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The Impact of Extension Success/ Failure and Congruity/ Incongruity on Family Brand Image: A Broadcaster Branding Context

Abstract
An investigation of the effects of consumer evaluations on family brand image, as a result of extension congruity/ incongruity and success/ failure. All possible combinations of these variables are examined within a broadcaster-branding context (specifically radio and television). Quasi-experimental studies show that program successes and failures cause an enhancement and dilution effect, respectively, to broadcaster brand image, with program sub-brand salience increasing these effects. Congruity/ incongruity of program image also produces enhancement and dilution effects in broadcaster brand image, in both ratings of perceived quality and specific brand beliefs. However, a significant interaction effect occurs between program congruity/ incongruity and program success/ failure only for specific brand beliefs, and not for perceived quality.

Introduction
The broadcasting industry has come to realize the importance of branding and brand management. A reason for this is the belief that branding can serve as an important differentiating tool when broadcasters are attempting to reach viewers, listeners and advertisers in an increasingly competitive market - a market that now includes multi-channel cable television, interactive-TV, digital radio, etc. As a result of this increased emphasis placed on branding, stronger associations have been created between the brand image of broadcasters and the programs they schedule (Section 1). It is the purpose of this paper to investigate these associations.

It is argued that these programs share many of the same characteristics as conventional line extensions and brand extensions (in the form of sub-brands). As a result, if a program is perceived to succeed or fail, it may have an enhancement or dilution effect on perceptions of the broadcaster's brand image (as in other markets). The issue of congruity, or perceived fit between the extension and the family brand, also appears to have a significant impact on consumer evaluations of the family brand. From this a conceptual framework is developed to examine the impact of perceived program success or failure, and program congruity or incongruity, on the brand image of television and radio broadcasters (Section 2). A possible
moderating variable between the perceived success or failure of the program and its effect on
the broadcaster brand image is the salience of the program sub-brand.

Three specific research questions are considered: RQ1: How does the perceived success or
perceived failure of programs affect consumer evaluations of the broadcaster brand image?
RQ2: How does the congruity or incongruity between the program image and the broadcaster
brand image affect consumer evaluations of the broadcaster brand image? In addition, how
do congruity and incongruity interact with perceived program success and failure in
consumer evaluations of the broadcaster brand image? RQ3: How does program sub-brand
salience moderate the effect of perceived program success or failure on consumer evaluations
of the broadcaster brand image?

Emanating from these research questions are ten hypotheses, which are investigated using
two quasi-experiments (Section 3). Quasi-Experiment 1 examines the effect of perceived
success/failure on broadcaster brand image, and its relation to program sub-brand salience,
through the separate investigation of one radio and one television salient program and
corresponding broadcaster brands. Quasi-Experiment 2 explores the impact of program image
congruity/incongruity on evaluations of broadcaster brand image, and looks at the interaction
effect between perceived success/failure and program congruity/incongruity on evaluations of
broadcaster brand image. Each combination of extension success/failure and
congruity/incongruity is tested here separately, and the impact is measured on the family
brand image components of both perceived quality and specific brand beliefs.

Analyses are presented (Section 4) and results discussed (Section 5), followed by
consideration of the limitations of the study and possible directions for future research
(Section 6).

Section 1: The Context

Broadcaster Branding
In a formal sense, broadcaster branding is a fairly recent phenomenon. Chan-Olmstead and
Kim (2001) found that many U.S. broadcasters have only been using the term “brand
management” in recent years, and for most this goes no further than a tactical focus on logo
design and brand slogans. It is claimed that most broadcasters have yet to understand the
implications of branding as a strategic managerial commitment that incorporates areas such as programming decisions (Chan-Olmsted and Kim, 2001; Miller, 1995). Nevertheless, this is changing – because of deregulation of the airwaves, proliferation of commercial radio licenses, the impact of multi-channel cable services, the digital revolution, forces of media fragmentation and media convergence, etc. In terms of brand management, there are three aspects to the changes.

First, broadcasters are giving more thought to how they can use their brand identity and values to distinguish themselves for viewers, listeners, and advertisers\(^1\). This is particularly evident among cable operators – e.g., CNN, Discovery Channel, Disney Channel, MTV, National Geographic Channel, etc. (Miller, 1995). But increasingly free-to-air television stations also are placing much more emphasis on identifying themselves in the minds of viewers, notably through use of their logos and slogans on program promotions, station fillers, news broadcasts and program guides. Similarly, radio stations have defined and positioned themselves through the use of their brand name in program promotions, between programs and songs, in competitions and through their own interactive web-sites. This appears to be a global phenomenon, with particularly prominent U.S., French, Italian, U.K., Chinese, and Indian examples. BBC1 in the U.K., for instance, has recently changed its branding strategy to “develop a warmer, more modern image for the channel” (Brech, 2001, p.17). This example illustrates that the phenomenon is not confined to commercial broadcasters, but includes cable, community and non-commercial television and radio stations, such as PBS in the U.S.A. Australian broadcasters (the geographical focus of the current study) are no different, with two of the three commercial free-to-air television broadcasters (Channel 7 and Channel 10) having undergone major logo, design, communication and positioning changes within the past fifteen years.

Second, broadcasters are considering how they might exploit any distinct image that they are able to create. A distinct image may present broadcasters with opportunities to leverage and grow their brand by introducing brand extensions. For example, Galaxy radio in the U.K., a

---

\(^1\) A contrary view is that consumers of media are not much concerned with broadcasters and their brands, but instead are mainly interested in quality programming (Barwise and Ehrenberg, 1994; McIntyre, 2001). Audiences, therefore, are attracted to quality programs, not distinctly branded broadcasters. Set against this is the evidence of large sums of money being invested by commercial and public broadcasters in logo and station design (Anonymous, 2000; Bashford, 2001). Moreover, this debate can be seen to further strengthen the argument that broadcasters are very dependent on their programs to establish and maintain their brand image – which is the theme of this research.
national youth radio network, has extended its brand into the fashion industry, through the introduction of a range of cutting-edge clothes under a new fashion label that bears a portion of the station's logo (Michalczyk, 2000). Broadcasters also have the opportunity of developing line extensions in the form of other broadcast channels. E! Entertainment Television extended their brand into a 24-hour fashion channel in the U.S. (Cooper, 1999). While it may be easier for cable operators to extend their brand, given their relatively narrow target markets and distinct images, free-to-air broadcasters have also been able to leverage aspects of their brand - as illustrated by NBC's successful line extensions of the CNBC and MSNBC networks (Fattah, 2001).

Third, some broadcasters are beginning to think about the implications of their image for programming decisions. A consequence of increased branding by television and radio stations, is the strengthening of the associations between the broadcaster’s brand image and that of the programs they schedule. This is occurring at the network level (e.g., sponsorship of community events), the flagship program level (e.g., personalities in news and sport programs) and the regular program level. On the radio, regular program promotions such as: "MIX 106.5’s Love Song Dedications!" can be heard. A regular program promotion on television might contain slogans such as "Channel 7’s The Practice - The One To Watch", with visuals of The Practice appearing, surrounded by Channel 7’s brand elements – the same is seen for CBS’s Cosby, ABC’s Roseanne, and NBC’s Suddenly Susan. Many television networks now place their logo as a constant 'watermark' or 'bug' in a corner of the screen during the broadcast of their programs. These ever more prevalent bugs and watermarks further reinforce the connection between the program and broadcaster brand.

**Motivation for the Study**

It is the purpose of this paper to investigate these associations between broadcaster brand image and that of scheduled programs\(^2\). Specifically, this study is motivated by a number of theoretical and managerial considerations. First, while much of the brand extension literature has focussed on consumer evaluations of the extensions themselves (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Bhat and Reddy, 2001; Bottomley and Doyle, 1996; Bousch and Loken, 1991; Broniarczyk and Alba, 1994; Dacin and Smith, 1994; Hartman, Price and Duncan, 1990; Park, Milberg

\(^2\) In the current study we investigate these associations from a consumer (i.e., viewer and listener) viewpoint. There is no consideration of brand image and brand equity of broadcaster brands among industry players such as...
and Lawson, 1991; Sunde and Brodie, 1993), a more limited number of studies have explored
the impact brand and line extensions have on consumer evaluations of family brand image
(Chen and Chen, 2000; Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Loken
and Roedder-John, 1993; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Romeo, 1991; Swaminathan,
Fox and Reddy, 2001). This paper contributes to the latter body of knowledge.

Among those studies that have examined the effect of extensions on evaluations of family
brand image, some have focused solely on extension failure (Chen and Chen, 2000), while
others have examined only extension incongruity (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Milberg,
Park and McCarthy, 1997). The combined effects of extension failure and extension
incongruity have also been examined in past research (Romeo, 1991). The effect of
successful intervening extensions was addressed by Keller and Aaker (1992), and Gurhan-
Canli and Maheswaran (1998) looked at the effects of extension congruity and incongruity.
However, with one exception, no published study has investigated the effects on family brand
image of all possible combinations of extensions: congruity and success; congruity and
failure; incongruity and success; and incongruity and failure. It follows that one purpose here
is to examine all these combinations, as well as examining a couple of under-explored
combinations (i.e. congruity and success; and congruity and failure).

The one exception is an article by Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy (2001) that examines all
four combinations from a behavioral perspective, using scanner data. To strengthen their
findings, the authors call for future research to obtain attitudinal data that may support their
purchase behavior data - something that is undertaken in the present study. More generally,
studies in the branding literature emphasize the need for future research to identify
circumstances under which different extension strategies contribute to enhancement or
dilution effects on family brand image (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Keller and
Aaker, 1992; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997).

Also, many have called for further research across different product categories, into areas
such as services and other categories conceptually quite removed from consumer goods
(Keller and Aaker, 1992; Romeo, 1991; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001). Broadcasting
provides an example that has many features of a service brand, where the company is seen as

advertisers, financial analysts and media buyers. However, these other viewpoints suggest important angles for future research.
the primary brand, and where consumers of programs (intangible goods) are a diverse mix of listeners, viewers and advertisers (Berry, 2000). The significance and timeliness of this is evident to practitioners\(^3\); but hitherto, formal academic research in the area of broadcaster branding has been very limited.

**Section 2: Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework is shown in Figure 1. Family (i.e. broadcaster) brand image is seen as a component of consumer-based brand equity. It can experience enhancement or dilution effects through the altering of brand associations in consumers’ minds. Program sub-brands may alter these brand associations, depending on whether the program is seen as a success or a failure, congruous or incongruous. Formally, the perceived success or congruity of a program sub-brand is information that is available for consumers to process. In processing this information, family brand associations change incrementally. It follows that more changes occur at high levels of success (failure) / congruity (incongruity). This conceptualization is in line with the “bookkeeping model” that has been used in previous studies – i.e., where consumers were first exposed to brand extension information and then asked to evaluate the family brand (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Sujan and Bettman, 1989)\(^4\).

In this study, attention is concentrated on that part of the framework contained within the dotted line in Figure 1. The details of this are fully documented in the rest of this section. The factors outside the dotted line that contribute to perceived program success or failure were developed from Reddy, Holak and Bhat (1994). A thorough investigation of all these determinants is beyond the scope of this paper; however, some discussion of this is provided in Section 6.

---

\(^3\) The context for this study is Australian broadcasting, but the issues are global – as is evident from the business press of many different countries. For instance, U.S. sources (Abelman, Atkin and Rand, 1997; Bednarski, 2001; Higgins, 2001) tell a very similar story to that in Australia (Brech, 2001; Chapman, 2001; Ligerakis, 2001). One reason is that many of the corporate players are multinationals (e.g. Fox, CNN). It is an empirical question whether our results hold cross-nationally, but we would not expect there to be major differences.

\(^4\) The alternative “sub-typing model” suggests that extremely incongruent information is evaluated by consumers as an exception, and placed in a sub-category on its own (Weber and Crocker, 1983). Therefore, the impact on family brand image of highly incongruent extensions would be minimal (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997). Conversely, when information is moderately congruent, more changes in evaluation of the schema are predicted (Bousch and Loken, 1991; Hartman, Price and Duncan, 1990). This model has been used when consumers are first asked to assess how typical the extension is of the family brand, before evaluating the family brand beliefs.
Before listing the research hypotheses to be tested, the main constructs are defined.

**Construct Definition**

*Brand extensions.* Many existing product offerings, across multiple industries, fall clearly under the definition of either a line extension or a brand extension (Tauber, 1981). However, programs scheduled by radio and television broadcasters share characteristics of *both* line extensions and brand extensions. Programs can be perceived as using the existing broadcaster brand name to introduce a new product offering in the same product category of television or radio, thereby fulfilling the criteria of line extensions. Consider the popular U.S. television program, *Survivor.* In Australia, this program is broadcast on the highest rating, free-to-air broadcaster, Channel 9. It is promoted using the *Survivor* logo, but surrounded by the Channel 9 brand elements of its own logo, colours and consistent voice-over artist. Associations between the Channel 9 family brand and *Survivor* are contained, not only in program promotions, but also in the nature of the program itself, since commercial breaks throughout the program contain Channel 9 promotions. Also, the web-site address for the show is www.ninemsn.com.au/survivor – a clear combination of the program name and family brand name, thereby further strengthening associations between *Survivor* and Channel 9. Since the parent brand of Channel 9 is being used to brand a new program (i.e. new offering) in the same product category of television, *Survivor* could be considered as a line extension of the family brand of Channel 9. However, the relationship between the broadcaster and its programs also involves some degree of sub-categorization of programs, for example, reality programs, game shows, lifestyle programs, news and current affairs, and talk-back shows. In the *Survivor* example, a reality game show, Channel 9 could be perceived as extending its brand into a *new* product category of reality programming, which it may have previously never entered. Subsequently, programs share some characteristics of brand extensions.

Although programs contain components of line and brand extensions, it is evident that they are primarily promoted using a sub-branding strategy (Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Sheinin, 1998). A sub-branding strategy involves the combination of a family brand name

---

5 An alternative perspective is to see broadcaster image as being akin to store image, with the programs scheduled as retailed products. For example, a store with high perceptions of quality, such as Harrods in the U.K., may only choose products that support and reflect this prestige image. A broadcaster may treat its programming decisions in a similar way and broadcast programs that are congruent with its desired image. In
and a new brand (Sheinin, 1998). In the previous example, since Survivor possesses its own logo, theme music and brand associations, a new brand is introduced, and Survivor can be viewed a sub-brand to the Channel 9 family brand. In developing hypotheses we draw in particular on brand extension and sub-branding studies (Chen and Chen, 2000; Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Romeo, 1991; Sullivan, 1990; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001).

*Brand image.* Despite interest in the concept of brand image amongst marketers and consumer psychologists for the past fifty years, there is no clear consensus as to its definition (contrast the definitions in Aaker and Keller, 1990; Bottomley and Doyle, 1996; Dolich, 1969; Gardner and Levy, 1955; Hussey and Duncombe, 1999; Keller, 1993; Low and Lamb, 2000; Sunde and Brodie, 1993). In choosing a definition for this research, it was deemed important to use one with a consumer perspective, as in Keller’s (1993) definition of brand image as "perceptions about a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumer memory" (p.3). Techniques have been developed with which to operationalize this definition and this is the definition of brand image adopted here. It is important to note that the associations in this definition involve specific brand beliefs (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993), as well as the more universal term of perceived quality (Keller and Aaker, 1992; Romeo, 1991). It is necessary to include both of these components of brand image, as past brand extension literature has revealed enhancement or dilution effects have sometimes occurred on one of these components, but not the other.

*Program image.* Since programs have been defined as sub-brands, the definition of program image is adapted from that for brand image – namely, program image is defined as "perceptions about a program as reflected by the program associations held in consumer memory".

*Congruity and Incongruity.* The definition of congruity used in this research is a "match between the specific brand belief components of the broadcaster brand image and program

---

this study it was judged that the perceived connection between programs and broadcaster brand is much stronger than the perceived connection between product and store, owing to the presence of the broadcaster brand in all advertising of the program. Also, the program can only be accessed through the single broadcaster, whereas it is common for products to be accessed across many different stores. Moreover, most broadcasters are themselves using branding terminology, rather than the retail analogy (Chan-Olmsted and Kim, 2001).
image”. The definition of incongruity is a "direct contrast" between these aspects of broadcaster and program image. These definitions are fundamentally based on Osgood and Tannenbaum’s (1955) Congruity Theory, which states that when a judgment must be made about two sets of information that are incongruent, pressure is experienced by the observer to change his/her judgment regarding one of the cases. This theory has been incorporated into past brand extension research in different ways. Perceived fit between a brand extension and the family brand has been defined in certain studies as the perceived level of similarity between the product categories of each (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Bousch and Loken, 1991; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001), whereas other studies defined perceived fit as perceived consistency between the image beliefs and associations of the family brand and brand extension (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Park, McCarthy and Milberg, 1993; Park, Milberg and Lawson, 1991; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998; Romeo, 1991). To a certain degree, the latter definition includes the former, and therefore the definition used in this research is more aligned with the latter. The level of congruity of a program can also be seen as the level of acceptance by a consumer that the program is logical and would be expected from the broadcaster (Tauber, 1988). Applying this idea here, a high level of congruity would have the program sharing the same specific brand beliefs as the broadcaster family brand.

Perceived program success and failure. Perceived program success/failure is defined as "the perception in the consumer’s mind that a program has succeeded or failed". This can be brought about by a number of different factors, including: being directly informed a program has high ratings (or, alternatively, has been cancelled); being exposed to a critique of the program, from (say) the opinions of referents; or that the individual consumer personally enjoys and appreciates the program very much, or not at all. Here importance is placed on the fact that a consumer perceives a program to have succeeded or failed, regardless of how that perception came about (a theme that is beyond the scope of this study). It is acknowledged that there are other ways to look at program success or failure from a broadcaster perspective, such as its removal from the schedule, promotion to prime-time, sales potential overseas and critical acclaim. However, this study is strictly concerned with a consumer perspective.
**Program sub-brand salience.** Program sub-brand salience is defined as "the level of awareness and top-of-mind recall a consumer has about a program". That is, a highly salient brand includes awareness, familiarity, memorability and prior usage. This captures previous definitions where salience is seen as the order in which brands come to mind (Miller and Berry, 1998); how many people are aware of the brand, have it in their consideration set, buy it or use it (Ehrenberg, Barnard and Scriven, 1997); and the prominence or level of activation of a brand in memory (Alba and Chattopadhyay, 1986). Common to these definitions is that brand salience is related to brand awareness. Often the issue of usage experience is raised when defining salience. For the purposes of this research, usage experience is one of the many factors that strengthens the likelihood of a brand being salient (together with program promotion, support and publicity), but, in contrast to Ehrenberg, Barnard and Scriven (1997), usage does not necessarily have to be present to achieve salience. Moreover, this study is not concerned with exactly what causes program sub-brand salience, but rather that it is an influential factor.

**Research Hypotheses**

We now turn to the development of the research hypotheses. For convenience these are summarized in Figure 2, where hypotheses are grouped according to the particular quasi-experiment in which they are investigated6. No prior research has dealt clearly with consumer evaluations of family brand image as a result of all combinations of extension congruity/incongruity and success/failure. The hypotheses, therefore, have been developed from past findings across multiple studies of extension-based enhancement and dilution effects of family brand image.

The first two hypotheses relate to the first RQ – whether perceived program success (or failure) has an enhancement (or dilution) effect on broadcaster brand image. These hypotheses are concerned only with the perceived quality component of brand image (Keller and Aaker, 1992).

Past literature does not definitively deal with the effects of extension success on family brand image. Sullivan (1990) found positive spillover effects on family brand image as a result of positive information about an umbrella-branded extension. Keller and Aaker (1992) found

---

6 To save space the support, or otherwise, for each hypothesis is shown in Figure 2. This information is best read in conjunction with Section 4.
that a successful *intervening* extension increased evaluations of an *average quality* core brand. For our purposes, broadcaster brands are assumed to possess average levels of perceived quality (this is empirically verified in Pretest 3, Appendix A). As a result of the findings of Keller and Aaker (1992), and the predicted use of the bookkeeping model, $H_1$ is developed.

$H_1$: A program that is perceived to be successful will have an enhancement effect on the broadcaster brand image.

Previous literature reveals mixed results with regard to the impact of unsuccessful extensions on family brand image. Keller and Aaker (1992) found that an unsuccessful intervening extension *did not* decrease overall evaluations of the family brand, regardless of the level of perceived quality of the family brand. Similarly, Romeo (1991) found no conclusive evidence that negative information regarding the performance of an extension had a dilution effect on family brand image. However, as highlighted by Loken and Roedder-John (1993), the potential feedback effects in these studies were measured *after* consumers were asked to evaluate the overall levels of quality and typicality of the extension relative to the family brand (thereby prompting use of the sub-typing model). By contrast, in earlier studies the bookkeeping model assumed here has been found to produce dilution effects on family brand image as a result of unsuccessful extensions (Chen and Chen, 2000). In addition, Sullivan (1990), through the use of economic models, discovered negative spillover effects on demand for the family brand, as a result of failed extensions. Consistent with the bookkeeping model, $H_2$ is formed.

$H_2$: A program that is perceived to be a failure will have a dilution effect on the broadcaster brand image.

With regard to program sub-brand salience, this should moderate the effect of perceived program success or failure on the broadcaster brand image (Miller and Berry, 1998; Sheinin, 1998). Therefore, it is proposed that the higher the program sub-brand salience, the greater any feedback effects on the broadcaster brand image. For example, the success or failure of a program with high awareness - a popular reality television show such as *Survivor* - should have a stronger impact on the brand image of its broadcaster, compared to that of a little-known morning cookery show. It should be noted that program sub-brand salience refers to
the extension salience, not any strengthening of effects brought about by the use of a sub-branding strategy (i.e., the idea of sub-branding is not itself under investigation). \(H_3\) and \(H_4\) are proposed extensions of \(H_1\) and \(H_2\).

\(H_3\): The perceived success of a program that is highly salient will have a greater enhancement effect on the broadcaster brand image than that of a program with low salience.

\(H_4\): The perceived failure of a program that is highly salient will have a greater dilution effect on the broadcaster brand image than that of a program with low salience.

The effects of incongruent brand extensions on family brand image have been quite heavily studied. Loken and Roedder-John (1993) found consumers who rated the family brand before assessing the extension typicality used the bookkeeping model in their revision of the family brand image. Incongruent extensions caused dilution of family brand image in levels of perceived quality, as well as specific brand beliefs. These findings were confirmed in a later study by the same authors, for both moderately and highly incongruent extensions (Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998). Milberg, Park and McCarthy (1997) found that family brand image attitudes and specific beliefs were diluted when extension attributes were inconsistent with those family brand image beliefs, thereby also supporting a previous study by the same authors (Park, McCarthy and Milberg, 1993). These results are consistent with a bookkeeping model, enabling \(H_{5a}\) and \(H_{5b}\) to be developed.\(^7\)

\(H_{5a}\): A program with an incongruent image will have a dilution effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image.

\(H_{5b}\): A program with an incongruent image will have a dilution effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image.

Although the aforementioned results relate specifically to dilution effects brought about by incongruent extensions, the results suggest the bookkeeping model also could be adapted as a

\(^7\) The remaining hypotheses are split into subscripts (a) and (b); where (a) represents the perceived quality component, and (b) represents the specific brand belief component, of family brand image.
basis for hypothesising a potential enhancement effect of the perceived quality and specific brand belief aspects of family brand image, as a result of highly congruent extensions. Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran (1998) found that, in conditions of high motivation, consumers are more likely to use the bookkeeping model in evaluating family brand image as a result of extension congruity, resulting in enhancement effects. While most of the literature focuses on potential negative feedback effects, past research has also found evidence that brand extensions consistent with family brand beliefs may serve to fortify and strengthen these beliefs (Park, Jaworski and MacInnis, 1986). An adaptation of the bookkeeping model, as evidenced by the above studies, forms the foundation for $H_{6a}$ and $H_{6b}$.

$H_{6a}$: A program with a congruent image will have an enhancement effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image.

$H_{6b}$: A program with a congruent image will have an enhancement effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image.

The remaining hypotheses are concerned with possible interaction effects between program congruity/incongruity and program success/failure in consumer evaluations of broadcaster family brand image. Some researchers have claimed that extension congruity/incongruity moderates the effect of extension success/failure on family brand image (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001). However, an argument can be made for the converse – i.e., that success/failure actually moderates effects of congruity/incongruity on family brand image. This is supported by the amount of literature revealing feedback effects from extension congruity/incongruity (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Park, Jaworski and MacInnis, 1986; Park, McCarthy and Milberg, 1993; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998), as opposed to the relatively few studies reporting feedback effects as a result of brand extension success/failure (Chen and Chen, 2000; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Romeo, 1991; Sullivan, 1990). This may provide an explanation for the lack of scanner data found by Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy (2001) for a highly congruent extension that failed. Hence, the ensuing hypotheses have been constructed based on extension success/failure moderating the effect of extension congruity/incongruity on family brand image (see Figure 2 again).
The following hypotheses ($H_{7a}$, $H_{8a}$, $H_{9a}$ and $H_{10a}$) are all concerned with the perceived quality component of family brand image and, as a consequence, are developed together. The interaction effect between program congruity/incongruity and success/failure is measured by having subjects first rate the broadcaster brand image after being exposed only to the congruity/incongruity of the program sub-brand. Therefore, for this first step, the bookkeeping model is predicted to be used, resulting in enhancement and dilution effects, as hypothesized in $H_5$ and $H_6$. Subjects are then exposed to the success/failure statement and asked to rate the broadcaster brand image, after having been exposed to both the congruity/incongruity statement and the success/failure statement. These two steps are similar to those contained in Loken and Roedder-John (1993). The first step is akin to making typicality salient in the minds of consumers, before asking them to make their evaluations of family brand image when taking both congruity/incongruity and success/failure of the program into account. It follows that program success/failure will have no significant additional impact on the perceived quality component of broadcaster brand image (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993), leaving the main effect of congruity/incongruity impacting on their overall evaluations. Hypotheses $H_{7a}$, $H_{8a}$, $H_{9a}$ and $H_{10a}$ can therefore be developed.

$H_{7a}$: A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to succeed will have a dilution effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image.

$H_{8a}$: A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to fail will have a dilution effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image.

$H_{9a}$: A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to succeed will have an enhancement effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image.

$H_{10a}$: A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to fail will have an enhancement effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image.

The representation of congruity/incongruity used by Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy (2001) was product category similarity, measured using scanner data. As a result, their findings are more relevant to the construction of hypotheses relating to specific family brand beliefs/attributes, rather than levels of perceived quality. They found brand extensions with low category similarity to the family brand, that were successful, had no reciprocal effect on
purchases of the family brand, amongst prior users of the family brand. For those incongruent extensions that failed, a negative effect on purchases of the family brand was detected, again amongst prior users of the family brand. To incorporate these findings, consumers of broadcaster media are assumed to be prior users of the broadcaster brand (as verified through the use of a screening question in the main study).

With regard to specific family brand beliefs, in remaining consistent with the findings of Loken and Roedder-John (1993), when typicality was salient, consumers used the sub-typing model, resulting in no dilution of the specific brand beliefs of family brand image as a result of highly incongruent extensions. Applied in this study, since the levels of incongruity are high, it is hypothesized that a significant interaction effect will occur, however, the resulting overall direction will be a no effect rating on broadcaster brand image. Since this study is concerned with attitudinal, not behavioral, data (in contrast to Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001), this result of no effect is hypothesized to apply to incongruent extensions that are perceived to succeed and fail. This is the basis for \( H_{7b} \) and \( H_{8b} \).

\( H_{7b} \): A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to succeed will have no effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image.

\( H_{8b} \): A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to fail will have no effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image.

The investigation of the interaction between program congruity and program success/failure is predominantly exploratory in nature, owing to a scarcity of previous research in the area. Of the limited research available, Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy (2001) found that behavioral data revealed extensions representing high category similarity, that were successful, produced positive reciprocal purchasing effects on the family brand. Applied in the context of consumer evaluations, \( H_{9b} \) is formed.

\( H_{9b} \): A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to succeed will have an enhancement effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image.

Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran (1998) found that negative information about an extension produced a dilution effect of family brand attributes, in particular when the extension was very similar to the family brand. Romeo (1991) also discovered that dilution effects of family
brand image occurred when extensions, in the same product category as the family brand, were the target of negative information. Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy (2001) hypothesized a negative impact of congruent failed extensions on family brand purchases; however, they were unable to find appropriate behavioral data to confirm or falsify this claim. Therefore, the results of Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran (1998) and Romeo (1991) provide the tentative foundation upon which $H_{10b}$ is based.

$H_{10b}$: A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to fail will have a dilution effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image.

Section 3: Methodology

Past research into consumer evaluations of line and brand extensions has mostly relied upon experimental or quasi-experimental studies (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Bousch and Loken, 1991; Broniarczyk and Alba, 1994; Chen and Chen, 2000; Dacin and Smith, 1994; Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Park, Milberg and Lawson, 1991; Romeo, 1991). The current study is no different in this respect. However, given the extent of the penetration of many broadcaster brands, and partially to address questions of external validity, regular consumers (viewers and listeners) were used as subjects for all pretests and final experiments. This contrasts with the majority of previous studies (exceptions being Loken and Roedder-John, 1993 and Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997).

Operationalization of Constructs

The constructs defined in Section 2 were operationalized in the following way.

*Brand image.* As noted earlier, brand image has been measured in many different ways. Of the researchers involved in measuring feedback effects on family brand image, some had subjects rate their overall attitude towards the family brand on 7-point Likert scales (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Romeo, 1991), while others used separate semantic differential scales for each brand attribute (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998). The methods used to measure brand image in this study are largely based on those above, which, in turn are consistent with Keller (1993). Specifically, measures include: free association, projective techniques, and depth interviews (for association type); evaluations of associations rating
scales (Likert scales) (for association favorability); and beliefs of associations rating scales (Likert scales) (for association strength). Details of the specific techniques used are given when discussing the pretests and quasi-experiments.

**Program image.** As, by definition, program image is derived from brand image, the techniques used to manipulate program image were based on those used to operationalize brand image.

**Congruity and Incongruity.** Congruity, too, has been operationalized in a number of different ways, and in various contexts. However, most brand extension researchers have used 7-point scales representing perceived typicality or similarity (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998; Romeo, 1991), which is the technique used in this study. In the specific case of examining potential dilution effects caused by brand extensions, manipulation of congruity was achieved by altering the levels of consistency between important cues (identified in a pretest) of the family brand image and the brand extension (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998). Specific techniques used to achieve the successful manipulation of congruity have included the use of Consumer Report tables (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998) and the use of scenarios (Chen and Chen, 2000; Keller and Aaker, 1992). Similarly, manipulating the variable of congruity/incongruity in this research involved constructing scenarios that created congruity (through describing all program image associations as being the same as family brand image associations); and incongruity (through describing all program image associations as being completely opposite to family brand image associations).

**Perceived program success and failure.** A way for perceived program success or failure to arise is through coming into contact with a direct statement of success or failure of a program. This technique has been used in past research (Chen and Chen, 2000; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Romeo, 1991) and it is the method by which perceived program success and failure were operationalized in this study.

**Program sub-brand salience.** Brand salience has been generated in the past by asking consumers to name the first brand that comes to mind in a certain category (Miller and Berry,
In this study, program sub-brand salience is measured in a similar way, using actual programs with varying levels of top-of-mind awareness.

**Pretests**

Four pretests were conducted to determine: (1) which real programs to use in the measurement of the effects of program sub-brand salience; (2) the choice of the neutral sub-brand name for use in the experiments; (3) which radio and television broadcaster brands to be use in the second quasi-experiment, and the types of associations these brands possess; and (4) the manipulation of congruity and incongruity. These pretests are fully described in Appendix A, together with an explanation of the venue for all of the tests and experiments.

**Quasi-Experiment 1**

Quasi-Experiment 1 tested $H_1$, $H_2$, $H_3$ and $H_4$ using a $2$(success/failure) $\times$ $2$(television/radio) design. Based on Prestest 1, the most salient radio program sub-brand (*The Morning Crew*) and most salient television program sub-brand (*Home and Away*) were used.

For each program sub-brand, quota samples of 50 consumers were recruited from a shopping centre in the same manner as respondents were recruited in the pretests. These also fitted the age group of the salient program's broadcaster target demographics. Subjects were asked two screening questions (i.e., whether they were aware of the salient program sub-brand and its broadcaster, and whether they had participated in this study before). If they passed both screening questions, they were given an instrument containing a set of questions for self-completion and informed they were part of a study about radio listening or television viewing habits.

**Instrument - Quasi-Experiment 1.** The broadcaster brand used was that on which the salient program was broadcast. This applied to both of the scenarios, to which subjects were exposed. The scenarios were shown to them on cards, and they completed the rating scales regarding each scenario in the instrument, in front of the researcher. This supervision by the researcher ensured there was no missing data.

**Scenario 1.1 ($H_1$ and $H_2$).** In order to test the first two hypotheses, each of the subjects were firstly randomly allocated either a scenario about the success, or one about the failure, of the
neutral program name identified in Pretest 2, and the broadcaster brand on which it was broadcast. They were then asked to evaluate whether their perception of quality of the broadcast brand in question had increased, decreased, or was not affected, as a result of this statement of success or failure. This evaluation took the form of a 7-point Likert scale (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Sunde and Brodie, 1993), bounded by 'Increased dramatically' (rating of "7") and 'Decreased dramatically' (rating of "1"), including 'No effect' (rating of "4").

Scenario 1.2 ($H_3$ and $H_4$). The subjects were then exposed to another scenario involving the success or failure of the salient program sub-brand with which they were familiar (as ensured via the screening question). Held constant from Scenario 1.1 were the broadcaster brand and whether the program was successful or unsuccessful. The subjects were then asked to again rate the perceived quality of the broadcaster brand, using the same scale as that used for Scenario 1.1.

There were four possible combinations (success/failure × television/radio), to each of which 25 subjects were exposed. Table 1 summarizes the structure of Quasi-Experiment 1. Note that in this experiment only changes in perceived quality were measured. It was unlikely that any specific broadcast brand beliefs would be affected by the success or failure of the fictitious program sub-brand, since there was no description offered of the actual content of this fictitious program.

Quasi-Experiment 2
Quasi-Experiment 2 tested $H_5$, $H_6$, $H_7$, $H_8$, $H_9$ and $H_{10}$ with a 2(congruity/incongruity) × 2 (success/failure) × 6 (broadcaster brand) design. The six brands were those generated in Pretest 3 – three television broadcaster brands (i.e., ABC, SBS and Channel 10) and three radio broadcaster brands (i.e., Radio National, Triple J and 2DayFM).

For each broadcaster brand, quota samples of 60 consumers were recruited from the shopping centre in the same manner as respondents were recruited in the pretests and Quasi-

---

8 For example, "The Program has not performed well in the ratings, with many listeners switching off. 2Day FM has announced this week that The Program is fast becoming a huge failure, and it is very close to being cancelled".
Experiment 1. Again, only those who matched the age group of the broadcaster’s target demographics were invited to participate and subjects had to pass two screening questions (i.e., whether they were aware of the particular broadcaster brand, and whether they had participated in this study before). If subjects passed both screening questions, they were given an instrument containing a set of questions for self-completion, and informed they were part of a study about television viewing or radio listening habits.

Instrument - Quasi-Experiment 2. Each subject was exposed to two scenarios. These scenarios were those that had previously undergone informal and formal manipulation checks in Pretest 4. The scenarios were shown to subjects on cards, and they completed the questions relating to each scenario in front of the researcher. This again ensured there was no missing data.

Scenario 2.1 ($H_{5a}$ and $H_{5b}$; $H_{6a}$ and $H_{6b}$). This scenario tested whether a congruent/incongruent program has any effect on broadcaster brand image, regardless of perceived success or failure. Firstly, each of the subjects was randomly allocated one scenario about the fictitious program name (generated in Pretest 2) broadcast on the broadcaster brand being examined, and with which they were familiar as ensured via the screening question. The scenarios had been manipulated to alter whether the program described was congruent or incongruent with the broadcaster brand image. Subjects were then asked to rate whether their level of perceived quality and specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster family brand had increased, decreased, or were not affected. This was achieved using 7-point Likert scales representing perceived quality (identical to those used in Quasi-Experiment 1), as well as similar scales for each of the brand image associations ascertained in Pretest 3.

Scenario 2.2 ($H_{7a}$ and $H_{7b}$; $H_{8a}$ and $H_{8b}$; $H_{9a}$ and $H_{9b}$; $H_{10a}$ and $H_{10b}$). This tested the combinations of program congruity/incongruity and perceived program success/failure. After completing Scenario 2.1, subjects were directed to turn the page, where they were presented with a randomly allocated success or failure statement regarding the same neutral program contained in Scenario 2.1. Subjects were asked to consider both the congruity/incongruity

---

9 For example, “The Morning Crew has been a huge success for 2Day FM. It has boosted the radio station’s performance, consistently rating in the top ten radio programs of the week. It is a real winner, and looks like it will be around for many years to come”.
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statement and the success/failure statement in again rating whether their evaluations of the broadcaster family brand had increased or decreased, and to what extent (including having no effect). This was done using the same 7-point Likert scales, representing perceived quality and specific brand beliefs, as those used for rating Scenario 2.1.

**Manipulation check.** In a previous study, Loken and Roedder-John (1993) asked subjects to rate the typicality of the proposed extension with the family brand *before* having them evaluate effect on family brand image. This, however, increased the salience of typicality and biased the evaluations towards use of the sub-typing model (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993). In the current study, subjects were asked to rate how typical the described show was of the broadcaster at the *end* of the evaluation, as a manipulation check, to ascertain whether the variable of congruity/incongruity had been manipulated successfully. As in past research (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998) this was achieved using a 7-point semantic differential scale, bounded by 'Not typical at all' (rating of "1") and 'Very typical' (rating of "7").

For each broadcaster brand there existed four possible combinations, to each of which 15 subjects were exposed. Table 2 summarizes the structure of Quasi-Experiment 2.

In Quasi-Experiments 1 and 2 all subjects were asked usage questions regarding their broadcast media consumption habits, and also demographic information was recorded. Having subjects rate an increase, decrease, or no change in brand image associations, eliminated the need for a separate control group (Cook and Campbell, 1979).

**Section 4: Analysis**

**Quasi-Experiment 1**

Student t-tests were conducted to assess the degree to which the sample of television subjects matched the sample of radio subjects in terms of media usage and demographic characteristics. Owing to the fact that both the broadcaster brands were examined amongst their respective target demographic age groups, and the target audiences for *Home and Away* and *The Morning Crew* are extremely similar in age (16-39 years), there existed a significant degree of overlap between these samples.

---

10 For example, “*The Program* is a new show on Triple J. It is a cutting edge, alternative music program that appeals to the youth of Australia”.
To test H₁ and H₂, results were analysed using ANOVA with Program Success/Failure as a between-subjects factor. Age, and whether the respondent consumed the particular brand in question, were both run as covariates. The rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to the success or failure of the neutral program, was the dependent variable. Results were analyzed across all 100 subjects and across both television (Channel 7) and radio (2Day FM). Contrary to general expectations, media type (i.e. television versus radio) was found to be not significant. Levene's test of the underlying assumption of homogeneity of variances revealed the assumption held true (Sig.=0.291). Results of the ANOVA revealed the mean rating for a successful program was 4.74, and that of a failed program was 3.88. This difference, between successful and unsuccessful programs, was statistically significant at the p < 0.01 level. The covariates were found to have no significant effect on ratings.

To the extent that all the hypotheses are directional (i.e. involving enhancement or dilution), it was also necessary to test for statistical significance of the distance that the sample means were from a 'No effect' rating of "4.00". In all analyses, for both quasi-experiments, this was accomplished using a one-sample t-test with a test value of "4", for each relevant combination of independent variables.

Results for H₁ and H₂ revealed that successful programs (mean=4.74) experienced a significant enhancement effect (Sig.=0.000), thereby supporting H₁. However, the dilution effect as a result of failed programs (mean=3.88) was not significantly lower than a 'No effect' rating (Sig.=0.402), indicating that support for H₂ is purely directional. (Tables B1a and B1b, in Appendix B, summarize these results).

To test H₃ and H₄, results were analysed using a MANOVA with Program Success/Failure as a between-subjects factor. Whether the respondent consumed the particular salient program in question was run as a covariate. The dependent variables of the MANOVA were: the rating of change in perceptions of quality of the broadcaster brand from exposure to the success or failure of the neutral program; and the subsequent rating of the change in perceived quality of

---

11 The general expectation is that any effects of programs on broadcaster brand image will be greater for television, than for radio. It is argued that the visual nature of television could strengthen these effects (Miller, 1995), also that the brand image of television is less dependent on non-programming factors than radio (e.g., personalities, type of music, etc., Chapman, 2001). However, we do not find significant differences by media type.
the broadcaster brand, resulting from exposure to the success or failure of the salient program. Results were analysed across all 100 subjects and across both television (Home and Away - Channel 7) and radio (The Morning Crew - 2Day FM). Medium type was again found to be not significant. Levene's test of the underlying assumption of homogeneity of variances revealed the assumption held true (Sig. = 0.319 and 0.384). Results of the MANOVA revealed the mean rating brought about by exposure to a successful salient program was 5.02 and that of a failed salient program was 3.02. This difference was statistically significant from the ratings as a result of exposure to the neutral program, at the p < 0.01 level. The covariate was found to have only a marginally significant effect on ratings of the perceived quality of the broadcaster brand after exposure to success or failure of the salient program (Sig.=0.054).

From analysis of the direction, the means represented a significantly greater enhancement effect (Sig.=0.045) from the successful salient program (mean=5.02), compared with the successful neutral program (mean=4.74), thereby supporting H₃. A significantly greater dilution effect (Sig.=0.000) from the failed salient program (mean=3.02), compared with the failed neutral program (mean=3.88), was also demonstrated - supporting H₄. (Tables B2a and B2b).

**Quasi-Experiment 2**

Student t-tests were conducted to assess the extent to which the samples for each broadcaster brand were matched in terms of media usage and demographic characteristics. Since different broadcaster brands were examined amongst their respective target demographic age groups, age differed between broadcaster brands. There was, however, a significant degree of overlap between the target age groups of Channel 10, Triple J and 2Day FM (16-39 years); as well as between Radio National and the ABC (40-55+ years)¹².

To test H₅a and H₆a, results were analysed using ANOVA with Congruent/Incongruent Program Image as a between-subjects factor. Whether the respondent consumed the particular brand in question, was run as a covariate. In this analysis, the rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to the congruent/incongruent scenario of the neutral

¹² Not reported here are the separate analyses of each brand. However, this exercise was undertaken to assess the replicability of results. It is recognized that there is value in studying a number of test cases (e.g., brands,
program was used as the dependent variable. Results were analysed across all 360 subjects and across medium type (i.e. television and radio). Medium type was found to be not significant. Levene's test of the underlying assumption of homogeneity of variances revealed the assumption was supported (Sig.=0.258). Results of the ANOVA revealed the mean quality rating of the broadcaster brand for a congruent program was 4.49 and that of an incongruent program was 3.79. This difference was statistically significant at the p < 0.01 level. The covariate was found to have no significant effect on ratings (Sig.=0.307).

The directions of both the dilution (Sig.=0.047) and enhancement (Sig.=0.000) effects were also significantly different to a 'No effect' rating of "4". These results support H₅ₐ and H₆ₐ. (Tables B3a and B3b).

To test H₅₉ and H₆₉, the results were analysed using an ANOVA, again with Congruent/Incongruent Program Image as a between-subjects factor. Similarly, whether the respondent consumed the particular brand in question, was run as a covariate. The rating of change in specific beliefs of the broadcaster, from exposure to the congruent/incongruent scenario of the neutral program, was used as the dependent variable. The dependent variable was computed by taking the average of all three specific brand belief ratings across each respondent. This was considered appropriate, as the study was not concerned with individual specific brand beliefs for each broadcaster brand per se. Statistically, these variables could also be averaged, since a reliability test revealed a Cronbach alpha of 0.713, that is, greater than 0.700 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 1998). Results were analysed across all 360 subjects and across medium type (i.e. television or radio). As in the previous analyses, medium type was found to be not significant. Levene's test of the underlying assumption of homogeneity of variances revealed the assumption was supported (Sig.=0.233). Results of the ANOVA revealed the mean overall specific beliefs rating of the broadcaster brand for a congruent program was 4.82, and that of an incongruent program was 3.57. This difference was statistically significant at the p < 0.01 level, and the directional support for both means was also highly significant. This indicates a respective enhancement and dilution effect of the broadcaster brand image, and subsequently supports H₅₉ and H₆₉. The covariate was found to have no significant effect on ratings (Sig.=0.865). (Tables B4a and B4b).

product categories, countries) and measuring and analyzing them separately, thereby achieving a degree of internal differentiated replication (Malhotra, 1999).
To test $H_{7a}$, $H_{8a}$, $H_{9a}$ and $H_{10a}$, results were analysed using ANOVA with Congruent/Incongruent Program Image and Program Success/Failure as between-subjects factors. Whether the respondent consumed the particular brand in question, was run again as a covariate. The rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to the congruent/incongruent scenario of the neutral program, and a success or failure statement, was used as the dependent variable. Results were analyzed across all 360 subjects and across medium type (i.e. television or radio). Yet again, medium type was found to be not significant. Levene's test of the underlying assumption of homogeneity of variances revealed the assumption was not supported (Sig.=0.010), indicating that caution should be exercised if interpreting marginally significant results. However, as hypothesised, the congruity/incongruity and success/failure interaction effect was found to be not significant (Sig.=0.225). In addition, the main effects were found to be highly significant (Sig.=0.000). The lack of homogeneity of variances is therefore of no concern. Results of the ANOVA revealed, in accordance with expectations, that no significant interaction effect existed between congruity/incongruity and success/failure. Also, as predicted, there was a strongly significant main effect of congruity/incongruity. However, contrary to expectations a significant main effect of success/failure was discovered. The covariate had no significant effect on ratings (Sig.=0.324).

Each hypothesis was analysed separately to ascertain the significance of the direction of any change in the perceived quality component of broadcaster brand image, from a 'No effect' rating of "4". For a successful incongruent program, although indicating an enhancement effect (mean=4.17), this was found to be not significantly different to an overall 'No effect' impact on family brand image (Sig.=0.311). Nevertheless, $H_{7a}$ hypothesized a dilution effect, which is rejected. A failed incongruent program caused an overall dilution effect of family brand image (mean=3.79). However, this dilution effect was not found to be significantly different to 'No effect' (Sig.=0.100). Hence, the support for $H_{8a}$ is directional only.

A congruent program, in combination with both success and failure, produced an overall enhancement effect on family brand image, subsequently supporting $H_{9a}$ and $H_{10a}$. The level of enhancement for successful congruent programs (mean = 4.99) was greater than that for failed congruent programs (mean = 4.26). Both were significantly greater than a 'No effect' rating of "4" (Sig.=0.000 and Sig.=0.050 respectively). (Tables B5a and B5b).
To test $H_{7b}$, $H_{8b}$, $H_{9b}$ and $H_{10b}$, the results were analysed using an ANOVA, again with Congruent/Incongruent Program Image and Program Success/Failure as between-subjects factors. Similarly, whether the respondent consumed the particular broadcaster brand, was run as a covariate. The rating of change in specific beliefs of the broadcaster, from exposure to the congruent/incongruent scenario of the neutral program, and a success or failure statement, was used as the dependent variable. For the same reasons as contained in the previous analysis regarding evaluation of specific brand beliefs, the dependent variable was computed by taking the average of all three specific brand belief ratings across each respondent. This was statistically permissible since the Cronbach alpha between the three ratings was 0.747. Results were analysed across all 360 subjects and across medium type (i.e. television or radio). Medium type was again found to be not significant (Sig.=0.846). Levene's test of the underlying assumption of homogeneity of variances revealed the assumption was not supported (Sig.=0.004), indicating that caution should be exercised if interpreting marginally significant results. However, since the significance of the congruity/incongruity and success/failure interaction effect, and the main effect of congruity/incongruity, were highly significant at the $p < 0.01$ level (Sig.=0.000), the results are interpretable, despite the assumption not being supported.

In line with expectations, results of the ANOVA revealed that a significant interaction effect existed between congruity/incongruity and success/failure at the $p < 0.01$ level (Sig.=0.000); however, there also existed a significant main effect of congruity/incongruity at the $p < 0.01$ level (Sig.=0.000). The covariate was found to have no significant effect on ratings (Sig.=0.233).

As in previous analyses, each hypothesis was analysed to determine the statistical significance of resultant directions for the overall ratings of specific broadcaster brand beliefs. Results revealed that the significant main effect of congruity/incongruity in most cases determined whether enhancement or dilution to the broadcaster brand image occurred. Incongruent programs that were successful (mean=3.60) resulted in a significant dilution effect of broadcaster brand image (Sig.=0.006), thereby rejecting $H_{7b}$. However, incongruent programs that were perceived to fail (mean=3.93) were not significantly different to the hypothesis of 'No effect' (Sig.=0.480), subsequently supporting $H_{8b}$.  
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Congruent programs that were successful (mean=5.03) resulted in a significant enhancement of broadcaster brand image (Sig.=0.000), thereby supporting $H_{10b}$. Congruent programs that were perceived to fail (mean=4.38) also had an overall significant enhancement effect on broadcaster brand image (Sig.=0.001). However, this rejected $H_{10b}$ that hypothesized an overall dilution effect. As a result of the significant interaction effect, the level of enhancement of failed congruent programs was lower than that for successful congruent programs, indicating a relative dilution effect of broadcaster brand image. (Tables B6a and B6b).

**Manipulation check.** Manipulation checks for Quasi-Experiment 2 were analysed using ANOVA F tests (Dacin and Smith, 1994; Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998). They revealed that no significant differences existed between the typicality ratings in Pretest 4, and the typicality ratings given by subjects in Quasi-Experiment 2 for all six broadcaster brands. A significant correlation also existed between the ratings of typicality of the scenarios in this experiment and the variable of congruity/incongruity (Pearson correlation coefficient=0.906), thereby highlighting the successful manipulation of the congruity/incongruity variable.

For all hypotheses, the support or otherwise, is summarized in Figure 2.

**Section 5: Discussion and Conclusions**

**Research Questions**

With respect to each research question, the following conclusions are drawn.

**RQ1: How does the perceived success or perceived failure of programs affect consumer evaluations of the broadcaster brand image?** Results show that, having been exposed to evidence of a successful program on a particular broadcaster, consumers are likely to improve their perceptions of quality of the station. That is, an enhancement effect of the broadcaster brand image is likely to result. Conversely, information regarding a failed program is likely to cause consumers to downgrade their perceptions of quality of the broadcaster, resulting in a dilution effect on broadcaster brand image.

**RQ2: How does the congruity or incongruity between the program image and the broadcaster**
brand image affect consumer evaluations of the broadcaster brand image? In addition, how do congruity and incongruity interact with perceived program success and failure in consumer evaluations of the broadcaster brand image? When broadcasters schedule a program that is highly incongruent with what consumers would normally expect from the radio or television station, an overall negative effect on broadcaster brand image is probable. A positive, fortifying effect of broadcaster brand image, on the other hand, may be brought about by the scheduling of a program that is consistent with the brand image of the broadcaster. It is conceivable that these negative and positive effects would impact on both the perceived quality and specific association elements of broadcaster brand image, especially for broadcaster brands that are particularly distinctive.

With regard to the interaction between perceived program success and failure, and program congruity and incongruity, results were mixed. An incongruent program that was perceived to succeed seemed a confusing proposition, as no effect was produced on perceptions of broadcaster brand quality, and a weakening was found of previously-held specific broadcaster brand beliefs. A possible reason for this is the premise that many incongruent programs are not actually successful in the marketplace, owing to the very fact that they are incongruent. The negative effect on specific broadcaster attributes brought about by the introduction of an incongruent program, is likely to be counteracted and restored if the program fails. However, a detrimental effect may remain on levels of perceived quality of the broadcaster. The commissioning of congruent programs seems to invoke generally positive evaluations of broadcaster brand image, regardless of success or failure. Although, successful congruent programs tend to cause consumers to make relatively more positive evaluations of the broadcaster, compared with unsuccessful ones. Results of this study suggest these overall enhancement effects are more applicable to specific brand beliefs than perceptions of quality of the broadcaster brand image.

*RQ3: How does program sub-brand salience moderate the effect of perceived program success or failure on consumer evaluations of the broadcaster brand image?* Programs that are the subject of heavy promotion and publicity may be more salient in consumers' minds. Subsequently, the perceived success or failure of such a program is likely to have a stronger respective enhancement or dilution effect on the perceived quality component of broadcaster brand image.
**Research Hypotheses**

For each hypothesis the following findings and implications are drawn from the study.

**H$_1$:** A program that is perceived to be successful will have an enhancement effect on the broadcaster brand image *(Supported).* Support for H$_1$ confirms the findings of Keller and Aaker (1992), namely that a successful extension has an enhancement effect on the perceived quality component of family brand image, for an average quality family brand. As the ratings for all six broadcaster brands tested revealed they were all of average quality (Pretest 3, Appendix A), this result verifies the effects produced by successful *intervening* extensions in the study by Keller and Aaker (1992). Confirmation of H$_1$ also provides attitudinal data to complement the empirical findings of Sullivan (1990). Moreover, the above result suggests that successful extensions prompt consumer use of the bookkeeping model, or an equivalent schematic model that produces incremental changes of a family brand schema in consumers' minds (Sujan and Bettman, 1989).

**H$_2$:** A program that is perceived to be a failure will have a dilution effect on the broadcaster brand image *(Directional Only).* The weak support for this hypothesis adds to the limited past research regarding the negative dilution effects of family brand image caused by an unsuccessful extension (Chen and Chen, 2000). However, since the support is directional only, the findings of Keller and Aaker (1992) and Romeo (1991) are not directly contradicted by this result. A factor here may be differences that exist in the order that measurement and manipulations of certain key variables are carried out. Debate is likely to continue over which measurement process is more appropriate and best represents the actual sequence of evaluations consumers make outside the quasi-experimental setting. However, as for H$_1$, the weak support with attitudinal data for H$_2$ complements the non-experimental study by Sullivan (1990), and it is concluded that an unsuccessful program is likely to have a negative impact on the perceived quality component of broadcaster brand image.

**H$_3$:** The perceived success of a program that is highly salient will have a greater enhancement effect on the broadcaster brand image than that of a program with low salience *(Supported), and H$_4$:** The perceived failure of a program that is highly salient will have a greater dilution effect on the broadcaster brand image than that of a program with low salience *(Supported).* Support for the above hypotheses allows conclusions to be drawn with regard to the moderating impact of extension salience on enhancement and dilution effects of...
family brand image – something that has not been comprehensively studied before. Specifically, brand extension salience (i.e., the level of awareness and top-of-mind recall a consumer has about the brand extension) was found to bolster any feedback effects on family brand image. In addition, this suggests that extensions higher in salience also possess corresponding higher levels of risk and return.

\( H_{5a} \): A program with an incongruent image will have a dilution effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image (Supported), and \( H_{5b} \): A program with an incongruent image will have a dilution effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image (Supported). Confirmation of these hypotheses provides additional verification for the findings of Loken and Roedder-John (1993). When consumers, presented with an incongruent extension, evaluate the family brand before assessing the typicality of the incongruent extension, they tend to use the bookkeeping model in making their evaluations of both perceived quality and specific brand beliefs. Support for \( H_{5a} \) and \( H_{5b} \) allows the current study to be added to the growing volume of extant literature that has found overall support for the notion of incongruent extensions having dilution effects on family brand image (Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Park, McCarthy and Milberg, 1993; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998).\(^{13}\)

\( H_{6a} \): A program with a congruent image will have an enhancement effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image (Supported), and \( H_{6b} \): A program with a congruent image will have an enhancement effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image (Supported). As past research is limited in its examination of the effect of congruent extensions, the fact that these hypotheses are supported contributes to an emerging knowledge base. They offer some support for the findings of Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran (1998), in that the bookkeeping model appears to have been used. Also, support of \( H_{6b} \) confirms the findings of Park, Jaworski and MacInnis (1986), in that, specific family brand attributes may be fortified by introducing extensions that possess highly similar specific attributes.

\(^{13}\) The two broadcaster brands that support \( H_{5a} \) most strongly are found to be the most distinctive in each medium (Radio National and SBS), and it is tentatively suggested that a program with an incongruent image has a dilution effect on the perceived quality component of broadcaster brand image, mainly for broadcaster brands that already possess a highly distinctive brand image.
Hypotheses concerning the impact on the perceived quality component of broadcaster brand image, received varied levels of support (H7a H8a H9a H10a). Results revealed that, while no significant interaction effect was found between program success/failure and program congruity/incongruity, main effects of program congruity/incongruity and program success/failure existed. The main effect of congruity/incongruity was predicted; however, that of program success/failure was unexpected. In hindsight, since program success/failure was found to have a direct incremental effect on consumers’ evaluations of the perceived quality component of broadcaster brand image in H1 and H2, the resultant main effect of success/failure appears to be logical. This issue is included in the following discussion regarding each of the above hypotheses.

**H7a:** A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to succeed will have a dilution effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image (Rejected). The overall rejection of H7a was not anticipated and somewhat conflicts with theories explaining the findings of the other hypotheses (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993). One potential reason for this is the confusing proposition of having an incongruent program that is successful. Despite being rejected when measured across all 360 subjects, H7a was supported by two of the six broadcaster brands when these were analyzed separately. Nevertheless, since the overall lack of support for H7a seems to contradict past research, as well as oppose other research hypotheses developed from an identical literature base, reliable conclusions cannot be formed.

**H8a:** A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to fail will have a dilution effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image (Directional Only). The main effects of failure and incongruity caused an overall dilution effect on the perceived quality aspect of family brand image, thereby supporting H8a. However, this dilution effect is purely directional, indicating only weak support. As developed from the findings of Loken and Roedder-John (1993), the bookkeeping model seems to have been used to some extent by consumers in making their overall evaluation of broadcaster brand image.14

---

14 Again, three of the most distinctive broadcaster brands separately supported H8a (Radio National, Triple J and the ABC), suggesting that incongruent failed programs produce a dilution effect on perceptions of quality of broadcaster brand image for highly distinctive broadcaster brands.
$H_{9a}$: A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to succeed will have an enhancement effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image (Supported), and $H_{10a}$: A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to fail will have an enhancement effect on the perceived quality component of the broadcaster brand image (Supported). The overall support for $H_{9a}$ and $H_{10a}$ was brought about by the resultant main effect of program congruity producing an enhancement effect on the perceived quality aspect of family brand image, for both successful and failed programs. As in $H_{6a}$, this can be explained through consumers’ use of the bookkeeping model in altering their evaluation of broadcaster brand image (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993). The main effect of program success/failure, however, produced greater enhancement effects for successful programs, than those for failed programs. This is further evidence that the bookkeeping model was used in consumers’ overall evaluations (Sujan and Bettman, 1989).

$H_{7b}$: A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to succeed will have no effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image (Rejected). In the rejection of $H_{7b}$, according to expectations, a significant interaction effect was found between program incongruity and success for evaluations of specific brand beliefs. However, the unforeseen main effect of incongruity was greater than any restoring effects of this interaction, causing an overall dilution effect of broadcaster brand image. Contrary to the findings of Loken and Roedder-John (1993), evaluations of family brand image seem to have predominantly followed the bookkeeping model, rather than the sub-typing model. Having been presented with the incongruent program first, consumers appear to have been compelled into evaluating a dilution of broadcaster brand beliefs. The interaction effect with success, though statistically significant, was not large enough to restore evaluations and produce a rating of ‘No effect’. The dichotomy between supportive theory, and actual findings, for $H_{7b}$, presents challenges in arriving at the most appropriate conclusion for this research hypothesis. However, Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy (2001) also found that there were no reciprocal effects on family brand purchases as a result of extensions, with low category similarity, that were successful. It is concluded that a successful incongruent program, is likely to have no significant impact on the specific brand beliefs of a broadcaster.

$H_{8b}$: A program with a highly incongruent image that is perceived to fail will have no effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image (Supported). The support for $H_{8b}$ indicates that consumers use the sub-typing model in their evaluations of broadcaster brand
image after exposure to an incongruent program that failed, resulting in an overall rating of 'No effect' on the specific broadcaster brand beliefs. The significant interaction effect that occurred yielded results that supported the findings of past researchers (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Swaminthan, Fox and Reddy, 2001). It is concluded that highly incongruent programs, that are perceived to fail, have no overall effect on consumer evaluations of specific broadcaster associations.

H9b: A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to succeed will have an enhancement effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image (Supported), and H10b: A program with a highly congruent image that is perceived to fail will have a dilution effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster brand image (Rejected). Owing to a lack of substantial past research exploring these variables, the investigation of the above hypotheses was mainly exploratory in nature. Nevertheless, according to our expectations, a significant interaction effect occurred between program congruity and program success/failure for specific brand beliefs. The work of Swaminthan, Fox and Reddy (2001), using behavioral data, provided the conditional basis for H9b, and received some attitudinal support here. The main effect of program congruity seems to have provoked consumers to make incremental changes to the family brand schema, resulting in an overall enhancement effect of specific broadcaster beliefs, as a result of congruent, successful programs.

In direct contrast to findings from the limited number of previous studies (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Romeo, 1991), congruent extensions that were perceived to fail produced enhancement effects on the specific brand beliefs of broadcaster brand image. It was the resulting main effect of congruity that caused an enhancement effect of the specific broadcaster brand beliefs, through apparent use of an adaptation of the bookkeeping model. The order of the procedure in presenting consumers with the congruent extension first appears to have influenced their evaluations in such a way as to produce a strengthening of family brand beliefs, rather than a dilution. Of the extant studies dealing with this combination, one involved a moderating effect of involvement (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998), while the other had consumers assess the typicality of the extension before evaluating family brand image (Romeo, 1991). These differences enable the results of the current research to remain interpretable. The conclusion subsequently drawn regarding H10b is that congruent programs, that are perceived to fail, have an overall fortifying effect on the specific brand beliefs of the broadcaster.
Implications

There are several important implications for brand extension theory. First, no single study has reported on all combinations of the variables of brand extension success/failure and brand extension congruity/incongruity. As a result of the examination of each of these combinations, certain theories are introduced with regard to previously unexamined combinations, namely those relating to brand extension congruity and brand extension success.

Second, several of the findings of previous studies are replicated (Chen and Chen, 2000; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Loken and Roedder-John, 1993; Roedder-John, Loken and Joiner, 1998; Sullivan, 1990; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001), thereby supporting these brand extension theories. However, other theories are challenged, hence raising issues regarding the strength of certain results (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Romeo, 1991).

Another important theoretical contribution made by this study is in response to previous researchers calling for the examination of feedback effects at both the attribute and overall attitude levels (Keller and Aaker, 1992; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001). This was achieved by measuring feedback effects on the level of perceived quality, and specific brand belief, components of family brand image.

In contrast to the previous studies that used student and academic subjects, this research used samples of viewers and listeners taken from the general public. Potentially, this is important because of differences in education, attitudes and lifestyle that may have an impact on media usage. In addition, using subjects sampled from the general public has positive implications for the generalizability of past theories confirmed by this study to the general population of consumers.

The use of a product category that is not a consumer good, but is more akin to a service, makes an initial contribution to theory development in the area of service brand extension evaluations. This takes up the call for more research into this aspect of branding (Berry, 2000), and is in contrast to most previous empirical studies of line and brand extensions and sub-branding (e.g. in contrast to Chen and Chen, 2000; Keller and Aaker, 1992; Loken and
Also, we believe there are implications for management practice. Brand managers, in all industries that use dual branding techniques, constantly seek to understand the potential impact of their brand extension strategies on the brand image of their family brand (Aaker, 1991, 1996; Bhat, Kelley and O'Donnell, 1998; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001). Of particular interest to managers are the brand image fortifying and diluting effects of brand extension congruity/incongruity. This is of particular relevance because companies can control the level of congruity/incongruity between their family brand image and brand extensions, whereas the market determines brand extension success or failure.

Results are of direct interest for those managing broadcaster branding at radio and television networks, especially where an attempt is made to create distinct brand associations and high levels of perceived quality present opportunities for company growth via line and brand extensions. The findings are likely to apply in particular to broadcasters who already possess a brand image that is highly distinctive and differentiated from competitor broadcaster brands. Programmers introducing new programs can assess the likely risks and benefits to aspects of their brand image if the program becomes successful, or fails, after having been introduced. Alternatively, if an existing program is already a failure, or successful, the findings can be used to understand the impact on components of the broadcaster brand image, depending on how many associations the program shares with the broadcaster.

In addition, the strengthening effect of program salience found in this study has implications for the amount of promotion and publicity broadcasters give certain programs, and the subsequent risks and benefits to their brand image of potential success or failure of salient programs. Generally, higher levels of risk and return are associated with programs that are accordingly higher in salience.

**Section 6: Limitations and Future Research**
A number of theoretical and methodological limitations should be kept in mind. The core concept of programs being akin to extensions of the broadcaster family brand is itself subject to debate. A number of alternative perspectives could be taken in describing the relationship between a program and its broadcaster, e.g. the product/store image analogy. This raises a
more general problem – the lack of consensus over definitions. In this study all key terms are defined and support is given for these definitions; nevertheless, there is a lack of consensus about the definition of these terms in the literature.

Potential moderating roles played by other variables (apart from program sub-brand salience) were not included in this study. For example, past brand extension researchers have found significant moderating effects of involvement (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 1998), brand type (Lye, Venkateswarlu and Barrett, 2001), and prior family brand usage / family brand loyalty (Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001). Other variables that may have an effect on feedback effects of extensions include: the loyalty towards the brand extension; the level of familiarity towards, and salience of, the family brand; and the role of target market similarity in influencing perceived fit (Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001).

Another potential limitation is the hypothetical nature of the programs used in the study, which may not represent strategies that would actually be considered by a broadcaster. For instance, the study has not attempted to establish the incidence of congruent successful programs versus incongruent successful programs, or the incidence of any other programming combination used in this research (in contrast to the regression-based approach of Klink and Smith, 2001). More generally, with a quasi-experimental design questions will always arise as to the applicability of results to a more 'real-world' setting and consumption situation. A quasi-experimental setting can also produce effects that are overstated (Dacin and Smith, 1994)\textsuperscript{15}. The issue of external validity is partially addressed through the use of consumers (viewers and listeners) who exhibited a range of demographic and psychographic characteristics, as opposed to using only university students. The replication built into the study also enhanced the generalizability of the findings.

We see merit in the complementary use of experimental and non-experimental methods to address these issues. Although actual feedback effects on family brands, as a result of brand extensions, develop over a period of time, and, as such, are difficult to capture in either a quasi-experimental design or an ad hoc survey (Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001). An additional limitation of the study was the sample size contained in each cell in both quasi-

\textsuperscript{15} A specific issue is the finding that there are no significant differences between television and radio broadcaster brands. This may reflect the way the effects of media type are measured in our study (i.e., that
experiments, especially Quasi-Experiment 2 (15 subjects per combination). Nonetheless, sample sizes are comparable to the sub-group sizes reported in related work (e.g. Broniarczyk and Alba, 1994), and overall sizes are adequate. The use of a quota-sampling technique has limitations with regard to representativeness (Malhotra, 1999); however, once the quotas were established, they were filled using a randomized process of subject selection. This served to partially constrain researcher selection bias.

In a quasi-experimental setting, while attempting to control for certain key variables, a number of extraneous variables inevitably exist that could potentially impact on the reliability and validity, and the subsequent interpretation, of results. Four of these are summarized below, along with how attempts were made to control them. First, there was an inability to control for individual preconceptions of the broadcast media brands and salient programs used, since they were real broadcaster brands and real programs, and were therefore subject to consumers’ personal opinions. These preconceptions may have been strong and resistant to new information, thereby affecting results. In an attempt to measure these effects, consumption of the broadcaster brand and salient program were included as covariates in the analyses, and were found to have no significant impact on findings.

Second, testing effects may have confounded the results (Malhotra, 1999). Main testing effect (when prior observation affects later observation) was avoided, since subjects were not asked to evaluate the broadcaster brand image before exposure to the scenario. However, interactive testing effect (Malhotra, 1999) may have been present, as subjects were forced to become aware of the broadcaster brand and hence were more likely to pay attention to the congruity/incongruity, or success/failure, than they normally would have in a more realistic context. Although examining salience attempted to address this issue somewhat, it remains a potential threat to external validity.

Third, instrumentation effect (the effect of the instrument changing during the period of the quasi-experiment) (Malhotra, 1999) was avoided by ensuring consistency in the measuring instruments and scales used, from pretests through to completion of the quasi-experiments. The chance of this effect having been avoided is greatly strengthened by the researchers written hypothetical program scenarios are presented to subjects in all cases, rather than visual and verbal scenarios as would appear on television and radio, respectively, in practice).
having had complete control over all instruments used, and not involving a third party (e.g. a market research firm) in any of the studies.

Fourth, using a quota sample of subjects that exhibited a range of demographic attributes introduced the possibility that the extraneous variable of age may impact on results. However, this was controlled to a certain degree by only choosing those that made up the target audience of each broadcaster. Age was also measured and included as a covariate in the analyses, and was found to have no significant effect.

We are confident that at least some of these problems can be addressed in future research. For example, a natural progression is to incorporate related sub-branding theories – to the extent that they are pertinent to the issue of programs as sub-brands. Also, the inclusion of other potential moderator variables is to be expected. Moreover, only the effect of brand extension salience on success/failure was investigated – in further research we would expect to see the study of effects on congruity/incongruity.

Alternative research methodologies would act as a substitute, or complement, to the quasi-experimental design used in this thesis. For instance, a more complete understanding of consumer evaluations might have been obtained had the data collection methods included a qualitative element, in which consumers’ reasons for their evaluations could have been captured. Such data would have been relatively accessible, as, without any prompting, many subjects readily volunteered reasons for their responses. Also, other quantitative methodologies might be used, such as the empirical analysis of behavioral data relating to actual successful or failed programs within a longitudinal study, similar to past empirical studies on the reciprocal effects of brand extensions (Erdem, 1998; Kim and Sullivan, 1998; Klink and Smith, 2001; Sullivan, 1990; Swaminathan, Fox and Reddy, 2001).

Further work is to be expected on a wider front. Of the variables outside the dotted line in Figure 1, the factors contributing to program sub-brand salience could motivate future research. Namely, investigating exactly which factors make a program sub-brand salient in consumers’ minds (e.g. promotion, publicity, prior consumption, opinions of referents, word-of-mouth). This would have implications for the methods used by broadcasters to promote their programs. The relationship between program sub-brand salience and the common practice of broadcasters merchandising and licensing their program sub-brands - e.g. the
abundance of *The Simpsons* and *South Park* merchandise and paraphernalia – also deserves investigation (Miller, 1995).

Broadcasters currently seem equally, if not more concerned, with their standing amongst stakeholders and industry participants, such as financial analysts, media buyers, advertisers and major shareholders, as they are among viewers and listeners. An extension of this study would entail looking into the brand image and brand equity effects of perceived program success or failure, and congruity/incongruity, from the perspective of stakeholders and industry participants, as opposed to consumers. This would incorporate and combine the notion of corporate reputation with that of family branding, allowing the relationship between these two concepts to be further understood (Dowling, 1994; Gray and Balmer, 1998).

Finally, the focus here has been on traditional free-to-air broadcast television and radio stations, but the observations made in the Introduction highlight the fact that media are changing (e.g. interactive TV, multi-channel cable services, digital radio, etc.). There is a need to explore the themes of this study in a broader media environment, and consider whether there are any differences as a result of the digital revolution and 'e-branding' (e.g. Pauwels and Dans, 2001; Uncles, 2001). Moreover, results are potentially applicable to any extension a media brand may introduce. For example, datacasters, as well as interactive television providers and digital radio managers, could use the findings to assess the impact on their brand image of extensions such as EPGs (electronic program guides), web-sites and high-profile station promotions.
Appendix A: Pretests

[To be included in the published paper, but probably printed in smaller type]

Four pretests were conducted to identify the family (television and radio broadcaster) brands to be used, determine their unique associations, discover the extensions (programs) that are high in salience, and control for extraneous variables. These are described below, after we consider the choice of location for the fieldwork.

Shopping center selection
All subjects were recruited from a single shopping center in Sydney, over three consecutive weekends. The focus on weekends allows full-time workers to be included in the sample. It also ensures a degree of consistency with regard to any recency effects; since radio and television programs run on a weekly schedule, any programs or stations watched or listened to the night before, that contributed to salience in the consumer's mind, were more likely to be the same if the day of measurement remained consistent. It was not necessary, however, for all the quasi-experiments and pretests to be conducted on exactly the same date, since the nature of brand management dictates that brand associations and perceptions should remain fairly constant over time (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1998), and this is generally assumed to hold true for the broadcaster brands involved in this study.

Westfield Shopping Towns, a large chain of Australian shopping malls, was contacted for permission to carry out the study on their premises. They were also asked to provide information regarding the shopping center in Sydney that was most representative of "middle Australia", in terms of socio-demographic characteristics. This is justified by the fact that most free-to-air radio and television broadcasters aim for as large an audience as possible, and thereby target middle Australia (AC Nielsen, 2001). Westfield Parramatta, located in the geographical center of Sydney, was the shopping center whose customers best exhibited these characteristics and was consequently used for all fieldwork. Details of how subjects were recruited within the shopping center differ across pretests and quasi-experiments, and are described in the corresponding sections below.

Pretest 1
This pretest determined which real programs were to be used in the measurement of the effects of program sub-brand salience in Quasi-Experiment 1. Although it is acknowledged that using real programs may confound the results with extraneous variables, it is considered an effective way to produce a 'real-world' effect of salience. Salience is often difficult to manipulate in a quasi-experimental design (Sheinin, 1998).

A quota sample of 32 people was chosen who covered the range of potential target audiences of all television and radio stations. This dictated that they must have exhibited a range of demographic characteristics – demographics being the main method of segmenting the radio and television markets in practice (AC Nielsen, 2001) (though this has been questioned, e.g. see Goodhardt, Ehrenberg and Collins, 1987). A quota sampling technique, by choosing those passing a certain point in the shopping center who fitted the demographic segments specified as target audiences of television and radio stations. Refusal rates were noted for this, and all other pretests and quasi-experiments. The demographic segments comprising the quota samples for Pretest 1 and all other pretests are outlined in Table A1 (AC Nielsen, 2001).
Respondents were asked to: (a) volunteer the name of any program on television and state the station it is on, and (b) volunteer the name of any program on radio and state the station it is on. In the case of people answering with a program type (e.g. the news), as opposed to a program name (e.g. Macquarie National News), they were asked to give the correct name of the program they had in mind. If this was not immediately produced, they were thanked and excused from the study.

The most mentioned program on television and radio, with correct identification of the relevant broadcaster, was chosen for use in Quasi-Experiment 1. This implied that the one television program chosen, and the one radio program chosen were high in salience (i.e. high awareness and top-of-mind recall). It was expected that the most salient programs would be prime-time programs, owing to their higher ratings and the amount of publicity and promotion broadcasters give programs in prime-time slots.

**Results of Pretest 1**

In accordance with expectations, the most salient television program was found to be *Home and Away*, a popular prime-time series broadcast on Channel 7 (most salient for 25% of respondents). The radio program highest in salience, amongst 28% of respondents, was found to be a morning breakfast show entitled *The Morning Crew*, broadcast on the youth station, 2Day FM.

**Pretest 2**

Pretest 2 asked a different quota sample of 32 subjects, recruited in the same way as in Pretest 1, a question regarding the neutral program sub-brand name to be used in Quasi-Experiments 1 and 2. This fictitious name was used to eliminate any preconceived associations subjects may have had to a real program name, thereby controlling these external variables (Loken and Roedder-John, 1993). The neutral program name also served to eliminate any potential mitigating effects of using a sub-branding strategy (Milberg, Park and McCarthy, 1997; Sheinin, 1998), thereby focusing subjects’ attention on the extension itself. A number of possible neutral program names were generated; namely *The Show*, *Lifestyle*, *The Program* and *Comments*. Each of these was the subject of free-association tasks, where respondents were asked to write up to three words that first came to mind, for each neutral program name. The order in which the neutral program names were listed was reversed amongst half of the quota sample, to counter any order effects. In addition, half of the subjects were given a scenario where the neutral program name was a new radio program, and the other half were given a scenario where the neutral program name was a new television program. The neutral program name with the least number of specific associations generated was chosen as the fictitious program sub-brand name to be used in the quasi-experiments.

**Results of Pretest 2**

For two different order combinations, and for both radio and television, *The Program* was the neutral name that generated the least number of specific associations. The exact figures were: *The Program* (24 associations); *The Show* (39); *Comments* (52); and *Lifestyle* (66). Therefore, *The Program* was the name selected for use in both Quasi-Experiments 1 and 2.

**Pretest 3**

Pretest 3 determined the radio and television broadcaster brands to be used in Quasi-Experiment 2, and the types of associations these brands possess. A list of the eight most popular radio stations (AC Nielsen, 2000) and five free-to-air television stations in Sydney was compiled, and formed the basis for each interview. It was not necessary to
comprehensively explore consumers’ varying levels of awareness of radio and television brands, since the brand awareness component of brand equity was not central to this study, rather the brand image component only (Keller, 1993). However, for its innate interest, awareness scales regarding each broadcaster brand were included, and an awareness screening question was posed to each respondent (they must have had at least heard of each broadcaster brand). The same 32 respondents recruited for Pretest 2 were each taken aside for 5-10 minutes and guided through the completion of the instrument. The order in which the radio and television brands were listed was reversed amongst half of the quota sample, to counteract possible order effects.

Respondents were asked to: (a) draw linkages between the radio/television brands according to those they perceived as being similar to one another (this was necessary to achieve 'distinctiveness'); (b) next to each radio/television brand write up to three words that first come to mind; (c) for each brand, rate their perception of quality on a 7-point semantic differential scale bounded by 'Very low quality' and 'Very high quality'; and (d) rate their level of awareness of each brand on a 7-point semantic differential scale, bounded by 'Not at all aware' and 'Very much aware'.

The top three radio brands and top three television brands were chosen that possessed the most unique associations and most specific beliefs, amongst the greatest number of respondents. These brands consisted of those that were identified as having the least number of linkages with other brands, thereby being the most distinct. These six brands were used in Quasi-Experiment 2. Subsequently, their corresponding associations and specific brand beliefs that were generated were also used. The associations generated by the most number of respondents made up the specific brand beliefs of each broadcaster brand used in Quasi-Experiment 2, and were used in the construction of the congruity/incongruity scenarios.

Results of Pretest 3
The number of linkages between broadcaster brands for both radio and television, as a result of the initial grouping exercise, were tallied and tabulated. For both order combinations, the three television stations identified as possessing the most distinct images are SBS (25 links), the ABC (27 links) and Channel 10 (36 links). Similarly, for both order combinations, the three radio stations identified as possessing the most distinct images are Radio National (17 links), Triple J (20 links) and 2Day FM (26 links). These six broadcaster brands were subsequently used in Quasi-Experiment 2.

Results of the associations generated for the above six most distinct broadcaster brands were collated and summarized. The method employed is based on that of Aaker and Keller (1990), where open-ended associations generated from thought-listing techniques are tallied in a tabular format. Some of the hypotheses in our study were dependent on the results of Keller and Aaker (1992), who found certain feedback effects on core brand image were present only for average quality family brands. In the application of these findings to the current study, it was assumed that the broadcaster brands used were all of average perceived quality. The results of Pretest 3 verified this assumption, with the means of all six broadcaster brands ranging between the 'average' levels of 3.72 and 4.97 on a seven-point scale of perceived quality (Radio National: 3.72; 2Day FM: 3.88; Triple J: 4.13; Channel 10: 4.19; SBS: 4.41; the ABC: 4.97).

Pretest 4
It was necessary to test the manipulation of congruity and incongruity via another pretest (Cook and Campbell, 1979; Kidd, 1976). From the results of Pretest 3, congruity/incongruity scenarios were developed regarding the three radio and three television broadcaster brands, for use in Quasi-Experiment 2. These scenarios were based on the associations produced for each broadcaster brand. As outlined in Section 3, to obtain a scenario regarding a program that was congruent with the broadcaster brand image, the generated associations were included in the scenario in their original form. Conversely, to obtain a description of a program that was incongruent to the broadcaster brand image, the opposite of each of the associations was included in the wording of the scenario. A total of twelve specific scenarios were constructed for use in Quasi-Experiment 2 (six broadcaster brands × congruity/incongruity). All scenarios were first tested amongst eleven marketing thought leaders, comprised of academics, post-graduate students and general staff, to obtain the desired degree of variance in the manipulations. After undergoing any necessary modifications, the successful scenarios formed the basis of the manipulation check that constituted Pretest 4.

A different quota sample of 32 people, recruited in the same way as in the previous pretests, were each asked to read all scenarios and rate on seven-point Likert scales the typicality of the program description to what would normally be expected from the broadcaster brand (bounded by 1='Not typical at all' and 7='Very much typical'). The order of the scenarios was randomized to eliminate any possible order effects.

Results of Pretest 4
The scenarios achieved the desired manipulations of congruity and incongruity. The mean rating of typicality for the congruent scenarios was 6.00 (median = 6), with 1.96 being the mean rating of typicality for the incongruent scenarios (median = 2). The results of this pretest were again used when verifying the manipulation of congruity/incongruity in Quasi-Experiment 2.
Appendix B: Summary Results

Summary results are presented in Tables B1 through to B6.
References


45


Ligerakis, M., 2001, "Seven's Plavsic is the one to watch", *B&T Marketing & Media*, November 8, p. 2.


Michalczyk, I., 2000, "Galaxy extends radio brand into clothes", Marketing, January 6, p. 4.


Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
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**Figure 2: Research Hypotheses Matrices**

**Quasi-Experiment 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program sub-brand salience</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(enhancement)</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(greater enhancement)</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dilution)</td>
<td>DIRECTIONAL ONLY</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(greater dilution)</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quasi-Experiment 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program congruity/incongruity</th>
<th>Incongruent</th>
<th>Congruent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>Specific brand beliefs</td>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither success nor failure involved</td>
<td>H$_5$a (dilution)</td>
<td>H$_5$b (dilution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>H$_7$a (dilution)</td>
<td>H$_7$b (no effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>H$_8$a (dilution)</td>
<td>H$_8$b (no effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIRECTIONAL ONLY</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>H$_9$a (enhancement)</td>
<td>H$_9$b (enhancement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>Specific brand beliefs</td>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Quasi-Experiment 1 – Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program sub-brand</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RADIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Morning Crew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 subjects</td>
<td>25 subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 subjects</td>
<td>25 subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of 100 subjects for Quasi-Experiment 1.

Table 2: Quasi-Experiment 2 – Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadcaster family brand</th>
<th>Program sub-brand (numbers of subjects)</th>
<th>Total no. of subjects (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incongruent</td>
<td>Congruent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio National</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple J</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Day FM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of 360 subjects for Quasi-Experiment 2.
Table A1: Pretests – Demographic Characteristics of Quota Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number, Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24 years</td>
<td>4 males, 4 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39 years</td>
<td>4 males, 4 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54 years</td>
<td>4 males, 4 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+ years</td>
<td>4 males, 4 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 subjects</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B1a and B1b: Results of Quasi-Experiment 1 (H₁ and H₂)

Table B1a: Descriptive Statistics

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to success/failure of neutral program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program success/failure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig. (Direction)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful program (H₁)</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed program (H₂)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B1b: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to success/failure of neutral program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/covariates</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program success/failure</td>
<td>19.895</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of broadcaster brand</td>
<td>3.849</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B2a and B2b: Results of Quasi-Experiment 1 (H₃ and H₄)

Table B2a: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Program success/failure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig. (Direction)*</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to success/failure of salient program</td>
<td>Successful program (H₃)</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed program (H₄)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Test Values were not ‘No effect’ ratings of “4” as in all other analyses. Instead, they were 4.74 (successful) and 3.88 (failed).

Table B2b: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/covariate</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program success/failure</td>
<td>Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to success/failure of neutral program</td>
<td>18.609</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to success/failure of salient program</td>
<td>61.481</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of salient program</td>
<td>Rating of change in perceptions of quality from success/failure of salient program</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B3a and B3b: Results of Quasi-Experiment 2 (H$_{5a}$ and H$_{6a}$)

Table B3a: Descriptive Statistics

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to congruent/incongruent program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program success/failure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig. (Direction)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent program image (H$_{5a}$)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent program image (H$_{6a}$)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B3b: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to congruent/incongruent program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/covariate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program congruity/incongruity</td>
<td>26.200</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of broadcaster brand</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B4a and B4b: Results of Quasi-Experiment 2 (H₅b and H₆b)

Table B4a: Descriptive Statistics
(Dependent variable: Rating of change in overall specific beliefs from exposure to congruent/incongruent program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program success/failure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig. (Direction)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent program image (H₅b)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent program image (H₆b)</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B4b: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
(Dependent variable: Rating of change in overall specific beliefs from exposure to congruent/incongruent program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/covariate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program congruity/incongruity</td>
<td>135.739</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of broadcaster brand</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B5a and B5b: Results of Quasi-Experiment 2 (H7a, H8a, H9a, H10a)

Table B5a: Descriptive Statistics

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to congruent/incongruent program and program success/failure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program congruity/incongruity</th>
<th>Program success/failure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig. ((\text{Direction}))</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent program image</td>
<td>Successful program (H7a)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed program (H8a)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent program image</td>
<td>Successful program (H9a)</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed program (H10a)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B5b: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in perceptions of quality from exposure to congruent/incongruent program and program success/failure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/covariate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program congruity/incongruity</td>
<td>21.229</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program success/failure</td>
<td>15.017</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program congruity/incongruity × Program success/failure</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of broadcaster brand</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B6a and B6b: Results of Quasi-Experiment 2 (H_7b, H_8b, H_9b, H_10b)

Table B6a: Descriptive Statistics

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in overall specific beliefs from exposure to program congruity/incongruity and program success/failure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program congruity/incongruity</th>
<th>Program success/failure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sig. (Direction)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent program image</td>
<td>Successful program (H_7b)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed program (H_8b)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent program image</td>
<td>Successful program (H_9b)</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed program (H_10b)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B6b: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

(Dependent variable: Rating of change in overall specific beliefs from exposure to program congruity/incongruity and program success/failure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/covariate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program congruity/incongruity</td>
<td>63.532</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program success/failure</td>
<td>2.225</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program congruity/incongruity × Program success/failure</td>
<td>17.623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of broadcaster brand</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>