

Brand Personality Studies in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS): A systematic Literature Review

Juma Matonya, PhD

Department of Marketing, Entrepreneurship and Management, Open University of Tanzania

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4700-8281>

Email: Juma.matonya@gmail.com

Copyright resides with the author(s) in terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY-NC 4.0.
The users may copy, distribute, transmit and adapt the work, but must recognize the author(s) and the
East African Journal of Management and Business Studies

Abstract: This paper presents a review of brand personality studies in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS) by applying a systematic literature review. Taylor and Francis, Google Scholar, Emerald, and ScienceDirect were the databases utilized in this review. A total of 46 articles covering a period from 2003 to 2022 were used as data source. The study used the deductive research approach and analyzed data using content analysis method. The study revealed that quantitative research approach, convenience sampling technique, structural equation modeling and the Big Five human personality framework have dominated brand personality research. The color of the product package, the shape of the product package, sensorial image and corporate image, perceived effectiveness of celebrity endorsement, power distance belief and business competence are antecedents of brand personality. The majority of studies established that self-congruency mediates the relationship between brand personality and other consumer and brand related variables. It was confirmed that ethnocentrism, country of origin image, self-image congruence and corporate-brand credibility moderate the relationships between brand personality and other consumer and brand related variables. The majority of studies support that purchase intention is the consequence of brand personality. It is recommended that brand management practitioners and stakeholders should fully utilize the factors that influence brand personality to differentiate themselves from their competitors. The study further recommends the use of non-probability sampling techniques, qualitative techniques and country-specific brand personality measurement scale in future studies.

Keywords: Brand personality; BRICS; content analysis; systematic literature review.

How to cite: Matonya, J. (2023). Brand Personality Studies in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS): A systematic Literature Review. *East African Journal of Management and Business Studies* 3(4), 34-46 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46606/eajmbs2023v03i04.0032>.

Introduction

The need to find means to differentiate from competing brands is increasing. Consequently, marketers are striving to differentiate their brands from numerous competing brands (Saeed et al., 2022). In looking at brand perceptions and differentiation, brand personality has been considered as one of the most important symbolic characteristics that works as a fundamental element in differentiation strategy (George & Anandkumar, 2018; Japutra & Molinillo, 2019). Brand personality is defined as the set of human characteristics associated with a brand (Aaker, 1997). In the 1950s,

marketing literature acknowledged the influence of personality traits in describing firms, products and brands. In the 1980s, researchers proposed the utilization of personality and its measurements in brand personality studies (Carvalho, et al., 2021). Aaker (1997) published an article which considered brand personality as a unique construct. The author discussed the theoretical framework of brand personality, developed the measurement scale of brand personality and discussed inferences about the symbolic use of brands. Nowadays brand personality has become a dominant element in marketing research (Giroux et al., 2017).

Despite the broad body of literature about brand personality, there is still no consensus amongst scholars about a common definition and operationalization of the concept (Radler, 2018). Previous studies noted that, its theoretical foundation has been deemed equivocal (Avis et al., 2012), brand personality construct has generated disagreements about its theoretical foundations and the applications of its dimensions across diverse contexts (Freling et al., 2011), and that the measure of brand personality constructs is still not clear (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003).

Radler (2018) pointed out that, “literature is fragmented and characterized by a diverse range of theories, models and constructs used to conceptualize, operationalize and apply brand personality, which has resulted in unsystematically conducted research.” Moreover, scholars have utilized various theories, methods, contexts and measures in this domain. Diversity in the approaches to studying brand personality research makes it difficult for scholars and practitioners to reach definite conclusions (Saeed et al., 2022). Consequently, only a few scholars have endeavored to integrate the present brand personality research.

For example, Radler (2018) conducted a bibliometric review from 1995 to 2016 while utilizing Web of Science articles to ascertain brand personality research streams and to endorse potential areas for further research. Similarly, Llanos-Herrera and Merigo (2019) applied the bibliometric review from 1995 to 2017, using Web of Science articles to describe the features of brand personality research. However, these reviews focused on a single database (Web of Science), leaving other databases which receive numerous articles regarding brand personality. A review by Carvalho et al. (2021) dealt with only two databases: Web of Science and Scopus within five years of production. Contrarily, the review in this study used four databases: Taylor and Francis, Emerald, Google Scholar and ScienceDirect to fill this gap.

The area of brand personality is still growing, a trend which calls for further review to ensure that brand personality studies will move in the right direction. Hence, there is a need to have consistent and honest reexaminations (Cooper, 2012). Zupic and Cater (2015) pointed out that the mapping of the scientific knowledge ought to be done periodically, which enables further research to be linked to the existing knowledge. This will also help

to synthesize the literature on broadly examined areas, enabling theory development, research paths identification and further viewpoints propositions (Snyder, 2019). Lim et al. (2022) revealed a need for future reviews as they offer rapid and all-inclusive knowledge of particular areas of research. They also indicate research gaps and give suggestions where future studies can advance.

Heeding this call, this study reviewed literature on theories used in brand personality studies, contexts, methods and characteristics of brand personality including antecedents, mediators, moderators and consequences focusing on Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS) countries. BRICS is an acronym for the grouping of the world’s leading emerging economies, namely Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. Reviewing the state-of-the-art brand personality construct in the BRICS is of paramount importance as the role of BRICS in the global governance system is steadily increasing (de Kock, 2015). Additionally, Scussel and Demo (2019) called for an investigation of brand personality in emergent countries such as those of BRIC due to the necessity of understanding the consumption of consumers in these countries. BRICS countries have also emerged as significant consumer markets, hence it is important to gauge information regarding consumer’s brand personality perception in these countries. Interestingly, BRICS countries are becoming sources of influential research on brand personality (Carvalho et al., 2021).

This review contributes to the field of brand management by enlarging the understanding of relationships between brand personality and other customer and brand-related variables. It also contributes to the body of branding and brand management literature by unveiling the past, analyzing the present research and presenting detailed and more specific guidance for further research (Paul & Criado, 2020).

Literature Review

Brand Personality

The symbolic usage of brands is possible as consumers habitually infuse brands with human personality traits (Gilmore, 1919). Brand personality has gained attention by scholars since the seminal article of Aaker (1997). In the article, the author likened brand personality with Big Five human personality measures. The “Big Five” human personality forms the theoretical foundation of brand personality. According to Davies et al. (2018),

human personality dimensions include extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness. Aaker (1997) argued that the three dimensions of brand personality viz. Excitement, Competence and excitement are similar to the Big Five human personality dimensions *i.e.* agreeableness is similar to sincerity as all capture the notion of warmth and reception, extraversion resembles with excitement as all indicate the idea of friendliness whereas conscientiousness is likened to competence as they both connote accountability, reliability and safety.

However, Aaker et al. (2001) applied the five dimensions (competence, ruggedness, excitement, sophistication and sincerity) in studying brand personality in Spain and indicated that only three dimensions viz. excitement, sophistication and sincerity suited for studying brand personality in the Spanish culture. The two dimensions namely ruggedness and competence were not suitable for studying brand personality in Spain. Hence peacefulness and passion were applied instead ruggedness and competence respectively. On the other hand, Kim et al. (2012) utilized Korean Sports consumers and found that only four of Aaker's brand personalities *i.e.* competence, ruggedness, excitement and sincerity applied to Korean culture and two new personalities were identified (creativity and energy). A study by Yang and Cho (2002) in Korea found cute dimension to be suitable for studying brand personality instead of competence. It can be deduced from the studies reviewed that the measurement scale by Aaker (1997) is not suited for studying brand personality in various cultures. Therefore, some scholars have opted to develop country-specific brand personality measurement. For example, Bosnjak et al. (2007) constructed the German brand personality scale, Milas and Mlacic, (2007) developed the Croatian brand personality scale whereas Smith et al. (2002) created the Dutch scale. Besides, the widely accepted definition that was coined by Aaker (1997) has been criticized by including various socio-demographic features such as gender and age in addition to personality trait (Bosnjak et al. 2007; Eisend & Stokburger-Sauer, 2013). Hence, more studies are needed to develop a universally accepted definition.

Methodology

This study applied the Theoretical-Context-Characteristics-Methodology (TCCM) to do a holistic analysis. This method has been applied in previous

studies (Chen et al., 2021; Hassan et al., 2022; Mandler et al., 2021; Paul & Rosado-Serrano, 2019). Data used in this study was obtained from four online databases: Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, Emerald and Taylor and Francis just like in previous studies (Vlahovic-Mlakar & Ozretic-Dosen, 2022). Each of these data bases has some advantages. Google Scholar, for instance, returns all-inclusive results over other databases (Chen et al., 2021). The Emerald database has increased variability of published brand personality articles. Taylor & Francis, on the other hand, is one of trustworthy publishers that produce all-inclusive articles (Levinson & Amar, 1969).

The study used the content analysis approach to classify content of the reviewed articles. According to Krippendorf (2013, p.24), content analysis is a "technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use." This study utilized a three-stage approach by Denyer and Tranfield (2009) and Moher et al. (2009) in mapping and selecting articles for review. The first stage in the analysis was data mapping in which designated keywords were used to search appropriate articles for inclusion. The keywords used were Brand Personality, Brand Personality AND BRICS, Brand Personality AND Brazil, Brand Personality AND Russia, Brand Personality AND India, Brand Personality AND China as well as Brand Personality AND South Africa. The researcher searched the keywords across article titles, abstracts, keywords and the text to establish the most appropriate studies for inclusion. The study involved articles published in English from 2003 to 2022.

The second stage was to refine the search results, where the early search from the databases generated 658 articles. Amongst those, 350 were duplicates, not in English, proceedings, theses, dissertations, book chapters or books and hence were excluded from the review. After screening, it was also found that 308 articles either did not have full scripts or brand personality or BRICS was not their main topic. Furthermore, 262 articles were not appropriate to the topic *i.e.* they did not comprise both brand personality and BRICS as the core topic of study. Applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, a total of 46 articles were retained for review.

The third stage encompassed the assessment of the articles and finishing the review list. The articles

were then read across the titles, abstracts, keywords, background information, theoretical approach, contexts used, characteristics (antecedents, mediators, moderators and consequence), results, discussion and implications, and areas for future research. The study utilized the MS Excel worksheet for coding the gathered information from the articles that were reviewed.

Results and Discussions

This section presents the findings of the study. More specifically, it offers answers to the research problem related to the state of brand personality studies in BRICS in terms of theory utilized, journal distribution, country of research and methodologies applied. It also unveils the antecedents, mediators, moderators and consequences of brand personality in BRICS.

State of Brand Personality Research in BRICS

Countries

A total of 46 articles included in this study were published in thirty-seven journals. More specifically nineteen (19) articles were published in nine (9) journal as follows: Journal of Tourism Management (3), Journal of Marketing Communication (2), Brazilian Administrative Review (2), Asian Academy of Management Journal (2), Journal of Business Research (2), Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics (2), Journal of Retailing and Customer Services (2), Journal of China Tourism Research (2) and Sustainability (2). The rest 28 journals received one article. These findings connote that brand personality researchers chose to publish their articles in the Journal of Tourism Management, Journal of Marketing Communication, Brazilian Administrative Review, Asian Academy of Management Journal and Journal of Business Research, Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, Journal of Retailing and Customer Services, Journal of China Tourism Research and Sustainability.

Distribution of Brand Personality Research in the BRICS Countries

The majority of brand personality studies in the BRICS countries were conducted in China (19) followed by India (11), Brazil (8), South Africa (4) and Russia (4). These findings suggest that China is extensively participating in brand personality research compared to other BRICS countries. The findings also imply that China is the main contributor to brand personality research followed

by India and Brazil. South Africa and Russia seem to be less involved in brand personality research.

Distribution of Brand Personality Research by Year of Publication

There has been an increase in studies regarding brand personality in the BRICS. The findings show that there was only one paper each year published regarding brand personality in the BRICS from 2003 to 2010. However, the number of articles published increased in 2011 and 2012 when two and three articles were published respectively. The year 2017 received twice the increase of articles published amounting to 6 articles. However, the following year (2018) experienced a decrease in number of articles published where only three articles were published. The peak of publications was the year 2019 when 7 articles were published. These findings imply that the brand personality topic is gaining more attention from scholars in the BRICS. However, there were a decrease of published articles in 2020 where only 4 articles were published and in 2021 and early 2022 where only 2 and 1 articles were published, respectively.

Theories Used By Brand Personality Studies in BRICS

Theories are utilized to conceptualize and expound a set of systematic clarifications of phenomena and intricate behaviors (Thomas, 2017). Therefore, it was good to establish theories used by different scholars to address the brand personality construct. The study reveals that the majority of studies (19 articles) applied the Big Five human personality framework by Aaker (1997). Previous researchers had adopted this theoretical framework to measure the brand personality of tangible and intangible products including beverage brands (Upadhyay & Agrawal, 2014), tourism (Matzler et al., 2016; Morrish et al., 2017), utilitarian brands (Ahmad & Thyagaraj, 2017), country brand (Mariutti & Giraldi, 2020), putin brand (Beale, 2018), mobile handsets (Khandai et al., 2015), automobile (Wang & Yang, 2011), Celebrity endorsement (Dissanayake & Weerasiri, 2017) and political brand (Jain et al., 2018).

On the other hand, the theory of self-congruity was applied by six articles (Hou et al., 2019; Li et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019; Pradhan et al., 2014; Shezi, 2022; Wang et al., 2009). This theory posits that consumers like to select brands with a perceived image that is consistent with their self-concept (Sirgy, 1982; Sirgy & Su, 2000). In the case of brand

personality studies, this theory suggests that the stronger the match between the perceptions of consumers regarding brand personality and their personality, the higher the possibility of recommending the brand. The study also reveals that three of the articles (He, 2012; Li et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2018) applied the categorization theory to study brand personality in the BRICS. For example, Li et al. (2019) used the theory of categorization to determine the relationship between brand personality and brand loyalty and established that favorable perceptions of brand personality contribute to the development of positive attitudinal loyalty which in turn arouses behavioral loyalty.

The theory of reasoned action (TRA) was applied by two studies (Kakati & Deorah, 2019; Wang & Yang, 2008) to gauge the perceptions of consumers

regarding brand personality. The theory assumes that the behavior of individuals can be anticipated from behavioral intentions, attitudes and subjective social norm influences (Becker & Gibson, 1998). Using this theory, Kakati and Deorah (2019) found that the failure of local brands to have a significant relationship with any personality dimension suggests that they may lack an appropriate positioning strategy for which consumers are not capable of narrating mainly to any specific personality dimension.

Furthermore, the theory of social identity was used by various scholars in search of consumer's perceptions of brand personalities. This theory proposes that individuals group themselves into various social classes to aid their definition of their own self (Tajfel & Turner, 1985).

Table 1: Theories Used in Reviewed Articles

Theory used	Studies	Frequency
Gestalt theory	Pantin-Sohier et al.(2005)	1
Theory of Reasoned Action	Kakati and Deorah (2019), Wang and Yang (2008)	2
Self-congruity theory	Hou et al. (2019); Li, et al. (2019); Liu et al. (2019); Pradhan et al. (2014); Shezi, (2022); Wang et al. (2009)	6
Goal derived theory	He (2012)	1
Categorization theory	[He (2012); Li, et al. (2019); Wang et al. (2018)	3
Conceptual coherence theory	He (2012)	1
McCracken's meaning transfer model	Pradhan et al. (2014)	1
Celebrity endorsements	Pradhan et al. (2014)	1
Malhotra scale	Pradhan et al. (2014)	1
Social comparison theory	Haryanto et al. (2016)	1
Brand attachment theory	Huang et al. (2017)	1
Construal level theory	Wang et al. (2018)	1
Flow theory	Mao et al. (2020)	1
Social identity theory	Mao et al. (2020) and Shezi (2022)	2
Indigenous scale	He (2010)	1
Big Five human personality framework	Ahmad and Thyagaraj (2017); Banerjee (2016); Beale (2018), Chu and Sung (2011); Dissanayake and Weerasiri (2017); Fortes et al. (2019); Jain et al. (2018); Khandai et al. (2015); Kim and Zhao (2014); Lin and Huang (2012); Mariutti and Giraldi (2020); Matzler et al. (2016); Morrish et al. (2017); Muniz and Marchetti (2012); Supphellen and Grønhaug (2003); Tong & Li (2013); Upadhyay and Agrawal (2014); Wang and Yang (2011).	19
Not mentioned a theory	Jana and Das (2017); Maciel et al.(2013); Prayag (2007)	3
Used other scales	Deventer (2021); Dias et al. (2020); Kong et al. (2020); Venkateswaran (2020)	4

Personalities' identification with a brand community and the positive perceptions resulting from

belonging to a certain brand community can affect their associations with the brand. Mao et al. (2020)

and Shezi (2022) used the theory of social identity in an attempt to establish the perceptions of consumers towards brand personality in smartphones and sports industries, respectively.

In their study, Mao et al. (2020) found that brand personality and brand identity directly or indirectly influenced the purchase intention of consumers toward brands. Shezi (2022), on the other hand, established that successfulness and sincerity dimensions were statistically significant and hence impacted team identification amongst premier soccer league teams. Table 1 reveals the theories and studies that utilized each theory.

The majority of brand personality studies in BRICS favored the Aaker (1997) theoretical framework of five dimensions of brand personality (Sincerity, Excitement, Competence, Sophistication, and Ruggedness). A review by Saeed et al. (2022) also found similar findings. Aaker (1997) theory is the most expressive and most acknowledged one in the brand personality literature. This supports the fact that the measurement scale by this author is a valid measure of brand personality (Davies et al., 2018). Despite the fact that this theoretical framework has been applied by the majority of researchers, the same is not suitable to all cultures as it was developed from the USA population.

Context Perspective

Context is defined as the subset of physical and conceptual positions of interest to a certain entity (Pascoe, 1998). The TCCM method regards contexts as surroundings that form the research setting (Paul & Rosado-Serrano, 2019). This study grouped contexts into two categories namely offline and online contexts. The offline context refers to studies that collected data through face-to-face while the online context refers to studies that gathered data through normal online means such as emails, websites (Matonya, 2022). It was found that the majority of published articles (76%) used offline contexts while the remaining (24%) articles applied online contexts. This implies that brand personality researchers preferred face-to-face exchanges between the researcher and the research participant.

Characteristics Perspectives

The next portion synthesizes the constructs studied and their relations to brand personality. In particular, it presents the antecedents,

consequences, mediators and moderators of brand personality in the BRICS.

The Antecedents of Brand Personality in BRICS

This review identified seven antecedents of brand personality, including the color of the product package, the shape of the product package, sensorial image and corporate image, perceived effectiveness of celebrity endorsement, power distance belief and business competence. Through a series of experiments, Pantin-Sohier et al. (2005) in Russia found that the color of the product package and the shape of the product package are antecedents of brand personality. Sensorial image and corporate image were also identified as antecedents of brand personality by Prayag (2007) in South Africa and Upadhyay and Agrawal (2014) in India, respectively. On the other hand, the perceived effectiveness of celebrity endorsement (Dissanayake & Weerasiri, 2017), power distance belief and business competence (Venkateswaran, 2020) exerted influence on brand personality traits. Only six studies out of 46 dared to find out the variables that have an impact on brand personality. This is a gap that needs to be filled by future research. Identifying factors that have impact on brand personalities is important, particularly for managers who want to differentiate themselves from their competitors (George & Anandkumar, 2018; Japutra & Molinillo, 2019). Therefore, there is an opportunity for future research to explore potential antecedents such as brand experience, customer satisfaction, sales promotion, perceived value, brand reputation and brand awareness, which were not included in the reviewed literature.

Mediators of Brand Personality in BRICS

Mediators of brand experience were also noticed in the reviewed articles. These mediators can be grouped into one broad category of relational theme. This theme encompasses perceived quality, brand trust, brand attitude, brand self-congruity, Intimacy (consumer–brand, and brand–consumer), brand familiarity, flow experience, brand social categorization and attraction personality. Out of 46 articles, only ten included mediators. Some mediators appeared in more than one study. For example, self-congruity appeared in three studies (Huang et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2019; Matzler et al., 2016) whereas the rest of the mediators were determined in only one study. This paucity of information regarding mediators of brand personality calls for further research in this area. Including mediators in research helps to go beyond

studying a simple relationship between two variables for a fuller picture of the real world. These variables are especially important to consider when studying complex correlational or causal relationships between variables. Potential mediators, for example, between brand personality and other brand related constructs such as brand evaluation, brand trust, brand relationship and brand preference, can be investigated by future research. These include brand association, brand attachment, consumer trust and brand knowledge.

Moderators of Brand Personality in BRICS

This review identified few studied moderators of the relationship between brand personality and its consequences. The recognized moderators emerged into two themes, namely consumer-related moderators and company-related moderators.

Consumer-related moderator (consumer ethnocentrism) was applied by Supphellen and Grønhaug (2003) in Russia. Three moderators (country of origin image, self-image congruence with company-brand personality and corporate-brand credibility) were found in the company-related moderators. Wang and Yang (2008) in China revealed that the country of origin moderated the link between brand personality and purchase intention. On the other hand, Wang et al. (2009) in China pointed out that self-image congruence with company-brand personality moderates the link between company-brand personality and purchase intention. Furthermore, Wang and Yang (2011) in China showed that corporate-brand credibility is a moderator variable between brand personality and purchase intention.

Table 2: The consequences of brand personality in the BRICS

Consequences	Study
Brand evaluation	Supphellen and Grønhaug (2003)
Low-ethnocentric consumers	Supphellen and Grønhaug (2003)
Purchase intention	Lin and Huang (2012); Mao et al. (2020); Pradhan et al. (2014); Wang et al. (2009); Tong & Li (2013); Wang and Yang (2008)
Attitude toward downward brand extension	He (2012)
Attitude toward far brand extension	He (2012)
Brand trust	Kim and Zhao (2014)
Brand affect	Kim and Zhao (2014)
Brand attitude	Pradhan et al. (2014)
Brand relationship	Haryanto et al. (2016)
Brand preference	Banerjee (2016)
Brand self-congruity	Liu et al. (2019); Matzler et al. (2016); Pan et al. (2017)
Ideal self-congruity	Pan et al., 2017
Destination loyalty	Jana and Das (2017); Kong et al. (2020); Pan et al. (2017)
Brand social categorization tendency	Wang et al. (2018)
Brand equity	Ahmad and Thyagaraj (2017)
Intimacy (consumer-brand)	Jana and Das (2017)
Intimacy (brand-consumer)	Jana and Das (2017)
Temporal distance	Jain et al. (2018)
Brand loyalty	Liu et al. (2019); Venkateswaran, (2020)
Political brand	Jain et al. (2018)
Customer brand awareness	Fortes et al. (2019)
Customer perceived quality	Tong and Li (2013), Ha and Janda (2014)
Brand love	Fortes et al. (2019)
Affective loyalty	Li et al. (2019)
Brand experience	Hou et al. (2019)
Local milk brand	Kakati and Deorah (2019)
Global brand	Kakati and Deorah (2019)
Customer relationship perception	Dias et al. (2020)
Attraction loyalty	Kong et al. (2020)
Customer satisfaction	Venkateswaran, (2020)
Bank identification	Deventer (2021)
Team identification	Shezi (2022)

The general observation regarding the reviewed articles is that scholars have paid less attention to studying brand personality and other consumer-related and brand-related variables which can strengthen or weaken the relationships between brand personality and its consequences. This trend calls for more studies to search for the moderators of the link between brand personality and other variables such as customer satisfaction, purchase intention, brand loyalty and brand love.

Consequences of Brand Personality in BRICS

The reviewed articles came up with several brand personality consequences. Table 2 reveals that six studies (Lin & Huang, 2012; Mao et al., 2020; Pradhan et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2009; Tong & Li, 2013; Wang & Yang, 2008) support that purchase intention is the consequence of brand personality. Three of the studies (Liu et al., 2019; Matzler et al., 2016; Pan et al., 2017) confirmed that self-congruity is influenced by brand personality.

Table 2 further shows that the loyalty of customers toward brands and various products is created by brand personality traits (Jana & Das, 2017; Kong et al., 2020; Li et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019; Pan et al., 2017; Venkateswaran, 2020). In other words, if someone wants to make customers loyal to a brand or certain product, the person should pay more attention to personalities embedded in that particular brand or product. Brand personalities have significant impact on brand-related variables such as brand trust (Kim & Zhao, 2014), brand preference (Banerjee, 2016), brand equity (Ahmad & Thyagaraj, 2017), brand love (Fortes et al., 2019) and brand experience (Hou et al., 2019), to mention just a few. It was also found that the customer-related variables like customer satisfaction (Venkateswaran, 2020), customer relationship perception (Deventer, 2021) and customer brand awareness (Fortes et al., 2019) are consequences of brand personality. Moreover, the study revealed that, brand personality influences the majority of brand-related and customer-related variables. Consequently, this construct can be used by managers and other stakeholders to differentiate their brands from competitor's brands.

Methodological Perspective

This review also looked at the methodologies used in the published articles. It reveals that various sampling techniques, analytical methods and approaches have been utilized while gauging information about brand personality and its

antecedents, mediators, moderators and consequences.

It was found that slightly more than a third of the articles (39%) used convenient sampling while 35% did not mention the sampling techniques. Hence, this becomes not easy to recognize what kind of sampling techniques utilized by some of the published articles. The lack of transparency in sampling techniques was also witnessed in top-tier diverse international psychology articles (Scholtz et al., 2020). This prevents readers from examining the quality of sampling techniques utilized in the studies (Fisher & Sandell, 2015) and hampers replication of the studies (Trafimow, 2015). This habit increases the prevailing replication crisis (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). On the other hand, random sampling occupied 11% of sampling techniques applied followed by snowball sampling technique with 7%. Other sampling techniques included judgmental (4%), Quarter (2%) and purposive sampling (2%). These findings imply that the dominant sampling technique applied by brand personality studies is convenience sampling. This may be because convenience sampling is faster and easier to implement. However, this type of sampling is not without limitations. One of its limitations is that convenience samples are not certainly representative of the population in question, hence hindering generalization of the findings (Staetsky, 2019).

Moreover, the studies utilized quantitative and qualitative research approaches. The study reveals that the majority of the reviewed articles (85%) were quantitative, 11% used a qualitative research approach whereas the remaining articles (4%) utilized mixed approach. This implies that the quantitative approach is the main research approach used by brand personality scholars followed by the qualitative approach while the mixed approach is less used. Therefore, this study calls for the use of mixed methods in brand personality. This is because the mixed method encompasses two overriding research categories which can counterbalance the inadequacies of one single method and provide more reliable and valid research findings (Hafsa, 2019). The mixed method also offers a chance to realize a holistic view of the phenomenon under search by integrating the results from quantitative and qualitative inquiry (Tashakkori & Newman, 2010).

Furthermore, various analytical methods have been used. For instance, structural equation modeling (SEM) was used by 16 articles regarding brand personality in the BRICS. Twelve articles used SEM-AMOS, two articles used SEM-Smart PLS and two (2) applied SEM without stipulating the type of SEM used. Six articles also applied exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) as a means to examine validity and reliability. Multiple regression analysis was utilized by eleven 11 articles, thematic analysis by two, and hierarchical regression analysis by two. Other analytical methods such as discourse analysis, content analysis and ANOVA were applied by one of the article. The use of SEM and Regression analysis as analytical tools may be caused by the fact that most studies are quantitative in nature, which aims at establishing the causal relationship between the variables. Quantitative methods are preferred by researchers because they can alleviate individual bias (Savela, 2018) and provide a chance for replication of the research over time as they use standardized approaches (Taherdoost, 2022). Despite their advantages, quantitative studies do not provide an in-depth understanding and information regarding the studied objects because of their fundamentally reductive nature of classification (Savela, 2018; Taherdoost, 2022). Other reviews such as of Saeed et al. (2022) also found limited use of qualitative methods in brand personality studies. Thus, future studies may pay more attention to qualitative techniques in gathering information. These may include in-depth interviews or focus group discussions. Qualitative methods can offer an in-depth understanding of the antecedents, mediators, moderators and consequences of brand experience.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study concludes that the “Big Five” human personality framework by Aaker (1997) is the dominant theory in the study of brand personality in BRICS. Furthermore, the majority of brand personality scholars prefer to disseminate their research findings through the Journal of Tourism Management. China is the major contributor of brand personality studies in BRICS. Convenience sampling, quantitative approach, offline context and Structural Equation Modeling Techniques dominated brand personality studies. While only few brand personality scholars bother to study about the antecedents, mediators and moderators of brand personality, the majority of researchers

concentrated on finding the consequences of brand personality.

Based on the conclusions, it is recommended that scholars should use country-specific measure of brand personality as the measurement by Aaker (1997) was mainly for the US population. Since only few researchers have dared to search on the moderators of the relationship between brand personality and other customer and brand related variables, this study recommends that future studies search for moderators of the link between brand personality and other constructs. It is also recommended that future studies should consider probability sampling techniques, qualitative approach and online platforms such as social media to gather information on what brand personality is perceived in this context.

References

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (3), 347-356.
- Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish Brand Personality constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(3), 492-508.
- Ahmad, A. & Thyagaraj, K. S. (2017). An empirical comparison of two brand personality scales: Evidence from India. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 36, 86-92.
- Avis, M., Aitken, R. & Ferguson, S. (2012). Brand relationship and personality theory: Metaphor or consumer perceptual reality? *Marketing Theory*, 12(3), 311-331.
- Azoulay, A. & Kapferer, J. N. (2003). Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality? *Journal of Brand Management*, 11(2), 143-155.
- Banerjee, S. (2016). Influence of consumer personality, brand personality, and corporate personality on brand preference: An empirical investigation of interaction effect. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 28(2), 198-216.
- Beale, M. (2018). Brand Putin: An analysis of Vladimir Putin's projected images. *Defense Strategic Communications*, 5, 129 -169.
- Becker, E. A. & Gibson, C. C. (1998). Fishbein and Ajzen's Theory of Reasoned Action: Accurate Prediction of Behavioral Intentions Enrolling in

- Distance Education Courses. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 49(1), 43–55.
- Bosnjak, M., Bochmann, V., & Hufschmidt, T. (2007). Dimensions of Brand Personality Attributions: A Person-Centric Approach in the German Cultural Context. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 35(3), 303- 316.
- Carvalho, D., Demo, G., & Scussel, F. (2021). The Future of Brand Personality: Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho*, 21(3), 1585-1593.
- Chen, Y., Mandler, T., & Meyer-Waarden, L. (2021). Three decades of research on loyalty programs: A literature review and future research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 124, 179 – 197.
- Chu, S. & Sung, Y. (2011). Brand personality dimensions in China. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 17(3), 163-181.
- Cooper, H. (2012). *Research Synthesis and Meta-analysis: A Step-by-step Approach*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Davies, G., Rojas-Mendez, J., Whelan, S., Mete, M., & Loo, T. (2018). Brand personality: Theory and dimensionality. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 27(2), 115-127.
- de Kock, P. (2015). Development of BRICS Brand. Research Report, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324537816_The_development_of_the_BRICS_brand. Accessed on 12.12.2023.
- Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In Buchanan, D. A. & Bryman, A. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 671–689). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Deventer, M. (2021). Validating brand identification and personality scale within the South African retail-banking context”, *Banks and Bank Systems*, 16(4), 1-10.
- Dias, G. N., Demo, G., & Scussel, W. E. A. (2020). The magical world of disney: Building relationships with clients from the brand personality. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 16(1), 39-49.
- Dissanayake, D. M. R. & Weerasiri, R. A. S. (2017). The Impact of perceived effectiveness of celebrity endorsement on perceived brand personality. *Journal of Accounting and Marketing*, 6(3), 2- 9.
- Eisend, M. & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2013). Brand Personality: A meta-analytic review of antecedents and consequences. *Marketing Letters*, 1-12.
- Fisher, G. G. & Sandell, K. (2015). Sampling in industrial–organizational psychology research: Now what? *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 8(2), 232–237.
- Fortes, V. M. M., Milan, G. S., Eberle, L. & De Toni, D. (2019). Brand loyalty determinants in the context of a soft drink brand. *Resources and Entrepreneurial Development*, 20(5), 1 – 31.
- Freling, T. H., Crosno, J. L., & Henard, D. H. (2011). Brand personality appeal: Conceptualization and empirical validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(3), 392-406.
- George, J. & Anandkumar, V. (2018). Dimensions of product brand personality. *Vision*, 22(4), 377-386.
- Gilmore, W. G. (1919). *Animism*. Boston: Marshall Jones Company.
- Giroux, M., Pons, F., & Maltese, L. (2017). The role of perceived brand personality in promotion effectiveness and brand equity development of professional sports teams, *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 18(2), 180-195.
- Ha, Y. & Janda, S. (2014). Brand personality and its outcomes in the Chinese automobile industry. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 20(2), 216 – 230.
- Hafsa, N. (2019). Mixed Methods Research: An Overview for Beginner Researchers. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 58, 45 – 49.
- Haryanto, J. O., Moutinho, L., & Coelho, A. (2016). Is brand loyalty really present in the children's market? A comparative study from Indonesia. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 4020–4032.
- Hassan,, S. M., Rahman, Z. & Paul, J (2022). Consumer ethics: A review and research agenda. *Psychology and Marketing*, 39(1), 111–130.
- He, J. (2010). Humanity and trendiness key dimensions and differences in brand personality evaluation in Chinese market. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 19-35.
- He, J. (2012). Sincerity, excitement and sophistication. *Nankai Business Review International*, 3(4), 398 – 412.

- Hou, J., Zhao, X., & Zheng, J. (2019). The impact of consistency between the emotional feature of advertising music and brand personality on brand experience. *Journal of Management Analytics*, 6(3), 250-268.
- Huang, J., Zhang, C. & Hu, J. (2017). Destination brand personality and destination brand attachment: The involvement of self-congruence. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 34(9), 1198–1210.
- Jain, V., Chawla, M., Ganesh, B. E. & Pich, C. (2018). Exploring and consolidating the brand personality elements of the political leader. *Spanish Journal of Marketing*, 22(3), 297-319.
- Jana, S. K. & Das, J. R. (2017). How intimate are you with your preferred brand? A study on brand personality congruence. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 25(2), 723 – 740.
- Japutra, A. & Molinillo, S. (2019). Responsible and active brand personality: On the relationships with brand experience and key relationship constructs, *Journal of Business Research*, 99, 464- 471.
- Kakati, R. P. & Deorah, A. (2019). Linking brand attractiveness for brand personality development-local, national and global brand in the processed food industry of India. *International Journal of Research and Review*, 6(9), 53 – 176.
- Khandai, S., Bhawna, A., & Gulla, A. (2015). Brand personality scale: How do Indian consumers interpret the personality dimensions? *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 20(1), 27–47.
- Kim, R. B. & Zhao, M. (2014). Chinese consumers' brand loyalty for consumer products: importance of brand personality as major antecedent of brand loyalty. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 19(1), 1–15.
- Kim, Y. D., Magnusen, M. & Kim, Y. (2012). Revisiting sport brand personality: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(3), 65 – 80.
- Kong, W. H., Loi, K. L. & Xu, J. (2020). Investigating destination loyalty through tourist attraction personality and loyalty. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, 1-22.
- Krippendorff, K. (2013). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (3rd Edition). SAGE Publication: United Kingdom.
- Levinson, D. J. & Amar, S. (1969). The importance of a good database. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 8(4), <https://doi.org/10.1108/dpm.1999.07308dab.001>
- Li, X., Yen, C. & Liu, T. (2019). Hotel brand personality and brand loyalty: An affective, conative and behavioral perspective. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 29(5), 550–570.
- Lim, W. M., Kumar, S. & Ali, F. (2022). Advancing knowledge through literature reviews: 'what', 'why', and 'how to contribute. *The Service Industries Journal*, 42(7), 481–513.
- Lin, Y. & Huang, P. (2012). Effects of the big five brand personality dimensions on repurchase intentions: Using branded coffee chains as examples. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 15(1), 1-18.
- Liu, Z., Huang, S. & Liang, S. (2019). Does brand personification matter in consuming tourism real estate products? A perspective on brand personality, self-congruity and brand loyalty. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, 1-20.
- Llanos-Herrera, G. R., & Merigo, J. M. (2019). Overview of brand personality research with bibliometric indicators. *Kybernetes*, 48(3), 546-569.
- Maciel, F. A., Rocha, A., & Silva, J. F. (2013). Brand personality of global quick-service restaurants in emerging and developed markets: A comparative study in Brazil and the USA. *Latin American Business Review*, 14(2), 139-161.
- Mandler, T. B., Sezen, J. C., & Özsoyner, A. (2021). Performance consequences of marketing standardization/adaptation: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 125, 416–435.
- Mao, Y., Lai, Y., Luo, Y., Liu, Y., Du, Y., Zhou, J., Ma, J., Bonaiuto, F. & Bonaiuto, M. (2020). Apple or Huawei: Understanding flow, brand image, brand identity, brand personality and purchase intention of smartphone. *Sustainability*, 12(3391), 1-2
- Mariutti, G. F. & Giraldi, J. M.E. (2020). Country brand personality of Brazil: A hindsight of Aaker's theory. *Place Brand Public Diplomacy* 16, 251–264.
- Matzler, K., Strobl, A., Stokburger-Sauer, N., Bobovnick, A. & Bauer, F. (2016). Brand personality and culture: The role of cultural differences on the impact of brand personality perceptions on tourists' visit intentions. *Tourism Management*, 52, 507–520.

- Matonya, J. (2022). A Review and Future Directions of Brand Experience Research in Tourism. *Huria Journal*, 29(2), 100-135.
- Milas, G. Mlacic, B. (2007). Brand personality and human personality: Findings from ratings of familiar Croatian brands. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(6), 620-626.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 151(4), 264-269.
- Morrish, S. C., Pitt, L., Vella, J. & Botha, E. (2017). Where to visit, what to drink? A cross-national perspective on wine estate brand personalities. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 29(4), 373-383.
- Muniz, M. K. & Marchetti, R. Z. (2012). Brand personality dimensions in the Brazilian context. *Brazilian Administration Review*, 9(2), 168-188.
- Open Science Collaboration (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), 943–952.
- Pan, L., Zhang, M., Gursoy, D. & Lu, L. (2017). Development and validation of a destination personality scale for mainland Chinese travelers. *Tourism Management*, 59, 338–348.
- Pantin-Sohier, G., Decrop, A., & Brée, J. (2005). An Empirical investigation of the product's package as an antecedent of brand personality. *Innovative Marketing*, 1(1), 69 -80.
- Pascoe, J. (1998). Adding generic contextual capabilities to wearable computers. In Digest of papers. *Second international symposium on wearable computers* (cat. no. 98ex215), 92–99.
- Paul, J. & Rosado-Serrano, A. (2019). Gradual internationalization vs born-global/ international new venture models: A review and research agenda. *International Marketing Review*, 36(6), 830–858.
- Paul, J., & Criado, A. R. (2020). The art of writing literature review: What do we know and what do we need to know?. *International business review*, 29(4), 101717.
- Pradhan, D., Duraipandian, I. & Sethi, D. (2014). Celebrity endorsement: How celebrity–brand–user personality congruence affects brand attitude and purchase intention. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 22(5), 456–473.
- Prayag, G. (2007). Exploring the relationship between destination image and brand personality of a tourist destination: An application of projective techniques. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research*, 111 – 130.
- Radler, V. M. (2018). 20 Years of brand personality: A bibliometric review and research agenda. *Journal of Brand Management*, 25(4), 370-383.
- Saeed, M. R., Burki, U., Ali, R., Dahlstrom, R., & Zameer, H. (2022). The antecedents and consequences of brand personality: A systematic review, *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 17(4), 448-476.
- Savela, T. (2018). The advantages and disadvantages of quantitative methods in schoolscape research. *Linguistics and Education*, 44, 31– 44.
- Scholtz, S. E., De Klerk, W., & De Beer, L. T. (2020). The use of research methods in psychological research: A systematized review. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 5(1), 1–17.
- Scussel, F. & Demo, G. (2019). The relational aspects of luxury consumption in Brazil: the development of a Luxury Customer Relationship Perception Scale and the analysis of brand personality influence on relationship perception on luxury fashion brands. *Brazilian Business Review*, 16(2), 174–190.
- Shezi, N. E. (2022). The influence of brand personality towards identification of premier soccer league teams in South Africa: A structural equation model. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 25(1), 378 - 391.
- Sirgy, J. M. (1982). Self-concept in consumer behavior: A critical review. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(3), 287–300.
- Sirgy, M. J. & Su, C. (2000). Destination image, self-congruity, and travel behaviour: Toward an integrative model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, 340–352.
- Smit, E. G., van den Berge, E., & Franzen, G. (2002). Brands are just like real people: The development of SWOCC's brand personality scale. In Hansen F. and Christensen, L. B. (Eds.), *Branding and Advertising*, Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen, pp. 22- 43.
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines, *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333 – 339.

- Staetsky, L. D. (2019). Can convenience samples be trusted? Lessons from the survey of Jews in Europe, 2012. *Contemporary Jewry*, 39(1), 115–153.
- Supphellen, M. & Grønhaug, K. (2003). Building foreign brand personalities in Russia: The moderating effect of consumer ethnocentrism. *International Journal of Advertising: The Review of Marketing Communications*, 22(2), 203-226.
- Taherdoost, H. (2022). What are Different Research Approaches? Comprehensive Review of Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Research, Their Applications, Types, and Limitations. *Journal of Management Science & Engineering Research*, 5(1), 53-63.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*, pp. 7–24.
- Tashakkori, A. & Newman, I. (2010). Mixed methods: integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to research, In B. McGaw, Baker, E. & Peterson, P. P. (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed.). Oxford, U.K.: Elsevier.
- Thomas, J. E. (2017). Scholarly Views on Theory: Its Nature, Practical Application, and Relation to World View in Business Research. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(9), 230 -240.
- Tong, X. & Li, C. (2013). Impact of brand personality and consumer ethnocentrism in China's sportswear market. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 25(3), 491-509.
- Trafimow, D. (2015). An a priori solution to the replication crisis. *Philosophical Psychology*, 31(8), 1188–1214.
- Upadhyay, R. K. & Agrawal, K. K. (2014). Influence of corporate image on brand personality: A customers' perspective. *Prestige International Journal of Management & IT- Sanchayan*, 3(1), 98-109.
- Venkateswaran, P. S. (2020). Influence of business competency, customer personality, brand personality, customer satisfaction on brand loyalty for branded mobiles. *Tierärztliche Praxis*, 40, 1865 - 1880.
- Vlahovic-Mlakar, T. S. & Ozretic-Dosen, V. (2022). Brand Experience Research in Hospitality and Tourism— Review and Future Directions. *Tourism: An international interdisciplinary Journal*, 70(4), 674 – 693.
- Wang, X. & Yang, V. (2011). The impact of brand credibility and brand personality on purchase intention: An empirical study in China. *International Marketing, Emerging Markets*, 21, 137–153.
- Wang, X. & Yang, Z. (2008). Does country-of-origin matter in the relationship between brand personality and purchase intention in emerging economies? Evidence from China's auto industry. *International Marketing Review*, 25(4), 458 – 474.
- Wang, X., Wang, X., Fang, X. & Jiang, Q. (2018). Power distance belief and brand personality evaluations. *Journal of Business Research*, 84, 89-99.
- Wang, X., Yang, Z. & Liu, N. R. (2009). The impacts of brand personality and congruity on purchase intention: Evidence from the Chinese mainland's automobile market. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 22, 199–215.
- Yang, Y. & Cho, E. (2002). The study of Korean BP scale development and validation. *Korean Journal of Consumer and Advertising Psychology*, 3(2), 25-53.
- Zupic, I. & Cater, T. (2015). Bibliometric methods in management and organization. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(3), 429 – 472.