Perceived Fit in the Context of Brand Extensions: A Systematic Literature Review

- Supplementary Tables (authors' own work) -

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (1/8)

Direct positive effects of fit	
Dependent variable	**Article**
Extension-related	
Cognitive structure for an extension	Bhat and Reddy (2001)
Confidence in extension quality evaluations	Dacin and Smith (1994)
Extension categorization	Fedorkhin *et al.* (2008)
Extension evaluation	Aaker and Keller (1990); Ahluwalia (2008); Albrecht *et al.* (2013); Barone (2005); Barone *et al.* (2000); Boush and Loken (1991); Broniarczyk and Alba (1994); Buil *et al.* (2009); Chiu *et al.* (2017); Chun *et al.* (2015); Consumer Behavior Seminar (1987); Deng and Messinger (2022); Dens and de Pelsmacker (2010a, 2010b); Dimitriu and Warlop (2022); Dwivedi *et al.* (2010); Eren-Erdogmus *et al.* (2018); Hagtvedt and Patrick (2008); Hem *et al.* (2003); Herr *et al.* (1996); Hill and Lee (2015); Huang *et al.* (2017); Huber *et al.* (2013); Jung and Tey (2010); Kapoor and Heslop (2009); Kim *et al.* (2014); Kim and John (2008); Klink and Smith (2001); Lane and Jacobson (1997); Lee (1994); Lei *et al.* (2004); Mao and Krishnan (2006); Maoz and Tybout (2002); Mathur *et al.* (2012); Milberg *et al.* (2013); Nan (2006); Park *et al.* (1991); Pina *et al.* (2010); Pontes and Pontes (2021); Salinas and Pérez (2009); Sattler *et al.* (2010); Shine *et al.* (2007); Spiggle *et al.* (2012); Yeung and Wyer (2005); Zhang and Sood (2002); Zhang *et al.* (2020)
Extension perceived quality	Dacin and Smith (1994); Han and Schmitt (1997); Taylor and Bearden (2002)
Extension price premium	DelVecchio and Smith (2005); Sattler *et al.* (2010)
Extension purchase intention	Dawar and Anderson (1994); Guo *et al.* (2018); Herr *et al.* (1996); Mathur *et al.* (2023); Pontes and Pontes (2021); Spiggle *et al.* (2012); Taylor and Bearden (2002)
Extension sales	Wang and Liu (2020)
Extension service synergy	Fang *et al.* (2024)
Extension success	Athanasopoulou *et al.* (2015); Völckner and Sattler (2006)
Extension usage consideration	O'Reilly *et al.* (2017)
Global thoughts about an extension ad	Meyers-Levy *et al.* (1994)
Learning of an extension	Herr *et al.* (1996)
Perceived performance of an extension	Dimitriu *et al.* (2017)
Willingness to pay a premium for an extension	Liu and Hu (2012)
Willingness to recommend the extension	Spiggle *et al.* (2012)
Parent brand–related	
Parent brand affect	Bhat and Reddy (2001)
Parent brand evaluation	Dwivedi *et al.* (2010); Jung and Tey (2010); Mathur *et al.* (2012); Milberg *et al.* (1997)
Parent brand reliability	DelVecchio (2000)
Parent brand image	Milberg *et al.* (1997)
Parent brand spillover effects	Chun *et al.* (2015)
Risk of brand name dilution	Loken and John (1993)

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (2/8)

Direct negative effects of fit	
Dependent variable	**Article**
Extension-related	
Extension ad information processing	Meyers-Levy *et al.* (1994)
Extension purchase risk	Milberg *et al.* (2010); Milberg *et al.* (2013); Yeo and Park (2006)
Motivation to process extension benefit information	Chun *et al.* (2015)
Surprise about the extension	Chun *et al.* (2015)
Thoughts about extension ad message	Meyers-Levy *et al.* (1994)

Inverted U-shaped effects of fit	
Dependent variable	**Article**
Extension-related	
Cognitive responses evoked by an extension	Boush and Loken (1991)
Extension evaluation	Meyers-Levy *et al.* (1994)
Extension evaluation time	Boush and Loken (1991)

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (3/8)

Indirect positive effects of fit				
Fit x …	**Mediator**	**Dependent variable**	**Explanation**	**Article**
		Extension-related		
	Extension purchase risk	Extension choice	Extension purchase risk mediates the effect of fit on extension choice; that is, fit negatively affects extension purchase risk, which in turn has a negative influence on extension choice.	Milberg *et al.* (2013)
	Certainty the parent brand can deliver the extension	Extension evaluation	Customer certainty mediates the effect of fit on extension evaluation; that is, a high fit leads to higher customer certainty, which results in more favorable extension evaluations.	Smith and Andrews (1995)
Physical distance to extension	Extension information processing	Extension evaluation	The evaluations of high-fit (low-fit) extensions are best when the physical distance to the extension is small (large). This effect is mediated by extension information processing; that is, information about a high-fit (low-fit) extension can be processed easier when the physical distance is small versus large (large vs. small).	Huang *et al.* (2017)
	Extension purchase risk	Extension evaluation	Extension purchase risk mediates the effect of fit on extension evaluation; that is, fit negatively affects extension purchase risk, which in turn has a negative influence on extension evaluation.	Milberg *et al.* (2013)
Competitive setting	Extension purchase risk	Extension evaluation	In non-competitive settings, the purchase risk associated with an extension mediates the effect of fit on extension evaluation; that is, fit has a negative effect on extension purchase risk, and risk has a negative effect on extension evaluation.	Milberg *et al.* (2010)
Self-regulatory focus	Relative emphases of extension benefits versus extension risks	Extension evaluation	Consumers with a promotion focus (prevention focus) prefer extensions with a high benefit overlap (product category similarity). This effect is mediated by the relative emphases of extension benefits versus extension risks; that is, evaluations of extensions with high benefit overlap (category similarity) are best for promotion-focused (prevention-focused) consumers emphasizing extension benefits (extension risks).	Chang *et al.* (2011)
	Extension evaluation	Extension price premium	The effect of perceived fit on the extension price premium is mediated by extension evaluation; that is, perceived fit positively affects extension evaluation, which in turn has a positive influence on the extension price premium.	Sattler *et al.* (2010)
	Consumer loyalty	Extension purchase intention	Consumer loyalty mediates the effect of fit on extension purchase intention; that is, fit positively affects consumer loyalty, which in turn has a positive influence on extension purchase intention.	Liang and Fu (2021)
	Extension performance goal	Extension purchase intention	Extension performance goal mediates the influence of similarity on the extension purchase intention; that is, similarity has a positive (negative) effect on the intention to purchase the extension when consumers aim to purchase a product with a good overall performance (good performance on a specific attribute).	Dimitriu *et al.* (2017)
Visual distance to extension	Extension information processing	Willingness to pay for an extension	The willingness to pay is higher (lower) for high-fit (low-fit) extensions when the visual distance to the extension is small rather than large. This effect is mediated by extension information processing; that is, information about a high-fit (low-fit) extension can be processed easier when the physical distance is small versus large (large vs. small).	Huang *et al.* (2017)
		Parent brand–related		
	Extension evaluation	Parent brand evaluation	Extension evaluation mediates the relationship between fit and parent brand evaluation; that is, fit positively affects extension evaluation, which in turn leads to more favorable parent brand evaluations.	Dens and de Pelsmacker (2010b)
Parent brand reputation x extension benefit innovativeness	Trust in the parent brand's ability to deliver promised extension benefits	Parent brand spillover effects	The spillover effects on a poorly reputable brand are highest for extensions having a high fit and benefit innovativeness. This effect is mediated by consumer trust; that is, a high fit leads to an increase in trust and this increase in trust results in positive spillover effects.	Chun *et al.* (2015)

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (4/8)

Indirect negative effects of fit				
Fit x …	**Mediator**	**Dependent variable**	**Explanation**	**Article**
		Parent brand–related		
Parent brand reputation x extension benefit innovativeness	Motivation to process extension benefit information	Parent brand spillover effects	The spillover effects on a reputable brand are highest for extensions having a low fit and a high benefit innovativeness. This effect is mediated by consumer processing motivation; that is, a low fit leads to an increase in processing motivation and this increase in motivation results in positive spillover effects.	Chun *et al.* (2015)

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (5/8)

Interaction effects with fit (1/4)			
Fit x …	**Dependent variable**	**Explanation**	**Article**
	Extension-related		
Parent brand dominance	Affect transfer to an extension	The affect of a dominant brand spreads most easily to an extension under conditions of high relatedness.	Herr *et al.* (1996)
Parent brand portfolio relatedness	Confidence in extension quality evaluations	Decreasing parent brand portfolio relatedness reduces the positive impact of parent brand–extension similarity on the confidence in extension quality evaluations.	Dacin and Smith (1994)
Extension strategy	Extension advertising efficiency	High intrinsic similarity leads to a greater positive impact of extensions on the extension's advertising efficiency.	Smith and Park (1992)
Consumer loyalty	Extension choice	Consumers with strong (vs. weak) brand loyalty are more inclined to choose high-fit (vs. low-fit) extensions.	Liang and Fu (2021)
Extension display format x parent brand quality	Extension consumption experience	Low- (high-) fit extensions introduced by high- (low-) quality brands lead to better consumption experiences when presented in a by-category (by-brand) display format.	Zheng *et al.* (2019)
Implicit theories	Extension difficulty to make	Incremental theorists (not entity theorists) rate the difficulty to make a low-fit extension higher than that of a high-fit extension.	Mathur *et al.* (2012)
Age	Extension evaluation	Extension evaluations by adults are better when the similarity is high than when it is low. There is no difference for children.	Zhang and Sood (2002)
Amount of information about the extension	Extension evaluation	The more information is given about the extension, the weaker is the positive impact of fit on extension evaluation.	Klink and Smith (2001)
Associations with competitor brands	Extension evaluation	Under conditions of high category fit, positive (negative) associations with competitor brands lead to high (low) extension evaluations.	Pontes and Pontes (2021)
Attitude toward the extension ad	Extension evaluation	The lower the perceived congruity, the weaker is the positive impact of the attitude toward the extension ad on extension evaluations.	Nan (2006)
Attitude-transfer source	Extension evaluation	Extensions with a high prototype fit (exemplar fit) are evaluated better when the attitude-transfer source is a positive brand with a negative product than when it is a negative brand with a positive product (a negative brand with a positive product than when it is a positive brand with a negative product).	Mao and Krishnan (2006)
Cognitive resources	Extension evaluation	A high (vs. low) cognitive resource level strengthens the favorable impact of prototype fit on extension evaluation. Cognitive resources do not affect the influence of exemplar fit.	Mao and Krishnan (2006)
Competition cue	Extension evaluation	Extensions are rated worse in the presence of competition than in the absence of competition. In the presence (vs. absence) of competition, extensions with a high fit are more negatively affected than those with a moderate fit.	Kapoor and Heslop (2009)
Competitors' relative brand familiarity	Extension evaluation	Low-fit (high-fit) extensions whose competitors are less (more) familiar are rated better (worse) than low-fit (high-fit) extensions in a non-competitive environment. Low-fit extensions facing less familiar brands are evaluated as good or better than high-fit extensions facing more familiar brands.	Milberg *et al.* (2010)
Construal level x information cue about fit being important for extension success	Extension evaluation	A (non-) available information cue leads to high-fit extensions getting better evaluations from both high- and low-construal consumers (only from high-construal consumers) than extensions with a moderate fit.	Kim and John (2008)
Innovativeness	Extension evaluation	High (low) consumer innovativeness leads to a less (more) pronounced effect of perceived fit on extension evaluation.	Pina *et al.* (2010)
Context (in)dependence x type of extension information	Extension evaluation	While context-dependent consumers evaluate low-fit extensions better when the extension information is benefit-based (vs. attribute-based), context-independent consumers show no differences by type of extension information. Context (in)dependence and type of extension information do not affect high-fit extensions.	Mathur *et al.* (2023)
Distraction	Extension evaluation	Low-fit extensions receive higher evaluations under conditions of distraction (vs. deliberation). There is no difference for high-fit extensions.	Zhang *et al.* (2020)
Emergent extension attributes	Extension evaluation	The lower the perceived fit, the stronger is the positive impact of the extension attributes on the extension evaluation.	Bristol (2002)
Extension advertising appeal	Extension evaluation	Emotional advertising appeals (vs. informational advertising appeals) increase the influence of fit on extension evaluation.	Dens and de Pelsmacker (2010a, 2010b)
Extension authenticity	Extension evaluation	The greater the similarity or relevance, the better are the evaluations of inauthentic extensions. Similarity and relevance both do not affect evaluations of authentic extensions.	Spiggle *et al.* (2012)

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (6/8)

Interaction effects with fit (2/4)			
Fit x …	**Dependent variable**	**Explanation**	**Article**
Extension differentiation	Extension evaluation	The positive effect of extension differentiation on extension evaluation is stronger under conditions of high congruity than under conditions of moderate congruity.	Maoz and Tybout (2002)
Extension display format x parent brand quality	Extension evaluation	The evaluation of low- (high-) fit extensions with a high- (low-) quality brand are best when presented in a by-category (by-brand) display format.	Zheng *et al.* (2019)
Extension durability x parent brand concept	Extension evaluation	Brand image fit has higher positive effect on the evaluation of durable extensions stemming from a symbolic brand than from a functional brand. There is no difference for non-durable extensions.	Bhat and Reddy (2001)
Extension evaluation/similarity measurement order	Extension evaluation	Similarity's positive impact on extension evaluations is greatest when the evaluations are made after (vs. before) the similarity has been assessed.	Barone (2005); Zhang and Sood (2002)
Extension offering	Extension evaluation	Extensions from goods to goods are influenced more by the positive effect of category fit on extension evaluations than extensions from goods to services.	Ramanathan and Velayudhan (2015)
Extension order of entry	Extension evaluation	Evaluations of low-fit (high-fit) extensions profit from their brand being a pioneer (follower).	Oakley *et al.* (2008)
Extension service intensiveness	Extension evaluation	Low service intensive extensions are evaluated better than high service intensive extensions. This effect increases as similarity increases.	Lei *et al.* (2004)
Extension type	Extension evaluation	Category extensions (vs. line extensions) benefit more from the positive impact of perceived fit on extension evaluations.	Dens and de Pelsmacker (2010a)
Feelings of control x opportunity to structure	Extension evaluation	Low (vs. high) control results in less favorable evaluations of low-fit extensions when there is no chance to structure the environment. There is no difference when the possibility to structure is given.	Cutright *et al.* (2013)
Innovativeness	Extension evaluation	As innovation increases, the positive impact of perceived fit/perceived category fit on extension evaluations becomes less pronounced.	Klink and Smith (2001); Salinas and Pérez (2009)
Mood	Extension evaluation	The positive impact of mood on extension evaluations is more pronounced when extension ads have a low than moderate fit.	Sar *et al.* (2011)
Mood x extension evaluation/similarity measurement order	Extension evaluation	When consumers are (not) requested to assess the core–extension similarity before the extension evaluation, positive mood leads to higher evaluations of the moderately similar extension (both the moderately similar and the dissimilar extensions).	Yeung and Wyer (2005)
Parent brand affect x parent brand knowledge	Extension evaluation	While consumers knowing a lot about the brand rely on the relevance of the parent brand's associations in the new category when evaluating an extension, consumers with a low level of brand expertise depend on parent brand affect.	Broniarczyk and Alba (1994)
Parent brand architecture	Extension evaluation	Evaluations from low-category similarity extensions benefit from using a sub-branding (vs. direct) strategy. Evaluations from high-category similarity extensions are not affected by the brand's architecture.	Milberg *et al.* (1997)
Parent brand breadth	Extension evaluation	Low-similarity extensions of broad brands receive higher evaluations than high-similarity extensions of narrow brands.	Meyvis and Janiszewski (2004)
Parent brand competence type	Extension evaluation	Under conditions of low (high) extension distance, high operational brand competence (conceptual brand competence) results in better extension evaluations than high conceptual brand competence (operational brand competence).	Wang and Liu (2020)
Parent brand concept	Extension evaluation	Evaluations of low-similarity extensions from prestige brands profit more from high concept consistency than those of functional brands.	Park *et al.* (1991)
Parent brand evaluation	Extension evaluation	The lower the perceived congruity, the weaker is the positive impact of parent brand evaluation on extension evaluation.	Nan (2006)
Parent brand evaluation x core product portrayal	Extension evaluation	Showing the core product in the ad of a low- (high-) similarity extension leads to a reduced (more pronounced) positive effect of parent brand evaluation on extension evaluation.	Gierl and Huettl (2011)
Parent brand quality	Extension evaluation	High parent brand quality leads to better evaluations of extensions that are considered to complement or substitute the parent brand's products.	Aaker and Keller (1990)
Parent brand quality	Extension evaluation	Low-similarity extensions of a medium-quality brand are evaluated poorer than high- and moderate-similarity extensions. Similarity does not impact the evaluations of extensions from a high-quality brand.	Keller and Aaker (1992)
Parent brand relationship quality	Extension evaluation	Moderate-fit extensions receive better evaluations from consumers with a strong (vs. weak) relationship with the brand. This impact is less pronounced for high- or low-fit extensions.	Kim *et al.* (2014)

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (7/8)

Interaction effects with fit (3/4)			
Fit x …	**Dependent variable**	**Explanation**	**Article**
Parent brand reputation x extension benefit innovativeness	Extension evaluation	Extensions from a poor reputable brand are evaluated best if they have innovative benefits and a high versus low fit. The evaluations of extensions from reputable brands are only influenced by the benefit innovativeness and not by the fit.	Chun *et al.* (2015)
Presence of the product element in the extension logo	Extension evaluation	Service-to-service extensions with low similarity are evaluated worse than those with high similarity when the extension logo contains a product element. Without product cue, the evaluations do not vary according to similarity.	Dimitriu and Warlop (2022)
Product involvement	Extension evaluation	Extension evaluations by highly involved consumers benefit more from the positive effect of perceived fit than those by low-involved consumers.	Dens and de Pelsmacker (2010a); Huber *et al.* (2013)
Self-regulatory focus	Extension evaluation	Prevention-focused consumers evaluate high-similarity extensions better than low-similarity ones. There is no difference for promotion-focused consumers.	Yeo and Park (2006)
Situational involvement	Extension evaluation	Highly (lowly) involved consumers evaluate moderately congruent (congruent) extensions better than congruent and incongruent (moderately congruent and incongruent) extensions.	Maoz and Tybout (2002)
Situational involvement x innovativeness	Extension evaluation	Highly (lowly) innovative and involved consumers evaluate moderately similar (similar) extensions higher than similar and dissimilar (moderately similar and dissimilar) ones.	Jung and Tey (2010)
Temporal distance to extension introduction	Extension evaluation	High-fit extensions are rated better than moderate-fit extensions if they are introduced in the far future. Evaluations from extensions that will be introduced in the near future do not vary according to perceived fit.	Kim and John (2008)
Company size	Extension perceived quality	Low-fit extensions stemming from large companies receive higher quality evaluations than those from small companies. There is no difference for high-fit extensions.	Han and Schmitt (1997)
Extension price	Extension perceived quality	Only the perceived quality of dissimilar (not similar) extensions increases as the price rises.	Taylor and Bearden (2002)
Parent brand portfolio relatedness	Extension perceived quality	Decreasing parent brand portfolio relatedness lowers the positive impact of parent brand–extension similarity on the quality of the extension.	Dacin and Smith (1994)
Extension price	Extension perceived value	Price negatively affects the perceived value of similar extensions more than that of dissimilar ones.	Taylor and Bearden (2002)
Parent brand quality	Extension perceived value	Similar (vs. dissimilar) extensions from medium-quality brands receive higher value evaluations. Similarity has no impact on extensions from high-quality brands.	Taylor and Bearden (2002)
Extension purchase risk	Extension price premium	Fit positively affects price premiums when the purchase risk is high. However, fit does not impact price premiums when the risk is low.	DelVecchio and Smith (2005)
Parent brand quality	Extension price premium	The higher the perceived fit, the more the extension price premium is positively affected by the quality of the parent brand.	Sattler *et al.* (2010)
Attachment	Extension purchase intention	Purchase intention of high- and moderate-fit (vs. low-fit) extensions benefits from high (vs. low) attachment.	Fedorkhin *et al.* (2008)
Creativity	Extension purchase intention	Purchase intention of low-fit (vs. high-fit) extensions benefits from creativity.	Wu *et al.* (2015)
Extension authenticity	Extension purchase intention	The greater the similarity or relevance, the higher is the purchase intention of inauthentic extensions. Similarity and relevance both do not affect the purchase intention of authentic extensions.	Spiggle *et al.* (2012)
Extension price	Extension purchase intention	Price negatively affects the purchase intention of similar extensions more strongly than that of dissimilar extensions.	Taylor and Bearden (2002)
Parent brand relationship quality	Extension purchase intention	Consumers with a strong relationship with the brand show higher purchase intentions for moderate-fit extensions than consumers with a weak relationship. This effect is less pronounced for high- or low-fit extensions.	Kim *et al.* (2014)
Competitors' relative brand familiarity	Extension purchase risk	Low-fit (high-fit) extensions whose competitors are less (more) familiar have a lower (higher) purchase risk than low-fit (high-fit) extensions in a noncompetitive environment. Low-fit extensions facing less familiar brands have as high as or lower purchase risk than high-fit extensions facing more familiar brands.	Milberg *et al.* (2010)
Parent brand quality	Extension sales	Parent brand quality has a positive (negative) effect on extensions sales when image fit (functional fit) is high.	Carter and Curry (2013)
Familiarity with the extension	Extension success	The higher the familiarity with the extension, the higher is the positive effect of fit on extension success.	Völckner and Sattler (2006)
Parent brand conviction	Extension success	The higher the perceived fit, the more positive is the impact of parent brand conviction on extension success.	Völckner and Sattler (2006)

Supplementary Table I. Perceived fit as independent variable (8/8)

Interaction effects with fit (4/4)			
Fit x …	**Dependent variable**	**Explanation**	**Article**
Parent brand quality	Extension success	The higher the perceived fit, the more positive is the impact of parent brand quality on extension success.	Völckner and Sattler (2006)
Attachment	Intention to spread positive word of mouth about an extension	The intention to provide favorable word of mouth about high- and moderate-fit (vs. low-fit) extensions benefits from high (vs. low) attachment.	Fedorkhin *et al.* (2008)
Implicit theories	Perceived effort of an extension	Incremental theorists (not entity theorists) rate the perceived effort of a low-fit extension higher than that of a high-fit extensions.	Mathur *et al.* (2012)
Extension performance goal	Perceived performance of an extension	The perceived performance of a high- (low-) similarity extension is higher than that of a low- (high-) similarity extension when consumers aim to purchase a product with a good overall performance (a good performance on a specific attribute).	Dimitriu *et al.* (2017)
Consumption type of an extension	Willingness to pay a premium for an extension	High similarity reinforces the effect that publicly (vs. privately-) consumed extensions result in a higher willingness to pay a premium.	Liu and Hu (2012)
Attachment	Willingness to pay for an extension	The willingness to pay for high- and moderate-fit (low-fit) extensions benefits from high (low) attachment.	Fedorkhin *et al.* (2008)
Extension authenticity	Willingness to recommend the extension	The higher the similarity or relevance, the higher is the willingness to recommend inauthentic extensions. Similarity and relevance both do not impact the willingness to recommend authentic extensions.	Spiggle *et al.* (2012)
	Parent brand–related		
Parent brand dominance	Parent brand categorization	Categorization speed for non-dominant brands is more endorsed when the extension has a high (vs. low) fit. There is no difference for dominant brands.	Morrin (1999)
Extension trial	Parent brand choice	The higher the similarity, the higher is the positive impact of having tried a successful extension on parent brand choice. There is no difference when an unsuccessful extension was tried.	Swaminathan *et al.* (2001)
Parent brand familiarity	Parent brand dilution	High category similarity increases the dilution only for unfamiliar (vs. familiar) brands.	Morrin and Jacoby (2000)
Extension strategy	Parent brand equity	High-fit extensions reduce the dilution effect of extension strategies on parent brand equity.	Buil *et al.* (2009)
Extensions service intensiveness	Parent brand evaluation	Brands of high service-intensive extensions are evaluated better than those of low service-intensive extensions. This effect increases as similarity increases.	Lei *et al.* (2004)
Parent brand architecture	Parent brand evaluation	The negative impact of low category similarity or inconsistent attribute information on parent brand evaluation can be decreased by using a sub-branding (vs. direct) strategy.	Milberg *et al.* (1997)
Situational involvement x innovativeness	Parent brand evaluation	Highly (lowly) innovative and involved consumers evaluate the parent brand of a moderately similar (similar) extension better than that of a similar and dissimilar (moderately similar and dissimilar) one.	Jung and Tey (2010)
Extension evaluation	Parent brand image	A high (low) fit positively (negatively) affects the parent brand image of highly (both high and low) evaluated extensions.	Salinas and Pérez (2009)
Parent brand architecture	Parent brand image	The negative influence of low category similarity or inconsistent attribute information on the parent brand image can be decreased by using a sub-branding (vs. direct) strategy.	Milberg *et al.* (1997)
Implicit theories x extension success	Parent brand personality	Incremental theorists (entity theorists) perceive the parent brand personality to be diluted when a high-fit (both a low- and a high-fit) extension is unsuccessful.	Mathur *et al.* (2012)
Parent brand breadth	Parent brand reliability	The more products are related to the brand, the greater is the beneficial impact of fit on brand reliability.	DelVecchio (2000)
Quality variance of the products affiliated with the parent brand	Parent brand reliability	The higher the quality variance of the brand's products, the weaker is the beneficial impact of fit on brand reliability.	DelVecchio (2000)
Attachment	Willingness to forgive the parent brand	The willingness to forgive the brand of high- and moderate-fit (vs. low-fit) extensions benefits from high (vs. low) attachment.	Fedorkhin *et al.* (2008)

Supplementary Table II. Perceived fit as mediator

Fit as mediator					
Independent variable	**1st mediator**	**2nd mediator**	**Dependent variable**	**Explanation**	**Article**
			Extension-related		
Competition fit			Extension evaluation	The effect of competition fit on extension evaluation is mediated by fit; that is, competition fit negatively affects extension fit, which in turn has a positive influence on extension evaluation.	Peev and Kumar (2023)
Parent brand affect x extension evaluation/similarity measurement order	Fit		Extension evaluation	If consumers are requested to assess the core–extension similarity before the extension evaluation, the positive effect of parent brand affect on extension evaluation is mediated by similarity.	Yeung and Wyer (2005)
Parent brand concept x consumer believability			Extension evaluation	For consumers believing the parent brand introduced the extension, a luxury (vs. performance) parent brand concept leads to higher perceived fit ratings, which in turn increases extension evaluations.	Pontes *et al.* (2024)
Parent brand image			Extension evaluation	The effect of parent brand image on extension evaluation is mediated by perceived category and image fit; that is, the parent brand image has a positive effect on category and image fit, which in turn positively affect extension evaluation.	Salinas and Pérez (2009)
Parent brand price range x attention focus			Extension evaluation	Under conditions of narrow (vs. broad) attention focus, ratings of vertical upward extensions are better when presented in a wide (vs. narrow) price range. Perceived consistency mediates this effect; that is, a wide (vs. narrow) price range results in higher perceived consistency, which creates better extension evaluations.	Pontes (2018)
Marketing support for an extension		Retailer acceptance	Extension success	Both perceived fit and retailer acceptance mediate the effect of marketing support for an extension on extension success; that is, marketing support for an extension positively affects perceived fit, which in turn increases retailer acceptance. High retailer acceptance leads to more successful extensions.	Völckner and Sattler (2006)
			Parent brand–related		
Extension ad art presence	Fit		Parent brand extendibility	The effect of extension ad art presence on the extendibility of the parent brand is mediated by fit; that is, the presence of art positively affects fit, which in turn results in higher parent brand extendibility.	Hagtvedt and Patrick (2008)

Supplementary Table III. Perceived fit as dependent variable

Direct positive effects on fit		
Independent variable	**Explanation**	**Article**
Exposure to the extension	The more frequently the consumer is exposed to the extension, the higher is the perceived fit.	Klink and Smith (2001)
Extension ad art presence	Showing the extension with (vs. without) art has a positive effect on fit.	Hagtvedt and Patrick (2008)
Extension direction	Launching an intermediate extension with the same direction increases the perceived coherence of the following extension.	Dawar and Anderson (1994)
Extension goal	The higher the congruence between the extension's and the parent brand's goal, the higher is the fit.	Martin *et al.* (2005)
Extension type	Line extensions (vs. category extensions) have both higher functional fit and image fit.	Carter and Curry (2013)
Mood	Positive (vs. negative) mood leads to a higher perceived fit.	Barone *et al.* (2000); Sar *et al.* (2011)
Parent brand affect	The higher the parent brand affect, the higher is the fit.	Hill and Lee (2015)
Parent brand buyers	Perceived fit increases with the number of a brand's buyers	Dall'Olmo Riley *et al.* (2014)
Parent brand image	The better the brand's image, the higher is the perceived fit.	Dwivedi *et al.* (2010); Salinas and Pérez (2009)
Parent brand knowledge	The higher the parent brand knowledge, the higher is the fit.	Hill and Lee (2015)

Mediation effects on fit			
Independent variable	**Mediator**	**Explanation**	**Article**
Processing motivation x interdependent self-construal level	Relational elaboration	Only when consumers are highly motivated to process extension information is the positive impact of interdependent self-construal level on perceived fit mediated by relational elaboration; that is, highly interdependent consumers try to overcome the presented incongruity and, as a result, have higher perceived fit perceptions.	Ahluwalia (2008)

Interaction effects on fit		
Independent variable	**Explanation**	**Article**
Dominant parent brand association x extension–parent brand relationship x extension communication strategy	When the relationship between an extension and its brand is attribute-based (not-attribute-based) and the prevailing associations about the brand are non-attribute-based (attribute-based), focusing on the relationship (the extension) in the communication strategy results in higher perceived fit than under conditions with no information.	Bridges *et al.* (2000)
Extension goal x extension ad message	The higher the congruence between the extension's and the parent brand's goal and the stronger the extension ad message transmits brand information to the extension, the higher is the fit.	Martin *et al.* (2005)
Interdependent self-construal level × extension–parent brand relationship	Only the perceived fit perceptions of low- (vs. high-) interdependent consumers benefit from putting the relationship between the extension and the parent brand in focus.	Ahluwalia (2008)
Style of thinking x extension communication frame	Holistic (analytic) thinkers rate the fit of holistic (analytic) presented extensions higher.	Monga and John (2010)
Style of thinking x extension communication strategy	Holistic (vs. analytic) thinkers rate the fit higher when they receive no information about the extension. There is no difference in fit perceptions when elaborative communication is used.	Monga and John (2010)
Style of thinking x parent brand architecture	Holistic (vs. analytic) thinkers rate the fit of extensions stemming from a direct brand higher. There is no difference in fit perceptions when a sub-brand is used.	Monga and John (2010)
Style of thinking x parent brand concept	Holistic (vs. analytic) thinkers rate the fit of extensions stemming from a functional brand higher. There is no difference for prestige brands.	Monga and John (2010)