**Introduction**

Of late, many brands, typically associated with one particular gender, are extending into the opposite gender category using the same brand names (Cross-Gender Brand Extensions).

In the context of gender mediating the information processing strategies in consumption (Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran 1991), it is interesting to study consumer evaluation of cross-gender brand extensions.

**Brand Gender**

Brands are perceived by consumers on a scale of masculine to feminine (Alreck et. al 1982).

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlboro</td>
<td>Virginia Slims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lego</td>
<td>Barbie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidoff</td>
<td>Lancôme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cross- Gender Brand Extensions**

Example: Ponds → Ponds for Men  
Dove → Dove for Men

The gender, of the brand and of the consumers, product type, and direction of the brand extension influence the evaluation of cross-gender extensions (Jung and Lee 2006).

A more positive attitude is likely for an extension from a masculine brand to the feminine category, than from a feminine brand to the masculine category (Jung and Lee 2006).

Marketers want to know the conditions that can increase the chances of success of this increasingly popular strategy.

**Information Processing**

Females’ processing entails detailed elaboration of message content, males processing driven by overall message themes or schemas (Meyers-Levy and Maheswaran 1991).

**Research Questions**

Question 1: How do the gender-different information processing strategies apply differently to the evaluation of cross-gender brand extensions?

Question 2: Does the gender of a successful cross-gender evaluation mediate the attitude towards the parent brand, post the extension?
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