

Examining the Purchase Likelihood of a Brand Extension through the Lenses of
Emotional and Cultural Branding

Stephen P. Rennalls

A Thesis

in

John Molson School of Business

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science (Administration) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

May 2013

© Stephen P. Rennalls, 2013

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Stephen P. Rennalls

Entitled: Examining the Purchase Likelihood of a Brand Extension through the
Lenses of Emotional and Cultural Branding

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science (Administration)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with
respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Chair
_____ Bryan Barbieri, Examiner
_____ Tieshan Li, Examiner
_____ Bianca Grohmann, Supervisor

Approved by _____
Harjeet Bahbra, Graduate Program Director

_____, 20____
Steve Harvey, Dean of John Molson School of Business

ABSTRACT

Examining the Purchase Likelihood of a Brand Extension through the Lenses of Emotional and Cultural Branding

Stephen P. Rennalls

The emotional branding paradigm has received much attention in the literature over the years. The emergence of cultural branding as a competing paradigm to understand and explain consumers' consumption behaviour calls for a comparison of the two paradigms to understand which more accurately describes consumers' brand-related behaviours. This thesis examines whether emotional or cultural branding better explains consumers' evaluation of a brand extension. American college football fans were recruited for an online survey that asked them to respond to two emotional branding scales, one cultural branding scale, and a question measuring their purchasing intentions towards a hypothetical new television channel dedicated to the broadcasting of their school's football and varsity sports programming. Subsequent analysis examined which scales better predicted purchasing behaviour, and whether the effect was moderated by either the dedication of the fan in question or the respondent's perception of the extension's fit with the parent brand. Results indicate that the emotional branding scales were better predictors of purchase likelihood than the cultural branding indicators. Neither moderation hypothesis was confirmed. These results highlight the value of the emotional branding paradigm in explaining consumers' responses to brands, but raise questions regarding the explanatory power of the cultural branding paradigm. This research also has managerial implications in that it ties emotional branding to purchase intentions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support of many people and as such I would like to broadly thank everyone who helped me along the way for their contribution. Specifically I would like to acknowledge my supervisor, Bianca Grohmann, for her patience, guidance, and support of my thesis work as well her patience and understanding of the many other competing interests in my life; her contribution was essential in seeing this work to completion. Also, the love, support, and prayers of my parents, Paul and Valerie, siblings, David and Emily, and church, gave me motivation to complete this work even when I had none of my own. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the help, and insight provided by my friends Sook and John throughout the technical implementation and analysis of my study. Finally I would like to thank my friend Erika for her constant support and friendship from the beginning through completion of this degree.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Emotional Branding Paradigm	2
2.1 <i>Consumer Identity and Signalling</i>	2
2.2 <i>Brand Personality</i>	3
2.3 <i>Brand Relationship</i>	4
2.4 <i>Brand Community</i>	6
2.5 <i>Summary: Emotional Branding</i>	9
3. The Cultural Branding Paradigm	10
3.1 <i>Brands and Culture</i>	10
3.2 <i>Iconic Brands</i>	11
3.3 <i>Cult brands</i>	13
3.4 <i>Summary: Cultural Branding</i>	18
4. Brand Extensions	18
5. Hypotheses.....	19
6. Pretest.....	21
6.1 <i>Product Category Selection</i>	21
6.2 <i>Brand Extensions</i>	22
7. Main Study.....	24
7.1 <i>Method</i>	24
7.2 <i>Results</i>	25
8. Summary.....	28
9. Implications for Theory	29
10. Managerial Implications	33

1. Introduction

The majority of research on consumer-brand and consumer-brand-consumer interaction has been from the perspective of what Holt (2004) describes as the emotional branding paradigm. As such, it focused on the emotional bonds between consumers and brands (e.g., in the form of brand relationships and brand communities). This is in contrast to Holt's (2004) cultural branding paradigm that suggests that iconic brands attain success not by forming emotional bonds, but by working to resolve cultural tensions that are subtly embedded into a society. This research examines whether the emotional or cultural branding paradigm is more effective at describing a consumer's interaction with a brand. This comparison between the emotional and cultural branding paradigms is carried out in the context of the American College Football Bowl Championship Series (BCS). This research therefore investigates the emotional and cultural branding paradigms as they relate to the BCS brand. Determining which branding strategy, emotional or cultural, more accurately describes a consumer's interaction with a brand is an important consideration for brand managers seeking to gain a competitive advantage. From a theoretical perspective, this study addresses the lack of empirical research on the distinction between emotional and cultural branding. The objectives of this research are to examine (1) the explanatory power of the emotional branding and cultural branding paradigms, and (2) the characteristics of iconic (cultural) brands. The central research questions are:

1. Which branding paradigm, cultural or emotional, more accurately describes consumers' interaction with the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) brands (i.e., the football team)?
2. What are consumers' brand-related responses to cultural and emotional branding strategies (e.g., in terms of intentions, actual consumption, or

responses to brand extensions)?

2. The Emotional Branding Paradigm

The emotional branding paradigm holds that consumers' responses to brands are guided by the brands' value in identity signalling, brand personality, positive brand relationships, and brand community (Holt 2004).

2.1 Consumer Identity and Signalling

Possessions have the potential to be powerful contributor in the development of our identities (Belk 1988). People use their possessions to manage their identities by owning, creating, and/or knowing a person, place or thing (Belk 1988). This management takes place as people acquire various possessions through which they define who they would like to be, who they are, or where they have come from (Belk 1988). Likewise, people use brands as a means of self-expression and social integration (Escalas and Bettman 2005). Certain products have a greater capacity to signal their owners' identity than others (Bearden and Etzel 1982; Richins 1994; Wang and Wallendorf 2006). Products that are publicly versus privately consumed and products that are considered luxury versus necessity have greater potential to convey symbolic meaning about a person (Bearden and Etzel 1982). Furthermore, the use of products to convey personal identity to others is a cross-cultural phenomenon (Childers and Rao 1992). These products signal their meanings via characterization, that is, the embodiment of an owner's values in a product, and communication of the owner's values through the product (Richins 1994). The principle of self-expression through brands underpins the following discussion on various forms of consumer-brand interaction.

2.2 Brand Personality

Until the late 1990's, the understanding of how consumers form connections with brands was largely examined through the lens of brand loyalty. The concept of brand personality, introduced by Aaker (1997), ushered in a new era for branding research. Aaker (1997) defined brand personality as the human traits consumers associate with brands, and identified five dimensions of brand personality in the American culture: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness. This was an important advancement because it helped describe why consumers choose to consume certain brands; consumers attempt to characterize themselves based on a brand's personality and communicate this to others through brand consumption. The fact that the brand personality dimensions do not perfectly match the big five personality dimensions (i.e., extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience) suggests that consumers not only try to express the way they are through brands, but also the way they would like to be (Aaker 1997). The existence of varying personalities also explains why consumers react differently to transgressions by different brands. For example, if consumers perceive a brand to be sincere, reaction to a transgression will be far more severe than a transgression from an exciting brand (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004). This underscores the importance of maintaining a congruent brand image and avoiding transgressions. That being said, the different personality characteristics of consumers causes them to react differently to the behaviours of a brand (Monga and Lau-Gesk 2007; Swaminathan, Stilley, and Ahluwalia 2009). Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) demonstrate that the positive effects on company evaluation and purchase intentions of a firm demonstrating corporate social responsibility (CSR) behaviour is mediated by a consumer's perceived similarity with him or herself and the

company and its CSR behaviours. If a firm's non-product brand boosting initiatives do not match its own personality and those of its target customers, it will not achieve the desired outcomes (Sen and Bhattacharya 2001). The overall findings on brand personality point to the importance of achieving congruence between a brand's actions and personality and the personality of its target market.

2.3 Brand Relationship

This search for consumer-brand congruence led Fournier (1998) to propose that consumers who find sufficient congruence between self and brand initiate a relationship with that brand based on shared personality traits (actual or desired). She proposes that it is possible for consumers who are actively managing their identities to form relationships with a brand based on its personality traits (Fournier 1998). In order to identify consumer-brand interactions, the measures of relationship quality, the outcomes of a relationship, and ultimately, the stability of brand-consumer relationships, she developed the Brand Relationship Quality (BRQ) model (Fournier 1998). Based on this model, research then examined how consumer-brand relationships are formed in youth (Chaplin and Roedder John 2005), adolescents (Wooten 2006), and adults (Escalas and Bettman 2005).

Different aspects of a consumer-brand relationship have also come under investigation. When a relationship with a brand has been formed, people assess brands based on norms of interpersonal relationships (Aggarwal 2004). This principle is founded on the premise that people form two types of relationships, exchange and communal, each with different rules and norms by which it is governed (Clark and Mills 1979). Exchange relationships are characterized by the giving of a benefit in response to the

receipt of a benefit, while communal relationships are governed by the giving of a benefit in response to the need for the benefit (Clark and Mills 1979). Aggarwal (2004) finds that a brand's violation or adherence to relationship norms contributes to consumers' brand attitudes and behaviours. Furthermore, relationship type moderates consumers' processing strategy with communal relationships leading to an overall holistic evaluation where brand information is processed abstractly (Aggarwal and Law 2005). This is of particular importance because as a person becomes more involved with a brand one would expect a more communal relationship to form and therefore information about the brand would be processed in a different way than in an exchange relationship (Fournier 1998). As previously discussed, consumers can react quite strongly to a brand's violation of expected norms. Delgado-Ballester and Munuera-Aleman (2001) add the dimension of trust into brand relationships as another key component in building and maintaining brand loyalty. Hess and Story (2005) build on their work by pointing out that trust, in the functional sense, is an outcome of satisfaction while in the relationship sense, trust is an outcome of personal connection to the brand. This observation is important because consumers whose trust in a brand is based on a more personal relationship are more likely to claim a brand as their favourite and to pay more for it (Hess and Story 2005).

With the rise of the internet, brand-managers have been forced to adapt their strategies to this new medium. Two common methods of building brand relationship online are personalized websites and online communities (Thorbjornsen et al. 2002). Each one has been demonstrated to be a successful tool for increasing brand relationship quality as measured by the BRQ scale, the latter for consumers with extensive internet experience, the former for consumers with limited experience online (Thorbjornsen et al.

2002). Wang and Head (2007) develop a model for building brand relationships through e-tailing. This model shows that increasing consumers' perceived power, relationship investment, and interaction as well as decreasing shopping risk all contribute to increased relationship intentions mediated by perceived switching costs, satisfaction and trust (Wang and Head 2007). Research into the understanding of brand relationships continues with recent developments such as Breivik and Thorbjornsen's (2008) relationship investment model for explaining brand relationships. While this model offers a different conceptualization of the consumer-brand relationship than the BRQ model, they both clearly demonstrate that consumer-brand relationships do exist. Although the various concepts such as internet-based relationships and norm violation may seem somewhat disconnected, each can be used to increase the strength of the consumer-brand relationship. What's more, they can all be used as tools in the building of brand communities.

2.4 Brand Community

As many individuals form relationships with brands, researchers have discovered that communities form around the brand as well. Brand communities are typically imagined (intangible), they provide an opportunity for human interaction to take place within a consumption context, and they form around one good or service (Muniz Jr. and O'Guinn 2001). They are not based on incidental contact with a brand, but rather brand communities are solely developed around the brand (Muñiz Jr. and O'Guinn 2001). They are not about belonging to or aspiring to belong to a reference group (Bearden and Etzel 1982), but rather about the brand itself (Muñiz Jr. and O'Guinn 2001). A brand community is defined as “a specialized, non-geographically bound community, based on

a structured set of social relationships among users of a brand” (Muñiz Jr. and O’Guinn 2001, 412). These principles led McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig (2002) to develop a more comprehensive model of the brand community concept. They propose that a focal consumer is the centre of relationships between other consumers, marketers, the brand, and the product (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002). To build their model they draw on ethnographic research with Harley Davidson and Jeep owners. Their research provides insight into how consumers are introduced, socialized, and embedded into communities and also how they reinforce the community's meaning and pass it on to others (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002). Furthermore, their research demonstrates that a brand's differentiation comes not just through a product and its positioning, but also through the experiences associated with owning and consuming the product (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002). Members of strong brand communities also act as brand missionaries, carrying forth the good news about the brand and they tend to be more forgiving of brand transgressions or norm violations (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002). Furthermore, they are less likely to switch to competitors even in the face of superior products, they are happy to purchase more brand extensions and licensed products, and they are key contributors of feedback to the firm (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002). This suggests that brand communities have unique and hard to replicate attributes that are key for differentiation and therefore strengthening of the brand.

As a result, the understanding of brand communities has continued to grow. Researchers have explored how brand communities are built in specific contexts such as for a university (McAlexander, Koenig, and Schouten 2005). Also, the consequences of

membership have been investigated, showing that community members experience both positive and negative consequences from participation (Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann 2005). New consumers are less likely than experienced users to engage in, and receive, the positive benefits such as greater involvement of a brand community (Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann 2005). Furthermore, communities sometimes exert undue pressure on their members to conform to norms; this may result in reactance from affected individuals (Algesheimer, Dholakia, and Herrmann 2005). Knowing that the potential for negative consequences exists for brand community members, managers should be aware of the drivers of brand community success. Woisetschläger, Hartleb, and Blut (2008) empirically show that three factors, identification, satisfaction, and degree of influence, explain most of the variation in brand community participation. These factors have profound implications for company-sponsored community managers such as grouping homogeneous consumers into subgroups to maximize identification within the brand community at large (Woisetschläger, Hartleb, and Blut 2008).

Given that brand communities are typically imagined, participation often takes place outside of the physical realm in the form of online brand communities (Muniz Jr. and O'Guinn 2001). These communities can be company or consumer initiated. Both types have the potential to increase brand loyalty, commitment, and positive word-of-mouth marketing (Jang et al. 2008). In order to maximize these benefits, the importance of stimulating interaction in online communities cannot be overlooked (Woisetschläger, Hartleb, and Blut 2008). Companies benefit from online brand communities by allowing like-minded consumers to interact with one another, around the brand which can result in demonstrated increases in participants' ratings of brand image (Woisetschläger, Hartleb,

and Blut 2008). The variety and quality of ways in which brand communities can enhance consumers trust, loyalty, image, and ratings of a brand indicate that creating and managing strong communities is a worthwhile organizational endeavour.

2.5 Summary: Emotional Branding

Up to this point, brand meaning, brand personality, brand relationships, and brand communities, have all been discussed as related, but separate concepts. The emotional branding paradigm includes these concepts as components and/or outcomes of successful brands. The emotional branding paradigm essentially posits that consumers acquire meaning from and form relationships with brands and other brand users. Emotional branding as a concept was first introduced by Gobé (2001). He argues that the traditional brand awareness model of building brand equity is no longer effective in today's consumption climate. Instead, he presents the emotional branding paradigm as a new, more effective way to build brand equity. Emotional branding is founded on four pillars: relationship, sensorial experiences, imagination, and vision (Gobé 2001). Relationships refer to a brand being deeply aware of, and connected to, their consumers' real person allowing the brand to give them the experiences they really want (Gobé 2001). Sensorial experiences are about connecting brands with peoples' senses of touch, taste, smell, sight, and sound where possible (Gobé 2001). Imagination is all about implementing new and creative ways of using traditional branding tools such as packaging and retail stores and advertisements in fresh and unexpected ways to reach consumers' hearts (Gobé 2001). Lastly, vision is the management of a brand's long-term direction in the marketplace through thoughtful reinvention of itself with the goal of remaining emotionally relevant in the minds of consumers (Gobé 2001). Current literature suggests that emotional

branding underpins various other popular branding principles such as brand communities, and brand relationships and is necessary for brand success (Morrison and Crane 2007; Stapleton and Hughes 2005; Thompson, Rindfleisch and Arsel 2006).

3. The Cultural Branding Paradigm

The cultural branding paradigm—which is viewed as an alternative to the emotional branding paradigm (Holt 2004)—is discussed next.

3.1 Brands and Culture

For a discussion of the cultural branding paradigm, it is important to understand how brands themselves acquire meaning. McCracken (1986) describes how cultural meaning is transferred to products and ultimately consumers. First, he proposes three domains within which cultural meaning exists: the culturally constituted world, the consumer good, and the individual consumer (McCracken 1986). The culturally constituted world is defined as “the world of everyday experience in which the phenomenal world presents itself to the individual's senses fully shaped and constituted by the beliefs and assumptions of his/her culture” (McCracken 1986, 72). Meaning is transferred from the culturally constituted world to products through the advertising and fashion systems, then from the product to the individual consumer through possession, exchange, grooming, and divestment rituals (McCracken 1986). The advertising system transfers meaning by combining a representation of the culturally constituted world and a product together in a particular advertisement (McCracken 1986). The fashion system transfers meaning to products in three ways. First, products are represented alongside aspects of the culturally constituted world in magazines, newspapers, television, and now

the internet thereby transferring meaning to the good (McCracken 1986). Second, opinion leaders shape and refine existing cultural categories which, in a modest way, invent new cultural meaning (McCracken 1986). Finally, groups existing at the margins of society (e.g., hippies in the 1960s) drive radical cultural reform through the fashion system (McCracken 1986). It is this transference of meaning from the culturally constituted world to the product that is of particular interest as the focus now shifts to cultural brands.

3.2 Iconic Brands

All of the previously discussed concepts offer valuable insight into the understanding of how to build stronger brands. Each one identifies ways in which a brand can differentiate itself from the competition and build equity. Trust, loyalty, consumers' product referral, expression of meaning, and commitment are all valuable outcomes built through brand personalities, relationships, communities, and even emotional connections. While each valuable in their own right, they do not, on their own, allow a brand to acquire maximum equity according to the theory first put forth by Holt (2004) in his book *How Brands Become Icons: the Principles of Cultural Branding*. For a brand to reach iconic status it must embrace a cultural branding approach. In his book, Holt (2004) develops a new paradigm for thinking about how brands transcend traditional consumer relationships to become icons. Before moving forward, it is important to define some key terms put forth by Holt (2004, 11):

Cultural icon: a person or thing regarded as a symbol, especially of a culture or movement; a person, institution, and so forth, considered worthy of admiration or respect.

Iconic brand: an identity brand that approaches the identity value of a cultural icon

Identity myth: a simple story that resolves cultural contradictions; a prerequisite for an icon

Identity value: the aspect of a brand's value that derives from the brand's contributions to self-expression

Identity brand: a brand whose value to consumers (and, thus, its brand equity) derives primarily from identity value

Given that products have varying capacities to convey meaning (Bearden and Etzel 1982) not all brands are well suited to the model of cultural branding. Brands whose primary value is derived from its capacity for self-expression are best suited to cultural branding (Holt 2004). Holt (2004) argues that if an identity brand is able to create a culturally relevant identity myth surrounding the brand, it can reach iconic status. In order for a myth to be culturally relevant, it must address a cultural contradiction made up of the acute anxieties and desires of a society (Holt 2004). It can do this by employing a cultural icon, a person or thing regarded as a compelling symbol of a culturally relevant topic, as a deliverer of the myth. For example, Corona Beer was able to take on the American desire to 'get away from it all' with their 'miles away from ordinary' ad campaign where a businessman rejects the symbolic call of the American working life in favour of rest and relaxation on a beach (Holt 2004). As an iconic brand consistently delivers the myth to consumers, consumption of the product becomes a material and symbolic consumption of the myth (Holt 2004). The strength and durability of iconic brands suggests that consumers are not just matching bits and pieces of their personality to those of a product or brand, as in the context of a brand relationship; instead, they are engaging in a higher level of interaction found in the resolution of a cultural

contradiction. In the Corona case, for example, the cultural contradiction is the anxiety over work-life balance.

Brand relationships rely on the personality dimensions of a brand to express and convey meaning about a consumer, but cultural brands seek to put “images, sounds, and feelings on barely perceptible desires” (Holt 2004, 9). These desires are barely perceptible because they represent the combination of cultural categories used to divide up the phenomenal world and cultural principles a society uses to organize, evaluate and construe those categories (McCracken 1986). Furthermore, these desires are barely perceptible to consumers because nothing about them is alien or incomprehensible; they are typically a part of a society's norms (McCracken 1986). When these desires begin to diverge from societal or group norms, a struggle arises between conforming to those norms and maintaining individuality. Often this struggle is not explicit, but rather it is conveyed in the actions taken by individuals and/or groups that attempt to express the tension they feel and ultimately resolve the conflict (Ariely and Levav 2000; Ratner and Kahn 2002; Yoon, Suk, Lee, and Park 2011). The goal of cultural branding is to have the brand become the instrument a consumer can use to express their tension, and hopefully to resolve it. The brand becomes a symbol, champion or player in the individual, subgroup or society’s cause and it is in this role that a brand can reach iconic status.

3.3 Cult brands

Cult brands are those whose consumers, and often employees, exhibit many of the same characteristics of devotion to the brand as members do to traditional cults. Atkin (2004, xix) defines a cult brand as follows:

A brand for which a group of customers exhibit a great devotion or dedication. Its ideology is distinctive and it has a well-defined and committed community. It enjoys exclusive devotion (that is, not shared with another brand in the same category), and its members often become voluntary advocates.

In contrast to this somewhat positive definition, the populist belief on cults is that their leaders manipulate gullible, weak-minded individuals, brainwashing them out of their free will in order to accomplish some sort of agenda. Research by Atkin (2004) finds that, in most cases, this does not reflect reality for cult members. In fact, they are most often well-educated, middle class individuals functioning normally in everyday society (Atkin 2004). Cults, and in particular, cult brands, are built around this desire to belong and create meaning and it is these emotional connections that cause devotees to sacrifice so much in order to participate (Atkin 2004). In practice, Belk and Tumbat (2005) demonstrate that the Apple brand and users of its products demonstrate cultic characteristics. They cite creation, hero, satanic, resurrection, and other myths that parallel those commonly found in religious cults (Belk and Tumbat 2005). Steve Jobs, Apple's CEO was likened to a religious cult leader, with employees and consumers revering his vision and leadership. Furthermore, followers act on this reverence with regular consumption of Apple products as well as active evangelism and apologetic discourse on the Apple brand (Belk and Tumbat 2005). Similarly, Muñiz and Schau (2005) found users of Apple's 'Newton' reported several religious themes related to its use. Tales of persecution, faith bringing reward, survival, miraculous recovery, and resurrection, were told by various Newton loyalists (Muñiz and Schau 2005). The similarities between brands and cult religions were further advanced by (Shachar et al.

2011). They demonstrate that religiosity is intimately linked to brand reliance for brands that possess high signalling potential. Those who are high in religiosity are low in brand reliance and vice versa (Shachar et al. 2011). This indicates that brands and religions can serve as substitutes for one another and further demonstrates the potential for powerful, cult-like relationships to be formed between brand and consumer.

The topic of sports fandom and its similarity to that of religious zeal has often been examined in a similar light as the concept of cult branding. Fans of professional sports teams display many phenomena mirroring those of religious zealots and that the entire fan experience mirrors that of religious fervour. Frequent pilgrimages to places of worship, unique and symbolic attire, adornment with face and body paint, reciting chants and songs, and the ascension of important contributors to 'holy' status are just some of the characteristics that can be used to describe either sports or religion. These similarities have been observed by various authors including Prebish (1993) and Borer (2008). Another, Price (2005), assembled a series of essays that demonstrated how the fans of various sports including Major League Baseball, NFL football and the Superbowl specifically, NCAA basketball's championship tournament, NHL hockey, and even professional wrestling demonstrate these principles of religiosity. However, given that the definition of religion is not universally agreed upon, it is necessary to establish criteria for which to make this comparison. While consideration of sport as religion was still in its infancy, Brody (1979) identified Durkheim's view of religion as appropriate for the comparison. Specifically, "sport may be viewed as a collective representation of the collective consciousness of the group or society in which it appears" (Brody 1979, 10). Melero Jr. (2009) analyzes the phenomenon by drawing on Durkheim's *The Elementary*

Forms of Religious Life. Durkheim argues that religion is something intrinsically social that serves as a source of solidarity and as a social adhesive. The rites and rituals employed by religions are symbolic representations of shared customs and beliefs that have been licensed with a level of authority. This license allows people to distinguish between the sacred and the profane and, through collective gatherings, rites are performed that continue to separate the sacred and profane while maintaining their reverence. The guiding principle of all this is that religion is a distinctly social phenomenon that builds social solidarity.

Based on these observations, it is appropriate to acknowledge that the principles of religiosity apply to sport. Being a sports fan is defined by its social connections. The tail-gating, fantasy leagues, family bonding, road trips, and shared beliefs are all examples of the social solidarity, and therefore religiosity of the fan. In traditional religions, the Biblical and Koranic teachings, or the teachings of Buddha and the like, are what separate the sacred from the profane. For the sports fan, the lore of a particular team, its history, traditions, 'saints' (past heroes, superstars, and coaches), jerseys, and colours serve that function. The collective fan base then reinforces these sacred and profane teachings by the rituals performed in various social settings (Prebish 1993).

College football in the United States is awash with traditions that reinforce religious principles. For example, the speed limit on Ole Miss' campus was changed to 18MPH and subsequently 10MPH, the jersey numbers of their legendary quarterbacks Archie, and son Eli, Manning (Kercheval 2012). Most colleges have their own dedicated war 'hymns' that they use to spur on their 'sacred' troops (players) into battle while deriding their 'profane' rivals. These include USC's "fight on," Texas A&M's "Aggie War

Hymn,” Oklahoma's “Boomer Sooner,” and many more that can be found on www.fightmusic.com. Until the recent development of a new painting process that perfectly matched the color of Notre Dame’s Golden Dome, a staff of over 80 people would disassemble, clean, and repaint the team’s helmets in their signature golden hue that included real gold flakes as described in a comment posted to the *ND Go Irish Blog* on August 20, 2010. Before games, fans gather outside stadiums in ritualistic fashion to share a meal and party before virtually every college game. These tail-gate parties, of up to half a million people, are replete with unique habits amongst different teams. For example, the University of Washington takes their tailgate onto the water, that is, they arrive by boat in the thousands to party and celebrate before home games on Lake Washington as described by Greg Bishop in a *New York Times* article on October 13, 2011. Mike Poorman of *statecollege.com*, notes how at Penn State University, it is the 'white out,' 108,000 fans clad in white Penn gear, that distinguish the Penn faithful from their opposition. Then there are the smaller nuances defining the sacred and the profane. Eric R. Ivie, a passionate Texas A&M fan highlighted some of their more subtle traditions in an article published on August 31st, 2011 for *Yahoosports.com*. During the 'hump it' yell (A&M fans don't cheer, they 'yell'), fans are expected to remove their hats as a sign of respect. Furthermore, during the same chant fans are expected to lean forward to 'amplify' the sound. During the third verse of the Aggie War Hymn, fans rock from side to side symbolizing sawing off the horns of their arch rivals the Texas Longhorns. Even the seating at Texas A&M offers a rite of passage as freshmen sit in the highest seats and with each passing year move progressively closer to the 'holy ground' of the

field. All this to demonstrate that, by Durkheim's definition, modern day sports can be classified as religious in nature.

Particularly relevant to the current research is the fact that college football fans in the United States show a high level of devotion and passion for their teams. This level of devotion to various BCS brands (i.e., the teams) indicates that the BCS, as a brand, has reached iconic brand status as defined by Holt (2004).

3.4 Summary: Cultural Branding

The cultural branding paradigm advanced by Holt (2004) states that for a brand to achieve iconic status it must perform a myth that resolves a cultural contradiction, or tension faced by a society. Consumers respond favourably to a brand that resolves societal tensions for them. This is in contrast to the emotional branding paradigm, which argues that consumer responses are guided primarily by meaningful emotional connections the brand offers to allow consumers' to express themselves.

4. Brand Extensions

This research examines to what extent the emotional and cultural branding paradigms explain consumer responses in the context of the BCS. For the purposes of this research, the relevant consumer response consists of purchase likelihood of a (hypothetical) brand extension. This choice is based on the managerial relevance of brand extensions (Broniarczyk and Alba 1994) and the fact that success factors underlying brand extensions constitute an active research domain in the marketing literature (e.g. Monga and Gürhan-Canli 2012; Torelli and Ahluwalia 2012; Völckner, Sattler, Hennig-Thurau, and Ringle 2010).

A brand extension involves the move of an existing brand into a product category that it has not offered previously. The principle that a company can transfer consumers' existing experience with a brand to a new product or service offering has long been established. Tauber (1981) broke down the general process of brand extension into several extension categories and began to conceptualize it, offering insight into the criteria that lead to successful extensions. His work formed a foundation on which much of the current literature on brand extension is based. Aaker and Keller (1990) demonstrate that a strong fit between the original and extension brands, along with a high perception of quality for the original brand led to higher attitudes towards the extension. Bhat and Reddy (2001) developed a model that assessed the role of parent brand affect and associations on the initial evaluation of a brand extension. The model suggests that a parent brand's attribute associations are more important than affect towards the parent brand when consumers evaluate a new extension. This suggests that brand extension evaluations used as the dependent variable in this research does not necessarily favour the emotional branding paradigm (compared to the cultural branding paradigm) in terms of explanatory power.

5. Hypotheses

Both the emotional and the cultural branding paradigm seek to explain consumer responses toward brands. The cultural branding paradigm was introduced to the literature as an alternative mechanism to the longer existing and more frequently researched emotional branding paradigm (Holt 2004). Although the cultural branding paradigm presents an interesting and new perspective from which to examine consumer responses to brands, the more comprehensive body of literature and consistent findings supporting

the explanatory power of the emotional branding paradigm make the emotional branding paradigm the more compelling framework. In the absence of research comparing the explanatory power of the cultural and emotional branding paradigms, there is stronger evidence to suggest that the emotional branding paradigm is a better predictor of consumer responses to the brand—operationalized here in terms of consumers’ purchase likelihood of new brand extensions.

H1: Measures of emotional branding (i.e., consumer-brand relationship, brand community integration) better predict purchase likelihood of a brand extension than measures of cultural branding (i.e., iconic brand status).

Hypothesis 2 was derived from the brand extension literature (Bhat and Reddy 2001) that suggests that a brand extension's fit with parent brand associations is critical for extension success. Since the emotional branding paradigm works through self-expression and coherent personal meaning through brand consumption (e.g., Fournier 1998), it is proposed here that consumers’ perceptions of fit between the parent brand and the brand extension should be of particular importance to consumers who have a strong emotional investment (e.g., strong brand relationships, high levels of integration in brand community). The relationship between measures reflecting the emotional branding paradigm and purchase likelihood should therefore be moderated by the perceived fit between parent brand and brand extension, such that lower levels of perceived fit decrease purchase likelihood.

H2: Fit with parent brand will moderate the relationship between emotional branding measures and purchase likelihood, such that greater fit results in a

stronger relationship between measures of emotional branding and purchase likelihood of a brand extension compared to less fit.

Hypothesis 3 builds on the literature that links the cultural branding paradigm to the existence of a cult-like following (i.e., devoted, passionate consumers) to an iconic brand (Wittwer et al. 2012). It is therefore proposed here that the impact of cultural branding paradigm related constructs (e.g., iconic brand status) on consumer responses should be particularly strong among consumers who are devoted followers of the brand. Thus, the relation between measures of cultural branding on purchase likelihood of a brand extension is expected to be stronger for consumers who strongly identify with the brand, or—in the context of sports—identify as a fan of the team.

H3: Quality of the fan in question will moderate the relationship between cultural branding measures and purchase likelihood, such that greater devotion to the brand (i.e., fan quality) results in a stronger relationship between measures of cultural branding and purchase likelihood of a brand extension compared to less devotion.

6. Pretest

6.1 Product Category Selection

For a rigorous comparison of the two branding paradigms, brands that were perceived as both iconic (i.e., consumers recognize the iconic status of these brands) and emotional (i.e., consumers form strong relationships and brand communities) had to be selected. Given the massive fan following of college football in the United States, teams from three of the most successful conferences were selected: the Big Ten, Big 12, and South Eastern Conference (SEC). These three conferences were selected because their

teams have appeared in more BCS bowl games than any others, demonstrating that they contain some of the most well established, well loved, and iconic football programs in the country and making them suitable brands in a comparison of the emotional versus cultural branding paradigm. The three conferences were grouped together under the premise that in professional sports, it is the leagues themselves rather than individual teams that represent the brand in question (Neale 1964).

6.2 Brand Extension Selection

In addition, the pretest served to identify relevant and believable hypothetical brand extensions for inclusion in the main study. Three potential extensions were tested: a television channel dedicated to the exclusive broadcast of a specific team's football and other varsity sports coverage, an officially branded restaurant and sports bar, and a team branded, barbeque ready, line of ribs and sausages. Each of these potential products was chosen because of their close relationship to fans of college sports. Fans often watch football on television, go to bars to watch games, and barbeque at tailgate parties before attending games live. Measures included were attitude toward the extension, fit with the parent BCS brand, and extension believability, as well as a question to determine whether consumers believed such a product already existed.

6.3 Method

For the pretests, participants (N =47) selected their favourite team from one of the aforementioned conferences and then rated the brand on seven-point scales (agree/disagree) measuring consumer-brand relationship indicators (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), community integration indicators (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002), and the iconic brand status scale (Wittwer et al. 2012). This procedure allowed

participants to briefly consider the parent brand prior to evaluating the potential extensions. Hypothetical brand extensions were tested by measuring how logical and believable the brand extension was (on seven-point scales). Wann and Branscombe's (1993) scale measuring fan's identification with their team was also included as a potential control variable.

6.4 Results

Table 1 describes the demographic characteristics of the pretest sample.

When considering which brand extension to use in the main study, the means of quality of brand extension and fit with parent brand were examined. After removing respondents who believed that one or more of the potential extensions existed, 28 respondents remained. The remaining participants rated the dedicated television channel highest for quality ($M = 6.3$) and fit ($M = 5.2$). This extension was therefore selected for inclusion in the main study.

In order to examine the dimensionality and reliability of the measures of emotional and cultural branding that were included in the pretest (and then again in the main study), a series of factor analyses and reliability tests was also conducted: Principal component analysis was used to examine scale dimensionality. The iconic brand status scale (Wittwer et al. 2012) revealed five factors (Table 2). The consumer-brand relationship scale (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004) revealed five factors (Table 3). The community integration scale (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) revealed two factors (Table 4). Finally, one factor was extracted from the fan identification scale (Wann and Branscombe's 1993; Table 5). Cronbach's alpha was .92 for the iconic brand measures (Wittwer et al. 2012), .95 for the consumer-brand relationship indicators

(Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), .93 for the community integration indicators (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002), and .86 for the fan identification scale (Wann and Branscombe 1993), indicating high reliability for all scales.

To further verify the validity of the scales in question, they were broken down into their sub scales and once again tested for reliability. Of the six subscales in the iconic brand scale (Wittwer et al. 2012), the lowest Cronbach Alpha score was .74 indicating high overall reliability. The brand relationship subscales (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004) showed high reliability as well with the lowest Cronbach Alpha being .78 and the rest being .85 or above. Finally, the subscales from the community integration scale (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) had Cronbach Alpha scores of at least .74. Table 6 presents the results of the reliability tests.

7. Main Study

7.1 Method

The main study consisted of a large scale survey (n = 309). Participants were recruited online using Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk software. Mechanical Turk is an online program that allows requesters to submit "human intelligence tasks" (HITs) to be completed by workers for a small compensation. In this case, the HIT was the survey and workers were compensated \$0.50 for the time it took them to complete the survey. To make this study more relevant to participants (and thus increase the likelihood of participation and completion), the link to the survey requested that participants be fans of college football teams from the Big 10, Big 12, or SEC conferences and access to the survey was limited to American residents.

To measure consumer responses toward the BCS brand, the questionnaire included a measure of purchase likelihood of the hypothetical brand extension (i.e., dedicated TV channel) identified in the pretest. To test whether the emotional or cultural branding paradigm better accounted for these responses, measures of emotional (brand relationship scale, Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004; brand community integration scale, McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) and cultural (iconic brand status scale, Wittwer et al. 2012) branding indicators, as well as Wann and Branscombe's (1993) scale measuring fans' degree of identification with their sports team were included in the questionnaire.

7.2 Results

The sample consisted of 309 valid participants after eliminating participants who already believed that the chosen brand extension (i.e., a television channel existed), those who were not willing to purchase the channel, those who were willing to buy the extension but at a price greater than \$50, and those who consented to participate in the study but were actually under the age of 18. Table 7 describes the demographic characteristics of the sample.

Each scale underwent principle component analysis. The iconic brand status scale (Wittwer et al. 2012) revealed four factors (Table 8). Overall, the scale's Cronbach Alpha score was .92. The brand relationship scale (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004) loaded onto five factors (Table 9). It had a Cronbach Alpha of .94. The brand community integration scale (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) was found to have two factors (Table 10) and the scale had a .92 Cronbach Alpha score. Finally, Wann and

Branscombe's (1993) fan identification scale was measured and found to have one factor (Table 11) and to have a Cronbach Alpha score of .87.

Each of the subscales was tested for reliability. The six iconic brand status subscales (Wittwer et al. 2012), the five brand relationship five subscales (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), and the four community integration subscales (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) all had Cronbach's Alpha scores of at least .73, .78, and .77, respectively. This indicates that all of the scales and subscales tested were reliable (Table 12). Table 13 shows correlations between the measures included in this study.

After PCA and reliability tests, the data was analyzed through a series of regressions. First, all three scales were found to be correlated with purchase likelihood (iconic brand status $r = .32$, $p < .05$; consumer-brand relationship $r = .49$, $p < .01$, brand community integration scale, $r = .46$, $p < .01$). Then a regression was run with the intention of discovering whether a participant's score on the emotional (i.e., consumer-brand relationship and brand community integration) or cultural (i.e., iconic brand status) branding paradigm related measures were better predictors of their likelihood of purchasing the television channel. When entered into the same equation, consumer-brand relationship (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004) and brand community integration were found to be highly significant predictors of purchase likelihood ($\beta = .40$, $p < .01$; $\beta = .23$, $p < .01$) while iconic brand status (Wittwer et al. 2012) was marginally significant and negatively related ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .1$; see Table 14). These results indicate that when examining the likelihood of purchasing the hypothetical brand extension (i.e., television channel) as the dependent variable, the two emotional branding paradigm-related measures are better predictors. These results support H1.

To clarify which subscales were driving the observed relationships with purchase likelihood, regressions analysis using each scale's subscales were carried out. Purchase likelihood of the brand extension served as the criterion. For the iconic brand scale (Wittwer et al. 2012), the 'trendsetting' ($p < .05$) and 'richness of story' ($p < .01$) subscales were both found to be significantly related to purchase likelihood (Table 15). For the brand relationship scale (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), only the 'commitment' and 'intimacy' subscales were significant and both were highly so ($p < .01$) (Table 16). For the community integration scale (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002), 'other owners' was highly significant ($p < .01$) while 'product' was marginally significant ($p < .1$) (Table 17 - Main Study Community Integration Subscale Regression). When all the subsets were entered into the same equation, the 'intimacy' (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004) and 'believability' (Wittwer et al. 2012) subscales were highly significant ($p < .01$) although the 'believability' subscale was found to have a negative relationship. The 'commitment' subscale (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004) was also significant ($p < .05$) (Table 18).

To test the first moderation hypothesis, the mean-centered scales and a newly created interaction term measuring fan quality were entered into a regression. This tested whether the relation between iconic brand status (Wittwer et al. 2012), consumer-brand relationship (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), or brand community integration (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) and the likelihood of purchasing the brand extension is moderated by fit with the parent brand. The significant interactions were observed (Table 19 – Main Study Moderation Analysis: Extension Fit with Parent Brand)

An additional analysis was undertaken to test whether there was a moderation effect when analyzing the iconic and emotional branding scales in separate regression equations. No significant moderation effects emerged, however ($p > .05$, see Table 20, Table 21). These results do not support H2: perceived brand extension fit with the parent brand did not moderate the relationship between emotional branding measures and purchase likelihood.

Finally, the mean-centered scales and their interaction term with the fan quality scale (Wann and Branscombe 1993) were entered into a regression to test whether the relation between iconic brand status (Wittwer et al. 2012), consumer-brand relationship (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004), or brand community integration (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) and the likelihood of purchasing the brand extension is moderated by fan quality. When entered into the same equation, the results indicate that fan quality is not a moderator ($p > .05$; Table 22).

Additional analysis was undertaken to test whether there was a moderation effect when analyzing the cultural and emotional branding paradigm related scales in two separate regression equations separately. No moderating effects of fan quality emerged, however ($p > .1$, Table 23, Table 24). H3 was not supported.

8. Summary

After analysing the data from the study, the results provide support for H1, but not for H2 and H3, the moderation hypotheses. The support for H1 demonstrates that emotional branding measures are a stronger predictor of purchase likelihood of a brand extension than cultural branding indicators. The relationship between purchase likelihood

and branding strategy does not appear to be moderated by the extension's fit with the parent brand or the quality of the fan in question. This observation runs in contrast to both hypotheses 2 and 3 that suggested that these items would moderate the relationship.

9. Implications for Theory

The confirmation of H1 provides further support for the value of the emotional branding paradigm in explaining consumer responses to brands. This research demonstrates—in a novel, sports-brand related context—the ability of emotional branding measures to help account for consumers' purchasing decisions. The finding that emotional branding paradigm related measures, such as the consumer-brand relationship (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004) and brand community integration (McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002) scales, are predictors of purchase likelihood of a brand extension is a new finding that contributes to the brand extension literature. Previous work has identified consumers' responses to brand transgressions (Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel 2004; Herm 2013), evaluation of marketing objectives and overall brand evaluation (Aggarwal 2004), the rise of the effect of “doppelganger” brand images (Thompson, Rindfleisch, and Arsel 2006), and attitude towards brand extensions (Abosag, Roper, and Hind 2012), but none has explicitly linked purchase intentions of brand extensions to emotional relationship with a brand. This demonstrates that consumers' emotional relationship with a brand leads to tangible consumption behavior.

This research also leaves room for study regarding whether the iconic branding theory really does help describe consumer's decision making process. The emergence of the cultural branding paradigm as an alternative for understanding consumer's

relationships with brands has the potential to add a new level of understanding to branding theory. The failure of the cultural branding paradigm related measure (i.e., the iconic brand status scale; Wittwer et al. 2012) to demonstrate a significant relationship to purchase likelihood of the brand extension does leave some questions unanswered. First, were the college football fans selected an appropriate sample for testing the theory? In order to find an appropriate and large enough sample while not being physically proximal to the fans in question, a group of fans from a diverse set of teams was selected under the premise that the league rather than individual teams represented the brand in question (Neale 1964). This premise might have been an oversimplification of Neale's research. Neale's research purports that the league represents the profit maximizing entity in question and that the teams within the league are not in competition with each other from an economic perspective. In essence, the teams represent brands within a company's portfolio. The fans of the individual teams (brands), may not all have the same relationship with their brands and therefore they might react differently to the extensions; for some fans, the team might not have the same iconic status as for others. Wann's (1993) fan quality scale was tested as a moderator to try and eliminate the possibility that fans from some teams may not have been as devout in their following as others yet it did not moderate the relationship. In a further attempt to assure that the fans were not significantly different from each other, subjects from each conference were collectively tested for differences in purchase likelihood with no significant differences found amongst them (Table 25). No one team had a large enough sample of respondents to test on its own, so the potential for variability amongst responses between fans of different teams exists. In the future, acquiring sample of fans from a single team's fan base might

provide results that demonstrate significance, or even superiority for the iconic branding theory.

Future research could also examine different product categories and also different cultures. Fans of sports teams represent a unique category of consumers. For example, their consumption habits are often not driven by the rational thinking foundational to economic theory but rather irrational purchasing behaviour, consumers themselves often are a part of the production of the product itself as the interaction with other fans is an integral part of the consumption experience, and rather than a consistently high standard of quality in the product it, is the uncertainty of the on field result that motivates consumption (Chadwick and Beech 2007). Furthermore, Mullin and Sutton (2000) argue that the consumption experience varies greatly from game to game, and season to season, leaving marketers with very little control over their core product, the actual game (as cited in Abosag, Roper, and Hind 2012). Thus, while college football fans do represent an extremely passionate group consuming iconic brands, that passion may have introduced ‘noise’ into the data that is not easily silenced. There are, however, a plethora of other iconic brands in various industries whose consumption experience is less complex. For example, Tim Horton’s fast food chain appears to have achieved iconicity by providing a narrative that defines the Canadian identity. The lack of clear Canadian identity could easily be framed as one of Holt’s (2004) cultural contradictions. Comparing the iconic versus cultural branding theories using a brand such as Tim Horton’s may be a simpler test of this theory that confirms the results of this study that indicate that emotional branding better accounts for purchasing behavior while providing greater insight into the iconic branding paradigm.

In this case it was interesting to note that the relationship between emotional branding measures and purchase likelihood was not moderated by perceived fit between parent brand and extension. This relationship has been well documented in the literature (Aaker and Keller 1990; Bhat and Reddy 2001; Bottomley and Holden 2001) and its absence here is puzzling. One possible explanation lies in the details of the aforementioned literature. Bottomley and Holden's (1990) analysis of brand extension research spawned by Aaker and Keller's (1990) work reinforces the link between perceived fit between parent brand and extension, and favourable attitude towards the extension. This study made the natural assumption that such a favourable attitude would correspond with greater purchase likelihood and as a result, this moderation was hypothesized. Given the lack of moderation, it appears as though favourable attitude on its own is not enough to predict consumption behaviour. This is an interesting finding in its own right. Future research in brand extension literature should not solely be focussed on attitude towards brand extensions but rather purchasing intentions of the consumers evaluating these brands. While attitude towards an extension is valuable in its own right, purchasing intentions represent a more tangible outcome for managers seeking to add to their bottom line. Similarly, researchers should also consider investigating how, or even if, attitude towards an extension and purchasing behaviour are related to one another. Examining this relationship may lead to a more effective construct to use for evaluating a brand extensions success.

10. Managerial Implications

This research also offers managerial implications. The relation between emotional connection to a brand and purchase intentions of a brand extension shown in this research is extremely valuable. It indicates that not only does a strong emotional relationship with a brand form intangible benefits such as brand loyalty and word-of-mouth referrals [von Loewenfeld (2006) as cited in Wiegandt (2009)], but also tangible ones in the form of purchasing intentions. The large investment of resources and the long-term nature of developing brand personality, brand relationships, brand communities, and other emotional branding strategies may seem prohibitive to managers without any evidence of increased revenue. By making a direct link between purchasing intentions and a strong emotional relationship with a brand, managers now have concrete evidence that their efforts can lead to higher revenue and therefore they have more incentive to pursue such a long-term strategy.

This result also has practical implications for those in charge of the marketing programs for college football teams. While the rise of the brand relationships and communities surrounding these programs has largely been organic, that is to say, not formally directed by the teams themselves, they now represent a powerful tool for marketing of both existing and new product and service offerings. By demonstrating that this relationship has the ability to influence the purchase of brand extensions, management can leverage this asset to new and unique offerings. It gives management incentive to cultivate the emotional attachment between fan and team for use in building the brand's personality. Abosag, Roper, and Hind (2012) demonstrate that in the professional European soccer leagues, the perception of a team as a brand exists amongst both fans and staff of the team and that leveraging the brand's equity to build new

extensions has the potential to create more on field success by having enough money to pay for better players. While the parallels between European soccer and American college football are not exact, particularly because college football teams are not allowed to pay for players, the finding is still worthwhile. Being able to successfully extend a brand into new markets creates more revenue which can be used to fund better stadiums, better training facilities, more support staff, and to create a bigger and stronger fan base, all of which create incentive for the best high school players to attend colleges embracing an emotional branding strategy and thus creating better on-field performance. Better on-field performance leads to more playoff games, more nationwide television coverage, and a larger fan base, among other things, all of which add significantly to existing revenue streams.

Tables

Table 1 – Description of the Pretest Sample

Variable	Categories	Percentages
Age	18 – 29	51.1% (n = 24)
	30 – 39	21.3% (n = 10)
	40 – 49	21.3% (n = 10)
	50 – 59	6.3% (n = 3)
Sex	male	59.6% (n = 28)
	female	40.4% (n = 19)
Education	Some High School	2.1% (n = 1)
	High School Graduate/GED	14.9% (n = 7)
		36.2% (n = 17)
	Some College	2.1% (n = 1)
	Associate's Degree	29.8% (n = 14)
	Bachelor's Degree	4.3% (n = 2)
	Some Post Graduate	6.4% (n = 3)
	Master's Degree	4.3% (n = 2)
Income	Doctoral Degree	
	Less than \$10,000	8.5% (n = 4)
	\$10,000 - \$19,999	10.6% (n = 5)
	\$20,000 - \$29,999	14.9% (n = 7)
	\$30,000 - \$39,999	19.1% (n = 9)
	\$40,000 - \$49,999	4.3% (n = 2)
	\$50,000 - \$59,999	8.5% (n = 4)
	\$60,000 - \$69,999	4.3% (n = 2)
	\$70,000 - \$79,999	2.1% (n = 1)
	\$80,000 - \$89,999	8.5% (n = 4)
	\$90,000 - \$99,999	4.3% (n = 2)
	\$100,000 - \$149,999	12.8% (n = 6)
\$150,000+	2.1% (n = 1)	

Table 2 - Principle Component Analysis for Pretest Iconic Brand Scale

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.273	42.805	42.805	10.273	42.805	42.805	6.091	25.378	25.378
2	3.372	14.051	56.856	3.372	14.051	56.856	3.800	15.832	41.209
3	1.971	8.213	65.068	1.971	8.213	65.068	3.028	12.618	53.828
4	1.450	6.042	71.111	1.450	6.042	71.111	2.872	11.967	65.795
5	1.303	5.429	76.540	1.303	5.429	76.540	2.579	10.745	76.540
6	.894	3.723	80.263						
7	.749	3.119	83.383						
8	.607	2.529	85.912						
9	.502	2.093	88.005						
10	.464	1.933	89.938						
11	.420	1.749	91.687						
12	.398	1.658	93.345						
13	.292	1.216	94.561						
14	.250	1.041	95.602						
15	.222	.926	96.528						
16	.176	.732	97.260						
17	.143	.597	97.857						
18	.126	.523	98.380						
19	.105	.438	98.818						
20	.090	.377	99.194						
21	.078	.324	99.519						
22	.049	.205	99.724						
23	.040	.167	99.891						
24	.026	.109	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 3 - Principle Component Analysis for Pretest Brand Relationship Scale

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	11.203	46.680	46.680	11.203	46.680	46.680	4.085	17.022	17.022
2	2.470	10.292	56.972	2.470	10.292	56.972	3.874	16.143	33.164
3	1.593	6.636	63.608	1.593	6.636	63.608	3.320	13.833	46.998
4	1.404	5.850	69.458	1.404	5.850	69.458	3.245	13.520	60.518
5	1.099	4.579	74.037	1.099	4.579	74.037	3.245	13.519	74.037
6	.980	4.084	78.121						
7	.835	3.479	81.600						
8	.728	3.034	84.634						
9	.593	2.471	87.105						
10	.525	2.188	89.293						
11	.460	1.918	91.212						
12	.359	1.496	92.707						
13	.306	1.275	93.983						
14	.275	1.147	95.129						
15	.208	.868	95.998						
16	.182	.758	96.756						
17	.176	.733	97.489						
18	.149	.620	98.109						
19	.134	.556	98.666						
20	.103	.427	99.093						
21	.082	.342	99.435						
22	.068	.285	99.720						
23	.041	.172	99.892						
24	.026	.108	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4 - Principle Component Analysis for pretest Community Integration Scale

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.449	57.301	57.301	7.449	57.301	57.301	4.608	35.446	35.446
2	1.152	8.864	66.165	1.152	8.864	66.165	3.994	30.719	66.165
3	.987	7.596	73.761						
4	.920	7.074	80.835						
5	.574	4.416	85.250						
6	.518	3.986	89.236						
7	.414	3.183	92.420						
8	.379	2.913	95.333						
9	.216	1.658	96.991						
10	.189	1.454	98.445						
11	.096	.742	99.187						
12	.074	.569	99.756						
13	.032	.244	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 5 - Principle Component Analysis for Pretest Fan Identification Scale

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.086	58.366	58.366	4.086	58.366	58.366
2	.984	14.061	72.427			
3	.644	9.193	81.620			
4	.499	7.132	88.752			
5	.395	5.649	94.400			
6	.221	3.152	97.552			
7	.171	2.448	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 6 – Pretest Subscale Reliability Tests

Scale	Subscale	α
Iconic Status		0.92
	Cult Following	0.82
	Trendsetting	0.93
	Cultural Change	
	Orientation	0.86
	Believability	0.90
	Uniqueness	0.81
	Richness of Story	0.74
Brand Relationship		0.95
	Commitment	0.78
	Satisfaction	0.90
	Intimacy	0.79
	Self-connection	0.90
	Partner quality	0.90
Community Integration		0.93
	Product	0.77
	Brand	0.87
	Company	0.93
	Other Owners	0.82
Fan Identification		0.86

Table 7 – Description of the Main Study Sample

Variable	Categories	Percentages
Age	18 – 29	59.2% (n = 183)
	30 – 39	25.6% (n = 79)
	40 – 49	8.4% (n = 26)
	50 – 59	5.5% (n = 17)
	60 – 69	1.3% (n = 4)
Sex	Male	74.8% (n = 231)
	Female	25.2% (n = 78)
Education	Some High School	1.3% (n = 4)
	High School Graduate/GED	11.3% (n = 35)
	Some College	34.0% (n = 105)
	Associate's Degree	6.5% (n = 20)
	Bachelor's Degree	31.7% (n = 98)
	Some Post Graduate	4.5% (n = 14)
	Master's Degree	8.7% (n = 27)
	Doctoral Degree	1.6% (n = 5)
Prefer not to say	0.3% (n = 1)	
Income	Less than \$10,000	8.7% (n = 27)
	\$10,000 - \$19,999	12.0% (n = 37)
	\$20,000 - \$29,999	11.3% (n = 35)
	\$30,000 - \$39,999	9.7% (n = 30)
	\$40,000 - \$49,999	7.8% (n = 24)
	\$50,000 - \$59,999	12.0% (n = 37)
	\$60,000 - \$69,999	9.4% (n = 29)
	\$70,000 - \$79,999	5.8% (n = 18)
	\$80,000 - \$89,999	4.9% (n = 15)
	\$90,000 - \$99,999	4.5% (n = 14)
	\$100,000 - \$149,999	8.4% (n = 26)
	\$150,000+	1.6% (n = 5)
Prefer not to say	3.9% (n = 12)	

Table 8 - Principle Component Analysis for Main Study Iconic Brand Scale

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.756	40.651	40.651	9.756	40.651	40.651	4.975	20.728	20.728
2	2.535	10.563	51.214	2.535	10.563	51.214	4.122	17.175	37.903
3	1.809	7.538	58.752	1.809	7.538	58.752	4.114	17.143	55.046
4	1.591	6.629	65.381	1.591	6.629	65.381	2.481	10.336	65.381
5	.986	4.108	69.489						
6	.880	3.665	73.154						
7	.701	2.921	76.076						
8	.562	2.342	78.417						
9	.521	2.173	80.590						
10	.482	2.008	82.598						
11	.461	1.920	84.519						
12	.444	1.851	86.370						
13	.396	1.649	88.019						
14	.370	1.541	89.560						
15	.326	1.360	90.919						
16	.318	1.324	92.244						
17	.299	1.248	93.491						
18	.286	1.191	94.682						
19	.260	1.084	95.766						
20	.240	1.001	96.766						
21	.219	.914	97.680						
22	.203	.846	98.526						
23	.181	.754	99.280						
24	.173	.720	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 9 - Principle Component Analysis for Main Study Brand Relationship Scale

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.480	43.665	43.665	10.480	43.665	43.665	4.379	18.246	18.246
2	2.194	9.142	52.807	2.194	9.142	52.807	4.288	17.865	36.111
3	1.846	7.693	60.500	1.846	7.693	60.500	2.904	12.099	48.210
4	1.232	5.133	65.633	1.232	5.133	65.633	2.656	11.065	59.276
5	1.057	4.403	70.036	1.057	4.403	70.036	2.582	10.760	70.036
6	.713	2.970	73.006						
7	.646	2.693	75.699						
8	.565	2.352	78.051						
9	.538	2.242	80.293						
10	.508	2.116	82.410						
11	.467	1.945	84.355						
12	.444	1.849	86.203						
13	.429	1.786	87.990						
14	.388	1.615	89.605						
15	.345	1.439	91.044						
16	.328	1.365	92.409						
17	.315	1.312	93.722						
18	.297	1.237	94.958						
19	.262	1.090	96.048						
20	.253	1.054	97.103						
21	.217	.903	98.006						
22	.201	.837	98.843						
23	.194	.809	99.652						
24	.083	.348	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 10 - Principle Component Analysis for Main Study Community Integration Scale

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.918	53.213	53.213	6.918	53.213	53.213	4.733	36.406	36.406
2	1.567	12.053	65.265	1.567	12.053	65.265	3.752	28.859	65.265
3	.895	6.882	72.148						
4	.676	5.199	77.347						
5	.651	5.009	82.356						
6	.467	3.592	85.948						
7	.380	2.927	88.875						
8	.341	2.625	91.500						
9	.301	2.316	93.816						
10	.267	2.055	95.870						
11	.211	1.627	97.497						
12	.204	1.569	99.066						
13	.121	.934	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 11 - Principle Component Analysis for Main Study Fan Identification Scale

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.159	59.407	59.407	4.159	59.407	59.407
2	.840	12.002	71.409			
3	.561	8.021	79.430			
4	.490	7.006	86.436			
5	.476	6.795	93.231			
6	.257	3.665	96.896			
7	.217	3.104	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 12 – Main Study Subscale Reliability Tests

Scale	Subscale	α
Iconic Status		0.92
	Cult Following	0.73
	Trendsetting	0.88
	Cultural Change Orientation	0.86
	Believability	0.91
	Uniqueness	0.87
	Richness of Story	0.77
Brand Relationship		0.94
	Commitment	0.78
	Satisfaction	0.90
	Intimacy	0.79
	Self-connection	0.90
	Partner quality	0.90
Community Integration		0.92
	Product	0.77
	Brand	0.87
	Company	0.93
	Other Owners	0.82
Fan Identification		0.87

Table 13 – Main Study Correlations

		Correlations			
		Metalconic	MetaBrandRelati onship	MetaCommunity Integration	MetaFanID
Metalconic	Pearson Correlation	1	.730**	.676**	.459**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	309	309	309	309
MetaBrandRelationship	Pearson Correlation	.730**	1	.801**	.665**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	309	309	309	309
MetaCommunityIntegration	Pearson Correlation	.676**	.801**	1	.683**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	309	309	309	309
MetaFanID	Pearson Correlation	.459**	.665**	.683**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	309	309	309	309

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 14 – Main Study Regression Emotional versus Cultural Branding Scales

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
	(Constant)	-.042	.484				-.086
1							
Metalconic	-.211	.124	-.126	-1.704	.089	.444	2.250
MetaBrandRelationship	.625	.143	.397	4.358	.000	.293	3.416
MetaCommunityIntegration	.316	.116	.229	2.715	.007	.340	2.941

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 15 - Main Study Iconic Branding Subscale Regression

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	.922	.565		1.631	.104
	Cult Following	.035	.083	.030	.420	.675
	Trendsetting	.181	.077	.170	2.343	.020
	Cultural Change Orientation	.010	.053	.010	.180	.858
	Believability	-.064	.115	-.043	-.563	.574
	Uniqueness	.084	.105	.059	.795	.427
	Richness of Story	.299	.099	.220	3.019	.003

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 16 - Main Study Brand Relationship Subscale Regression

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	-.636	.466		-1.366	.173
	Commitment	.329	.097	.224	3.398	.001
	Satisfaction	.052	.073	.047	.714	.476
	Intimacy	.426	.095	.316	4.479	.000
	Self-connection	.086	.081	.076	1.060	.290
	Partner quality	-.067	.096	-.051	-.696	.487

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 17 - Main Study Community Integration Subscale Regression

Coefficients ^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	.493	.431		1.143	.254
	Product	.179	.106	.133	1.696	.091
	Brand	.162	.100	.127	1.625	.105
	Company	.035	.059	.040	.597	.551
	Other Owners	.251	.072	.250	3.502	.001

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 18 - Main Study Regression of all Subscales

Coefficients ^a										
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.					
	B	Std. Error	Beta							
1	(Constant)	-.149	.555							
	Cult Following	-.037	.076	-.032	-4.83	.629				
	Trendsetting	.093	.074	.087	1.260	.209				
	Cultural Change Orientation	-.081	.053	-.085	-1.520	.130				
	Believability	-.310	.115	-.208	-2.706	.007				
	Uniqueness	.054	.096	.038	.562	.574				
	Richness of Story	.024	.097	.017	.243	.808				
	Commitment	.268	.109	.183	2.448	.015				
	Satisfaction	.056	.080	.050	.700	.484				
	Intimacy	.405	.107	.301	3.797	.000				
	Self-connection	.111	.089	.098	1.238	.217				
	Partner quality	.012	.104	.009	.112	.911				
	Product	-.070	.111	-.052	-.632	.528				
	Brand	.151	.115	.119	1.315	.190				
	Company	-.053	.065	-.060	-.823	.411				
	Other Owners	.115	.074	.115	1.565	.119				

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 19 – Main Study Moderation Analysis: Extension Fit with Parent Brand

Model		Coefficients ^a				t	Sig.
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	4.023	.057		70.764	.000	
	CenterIconic	-.352	.116	-.210	-3.024	.003	
	CenterBrandRelationship	.598	.133	.380	4.498	.000	
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.251	.108	.182	2.320	.021	
	CenterGoodness	.280	.039	.353	7.138	.000	
2	(Constant)	4.023	.061		65.750	.000	
	CenterIconic	-.356	.118	-.212	-3.002	.003	
	CenterBrandRelationship	.592	.137	.376	4.322	.000	
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.258	.115	.188	2.254	.025	
	CenterGoodness	.280	.040	.353	7.072	.000	
	CenterIconic X	-.005	.078	-.005	-.066	.947	
	CenterBrandRelationship X	-.010	.084	-.011	-.123	.902	
	CenterGoodness X	.013	.068	.014	.187	.852	

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 20 - Main Study Moderation Analysis Iconic Brand Scale: Extension Fit with Parent Brand

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.023	.062		64.829	.000
	CenterIconic	.290	.090	.173	3.239	.001
	CenterGoodness	.317	.042	.399	7.458	.000
2	(Constant)	4.017	.066		60.788	.000
	CenterIconic	.293	.090	.175	3.245	.001
	CenterGoodness	.316	.043	.398	7.389	.000
	CenterIconicX CenterGoodness	.014	.053	.013	.264	.792

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 21 - Main Study Moderation Analysis Emotion Branding Scales: Extension Fit with Parent Barnd

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.023	.058		69.838	.000
	CenterBrandRelationship	.431	.123	.274	3.517	.001
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.184	.107	.134	1.716	.087
	CenterGoodness	.260	.039	.328	6.634	.000
2	(Constant)	4.021	.061		65.645	.000
	CenterBrandRelationship	.436	.128	.277	3.418	.001
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.179	.112	.130	1.596	.112
	CenterGoodness	.260	.039	.328	6.610	.000
	CenterBrandRelationshipXCenterGoodness	.014	.073	.014	.186	.853
	CenterciXCenterGoodness	-.008	.067	-.009	-.124	.902

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 22 - Main Study Moderation Analysis: Fan Quality

Coefficients^a						
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	4.023	.060		66.975	.000
	CenterIconic	-.148	.122	-.088	-1.205	.229
	CenterBrandRelationship	.460	.147	.292	3.123	.002
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.153	.122	.111	1.253	.211
	CenterFanID	.309	.083	.259	3.736	.000
2	(Constant)	3.936	.073		54.189	.000
	CenterIconic	-.153	.123	-.091	-1.237	.217
	CenterBrandRelationship	.469	.150	.298	3.131	.002
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.160	.125	.116	1.278	.202
	CenterFanID	.347	.084	.291	4.109	.000
	IconicXFanID	-.070	.110	-.050	-.635	.526
	BrandRelationshipXFanID	.137	.138	.101	.994	.321
	CenterciXCenterFanID	.057	.106	.049	.536	.593

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 23 - Main Study Moderation Analysis Iconic Brand Scale: Fan Quality

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.023	.062		65.266	.000
	CenterIconic	.201	.093	.120	2.152	.032
	CenterFanID	.517	.066	.433	7.779	.000
2	(Constant)	3.993	.067		59.970	.000
	CenterIconic	.216	.094	.129	2.292	.023
	CenterFanID	.527	.067	.442	7.870	.000
	IconicXFanID	.084	.071	.060	1.178	.240

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 24 - Main Study Moderation Analysis Emotional Branding Scales: Fan Quality

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.023	.060		66.925	.000
	CenterBrandRelationship	.381	.132	.242	2.886	.004
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.115	.118	.084	.976	.330
	CenterFanID	.323	.082	.270	3.938	.000
2	(Constant)	3.941	.072		54.745	.000
	CenterBrandRelationship	.392	.135	.249	2.897	.004
	CenterCommunityIntegration	.120	.121	.087	.993	.321
	CenterFanID	.357	.083	.299	4.277	.000
	BrandRelationshipXFanID	.101	.121	.074	.835	.405
	CenterciXCenterFanID	.041	.104	.036	.397	.692

a. Dependent Variable: How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

Table 25 – Comparison of Fan Response between the Three Conferences

ANOVA

How likely would you be to pay to subscribe to a television channel 100 percent dedicated to the broadcasting of everything to do with your team's football and other varsity sports?

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.768	2	.884	.567	.568
Within Groups	477.073	306	1.559		
Total	478.841	308			

REFERENCES

- Aaker, David A., and Kevin Lane Keller (1990), "Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions," *The Journal of Marketing*, 54 (1)27-41.
- Aaker, Jennifer, Susan Fournier, and Adam S. Brasel (2004), "When Good Brands Do Bad," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (June), 1-16.
- Aaker, Jennifer (1997), "Dimensions of Brand Personality," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34, (August), 347-356.
- Abosag, Ibrahim, Stuart Roper, and Daniel Hind (2012), "Examining the Relationship Between Brand Emotion and Brand Extension Among Supporters of Professional Football Clubs," *European Journal of Marketing*, 46 (9), 1233-1251.
- Aggarwal, Pankaj (2004), "The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (June), 87-101.
- Aggarwal, Pankaj, and Sharmistha Law (2005), "Role of Relationship Norms in Processing Brand Information," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (3), 453-464.
- Algesheimer, René, Utpal M. Dholakia, and Andreas Herrmann (2005), "The Social Influence of Brand Community: Evidence from European Car Clubs," *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (July), 19-34.
- Ariely, Dan, and John Levav (2000), "Sequential Choice in Group Settings: Taking the Road Less Traveled and Less Enjoyed," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (3), 279-290.
- Bearden, William O., and Micheal J. Etzel (1982), "Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (2), 183-194.
- Beech, John, and Simon Chadwick (2007), *The Marketing of Sport*, Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Belk, Russell (1988), "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, (September), 139-168.
- Bhat, Sobodh, and Reddy, Srinivas K (2001), "The Impact of Parent Brand Attribute Associations and Affect Brand Extension Evaluation," *Journal of Business Research*, 53 (3), 111-122.
- Borer, M. (2008), *Faithful to Fenway: Believing in Boston, Baseball, and America's Most Beloved Ballpark*, NYU Press.

- Bottomley, Paul A., and Holden, Stephen J.S. (2001), "Do We Really Know How Consumers Evaluate Brand Extensions? Empirical Generalizations Based on Secondary Analysis of Eight Studies," *Journal Of Marketing Research*, 38(4), 494-500.
- Breivik, Einar, and Helge Thorbjornsen (2008), "Consumer Brand Relationships: An Investigation of two Alternative Models," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36 (4), 443-472.
- Broniarczyk, Susan M., and Joseph W. Alba (1994), "The Importance of the Brand in Brand Extension," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31 (2), 214-228.
- Chaplin, Lan Nguyen, and Deborah Roedder John (2005), "The Development of Self Brand Connections in Children and Adolescents," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (1), 119-129.
- Childers, T., and A. Rao (1992), "The Influence of Familial and Peer-based Reference Groups on Consumer Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(2), 198-211.
- Clark, Margaret S. and Judson Mills (1979), "Interpersonal Attraction in Exchange and Communal Relationships," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 12-24.
- Delgado-Ballester, Elena, and Jose Luis Munuera-Aleman (2001), "Brand Trust in the Context of Consumer Loyalty," *European Journal of Marketing*, 35 (11/12), 1238-1258.
- Escalas, Jennifer Edson, and James R. Bettman (2005), "Self Construal, Reference Groups, and Brand Meaning," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32 (3), 378-389.
- Fournier, Susan (1998), "Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (March), 343-373.
- Herm, Steffen (2013), "When Things Go Wrong, Don't Rely on Committed Consumers: Effects of Delayed Product Launches on Brand Trust," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30 (1), 70-81.
- Hess, Jeff, and John Story (2005), "Trust-based Commitment: Multidimensional Consumer-Brand Relationships," *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22 (6), 313-322.
- Holt, Douglas B. (2004), *How Brands Become Icons: The Principles of Cultural Branding*, United States of America: Harvard Business School Press.
- Jang, Heehyoung, Lorne Olfman, Islang Ko, Joon Koh, and Kyungtae Kim (2008), "The Influence of On-Line Brand Community Characteristics on Community

- Commitment and Brand Loyalty," *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 12 (Spring), 57-80.
- Kercheval, Ben, "Manning Way Gets a New Speed Limit to Honor Eli," *NBC Sports*, April 21, 2012, accessed on April 20, 2013, <http://collegefootballtalk.nbcsports.com/2012/04/21/manning-way-gets-a-new-speed-limit-to-honor-eli/>.
- McAlexander, James H., Harold F. Koenig, and John W. Schouten (2005), "Building a University Brand Community: The Long-Term Impact of Shared Experiences," *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 14 (2), 61-79.
- McAlexander, James H., John W. Schouten, and Harold F. Koenig (2002), "Building Brand Community," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (1), 38-54.
- McCracken, Grant (1986), "Culture and Consumption: A Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods," *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(1), 71-84.
- Monga, Alokparna Basu, and Loraine Lau-Gesk (2007), "Blending Cobrand Personalities: An Examination of the Complex Self," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 44 (3), 389-400.
- Monga, Alokparna Basu, and Zeynep Gürhan-Canli (2012), "The Influence of Mating Mind-Sets on Brand Extension Evaluation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49 (4), 581-593.
- Morrison, Sharon, and Frederick G. Crane (2007), "Building the Service Brand by Creating and Managing an Emotional Brand Experience," *Journal of Brand Management*, 14 (5), 410-421.
- Muniz Jr., Albert M., and Thomas C. O'Guinn (2001), "Brand Community," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (March), 412-433.
- Mullin, B., Hardy, S., and Sutton, W.A. (2000), *Sport Marketing*, 2nd ed., Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL.
- Neale, Walter C. (1964), "The Peculiar Economics of Professional Sports: A Contribution to the Theory of the Firm in Sporting Competition and in Market Competition," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 78 (1), 1-14.
- Prebish, Charles S. (1993), *Religion and sport: The meeting of sacred and profane*. Greenwood Press, a Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

- Ratner, Rebecca K., and Barbara E. Kahn (2002), "The Impact of Private versus Public Consumption on Variety-Seeking Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (2), 246-257.
- Richins, M. (1994), "Valuing Things: The Public and Private Meanings of Possessions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (3), 504-521.
- Sen, Sankar, and C. B. Bhattacharya (2001), "Does Doing Good Always Lead to Doing Better? Consumer Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (May), 225-243.
- Stapleton, Christopher B., and Charles E. Hughes (2005), "Mixed Reality and Experiential Movie Trailers: Combining Emotions and Immersion to Innovate Entertainment Marketing," *Proceedings of 2005 International Conference on Human-Computer Interface Advances in Modeling and Simulation*, 23-27.
- Swaminathan, Vanitha, Karen M. Stilley, and Rohini Ahluwalia (2009), "When Brand Personality Matters: The Moderating Role of Attachment Styles," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35 (6), 985-1002.
- Tauber, Edward M (1981), "Brand Franchise Extension: New Product Benefits From Existing Brand Names," *Business Horizons*, 24 (2), 36-41.
- Thompson, Craig J., Aric Rindfleisch, and Zeynep Arsel (2006), "Emotional Branding and the Strategic Value of the Doppelgänger Brand Image," *Journal of Marketing*, 70 (1), 50-64.
- Thorbjornsen, Helge, Magne Supphellen, Herbjorn Nysveen, and Per Egil (2002), "Building Brand Relationships Online: A Comparison of Two Interactive Applications," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 16 (3), 17-34.
- Torelli, Carlos J. And Rohini Ahluwalia (2012), "Extending Culturally Symbolic Brands: A Blessing or a Curse?," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38 (5), 933-947.
- Völckner, Franziska, Henrik Sattler, Thorsten Hennig-Thurau, and Christian M. Ringle (2010), "The Role of Parent Brand Quality for Service Brand Extension Success," *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (4), 379-396.
- Von Loewenfeld, Fabien (2006), *Brand Communities*, Frankfurt, Germany: Springer.
- Wang, Fang, and Milena Head (2007), "How Can the Web Help Build Customer Relationships?: An Empirical Study on E-tailing," *Information & Management*, 44 (2), 115-129.
- Wang, Jeff and Melanie Wallendorf (2006), "Materialism, Status Signaling, and Product Satisfaction," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34 (4), 494-505.

- Wann, Daniel L. and Nyla R. Branscombe (1993), "Sports Fans: Measuring Degree of Identification with their Team," *International Journal of Sports Psychology*, 24 (1), 1-17.
- Wiegandt, Philipp (2009), *Value Creation of Firm-Established Brand Communities*, Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Wittwer, Dimitri, Lucia Malär, Bettina Nyffenegger, Harley Krohmer, and Bianca Grohmann (2012), "Measuring the Cult Status of Brands: Conceptual Considerations and Scale Development," *Proceedings of the 41st European Marketing Academy (EMAC) Conference*, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Woisetschläger, David M., Vivian Hartleb and Markus Blut. 2008, "How to Make Brand Communities Work: Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Participation," *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 7(3), 237-256.
- Wooten, David B. (2006), "From Labeling Possessions to Possessing Labels: Ridicule and Socialization among Adolescents," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (2), 188-198.
- Yoon, Song Oh, Kwanho Suk, Seon Min Lee, and Eun Young Park (2011), "To seek variety or uniformity: The role of culture in consumers' choice in a group setting," *Marketing Letters*, 22 (1), 49-64.