

Peter Zickermann

Co-Branding

Fit Factors between Partner Brands



Anchor Academic Publishing

disseminate knowledge

Zickermann, Peter: Co-Branding: Fit Factors between Partner Brands, Hamburg, Anchor Academic Publishing 2015

Buch-ISBN: 978-3-95489-296-9

PDF-eBook-ISBN: 978-3-95489-796-4

Druck/Herstellung: Anchor Academic Publishing, Hamburg, 2015

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographical Information of the German National Library:

The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography. Detailed bibliographic data can be found at: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Bearbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Die Wiedergabe von Gebrauchsnamen, Handelsnamen, Warenbezeichnungen usw. in diesem Werk berechtigt auch ohne besondere Kennzeichnung nicht zu der Annahme, dass solche Namen im Sinne der Warenzeichen- und Markenschutz-Gesetzgebung als frei zu betrachten wären und daher von jedermann benutzt werden dürften.

Die Informationen in diesem Werk wurden mit Sorgfalt erarbeitet. Dennoch können Fehler nicht vollständig ausgeschlossen werden und die Diplomica Verlag GmbH, die Autoren oder Übersetzer übernehmen keine juristische Verantwortung oder irgendeine Haftung für evtl. verbliebene fehlerhafte Angaben und deren Folgen.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

© Anchor Academic Publishing, Imprint der Diplomica Verlag GmbH
Hermannstal 119k, 22119 Hamburg
<http://www.diplomica-verlag.de>, Hamburg 2015
Printed in Germany

Abstract

This study is about the perception of “fit” between two partner brands in a co-branding venture. Previous studies have already identified that a perceived fit between partner brands leads to a positive evaluation of the co-branded offering by consumers. Despite the great importance of fit between brands, it has not been investigated yet which factors (e.g. similar price level, target group, product category) lead to a perceived fit between partner brands by consumers.

For closing this research gap, a theoretical framework is developed in order to identify potential “fit factors” that have an influence on the perceived fit. Based on the categorization theory and different brand association classifications the following potential fit factors between two brands are identified: price fit, user fit, usage fit, quality fit, brand personality fit, and category fit.

To find out if these fit factors have an impact on the perceived overall (global) fit of two partner brands, an empirical study of 9 real co-brands is conducted. 180 students are asked in an online questionnaire to state their perception of the 9 co-brands regarding the different fit factors.

On the one hand, these findings help brand managers to select the right partner brand. On the other hand, it delivers first indications for academics why consumers perceive some co-brands as fitting together and others not. Therefore, the findings of this research as well as the developed theoretical framework can be used for future research in this area.

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	11
1.1 Research Purpose, Research Question and Managerial Relevance	12
1.2 Delimitations	13
1.3 Structure of this study	14
2. Foundations of Co-Branding	15
2.1 Brand, Co-Branding and Brand Leverage	15
2.1.1 Brand	15
2.1.2 Definition of Co-Branding	15
2.1.3 Brand Leverage Strategies: Co-Branding, Brand and Line Extension	16
2.2 Types and related types of Co-Branding	18
2.2.1 Types of Co-Branding	18
2.2.2 Related types of Co-Branding	19
2.3 Benefits, Drawbacks and Success Factors of Co-Branding	21
2.3.1 Benefits of Co-Branding	21
2.3.2 Drawbacks of Co-Branding	23
2.3.3 Success factors of a co-branded offering.....	25
2.4 Literature Review of Co-Branding and Research Gap	27
3. Theory	30
3.1 Cognitive Theories.....	30
3.1.1 Perception and Attitude.....	30
3.1.2 Associative Network Memory Model	33
3.1.3 Categorization Theory.....	35
3.2 Fit Factors	39
3.2.1 Brand Fit	39
3.2.2 Category Fit	44
3.2.3 Theoretical Framework	45
4. Methodology & Research Design.....	47
4.1 Type of data: Primary vs. Secondary data.....	47
4.2 Type of research: Qualitative vs. Quantitative research	47
4.3 Questionnaire Design	51
4.3.1 Brand Selection.....	51
4.3.2 Questionnaire structure and questions	52

4.3.3 Number of questionnaires	60
4.4 Sample and Sample Size	60
4.4.1 Sample vs. Census	60
4.4.2 Sample Type	61
4.4.3 Sample Size	63
4.5 Data Collection	64
4.5.1 Method	64
4.5.2 Time Horizon	66
4.5.3. Techniques for increasing the Response Rate	66
4.6 Validity, Reliability and Generalisability	67
4.6.1 Validity	67
4.6.2 Reliability	68
4.6.3 Generalisability	69
5. Data Analysis	70
5.1 Method	70
5.1.1 Method for Demographic (Classification) questions	71
5.1.2 Method for Target questions	72
5.2 General and demographic statistics of the survey	72
5.3 Analysis of the Target questions	75
6. Conclusions, Limitations and Future Research	82
6.1 Conclusions	82
6.1.1 Conclusions from the Data Analysis	82
6.1.2 Answering the Research Question	83
6.1.3 Managerial Implications	84
6.1.4 Academic Implications	85
6.2 Limitations and Future Research	85
References	87

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Structure of the study.....	14
Figure 2: Brand Leverage Strategies based on Aaker (1996, p.275).....	17
Figure 3: Benefits of Co-Branding	23
Figure 4: Drawbacks of Co-Branding	25
Figure 5: Success factors for a positive evaluation of a co-branded offering	27
Figure 6: Overview of the perceptual process	30
Figure 7: Tri-component attitude model / ABC-model of attitudes	32
Figure 8: Example of a schema.....	35
Figure 9: Types of Brand Associations based on Keller (1993)	41
Figure 10: Brand Personality dimensions and traits based on Aaker (1997)	43
Figure 11: Dimensions of Category Fit based on Simonin & Ruth (1998).....	45
Figure 12: Theoretical Framework for the empirical study	46

Table of Tables

Table 1: Overview of the different views in the categorization theory	38
Table 2: Selected 9 co-brands for this study (product categories in brackets).....	52
Table 3: Cover Letter of the questionnaire	54
Table 4: Rating scale of the target questions (six-point Likert scale).....	55
Table 5: Target question regarding the Global Fit of the two partner brands.....	56
Table 6: Target question regarding the Price Fit of the two partner brands	56
Table 7: Target questions regarding the User Fit of the two partner brands.....	57
Table 8: Target question regarding the Usage Fit of the two partner brands	57
Table 9: Target questions regarding the Quality Fit of the two partner brands	58
Table 10: Target questions regarding the Brand Personality Fit of the two partner brands ...	58
Table 11: Target questions regarding the Category Fit of the two partner brands.....	59
Table 12: Text regarding the Raffle (Lottery) of the questionnaire	60
Table 13: Questionnaires and the containing co-brands.....	60
Table 14: Samples of similar studies.....	63
Table 15: Characteristics of the different data collection methods (based on Schiffman & Kanuk 2009).....	65
Table 16: General statistics of the study	73
Table 17: Demographic statistics of the study.....	74
Table 18: Statistics about the raffle (lottery).....	74
Table 19: Rating scale of the target questions (six-point Likert scale)	75
Table 20: Example of how respondents rated the Global Fit (here btw. Apple and Nike).....	75
Table 21: Example of how the analysis calculates the Quality Fit (here btw. Apple and Nike).....	76
Table 22: Questionnaire 1 – Mean values of the global fit and the single fit factors	77
Table 23: Questionnaire 2 – Mean values of the global fit and the single fit factors	79
Table 24: Questionnaire 3 – Mean values of the global fit and the single fit factors	80
Table 25: Brand Fit vs. Category Fit.....	81

1. Introduction

Firms are continuously looking for new opportunities to exploit and leverage their existing brands for achieving business growth. In the past, companies have leveraged their “most important asset” (brands) through brand and line extensions (Aaker 1990, James, Lyman & Foreman 2006). Nowadays, the most recent trend for capitalising on brands is called “Co-Branding”, in which two or more brands are presented jointly to the consumer, forming a new product or service offering (Dickinson & Heath 2008). This new branding strategy promises many benefits, especially for international operating companies with strong global brands (James 2006, Dickinson & Heath 2006). Because of the high rate of product failures, the intense competition among companies and the high costs to enter new markets, the use of co-branded products has become increasingly important for brand managers: Because they provide a way to take advantage of existing brand name recognition and associations (Helmig, Huber & Leeflang 2008, Besharat 2010). Co-branding came up in the early 90’s and has recently reached an all-time high with annual growth rates estimated at 40 percentage (Dickinson & Heath 2006).

Any form of co-branding is conducted in an attempt to transfer positive associations from brand partners to the new co-branded offering (Spethman and Benezra 1994). Examples are Sony and Ericsson offering mobile phones together, Nike and Apple manufacturing a collaborative shoe together or Häagen Dazs and Baileys creating a new kind of ice cream together. By providing consumers the familiarity of, and knowledge about, an established brand, reduces the financial risk of introducing a new product to the market is substantially. Further benefits are easier access to new markets, additional marketplace exposure and shared expenses (Dickinson & Heath 2008). But co-branding is not without risks. If the consumer evaluation of the co-brand/co-branded offering is not favourable, it results in a product failure (linked with high costs and wasted resources) and may also damage the brand image of the partner brands (Roedder, Loken & Joiner 1998, Leuthesser, Kohli & Suri 2003). Consequently, a poor co-branding venture can create damaging associations, which affect the brands involved negatively. Therefore, a positive evaluation by the consumer is crucial. A positive evaluation improves the likelihood of purchasing the co-branded product and is thus essential for the success of any co-branding activity (James 2006). Previous studies have already identified three main factors that have a positive influence towards the evaluation of a co-branded offering by consumers: Positive attitudes toward the partner brands, perceived “fit” between the partner brands, and a high difficulty of making the co-branded offering (James 2006, Dickinson & Heath 2006, Dickinson & Heath 2008). These

studies have also revealed that consumers look first for a fit between partner brands when they evaluate a co-branded offering (Dickinson & Heath 2006). Once fit is present, consumers evaluate a co-branded offering more positive and are more intent to buy the co-branded product or service (Dickinson & Heath 2006). Therefore, the factor “fit”, which refers to the compatibility of two brands, plays a superior role in the evaluation of a co-branded offering.

Despite the great importance of fit in the evaluation of a co-branding offering, there is still no, or no holistic, answer under which conditions (e.g. similar price level, target group, product category) two partner brands are perceived as compatible by consumers. The objective of this study is to identify, based on an empirical study of international well-known brands, factors that are important for two brands to be perceived as fitting together.

1.1 Research Purpose, Research Question and Managerial Relevance

As mentioned in the introduction, it is already known that the perception of fit between partner brands is very important for the evaluation and the likelihood of purchasing the co-branded offering by the consumer (James 2006, Dickinson & Heath 2006, Dickinson & Heath 2008). Given the importance of perceived fit between partner brands, it prompts the need for academic research that investigates under which conditions consumers perceive two brands as fitting together. Up to now, not much research has been conducted in this area. Academics have examined the factor “perceived fit” in a general manner, without specifying and examining which dimensions it consist of (Washburn, Till & Priluck 2000, James 2006). All of their studies have focused mainly on identifying factors, which influence the evaluation of a co-branded offering rather than investigating the concept of fit itself. That means “fit” has never been investigated alone and in more detail.

This study investigates “fit” in more detail and tries to find out, which factors lead to a perceived fit between two brands by consumers. Given this research purpose the *research question* of this study can be formulated as follows:

“Which factors lead to a perceived fit between two partner brands by consumers?”

The following sub-questions arise within the attempt to answer the research question:

“Are there any clear factors that lead to a “fit” between partner brands?”, “Are some factors more important than others?”, “If yes, which?”.