

A STUDY ON FACTOR INFLUENCING ON CONSUMER PREFERNCES TOWARDS BRAND EXTENSIONS

***RAMBABU LAVURI**

***MA, MBA (UGC - JRF, NET), PGDSRD-NIRD, (PH.D.) DEPT. OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT,
OSMANIA UNIVERSITY, HYDERABAD**

ABSTRACT:

Now a day's many of the organisations are using best branding strategies towards extensions of their existing brands for capturing consumers attentions in long period. So every companies frequently follow the Extensions strategies towards their Brands. In order to understand customer preferences towards brand extensions, this paper identify the factor like Cognitive mechanism, Quality of the Parent Brand, Fit between the parent brand and extensions, Advertisements impact and so on. To achieve the objectives of the study a survey has been conducted on 186 respondents in the Hyderabad area, and tested by percentages, ANOVAs, Correlations and Multiple regression by SPSS 20.0 version. The results indicates that the respected factors influence on the customer preferences towards Brand Extensions

KEYWORDS: Brand, Brand Extensions, Customers, Customer preferences, Parent Brand.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Every year an enormous number of new products in different categories are launched worldwide. Factors such as increasing competition and growing advertising costs have made the successful implementation of a new product more difficult in recent years (Aaker 1996). This makes the task, faced by marketers crucial when and how to use a brand name, as there are various options in naming a product. One choice is to introduce an entirely new brand name for a new product line, for example when Coca-Cola launched new beverages under the name of Fruitopia. Another option is using an existing brand in conjunction with a new brand, known as sub-branding or nested branding. A sub-brand, such as Weight Watchers Smart Ones, adjoins an existing brand name with a new product. On the other hand a nested brand, such as Polo by Ralph Lauren, helps the consumer identify the brand, meanwhile distancing associations relatively farther away from the parent brand (Bhat et al 1998). One of the

most common and successful ways for marketers to expand their portfolios, while reducing launching costs as well as the risk of product failure, is the concept of brand extension.

Through brand extension, a strong brand can make it easier for the consumer to accept the new product introduced under the parent brand. In the last two decades, brand extensions have become the most prominent product strategy, due to its perceived ability to reduce risk among consumers and decrease the marketing and promotion costs. However, this process of developing a new brand can be expensive, time consuming and obviously not always easily conducted nor well received. Moreover, it requires substantial investments not only in creating a new brand concept but also in advertising the new product on the market, as well as supporting it during its life cycle. Some marketers doubt that a brand extension is the universal way of revitalizing a brand. It is instead believed that many managers choose to use this strategy because it is fashionable, with the risk of companies embracing the use of a brand extension before consuming all the resources for growth of the parent brand (Kapferer 2001).

Brand extensions are explained as using an established brand name for new products or product categories and widely used in marketing practices. The main objectives of brand extensions are ensuring that consumers would accept new products and therefore contribute to the success of new products. In addition to this, marketing expenses are lowered and profitability of the new product is increased by means of brand extensions. With these qualities, brand extensions have recently been subject to researches in the field of marketing. These researches have focused on identification of success factors of brand extensions and evaluation of these success factors in terms of cultural effects, cognitive reactions of consumers and relations between product categories. Nevertheless, as the study carried out by Völckner and Sattler (2007) has already stressed, to generalize the success factors of brand extensions to rapidly changing consumer product categories, real life products and to apply them in different main brand products, to different consumer groups are subject to a question mark.

Brand extension is a marketing strategy in which new products are introduced in relation to a successful brand. Various experts have defined brand extensions differently though, these definitions look quite similar. Kotler and Armstrong (2002) defined brand extension as using a successful brand name to launch new or modified products in a new category. Verma (2002) also defined brand extension as using an existing brand name to launch a product in a different category.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

- *Subodh Bhat et al (1998)* investigated consumer reactions to the use of different brand names. They examined consumer reactions to new products introduced under four different brand naming scenarios. The results suggested that when consumers see a high degree of fit between the new product and the existing brand, brand extensions, sub-brands, and nested brands are about equally preferred. But when consumers perceive little fit, a new brand name is the most preferred, followed by nested brands, sub-brands, and extensions, in that order.
- *Morrin (1999)* examined the impact of brand extension on the consumer memory for parent brand information. 39 graduate business students participated in the experiment and were exposed to a set of either 42 dominant or non dominant parent brand stimuli. Extension number and fit were crossed within subject so that all subjects were exposed to all levels of these variables as well as to unextended parent brand stimuli. The study demonstrated that exposure to brand extensions facilitates the speed with which subjects can categorize parent brands correctly and this result is moderated by parent brand dominance, such that non dominant brands benefit more from such exposure.
- *Balachander and Ghose (2003)* investigated the existence of reciprocal spillover effect emanating from the advertising of a brand extension. The authors used A. C. Nielson scanner panel data for the two products namely, yogurt and powdered detergents for the period September, 1987 to August, 1988 during which household exposure to advertising was recorded. The results showed strong support to a positive spillover effect from advertising an extension to the parent brand. It was also found that forward spillover effect was absent.
- *Eva Martínez and Jose Pina (2003)* analysed the influence that brand extensions had on brand image. For this analysis, an experiment was performed that examined the most important variables to be considered in using the brand extension strategy. After analysing the information obtained they reached the conclusion that brand extension strategies influenced the brand image after the extension and that variables such as the brand image prior to the extension, the perceived quality of the extension and the fit between the parent brand and the new product also affected the image.
- *Joo Young Kim (2003)* studied the communication message strategies for two distinct brand extension types: close and remote brand extensions. An experiment was conducted with four cells which were exposed to different communication strategies for five extension types. 46 Communication strategies used were brand essence cue, extension attribute cue, extension dissonance reducer cue, and some combinations of the named

cues. Results showed that different communication strategies are necessary for extension situations that differ in distance from parent brand territories.

- *Kuang-Jung Chen and Chu-Mei Liu (2004)* studied the impact of a parent brand on the trial of the extension and the reciprocal effect of a successful trial of new brand extensions positioned horizontally and vertically on the parent brand. Results showed positive influence of the parent brand on the trial of the extension. Successful trial also helped the parent brand on a 48 reciprocal basis, particularly among the non-loyal users and non-users of the parent brand. Another finding was the moderating effect of category positioning on the magnitude of the reciprocal effect of the brand extension on the parent brand. There was also an indication that prior parent brand experience acted as a moderator of reciprocal effects.
- *Isita Lahiri and Amitava Gupta (2009)* examined situations in which brand extensions are likely to dilute beliefs associated with family brands. Hypotheses are developed and tested in a consumer survey that included experimental and control groups. The findings show the congruity of the extension with the family brand is an important factor, the absence of which increases the chances of dilution of the family brand. Perceived success/failure of the extension is a more important factor that also enhances or dilutes the image of the family brand.
- *Eva Martínez and Jose Pina (2010)* studied the reciprocal spill-over effects of brand extensions by testing a comprehensive model that gathers both the brand extension evaluation process and the later influence on brand image. Data were obtained from 699 face-to-face interviews conducted in Spain. Structural equation modelling was used to test the proposed hypotheses. The results indicated that brand extensions have feedback effects on brand image depending on the attitude toward the new product and perceived image fit. Consumer attitude depends, in turn, on initial brand associations, perceived category fit, perceived image fit and consumer innovativeness. Brand familiarity also showed indirect effects.

3. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study are to realise the following:

- To study the influence of Brand extensions on demographical variables of customers
- To Study the factor influence on consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions

4. HYPOTHESIS

The following are the hypothesis designed with above objective:

- H_0^1 : There is no significant impact of Brand Extensions on Demographical variables of Customers
- H_0^2 : There is no significant impact of factor influencing consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions

5. METHODOLOGY

The study is concerned with the factor influencing consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions based on that source of the data collected from Primary source of data is collected from the respondents through structured questionnaire and interviews. Secondary data is collected from various Journals, Periodicals such as Magazines, Business newspapers, and from subject related books and websites. Convenience sampling method is used for the study, with 186 sample size from the selected area i.e. Hyderabad city. The Data collected from Primary and Secondary sources is analyzed with the help of appropriate statistical Package like SPSS 20. The Statistical tools used are Correlation and ANOVA.

6. RESULTS

Demographic Variables: The frequency distribution of demographic variables is presented in the following table.

Table-1: Demographic Variables Results

Age		
	No of Responses	Percentage
Below 20 years	39	21.0
21-30 years	59	31.7
31-40 years	63	33.8
41-50years and above	25	13.5
Gender		
Male	121	65
Female	65	35
Education		
Below Graduation	57	30.6
Graduation	92	49.5
Graduation and above	37	19.9
Occupation		
Student	52	28.0

Govt employee	43	23.1
Private employee	71	38.2
Business	20	10.7
Income for month (in rupees)		
Below Rs.10,000	28	15.1
Rs.10,001-20,000	41	22.1
Rs.20,001-30,000	53	28.4
Rs.30,001-40,000	25	13.4
Above Rs.40,001	39	21.0
Total	186	100.0

Source: Primary data

n=186

The descriptive analysis of all the demographical variables is shown in the above Table, from that more than 33% of respondents in the group of 31-40 years and 30% of respondents in the group of 21-30 years, followed by 65% of the respondents belonged male and 35% of respondents belonged female, and 49% of respondents studied Graduation and with followed 30% of respondents studied Below Graduation, 38% of respondents working as a Private Employees, 28% are the students, and 28% of respondents earned Rs.20,001-30,000 for month and 22% of respondents earned above Rs. 10,001-20,000 respectively.

ANOVA: The analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between the means of two or more independent (unrelated) groups. So ANOVA is conducted in order to understand whether there is any significant difference in opinion of the Consumers towards Brand extensions. It has been considered for the study is explained in the table.

- **HO¹:** *There is no significant impact of Brand Extensions on Demographical variables of customers*

Table-2: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age in years	Between Groups	71.353	18	3.964	3.134	.000
	Within Groups	503.338	168	1.265		
	Total	574.691	186			
Gender	Between Groups	4.662	18	.259	1.232	.001
	Within Groups	83.659	168	.210		
	Total	88.321	186			
Education	Between Groups	26.472	18	1.471	1.320	.000
	Within Groups	443.289	168	1.114		
	Total	469.760	186			

Occupation	Between Groups	19.800	18	1.100	1.126	.000
	Within Groups	530.262	168	1.332		
	Total	550.062	186			
Income in rupees	Between Groups	22.049	18	1.225	.935	.002
	Within Groups	521.309	168	1.310		
	Total	543.357	186			

In order to understand whether there is any significant difference in impact of Brand Extensions on demographical variables, with respect of the demographics i.e. Age, Gender, Education, Occupation and Income in rupees.

It is observed that from the above table, the sum of the squares of the difference between means of different respondents ages Brand Extensions and the **Between groups** variation 71.353 is due to interaction in samples between groups. If sample means are the close to each other. The **Within** variation 503.338 is due to difference within individual samples. The table also lists the F statistic 3.134, which is calculated by dividing the Between Groups Mean square by the Within Groups Mean Square. The Significance level of 0.000 is less 0.05, so its indicating that null hypothesis can be rejected. so age is significantly different with Brand extensions. And followed with demographics like Gender, Education, Occupation and income status of between groups variations are 4.662, 26.472, 19.800, 22.049 , and their Within group variations are 83.659, 443.289, 530.262, 521.309. followed with F statistic values 1.232, 1.320, 1.126 and .935, significant level are 0.01, 0.00, 0.00 and 0.002 . This all are less than 0.05. so its indicating that null hypothesis can be rejected. so all the demographic variables are significantly different with Brand extensions .

- ***HO²: There is no significant of factor influence on Consumer preferences towards brand extension***

ANOVA is conducted in order to understand whether there is any significant difference in between Factor influence Consumer preferences towards brand extension. It has been considered for the study is explained in the table.

Table -3: ANOVA

Factors		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Cognitive Mechanism	Between Groups	3.316	13	.255	.277	.000
	Within Groups	371.562	173	.922		
	Total	374.878	186			
Quality of the Parent	Between Groups	8.260	13	.635	.811	.000

Brand	Within Groups	315.855	173	.784		
	Total	324.115	186			
Fit Between the Parent Brand and Extensions	Between Groups	11.061	13	.851	.849	.002
	Within Groups	403.702	173	1.002		
	Total	414.763	186			
Difficulty	Between Groups	7.862	13	.605	.753	.000
	Within Groups	323.783	173	.803		
	Total	331.645	186			
Familiarity of the Parent Brand	Between Groups	4.259	13	.328	1.316	.000
	Within Groups	100.336	173	.249		
	Total	104.595	186			
Innovativeness of the Extension	Between Groups	15.639	13	1.203	1.603	.001
	Within Groups	302.509	173	.751		
	Total	318.149	186			
Advertisement Impact	Between Groups	58.669	13	4.513	3.258	.000
	Within Groups	558.213	173	1.385		
	Total	616.882	186			
Parent Brand Association	Between Groups	24.328	13	1.871	2.391	.001
	Within Groups	315.404	173	.783		
	Total	339.731	186			
Brand Concept Consistency	Between Groups	40.145	13	3.088	2.694	.000
	Within Groups	461.918	173	1.146		
	Total	502.062	186			
Price of the Extension	Between Groups	11.126	13	.856	1.988	.000
	Within Groups	173.526	173	.431		
	Total	184.652	186			

In order to understand whether there is any significant difference in between Consumer preferences towards brand extension, With respect of factors influence on consumer preferences. In order to understand whether there is any significant difference in the two different variables like Cognitive Mechanism, Quality of the Parent Brand, Fit Between the Parent Brand and Extensions, Difficulty, Familiarity of the Parent Brand, Innovativeness of the Extension, Advertisement Impact, Parent Brand Association, Brand Concept Consistency and Price of the Extension. It is observed that from the above table, the sum of the squares of the difference between means of different Customer Preferences like Cognitive Mechanism towards Brand extensions, and the **Between groups** variation 3.316 is due to interaction in samples between groups. If sample means are the close to each other. The **Within** variation 371.562 is due to difference within individual samples. The table also lists the **F statistic** 1.241, which is calculated by dividing the Between Groups Mean square by the Within Groups Mean Square. The **Significance level** of 0.000 is less 0.05, so its indicating that null hypothesis can be rejected. so " Cognitive

Mechanism " significantly different with Brand Extensions. And followed with Quality of the Parent Brand, Fit Between the Parent Brand and Extensions, Difficulty, Familiarity of the Parent Brand, Innovativeness of the Extension, Advertisement Impact, Parent Brand Association, Brand Concept Consistency and Price of the Extension of **between groups variations** are 8.260, 11.061, 7.862, 4.259, 15.639, 58.669, 24.328, 40.145, and 11.126 and followed with The **Within** variation are 315.855, 403.702, 323.783, 100.336, 302.509, 558.213, 315.404, 461.918 and 173.526. **F statistic values** of dimensions are .811, .849, .753, 1.316, 1.603, 3.258, 2.391, 2.694 and 1.988 and followed with **significant level** are .000, .002, .000, .001, .000, .000, .000. This all are less than 0.05. so this are indicating that null hypothesis can be rejected. so all the respected consumer preferences factors significantly different with the Brand Extensions. So finally respected factor influence on consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions.

CORRELATION: Correlation is used to describe the linear relationship between two continuous variables. In general, correlation tends to be used when there is no identified response variable. It measures the strength (qualitatively) and direction of the linear relationship between two or more variables. In order to understand correlation between the different demographic variables like age, gender, education, Occupation, Income in rupees, Brand extensions and factors influences on Consumer preference.

Table - 4: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Age in years	2.56	1.175	186
Gender	1.30	.461	186
Education	3.36	1.063	186
Occupation	2.92	1.150	186
in rupees	2.89	1.143	186
Brand extensions	3.3758	.31465	186
Factor influence on Consumer preferences	3.9122	.41402	186

The mean values for age, gender, education, occupation, rupees and Brand extensions and Consumer preferences are found to be 2.56, 1.30, 3.36, 2.92, 2.89, 3.3758 and 3.9122 with standard deviations of 1.175, 0.461, 1.063, 1.150, 1.143, 0.31465 and 0.41402 respectively.

Table - 5: Correlations between demographic variable, Brand extensions and Consumer preferences

		age in years	gender	Education	Occupation	Income status	Brand extensions	Consumer preferences
Age in years	Pearson Correlation	1	-.223**	.151**	-.374**	.042	-.184**	.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.005
	N	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
Gender	Pearson Correlation	-.223**	1	-.238**	.008	-.126*	-.047	.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.003	.003	.012	.004
	N	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
Education	Pearson Correlation	.151**	-.238**	1	.029	.292**	.093	-.132**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000		.561	.000	.058	.000
	N	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
Occupation	Pearson Correlation	-.374**	.008	.029	1	.218**	.043	-.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.561		.000	.383	.238
	N	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
Income status	Pearson Correlation	.042	-.126*	.292**	.218**	1	.091	-.021
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.000	.000		.063	.674
	N	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
Brand extensions	Pearson Correlation	-.184**	-.047	.093	.043	.091	1	.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.000	.383	.063		.580
	N	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
Consumer preferences	Pearson Correlation	.018	.004	-.132**	-.058	-.021	.027	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.004	.007	.238	.674	.580	
	N	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).								
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).								

All the variables like gender, education, occupation, income status, Brand extensions and Consumer preferences are significantly correlated with Age. Similarly all are significantly correlated with gender except Brand extensions. In the case of education is not significant with occupation and Brand extensions. Similarly, Occupation is not correlated with and education, Brand extensions and Consumer preferences significantly

correlated. In the case of Income status is not significant with customer value and Brand extensions. finally Brand extensions and Consumer preferences are not correlated with the occupation, income status and each other.

Multiple regression: It is a statistical tool used to derive the value of a criterion from several other independent, or predictor, variables. It is the simultaneous combination of multiple factors to assess how and to what extent they affect a certain outcome.

In order to understand impact of factor influences on Consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions.

- ***HO²: There is no significant impact of factor influences on Consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions***

Table -6: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
1	.237 ^a	0.056	0.033	0.40717	2.411	.000 ^b

a. Predictors: (Constant), Cognitive Mechanism, Quality of the Parent Brand, Fit Between the Parent Brand and Extensions, Difficulty, Familiarity of the Parent Brand, Innovativeness of the Extension, Advertisement Impact, Parent Brand Association, Brand Concept Consistency, Price of the Extension.

From the above table, it reveals that R² value is found to be 0.056, meaning there by that 56% of the variation in dependent variable is explained by predictors. Since the F value is found to be significant, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative is accepted , meaning thereby that there is a significant difference in the variation caused by predictors towards Brand Extensions.

Table 4.26.3 - Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.976	.339		11.737	.000
	Cognitive Mechanism	.024	.022	.009	.183	.000
	Quality of the Parent Brand	.087	.032	.015	.226	.001

Fit Between the Parent Brand and Extensions	.021	.028	.051	.747	.056
Difficulty	-.28	.026	.017	-.294	.069
Familiarity of the Parent Brand	-.027	.044	-.032	-.600	.003
Innovativeness of the Extension	.042	.027	.088	1.571	.001
Advertisement Impact	.034	.020	.196	-3.288	.001
Parent Brand Association	.025	.033	.054	-.745	.000
Brand Concept Consistency	.036	.029	.096	1.236	.002
Price of the Extension	-.024	.044	-.038	-.540	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Brand Extension					

From the above table, it is evident that Quality of the Parent Brand(.087) is emerged as the most important factor influence on consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions, followed with Innovativeness of the Extension(.042), Brand Concept Consistency(.036) and Advertisement Impact(0.34) having positive influence on consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions, and also results shown that there is a negative influence on Consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The present paper study concluded that, successes of many companies depends on their strategies to retaining new and existing customers towards products and services, so there is a need of brand extension for existing products. Brand extensions helps companies in several ways, such as reducing the risk of introducing a new products, and reducing the cost of promotion and increasing the acceptability of the new products and services by consumers. As per results 33% of respondents in the group of 31-40 years and 30% of respondents in the group of 21-30 years, followed by 65% of the respondents belonged male and 35% of respondents belonged female, and 49% of respondents studied Graduation and with followed 30% of respondents studied Below Graduation, 38% of respondents working as a Private Employees, 28% are the students, and 28% of respondents earned Rs.20,001-30,000 for month and 22% of respondents earned above Rs. 10,001-20,000. The results of multiple regression found that Quality of the Parent Brand(.087) is emerged as the most important factor influence on consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions, followed with Innovativeness of the Extension(.042), Brand Concept Consistency(.036) and Advertisement Impact(0.34) having positive influence on consumer preferences towards

Brand Extensions, and also results shown that there is a negative influence on Consumer preferences towards Brand Extensions.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thankful and grateful to the earlier contributions as a references of the journals for their extremely useful suggestions to improve quality of the article for carryout this task.

9. REFERNCES

1. Aaker D.A. (1996) "Building Strong Brands", New York: The Free Press, N
2. Bhat S.; Reddy S.K. (2001) "The impact of parent brand attribute associations and affect on brand extension evaluation", Journal of Business Research.
3. Dr. Tarun Kushwaha," Brand Extension: A Strategy for Competitive Advantage", marketing,volueme V, September 2012.
4. Eva Martínez and Jose Pina, M. "Consumer Responses to Brand 19. Extensions: A Comprehensive Model", European Journal of Marketing, Vol.44, No. 7/8, pp.1182-1205, 2010
5. Eva Martínez and Jose Pina, M. "Consumer Responses to Brand 19. Extensions: A Comprehensive Model", European Journal of Marketing, Vol.44, No. 7/8, pp.1182-1205, 2010.
6. Gustav Berntorp," Brand extensions – the influence of the parent brand", School of economics and management, Lund University.
7. Henseler, J., Horvath, C., Sarstedt, M., & Zimmermann, L. (2010). A cross-cultural comparison of brand extension success factors: A meta-study. Journal of Brand Management, 18, 5-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/bm.2010.25> .
8. Isita Lahiri and Amitava Gupta "Dilution of Brand Extensions: A 38. Study", International Journal of Commerce and Management, Vol.19, No. 1, pp.45- 57, 2009.
9. James Oakley, L., Subramanian Balachander and Sriram, S. 39. "Understanding the Simultaneous Effects of Category Fit and Order of Entry on Consumer Perceptions of Brand Extensions", in Advances in Consumer Research eds. Geeta Menon and Akshay, Rao R., Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research, Vol.32, pp.135-136, 2005.
10. Joo Young Kim "Communication Message Strategies for Brand 42. Extensions", Journal of Product and Brand Management, Vol.12, No.7, pp.462-476, 2003.
11. Kapferer J.N. (2001) "The new Strategic Brand Management: Creating and Sustaining Brand Equity Long Term", London: Kogan Page

12. Kotler Philip and Armstrong Gary, Principles of Marketing, 9th Edition, Pearson Education Asia, Delhi, 2002
13. Kuang-Jung Chen and Chu-Mei Liu “Positive Brand Extension Trial and Choice of Parent Brand”, Journal of Product & Brand Management, Vol.13, No.1, pp.25-36, 2004.
14. Morrin, M. “The Impact of Brand Extensions on Parent Brand Memory Structures and Retrieval Processes”, Journal of Marketing Research, Vol.36, No.4, pp.517-525, 1999
15. Subodh Bhat, Gail Kelley, E. and Kathleen O’Donnell, A. “An Investigation of Consumer Reactions to the Use of Different Brand Names”, Journal of Product and Brand Management, Vol.7, No.1, pp.41-50, 1998.
16. Subramanian Balachander and Sanjoy Ghose “Reciprocal Spillover Effects: A Strategic Benefit of Brand Extensions”, Journal of Marketing, Vol.67, pp.4-13, 2003.
17. Thomas michael, "A study on the factors influencing Consumer preferences towards brand Extensions and their impact on parent Brands image with reference to fast Moving consumer goods FMCGS", Anna University.
18. Verma Harsh V., Brand Management. Excel Books. New Delhi. 2002.
19. Völckner, F., & Sattler, H. (2007). Empirical generalizability of consumer evaluations of brand extensions. International Journal of Research in Marketing, 24, 149-162<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2006.11.003>.