand associations and brand personality traits are dominant enough to overshadow the characteristics associated with green products? Fit and relevance have been studied extensively in brand extension literature. However, what also needs to be looked into is situations in which the brand characteristics and product qualities can determine whether the decision of a product extension to a new category would be viable. In general, prosocial behaviour and activities have proven to create a positive perception of the brand by communicating values such as honesty, benevolence, integrity and reliability (Olsen et al., 2014). However, it is these same qualities which sometimes hold back the cause of sustainable products. Therefore, in this case, the product category could benefit from a branding strategy which overcomes these traits.

2.3. Why Brand Personality Matters

Communicating one’s brand personality is a key part of the branding process and could play an important role in creating the intended perception. Brand Personality is defined “as a set of human characteristics associated with a brand” (Aaker, 1997). Brand Personality can be measured using a scale with 42 traits developed by Aaker (1997) called the Brand Personality Scale. The key personality dimensions that all brands are categorised under are Sincerity, Excitement, Competence, Sophistication and Ruggedness (Aaker, 1997). A large body of research has been done to assess the benefits of brand personality.
From the firm’s perspective, there are many advantages in having a clear and cohesive brand personality. First, it helps a brand create product value for consumers that goes beyond the purview of functional benefits. A personality helps the brand differentiate itself from competition on deeper, more meaningful parameters because they are more difficult to imitate by competition (Kum et al., 2012).

Second, it makes it easier for a brand to undertake product extensions because the personality acts as a constant across different categories and carries brand values forward (Kum et al., 2012). Brand extensions are likely to be more successful when the brand personality of the parent brand is effectively transferred to new/extended brand (Nhat Hahn Le et al., 2012). It helps consumers draw the positives of the parent brand and apply it to the extension and this leads directly to the third advantage: brand personality plays a critical role in setting expectations for consumers in terms of how the brand is likely to communicate and interact with its consumers.

Third, when a brand personality is appealing, it is also seen to have a positive effect on the purchase intention of that brand (Wang and Yang, 2008). Consumers decide and make choices about the brands basis associations they form with the brand. In comparison to these brand personality associations, product features and physical attributes have a relatively weak correlation with product choice (Dick et al., 1990). Even the relationship between brand personality and attachment styles has been studied: Individuals who have attachment style of high anxiety and high avoidance tend to be drawn to exciting brands whereas individuals with high anxiety and low avoidance attachment styles gravitate towards sincere brands (Swaminathan et al., 2009).
underlying purpose for this research was to show that brand personalities can positively influence purchase intention by helping consumers express themselves and reach their ideal self (Belk, 1988).

Fourth, brand personality is an important predictor of consumer reactions to a brands’ persuasion attempts as it creates consumer expectations about the brand. For instance, when flattery is used by sincere brands as a form of persuasion, consumers respond negatively (i.e., felt disappointed) because this strategy is seen with manipulative motives, as it is inconsistent with consumers’ expectations about sincere brands, such as trust, honesty, and dependability (Guèvremont and Grohmann, 2013). However, the same persuasion strategy may work for exciting brands. This is because flattery may not be perceived as manipulative and thus negative. In fact, consumers expect exciting brands to have some self-serving motives behind their actions and therefore, the attitude to the exciting brand does not suffer as a result of flattery (Guèvremont and Grohmann, 2013). More importantly, it shows that consumers expect a certain level of surprise or transgressions or unexpected actions from exciting brands.

A parallel finding was seen in Sundar and Noseworthy’s (2016) study where the brand personality along with sensory confirmation determined the purchase intention of the product. When a sincere brand leads to sensory confirmation, the attitudes to the brand were favourable but when an exciting brand behaved inconsistent with the sensory expectations, consumers responded more favourably. With sincere brands, consumers expect sensory confirmation and when they do not see this, consumers feel that the brand is inauthentic and therefore, respond negatively to the brand. However, for exciting brands, consumers expect a sensory disconfirmation because it is in
sync with how they expect the brand to behave. Consequently, sensory disconfirmation is seen as authentic for exciting brands, which then increases consumers’ purchase intention. This study highlights the role of brand personality in setting expectations for consumers about whether the brand is behaving authentically, i.e., being true to its nature (Aaker, 1997; Aaker et al., 2004; Beverland, 2005; 2006).

The basis for flattery and sensory disconfirmation in brand personalities lies in Aaker et al.’s (2004) study where the focus was on the effect of transgressions of brand personalities on brand relationships. The traits associated with sincere brands make them more amenable to more long-term and stronger relationships in comparison to exciting brands which are seen to be more fitting for transitory yet elating relationships. The means through which they are able to establish relationships – sincere brands do it through being honest, trustworthy and dependable whereas exciting brands do it through being attractive and vivacious (Aaker et al., 2004). Actions that seem to be out of sync with the brand’s personality, would have a negative impact on the attitude towards sincere brands but this effect was not seen for exciting brands (Aaker et al., 2004).

The fact that most research focuses on the comparison between the ‘sincere’ and ‘exciting’ brand personalities is because of the vast difference between these two brands and the variance explained by these personalities (Aaker et al., 2004; Guèvremont & Grohmann, 2013). Additionally, these brand personalities have a higher potential to establish relationships with their consumers (Aaker et al., 2004) and the characteristics they exhibit when it comes to forming these relationships (Fletcher et al., 1999). Even in practice, many popular brands tend to be categorised as one of these two brand personalities For instance, in the product category of soda, Pepsi and
Mountain Dew would be categorized as exciting brands. Their communication and messaging is about youth, fun and independence. Other examples of exciting brands are MTV and Red Bull. Coca Cola, on the other hand, would be categorized as a sincere brand with its focus on togetherness, sharing and wholesomeness. Another popular sincere brand is Hallmark (Aaker, 1997; Aaker et al., 2004).

Often, firms choose to launch their brands as sincere brands in order to be perceived as more caring, down-to-earth, gentle and warm (Aaker, 1997; Aaker et al., 2004). These brands also reflect traits such as warmth, nurturance, trustworthiness and reliability (Aaker, 1997; Aaker, 1999). On the other hand, ‘exciting’ brands are energetic, youthful, attention seeking, aim to be unique and break the mold in their marketing mix (Aaker, 1997; Aaker et al., 2004). These brands are also associated with labels such as cool, trendy and being bold (Guèvremont & Grohmann, 2013) yet relationships with these brands are not based on trust or dependability but on being intriguing, attractive and lively (Aaker et al., 2004). Interestingly, the equivalent of exciting brand personality in human personality dimension is extraversion (Aaker, 1997) and extraversion as a personality trait is associated with behaviours such as being expressive, social and assertive (McCrae and Costa, 1991). Advertising from exciting brands is also said to be more interesting, entertaining and enjoyable. Additionally, the exciting brand personality is associated with feelings of uniqueness and change, i.e., its ability to create a positive disruption from what is expected (Sung and Kim, 2010).

One key issue which emerges in brand personality, especially in practice, is maintaining the sync between the intended (what brand managers intend) and the realised (what consumers
perceive) brand personality (Malar et al., 2012). The key to establish and maintain this lies in five factors identified in Malar et al.’s (2012) study: singularity of brand personality, competitive differentiation of brand, credibility of brand-related communication, consumer’s product involvement and consumers’ prior brand attitude. In the present study, singularity and consumers’ prior brand attitude are relevant – it is important to maintain singularity when the brand decides to enter the green product category actions and the brand needs to consider the impact of how the consumer’s prior attitude to the brand will affect their perception of the decision to enter the green product category. These are important aspects to consider, especially given that consumers use the schema of the brand to create opinions about the new product’s attributes and benefits (Lau and Phau, 2007).

4. Schema Incongruity and Brand Affect

For a brand that chooses to enter the green product category, overcoming its stereotypes and barriers is a challenge. Thus, the extension needs to be planned in a way to ensure that the brand will elevate the appeal of the green product. Previous research has shown that there is a need to overcome some negative associations of the category.

“Schema incongruity is a case of interrupted expectations and predictions” (Mandler, 1982; pp. 21). Moderate schema incongruity (compared to congruence) is seen as interesting and thus, leads to positive evaluation. In such cases, individuals have to accommodate the inconsistency and make the effort to fit the inconsistency with preexisting schemas. When individuals are able to resolve the inconsistency successfully, they feel rewarded and are likely to make positive
evaluations. However, in cases of extreme incongruity, the added effort to process leads to the opposite effect. This effort requires individuals to make adjustments to deep-seated schemas which leads to negative evaluation (Mandler, 1982; Meyers-Levy et al., 1994).

An example of this phenomenon is seen in Meyers-Levy et al.’s (1994) study on brand name congruency in brand extensions. Products that were moderately incongruent with their brand names, had higher preference than when the products were extremely congruent or completely incongruent with their brand names. The underlying mechanism here was greater elaboration to process the incongruency and successfully reconciling the incongruency.

Moreover, in situations of schema incongruity, the autonomous nervous system (ANS) experiences arousal which leads to affect. In other words, individuals make evaluations in accordance with this physiological arousal. The valence of the affect (positive or negative) depends on the context and situation in which this happens (Mandler, 1982).

Affect plays an important role in creating brand recall and recognition as the memory is retrieved basis the emotion experienced (Sung and Kim, 2010). In general, affect or emotion plays an important role in creating mental representations of any kind of stimuli – be it an incident, a person or an advertisement (Bower and Forgas, 2001). This is important for branding and communication because any experience or interaction with the brand will be affected by the ‘emotional’ or ‘affective’ aspect of the brand to make it more entrenched in consumer’s mind (Sung and Kim, 2010).

Brand Affect is emotion that consumers have and express for the brand based on
experience, interaction or use with the brand (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Kabadayi and Alan, 2012). Brand affect also has a positive impact on purchase and attitudinal loyalty (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001) thus, showing that brand affect contributes positively to the brand and its products’ perception. Positive affect elicited by a brand also leads to a stronger connection and commitment towards the brand (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001). Similar findings were reported by Dick and Basu (1994) who observed that positive affect and mood lead to higher brand loyalty. This is because they make consumers feel happy and joyful, which increases the brand’s purchase loyalty (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001).

Brand affect has a positive relationship with the nature of the product. Chaudhuri and Holdbrook (2002) found that as the ratio of hedonic to utilitarian value of a product increases, the brand affect also increases. Moreover, they also found that brand affect also increases as the emotional brand-choice risk increases. Here, an emotional brand-choice risk is the risk that a consumer faces when he/she has to choose between brands based on factors that are psychologically involving such as status or self-image.

In Sung and Kim’s (2010) study, they found that the exciting brand personality has a strong influence on creating positive brand affect. The excitement personality dimension is associated with traits of uniqueness, imagination and spiritedness (Aaker, 2007) which lead to consumers feeling excited, captivated and drawn to the brand (Sung and Kim, 2010). On the other hand, sincere brands have a stronger impact on creating brand trust as opposed to brand affect (Sung and Kim, 2010). As an extension of this, brand personality of potential employers plays a role in attracting employees to a firm; specifically, sincere employers create attractiveness for themselves.
through brand trust whereas exciting and rugged employer personalities create attractiveness through brand affect (Rampl and Kenning, 2014).

The literature on schema congruity shows that when there is incongruity, it leads to arousal and individuals make judgements based on affect produced. The valence of this affect depends on the context. In the context of an exciting brand personality which is positively associated with positive brand affect, we can assume that the valence of affect here would be positive and would also lead to more positive evaluation and higher purchase intention.

Summary of Research Gaps

This research attempts to answer a substantive question of whether a particular brand personality would benefit the green product category. It also tries to address certain gaps in extant literature. First, most research regarding green products has been in the context of the product itself
without much specific focus on the impact that branding can have on the reception of these products. Therefore, this research will uncover the important role of branding of green products. This can be especially relevant given that consumers show intention to buy green products but stereotypical ideas about the product category are deal breakers. The importance of branding through brand personality could make green products more appealing by negating certain misconceptions and creating a more positive predisposition to it.

Second, research so far has looked at green product adoption from the point of view of the consumer but little attention has been paid to what being the green product space means for the business and the brand. Being able to foresee whether a green product under a certain brand name will be adopted or not, would help the brand determine whether it should even enter that product category or not. This question is addressed by looking into and filling a gap in brand extension literature, i.e., when a brand chooses to enter into a new product category or benefit space, what is the impact of the brand characteristics and already existing brand personality that affects how this extension is perceived.

Chapter 3: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

There is a strong demand from consumers for green products and the environment-conscious mentality is constantly growing. This urges brands to enter the category of green products. However, given the slow adoption of the green products, there needs to be more careful
consideration and strategy around what kind of brands should enter this product category. It is critical to have a cohesive branding strategy and implementation of the strategy to successfully market green products (Pujari and Wright, 1996). We also know that making a choice to buy a green product requires additional cognitive resources on the consumers’ part (Thorgensen et al., 2012). Therefore, a branding it with an exciting brand could help overcome this. In general, an important purpose of a brand is to influence consumer attitudes (Picket-Becker and Ozaki, 2008) by taking the product’s features (rational aspect) and transform that into a product with an emotional or social aspect (Travis, 2000).

Green products have their own qualities and characteristics (Gildea, 2001; Aaker et al., 2010; Lusch et al., 2010; Brough et al., 2016). Unfortunately, many of these traits are also seen as flaws of the product category, create misconceptions about green products and are reasons for their slow adoption. A green product that has a core attribute as ‘green’ is said to be more green and therefore, embody more green characteristics (Gershoff and Frehls, 2015). Brand personalities create expectations and set precedence for the direction in which the brand grows (Aaker, 1997). ‘Sincere’ brand personalities represent characteristics such as being down-to-earth, honest, wholesome and cheerful (Aaker, 1997). However, these characteristics are more likely to reinforce the stereotypes and negative notions related to green products. A body of research has been conducted to show that consumers perceive environment-friendly products to be less efficacious and less potent largely due to the nurturing, gentle characteristics associated with the product category (e.g. Lusch et al., 2010). Sincere brands have a similar set of characteristics associated with it: mild and down-to-earth. Thus, it is possible that under a sincere brand, the ‘less efficacious’ and ‘less potent’ perception of green products is further reinforced for high green products, and
could lead to a lower purchase intention for those products. Characteristics associated with a sincere brand personality are too similar to the ‘gentle’ characteristic of green products and do not counteract the stereotypical notion of green being less effective or too feminine.

On the other hand, ‘exciting’ brands which show characteristics such as daring, spirited, imaginative and up-to-date (Aaker, 1997) and are more likely to steer consumers attention away from these perceptions. A product extension from an exciting brand personality increases the legitimacy of green products by negating stereotypes associated with them. When an exciting brand launches a product with higher ‘greenness’, the ‘cool’, ‘trendy’, and ‘imaginative’ aspects of its personality could help to counter some of the negative perceptions of green products. Moreover, when exciting brands act in manner that is unexpected of them, it leads to a positive disconfirmation and increases the overall appeal and is therefore, likely to increase the purchase intention of a green product from an exciting brand.

The characteristics of green products and exciting brand personality are not completely in sync. However, when consumers perceive something as being moderately incongruent, they are likely to evaluate it positively (Mandler, 1982). The fact that they resolved something that is seemingly incongruent, leads to positive evaluations because they feel rewarded for resolving the incongruency (Mandler, 1982). Therefore, when an exciting brand has a product with high greenness (rather than low greenness), it is seen as inconsistent. The schema for an exciting brand is unique, daring and spirited whereas the schema for a green product is safe, gentle and sensitive. In accordance with the schema congruity theory, consumers would resolve this incongruency successfully by accommodating their schemas to fit this incongruency. Making this effort leads to
consumers feeling rewarded and positive which would lead to higher purchase intention for these products. However, idea of a sincere brands with high greenness product (rather than low greenness), is completely congruent and possibly, too predictable. This does not require consumers to resolve any incongruency and thus, does not lead to higher affect and higher purchase intention. Schema incongruency also leads to arousal that leads to making evaluations based on affect. The valence of this affect depends on the context in which the incongruence is presented (Mandler, 1982; Clark and Fiske, 1984). Given that exciting brands are associated with positive brand affect (Sung and Kim, 2010), exciting brands with high greenness will lead to more positive brand affect that leads to higher purchase intention.
Figure 1a: Conceptual Model for Moderating Effect

H1a: *Brand Personality* (Mo) will moderate the relationship between *Greenness*(X) and *Purchase Intension* (Y) such that an exciting brand with high greenness has a positive impact on purchase intention than exciting brand with low greenness

H1b: When a sincere brand has a product with low greenness, it positively impacts purchase intention than when it has a product with high greenness
H2: Brand Affect (Me) will mediate the proposed moderation effect of Greenness and Brand Personality (X*Mo) i.e. there will be significant indirect effect of X*Mo on Purchase Intention (Y) through Me such that Me will fully (or partially) mediate when Brand is Exciting & Product is High on Greenness compared to when Product is Low on Greenness.

Chapter 4: PROPOSED METHODOLOGY
**Stimulus**

The stimulus will be presented to participants in the form of a print advertisement or poster, one similar to consumers are likely to see in magazines or newspapers. For the purpose of the study, backpacks will be used as the product category for which a green is being launched. Backpacks are fairly involved purchase, their branding matters and can be easily modified to being green products. Moreover, backpacks are familiar and relevant to the sample used in the study. The backpacks will be presented to participants under two types of branding: sincere brands or exciting brands. Hypothetical brands will be created for the study to ensure that existing perceptions and experiences with known brands do not interfere with the study. The brand personalities will be created basis the instructions of Aaker (1997) and Aaker et al. (2004) and as it was used in Sundar and Noseworthy’s (2016) study as well. Relevant measures will be taken to ensure that the brands created represent either sincere or exciting brands including: use of logo pictures, font, background colour and photos used.

For greenness (high versus low), Gershoff and Frier’s (2015) steps will be used to create the stimulus. High level of greenness will be manipulated by making the core feature in the backpack green - i.e., the material from which the bag is made including the straps. Low level of greenness will be manipulated by making a peripheral feature of the product green - i.e., the zippers, clasps, etc.

A pre-test will be done for both, greenness level (high versus low) as well as brand personality (sincere vs. exciting) to ensure that they represent the variable they are meant to.
**Pre-tests**

For Greenness: Participants will be shown any one of two greenness levels - high and low. High level of greenness will be manipulated as the core attribute being green while low level will be manipulated as the peripheral attribute being green. Participants will be asked to fill in the survey similar to the one used in Gershoff and Frier’s (2015) study to indicate the perceived greenness in both.

For Brand Personality:

Four versions of the brand personality were tested - two versions of sincere brands and two versions of exciting brands. Then, they were asked to complete Aaker’s (1997) brand personality scale. The versions which score higher on the exciting and sincere dimensions respectively, was taken forward into the main study.

**Main Study**

**Procedure**

The purpose of the study is to understand if there is an interaction between brand personality and level of greenness, its impact on purchase intention of the green product and if brand affect drives this interaction.

This study uses a between subjects’ design where each participant will be randomly assigned to one of four conditions: 2 (sincere vs. exciting) X 2 (high vs. low).

First participants are shown the information about the brand which communicates the brand personality without any information about the product. Participants will be exposed to any one of
the brand personalities in the form of a print advertisement for each of the brands. The brand personalities will be subject to a pre-test to ensure that they fulfill the criteria of being either a sincere or an exciting brand. First, participants will be shown the brand personality poster without the green product description. This is done to ensure that participants create a brand personality perception before seeing the green product description so that they see the product in light of the brand personality. Once participants have done this, they will be exposed to the brand personality along with the green product description. The green product descriptions will be pre-tested to ensure that they represent the level of greenness they are meant to. Participants will then be given a survey to fill out to assess their purchase intention, the likelihood of recommendation to others, etc. This survey will also include 2-3 open ended questions regarding the reason for stating the purchase intention and areas of improvement. Then, participants will be asked to fill out the Brand Affect Scale as used in Sung and Kim’s (2010) study. The participants will then be debriefed and thanked for their participation in the study.
Chapter 5: PRETESTS

Pre-tests were conducted in order to finalise the stimulus for the sincere and exciting versions of brand personalities as well as for the high and low green conditions.

5.1. Pre-tests for Brand Personality

For each of the brand personality conditions, multiple versions were tested to finalise the stimulus to represent sincere and exciting brands. The stimulus was designed as per instructions and steps followed by Aaker et al., (2004) and Sundar and Noseworthy (2016) in their papers. The original brand personality scale from Aaker’s (1997) paper was adapted to measure the sincerity and exciting brand personalities by selecting certain items to operationalise each personality dimension. These were selected by conducting a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The scale used was a 7-point scale (1 – Strongly Disagree to 7 – Strong Agree). Each manipulation of the sincerity brand personality was tested not only for its sincerity scores but also for its exciting scores to ensure that it is low on the exciting dimension. The same process was followed for the exciting manipulations.

The sincerity scale (sincere, down-to-earth, friendly and cheerful) had a reliability of 0.83. The results from the pre-tests showed the following results (Figure 2): for sincere brand personality, manipulation 2 (circle of friends) emerged as the strongest manipulation with a mean sincerity score of $M=5.79$, $t=-4.18$, $p=0.001$ in comparison to a mean sincerity score of $M=4.68$, $t=-2.49$, $p=0.026$ for students with books (manipulation 1). The circle of friends also had a
significantly different exciting score of 4.3.

![Figure 2: Pretest results for stimulus for Sincere Personality manipulation](image)

The exciting scale (exciting, spirited and young) has a high reliability score of 0.89. The results showed that the Skydiving manipulation was the winner (Figure 3): mean exciting score for skydiving was $M=5.10$. We also ensured that the mean scores sincerity were low for the exciting manipulation; where the score for skydiving was 4.27 and was nearly significantly different from the exciting score, $t=2.65$, $p=0.07$. The mean exciting score for space tourism was $M=4.39$, and the sincerity score was $M=4.04$, $t=0.247$, $p=0.80$. 
Figure 3: Pretest results for stimulus for Exciting Personality manipulation

5.2. Pre-tests for Greenness

Pre-tests were also conducted for finalising the stimulus for the greenness high versus low conditions. The stimulus was created using Gershoff and Frehl’s (2015) findings, i.e., a product with high greenness has a green benefit that is associated with a central attribute of the product and low greenness has a green benefit associated with a peripheral attribute of the product. The green benefit was expressed in terms of the energy which would be saved as a result of using recycled materials for the product. Two products were pretested and each product had a high and low condition – water bottle and backpack. The scale used in Gershoff and Frehl’s (2015) study was also used here to assess the strength of the manipulation, i.e., assess the level of greenness for each. The level of greenness was manipulated as high versus low as per instructions from Gershoff.
and Frehl’s (2015) study with some adaptations.

The scale included questions such as ‘this product deserves to be labelled ‘environmental-friendly’, ‘using this product could prevent further harm to the other environment’, ‘purchasing this product is a good environmental choice” and ‘A person who cares about the environment, would buy this product’. The scale used was a 7-point scale (1 – Strongly Disagree to 7 – Strong Agree). Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that all the items loaded on the same factor and had a reliability of 0.85. The results showed that the high and low greenness conditions were different from each other for the backpacks but not for the water bottles (p=0.50). The results of the manipulation for backpack are shown in Figure 4, where the high greenness condition (M=5.74) is significantly higher than the greenness level of the low condition (M=3.88), t=5.81, p=0.001. Therefore, this manipulation was taken forward into the main study.

![Figure 4: Pretest results for stimulus for Greenness manipulation](image-url)
The study was a between subjects 2 (Sincere vs. Exciting) X 2 (High greenness vs. Low Greenness) design. Brand personality conditions were manipulated following the instructions of Aaker (1997) and Aaker et al. (2004) and finalised in the pretests. Greenness conditions were manipulated using Gershoff and Frehl’s (2015) study and was finalised basis the pretests. The required sample was calculated using G-Power using an effect size 0.25 (medium effect size), a power of 0.95 and an (alpha) of 0.05. The suggested sample size was 128. For the purpose of this study, 150 undergraduate students from University of Guelph were recruited to participate in the study in exchange for academic course credit online. After accounting for incomplete surveys, missing data and non-consenting participants, a sample of 130 was analysed.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: sincere + high greenness, sincere + low greenness, exciting + high greenness and exciting + low greenness. Once they gave consent to participant in the study, participants were first shown only the brand poster – either sincere or exciting. This poster had no information about the product but was to ensure that participants formed and internalised the brand’s personality. Once they viewed the brand personality manipulation, they were shown the product – either in a high or low greenness condition with the branding. They were then asked to indicate how green they though the product is which also served as a manipulation check for greenness and then asked to indicate their purchase intention for the product. Additional dependent measures of product evaluation, brand perception and indication of fair price were also collected. Following this, participants were asked to complete the brand affect questionnaire and lastly, fill the environment consciousness questionnaire. Participants were then debriefed by informing them the purpose of the study and thanked for their participation.
6.1. Measurements

The scales for the dependent measures and control measures were adapted using scales from previous literature and were administered with a 7-point Likert scale. The brand personality scale from Aaker (1997) was used and for greenness, Gershoff and Frehl’s (2015) questionnaire was used and had items such as “This product deserves to be labelled environmentally-friendly”, “using this product can reduce environmental harm”, “Purchasing this product is a good environmental choice” and “A person who cares about the environment, would buy this product” and has a cronbach’s alpha of 0.88. Purchase intention was measured by asking “When this product is introduced in the market, would you buy it?” and “I would recommend this product to my friend to buy it”. The Brand Affect questionnaire was adapted from Sung and Kim’s (2010) study with items such as “using this brand gives me pleasure”, “using this brand makes me happy” and “I feel good when I see this brand” and had a cronbach’s alpha of 0.88. Other dependent measures were collected in order to validate findings (refer to Appendix for complete list of items): Product Evaluation which had polarised items such as ‘good-bad’, ‘desirable-undesirable’ and ‘low quality-high quality’ and had a cronbach’s alpha of 0.91. Moreover, brand perception questionnaire which also contained polarised items such as ‘not distinctive-distinctive’, ‘untrustworthy-trustworthy’ and ‘dull-exciting’ and had a cronbach’s alpha of 0.85. Consumers were also asked to indicate what they would consider as a fair price for the backpack (“If you were in-charge of the brand, what would you price this backpack at?”) and the average for this amount was used to analyse results. A questionnaire to assess the environmental-consciousness of participants was also administered. This scale had items which captured both a concern for the environment and ones
that pointed to a lack of worry for climate change. The positive items included items such as “we have reached the limit on the number of people this planet can support” and the lack of concern items included items like “the climate change crisis is greatly exaggerated.”

6.2. Manipulation Check for Greenness

Results confirmed that high greenness manipulation had a higher greenness ($M=5.48$) score than the low greenness ($M=4.22$) condition, $t=-5.16$, $p=0.001$ (Figure 5). Therefore, the manipulation check was successful in conforming that the levels of greenness across the conditions was significantly different.

![Figure 5: Manipulation check for greenness levels](image)

CHAPTER 7: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The data collected from the study was analysed with SPSS and PROCESS model 1 for moderation effect and PROCESS model 8 to test for mediated moderation.
7.1. Interaction Effects of Brand Personality and Green Products

This part of the study was analysed using the Univariate option in General Linear Model toolbar in SPSS. Dummy coding was used for both Brand Personality (Sincere – 0, Exciting – 1) and Level of Greenness (High Greenness – 1, Low Greenness – 0).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenness</th>
<th>Brand Personality</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Purchase Intention for all four conditions

The interaction between brand personality and greenness was analysed using PROCESS model 1 in SPSS. Results showed that there was a moderately significant interaction effect between brand personality and level of greenness of a product, \( b=8.26, t (126) = 1.90, p = 0.059 \) (Table 2, Figure 6). The results show that the level of greenness and the nature of the brand personality do interact and product different purchase intention scores at different levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Personality</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenness</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditional effect of Greenness on Purchase Intention at values of Brand Personality**
Further, a test for simple effects was done to identify the source of interaction by analysing the difference between the levels of greenness for each brand personality (Table 3). Results showed that when a brand has an exciting brand personality, products high on greenness have a higher purchase intention than products low on greenness $F(1, 126) = 3.81$, $p = 0.053$. Therefore, as the level of greenness increases, the purchase intention increases for exciting brands. However, when a brand has a sincere personality, the level of greenness does not matter $F(1, 126) = 0.57$, $p = 0.45$. In other words, for sincere brands, as the level of greenness increases, there is no significant impact on the purchase intention of the product. This observed effect shows that there is an interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Personality</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Sincere)</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Exciting)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results from test for interaction between Greenness and Brand Personality

Figure 6: Interaction effect of Greenness and Brand Personality on Purchase Intention
between brand personality and green levels and this interaction is being driven by the exciting brand personality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple effect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Purchase Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Personality</td>
<td>(I) GreenCon</td>
<td>(J) GreenCon</td>
<td>Mean Difference (I-J)</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval for Difference^a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Low Greenness</td>
<td>High Greenness</td>
<td>-.590</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Greenness</td>
<td>Low Greenness</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>Low Greenness</td>
<td>High Greenness</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Greenness</td>
<td>Low Greenness</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>-.854</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Univariate Tests</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Purchase Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCond</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>5.839</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.839</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>193.356</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>193.356</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each F tests the simple effects of Greenness within each level combination of the other effects shown. These tests are based on the linearly independent pairwise comparisons among the estimated marginal means.

Table 3: Test of simple effects to test for significant differences between high and low greenness products for each brand personality

The main effect for brand personality on purchase intention was also analysed and found to be non-significant $F (1, 128) = 0.94, p=0.33$. The purchase intention score for exciting brand
personality \((M=4.27)\) was higher than that for sincere brand personality \((M=4.07)\). The main effect for level of greenness of the products was also found to be insignificant but in the positive direction \(F(1, 128)=0.66, p=0.42\) Participants expressed a higher purchase intention for products high on greenness \((M=4.27)\) than they did for products with low greenness \((M=4.08)\).

Other dependent measures related to purchase intention were also collected and analysed for the purpose of this study: brand perception, product evaluation and amount consumers would be willing to pay (WTP) for the product. Brand personality and greenness did not have a significant interaction effect on brand perception, \(F(1, 127)=0.58, p=0.45\) and product evaluation \(F(1, 127)=1.27, p=0.263\). However, these results were directionally consistent with the results obtained for purchase intention. Similar results are obtained when consumers are asked what they would consider a ‘fair’ price that they would be willing to pay for the product \(F(1, 127)=2.09, p=0.15\). While the results for these dependent measures are non-significant, they were in the same direction as the results for purchase intention. Additionally, since green behaviours are seen as feminine, we also tested for the effect of gender and it was found to be non-significant \(F(1,128)=1.50, p=0.62\).

7.2. Mediated Moderation Effect

PROCESS model 8 was used to test for the mediated moderation effect proposed in the second hypothesis of this study. Results showed that brand affect has a positive, yet non-significant mediating effect on purchase intention (indirect effect= 0.035, SE=0.259, LLCI=-0.501, ULCI=0.499) Therefore, while there is a moderately significant interaction between brand personality and greenness levels, it is not mediated by brand affect (Tables 5 and 6).
Greenness | Brand Personality | Mean | Std. Deviation |
---|---|---|---|
Low Greenness | Exciting | 4.26 | 1.29 |
| Sincere | 4.06 | 1.31 |
| Total | 4.17 | 1.29 |
High Greenness | Exciting | 4.22 | 1.26 |
| Sincere | 4.01 | 1.00 |
| Total | 4.12 | 1.13 |

Table 4: Means for Brand Affect for each of the four conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV=Brand Affect</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>18.735</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenness</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Personality</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenness X Brand Personality</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV=Purchase Int</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>5.031</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Affect</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>8.217</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenness</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-0.808</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Personality</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>-1.307</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenness X Brand Personality</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>2.288</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: PROCESS model results for mediated moderation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional Effect of Greenness on Purchase Intention for different Brand Personalities</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>2.445</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-0.809</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect of Greenness on Purchase Intention for different Brand Personalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Boot SE</td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Affect</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>-0.501</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Conditional effect and Indirect effect of Greenness through brand affect

| Indirect Effect of High Greenness through Brand Affect |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Effect                          | Boot SE | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Brand Affect                    | 0.107  | 0.144  | -0.1574 | 0.4302  |

Table 7a. Indirect Effect of High Greenness on Purchase Intention

| Indirect Effect of Low Greenness through Brand Affect |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Effect                          | Boot SE | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Brand Affect                    | -0.134 | 0.219  | -0.2778 | 0.5966  |

Table 7b. Indirect Effect of Low Greenness on Purchase Intention

Furthermore, the mediation effect of brand affect was tested separately for high and low levels of greenness (Table 7a, 7b). This was done in order to test for possible mediation effect only for any one level of greenness. However, this effect was not seen: for low greenness, the indirect effect of brand affect was not significant (Indirect effect = 0.134, SE = 0.219, LLCI = -0.2778, ULCI = 0.5966). An insignificant effect but in the positive direction was found for high greenness (Indirect effect = 0.107, SE = 0.144, LLCI = -0.1574, ULCI = 0.4302).

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION
The purpose of this research was to understand if a certain brand personality would have better success in the green product category and if so, what is the underlying mechanism for this. Results confirmed that brand personality does play a role in determining the purchase intention of green products: exciting brands had a higher purchase intention than sincere brands with high greenness. However, the mediating role of brand affect is not seen.

The barriers of green products have been well-researched in consumer behaviour literature. Most barriers identified are consumer perceptions that tend to stereotype and create misconceptions about green products such as: green products are less efficacious (Luchs et al., 2010), firms that are non-profit are less competent (Aaker et al., 2010) and that green products are feminine and gentle (Brough et al., 2016). In all these scenarios, an effort had to be made to overcome these negative perceptions. Therefore, the green product category needs a new dimension that could negate these notions. An effective branding strategy through brand personality is able to do that: exciting brands with products high in greenness have a higher purchase intention than exciting brands with low greenness as well as sincere brands at both levels of greenness. The traits and characteristics of exciting brands such as newness and spiritedness are very distinct from the stereotypes of green and thus, help overcome these barriers to a large extent.

If a product is high on greenness, it will benefit from an exciting brand personality in comparison to a sincere brand personality. The mean purchase intention for exciting brands with high greenness is 4.58 whereas the purchase intention for high green products, irrespective of brand personality, is 4.27. Thus, for a product high on greenness, the exciting personality heightens its appeal and purchase intention. An exciting brand is successful in creating a positive
disconfirmation (Sundar and Noseworthy, 2016) or positive evaluation by resolving the inconsistency (Mandler, 1982) and potentially helps overcome the ‘weak’ and ‘gentle’ stereotype of green products (Lusch et al., 2010; Brough et al., 2016). On the other hand, for sincere brands, increasing the level of greenness does not impact the purchase intention; the mean purchase intention for a sincere brand with high greenness is 3.95 which is lower than the overall average purchase intention score. This reinforces the rationale that using a sincere brand personality for a highly green product makes reinforces the ‘gentle’ and ‘low efficacy’ associations of green products.

Furthermore, for products low on greenness, the brand personality does not have an impact on the purchase intention. In other words, when a product is low on greenness, it does not embody the negative associations of green to the same extent as products with high greenness. Therefore, the importance of brand personality in negating these stereotypes is less because of which there is a non-significant difference between exciting and sincere brands for low green products.

However, the underlying mechanism behind the reported interaction is not clear. The present study proposed brand affect as a possible reason for this phenomenon. When there is moderate incongruency, successful resolution of the inconsistency leads to positive object evaluation. Moreover, the heightened arousal from incongruency, in the context of an exciting brand should lead to positive affect for the brand. However, there was no significant effect found for brand affect as a mediating variable for the conditional effect of brand personality. Thus, while we know that exciting brands do benefit green products, the underlying mechanism is not clear. Brand affect in this study was operationalised only in terms of valence of emotion experienced,
i.e., it contained items such as “using this brand gives me pleasure”, “using this brand makes me happy” and “I feel good when I see this brand.” However, affect also has the dimension of ‘arousal’ to it which was not captured in this study. Exciting brands are seen to create more arousal in participants than sincere brands which is likely to be because of the attention-grabbing, elating and fascinating nature of the brand (Aaker et al, 2004; Sung and Kim, 2010). Research in related studies have shown that in conditions of high arousal, participants with low neuroticism and high extraversion and openness show attachment for exciting brands (Orth et al., 2010). While this study does not measure the participants’ personalities, there is merit in exploring the relevance of this finding to the current study.

Lastly, the participants recruited for this study were undergraduate students between the age of 18-24 years. With a young population as this, it is possible that there is a general tendency to be drawn to exciting brands (Aaker et al., 2004). Consumers are drawn to brand personalities which echo their own values and their self-image (Noble et al., 2009). The key characteristics of exciting brands are that of independence, going beyond the ordinary and the status-quo all of which are also values which a younger population of university students embody and hold in high regard. Furthermore, directional results for a general preference for green products can be attributed to participants wanting to match their personality with product personality (Govers and Schoorman, 2005). Participants in the current research were University students and generally had high preference for environment-friendly products and habits. Even if this preference does not translate to behaviour, this population shows strong advocacy for green products and behaviours. This was further reinforced in the present study where the environment consciousness was high ($M=5.55$).
CHAPTER 9: CONTRIBUTIONS, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

9.1. Contributions

This study set out to investigate the nature of relationship between the brand personality and level of greenness of a product, how it would impact the purchase intention of the product and the possible reason for this impact. While the results established a relationship between greenness levels and brand personality, the cause of this relationship is not clear. Having said that, the findings make certain theoretical and managerial contributions.

First, this study shows that the established brand personality does play a role in determining the purchase intention and product favourability of an environmental-friendly product. Thus, it contributes to the brand personality literature by highlighting its role in brand and product extensions and green products. Furthermore, most research currently focuses on environment-friendly claims from a product point of view while not giving the same attention to the branding strategy behind these products. A key part of the marketability and acceptance of green products is related to its branding, and this research makes a small attempt to uncover that relationship. Second, it has clear implications for firms and brands which target to enter the green product category. It requires managers to consider the brand’s existing brand personality as perceived by consumers in order to make the decision.

More importantly, by establishing the relationship between greenness and brand personality, the results show a possible way in which the barriers of green products can be overcome. Not only does this benefit firms which want to increase the acceptance of their green products but also helps the green product category grow.
9.2. Limitations and Future Research

This study has some limitations which could be addressed in future studies.

First, the sample of participants used for the study was limited and fairly homogenous in nature. Due to the constraints of time and other resources, an undergraduate student sample was used who received academic credit for participation in the study. While it limits the generalisability of the results to a larger, more heterogeneous population, future research could be conducted to understand if the results translate to other consumer groups of different age groups and socio-economic backgrounds.

Current research looked into brand extension for green products without taking into account consumer preferences for other product attributes (e.g. price). Discrete choice experiments can be an alternative methodology that accounts for attribute tradeoffs. For more detail description of this methodology and applications, see Noseworthy et al. 2010; Noseworthy et al. 2012; Eckert et al. 2012; Czoli et al. 2015; Kotnowski et al. 2016.

Second, with any brand research, there is a dilemma about using established, known brands versus hypothetical brands created for the purpose of the study. Brand uncertainty plays a major role in extension decisions and need to account for this factor (Eckert et al. 2012). The present research used hypothetical brands in order to maintain control and to ensure that pre-existing attitudes and experiences with known brands do not confound results. However, since hypothetical brands were used, it could have been difficult for participants to form a strong and consistent perception of the nature of the brand and their personality. Most brands and the associations with
them are built over a period of time and there was not enough opportunity in this study to replicate that level of familiarity.

Third, even though the pretests established the brand personality of the stimulus used in the main study, manipulation checks were not conducted in the main study to reaffirm their brand personality. The manipulation check for the independent variable (Greenness levels) was carried out but doing the same for brand personality could have made the findings more robust.

Fourth, the study was carried out in a relatively artificial setting and not a real decision making scenario. As a result, it could have lead to participants paying lip service to the purchase of green products when this may not translate to real behaviour. Moreover, with the new and continuing trend of focusing the environmental-friendliness of our products and habits, participants may have experienced a subconscious need to comply with buying of green products.

However, these limitations pave the way for future research; future studies could focus on if and how the results differ for established and existing brands. Doing so might also increase the ecological validity of the results since participants would be able to visualise how an environmental or sustainable product would perform under the brand. There is also opportunity for case studies to be conducted on existing brands that have extended their product lines to include environment-friendly products. Additionally, research can be conducted with a more heterogeneous sample to ensure generalisability. This research stream can be further extended to investigate consumer segments (Bateman et. al. 2010; Burke et. al. 2010; Marley and Islam 2012; Meade and Islam 2010) in the context of brand extension.
Future research could also focus on other possible mediators that could explain the interaction between brand personality and greenness. While this research focused on brand affect, future studies could be conducted to take a step back and to investigate the disconfirmation theory in detail. This disconfirmation can be studied from the point of view of both: breaking the gender stereotypes as well as disqualifying the ‘weak’ association of green products. More replication studies need to be carried out for studying the importance of brand personality in predicting the purchase intention of green products. Future studies might also be able to identify other branding-related predictors for the success of green products. Furthermore, these studies could include other moderators such as product categories and pricing and their impact on other important dependent measures such as brand image before and after the introduction of the green product.
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11.0 Appendix

Run MATRIX procedure:
Model = 1

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2002</td>
<td>.0401</td>
<td>1.7540</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>126.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model coeff se t p

| constant | 4.1875 | .2190 | 19.1221 | .0000 |
| BPCon    | -.2022 | .3051 | -.6627  | .5087 |
| GreenCon | -.2359 | .3122 | -.7556  | .4513 |
| int_1    | .8264  | .4348 | 1.9003  | .0597 |

Interactions:

int_1 GreenCon X BPCon

R-square increase due to interaction(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R2-chng</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.0275</td>
<td>3.6112</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****************************** ANALYSIS NOTES AND WARNINGS

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output:
MODEL 8 = MEDIATED MODERATION

Sample size
129

Outcome: Me_BAff

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.0871</td>
<td>.0076</td>
<td>.3183</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>125.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>4.0625</td>
<td>.2168</td>
<td>18.7355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenCon</td>
<td>-.0517</td>
<td>.3091</td>
<td>-.1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCon</td>
<td>.2022</td>
<td>.3021</td>
<td>.6693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.0058</td>
<td>.4322</td>
<td>.0134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

int_1 GreenCon X BPCon

Outcome: Y1_PI2

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6140</td>
<td>.3770</td>
<td>18.7572</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>124.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.0000
Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>1.7429</td>
<td>.3465</td>
<td>5.0307</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me_BAff</td>
<td>.6017</td>
<td>.0732</td>
<td>8.2168</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenCon</td>
<td>-.2047</td>
<td>.2531</td>
<td>-.8089</td>
<td>.4201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPCon</td>
<td>-.3239</td>
<td>.2478</td>
<td>-1.3070</td>
<td>.1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_2</td>
<td>.8096</td>
<td>.3539</td>
<td>2.2877</td>
<td>.0238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

| int_2     | GreenCon | X | BPCon |

*************** DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS ***************

Conditional direct effect(s) of X on Y at values of the moderator(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPCon</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-.2047</td>
<td>.2531</td>
<td>-1.3070</td>
<td>.4201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.6049</td>
<td>.2474</td>
<td>2.4451</td>
<td>.0159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional indirect effect(s) of X on Y at values of the moderator(s)

Mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPCon</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me_BAff</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.0311</td>
<td>.1797</td>
<td>-.3484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me_BAff</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.0277</td>
<td>.1879</td>
<td>-.4108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect effect of highest order interaction

Mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE(Boot)</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me_BAff</td>
<td>.0035</td>
<td>.2592</td>
<td>-.5618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of bootstrap samples for bias corrected bootstrap confidence intervals: 1000

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.00

NOTE: Some cases were deleted due to missing data. The number of such cases was: 1

------- END MATRIX ------

Model = 4
Y = Y4_PI
X = GreenCon
M = BAff

Sample size 66

Outcome: BAff

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.0182</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0213</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>64.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>4.2647</td>
<td>.2192</td>
<td>19.4579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenCon</td>
<td>-.0460</td>
<td>.3148</td>
<td>-.1460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

******************************************************************************
***************
Outcome: Y4_PI

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6808</td>
<td>.4635</td>
<td>27.2183</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>63.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>1.2574</td>
<td>.4246</td>
<td>2.9612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAff</td>
<td>.6396</td>
<td>.0921</td>
<td>6.9456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenCon</td>
<td>.6066</td>
<td>.2319</td>
<td>2.6153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****************** DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS ******************

Direct effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6066</td>
<td>.2319</td>
<td>2.6153</td>
<td>.0111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect effect of X on Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAff</td>
<td>-.0294</td>
<td>-.4530</td>
<td>.3609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****************** ANALYSIS NOTES AND WARNINGS ******************

Number of bootstrap samples for bias corrected bootstrap confidence intervals:

1000

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output:

95.00

NOTE: Some cases were deleted due to missing data. The number of such cases was:

1
Stimulus
Brand Personality Exciting

Brand Personality Sincere

Exciting + High Green

Exciting + Low Green
Sincere + High Green

Feature Highlights:
- The outer material and their inner lining are ALL made from environment-friendly, 80% post-consumer recycled polyester and cotton.
- The use of recycled fabrics can help save up to 50% energy resources that would be used in the manufacturing process.
- A secure laptop section, water bottle holder
- Key holder and stationary compartment
- 5 pockets to hold small items such as headphones
- A secret compartment
- Can carry up to 10 kg of weight
- In a selection of 7 colours

Because learning is too meaningful to let it pass you by

Sincere + Low Green

Feature Highlights:
- The materials of the backpack are made from 5% post-consumer recycled material.
- A secure laptop section, water bottle holder
- Key holder and stationary compartment
- 3 pockets to hold small items such as headphones
- A secret compartment
- Can carry up to 10 kg of weight
- In a selection of 7 colours

Because learning is too meaningful to let it pass you by
Thank you so much for signing up to participate in this study. This survey takes approximately 20 minutes to complete so please ensure that you have enough time to complete this survey. Please complete this survey in one go, without any interruptions to maintain the validity of the results.

Q1
☐ I wish to participate (1)
☐ I don't wish to participate (2)

Q2 On the next page, you will see some information about a brand named Jaunt. Please read the information carefully. Please focus on Jaunt as a BRAND when you are responding. Try to imagine what you would think of the brand if it were a person and the characteristics that it has. Please go by your gut feeling when responding - there are no right or wrong answers.

Q3 Brand Personality Poster

Q4 Timing
   First Click (1)
   Last Click (2)
   Page Submit (3)
   Click Count (4)

Q5 Now that you know something about Jaunt, one the next page we will show you a new product that Jaunt plans to introduce. Note that because the look of the backpack is still in design, the picture of it just provides a hypothetical prototype. Please let us know what you think about this new backpack based on the provided attributes and features. Please go by your gut feelings as there are no right or wrong answers. Please keep in mind the brand Jaunt when you are reviewing and evaluating this new backpack.

Stimulus shown: Brand Personality + Green Product Description

Q6 Please take some time to recall the backpack you just reviewed and then rate it on the
following dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat at Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad:Good</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable:Desirable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing:Appealing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awful:Nice</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive:Attractive</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable:Favourable</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Quality:High Quality</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 Assuming that you wished to buy this backpack, what do you think is the MOST you would pay for it?

Q8 If you were the manager at Jaunt, what would you consider to be a FAIR price for this backpack?

Q9 I would buy this backpack when it becomes available
   ○ Strongly disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Somewhat disagree
   ○ Neither agree nor disagree
   ○ Somewhat agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly agree
Q10 I would recommend others to buy it when it becomes available
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Q11 Please indicate what you think about Jaunt as a BRAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>7 (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Quality:High Quality</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Distinctive:Very Distinctive</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrustworthy:Trustworthy</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless:Useful</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous:Safe</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive:Inexpensive</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a status symbol:A status symbol</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant:Important</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming:Uncomforming</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Tech:High Tech</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable:Reliable</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex:Simple</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull:Exciting</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsophisticated:Sophisticated</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior:Superior</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12 This backpack deserves to be labelled 'environmentally friendly'
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Q13 Purchasing this backpack is a good environmental choice
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Q14 A person who cares about the environment is likely to buy a backpack of this kind
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Q15 Using backpacks of this kind could prevent further negative harm to the environment
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Q16 This backpack appears to be attractive and appealing
○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Somewhat disagree
○ Neither agree nor disagree
○ Somewhat agree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

Q17 I don't believe this backpack is actually environmentally-friendly
○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Somewhat disagree
○ Neither agree nor disagree
○ Somewhat agree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

Q18 I like the design of the posters
○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Somewhat disagree
○ Neither agree nor disagree
○ Somewhat agree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

Q19 The posters would be considered appealing by others
○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Somewhat disagree
○ Neither agree nor disagree
○ Somewhat agree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

Q20 On the next page are some questions which relate to Jaunt as a brand. Please think about the characteristics of the brand and the products it is introducing when you answer these questions.
Q21 Using a brand like Jaunt would give me pleasure
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Q22 Jaunt makes me feel happy
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Q23 I feel good when I see Jaunt
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Q24 We are approaching a limit to the number of people the Earth can support
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Q25 Humans have the right to modify the environment to suit their needs
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q26 When humans interfere with nature, it often produces disastrous consequences
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q27 Human ingenuity will ensure that we do not make the Earth unlivable
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q28 Humans are severely abusing the environment
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)
Q29 The earth has plenty of natural resources if we just learn to develop them
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q30 Plants and animals have as much right to exist as humans do
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q31 The balance of nature is strong enough for it to cope with the impacts of modern industrial nations
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q32 Despite our special abilities, humans are still subject to the laws of nature
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)
Q33 The so called 'ecological crises' facing humankind has been greatly exaggerated
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q34 The Earth is like a spaceship with limited resources and room
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q35 Humans were meant to rule over the rest of nature
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q36 The balance of nature is very delicate and easily upset
- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)
Q37 Humans will eventually learn enough about how nature works to be able to control it
○ Strongly disagree (1)
○ Disagree (2)
○ Somewhat disagree (3)
○ Neither agree nor disagree (4)
○ Somewhat agree (5)
○ Agree (6)
○ Strongly agree (7)

Q38 If things continue on their present course, we will soon be facing a major ecological catastrophe
○ Strongly disagree (1)
○ Disagree (2)
○ Somewhat disagree (3)
○ Neither agree nor disagree (4)
○ Somewhat agree (5)
○ Agree (6)
○ Strongly agree (7)

Q39 Which gender do you identify with?
○ Male
○ Female
○ Non binary
○ Prefer not to say

Q40 What ethnicity do you identify with?
○ White/Caucasian
○ Black/African
○ Native
○ Asian
○ Latino
○ Prefer not to say

Thank you for your participation.