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Abstract

Celebrity endorsement is a highly researched field in marketing. Having its roots in psychology and the source credibility of communication (Hovland and Weiss, 1952; McCroskey and Young, 1981) it has come up a long way since the early research was done in the seventies (Friedman, et al., 1976; Kamen et al., 1975). Researchers have delved into various issues of celebrity endorsements such as source credibility of the celebrity, celebrity-brand congruence and meaning transfer model (McCracken, 1989). Research in Brand Personality is relatively new. The works of Aaker and Fournier (1995), Aaker (1997) and Durgee (1998) initiated the interest which ultimately resulted in the construction of a Brand Personality Scale by Aaker (1997). However, researchers have not looked into the issue of Celebrity Personality affecting the Brand Personality even in congruence studies. In this paper we try to address the issue of celebrity personality affecting brand personality. Based on an empirical study, we try to find out whether the same personality dimensions exist for the celebrity and the brand endorsed respectively. Following which we have tried to see whether celebrity personality has an effect of brand personality. The study is supposed to generate research interest because of its novelty of idea.
The practice of using celebrities in advertisements to promote products dates back to more than a hundred years and continues till date. Some studies have found out that as much as 25% of the total advertisements aired use celebrity endorsements (Shimp 2000). The scenario is not too different in India. Celebrities from the field of sports and movies have a string of endorsements under their belt. Thus celebrity endorsements become a relevant field of research in India. One of the key streams of research in celebrity endorsements is the “source credibility” research that primarily looked into finding out the dimensions of a celebrity source which affect the consumer in the communication process. The other important stream of research is the celebrity-brand congruence studies. The congruence studies have delved into the similarities or correspondence between the product or brand and the celebrity which is popularly known as the “match-up” hypothesis (Kamins 1990; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Kirmani and Shiv 1998; Misra and Beatty 1990; Mittelstaedt and Riesz 2000). Again, each and every celebrity has a personality of his/her own. Through the endorsement a part of that is supposed to rub off onto the brand. The Meaning Transfer Model of McCracken (1989) suggests this, though not directly. However, this aspect of the effect of celebrity personality on Brand Personality has not been studied yet in consumer research. The BP construct however, has been studied at a conceptual (Durgee 1998; Gardner and Levy 1955) and at an empirical level (Aaker 1997; Johar, Sengupta, and Aaker 2005; etc). Aaker (1997) had constructed and validated a scale to measure BP which was loosely based on the Big Five personality traits (Goldberg 1990). However, there has been no effort as per the knowledge of the researchers to integrate both aspects of celebrity endorsements and BP. Thus the current study aims to fill such a gap in the literature. The study tries to examine whether Celebrity personality has an effect on BP with the help of a conceptual model and empirical data analysis. Given the context of incremental use of celebrities to promote brands examination of the effects of the celebrity personality on the brand personality becomes very important. Both the congruence studies in celebrity endorsements (Friedman and Friedman 1976; Kamins 1990; Mittelstaedt and Riesz 2000) and the meaning transfer (McCracken 1989; Langmeyer and Walker 1991) studies have hinted on the congruence or transfer of attributes from the celebrity to the brand endorsed. To study whether the celebrity is a source of BP has also been hinted by Durgee (1998) who opined that the researchers need to delve into the sources of BP. Thus we define the objective of the study which is to examine the effect of the celebrity personality on the brand personality. Hence, we define our hypothesis which states:

Hypothesis: The personality of a celebrity will have a positive impact on the personality of a brand.

Figure 1. The Conceptual Model
There were four phases to the execution of this research. The first phase consisted of the celebrity selection for the study and the selection of the brand endorsed by the celebrity, questionnaire design and data collection. In the second phase the data collected on the celebrity was analyzed. In the third phase the data collected on the brand was analyzed. In the fourth and last phase, the conceptual model given in figure 1 was tested. The entire study used student samples. The justification of using student sample is from the fact that they are exposed to the media, and thus to celebrity advertisements. Secondly, at their age the celebrity becomes more of an idol or role model. Thus student sample was supposed to fulfill the study objectives. Sachin Tendulkar (Sachin), the cricketer was identified as the celebrity the brand identified for the celebrity was Pepsi. The items to identify personality of the celebrity as well as the brand were selected from the fifteen facets given in Aaker’s (1997) study. The data was collected using five point semantic differential scale (1 – Not at all descriptive to 5 – Totally Descriptive). A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed for each group, of which 196 usable questionnaires were obtained for the first group (Sachin) and 198 for the second group (Pepsi). Exploratory factor analysis (Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation) was conducted to identify the factor structure of the personality facets for Sachin and Pepsi independently. Both for Sachin and Pepsi, all fifteen facets had loadings above 0.50 and the same five factor structure of Aaker (1997) was obtained. All factors had reasonable coefficient alpha values of more than 0.7 (Nunnally 1978) ensuring internal consistency reliability. The Discriminant validity of the factors was tested using Structural Equation Modeling (AMOS 5) for each set (Sachin and Pepsi) separately. We took two factors at a time with a correlated and a restricted (correlation = 1) model for each pair. Thus a total of ten (10) pair-wise discriminant validity checks were run for each dataset. The constrained and unconstrained chi-square values of each model were compared and a significant difference was found between them for both datasets, thus indicating high discriminant validity. In this phase, the conceptual model given in Figure 1 was tested. For both the celebrity data and the brand data, the factor scores were calculated as mean of the items included in that factor. This was done to preserve the range of the original scale used to collect the data. Then a structural model was run using the celebrity personality as the exogenous latent variable and the brand personality as the endogenous latent variable. SEM was used to achieve the objective and the software used to run the model was AMOS 5. The results indicated a reasonably good fit and a statistically significant effect ($\beta = 0.391$) of the celebrity personality on the brand personality. For the researcher, the study has generated two major inferences. First, the BP scale developed by Aaker (1997) was found out to be reliable and valid both for the celebrity and the brand. Thus it supports the BP construct and its use in marketing research. Second, the study found support for the effect on celebrity personality on brand personality, and thus the Hypothesis stated in the conceptualization section could not be rejected. In a broader sense, the study supports the Meaning Transfer Model of McCracken (1989) if we consider personality to be a part of the meaning which is transferred. For the marketer, the study could draw inference
that there will be an impact of the celebrity personality on the brand personality. Thus in case of a new brand, care should be taken before going for the celebrity endorsement, because there may be a transfer of some personality attributes from the celebrity to the brand which is unwanted by the marketer. This also suggests a possible cause for why all celebrities do not create the same effect on all brands. Thus in effect the study contributes both to the celebrity endorsement and brand personality literature and calls for more research in this area.

**CELEBRITY ENDORSEMENTS AND BRAND PERSONALITY**

**INTRODUCTION**

The practice of using celebrities in advertisements to promote products dates back to more than a hundred years and continues till date. Some studies have found out that as much as 25% of the total advertisements aired use celebrity endorsements (Shimp 2000). The scenario is not too different in India. Celebrities from the field of sports and movies have a string of endorsements under their belt. Products ranging from cement to pens use celebrities for communication. A top celebrity can get as many as 21 advertisers to endorse products (AdEx India Report 2007). Thus celebrity endorsements become a relevant field of research in India. One of the key streams of research in celebrity endorsements is the "source credibility" research that primarily looked into finding out the dimensions of a celebrity source which affect the consumer in the communication process. The other important stream of research is the celebrity-brand congruence studies. The congruence studies have delved into the similarities or correspondence between the product or brand and the celebrity which is popularly known as the "match-up" hypothesis (Kamins 1990; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Kirmani and Shiv 1998; Misra and Beatty 1990; Mittelstaedt and Riesz 2000). Again, each and every celebrity has a personality of his/her own. Through the endorsement a part of that is supposed to rub off onto the brand. The
Meaning Transfer Model of McCracken (1989) suggests this, though not directly. However, this aspect of the effect of celebrity personality on Brand Personality has not been studied yet in consumer research. Even in case of Brand Personality (BP) research, there are not many studies as in celebrity endorsements. The BP construct however, has been studied from a conceptual (Durgee 1998; Gardner and Levy 1955) and at an empirical level (Aaker 1997; Diamantopoulos, Smith and Grime 2005; Johar, Sengupta, and Aaker 2005; etc). Aaker (1997) had constructed and validated a scale to measure BP which was loosely based on the Big Five personality traits (Goldberg 1990). However, there has been no effort as per the knowledge of the researchers to integrate both aspects of celebrity endorsements and BP. Thus the current study aims to fill such a gap in the literature. The study first discusses the various issues in celebrity endorsement and BP research. It then moves on to describe the empirical study in context which was done to test the relevance of the BP Scale of Aaker (1997) in the context of celebrity endorsements. Next the study tries to examine whether Celebrity personality has an effect on BP with the help of a conceptual model and empirical data analysis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Source Credibility of Communication

The concept of celebrity endorsement has its origin in Psychology. Researchers in psychology have extensively studied the communicator-message-receiver relationship and its sub issues such as the impact of communicator/source capabilities on making the message credible, effects of the communicator in attitude change of the receiver, communicator message match etc.
One of the most studied areas is that of "source credibility" which is very similar to the "ethos" of Aristotle (Hovland and Weiss 1952; McCroskey and Young 1981). Source credibility has been defined as:

"attitude toward a source of communication held at a given time by a receiver"

(McCroskey and Young 1981, 24)

Psychology literature has identified three dimensions of source credibility, in particular when the source is an individual; trust, expertness and attractiveness.

Giffin (1967) defined interpersonal trust in the communication process as:

"....reliance upon the communication behavior of another person in order to achieve a desired but uncertain objective in a risky situation." (105)

Hovland, Janis, and Kelly (1953) defined expertness of a source as:

"the extent to which a communicator is perceived to be a source of valid assertions" (21)

Thus the implication which can be drawn is that more trustworthy the source, or the more expert the source is perceived to be, the more impact the message communicated by him/her will have on the recipient.

Though the dimensions of Trust and Expertness were simultaneously studied the dimension of source attractiveness was studied in isolation but almost parallel to the former one. The concept of the attractiveness of a communicator affecting the attitude change of the receiver was first discussed by McGuire (1969 ref. 1985) who postulated three components of source valence: credibility, attractiveness and power. McGuire argued about the inclusion of the attractiveness of the source as a component of source along with trustworthiness and expertise. He further argued about the three components of source attractiveness; Similarity, Familiarity and Liking, where,
similarity referred to the supposed resemblance between the source and the receiver of the message; familiarity meant the awareness or knowledge about the source which comes from exposure and likeability was the acceptance of the source by virtue of its attractiveness and appearance. While discussing about liking, McGuire (1969) opined,

"it would seem unobjectionable to hypothesize that the more the subject liked the source of a persuasive message, the more he would change his belief toward the position the source is advocating." (192)

A literature review of experimental studies on attractiveness of the source (Joseph 1982) suggested that physically attractive sources were able to generate more favorable response from the consumer in the context of advertising. It is interesting to note that studies which involved the attractiveness construct in terms of celebrity endorsements in the later years (Baker and Churchill 1977; Bower 2001; Kamins 1990; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Misra and Beatty 1990; Mowen and Brown 1981; Till and Busler 1998, 2000) mostly tested the effects of physical attractiveness rather than the three components mentioned by McGuire (1969). In effect, the research focused on physical attractiveness instead of attractiveness as a whole.

Definitions

Celebrity has been defined by Friedman, Termini, and Washington (1976) as someone who is,

"......known to the public for his accomplishment in areas unrelated to the product class endorsed." (22)
One of the reasons of using a celebrity is his/her wide recognition which has an impact on the credibility of the product endorsed. According to McCracken (1989), a celebrity endorser can be defined as:

"...any individual who enjoys public recognition and who uses this on behalf of a consumer good by appearing with it in an advertisement." (310)

The role of the celebrity spokesperson can be multiple and not necessarily mutually exclusive, such as:

**Testimonial:** Here the individual attests to the superiority or excellence of a product or service on the basis of personal experience with it.

**Endorser:** Here the individual is merely associated with the brand, which implies an endorsement. In this case the individual may or may not be an expert in the field of the brand.

**Actor:** Here the individual is merely a character in a dramatic presentation.

**Spokesman:** The individual represents the company or brand, much as does a salesman. (Kamen, Azhari and Kragh 1975. 17)

The celebrity selected for the endorsement sometimes may be an expert in the product/related area, such as Michael Jordan endorsing basketball shoes for Adidas. However, the celebrity may not be an expert. Sometimes, the celebrity may also have a long-term association with the product or brand.

Parallel Research Streams on Celebrity Endorsement
If one looks at the literature on celebrity endorsements in the last thirty odd years (one of the earliest paper on celebrity endorsements was by Friedman et al. 1976) two streams become evident. The first is the source credibility stream of research and the second is the congruence studies, popularly known as “match-up” studies. Both streams have been influenced heavily by Psychology literature. However majority of work has been done in the source studies compared to the congruence studies.

The “Source Credibility” Studies. This research stream primarily looked into finding out the dimensions of a celebrity source which affect the consumer in the communication process. The three dimensions of source credibility which have come out in course of the studies were Trustworthiness, Expertise and Attractiveness. However, there was contradictory evidence about the impact of the dimensions on the consumer behaviour. While some studies found out Trustworthiness to be the most important dimension of source credibility (Atkin and Block 1983; Kamins 1989; McGinnis and Ward 1980), there were studies in support of Expertise (Maddux and Rogers 1980; Ohanian 1991; Swartz 1984) and on support of Attractiveness (Baker and Churchill 1977; Caballero, Lumpkin, and Madden 1989; Kahle and Homer 1985; Silvera and Austad 2004). While some of the former studies analyzed the impact of a single dimension of credibility on the consumer there were studies which incorporated all three of the dimensions (Ohanian 1990) or two of them taken together (Friedman and Friedman 1979; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Weiner and Mowen 1986). Ohanian (1990) developed a scale to measure the credibility of a celebrity endorser using all three dimensions of Attractiveness, Trustworthiness and Expertise. This is the only study till date which has developed a measurement instrument for measuring the credibility of a celebrity endorser. The scale was later validated by Pornpitakpan (2003) in a different geographical setting.
The "Congruence" Studies. The congruence studies have delved into the similarities or correspondence between the product or brand and the celebrity and are popularly known as the "match-up" hypothesis. The celebrity-product congruence hypothesis argues that for an advertisement featuring a celebrity to be effective on the consumers, there should be congruence or 'match-up' between the celebrity and the product advertised. This hypothesis also has its roots in psychology (Osgood and Tannenbaum 1955). The two earliest studies on celebrity endorsements by Friedman et al. (1976) and Friedman and Friedman (1979), however, investigated some aspects of congruence between the celebrity and the product. DeSarbo and Harshman (1985) applied a new methodology called Parallel Factor Analysis (PARAFAC) to come up with dimensions of celebrity-brand congruence. Speck, Schumann, and Thompson (1988) found out rather interesting results in their study. They found out that, a product incongruent celebrity may have the same impact on advertisement recall as that of a celebrity who is congruent. Moreover, they also found out that the expertise of the celebrity does not necessarily affect recall. A lot of research on the celebrity-brand congruence has taken place in the decade of the 90's and later on (Kamins 1990; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Mittelstaedt and Riesz 2000). Researchers have used various theories in course of studies such as associative network theory (Misra and Beatty 1990), elaboration likelihood model (Kirmani and Shiv, 1998) and theory of correspondent inferences (Cronley et al. 1999; Silvera and Austad 2004). The match-up studies also have their share of contradictory findings. A content analysis of advertisements published in sports illustrated featuring athlete endorsers by Jones and Schumann (2000) had findings which go against the match-up hypothesis. Some of the major findings by Jones and Schumann (2000) were; female oriented products were being endorsed by male athletes, products unrelated to the sport of a particular celebrity athlete were endorsed by the
athlete and a significant proportion of the ads did not have a message which reinforced the connection between the endorser and the product.

The Meaning Transfer Model. Because of the lack of explanatory power of the source models (both source credibility and source attractiveness), McCracken (1989) proposed the meaning transfer model. McCracken postulated that celebrities stand for a set of meanings to the consumer. In addition, they offer a range of personality traits and lifestyles that cannot be explained by the source models. McCracken, therefore, suggested that a general objective of an ad should be to transfer the meaning from the celebrity to the product. The roots of the meaning transfer model can be found in McCracken's (1986) work on cultural movement of meaning in consumer goods. The meaning transfer model was tested in a derived form in various areas in marketing literature such as Branding (O'Reilly 2005), Cause Related Marketing (Cornwell and Smith 2001), Advertising (Till and Priluck 2001), Consumer Behaviour (Hogg and Banister 2000; Roster 2001) and Event Sponsorships (Gwinner 1997). The number of studies related to the concept of meaning transfer proposed by McCracken (1989) was few compared to the source credibility and congruence studies. The early studies did some progress in testing out the meaning transfer phenomenon (Langmeyer and Walker 1991; Walker, Langemeyer, and Langemeyer 1992) but after that interest dwindled in that area. Some of the later studies have used source dimensions to explain meaning transfer such as Expertise (Peetz, Parks, and Spencer 2004) or Attractiveness and Trustworthiness (Charbonneau and Garland working paper).

Brand Personality
A number of studies have been undertaken on the subject of brand personality. The initial idea, that a brand should be considered as a person or a human being, was given in the work of Gardner and Levy (1955). Much later, Aaker and Fournier (1995) in a commentary of three ideas tried to define brand personality from three perspectives which were, Conceptual, methodological and substantive, and to develop a brand personality inventory based on personality traits from psychology and marketing literature. They also discussed the theoretical and practical implications of the existence of the big five factor structure and developed a 45 item pool which they called Brand Personality Inventory. This was followed by a study by Aaker (1997) in which she tried to develop a scale to measure brand personality. Aaker (1997) came up with five distinct brand personality dimensions which were Sincerity, Excitement, Competence, Sophistication and Ruggedness. Aaker (1997) also opined that the five dimensions could be further divided into fifteen facets which were: down to earth, honest, wholesome, cheerful, daring, spirited, imaginative, up-to-date, reliable, intelligent, successful, upper-class, charming, outdoorsy and tough. Aaker’s (1997) BP scale was later on used by a number of studies in different contexts. Supphellen and Grønhaug (2003) did a study to test the applicability of the BP scale in Russian context. The two major findings of their study were (a) Brand personalities of western brands had a significant impact on brand attitude, and (b) the effect of western brand personalities was found to be by the consumer ethnocentrism. A study by Venable, Rose, and Gilbert (2003) which intended to measure brand personality of the non-profit sector brands found out four dimensions out of the five by Aaker (1997) to be included in their study. Diamantopoulos et al. (2005) used Aaker’s (1997) BP scale and found out that brand personality of the parent brand did not have any adverse effect on the extensions. However, the generalizability of Aaker’s (1997) BP scale has been questioned by some researchers. Azoulay
and Kapferer (2003) pointed to the flaws in the Aaker (1997) BP scale and opined that the scale does not actually measure the brand personality construct but only aggregates some dimensions of brand identity. Austin, Siguaw, and Mattila (2003) tried to find out the generalizability of Aaker’s (1997) BP and concluded that the framework does not generalize to individual brands in a broadly defined product category. Another important area where researchers have delved is that of measuring brand personality of online brands personality (Okazaki 2003; Park, Choi, and Kim 2005, Müller and Chnadon 2003). The relationship between self-concept or consumer’s own personality and BP has also been studied (Phau and Lau 2000; Thomson 2006) where the researchers found out consumer’s own personality has an impact on the perceived brand personality. The other areas of brand personality, which have been studied by researchers, are: impact of brand personality on customer loyalty (Magin et al. 2003), cross cultural effects on BP (Aaker, Benet-Martinez, and Garolera 2001, Sung and Tinkham 2005), brand personality effects on consumer perceptions towards store brands (Beldona and Wysong 2007), existence and effect of BP of appliance brand (Triplett 1994) and change in perception of BP traits with time and information (Johar et al. 2005).

CONCEPTUALIZATION

From the literature review on celebrity endorsements and BP, it is obvious that researchers have not yet looked into the effects of the celebrity personality on the brand personality. However, given the context of incremental use of celebrities to promote brands, this becomes very important. Both the congruence studies in celebrity endorsements (Friedman and Friedman 1976; Kamins 1990; Kamins and Gupta 1994; Mittelstaedt and Riesz 2000) and the
meaning transfer (McCracken 1989; Langmeyer and Walker 1991; Walker, et al. 1992) studies have hinted on the congruence or transfer of attributes from the celebrity to the brand endorsed. Even if we infer from Misra and Beatty (1990), the associative network of a celebrity (which includes his/her personality attributes) should affect the brand personality he/she endorses. This very point could well explain the questions which were raised against the generalizability of the BP scale (Austin, Siguaw, and Mattila 2003; Azulay and Kapferer 2003). This point is even supported by Durgee (1998) that the researchers need to delve into the sources of BP. Thus we define the objective of the study which is to examine the effect of the celebrity personality on the brand personality. Hence, we define our hypothesis which states:

Hypothesis: The personality of a celebrity will have a positive impact on the personality of a brand.

Based on this, we come up with our conceptual model which is given in Figure 1.

Figure 1. The Conceptual Model

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, ANALYSIS AND RESULTS
There were four phases to the execution of this research. The first phase consisted of the celebrity selection for the study and the selection of the brand endorsed by the celebrity, questionnaire design and data collection. In the second phase the data collected on the celebrity was analyzed. In the third phase the data collected on the brand was analyzed. In the fourth and last phase, the conceptual model given in figure 1 is tested. The entire study used student samples. The justification of using student sample is from the fact that they are exposed to the media, and thus to celebrity advertisements. Secondly, at their age the celebrity becomes more of an idol or role model. Thus student sample was supposed to fulfill the study objectives.

Phase 1

To select the celebrity, a pre-test was performed. The students were asked to write the names of five celebrities whom they like the most, and would like to see them in product advertisements. There was one question for the gender and one for the region (where the respondent belongs to) to check for gender or regional bias. The pretest was administered on 50 students of a reputed business school in central India. The sample consisted of 22 females and 28 males. Sachin Tendulkar (Sachin), the cricketer was identified as the most liked celebrity being rated at the first or second position more than 80% of the times. Next, the brand identified for the celebrity was Pepsi. There were two reasons behind selecting the brand as Pepsi. Sachin endorsed Pepsi for a long time and Pepsi being a soft drink is well identified and used by the students. The items to identify personality of the celebrity as well as the brand were selected from the fifteen facets given in Aaker’s (1997) study. The data was collected using five point semantic differential scale (1 – Not at all descriptive to 5 – Totally Descriptive). Data was
collected from the students of the same business school (but different from the respondents of the pre-test). Two separate samples were selected for the celebrity and the brand respectively. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed for each group, of which 196 usable questionnaires were obtained for the first group (Sachin) and 198 for the second group (Pepsi).

Phase 2

Using the data collected on the celebrity (Sachin), exploratory factor analysis (Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation) was conducted to identify the factor structure of the personality facets. All fifteen facets had loadings above 0.50 and the same five factor structure of Aaker (1997) was obtained. All factors had reasonable coefficient alpha values of more than 0.7 (Nunnally 1978) ensuring internal consistency reliability (Refer to table 1 for Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Values and Component Matrix for Sachin)

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Values and Component Matrix for Sachin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name in Analysis</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>1 Sincerity</th>
<th>2 Excitement</th>
<th>3 Competence</th>
<th>4 Sophistication</th>
<th>5 Ruggedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDtoe</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHo</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWho</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SChee</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDar</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSpi</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SImagi</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUptoda</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRely</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLintelli</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though exploratory factor analysis is useful for identifying the underlying factor structure and thus providing initial unidimensionality (convergent validity) among the items in a factor, it cannot ensure discriminant validity (Gefen, Straub, and Boudreau 2000, Kline 1998). Thus, discriminant validity of the factors was tested using Structural Equation Modeling (AMOS 5).

We took two factors at a time with a correlated and a restricted (correlation = 1) model for each pair. For the five factors in the celebrity (Sachin) dataset, a total of ten (10) pair-wise discriminant validity checks were run. The constrained and unconstrained chi-square values of each model were compared and a significant difference was found between them, thus indicating high discriminant validity. We found all 10 chi-square differences statistically significant at p<0.05. (Refer to table 2) Thus the analysis for the celebrity data indicated support for the discriminant validity criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>Correlated Model</th>
<th>Restricted Model</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>32.06 19</td>
<td>158.4 20</td>
<td>126.34/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>32.90 13</td>
<td>104.3 14</td>
<td>71.4/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 3

Phase 3 was a repetition of Phase 2, only the dataset used was that of the brand (Pepsi). Exploratory factor analysis (Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation) identified the factor structure of the personality facets. In this case too all the fifteen facets had loadings above 0.50 and the same five factor structure was obtained. All factors had reasonable coefficient alpha values of more than 0.7 (Nunnally 1978) ensuring internal consistency reliability (Refer to table 3 for Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Values and Component Matrix for Pespi data).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name in Analysis</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>1 Sincerity</th>
<th>2 Excitement</th>
<th>3 Competence</th>
<th>4 Sophistication</th>
<th>5 Ruggedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDtoe</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pho</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pwho</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pchee</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pdar</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td></td>
<td>.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pspi</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimagi</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puptoda</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prely</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Pintelli</td>
<td>Psucc</td>
<td>Pupper</td>
<td>Pcharming</td>
<td>Pout</td>
<td>Ptough</td>
<td>Coefficient Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.773 0.766 0.800 0.902 0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.849 0.824 0.906 0.768 0.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discriminant validity of the factors was tested in the same procedure which was used for the celebrity data. Even in this case a total of ten (10) pair-wise discriminant validity checks were run and all ten chi-square differences were statistically significant at p<0.05 (Refer to table 4). Thus the analysis for the brand (Pepsi) data also indicated support for the discriminant validity criterion.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>Correlated Model</th>
<th>Restricted Model</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>194.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>195.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>222.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>151.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>219.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistication</td>
<td>Ruggedness</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 4

In this phase, the conceptual model given in Figure 1 was tested. For both the celebrity data and the brand data, the factor scores were calculated as mean of the items included in that factor. This was done to preserve the range of the original scale used to collect the data. Then a structural model was run using the celebrity personality as the exogenous latent variable and the brand personality as the endogenous latent variable. SEM was used to achieve the objective and the software used to run the model was AMOS 5. The results indicated a reasonably good fit (Refer to table 5).

Table 5
Fit Results of the Conceptual Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Chi Square/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity Personality → Brand Personality</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>92.237</td>
<td>2.713</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important finding of this phase was the statistically significant effect ($\beta = 0.391$) of the celebrity personality on the brand personality.

Phase 5

The objective of this phase was to examine the reverse causality of the brand on the celebrity endorser. Thus the model given in Figure 1 was modified so that the causal arrow goes from the brand to the celebrity to the brand. The result of the model run was interesting. The effect of the
DISCUSSION

The study had implication for the researcher as well as the marketer. For the researcher, the study has generated two major inferences. First, the BP scale developed by Aaker (1997) was found out to be reliable and valid both for the celebrity and the brand. Thus it supports the BP construct and its use in marketing research. Second, the study found support for the effect on celebrity personality on brand personality, and thus the Hypothesis stated in the conceptualization section could not be rejected. In a broader sense, the study supports the Meaning Transfer Model of McCracken (1989) if we consider personality to be a part of the meaning which is transferred. For the marketer, the study could draw inference that there will be an impact of the celebrity personality on the brand personality. Thus in case of a new brand, care should be taken before going for the celebrity endorsement, because there may be a transfer of some personality attributes from the celebrity to the brand which is unwanted by the marketer. This also suggests a possible cause for why all celebrities do not create the same effect on all brands. Thus in effect the study contributes both to the celebrity endorsement and brand personality literature and calls for more research in this area.

LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSION
The study was conducted only on student samples. Though there was justification behind that, but since the celebrity endorsements are a national phenomenon and affect people from all demographic backgrounds, such a study could be conducted on a rather large scale. Secondly, in this study, only one brand and one celebrity was selected. Future research could select multiple celebrities and multiple brands and look into various other issues such as whether in case of multiple endorsements, the same effect of celebrity personality on BP hold good or whether two celebrities endorsing the same brand have the same effect on the BP. The present study has tried to answer some questions within its limitations. It found out the BP scale of Aaker (1997) to be valid in the Indian context. It also found out that the celebrity personality has a positive impact on the BP of the brand he/she endorses. However, this study is a stepping stone for further research into a lot more questions.
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