

Ivana Marković*, Biljana Rabasović, Nikola Stojanović
Western Serbia Academy of Applied Studies, Valjevo department, Serbia

The Influence of the Brand Personality Concept on Consumer Satisfaction and Loyalty

DOI: 10.7595/management.fon.2022.0001

Abstract:

Research Question: The goal of this research is to describe how the concept of brand personality and its dimensions affect customer satisfaction and loyalty. **Motivation:** Creating brand personality is an efficient differentiation strategy, used by numerous companies for building and sustaining competitive advantage. Brands with personality are considered as real people and can be described using human characteristics. Therefore, consumers can establish connection with them more easily, which increases customer satisfaction and brand loyalty. **Idea:** The main idea of this paper was to empirically evaluate the relationship between the concept of brand personality and its dimensions and customer satisfaction and loyalty. **Data:** The information for this purpose was gathered through a survey that included 191 participants. **Tools:** Collected data were statistically analyzed using descriptive statistics, reliability and regression analyses in order to test the hypothesis. **Findings:** The results have proved that the brand personality plays a significant part in building satisfaction and loyalty. Furthermore, results indicate a significant positive relationship between all five brand personality dimensions and satisfaction on loyalty, with excitement and competency as dominant. **Contribution:** This paper provides new insights significant for the Serbian-speaking audience and is genuinely useful since it stresses the importance of brand personification and its influence on success. Therefore, it can be used by brand managers to aid the process of establishing and sustaining strong brands

Keywords: brand, brand personality, satisfaction, loyalty

JEL classification: M30, M31

1. Introduction

Advancements in technology have made it possible to recreate or copy a majority of the products' physical characteristics. Therefore, brand managers are forced to create differentiation factors through intangible brand elements that are more challenging to copy (Starcevic, 2016). Like people, brand has its own identity: name, symbols, physical attributes, country of origin, as well as its character – a brand personality. Brand personality has been described as the sum of human characteristics added to the brand that defy that brand, e.g., competent, modern, fun, active, etc. Personalizing helps consumers to better understand the brand, and to eliminate the feeling of insecurity during the purchase or usage of a product or a service. Consumers choose and make connections with a brand whose human characteristics they appreciate and identify with. Due to the possibility to express their own personality, show their achievements, success, and social status through brands, consumers have a sense of contentment. It is known that a satisfied customer is likely to repeat the purchase, therefore building brand loyalty. Loyal customers are a foundation for success – repetitive purchases increase sales and profits. This research intends to synthesize theoretical and practical knowledge into an in-depth analysis about brand personality, focusing on presenting this concept as a generator of satisfaction and brand loyalty among the mobile phone industry.

This study contributes to the field by offering new information on brand personality as a generator of satisfaction and loyalty. These findings are highly beneficial for the Serbian-speaking scientific community due to its rarity and uniqueness. A large body of domestic literature deals with the ways in which we measure

*Corresponding author: Ivana Marković, e-mail: ivana.markovic@vipos.edu.rs

brand personality, adjustments of the measuring scales to various cultures, as well as the effects of the brand personality upon numerous aspects of business. The authors are not aware of any empirical research within the domestic literature that connects the concept of brand personality with satisfaction and loyalty. Therefore, the key benefit of this research is going to be filling the gap within that field of research through offering new findings with both theoretical and practical implications. The results should point out benefits of brand personalization for improving customer satisfaction and loyalty.

This paper opens with presenting current theoretical and practical state within the field, followed by methodology and the sample structure description. The next part provides the results of empirical research. The paper ends with the conclusion, discussion about the benefits and limitations of the research, as well as the possibilities for future research.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Brand personality

Based on the most cited definition, “brand personality is a set of human characteristics related to a brand” (Aaker, 1997), brands can easily be described as a person by adding typical human characteristics – age, sex, social status, as well as certain personality traits – gentle, sensitive, kind, family-oriented, joyful. Depending on how long the brand has been present in the market, it can be considered as young or old, so Nokia can be considered as an old and Huawei as a young brand. Slim cigarettes, due to their appearance, are considered feminine, while Marlboro has a strong masculine character. Brands with lower price and quality are perceived as blue-collar brands, while more expensive, high-quality brands are recognized as persons of high social status. The reason for adding human characteristics to objects is to easily understand and make connection with it.

Several studies indicated that consumers are going to choose brands that match their personality the most (Seimiene, 2012; Tan et al., 2016; Tuzcuoglu et al., 2018). Seimiene (2012) in her theoretical model of emotional connection between brand and consumer personalities concluded that the main traits of both brand and consumer personalities should be similar; in that way consumers will more likely choose a certain brand.

Akin (2017) states that placing a product with a generic name directly leads to decreased market share since that product is now seen as common. It is also more difficult to establish good communication with prospective consumers since it is highly challenging to present such brand efficiently, and to make people remember a brand with a weak or no personality. Brand personality affects brand love, brand trust, brand commitment and purchase intention (Becheur et al., 2017; Mao et al., 2020; Tong et al., 2018) and enables companies to create unique positions of their brands in their consumers’ minds, therefore increasing brand equity (Helmi et al., 2019; Kiriri, 2019; Starcevic, 2016). Since brand personality is more difficult to imitate, it provides sustainable competitive advantage (Aaker, 1997; Helmi et al., 2019; Lim, 2013; Sung et al., 2010; Starcevic, 2016).

2.2. Brand personality dimensions and measuring scale

The intangible nature of brand personality makes this concept hard to measure. A most commonly used scale for measuring brand personality is created by Aaker (1997). Matching the personality scale used in psychology, known as The Big 5, Aaker (1997) created the scale which includes five key brand personality dimensions: sincerity, excitement, competency, sophistication, and ruggedness. To measure precisely, each of the five factors is described with appropriate traits, so the model ended up with five personality dimensions described with 42 characteristics.

Brands associated with Sincerity are down to earth, honest, wholesome, cheerful, family-oriented, sincere, real, and genuine. In general, this dimension covers the idea of warmth and acceptance. Sincerity brands are usually food, safety or hospitality brands, like Coca Cola or Pampers. Excitement dimension refers to being daring, spirited, imaginative and up to date. Brands positioned as exciting are usually intended for younger population, promising them the sociability, energy and activity. TikTok, Nike, MTV are brands dominantly described by this dimension. Competence is defined in terms such as: reliable, intelligent, and successful. Banks, insurance companies, logistics firms, medical or IT brands are mostly positioned as competent, e.g., UPS, Volvo, Microsoft. Sophistication refers to upper-class, glamorous, good-looking,

charming, feminine, and smooth. In most cases luxury, expensive and superior brands are associated with this dimension. Sophisticated brands are Tiffany & Co, Nescafe, and Mercedes. The fifth brand personality dimension, Ruggedness, is associated with outdoorsy, tough, masculine, western, and rugged. Rugged brands emphasize power and strength: Jack Daniels, Jeep, Harley Davidson (Davies et al., 2017; Starcevic, 2013).

Relying on Aaker scale, numbers of scholars have developed different brand personality measurement tools. Due to cultural differences of certain countries, these scales are often adapted accordingly. For the purpose of her brand personality research, Starcevic (2013) has adjusted the scale, in alignment with the perception of the participants on the Serbian market. She left out all items not related to personal characteristics, eliminated all items similar to participants, and excluded all items not suitable for describing related brands or not adequate for the questionnaire. For example, the Ruggedness factor was renamed to Strength, which was more understandable and appropriate for Serbian respondents. The final scale consists of the five basic factors and additional 32 description features. The overview is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Aaker scale adjusted to Serbian market.

Brand personality dimensions	Characteristics
SINCERITY	Realistic, family-oriented, fair, honest, kind, cheerful, sensible, friendly
EXCITEMENT	Bold, trendy, interesting, fun, cheerful, youthful, whimsical, genuine, extraordinary
COMPETENCY	Reliable, tireless, competent, successful, responsible, confident, governing
SOPHISTICATION	Sophisticated, charming, well-bred, glamorous, elegant
STRENGTH	Powerful, sporty, persistent, strong, tough

Source: Starcevic (2013)

2.3. Satisfaction

Marinkovic defines satisfaction as “the emotional response of a customer to the experience related to purchase of a certain product or a service” (Marinkovic, 2012, p.50). Satisfaction is the consumer’s assessment of the amount of fulfilling his/her desire or need, in comparison with his/her expectations (Rizwan et al., 2014). Brands that deliver values that exceed their customers’ expectations will result in high satisfaction levels among their customers (Helmi, 2019). Consumers’ expectations largely depend on their previous experiences with the product, on independent reviews, as well as on information provided by the seller. If this information is not aligned with the actual performance of a product or a service, the consumers’ expectations are going to be set high, certainly leaving the customer unhappy (Kotler, 2006).

A satisfied customer is more likely to repeat a purchase and spread positive verbal propaganda about a brand or an organization (Leninkumar, 2017). On the other hand, a consumer who is not happy with the purchase is very likely to share negative information about it, and to choose another product for the next related purchase (Milisavljevic et al., 2005). It is well known that it is significantly more cost-effective to keep the existing customers than to attract new ones; the importance of satisfaction is obvious. A high satisfaction level is widely recognized as a significant factor of loyalty. However, it is not a rule that high satisfaction will positively affect loyalty (Helmi, 2019). Consumers prone to experimenting tend to choose a different product each time, despite positive experiences with the previous ones (Kamble et al., 2019).

2.4. Loyalty

Customer loyalty is affection or deep dedication to a product, a service, a brand or an organization. (Oliver, 1999). Marinkovic defines loyalty as “devotion to a brand or a business subject based on a strong positive opinion, which results in repetitive purchases” (Marinkovic, 2012, p. 144). It is a multidimensional construct consisting of two components: attitude and action (Leninkumar, 2017) that can be weak or strong. Loyal buyers do not desire to change brands, they are faithful and less price sensitive. Since they perceive a specific brand as unique, they are ready to pay extra for that brand, even if there is a more affordable option (Nobre, 2010; Shin et al., 2019).

Companies with a strong base of loyal customers have an advantage on the market. Loyal customers are prone to sharing positive brand-related experiences to the people they are in touch with. Therefore, such companies can save significant resources on advertising (Shin et al., 2019). “Loyalty is considered as one

of the key elements for achieving a long-lasting business success” (Akin, 2017). It is recognized as an important factor that contributes to achieving competitive advantage in an extremely competitive and dynamic business environment, in comparison with other companies (Leninkumar, 2017). Forming a loyal customer base enables advantages such as cutting marketing costs, better positioning in the stores, attracting new while keeping old customers (Akin, 2017). Based on loyalty, other advantages can also be achieved, such as a larger market share, positive word-of-mouth, establishing premium price level, and ultimately increasing shareholder value. (Arjun et al., 2012; Helmi et al., 2019). Loyalty results in increased sales and profits (Al-Maslam, 2015).

2.5. Defining research hypothesis

Numerous scholars have researched brand personality and its influence on satisfaction and loyalty, from different standpoints (Adinehfar et al., 2016; Bilgili et al., 2015; Choi et al., 2017; Chung and Park, 2015; Kwong and Candinegara, 2014; Lombart and Louis, 2016; Mann and Rawat, 2016, Rafidah, 2021; Tuzcuoglu et al., 2018; Yang and Lee, 2019). Many confirmed positive relationships between brand personality, satisfaction and loyalty with a few opposite conclusions. Furthermore, many studies indicated the influencing variation of brand personality dimensions, depending on consumer characteristics (Tuzcuoglu et al., 2018), brand origin (Yang and Lee, 2019) or various brands (Chung and Park, 2015).

Yang and Lee (2019) examine the influence on brand personality dimension in forming the affective loyalty towards mid- to low-end fashion brands in Korea. Sincerity, competence, and excitement have been identified as determinants of affective loyalty. It is reported that each dimension had different levels of influence, depending on the product origin. Competence and sincerity had significant influence on affective loyalty towards Western and Eastern brands, and excitement as a brand personality trait has been identified as the most powerful dimension in forming the loyalty towards Eastern brands.

In their study, Mann and Rawat (2016) examine consumers’ affection and brand personality regarding their experience with cell phones. They identified that brands recognized as sincere, exciting, and competent create emotional attachment with consumers. Further, their findings demonstrated that consumer emotional attachment with the brand has a positive influence on satisfaction and loyalty.

Another study, focusing on mobile phones, examined brand personality effects on brand asset management. In order to fulfill the objective of the research the authors have used the concept of consumer self-identification with the brand. Results have shown a positive relationship between attractiveness, distinctiveness, and self-expressive value of brand personality. Consumers’ identification with a brand has been affected by these relationships, having a direct influence on word-of-mouth, and an indirect effect on brand loyalty. According to the results of the study, authors have concluded that the essential role in creating and maintaining brand personality is communication (Kim et al., 2001).

Bilgili and Ozkul (2015) have studied the relationship between brand awareness and brand personality and its effects on consumer satisfaction and loyalty. They concluded that brand awareness directly influences brand personality creation, while brand personality has a direct impact on customer satisfaction and brand loyalty.

Another study, investigating into the relationship between brand loyalty and brand personality, had in focus the variations of effects of different traits of brand personalities between two famous mobile phone brands (Apple and Samsung). First, the study confirmed a significant positive relationship between brand personality and brand loyalty. Second, the results indicated that the effect of certain brand personality traits will vary according to the brand. Furthermore, sincerity and competence dimensions had significant effect on loyalty for both brands. On the other hand, excitement had positive effects for Apple and negative effects for Samsung. This variation is explained by different characteristics of Samsung and Apple mobile phone users (Tuzcuoglu et al., 2018).

Chung and Park (2015) confirmed positive effects of brand personality on brand loyalty and discovered that dimensions of brand personality effect would vary depending on the mobile phone brand. According to the results, brand personality dimensions – excitement, competence, and sophistication, are the most influential factors that affect consumers’ brand loyalty on the European mobile phone market. Further, the study indicates the differences in impact among all five brand personality dimensions on brand loyalty across the top four mobile phone brands (Samsung, Apple, Nokia, and Sony). For instance, sincerity had a positive effect only with the brand loyalty of Sony, and ruggedness was positively associated only with Samsung and Apple brands.

Although a large number of scholars have confirmed a positive influence of brand personality on brand loyalty, there are studies with the opposite results. Kwong and Candinegara (2014) observed the relations between brand experience, brand personality, brand satisfaction and brand loyalty in the tobacco industry. According to their findings, a significant positive influence is found only between satisfaction and loyalty. On the other hand, brand experience and brand personality were insignificant to consumer loyalty. Lombart and Louis (2016) found a significant positive influence of brand trust and brand attitude on retailer brand personality, but no influence of brand personality on brand loyalty.

Accordingly, four research hypotheses are generated:

H1: Brand personality has statistically significant positive influence on customer satisfaction.

H2: Brand personality has statistically significant positive influence on customer loyalty.

H3: All five brand personality dimensions have statistically significant positive influence on customer satisfaction.

H4: All five brand personality dimensions have statistically significant positive influence on customer loyalty.

2.6. Research framework

According to the defined research hypothesis, research framework is composed and presented in Figure 1. The research framework gathers brand personality and its dimensions, satisfaction and loyalty into one, assuming the interconnected relationships among the variables.




Figure 1: Research framework

3. Sample Structure and Research Methodology

All data have been collected using a questionnaire method, through an online interview. The first three questions were related to socio-demographic characteristics of the interviewees, such as age, sex, and level of education. The fourth question required the interviewees to provide information about the cell phone they use, followed by four questions about the phone brand. Mobile phone brands were chosen as the objects of the research due to the fact that many people have an opinion and attitude towards that brand since the interaction with the cell phone is usually frequent. The remaining questions were actually statements, 23 out of 29 were related to the brand personality, 3 to satisfaction, and 4 to loyalty. Respondents used a five-degree Likert scale to express their opinion (1 - Do not agree at all, 5 - Completely agree). Statements included were taken from the relevant literature and adjusted accordingly. Thus, statements related to brand personality were taken from the studies of Aaker (1997) and Starcevic (2013), followed by satisfaction-related statements from the research of Bilgili and Ozkul (2015), and loyalty related statements by Rizwan (2014) and coauthors' scale.

An online survey was conducted from June 29th until July 6th 2020., involving 191 interviewees. The sample was segmented according to age, sex, and level of education. Age wise, the sample contains 43% of the people between the ages of 18 to 30, 31% between 31 and 40, 17% between 41 and 50, 7% between 51 and 60, and 2% above 60 years of age. Regarding sex, we had 60 male (31%) and 131 female participants (69%). Education-wise, 27% (52) participants obtained a high school diploma, while majority have a college degree, around 73% (139 participants). Collected data were processed and analyzed using SPSS. Regarding statistical analysis, descriptive, reliability, correlational and regression analyses were used.

4. Research Results

To examine how appropriate and homogenous the results are, descriptive analysis was conducted, calculating the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation. The results are shown in Table 2. Results have shown that the most positive attitude relates to satisfaction, or more precisely to the following statement: "I think I have made a good decision choosing that cell phone brand". The most negative attitude is related to the Courageous characteristic within the Excitement group of adjectives used to describe brand personality.

Table 2: Descriptive analysis and scale reliability

Statements	Arithmetic means	Standard deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Brand personality			0.976
SINCERITY			0.935
Truthful	3.61	1.209	
Realistic	3.82	1.142	
Honest	3.52	1.200	
Fair	4.02	1.131	
Friendly	3.76	1.246	
EXCITEMENT			0.911
Trendy	4.07	1.126	
Interesting	4.04	1.058	
Courageous	3.45	1.284	
Creative	3.51	1.256	
Original	3.66	1.270	
COMPETENCE			0.935
Reliable	4.06	1.129	
Competent	3.82	1.153	
Successful	3.82	1.205	
Responsible	3.66	1.254	
Self-confident	3.79	1.187	
SOPHISTICATION			0.900
Sophisticated	3.74	1.172	
Charming	3.66	1.215	
Well-bred	3.71	1.204	
Elegant	4.01	1.119	
STRENGTH			0.872
Powerful	3.87	1.137	
Persistent	3.58	1.162	
Strong	3.71	1.292	
SATISFACTION			0.967
I am satisfied with the brand of my cell phone	4.27	0.945	
This brand has fulfilled my expectations	4.25	0.904	
I believe I have made a good decision to buy this brand's product	4.28	0.941	
LOYALTY			0.884
I am ready to recommend the brand of the phone I use	4.21	0.945	
I consider myself loyal to the phone brand I currently have	3.84	1.119	
I would purchase the same phone brand again	4.09	1.060	
I am not interested in purchasing any other mobile phone brand	3.48	1.349	

Author's calculation using SPSS

Reliability of the measuring scale has been analyzed using Cronbach’s Alpha. Values of this factor range between 0 and 1. If its value is higher than 0.7, the scale is considered reliable and consistent (Hair et al., 2014). The results in the Table 2 prove high internal coherency of variables.

Table 3: Correlation analysis

Variables	Brand personality	Satisfaction	Loyalty
Brand personality	1	0.610**	0.590**
Satisfaction		1	0.694**
Loyalty			1

**Value considered significant at 0.01
Author’s calculation using SPSS

Table 3 presents the results of the correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationship strength between variables. Based on the results of the Pearson’s correlation factor, statistically significant positive relation is determined at the 0.01 level between all variables. Taking only Brand personality and Satisfaction (0.610) variables into account, as well as Satisfaction and Loyalty (0.694), strong linear correlation is determined.

Table 4: Results of the simple regression analysis for testing the Hypotheses 1 and 2

Variables	R ²	B	t	Significance (p)	Standard error
Brand personality- Satisfaction	0.372*	0.610	10.574	0.000*	0.062
Brand personality- Loyalty	0.348*	0.590	10.041	0.000*	0.059

Value significant at 0.01
Author’s calculation using SPSS

In order to test the research hypothesis, a simple regression analysis was conducted. Results are presented in Table 4. Test results for the Hypothesis 1 show that the independent variable Brand personality has a statistically significant positive influence on the independent variable Satisfaction – 37.2% of variability of the dependent variable has been described through this regression model. The same results were achieved by Helmi et al. (2019), Mann and Rawat (2016), and Bilgili and Ozkul (2015). It can be concluded that brand personification, perception of brands as people, triggers emotional response among consumers, which results in satisfaction. Therefore, the hypothesis cannot be rejected.

According to the results of the testing of the second hypothesis, it can also be concluded that the influence of the independent on the dependent variables is positive and statistically significant, while 34.8% of variability has been described through this model. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 cannot be rejected. Brand personality enables consumers to identify and connect with a brand, resulting in the sense of affection and dedication, so a consumer constantly purchases and uses a brand, therefore creating loyalty. The same results were achieved by Akin (2017), Bilgili and Ozkul (2015), Chung and Park (2015), Helmi et al. (2019), Mann and Rawat (2016), Kimm et al. (2001), Tuzcuoglu et al. (2018) and Yang and Lee (2019).

Table 5: Results of the simple regression analysis for testing the Hypothesis 3

Variables	R ²	B	t	Significance (p)	Standard error
Sincerity - Satisfaction	0.288*	0.537	8.749	0.000*	0.072
Excitement - Satisfaction	0.349*	0.590	10.059	0.000*	0.067
Competence - Satisfaction	0.338*	0.581	9.824	0.000*	0.069
Sophistication - Satisfaction	0.311*	0.557	9.231	0.000*	0.069
Strength - Satisfaction	0.307*	0.554	9.158	0.000*	0.072

Value significant at 0.01
Author’s calculation using SPSS

Table 5 presents the results of a simple regression analysis which is conducted in order to test Hypothesis 3. The results indicate statistically significant positive influence of each brand personality dimension on variable Satisfaction. Having this in mind, the third hypothesis cannot be rejected either. This result is partially in line with findings of Mann and Rawat (2016). The highest B value can be detected for the Excitement followed by the Competence. Dominance of the Excitement dimension can be explained by numerous mobile phone applications which provide amusement and activity to the user; at the same time users need a reliable device and therefore Competence as a dimension gains importance.

Table 6: Results of the simple regression analysis for testing Hypothesis 4

Variables	R ²	B	t	Significance (p)	Standard error
Sincerity – Loyalty	0.258*	0.508	8.113	0.000*	0.068
Excitement - Loyalty	0.359*	0.599	10.281	0.000*	0.062
Competence - Loyalty	0.309*	0.556	9.187	0.000*	0.066
Sophistication - Loyalty	0.279*	0.528	8.543	0.000*	0.066
Strength - Loyalty	0.290*	0.539	8.789	0.000*	0.067

Value significant at 0,01
Author's calculation using SPSS

The results of the simple regression analysis conducted in order to test the Hypothesis 4 are presented in Table 6. According to the results, all five brand personality dimensions have a statistically significant positive influence on the Loyalty variable. This result is in line with the study of Chung and Park (2015) and partly in line with Tuzcuoglu et al. (2018). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 cannot be rejected. Excitement followed by the Competence dimension has the highest value of B coefficient; this is the same result as in Hypothesis 3 test and it can be explained in the same way.

Conclusion

The research has been intended to examine if brand personality and its dimensions affect satisfaction and loyalty. The results of the research have confirmed that if a brand can be perceived as a human being and can be described using human characteristics, it can fulfill consumers' expectations and trigger a sense of satisfaction. The research has also confirmed that brand personification has a significant role in establishing loyalty. Participants have shown they are ready to recommend a brand with strong brand personality, that they plan to repeat a purchase, and that they would not switch to another brand. Finally, the research has confirmed that each brand personality dimension separately has a positive influence on satisfaction and loyalty. The dominant dimensions are Excitement and Competence, as the mobile devices provide entertainment and need to be reliable.

The research has several theoretical implications that expand knowledge about brand management. Firstly, the study has offered new information about brand management as a tool used to predict satisfaction and loyalty, which used to be an insufficiently covered topic throughout domestic literature. Papers on brand management lack empirical research, which directly increases contribution and value of this work due to quantitative empirical research that proves all tested relations. Moreover, theoretical contribution is reflected in the measuring instrument that can be used for any related future research.

The social contribution is seen in the practical application of the research results, which can be highly useful to brand managers for creating product policies, communication plans, and ultimately a business strategy. Basically, researching brand personality leads to the clear picture about brand position in consumers' minds, focusing on both strong and weak elements. This information is highly important for managers to decide which brand attributes should be stressed and improved. Moreover, since the concept of brand personality is a superior tool for achieving competitive advantage, critical information about how to build a unique brand personality can be obtained. Brand personality research can be conducted using numerous brands, which enables comparisons with competition, and eases identification of the differentiation points. Accordingly, suggestion for businesses would be to focus on building brand personality matching the personality traits of their main consumers and to distinguish its brands from competitors' brands by emphasizing personality traits which are relevant to the brand category and most appreciated by consumers.

Like many other economy-related research works, this contains several limitations. The first limitation is related to the structure and size of the sample. Due to the nature of online surveys, the sample does not cover all market segments. Second, the research covers only one product group (mobile phones), so the result cannot be generalized. The third limitation is related to the scale used for measuring brand concept. It consists solely of statements related to personal characteristics, while demography-related questions (age, sex, social status) were left out. During the survey process, it was observed that several participants had difficulties acknowledging a brand as a person. It turned out that their common trait was education within the natural sciences field.

As a response to the aforementioned limitations, further research possibilities are discovered. First, the research should be conducted across a larger sample, combining in-person and online survey methods in order to cover all segments. Then, it would be interesting to organize research on several product groups, to compare the importance of the concept of brand personality, depending on a product category. Similarly, it would be engaging to expand the survey with questions

regarding brand's demographic characteristics, to obtain a whole picture about its personality. Regarding a problem of inability to imagine brands as persons among a few participants, the next research could open with a question about whether it is possible to do so or attempt to determine if that problem is related to a certain demographic factor (age, sex, education, social status, income level). It would also be interesting to research connections between concepts of brand personality, satisfaction and loyalty with the business results of the company that owns the brand. A special area of research of the brand personality concept should be its influence upon satisfaction and loyalty of service customers, due to intangibility of services and even more complex personification-related problems, as well as problems related to customer-service relation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aaker, J.L. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356. DOI: 10.1177/002224379703400304
- [2] Adinehfar, A.R. Gayem, A. (2016). Impact of brand personality on satisfaction and loyalty of consumers (case study: luxury brands of watches in the city Isfahan). *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 8(3), 462-477. DOI: 10.4314/jfas.v8i3s.193
- [3] Akin, M. (2017). The Impacts of Brand Personality on Brand Loyalty: A Research on Automobile Brands in Turkey. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 9(2), 134-145. DOI: 10.5539/ijms.v9n2p134.
- [4] Al-Maslam, S. (2015). The Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Customer Loyalty in the Banking Sector in Syria. *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, 7, 27-34. DOI: 10.7176/JMCR
- [5] Arjun, C., Morris, B., Holbroo. (2012). The Chain of Effects from Brand Trust and Brand Affect to Brand Performance: The Role of Brand Loyalty, *Journal of Marketing*. 65(2), 81-93. DOI: 10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255
- [6] Becheur, I. Bayarassou, O. Ghrib, H. (2017). Beyond Brand Personality: Building Consumer-Brand Emotional Relationship. *Global Business Review*. 18(4), 2-17, DOI: 10.1177/0972150917693160.
- [7] Bilgili, B. Ozkul, E. (2015). Brand awareness, brand personality, brand loyalty and consumer satisfaction relations in brand positioning strategies (a TORKU brand sample). *Journal of global strategic management*, 9(2), 89-106. DOI: 10.20460/jgsm.2015915576.
- [8] Choi, Y. Ok, C., Hyun, S. (2017). Relationships between brand experiences, personality traits, prestige, relationship quality, and loyalty: An empirical analysis of coffeehouse brands, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 1185-1202. DOI: 10.1108/IJCHM-11-2014-0601
- [9] Chung, S. Park, J. (2015). The influence of brand personality and relative brand identification on brand loyalty in the European mobile phone market: Brand Personality and Relative Brand Identification. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 34(1), 47-62 DOI: 10.1002/cjas.1321.
- [10] Davies, G. Rojas-Méndez, J.I. Whelan, S. Mete, M. Loo, T. (2018). Brand personality: theory and dimensionality, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 27(2), 115-127. DOI: 10.1108/JPBM-06-2017-1499
- [11] Hair, F. J., Black, C. W., Babin, J. B., & Anderson, E. R. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.
- [12] Helmi, S., Rini, E., Lubis, A. (2019). Brand experience analysis-how it relates to brand personality, value, satisfaction and loyalty in tv brands?.*International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*. 10(1), 852-866, DOI: 10. 852-866.
- [13] Kamble, A., Walvekar, S. (2019), Customer Satisfaction, Loyalty and Switching Intent in Retail Service Settings, *International Journal of Electronic Marketing and Retailing*, 10(4), 389-405, DOI: 10.1504/IJEMR.2019.10018802
- [14] Kim, C. Han, D. Park, S. (2001). The Effect of Brand Personality and Brand Identification on Brand Loyalty: Applying the Theory of Social Identification. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 43(4), 195 - 206. DOI: 10.1111/1468-5884.00177.
- [15] Kiriri, P. (2019). Measurement, validity, and dimensionality of Jennifer Aaker's brand personality scale for a mobile telephone brand in a developing country. *Journal of Business & Retail Management Research*, 13(4), 79-92. DOI: 10.24052/JBRMR/V13IS04/ART-07.
- [16] Kotler, P., Keller, K.L., (2006). *Marketing menadžment*. Data Status. Beograd.
- [17] Kwong, M.Z. Candinegara, I. (2014). Relationship between Brand Experience, Brand Personality, Consumer Satisfaction, and Consumer Loyalty of DSSMF Brand. *iBuss Management*, 2(2), 89-98. DOI: 10.7903/cmr.11086
- [18] Leninkumar, V. (2017). The Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Customer Trust on Customer Loyalty. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(4), 450-465. DOI: 10.6007/IJARBS/v7-i4/2821

- [19] Lim, A.S.E. (2013). The Influence of Metaphors and Product Type on Brand Personality Perceptions and Attitudes. *Journal of Advertising*, 35(2), 39-53. DOI: 10.1080/00913367.2006.10639226
- [20] Lombart, C. Louis, D. (2016). Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services Sources of retailer personality : Private brand perceptions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 28, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(12), 117–125. DOI:10.1016/j.jretconser.2015.09.002.
- [21] Mann, B. J. S., Rawat, J. (2016). The Role of Consumer Personality Trait and Brand Personality Trait in Creating Customer Experience. *IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 13(3), 23–42.
- [22] Mao, Y. Lai, Y. Luo, Y. Liu, S. Du, Y. Zhou, J. Ma, J. B. Bonaiuto, M. (2020). Apple or Huawei: Understanding Flow, Brand Image, Brand Identity, Brand Personality and Purchase Intention of Smartphone. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 1-22. DOI: 10.3390/su12083391
- [23] Marinkovic, V. (2012). Marketinski aspekti satisfakcije i lojalnosti: Orijentacija na potrosace u savremenom bankarskom poslovanju, *Ekonomski fakultet Univerziteta u Kragujevcu*.
- [24] Milisavljevic M., Maricic B., & Gligorijevic M., (2005). *Osnovi marketinga*. CID Ekonomski fakultet, Beograd.
- [25] Nobre, H. Becker, K. Brito, C. (2010). Brand Relationships: A Personality Based Approach. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 3(2), 203-216. DOI: 10.4236/jssm.2010.32026
- [26] Oliver, R.L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty?, *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 33-34. DOI:10.2307/1252099
- [27] Rafidah. (2021). Effects of Islamic Brand Personality, Service Quality, Customer Motives and Customer Satisfaction on Customer Loyalty in Sharia Banks of Jambi City Under the Perspective of Tawhidi String Relation. *Proceedings of the 2nd Southeast Asian Academic Forum on Sustainable Development (SEA-AFSID 2018)*. 168, 337-341 DOI: 10.2991/aebmr.k.210305.060.
- [28] Rizwan, M., Javed, P., Aslam, J., Khan, R., Bibi, H. (2014). The relationship of Brand Commitment, Brand Credibility, Perceived Quality, Customer Satisfaction and brand loyalty: an empirical study on Stylo shoes. *Journal of Sociological Research*. 5(1), 337-404. DOI: 10.5296/jsr.v5i1.6572.
- [29] Seimiene, E. (2012). Emotional connection of consumer personality traits with brand personality trait: Theoretical considerations. *Economics and Management*, 17(4), 1472-1478. DOI: 10.5755/j01.em.17.4.3016.
- [30] Shin, S., Amenuvor, F., Basilisco, R., Owusu-Antwi, K. (2019). Brand Trust and Brand Loyalty: A Moderation and Mediation Perspective. *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 38(4), 1-17. DOI:10.9734/CJAST/2019/v38i430376.
- [31] Starcevic, S. (2013). Istraživanje koncepta ličnosti brenda u marketing, *Marketing*. 44(2), 149-172. DOI: 10.5937/markt1302149S
- [32] Starcevic, S. (2016). LIČNOST BRENDA: Razlika koju je najteže kopirati, *Fakultet za ekonomiju, finansije i administraciju – FEFA, Beograd*.
- [33] Sung, Y. and Kim, J. (2010). Effects of brand personality on brand trust and brand affect", *Psychology and Marketing*, 27(7), 639-661. DOI:10.1002/mar.20349
- [34] Tan, A. Çolakoğlu, E. Öztosun, E. (2016). The Relation between Consumer and Brand Personality: Example of yemeksepeti.com. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 6(12), 1-15. DOI: 10.6007/IJARBS/v6-i12/2462.
- [35] Tong, X., Su, J., & Xu, Y. (2018). Brand personality and its impact on brand trust and brand commitment: An empirical study of luxury fashion brands. *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education*, 11(2), 196-209. DOI: 10.1080/17543266.2017.1378732
- [36] Tuzcuoglu, A. Fayda, S. N. Tuniyazi, Y. Öz, Z. (2018), Do The Effects Of Brand Personality Dimensions On Brand Loyalty Change According To Consumers' Personalities?, *TUJOM*, 3(2), 84-107. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30685/tujom.v3i2.35>.
- [37] Yang, S., Lee, Y. (2019). Mid- to low-end fashion brand personality affects consumers' perceived quality, commitment, and loyalty. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 47(7), 1-17. DOI: 10.2224/sbp.7680

Received: 2021-04-28

Revisions requested: 2021-07-26

Revised: 2021-11-23 (2 revisions)

Accepted: 2022-01-16

////// About the Authors

Ivana Marković

Western Serbia Academy of Applied Studies, Valjevo department
ivana.markovic@vipos.edu.rs



MA Ivana Marković is a lecturer at Marketing, Market Research and Brand Management courses at the Western Serbia Academy of Applied Studies, Valjevo department. Since 2011, she has also been engaged as a guest lecturer at Duale Hochschule Baden-Württemberg Stuttgart, Germany at the International marketing course. Besides lecturing, Ms. Marković deals with public relations and organization of public events as a PR manager at the Western Serbia Academy.

Biljana Rabasović

Western Serbia Academy of Applied Studies, Valjevo department
biljana.rabasovic@vipos.edu.rs



Biljana Rabasović is a professor with PhD in Marketing. She is employed at the Western Serbia Academy of Applied Studies, Valjevo department, where she teaches Consumer Behaviour, Marketing Services, Business and Market communication and Introduction to Tourism and Tourism Business. As a member of the VIPOS Research and Development Center team, she participated in a number of projects for business and non-business entities. She is the author of more than twenty scientific papers and a co-author of two books.

Nikola Stojanović

Western Serbia Academy of Applied Studies, Valjevo department
nikola.stojanovic@vipos.edu.rs



Nikola Stojanović is an assistant teacher at the Western Serbia Academy of Applied Studies for HR management, Marketing and Entrepreneurship-related subjects. He earned his Master's degree in HR management at Northeastern University (Boston, USA) and a Graduate certificate in Strategic management at Harvard University (Cambridge, USA). Currently pursuing a PhD degree at the Faculty of Organizational Sciences, University of Maribor.