Potential of Brand Personality: Attachment Styles as Moderator

Lo Ying Tuan[1*], Huam Hon Tat[2], Ahmad Sharifuddin Shamsuddin[1], Amran Md Rasli[1] and Ahmad Jusoh[1]

[1] *Faculty of Management and Human Resource Management, Universit Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia*
[2] *Faculty of Business, Management and Social Sciences, Quest International University Perak, Malaysia*

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the effect of consumer's attachment styles as a moderator in the impact of brand personality on its brand attachment. This research investigated the preferred brand personality of anxious and avoidant attachment consumer, their likelihood to be attached to that brand and how they respond to any changes in brand personality. A total of 300 students were surveyed. Their attachment style and their response towards sincere and exciting personality and its brand attachment were assessed. Empirical study shows that anxious attachment style consumer preferred sincere brand personality, tends to be attached with it and did not respond to any changes in brand personality. Avoidant attachment style people on the other hand have a stronger relationship with the exciting brand personality, are not likely to be attached to it and will respond to changes in brand personality. This study implies that marketers should get to know their targeted market's attachment style prior coming out with the suitable brand personality.

Keyword: brand personality, attachment styles, brand attachment

Introduction

A brand personality describes brands in terms of human characteristics. It is a comprehensive concept, which includes all the tangible and intangible traits of a brand, say beliefs, values, prejudices, features, interests, and heritage. A brand personality is what makes the brand unique (Aaker, Frounier & Brasel, 2004). Brand personality is seen as a valuable factor in increasing brand engagement and brand attachment, in much the same way as people relate and bind to other people (Maheshwari, 2009). It is believed that the preference of a brand personality and it brand attachment are closely related by individual's attachment style. Some examples of different personalities of existing brands are; Dunhill perceived as 'masculine' while Mild Seven as 'feminine' and IBM as 'old' while Apple as 'young' (Aaker, 1997). All those brands of different personalities have their own target market. This is why some organizations try to change their brand personality hoping that they will gain a new target market. In essence, 'Personality traits are what the brand will live and die for'. A brand personality is affected by everything associated by it and by changing that, the brand personality can be changed (Ang, Dubelaar & Kamakura, 2006). The only question is how different consumers react to the different and changing brand personality?

According to Aaker (1999), brand personality is a vehicle of consumer self-expression and can be instrumental in helping a consumer expresses different aspects of his or her self. Brand personality like human personality is both distinctive and enduring, both are built over a period of time. The expression refers to the outcome of all the consumer's experiences with the brand. In the other words, the brand's personality is the weighted average of previous impressions. In consumer's mind, these impressions merge to form an overall concept of what to expect from brand (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). This is why different brand personalities will have difficulties in getting different consumer's attention. Brand strategists and marketers have eagerly searched for a perfect brand personality to adopt as different consumers react differently to different brand personality (Gopalan, Pagiavlas & Jones, 2006). For example, an anxious consumer will perceive a brand personality differently from an avoidant consumer. Hence this matter has made the marketers to come out with the ideas of changing the existing brand personality to have a new target market. But to which extend will the consumers react to it?

Literature Review

Brand Personality

A brand can help to express personality. There can be a set of feelings and emotions attached to a brand

---

[*]Corresponding author. Email: lyingtuan@hotmail.com

personality, just as there are to a person. For example, the feeling of using an Apple product would not emerge compared to using a Compaq. The ultimate personality expression occurs when a brand become an extension or an integral part of the self. Some people may never aspire to have a certain personality trait but would like to have a relationship with one who has that (Aaker, 1991).

This is the reason why brand personality is closely related to the consumer's personality and styles. Each person's distinct personality influences his or her buying behavior. Personality refers to the unique psychological characteristic that leads to relatively consistent and lasting responses to one's own environment. Personality is usually described in term of traits such as self confidence, dominance, sociability, autonomy, defensiveness, adaptability, and aggressiveness. Personality can be useful in analyzing consumer behavior for certain product or brand choices. The idea is that brands also have personalities, and that consumers are likely to choose brands whose personalities matched their own. A brand personality is the specific mix of human traits that may be attributed to a particular brand (Kotler & Keller, 2006).

Consumers often describe brands by using adjectival descriptors of personality traits, and marketers often create or reinforce these perceptions by their brand positioning. Successfully positioning a brand's personality within a product category requires measurement models that are able to disentangle a brand's unique personality traits from those traits that are common to all brands in the product category (Batra, Lenk & Wedel, 2006).

The appropriate measurement of existing brand personality imagery has been studied for over twenty years (Plummer, 1984). Researchers have quite naturally sought to develop a valid and reliable measurement (survey) instrument of brand personality that is suitable enough to be usable across various product categories and consumer segments, drawing on the extensive literature on human personality (Digman, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987). The measurement instrument used most often recently is the one developed by Aaker (1997). In her extensive development of this instrument, she sought to develop scales "suitable across product categories".

In Aaker's (1997) research, by having 631 respondents rate each of 37 brands on 114 personality traits; with these brands being carefully selected to represent a broad array of product/service categories, a few brands per category. She factor analyzed the between-brand variance after averaging the scores of each brand on each personality trait across multiple respondents.

In other words, the data matrix she factor-analyzed was based on pooled data from 37 brands across multiple product categories. Using this aggregated category/brand matrix, she found five factors, labeled Sincerity (sample item: honest), Excitement (daring), Competence (reliable), Sophistication (upper-class), and Ruggedness (tough). The Brand Personality dimension of Aaker (1997) is a framework to describe and measure the 'personality' of a brand in five core dimension, each divided into set of facets. It is an easy to understand model to describe the profile of a band using an analogy with the human being. The five core dimension and their facets are:
•Sincerity (down-to-earth, honest, wholesome, cheerful)
•Excitement (daring, spirited, imaginative, up-to-date)
•Competence (reliable, intelligent, successful)
•Sophistication (upper class, charming)
•Ruggedness (outdoorsy, tough)

Among the five dimensions, sincere and exciting brand personalities appear to capture much of the variance in personality ratings of brands (Aaker, Fournier & Brasel, 2004). Exciting and sincere brand personalities are particularly interesting because they map onto the key three ideals that Fletcher et al. (1999) note as being important in interpersonal relationships: that is, warmth, vitality, and status.

According to Aaker (1997), nurturance, warmth, family orientation, and traditionalism are characteristics of sincere brand personalities. Further, exciting brand personalities convey vitality, uniqueness, and independence. Hence, this research focuses only on exciting and sincere brand personality. If a personality can be created for a brand, it will be easier to attract consumers to the brand. As brand grows, as do human relationships, it is emotional dimension that tends to become dominant in brand loyalty. Personality grows brands by providing the emotional differences and experience (Temporal, 2002).

Brand Attachment

Brand attachment is defined as strength of the cognitive and emotional bond connecting the brand with the self by Park, MacInnis and Priester (2006). This definition involves two unique and essential elements which are connectedness between the brand and the self and a cognitive and emotional bond, the strength of which evokes a readiness to allocate one's processing resources toward the brand.

According to Thomson, MacInnis and Park (2005) research, brand-self connectedness reflects the extent to which the brand is linked to the self, given its essentiality in facilitating utilitarian, experiential and/or symbolic needs (goals). In the same way that human infants develop attachments to their mothers from their mothers' responsiveness to their needs

(e.g., needs for warmth, comfort, food), individuals develop attachments to brands that can be counted on to fulfill their needs. Although adults' needs are substantially more complex than those of infants, the basic process by which attachments develop is similar.

Previous research by Berman and Sperling (1994) showed that bonds that connect the brand to the self are both cognitive and emotional. Personalized experiences and autobiographical memories of the brand evoke rich cognitive schemata, with links connecting the brand with personalized elements of the self. Further research by Mikulincer and Shaver (2005) stated that brand attachments are inherently self-relevant and have strong self implications which make the links that connect the brand to the self are also emotional. The strength of the bonds connecting the brand to the self engenders two effects.

First, brand related thoughts and feelings become highly accessible and are automatically retrieved from memory whenever the self is implicated (Collins & Read, 1994; Holmes, 2000; Mikulincer et al., 2001). This automaticity in cognitive and affective responses is well documented (Bargh et al., 1996; Bargh & Chartrand, 1999).

Second, given its self-linkages, the brand will become self relevant. This will impact one's readiness to allocate processing resources to the brand (Holmes, 2000; Berman & Sperling, 1994; Reis & Patrick, 1996). High accessibility and greater willingness to allocate processing resources for a high attachment brand, makes brand-associated information (thoughts and feelings) automatically retrieved when implicit or explicit brand-relevant cues are present.

According to Mikulincer and Shaver (2005), brand attachment can be strong when they can be consistently relied on to provide gratification (pleasure) through aesthetic or hedonic elements that have immediate mood-altering properties. Such gratification can be delivered through any combination of sensory experiences — visual, auditory, gustatory, tactile, olfactory, thermal, equilabratory, and/or kinesthetic.

Brands with such qualities play a primitive and efficacious role in altering attention from external and potentially distracting negative stimuli or thoughts to the self and emotions relevant to pleasure. Such brands also impact emotions like hope, efficacy, and optimism regarding daily distress management, one's ability to cope with life problems, and emotional stability. Brand attachment can also be strengthened through an internalization process in which the brand is linked to the self and its enrichment.

Here, brands enable brand-self connections by symbolically representing one's ideal past, present, or future self (Markus & Nurius, 1986). At least three routes characterize the manner in which brands can enrich the self through symbolic self-representation: First, brands can enrich the self by serving as an anchor to and symbolically representing one's core past self. Second, brands can enrich the self by symbolically representing one's current self—reflecting who one is and what one believes. Third, brands can take on symbolic meaning representing who one is or wants to be, linking the brand to an ideal future self. Finally, strong attachments can occur when a brand creates a sense of an efficacious and capable self, enabling consumers to pursue goals and tasks.

Creating a sense of efficacy is in turn contingent on product performance attributes that consistently and reliably enable task performance. If and when a brand is not able to serve the consumers' needs effectively through reliable functional performance, the basic assumption behind the attachment would be violated. Consumers' trust with a brand's competence is therefore critical for the attachment formation and its sustainability (Carlston, 1992).

Anxiety Dimension of Attachment Theory

The anxiety dimension assesses the degree to which the self is perceived as being worthy or unworthy of love (or one's lovability). Anxious individuals, who are perpetually preoccupied with their selfworth and self-esteem concerns, are known to direct excessive attention toward attachment figures by using a defensive strategy known as hyperactivation (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). Hyperactivation implies greater vigilance of relationship- related behaviors and information as well as greater persistence in seeking comfort, reassurance, and support from relationship parties.

Anxiety is also highly related to a negative model of self which is characterized by an individual's belief that he or she is not worthy of love. Anxiety level is also related to low self-esteem according to Griffin and Bartholomew's (1994) research. Lastly, self-criticism also influences anxiety level (Murphy & Bates, 1997).

Anxious individuals' negative view of self generates feelings of uncertainty regarding their relationship partners and a fear of abandonment by loved ones, leading them to strive for acceptance by others (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). Anxious attachment types, who are lower in self-esteem, tend to use external help to enhance their self-worth and deal with relational problems (Birnbaum et al., 2006; Cicirelli 2004). For these reasons, we expect high anxiety types to be more sensitive to and more likely to direct attention to brand personality.

In contrast, individuals with a less anxious attachment style have a more positive view of self and relational self-worth. Given their higher feelings of self-worth, these individuals are less likely to rely on external means like brand names to help enhance their appeal and image in the interpersonal domain. In other words, less anxious individuals, for whom self-worth concerns are not chronically activated, may be less disposed to zero in on a brand's personality unless explicitly directed to it (Swaminathan & Ahluwalia, 2008).

Past research in consumer behavior shows that brand names are symbolic entities that can help consumers in signaling important attributes to others (Belk, 1988; Levy, 1959; Wallendorf & Arnould, 1988). For instance, the symbolic interactionism school of thought (Schenk & Holman, 1980) suggests that individuals will choose brand names in accordance with the particular self they choose to express in a given social situation. As such, the particular self that individuals decide to signal through brands may be either consistent with their actual self-concept or their ideal self-concept (Landon, 1974).

Past research of Belch (1978) suggests that individuals who are more concerned with social interaction and who require constant feedback from their environment in order to gain acceptance are more likely to be guided by their ideal self-concept. Brand personality endows a brand with humanlike traits and has been shown to be influential in understanding consumer brand relationships (Aaker, Frounier & Brasel, 2004). It is expected that a brand's personality fulfills a signaling role for anxious individuals by helping them project their ideal self-concept to others (Dolich, 1969; Landon, 1974).

In sum, anxious attachment style individuals are expected to use the brand as a means toward the goal of signaling oneself as a desirable individual. This implies that anxious individuals will project attributes they consider important from the perspective of their ideal self-concept. However, consumers are likely to vary in what attributes they value (ideal self-concept) and, therefore, want to project to others. These differences in their ideal self-concept are likely to be influenced by the demands of their particular interpersonal relationships (Landon, 1974).

Avoidance Dimension of Attachment Theory

The avoidance dimension of attachment captures the individual's view of others. Avoidant style individuals have a negative view of others. They are characterized by a high degree of self-reliance and desire for autonomy (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003). Since avoidant individuals are reluctant to rely on others, they tend to maintain a greater degree of emotional distance in their interpersonal relationships.

In other words, avoidant style individuals tend to have relationships characterized by lower levels of emotional involvement, trust, and satisfaction (Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Kirkpatrick & Davis, 1994; Shaver & Brennan, 1992).

It should be noted that the existing research does not suggest that avoidant individuals shun social contact altogether; rather, they avoid intimacy in relationships and, therefore, end up with a qualitatively different type of relationship compared to the low avoidant types (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

In this regard the literature notes that avoidant individuals tend to form shallow, less stable, short-term relationships. Hence, despite their independent nature and lower level of interest in close intimate relationships, it is expected that those with a negative view of self (high anxiety) and a negative view or others (high avoidance) will be interested in signaling a desirable image to others, in particular, if they expect relational exchanges with them in the future.

Because avoidant consumers value independence and self-reliance and are not desirous of intimate relationships, an exciting brand personality is most likely to reflect and be consistent with his or her ideal self-concept and the relationship ideals important to him or her. This rationale is consistent with past research on brand personality (Aaker, Benet-Martinez, & Garolera, 2001), which indicates that consumers who value self-assertion and independence tend to have a higher preference for brands that reflect the exciting personality trait.

Therefore, it is expected that avoidance type consumers to exhibit preference for exciting brands. In contrast, low avoidant style individuals have a favorable view of others and are interested in pursuing intimate and close relationships with them (Collins & Read, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). The low avoidant who are also low on self-worth (high anxiety) constantly strive for acceptance by valued others.

Therefore, sincerity, expressed by attributes such as down-to-earth, real, sincere, and honest, is likely to resonate with them and also most likely to symbolize the ideals that they would like to signal to potential relationship partners. Therefore, it is expected that sincere brands would appeal more to the anxious type consumers because sincerity is likely to be consistent with their ideal self-concept, since it also characterizes the qualities they seek in relationships.

Methodology

This research is designed with the purpose of determining the moderating effect of consumer's attachment style in the impact of brand personality on its brand attachment and aimed to study the hypotheses below:

H1:Anxious attachment style will moderate the preference over brands that perceived as having sincere brand personality which result in stronger brand attachment.

H2: Avoidant attachment style will moderate the preference over brands that perceived as having exciting brand personality which result in stronger brand attachment.

The research leaned heavily on the survey method, which used the quantitative approach to generate the primary research data. A set of questionnaire is designed to help obtain the data. The respondents of this research were the management students of Universiti Teknologi Malaysia with a population of 1300 people. The data is collected through questionnaires. Pilot test is run with data collected from 20 students and the validity is tested using the Cronbach's alpha reliability test. All variables are acceptable with alpha value recorded above 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978).

This research referred to Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table in determining the needed sample size S of a randomly chosen sample from a given finite population of N cases such that the sample proportion p is within $+ .05$ of the population proportion P with a 95 percent level of confidence. Based on the table, 297 respondents are needed for a population of 1300. Hence, the sample size of this research is set to 300 people.

The respondents are sampled using convenience sampling which is a nonprobability sampling that obtains a sample of elements based on the convenience of the researcher.

Questionnaires are distributed randomly to university students of Faculty of Management and collected within the same month on November 2009. The survey managed to get a perfect response rate with all the distributed questionnaires answered and valid. All the questions are designed based on the objectives of this research.

The questionnaire is divided into three different sections. Section 1 of the questionnaire contains questions to obtain respondent's demographic information. Section 2 contains questions that would answer the objectives of the study. There are a total of 12 questions which are adapted from Swaminathan and Ahluwalia's (2008) research. Thus, the validity of the questions is believed to be high. Respondents have to answer the questions based on two printed ads

which reflect sincere and exciting brand personality separately. Section 3 contains questions that would determine the respondent's attachment style. There are a total of 10 questions and are adapted from Fraley's (2000) Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) questionnaire. The factors which contribute to the impact of brand personality on its brand attachment are scaled using Seven-Point Likert Scale. The scale is developed by Rennis Likert in the 1930s that asked the respondents to indicate whether they agree or disagree with a statement (Wysocki, 2001). Each response is given a numerical score ranging from 1 to 7.

All quantitative data collected from the questionnaire is subsequently keyed in to the SPSS software (Statistical Package for Social Science) for further analysis. Frequencies statistics are used to indentify respondent's demographic background. Reliability analysis is used to identify the consistency of the questionnaire. Mean calculation is used to identify the respondent's attachment style.

Descriptive Statistics are used to identify the preferred brand personality (sincere or exciting) of individuals who have (anxious or avoidant) attachment style. Pearson Moment Correlation analysis is used to identify the strength of the relationships between the brand personality, attachment styles and brand attachment.

Multiple regression is used to identify the relationship between brand personality (sincere or avoidant) and its brand attachment with individuals' attachment style (anxious or avoidant) as moderator. Finally, paired samples T test is used to identify the significance of preference over the two personalities (anxious and avoidant).

Findings and Discussions

Profile of Respondents

Out of 300 copies of questionnaires, 27.0% are male and the rest are female respondents. 17.7% of the respondents were 19 to 20 years old, 56.3% were 21 to 22, 23.3% were 23 to 24 years old, and 2.7% were 25 years old and above.

From the total respondents, 33.3% are Malay, 62.7% are Chinese, 2.7% are Indian and the remaining 1.3% consisted of other races. Apart from that, the data according to the respondents' academic program is as follows–Management Technology (37.3%), Management Marketing (25.3%), HR Development (16.0%), Psychology (14.0%) and Accounting (7.3%). Table 1 summarizes the respondents' demographic profile according to the percentage of the overall number of respondents.

Table 1. Profile of respondents.

Demographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age		
19 – 20	53	17.7
21 – 22	169	56.3
23 – 24	70	23.3
25 and above	8	2.7
Gender		
Male	81	27.0
Female	219	73.0
Race		
Malay	100	33.3
Chinese	188	62.7
Indian	8	2.7
Others	4	1.3
Academic Program		
Management (Technology)	112	37.3
Management (Marketing)	76	25.3
HR Development	48	16.0
Psychology	42	14.0
Accounting	22	7.3

Respondent's attachment styles

The respondents are then separated into two groups of anxious or avoidant attachment style. The respondents are separated based on the attachment level based on their mean scores on the Close Relationship–Revised Adult (ECR-R) Attachment Questionnaire. The number of the respondents by attachment styles is illustrated in Table 2. The number of respondents whose attachment style is anxious is 118 respondents (39.3%) while 182 respondents (60.7%) have an avoidant attachment style.

Table 2. Respondents by attachment styles.

	Attachment Styles	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Anxious	118	39.3
2	Avoidant	182	60.7
	Total	300	100

Preference over brand personality

Descriptive statistics indicates how the respondents of the two attachment styles rated their preference over the brand personality of sincere and exciting. The anxious attachment style respondents prefer sincere brand personality with a mean of 5.02 compared to exciting personality with mean 4.83. However, the avoidant attachment style respondents prefer exciting brand personality with the mean of 4.88 compared to sincere personality with mean 4.78. It is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Preference over brand personality.

Attachment Styles	Brand Personality	Overall Mean	SD
Anxious	Sincere	5.02	1.23386
	Exciting	4.83	1.23255
Avoidant	Sincere	4.78	1.24782
	Exciting	4.88	1.16058

Relationship between brand personalities and its brand attachment with attachment styles as moderator

The strength of the relationship between the dependent variables (brand attachment) and independent variables (brand personality) is tested using multiple regressions. Table 4 shows that both sincere and exciting personalities have positive relationship with their brand attachment in the anxious attachment style group. However, sincere personality has a more positive relationship with its brand attachment with a beta value (0.565) compared to beta value (0.557) of exciting personality towards its brand attachment. The adjusted R2 of 0.314 and 0.305 illustrates that 31.4% and 30.5% of the variance had been significantly explained by the independent variables respectively.

Table 4. Regression result of brand personality and brand attachment for anxious attachment group.

Brand Personality	Brand Attachment	
	Beta (β) +	Significant
Sincere	0.565**	0.00
Adjusted R^2	0. 314	
F Statistic	54.485	
Sig. F	0.00	
Exciting	0.557**	0.00
Adjusted R^2	0.305	
F Statistic	52.311	
Sig. F	0.00	

** p-value < 0.01, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 5 shows the relationship of both the brand personalities with their brand attachment in the avoidant attachment style group. Both have positive relationship. However this time, exciting personality has a more positive relationship with its brand attachment with a beta value (0.684) compared to beta value (0.521) of sincere personality towards its brand attachment. The adjusted R2 of 0.267 and 0.465 illustrates that 26.7% and 46.5% of the variance had been significantly explained by the independent variables respectively.

Table 5. Regression result of brand personality and brand attachment for avoidant attachment group.

Brand personality	Brand attachment	
	Beta (β) +	Significant
Sincere	0.521**	0.00
Adjusted R^2 F Statistic Sig. F	0.267 67.007 0.00	
Exciting	0.684**	0.00
Adjusted R^2 F Statistic Sig. F	0.465 158.231 0.00	

** p-value < 0.01, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Significant difference between independent variables

Paired Samples T Test is done to test for the significant difference between the two independent variables (sincere and exciting personality) in order to determine the preference over them in this study. Table 6 shows the paired sample test result for anxious attachment group with the two independent variables; sincere and exciting brand personality put into test. The t value obtained is 2.098 and with the significance value of 0.038. This shows that there is a significant different between sincere and exciting brand personality as independent variables in the anxious attachment group.

Table 6. Paired sample test for anxious attachment group.

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Sincere – Exciting	.56780	2.93950	.27060	.03188	1.10371	2.098	117	.038

Table 7 shows the paired sample test results for avoidant attachment group with the two independent variables; sincere and exciting brand personality put into test. The t value obtained is -1.640 and with the significance value of 0.103. This shows that there is no significant different between sincere and exciting brand personality as independent variables in the avoidant attachment group.

Table 7. Paired sample test for avoidant attachment group.

	Paired differences					t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Sincere – Exciting	-.31868	2.62112	.19429	-.70205	.06468	-1.640	181	.103

Discussions and Recommendations

Conclusion is made based on the analyses and findings of the study. It has been demonstrated that there is a moderating effect of attachment styles towards the choice of brand personality on its brand attachment. The study indicates significant relationship between the respondents' attachment styles, brand personalities and brand attachment. There are more respondents who have an avoidant attachment style with 182 people or 60.7%. The rest of the 108 (39.3%) respondents have an anxious attachment style. This is because the respondents were university students. People who have avoidant attachment style tend not to seek comfort or contact from their close ones. Most students were far away from home and they have learned to be independent and not to rely on their parents. Those with an avoidant attachment tend to have difficulty with intimacy and close relationships. These individuals do not invest much emotion in relationships and experience little distress when a relationship ends (Feeney, Noller, & Patty 1993).

Most students put studies as their top priority and set their relationship matter aside. Hence, there are more respondents with an avoidant attachment style obtained. Anxious attachment style people prefer sincere brand personality and are tend to be attached with it. However anxious people are not likely to respond to any changes in brand personality. Anxious individuals hoped for a secure and lasting relationship. For this reason, they are attached to a single particular brand of their preferred personality. When they like a

brand, they tend to form a relationship with it. Hence, they are most likely to be attached to a single brand. In this research, it is found that anxious individuals prefers sincere brand personality and are likely to be attached to it. Avoidant attachment style people have a stronger relationship with the exciting brand personality but are not likely to be attached to it. They are also likely to be influenced by any changes in brand personality. Avoidant individuals have difficulty in forming intimacy and close relationships. They also do not invest much emotion in relationships. For this reason, they are not easily attached to a single particular brand even though the brand exhibits their preferred personality. They might prefer a particular brand over another but they are not likely to be attached to it. They will try new brands in the market. Hence, they are not likely to be attached to a particular brand.

In this research, it is found that avoidant individuals prefer sincere brand personality however they are not likely to be attached to it. Determining the correct personality for the brand has been a challenge for many organizations. The consumer behavior is changing from day to day. This has made any brand hard in keeping its customers. This is when the attachment style comes in. Attachment style according to Bowlby (1980) is something you are born with and hard to change. For this reason, using the attachment style as moderator can be a good way to foster the connection between a brand and its consumer. As recommendations, the finding of this study has proven that there is a moderating effect of attachment style in the impact of brand personality and its brand attachment. Organization can refer to its customer's attachment style in defining its brand personality.

The study shows that anxious attachment style people preferred sincere brand personality and are tend to be attached with it while avoidant attachment style people have stronger relationship with exciting brand personality. Organization can use this information to come out with a brand personality most preferred by its target customers. Secondly, the study also shows that avoidant consumers are more brand sensitive. The change in a brand's personality may cause their behavior towards the brand to change as well. This suggest to organization to investigate on its customer's attachment style first before making any decision of re-branding. Changing its current brand personality may affect its existing customers. Thirdly, it also shows that the formation of a brand attachment may also be fostered by attachment style as moderator. Organization can use this information and adopt using attachment style as moderator in building its brand attachment. Having known of the best combinations of attachment style and brand personality that result in brand attachment, organizations can build their brand

attachment with the most optimum cost and time. They need not search for the correct orientation or go through try and error targeting. It is recommended that all organization conduct researches on their consumer's attachment style in order to understand the whole market place picture.

Limitation and Future Research Direction

The study has some limitations and scarcity as shown by the research findings. Thus, few recommendations are suggested to future studies for further improvement and advancement. This study is designed to investigate the moderating effect of attachment style in the impact of brand personality on its brand attachment. However, this study is only conducted in among the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia's students. Hence, the data, information and findings may not represent the same result outside the university and in other countries.

The result would be much better if the future studies could be performed on larger scale to represent the actual market place. The variables tested in this study are confined to two dimension of brand personality (sincere and exciting). Thus, this study does not include all the dimensions of brand personality as variables.

Further researches can be done using other dimension of brand personality that might give rise to positive result as well. The attachment style moderator is also confined to only two attachment style of anxious and avoidant. There are many more attachment related styles that can be tested in the future researches. Different attachment styles might have different moderating effect in the impact of brand personality on its attachment. Lastly after knowing the importance of a brand personality, researches on other moderators should also be done to further enhance its potential.

References

Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing brand equity*. New York: The Free Press.
Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (3), 347–56.
Aaker, J. L. (1999). The malleable self: The role of self-expression in Persuasion. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (1), 45–57.
Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 81 (3), 492–508.
Aaker, J. L., Fournier, S., & Brasel, S. A. (2004). When good brands do bad. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (1), 1–16.
Aaker, J., S. Fournier & S. A. Brasel (2004). When good brand do bad. *Journal of Comsumer Research*, 31(1), 1-16.
Ang, L., Dubelaar, C., Kamakura, W. (2006). *Changing brand personality through celebrity endorsement*. ANZMAC Conference Proceedings, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, November, 1679-86.

Azoulay, A. & Kapferer, J. (2003). Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality? *Journal of Brand Management*, 11 (November), 143-55.

Bargh, J.A. & Chartrand, T.L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54(7), 462-479.

Bargh, J. A., Chaiken, S., Raymond, P & Hymes, C. (1996). The automatic evaluation effect: Unconditional automatic attitude activation with a pronunciation task. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 32, 104-128.

Bartholomew, K & Horowitz L M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–44.

Batra, R., Lenk, P. & Wedel, M. (2006). *Separating brand from category personality.* Retrieved June 19, 2009, from http://www.umich.edu.

Belch, G. E. (1978). Belief systems and the differential role of the self-concept. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 5 (1),320–25.

Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (September), 139-68.

Berman, W. H. & Sperling M. B. (1994). The structure and function of adult attachment in M. B. Sperling and W. H. Berman (Eds). *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives*, New York: Guilford, 3-28.

Birnbaum, G. E., Mikulincer, M., Reis, H. T. & Gillath, O. (2006). When sex is more than just sex: Attachment orientations, sexual experience and relationship quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(5), 929–43.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss,*3. New York: Basic Books.

Carlston, D. E. (1992). Impression formation and the modular mind: The associated systems theory in L. L. Martin and A Tesser (Eds). *The Construction of Social Judgments*, 301-341. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cicirelli, V. (2004). God as the ultimate attachment figure for older adults. *Attachment and Human Development*, 6 (4), 371–88.

Collins, N. & Stephen J. R. (1990), Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58 (4), 644–63.

Collins, N., & Read, S. J. (1994). Cognitive representations of attachment: The structure and function of working models. In D. Perlman & K. Bartholomew (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships,* 5, 53–90). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41 (1), 417-40.

Dolich, I. J. (1969). Congruence relationships between Self-Images and Product Brands.*Journal of Marketing Research*, 6 (February), 80–84.

Feeney, J. A., Noller, P., & Patty, J. (1993). Adolescents' Interactions with the Opposite Sex: Influence of Attachment Style and Gender. *Journal of Adolescence*, 16, 169–186.

Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., Thomas, G. and Giles, L. (1999). Ideals in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76 (1), 72–89.

Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item-response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 350-365.

Gopalan S., Pagiavlas N, & Jones T. (2006). Branding MBA Programs: Are They Sufficiently Related to An Institution's Strategy? *Allied Academies International Conference*, l7 (2).

Griffin, D. W. & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of the self and other: Fundamental dimensions underlying measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 430–45.

Hazan, C. & Shaver P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (3), 511–24.

Holmes, J. G. (2000). Social relationships: The nature and function of relational schemas. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 447-495.

Kirkpatrick, L. A. & Keith E. D. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psycho*logy, 66 (3), 502–12.

Kotler, P. & Keller, K. L. (2006). *Marketing Management* (12th edition). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.

Landon, E. L. J. (1974). Self concept, ideal self concept, and consumer purchase intentions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1(2), 44–51.

Levy, S. J. (1959). Symbols for sale. *Harvard Business Review*, 37 (July/August), 117-24.

Maheshwari, N. (2009). Choosing and leveraging the right brand ambassador in insurance sector. *Aima Journal of Management and Research*, 173(3), Issue 2/4.

Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41 (9), 954-969.

McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81-90.

Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. R. (2003). The attachment behavioral system in adulthood: Activation, psychodynamics, and interpersonal processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, ed. Mark P. Zanna, Burlington, MA: Elsevier, 53–152.

Mikulincer, M., Hirschberger, G., Nachmias, O. & Gillath, O. (2001). The affective component of the secure base schema: Affective priming with representations of attachment security. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 305-321.

Mikulincer. M. & Shaver, P. R. (2005). Mental representations of attachment security: Theoretical foundation for a positive social psychology. Mark W. Baldwin, ed., *Interpersonal Cognition*, 233-266, New York: Guilford Press.

Murphy, B. & Bates, G. W. (1997). Adult attachment style and vulnerability to depression. *Personality and Individual differences*, 22, 835–44.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Park W. C., Macinnis D. J., & Priester, J. (2006). Beyond attitudes: Attachment and consumer behavior. *Seoul Journal of Business*, 12(2).

Plummer, J. T. (1984). How personality makes a difference. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 24, 27-31.

Reis, H. T. & Patrick, B. C. (1996). Attachment and intimacy: Component Processes, in E. Tory Higgins & Arie W. Kruglanski (eds). *Social psychology, handbook of basic principles,* 523-63, New York: Guilford Press.

Schenk, C. T. & Holman, R. H. (1980). A sociological approach to brand choice: the concept of situational self-image. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 7 (1), 610–14.

Swaminathan, S. & Ahluwalia (2008). When brand personality matters: The moderating role of attachment styles. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35.

Shaver, P. R. & Brennan, K. A. (1992). Attachment styles and the 'Big Five' personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18 (5), 536–45.

Temporal P. (2000). *Branding in Asia. The creation, development and management of Asian Brands for the global Market-*Revised Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Thomson, M., MacInnis, D. J. & Park, W. C. (2005). The ties that bind: Measuring the strength of consumers' emotional attachments to brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15 (1), 77–91.

Wallendorf, M. & Arnould, E. (1988). My favorite things: A cross-cultural inquiry into object attachment, possessiveness, and Social Linkage, *Journal of Consumer Research,* 14, 531–47.

Wysocki, D. K. (2001). *Readings in social research methods.* Belmont: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.