

## Retailer Brand Extension in Financial Services – Perceived Fit, Risks and Trust

B. Diwakarnaidu<sup>a</sup> & Dr. H. N. Shivaprasad<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Management Studies and Research Centre, REVA Institute of Technology and Management, Bangalore, Karnataka, India - 560064

<sup>b</sup>Dr. D. Veerendra Heggade Institute of Management Studies and Research, Dharwad, Karnataka, India - 580004

Corresponding Author: B. Diwakarnaidu

---

**Abstract:** The study examines the customer fit, risk and trust perceptions towards the financial services offered by organized retailers. The data were collected from the customers of selected organized retailers those who are offering financial services. Using purposive sampling method 502 respondents residing in Bangalore, India were involved in the survey. Analysis of variance and T-Test was used to study the fit, risks and trust perceptions and compared with four groups of customers namely loyal vs. non-loyal, aware of financial services of retailers vs. un-aware, users vs. non-users and intended vs. non-intended to purchase financial services from retailers to find out whether there are any dissimilarities in terms of fit, risk and brand trust among these groups. The study found that occupational status and marital status has effect on fit, trust and risk perceptions of customers towards the financial services. Respondents' educational qualification, annual income, frequency of visit to retail outlet and average purchase per visit at retail outlet has effect on fit perception of customers. Respondents' educational qualification, annual income and average purchase per visit at retail outlet have effect on trust perception of customers. Respondents' gender and frequency of visit to retail outlet has effect on risk perception of customers. Results showed that fit perception was associated with customers who are non-loyal, un-aware, non-user, and non-intend to buy financial services. Risk perception was associated with non-loyal and customers who are aware of the financial services. Trust perception was associated with non-loyal customers. The article benefits organized retailers in their brand extension decision and implementation. The study contributes to retailer brand extension literature, perceived fit, risks and brand trust.

**Keywords:** Organized retailers, Retailing, Brand extension, Financial Services, Perception

---

Date of Submission: 21-03-2018

Date of acceptance: 06-04-2018

---

### I. Introduction

Change in customer preferences, increased customer spending, increased sales of core product due to the provision of financial services, increased profit margins and high return on capital for investment in financial services (Alexander and Pollard, 2000) influenced organized retailers to get into financial services business. The recent development in retailing is the offering of financial products by organized retailers. It is not a new phenomenon for retailers in offering financial products within their retail operations. Retailers such as corner stores who had built customer identification with their store have long been associated with systems that provided credit facilities to customers.

Here we analyze customer perceptions towards financial services offered by organized retailers. Further, we try to find out customer perceptions regarding fit (Extent to which financial products are comparable with the core brand), risk (Uncertainty and adversarial significances of purchasing a product) and trust (Response in customer assessment and usage of retailer's financial products specially, when there exists great risk related with buying) towards the core brand and financial services as a brand extension of organized retailers.

The purpose of this descriptive study was to determine the customer perceptions (Attitudes) towards the financial services offered by the organized retailers. Three dimensions of service quality known as perceived risk, fit and trust about the brand extension of retailer in to financial services were used to examine the consumer perceptions. These three dimensions were compared with four groups of customers namely loyal vs. non-loyal, aware of financial services of retailers vs. un-aware, users vs. non-users and intended vs. non-intended to purchase financial services from retailer to understand whether there exist any variances in risk, fit perception and brand trust among these four groups.

In retailer operations brand extension has become a tactical problem and has been hardly studied in the past and little research was carried out on highlighting its benefits and barriers (Nicholas Alexander and Mark Colgate 2000). Few have focused on customers' responses. Firstly, literature review was offered by focusing

on customer perception towards retailer brands, brand image, brand augmentation, fit, risk perceptions and brand trust. Later, a framework of methodology, analysis, findings, discussions and conclusion were presented.

### **Customer perception of retailers' brand extension**

#### **Perceived fit**

Customer attitude towards the augmentation was higher when the awareness of "fit" amongst the two product categories along one of three measurements (outcome, interaction and physical & environmental) and awareness of high quality for the original brand or the augmentation was not considered as too easy to make and possible negative affiliations might be neutralized more successfully by elaborating on the qualities of the brand augmentation than by reminding customers about the positive affiliations with the parent brand in the early studies on brand augmentation by Aaker and Keller (1990).

Brand augmentation success depends on: first, the transmission of awareness and relationship with parent brand to the brand extension (De Vecchio, 2000). Second, a great resemblance or fit among parent brand and augmented brand reflects in more common brand attributes among the parent brand and augmented brand. Or the parent brand was viewed relevant and customers assume that quality of augmented brand was similar to the quality of the parent brand (Keller and Aaker, 1992a; De Vecchio, 2000).

Moreover it was debated that customer perception towards proficiency of a retailer could be a significant aspect affecting assessment of brand augmentation (Chen and Paliwoda, 2004). Retailer proficiency denotes the degree to which customers trust that a retailer could render services and products that satisfies consumer wants and needs. This could be difficult since customer responses to the planned augmentation might influence the positive perceptions of the parent brand (Keller and Aaker, 1992a).

Retailer brand denotes a widespread and extremely complex umbrella branding strategy. Complex, since image of retailer was dynamic and complex than product associations (Collins Dodd and Lindley, 2003). Retailer brands might provide variety of products and retailer brand attributes might not be consistent for all attributes.

#### **Perceived risk**

Risk is the ambiguity and adverse significances of purchasing a service or product (Dowling and Staelin, 1994). Risk differs with type of product and purchasing positions such as door-to-door or online purchasing or retail outlet etc. (Statt, 1997). Six kinds of risks were specified in customer behaviour, namely, performance, time, social, financial, psychological and physical risk (Solomon and Askegaard, 1999).

Researches regarding retailer brands considered few risk types were important and verified. Anderson (1987) trusted on performance, physical and financial risks. However, to study the influence of risk over the level of information Dowling and Staelin (1994) suggested category risk, acceptable risk and overall risk. Narasimhan and Wilcox (1998) too considered psychological, emotional and social risks. Lastly, De Vecchio (2001) categorized these into social, financial and functional risks.

Batra and Sinha (2000) merged performance, financial and social risks into single general risk factor and used against two category characteristics "category quality level variance" and "search vs. experience". Authors found that retailer brand purchase increased when perception of general risk decreased and the result would increase when the category quality variance increased. Consequently, three merged risk factors remained negatively associated to both "retailer brand purchases" and "perceived quality level variance". Customers would also purchase few retailer brands, if, the category has greater experience over search characteristics. De Vecchio (2001) applied financial, functional and social risks against price level of the category, complexity, inter-purchase time, quality variance and public-ness category characteristics. He found complexity, quality variance, price-level and inter-purchase time are important pointers of perceived quality of retailer brands and all were correlated negatively with quality perceptions, with the exception of price level category. Similarly, retailer brands are anticipated to prosper in groups that are not complex, there were comparatively less variance in quality among the contending brands.

Semeijn et al. (2004) used three pairs of pooled risks and characteristics namely quality variance & financial risk, "product complexity & functional risk" and "visibility of product usage & psychosocial risk" in their study. Their

results revealed that the customer established a negative attitude towards a product carrying the retailer's retail brand where less likely that the customer perceived a particular retailer to be able to produce a particular product. Likewise, they found that public usage of the product condensed retail brand purchased due to lack of representative quality. Lastly, they found that customers would select manufacturer product over retailer brands to reduce the financial risks associated with the purchase where quality difference within a product category was high.

**Perceived brand trust**

A logical reaction in customer assessment and usage of retailer's brand augmentation, particularly, during high degree of risk related with buying (Jacoby and Kaplan, 1972 and Selnes, 1998) quoted by Sylvie Laforet (2008). Though,

there was a miniature reference of brand trust in brand augmentation literature, it was comparatively contemporary concept well-thought-out in relation to brand equity (Ambler and Styles, 1997; Delgado Ballester and Munera Aleman, 2005). However, formerly, there were few direct or indirect mentions of this concept in Keller and Aaker (1992) studied brand augmentation. Consequently their research showed a substantial relationship between "retailer credibility" through its "expertise" and its "brand trustworthiness" and brand augmentation acceptance (Reast, 2005). Yet, Reast (2005) observed that brand trust measured through two correlate dimensions: performance satisfaction based and credibility based was considerably associated with brand augmentation acceptance. To summarize, fit, risk and trust perceptions were often studied in isolation or indirectly in brand augmentation and branding literature. Though it is obvious that the association between brand fit, risk and trust must be explored as a whole in brand augmentation, more importantly, in related product category completely new to the firm (Sheinin and Schmitt, 1994) quoted by Kim and Lavack (1996) such as retailer brand augmentation in financial services i.e. an augmentation from a low risk to a high risk product class.

**II. Research Objective**

The objective of the research is to examine the customer's perceptions towards the financial services offered by organized retailers.

**III. Research Constructs**

Financial services are non-traditional products that are offered by retailers and are considered to be complex product category. It is less likely that customers buy the retail product as the complexity of product increases since "Brand Trustworthiness is associated with Brand Extension". Three constructs namely brand fit, risk and trust perceptions were used in the study. Fit construct was used to understand how far the financial services of retailer are alike to or fit the core brand. Risk dimension was used to find out the impact of badly devised financial services over the purchase of parent brand. Trust construct studied how far the consumers extended the trustworthiness of core brand to the financial services business of retailer.

**IV. Methodology**

A total of 502 respondents residing in Bangalore, India were involved in the customer survey. They were randomly selected outside the organized retail outlet in accordance with the literature on customer buying behaviour. The questionnaire included customer demographics, questions distinguishing loyal consumers from non loyal users of financial services provided by retailers from unaware users of retailers' financial services from non-users and intended-to-buy financial services from non-intended-to-buy consumers. Remaining part of the questionnaire contained a series of statements pertaining to brand trust, fit and risks to rate on a five-point Likert scale, from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

A pilot study was conducted to pre-test the questionnaire. This is to ensure that questionnaire translates the research objectives. The integrity of the information reciprocated by the respondents was evaluated through cross check response. The study was conducted among seventy three respondents. The reliability of the questionnaire was determined using Cronbach's alpha test and to ensure accuracy and consistency, scoring was performed multiple times.

**Table – 1 Overall Reliability Score**

S. No	Construct Name	Cronbach alpha
1	Fit	0.68
2	Risk	0.66
3	Trust	0.78
4	Satisfaction	0.85
5	Quality of Services	0.65

Cronbach’s alpha value on various constructs shown more than 0.65 indicating the reliability of the questionnaire is ensured. During the pre-test, the researcher found that few of the items (questions) in the questionnaire such as context of the question, technical jargons etc. were hard to interpret by the respondents. These flaws were addressed and carried forward to the actual field survey.

T-Test was used to study the fit, risks and trust perceptions and compared with four groups of customers namely loyal vs. non-loyal, aware of financial services of retailers vs. un-aware, users vs. non-users and intended to purchase vs. non-intended to purchase financial services from retailers to find out whether there exist any differences in terms of risk, fit perceptions and brand trust between these groups. ANOVA was used to understand the influences of customer demographic factors on buying financial services, fit perception, risk perception, quality of services at retail outlet and satisfaction. Regression analysis was used to know the impact of reasons for buying financial services and risk on fit perception, trust perception and satisfaction of customers. Correlation analysis was used to study correlation of each construct in the study with other constructs to know the relationship whether positive or negative correlation that exists.

**V. Results**

**Perceptions of loyal vs. non-loyal customers**

Customer loyalty was analysed to understand significant differences in perceived brand Fit, Risks and Trust across respondents’ loyalty towards retailers’ financial services.

**H<sub>A</sub>**: There are significant variances in Fit, Risk and Trust perceptions across respondents’ loyalty towards retailer financial services.

**Table – 2** Respondents loyalty towards financial services

Construct	Loyalty	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig.	Remarks
Fit	YES	378	3.02	0.41	-5.505	0.000*	Alternate Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	124	3.30	0.72			
Risk	YES	378	4.14	0.37	2.191	0.029*	Alternate Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	124	4.05	0.51			
Trust	YES	378	3.13	0.31	-3.279	0.001*	Alternate Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	124	3.26	0.51			

**Source:** Primary data

There are statistically significant differences across customer loyalty with respect to the Fit perception, Risk perception and Trust perception. The respondents respond differently for fit, risk and trust. Since the mean scores of non-loyal customers are higher, non-loyal customers perceived more risk, more trust and more fit perceptions about the financial services offered by retailers.

**Perceptions of Aware vs. Un-Aware Customers**

Customers’ awareness was analysed to understand the significant variances in brand fit, Risk and Trust across respondents’ awareness of retailers’ financial services.

**H<sub>A</sub>**: There are significant variances in brand fit, Risk and Trust across respondents’ awareness of financial services.

**Table– 3** Respondents awareness towards financial services

Construct	Awareness	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig.	Remarks
Fit	YES	434	3.02	0.48	-7.837	0.000*	Alternate Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	68	3.52	0.56			
Risk	YES	434	4.13	0.39	2.082	0.038*	Alternate Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	68	4.02	0.52			
Trust	YES	434	3.16	0.37	-0.125	0.900	Null Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	68	3.17	0.40			

**Source:** Primary Data

There are statistically significant differences across awareness of financial services with respect to Fit perception and Risk perception. Awareness of respondents about financial services does not respond differently for Trust perception as difference between awareness of financial services for this construct is not statistically

significant. Further those who are aware of financial services perceived less fit and more risk compared to the un-aware. When it comes to trust perception both who are aware and those who are not aware of retailers financial services perceived the same that the trust perception did not influence the selection of financial services offered by retailers.

**Perceptions of User vs. Non-User Customers**

The usage status of retailer’s financial services was analysed to understand significant variances in brandFit, Risk and Trust across respondents’ status of using financial services.

**H<sub>A</sub>**: There are significant variances in Fit, Risk and Trust across respondents’ status of using financial services.

**Table – 4** Respondents usage of financial services

Construct	Usage	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig.	Remarks
Fit	YES	227	2.91	0.35	-7.507	0.000*	Alternate Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	275	3.24	0.58			
Risk	YES	227	4.15	0.37	1.326	0.185	Null Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	275	4.10	0.44			
Trust	YES	227	3.16	0.36	-0.347	0.729	Null Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	275	3.17	0.38			

**Source:** Primary data

There are statistically significant differences across usage of financial services with respect to Fit perception. Usage of financial services do not respond differently for Risk perception and Trust perception as difference between usage of financial services for these constructs are not statistically significant. For fit perception those who are using financial services perceived less fit compared to nonusers as the mean scores are high. Customers using retailers’ financial services and those who are not using financial services perceived the same and felt that Risk and Trust do not influence the selection of financial services.

**Perceptions of Intended vs. Non-Intended to buy Customers**

The customers’ intension to buy retailers financial services analysed to understand significant variances in perceived brand Fit, Risk and Trust across respondents’ intention of buying financial services.

**H<sub>A</sub>**: There are significant variances in Fit, Risk and Trust across respondents’ intention of buying financial services.

**Table – 5** Respondents intention to buy financial services

Construct	Intension	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig.	Remarks
Fit	YES	284	2.99	0.46	-5.198	0.000*	Alternate Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	218	3.22	0.55			
Risk	YES	284	4.14	0.41	1.276	0.203	Null Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	218	4.09	0.42			
Trust	YES	284	3.18	0.40	0.960	0.338	Null Hypothesis Accepted
	NO	218	3.15	0.33			

**Source:** Primary data

There are statistically significant differences across intension to buy financial services with respect to fit perception. Intension to buy financial services does not respond differently for Risk perception and Trust perception towards financial services as difference between intension to buy financial services for these constructs are not statistically significant. Respondents who are intended to buy financial services have perceivedless fit when compared to those who do not intended to buy as their mean scores are high. The respondents who are intended to buy and those who are not intended to buy retailers financial servicesperceived the same that Risk and Trust perceptions do not influence the respondents’ decision of buying financial services from retailers.

**Findings**

There are statistically significant differences across customer loyalty with respect to the following constructs: Fit perception, Risk perception and Trust perception. The respondents respond differently for fit, risk and trust. Since the mean scores of non-loyal customers are higher, non-loyal customers feel more risk more trust and more fit perceptions about the retailer financial services.

There are statistically significant differences across awareness of financial services with respect to Fit perception and Risk perception. Awareness of respondents about financial services does not respond differently for Trust perception as difference between awareness of financial services for this construct is not statistically

significant. Further those who are aware of financial services felt less fit and more risk perception compared to the un-aware. When it comes to trust perception both perceive same about the financial services.

There are statistically significant differences across usage of financial services with respect to Fit perception. Usage of financial services do not respond differently for Risk perception and Trust perception as difference between usage of financial services for these constructs are not statistically significant. For fit perception those who are using financial services felt less fit compared to nonusers as the mean scores are high. There are statistically significant differences across intension to buy financial services with respect to fit perception. Intension to buy financial services does not respond differently for Risk perception and Trust perception towards financial services as difference between intension to buy financial services for these constructs are not statistically significant. Respondents who are intended to buy feel financial services are less fit compared to non-intend to buy as the mean scores are high.

The demographic factors like age, family type, family size and number of working persons in the family do not influence fit, trust and risk perceptions of customers towards financial services as they do not respond differently towards fit, trust and risk perceptions. The marital status and occupational status influences the customer fit, trust and risk perceptions towards financial services as they respond differently towards fit, trust and risk perceptions.

## **VI. Discussions**

The results revealed that age, family size, family type and number of working persons in the family have no effect on fit, trust and risk perception. Occupational status and marital status has effect on fit, trust and risk perceptions. Results show that fit perception was related to non-loyal, un-aware, non-user and non-intend to buy customers. These customers feel that the financial services are alike to or fit the parent brand category. Risk perception was associated with non-loyal customers and customers who are aware of financial services. Trust perception was associated with non-loyal customers. It is implications to the practicing managers to make the non-loyal, un-aware, non-user and non-intend customers to purchase financial services who feel financial services are fit to them. The practicing managers need to create awareness among these customers and make them to buy financial services.

Sylvie Laforet (2008) found in her study that “Fit and Risk perceptions were associated with non-loyal, non-users, non-aware and non-intended to buy customers and brand trust was perceived by the loyal, user, aware and intended to buy customers”. She also found that income, gender and age had effects on customer fit, trust and risk perceptions of the customer towards financial services. The present study finds only Fit perception is in the similar lines of the studies of Sylvie Laforet. The reasons for difference between the studies could be the result of geographical and demographical differences between the customer perceptions towards financial services.

### **Suggestions to Retailers**

Organized retailers must build upon the trust among non-loyal customers and customers aware of financial services as they felt these are risky. Retailers must create awareness among non-loyal, un-aware, non-user and non-intend-to-buy customers and make these customers to buy financial services as they felt fit.

Marital status and occupational status influences the customer fit, trust and risk perceptions towards financial services as they respond differently towards fit, trust and risk perceptions. Retailer need to consider these demographic factors while designing and delivering financial services as these factors influence the customers fit, trust and risk perceptions towards the financial services offered by retailers.

### **Implications for Practicing Managers**

This study makes a case for the practicing managers to make the non-loyal, un-aware, non-user and non-intend-to-buy financial services which are more likely to fit their requirements. The practicing managers need to create awareness and make such customers to buy financial services through publicity and brand building activities. Since most customers prefer mobile banking for financial services it becomes an implication to the retail organization to design and deliver the financial services through the mobile banking channel.

The study suggests practicing managers to leverage the trust the customers have on retailer and trust on its brands to create trust on financial services being offered by them. The study urges the retailers to develop and demonstrate over a period of time their expertise in offering financial services for specialized areas like insurance etc. to create confidence among customers to make them to buy retailers financial services. The study also highlights the need for the retailers' implications to become experts in financial services like their core business to create confidence among its customers to buy financial services and to compete with the traditional banks and financial institutions.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

This study does not compare the effect of brand leadership in brand extension among various organized retailers. The study requires further examining the correlation of trust with the size and power of various organized retailers offering financial services.

The study covered the extent to which the brand extension is alike to or fit the core brand, risk perception and trust perceptions of customer towards the core brand and financial services as a brand extension of organized retailers. This may lead to the benefits and barriers of retailer brand extension. The study requires further examination, which examines the benefits and barriers of brand extension of organized retailers offering financial services as brand extension.

### **VII. Conclusion**

Customer satisfaction and perception of fit, risk and trust about the brand extension is critical for the success of a retailer's brand extension, which was not focused and covered by the researchers in India. This maiden study was taken up to understand the customer satisfaction and perceptions of fit, risk and trust towards the financial services offered by organized retailers as a brand extension. Based on the results of the study, changes can take place in offering financial services by organized retailers to ensure that the consumers are offered the services and products that meet the requirements and needs of consumers. As the financial services offered by organized retailers created distrust among customers, the leaders in the retail organizations must manage and improve the satisfaction and trust for their financial services offerings.

It is concluded that occupational status and marital status has effect on fit, trust and risk perceptions of customers towards the financial services. Results showed that fit perception was associated with customers who are non-loyal, un-aware non-user, and non-intend to buy financial services. Risk perception was associated with non-loyal and customers who are aware of the financial services. Trust perception was associated with non-loyal customers.

These results may enlighten the leaders in organized retail to address consumer satisfaction and the need to alter their product offerings, training, brand building of their financial services and marketing mix to strengthen customer relationships, satisfaction, perception of fit and trust. Organized retailers are suggested to offer all financial services in their outlets with dedicated area for financial services with a shop in shop concept with their own financial services following do it yourself model and give the feel of a bank to all the categories of customers who can trust and buy financial services of all kind which match their requirements.

### **References**

- [1] Aaker, D. and Keller, K. (1990), "Consumerevaluation of brand extensions", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp.27-33.
- [2] Alexander, N. and Colgate, M. (2000), "Retail Financial services: Transaction to Relationship Marketing", *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(8), 938-952.
- [3] Ambler, T. and Styles, C. (1997), "Brand development versus new product development: towards a process model of extension decisions", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp.13-26.
- [4] Anderson, T.J. (1987), *Innovative Financial Instruments for Natural Disaster Risk Management*, Technical Papers Series, Inter-American Development Bank, Sustainable Development Department, Washington, DC.
- [5] Andrew Alexander and Jane Pollard, (2000), "Banks, Grocers and the changing retailing of financial services in Britain", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 7, Issue 3, Nov. 2000, Pages 137 – 147.
- [6] Batra, R. and Sinha, I. (2000), "Consumer level factors moderating the success of private label brands", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 76, No. 2, pp.175-91.
- [7] Chen, J. and Paliwoda, S. (2004), "The influence of company name in consumer variety seeking", *Brand Management*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp.219-31.
- [8] Collins Dodd, C. and Lindley, T. (2003), "Store brands and retail differentiation: the influence of store image and store brand attitude on store own brand perceptions", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 10, No. 6, pp. 345-52.
- [9] Delgado Ballester, E. and Munera Aleman, J.L. (2005), "Does brand trust matter to brand equity?", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp.187-96.
- [10] Del Vecchio, D. (2000), "Moving beyond fit: the role of brand portfolio characteristics in consumer evaluations of brand reliability", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 9, No. 7, pp.457-71.
- [11] Del Vecchio, D. (2001), "Consumer perceptions of private label quality: the role of product category characteristics and consumer use of heuristics", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 8, No. 5, pp.239-49.
- [12] Dhar, S.K. and Hoch, S.J. (1997), "Why store brand penetration varies by retailer", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp.208-27.
- [13] Dowling, G.R. and Staelin, R. (1994), "A model of perceived risk and intended risk handling activity", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp.119-34.
- [14] Erdem, T. (1998), "An empirical analysis of umbrella branding", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp.339-51.
- [15] Jacoby, J. and Kaplan, L. (1972), "The components of perceived risk", in Venkatesan, M. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Conference, Association for Consumer Research*, Champaign, IL, pp.382-93.
- [16] Keller, K.L. and Aaker, D.A. (1992a), "The effects of sequential introduction of brand extensions", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp.35-50.
- [17] Kim, C.K. and Lavack, A.M. (1996), "Vertical brand extensions: current research and managerial implications", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp.24-37.
- [18] Narasimhan, C. and Wilcox, R.T. (1998), "Private labels and the channel relationship: a cross category analysis", *Journal of Business*, Vol. 71, No. 4, pp.573-600.
- [19] Reast, J.D. (2005), "Brand trust and brand extension acceptance: the relationship", *Journal of Product & Brand*

- Management, Vol.14, No. 1, pp.4-13.
- [20] Semeijn, J., Allard, C.R. and van Riel, A.B.A. (2004), "Consumer evaluations of store brands: effects of store image and product attributes", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol.11, No. 4, pp.247-58.
- [21] Sheinin, D.A. and Schmitt, B.H. (1994), "Extending brands with new product concepts: the role of category attribute congruity, brand affect, and brand breadth", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.1, No. 31, pp.1-10.
- [22] Solomon, M. and Askegaard, S. (1999), *Consumer Behavior: A European Perspective*, Pearson, Harlow.
- [23] Statt, D.A. (1997), *Understanding the Consumer: A Psychological Approach*, Macmillan, London.
- [24] Sylvie Laforet, (May-June 2008), "Retail brand extension – perceived fit, risks and trust", *Journal of consumer Behaviour*, No.7, pp.189-209.
- [25] Veloutsou, C., Gioulistanis, E. and Moutinho, L. (2004), "Own labels choice criteria and perceived characteristics in Greece and Scotland: factors influencing the willingness to buy", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp.228-41.

IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) is UGC approved Journal with SI. No. 4481, Journal no. 46879.

B. Diwakarnaidua "Retailer Brand Extension in Financial Services – Perceived Fit, Risks and Trust." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* 20.4 (2018): 36-43.