An Empirical Study of Brand Image, Usage and Familiarity among Indian Users: A Factor Analytic Approach

Saurabh Grover*

Abstract

Purpose - This paper is to analyze and compare the branding strategies followed by various manufacturers. The core objectives of the study are to find out the factors that makes brand name familiar and also to examine the relationship between brand image and brand usage.

Design and Methodology - Based on the literature review, various statements have been designed to reach the set objectives. Database of 250 respondents have been selected on the basis of judgmental cum random sampling technique. Factor Analysis has been used for the data reduction and factors have been described in detail.

Findings - This study depicted the impact of the different variables on consumer's perception towards brands. The factors with more value of variance had a high impact and vice versa. Further this study showed the same matching results as of Leo Bogart and Charles Lehman (1973)- a positive correlation between a good class product and its purchase frequency.

Practical Implications – The paper offers insights for designing branding strategies when branding a product/ service.

Originality / Value – This study adds value to the growing body of literature on branding strategies by identifying a more comprehensive and simplistic list of branding strategies.

Keywords: Brand, Family Brand, Factor Analysis, Branding Strategies

A brand can be defined as "the name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors" (Kotler, 1991, p. 442). Brands can be among a company's most valuable assets. In their classic paper, Gardner and Levy (1955) contend that the long term success of a brand is contingent upon the proper selection and operationalization of brand meaning prior to market entry. Brand meaning can be conveyed by both brand name (Keller et al., 1998; Robertson, 1989) and brand mark (Henderson and Cote, 1998; Robertson, 1989; Vartorella, 1990). However, no research to date has looked at how to create branding elements that together communicate consistent brand meaning. (Klink Richard R., 2003).

Brand names are the visible, symbolic expression of a competitive economy, and product advertising is virtually inconceivable without them. The leading brand of any product usually enjoys both familiarity and salience out of proportion to its market share, if only because at least some who accept it as the leader will pick a secondary brand for price or other reasons at the time of decision. (Bogart Leo and Lehman Charles, 1973). Conveying a brand image to a target population is a vital part of marketing (Park, Jaworski, & Maclnnis, 1986).

Brands are valuable assets to an organization and can be combined with other brands. Collaborating partners may combine partners' preexisting brands creating a brand alliance. They may also present a completely new offering with its own unique brand, what we call a collaboration brand, as well as maintain their own unique brands, referred to here as partner brands. (Tschirhart Mary, Christensen Robert K. and Perry James L. (2005)).

Review of Literature

Bogart Leo and Lehman Charles (1973) reported a study of unaided brand recall by female household heads and examined some factors related to brand salience. They examined the brand awareness that arises from the large, heterogeneous, and haphazard outpouring of diversified advertising messages. Brands, we reasoned, exist as psychological symbols that compete with other brands in totally different product field.

* Assistant Professor, Khalsa College for Women, Punjab, India. Email: saurabhgrover1985@gmail.com

Keller Kevin Lane (1993) presented a conceptual model of brand equity from the perspective of the individual consumer. This article introduced the concept of customer-based brand equity, defined as the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand. The article also explored some specific aspects of this conceptualization by considering how customer-based brand equity is built, measured, and managed.

Milberg Sandra J., Park Whan C. and McCarthy Michael S. (1997) investigated the relation between alternative brand extension strategies and negative feedback effects of such extensions. They examined situations in which extensions may dilute family brand beliefs and create negative affect and how a sub-branding strategy (a new brand name in conjunction with a family brand name) may mitigate these effects. They found negative feedback effects when (a) extensions are perceived as belonging to a product category dissimilar from those associated with the family brand and (b) extension attribute information is inconsistent with image beliefs associated with the family brand. The results indicated that consumer beliefs regarding the manufacturing competency varied by type of branding strategy.

Chaudhuri Arjun (1999) used a causal modeling approach to analyze the direct and indirect influences of brand attitudes, habit and brand loyalty on brand equity outcomes such as market share, shelf facings and price. Results indicated that brand attitudes are directly and indirectly related to market share and shelf facings but only indirectly related to price, with the indirect path occurring through brand loyalty. The results of both studies indicate that managers may choose to position their brand as a "liked" brand towards which consumers have an overall favorable disposition but no strong sense of commitment.

Buchanan Lauranne, Simmons Carolyn J. and Bickart Barbara A. (1999) demonstrated that the retailer's display decisions can negate the equity of an established brand. The objective of this research is to examine whether the equity of an established brand can be influenced by context, in particular, by the retailers presentation of the brand. To summarize, their results show that high-equity brand valuations can be influenced by presentation context, and thus, they validate the concerns of industry informants.

Faircloth James B., Capella Louis M. and Alford Bruce L. (2001) reported a study which operationalizes brand equity and empirically tests a conceptual model adapted from the work of Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) considering the effect of brand attitude and brand image on brand equity. This study demonstrated that brand image and brand attitude, direct and indirect antecedents to brand equity are subject to a marketer's manipulation through the marketing mix. The results suggested that focusing on the constructs that create brand equity is more relevant to managers than trying to measure it as an aggregated financial performance outcome.

Ailawadi Kusum L., Lehmann Donald R. and Neslin Scott A. (2003) proposed that the revenue premium a brand generates compared with that of a private label product is a simple, objective, and managerially useful product-market measure of brand equity. They proposed revenue premium as a measure of brand equity, discussed its theoretical underpinnings, and validated the measure. Revenue premium is conceptually grounded in the fundamental definition of brand equity and theoretically grounded as the equilibrium outcome of a competitive marketplace.

Hsieh Ming-Huei (2004) presented a newly developed survey-based method for the measurement of customer-based brand equity in a cross national context. The proposed national brand equity (NBE) model decomposes customer-based brand equity into two components: measured and unmeasured brand equity. This article had also introduced a new methodological approach, based on the NBE model, for the measurement of GBE. Expansion of the perspective to include global markets offers two managerial insights for global brand management.

Srinivasan V., Park Chan Su and Chang Dae Ryun (2005) proposed a new approach for measuring, analyzing, and predicting a brand's equity in a product market. This approach took into account three sources of brand equity-brand awareness, attribute perception biases, and non-attribute preference and reveals how much each of the three sources contributes to brand equity. The method provided what-if analysis capabilities to predict the likely impacts of alternative strategies to enhance a brand's equity. The survey-based results from applying the method to the digital cellular phone market in Korea show that the proposed approach has good face validity and convergent validity, with brand awareness playing the largest role, followed by non-attribute preference.

Faircloth James B. (2005) examined the influence of antecedent factors on resource provider (volunteers and donors) based brand equity for a nonprofit organization. The study, utilizing a telephone survey, applied brand equity for the first time to the nonprofit sector and provides initial empirical evidence of the multidimensional influence of brand personality, brand image, and brand awareness antecedents of the resource providers' biased decision to support the nonprofit organization after controlling for the influence of altruistic volunteerism. The results of this study suggested the relevance of the brand equity construct as a tool for managers in nonprofit organizations coping with scarce resources.

Thompson Craig J., Rindfleisch Aric and Arsel Zeynep (2006) argued that emotional-branding strategies are conducive to the emergence of a doppelganger brand image, which is defined as a family of disparaging images and meanings about a brand that circulate throughout popular culture. The authors discussed how the tenets of emotional branding paradoxically encourage the formation and propagation of doppelganger brand imagery. Their analysis suggested that consumers avoid brands when their emotional branding promises are viewed as inauthentic and, emotional branding strategies succeeded when they can function as an authenticating narrative for consumers' identity project.

Roehm Michelle L. and Brady Michael K. (2007) conducted two experiments to explore conditions that mitigate negative customer reactions to high-equity brand failures. The results are consistent with their expectations regarding brand equity, distractions, and reactions to performance failure. When it comes to performance failures, brand equity may offer mixed blessings in shaping consumers' responses. However, their ability to draw any strong conclusions about low-equity brands is hindered by the dangers of over interpreting null effects.

Sriram S., Balachander Subramanian and Kalwani Manohar U. (2007) evaluated the usefulness of brand equity estimates obtained from store-level data for monitoring the health of a brand. Their analysis reveals that reliable estimates of brand equity can be obtained from store-level sales data, which marketing practitioners in packaged goods firms often use to monitor a brand's performance, estimate price elasticity, and perform various other analyses (Bucklin and Gupta 1999). The results revealed that new product innovations have a positive impact on brand equity and can explain a significant proportion of its variation.

Ham Peter van (2008) examined the relevance of place branding as a political phenomenon in international politics. He mapped out the connections between branding and international politics by looking at three examples. First, He examined the challenges facing the European Union to strengthen its image as a global player. Second, He analyzed the efforts of the United States to deal with its collapsing image in the aftermath of its failing "war on terror" and military intervention in Iraq. Third, He examined negative place branding by focusing on the Borat movie that upset Kazakhstan in 2006 and the cartoon crisis that erupted in Denmark in September 2005. This article also aimed to situate the practice of place branding in a broader analytical context.

Lim Wei Shi and TanSoo-Jiuan (2009) through formal game theoretic analysis, showed that in addition to learning, outsourcing firms could also make use of brand equity to safeguard themselves from the threat of potential market entry by their outsourcing suppliers when the outsourced component is a core competence, particularly when the rate of learning is at best moderate. In terms of managerial implications, the flexible outsourcing strategy derived in their framework is in line with what the consultants proposed as "dynamic sourcing," (Gottfredson et al. 2005). In addition, they showed that it may be optimal for outsourcing firms to adopt a make-and-buy strategy.

Chen Shih-Fen S. (2009) took a transaction cost approach to explore the coincidence of private branding with offshore outsourcing - two retail trends that have attracted substantial attention but have never been analyzed concurrently. Data obtained from a national chain reveal that the retailer is more likely to brand a product that needs its marketing efforts, but less motivated to outsource the product offshore before putting a private brand on it. The key finding in this study is that the investment made by retailers in product marketing is positively associated with private branding.

Lai Chi-Shiun, Chiu Chih-Jen, Yang Chin-Fang and Pai Da-Chang (2010) discussed CSR from customers' viewpoints by taking the sample of industrial purchasers from Taiwan small-medium enterprises. The aims of this study are to investigate: first, the effects of CSR and corporate reputation on industrial brand equity; second, the effects of CSR, corporate reputation, and brand equity on brand performance; and third, the mediating effects of corporate reputation and industrial brand equity on the relationship between CSR and brand performance .The empirical results supported their hypotheses and indicated that CSR and corporate reputation have positive effects on industrial brand equity and brand performance.

Chen Yu-Shan (2010*)* explored the positive relationships between green brand equity and its three drivers - green brand image, green satisfaction, and green trust. The object of this research study was information and electronics products in Taiwan. This research employed an empirical study by use of the questionnaire survey method. The results showed that green brand image, green satisfaction, and green trust are positively related to green brand equity.

Need of the Study and Methodology

This study provides a framework for various brand attributes and consumer's perception towards it. A company's brand ensures their value can stand out from their competitors, It also helps that company "get found" when a customer is shopping. This study is required to find out the different variables that makes a brand popular. Further the study is needed to find relationship between various brand attributes. Following are the objectives of the present study.

1. To find out the factors that makes brand name familiar.
2. To examine the relationship between brand image & brand usage.

For conducting research primary data has been opted i.e. use of questionnaire which has been answered by the 250 respondents according to their judgments. Respondents were from different age groups, different educational backgrounds and belong to different occupations having different income levels and secondary data were used from various journals and internet.

Factor analysis is used in this study. It is a procedure that takes a large number of variables or objects and searches if they have a small number of factors in common which account for their correlation. It is a procedure primarily used for data reduction and summarization (Malhotra 2004).

Data Analysis & Interpretation (Objective 1)

Factor analysis is a statistical method used to describe variability among observed variables in terms of potentially lower number of unabsorbed variables called factors. In other words, it is possible for example, that two or three observed variables together represent another, unabsorbed variable, and factor analysis searches for these possible combinations. The observed variables are modeled as linear combinations of the potential factors, plus "error" terms. The information gained about the interdependencies between observed variables can be used later to reduce the set of variables in a dataset. Factor analysis originated in psychometrics, and is used in behavioral sciences, social sciences, marketing, product management, operations research, and other applied sciences that deal with large quantities of data.

Table 1

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.509
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1744.747
	df	496
	Sig.	.000

This measures the normality of the distribution. As value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin is >.5 (i.e. 509) and sig. value of Bartlett's Test is <.05 (i.e .000) which signifies that distribution is normal.

Table 2

Total Variance Explained									
Component	*Initial Eigenvalues*			*Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings*			*Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings*		
	Total	*% of Variance*	*Cumulative %*	*Total*	*% of Variance*	*Cumulative %*	*Total*	*% of Variance*	*Cumulative %*
1	3.350	10.469	10.469	3.350	10.469	10.469	1.858	5.808	5.808
2	2.260	7.063	17.532	2.260	7.063	17.532	1.810	5.656	11.464
3	1.972	6.162	23.694	1.972	6.162	23.694	1.728	5.399	16.863

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
4	1.790	5.592	29.286	1.790	5.592	29.286	1.703	5.323	22.186
5	1.612	5.036	34.322	1.612	5.036	34.322	1.640	5.124	27.310
6	1.562	4.882	39.204	1.562	4.882	39.204	1.607	5.021	32.331
7	1.474	4.607	43.811	1.474	4.607	43.811	1.598	4.994	37.326
8	1.435	4.484	48.295	1.435	4.484	48.295	1.587	4.959	42.284
9	1.294	4.044	52.339	1.294	4.044	52.339	1.561	4.877	47.161
10	1.267	3.959	56.297	1.267	3.959	56.297	1.556	4.862	52.023
11	1.202	3.756	60.054	1.202	3.756	60.054	1.516	4.738	56.762
12	1.150	3.594	63.648	1.150	3.594	63.648	1.458	4.557	61.319
13	1.080	3.373	67.021	1.080	3.373	67.021	1.436	4.488	65.806
14	1.027	3.210	70.231	1.027	3.210	70.231	1.416	4.425	70.231
15	.965	3.014	73.245						
16	.936	2.924	76.169						
17	.842	2.632	78.801						
18	.818	2.555	81.357						
19	.737	2.304	83.661						
20	.652	2.036	85.697						
21	.561	1.752	87.449						
22	.525	1.640	89.089						
23	.484	1.511	90.600						
24	.448	1.399	91.999						
25	.422	1.319	93.318						
26	.385	1.202	94.520						
27	.364	1.138	95.658						
28	.348	1.089	96.747						
29	.300	.939	97.685						
30	.275	.860	98.545						
31	.246	.768	99.313						
32	.220	.687	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

There are 14 variables with eigenvalues greater than 1, and they account almost 70% of the total variance, from which 8 variables have variance less than 50% that is in significant and next 6 variables have variance greater than 50% that is significant.

Table 3

Rotated Component Matrix[a]														
	Component													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Variable 1	.105	-.291	-.032	-.054	.020	.011	-.025	-.013	.030	-.159	.009	-.182	**.715**	.091
Variable2	-.033	.190	.032	.114	-.001	-.055	.032	-.025	.036	.104	-.021	.088	**.844**	-.114

Rotated Component Matrix[a]														
	Component													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Variable3	-.169	**.592**	.091	.115	.095	.042	-.010	-.016	-.211	.155	-.043	.042	.198	**.451**
Variable4	.040	-.069	.028	.086	.024	-.061	.010	.031	.116	.050	.039	.070	-.069	**.871**
Variable5	-.010	-.076	.151	.183	.130	-.052	-.047	.015	**.734**	.087	-.037	-.088	-.003	.159
Variable6	-.022	**.523**	.240	.147	.109	-.134	-.107	-.089	**.516**	.096	.055	.043	.083	-.249
Variable7	.132	**.819**	.033	.017	-.042	.023	.085	.050	-.039	-.077	.030	-.026	-.110	-.090
Variable8	.040	.238	.107	.136	-.125	.032	**.737**	.080	-.020	-.085	.180	-.140	-.009	.048
Variable9	-.175	-.281	.363	.094	.082	.180	**.555**	-.029	.172	.016	.189	.004	-.006	-.162
Variable10	-.053	-.059	**.765**	-.013	.181	.046	.299	-.089	.057	.040	.060	.194	-.077	-.015
Variable11	.203	.201	**.731**	.086	-.076	.047	-.056	.129	-.008	-.011	.140	-.041	.057	.066
Variable12	.149	.064	**.402**	.331	-.346	.177	-.162	.228	.251	-.012	.080	-.108	.193	.218
Variable13	-.041	-.017	.088	**.753**	-.134	.179	.075	.061	.261	-.052	-.068	.046	.031	.148
Variable14	-.077	.130	.016	**.769**	.181	-.097	.159	-.103	.006	.083	.157	.060	.044	-.027
Variable15	.057	.057	.171	.282	.211	-.179	.089	.009	-.111	.004	**.730**	-.026	-.036	.069
Variable16	-.009	-.019	.064	-.104	-.053	.288	.062	-.013	.078	.036	**.826**	.034	.015	-.014
Variable17	-.091	-.006	-.019	.003	.033	**.833**	.145	.059	.036	.070	.186	.091	.019	-.082
Variable18	.305	.019	.158	.078	.221	**.723**	-.107	-.092	-.066	-.069	-.080	.008	-.091	.045
Variable19	**.766**	.126	.102	.018	.035	.205	-.121	.012	-.014	.007	.014	.079	-.118	.003
Variable20	**.643**	.130	-.107	-.143	-.119	-.073	.148	.096	.258	.118	.081	.226	.164	-.040
Variable21	.079	-.101	-.271	.014	.035	.127	.253	.089	**.482**	-.061	.025	.147	.063	.014
Variable22	.145	-.120	.006	.144	**.565**	.111	-.012	-.037	.077	-.023	.109	.220	.034	-.053
Variable23	.166	-.079	-.052	.307	.335	-.055	-.202	**.434**	-.235	.248	-.049	.010	-.132	-.332
Variable24	.059	.059	.039	.058	-.063	-.044	.021	**.799**	-.028	.327	.073	-.011	-.043	-.082
Variable25	-.024	-.021	.034	-.173	.178	.056	.139	**.720**	.153	-.221	-.101	.213	.032	.213
Variable26	-.067	.233	.068	-.117	**.666**	.157	.089	.246	.191	-.124	-.021	-.164	.018	.152
Variable27	.225	.033	.071	-.007	**.459**	.092	-.214	-.018	.047	**.520**	.164	-.343	-.051	.048
Variable28	.054	-.010	.018	.023	-.112	.007	.078	.137	.050	**.827**	.015	.159	-.008	.045
Variable29	.041	.064	.084	.016	-.030	.100	-.073	.065	.108	.244	-.054	**.820**	-.061	.125
Variable30	.260	-.098	.024	.139	.180	.020	-.097	.112	-.228	-.255	.146	**.540**	-.020	-.052
Variable31	**.573**	-.200	.135	-.048	.239	-.066	.189	-.005	-.124	.091	-.037	-.085	.123	.035
Variable32	.266	-.048	-.086	.085	.170	-.059	**.509**	.048	.014	.321	-.181	-.001	.031	.080

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Factors Influencing Brand Name and Its Familiarity

Table 4

Factors	Loadings	Variables
Factor 1 (External factors & after sale service)	.766 .643 .573	19- Brand's fame depends on Consumer psychology. 20- Competition makes brand familiar. 31-After sale service of the brand makes it known.
Factor 2 (Brand attractiveness & purchase decision)	.592 .523 .819	3-Brand familiarity depends on the purchase frequency. 6- Logos of the brand makes it familiar. 7- Packaging makes brand name familiar.

Factors	*Loadings*	*Variables*
Factor 3 (Brand status and usage)	.765 .731 .402	10-Cost of the brand affects its popularity. 11- Brand that others are using usually become familiar. 12- Brand equity makes the brand more popular.
Factor 4 (Features of brand)	.753 .769	13-Brand familiarity depends on its comforTable level. 14- Durability & reliability of the brand affects its fame.
Factor 5 (Brand perception and service provided)	.565 .666 .459	22-Brand ambassador makes brand familiar. 26- Nature of the product makes the brand known. 27- Word of mouth affects the fame of the brand.
Factor 6 (Consumer's semantics)	.833 .723	17- Financial sources of a person make him known to a brand. 18- Trust & confidence in the brand makes it popular.
Factor 7 (Market related variables)	.737 .555 .509	8- Brand's fame depends on the location of the store. 9- Trend in the market makes brand familiar. 32- C.S.R activities by the brand make it popular.
Factor 8 (Awareness and quality)	.434 .799 .720	23- When I am using brand then only I am aware what other are using. 24- Knowledge makes brand popular. 25-Quality element makes branded product familiar than non-branded.
Factor 9 (Brand exposure)	.734 .516 .482	5-Window display of the brand makes it familiar. 6- Logos of the brand makes it familiar. 21- Friend circle makes brand familiar.
Factor 10 (Services offered and its effect)	.520 .827	27- Word of mouth affects the fame of the brand. 28- Free gifts, discount makes the brand known.
Factor 11 (Image and status)	.730 .826	15- Status symbol of a person makes the brand popular. 16- Image of the brand makes it known.
Factor 12 (Exposure & ease)	.820 .540	29- Hoardings, bill board makes the brand name familiar. 30- Ease of access to the store makes the brand familiar.
Factor 13 (Media & brand awareness)	.715.844	1- Brand awareness makes brand familiar. 2- Advertisement makes brand name familiar.
Factor 14 (Recall & purchase)	.451 .871	3- Brand familiarity depends on the purchase frequency. 4- Recall and repetition makes brand familiar.

Data Analysis & Interpretation (Objective 2)

Table 5

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.505
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2064.078
	df	465
	Sig.	.000

As the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinis>.5(i.e.505)and sig. value of Bartlett's Test is <.05(i.e .000) which signifies that distribution is normal.

Table 6

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.831	12.359	12.359	3.831	12.359	12.359	1.907	6.151	6.151
2	2.096	6.761	19.120	2.096	6.761	19.120	1.822	5.877	12.028
3	1.936	6.245	25.365	1.936	6.245	25.365	1.739	5.609	17.637
4	1.801	5.810	31.175	1.801	5.810	31.175	1.738	5.606	23.243
5	1.739	5.610	36.785	1.739	5.610	36.785	1.727	5.571	28.814
6	1.586	5.116	41.901	1.586	5.116	41.901	1.711	5.520	34.335
7	1.514	4.885	46.786	1.514	4.885	46.786	1.673	5.397	39.731
8	1.442	4.651	51.436	1.442	4.651	51.436	1.673	5.396	45.127
9	1.302	4.201	55.638	1.302	4.201	55.638	1.654	5.337	50.464
10	1.270	4.097	59.735	1.270	4.097	59.735	1.592	5.136	55.600
11	1.221	3.939	63.673	1.221	3.939	63.673	1.590	5.130	60.730
12	1.131	3.647	67.321	1.131	3.647	67.321	1.584	5.109	65.839
13	1.044	3.367	70.687	1.044	3.367	70.687	1.503	4.848	70.687
14	.972	3.136	73.824						
15	.926	2.988	76.812						
16	.870	2.807	79.619						
17	.805	2.595	82.214						
18	.764	2.465	84.679						
19	.617	1.989	86.669						
20	.544	1.756	88.425						
21	.478	1.542	89.966						
22	.469	1.512	91.479						
23	.419	1.351	92.829						
24	.403	1.301	94.130						
25	.361	1.164	95.294						
26	.295	.953	96.247						
27	.283	.911	97.158						
28	.262	.844	98.002						
29	.215	.693	98.696						
30	.204	.657	99.353						
31	.201	.647	100.000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

There are 13 variables with eigen values greater than 1, and they account almost 70% of the total variance from which 7 variables have variance less than 50% that is insignificant and next 6 variables have variance greater than 50% that is significant.

Table 7

Rotated Component Matrix													
	Component												
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*
VAR00001	-.044	.033	-.169	-.002	.054	-.093	**.717**	.040	.101	-.166	-.147	-.170	.062
VAR00002	-.015	-.031	.091	.029	-.047	.067	**.863**	-.099	-.036	-.026	.121	.055	.017
VAR00003	-.027	-.102	.336	-.054	-.075	.156	.385	.159	-.185	.220	-.001	**.473**	-.161
VAR00004	.138	.027	.204	.032	.190	-.005	-.063	**.759**	-.050	-.108	-.120	.138	-.105
VAR00005	.289	.103	.206	-.076	.081	-.015	-.090	**.609**	.142	-.068	.292	-.154	-.010
VAR00006	.248	.093	.098	-.030	.064	.106	.040	.068	.158	-.014	**.788**	-.088	-.035
VAR00007	-.045	.001	-.014	.060	.064	-.019	-.038	-.055	-.008	.188	**.640**	**.544**	-.074
VAR00008	.089	.046	-.032	.037	.103	-.013	-.102	.004	.196	-.108	-.001	**.815**	.104
VAR00009	.162	.183	-.001	-.160	.070	**.518**	-.091	.007	.308	-.111	-.308	.371	.103
VAR00010	.077	.017	.103	-.140	.071	**.835**	.060	.000	.102	-.010	.040	-.024	.041
VAR00011	.134	-.160	.063	.185	.057	**.675**	-.036	.027	-.133	.190	.158	-.002	-.133
VAR00012	**.613**	-.274	-.009	.256	.197	.083	-.078	.048	-.124	.041	.032	.250	-.051
VAR00013	**.876**	.052	.006	.024	.033	.060	-.038	.076	.082	.075	.047	.055	.071
VAR00014	**.631**	.144	-.074	-.036	-.232	.254	.055	.166	.033	-.141	.226	-.171	.157
VAR00015	-.058	.125	-.212	.335	-.120	.282	-.206	.260	-.055	-.346	**.405**	.033	.247
VAR00016	-.121	-.044	-.014	.095	**.777**	.164	-.068	.188	-.041	-.085	.045	.134	.144
VAR00017	.149	.232	-.018	-.183	**.754**	.006	.095	.036	.164	.077	.020	-.019	-.204
VAR00018	.088	**.480**	.016	.218	.281	.018	.185	.023	.211	.107	.003	-.151	-.494
VAR00019	.022	.139	.092	**.839**	-.189	-.004	.032	.083	-.033	.043	.044	-.041	-.158
VAR00020	.147	-.137	.185	**.716**	.220	-.085	-.003	-.017	.159	.011	-.038	.094	.221
VAR00021	.141	**.499**	.188	.101	.389	-.066	-.182	-.084	.060	.073	.147	.072	.256
VAR00022	-.050	**.767**	.034	.018	.067	-.033	.026	.205	-.025	.199	.077	.030	.107
VAR00023	-.113	.086	-.280	.235	-.075	.096	.116	**.587**	.128	.383	.065	-.021	.165
VAR00024	.041	-.501	.010	.213	.142	.020	.126	.340	**.403**	.288	.116	-.047	.181
VAR00025	.015	-.085	.036	.075	.072	.017	.039	.062	**.857**	.098	.070	.146	.057
VAR00026	.034	.312	**.447**	-.052	.000	.103	-.050	-.001	**.543**	.070	.131	.017	-.173
VAR00027	-.029	.126	**.755**	.112	-.051	.074	-.059	.071	.175	.020	-.010	-.011	.020
VAR00028	-.017	-.085	**.682**	.143	.074	.062	.053	.114	-.084	-.012	.075	.022	.345
VAR00029	.139	.132	.182	.034	.036	-.030	.094	-.016	.064	.117	-.065	.013	**.745**
VAR00030	.101	.220	.011	-.024	.033	.123	.058	-.033	.138	**.643**	.049	-.038	.299
VAR00031	-.035	.032	.024	.044	-.023	-.001	-.200	.003	.025	**.716**	.008	.012	-.080

Factors Influencing Brand Image and Usage

Table 8

FACTORS	*LOADINGS*	*VARIABLES*
Factor 1 (Purchasing and retention)	.613 .876 .631	12- Purchase frequency depends on the image of the brand. 13- My loyalty depends on image of the brand. 14- Brand ambassador affects its image.

Factor 2 (Nature & service of the brand)	.480 .499 .767	18- Brand usage & image depends on nature of the person (follower or leader). 21- Once negative image is formed about the brand it is difficult to continue using it. 22- Brand image & its usage depend on the after sale services provided.
Factor 3 (Brand characteristics and its trustworthiness)	.447 .755 .682	26- Trust & confidence increase its usage. 27- Quality of the brand affects its image. 28- Usage of the brand depends on its durability & reliability.
Factor 4 (Trend & ease)	.839 .716	19- Trend in the market affects its usage. 20- Location of the store affects the usage of the brand.
Factor 5 (Quality and consumer's resources)	.777 .754	16-Person with less financial resources have negative about the brand. 17- One who prefer quantity than quality have negative image about the brand.
Factor 6 (Exposure & consumer's dynamics)	.518 .835 .675	9- Brand usage is affected by my pocket money. 10- High equity brands have good usage & image. 11- Advertisement affects the image & usage of the brand.
Factor 7 (Usage & image)	.717 .863	1- One who uses the brand knows the image of brand. 2- Person who uses the brand, express his views on brand.
Factor 8 (consumer attitude & brand image)	.759 .609 .587	4- Brand image & consumer attitude are directly related to each other. 5- When I am using the brand then only I am aware about what others are using. 23- Brand usage depends on what others are using.
Factor 9 (Brand attractiveness & consumer's Awareness)	.403 .857 .543	24- Packaging affects the brand image. 25- Brand image & usage depends on brand awareness. 26- Trust & confidence increase its usage.
Factor 10 (Exposure and activities of brand)	.643 .716	30- Hoardings, bill boards affect brand image & usage. 31- Image of the brand depends on its C.S.R activities.
Factor 11 (Brand image and perception)	.788 .640 .405	6- We use the brand with good image. 7- Word of mouth about the brand affects its image & usage. 15- Non users of the brand have negative image about the brand.
Factor 12 (Pricing & image of brand)	.473 .544 .815	3- More we use the brand more we are clear about its image. 7- Word of mouth about the brand affects its image & usage. 8- Price of the brand affects its usage & image.
Factor 13 (Social factors)	.745	29- My friend circle affects the image & usage of the brand.

Findings (Objective 1)

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin is >.5 (i.e. 509) and sig. value of Bartlett's Test is <.05 (i.e .000) which signifies that distribution is normal.

There are 14 variables with eigen values greater than 1, and they account almost 70% of the total variance .from which 8 variables have variance less than 50% that is insignificant and next 6 variables have variance greater than 50% that is significant.

- F1 includes Consumer psychology, Competition, After sale service, This factor contributes 10.469 of the variance. These makes brand name more familiar and also influence its preference.
- F2 includes purchase frequency, Logos, Packaging. This factor contributes 7.063 of the variance. The Pearsonian correlation between brand mentions in a

product class and purchase frequency was +.96, although this extraordinarily high aggregate relationship masks some substantial variation. (Leo Bogart and Charles Lehman (1973)).

- F3 includes Cost of the brand, Brand used by others, Brand equity, this factor contributes 6.162 of the variance. These increase the preference of the brand, and usage of the brand.
- F4 includes Comfortable level, Durability & reliability. This factor contributes 5.592 of the variance. These raise the fame of the brand and its preference also and ultimately its image.
- F5 includes Brand ambassador; Nature of the product, Word of mouth. This factor contributes 5.036 of the variance. These influence use and fame of the brand, and affect its image also.
- F6 includes - Financial sources, Trust & confidence. This factor contributes 4.882 of the variance. These raises the preference of the brand, and make it familiar.
- F7 includes location of the store; Trend in the market, C.S.R activities, This factor contributes 4.607 of the variance. These makes the brand more familiar.
- F8 includes Usage makes aware, Knowledge, Quality element. This factor contributes 4.484 of the variance. These positively affect the brand preference among consumers.
- F9 includes - Window display, Logos, Friend circle. This factor contributes 4.044 of the variance. These positively makes the brand familiar among the consumers.
- F10 includes Word of mouth, Free gifts, discount. This factor contributes 3.959 of the variance. These effect the usage and fame of the brand, and makes it popular.
- F11 includes - Status symbol, Image of the brand. This factor contributes 3.756 of the variance. These makes the brand more popular and familiar among consumers.
- F12 includes Hoardings, bill board, Ease of access to the store. This factor contributes 3.594 of the variance. These positively affect the fame and preference of the brand.
- F13 includes Brand awareness, Advertisement. This factor contributes 3.373 of the variance. A strong correlation (+.77) between the number of product mentions and the size of the product category's advertising investment was found, products whose brands were familiar usually had a lot of advertising behind them. (Leo Bogart and Charles Lehman (1973)).
- F14 includes Purchase frequency, Recall and repetition. This factor contributes 3.210 of the variance. variations in recall were predictable. Women aged 50 and over named fewer brands (21, on the average) than did younger and middle-aged house- wives (who named 29). Better educated women recalled more brands, as might be expected (Leo Bogart and Charles Lehman (1973)).

Recommendations (Objectives 1)

- After sale services should be given more emphasis by the company in this era of cut-throat competition,to have a positive edge over other brands and a positive influence over consumer psychology.
- There should be an appealing packaging technique used by the company and also effective logos should be used to increase the purchase frequency of the consumers.
- Cost of the brand should not be much higher or beyond the range of the user in order to win good brand equity.
- Brand should be comfortable, reliable, durable enough to win the confidence of the consumers.
- Brand ambassador should be an appealing personality and serious face, brand should be of good nature to have a positive word of mouth.
- Brand price should be ranged keeping in view the middleman to make it able to be used more and winning trust and confidence of the user.
- Location of the store should be convenient to the user and brand should be according to the trend in the market, company should also emphasize on the C.S.R activities.
- Quality of the brand should be kept superior to raise the usage of the brand and knowledge of user about the brand.
- Window display of the brand should be much attractive and effective.

- Free gifts and discount should be given in order to raise the sale and consumers.
- Image of the brand should be positive and high in order to signify the status symbol of the consumers.
- Hoardings and bill boards should be used and should be attractive enough to grasp the attention and interest of the consumers.
- Advertisements of the brand should be effective enough to arouse the interest and awareness about the brand.

Findings (Objective 2)

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin is >.5 (i.e. 505) and sig. value of Bartlett's Test is <.05 (i.e. .000) which signifies that distribution is normal.

There are 13 variables with Eigen values greater than 1, and they account almost 70% of the total variance, from which 7 variables have variance less than 50% that is insignificant and next 6 variables have variance greater than 50% that is significant.

- F1 includes Purchase frequency, loyalty; Brand ambassador. This factor contributes 12.359 of the variance. These variables raise brand image and usage among the consumers.
- F2 includes Nature of the person, Negative image reduce usage, after sale services. This factor contributes 6.761 of the variance. These variables effect the usage of the brand and its image also.
- F3 includes Trust & confidence, Quality of the brand, Durability & reliability. This factor contributes 6.245 of the variance. These raises the image of the brand and hence its usage.
- F4 includes Trend in the market, Location of the store. This factor contributes 5.810 of the variance. These raises the usage of the brand and hence its image also.
- F5 includes Financial resources, Quality. This factor contributes 5.610 of the variance. These effect the use of the brand among the consumers.
- F6 includes Pocket money, High equity, Advertisement. This factor contributes 5.116 of the variance, These effect the usage of brand in both manner and ultimately its image.
- F7 includes User of the brand, User express views. This factor contributes 4.885 of the variance. These are positively related with image of the brand.
- F8 includes Brand image & consumer attitude, Usage makes aware about others, what others are using. This factor contributes 4.651 of the variance. These are positively related with image of brand.
- F9 includes Packaging, Brand awareness, Trust & confidence. This factor contributes
- 4.201 of the variance. These raise image and usage of the brand among the consumers.
- F10 includes Hoardings, bill boards, C.S.R activities. This factor contributes 4.097 of the variance. These influence image and usage of the brand positively.
- F11 includes Good image, Word of mouth, Non users have negative image. This factor contributes 3.939 of the variance. These effect both image and usage of the brand among the users.
- F12 includes Usage increase image, Word of mouth, Price of the brand. This factor contributes 3.647 of the variance. These effect usage and image also among consumers.
- F13 includes Friend circle. This factor contributes 3.367 of the variance. This positively affect the usage and image of the brand among the consumers.

Recommendations (Objective 2)

- Brand ambassador should be an appealing personality and serious face to raise the purchase frequency and loyalty of the consumers.
- After sale services should be given more emphasis by the company in this era of cut-throat competition, to have a positive edge over other brands and to make positive image in the mind of consumers.
- Brand should be comfortable, reliable, durable enough to win the trust and confidence of the consumers and Quality of the brand should be kept superior to raise the usage of the brand.
- Location of the store should be convenient to the user, and brand should be according to the trend in the market, company should also emphasize on the C.S.R activities.
- Brand price should be ranged keeping in view the middleman, to make it able to be used more. More

emphasis should be given on quality of the brand.

- Advertisements of the brand should be effective enough to arouse the interest and awareness about the brand user in order to win good brand equity.
- More users should be made to raise the image of the brand.
- Brand should have good image to gain positive attitude of consumers towards the brand.
- There should be an appealing packaging technique used by the company to gain attraction and confidence in the brand.
- Hoardings and bill boards should be used and should be attractive enough to grasp the attention and interest of the consumers. Company should also emphasize on the C.S.R activities.
- Image of the brand should be positive and high, to have a positive word of mouth.
- Brand price should be affordable, to raise its usage.
- Brand should be such that user hear almost from everywhere about it including his friend circle.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this study Factor analysis technique was used to analyze and interpret the data,

This study depicted the impact of the different variables on consumer's perception towards brands.

The factors with more value of variance had a high impact and vice versa, as shown by total variance explained table and rotated component table that highlighted the variables falling in those factors selected on the basis of their factor loadings.

Further this study showed the same matching results as of Leo Bogart and Charles Lehman (1973) - a positive correlation between a good class product and its purchase frequency and also the other results that products whose brands were familiar usually had a lot of advertising behind them, and Better educated women recalled more brands, as might be expected (Leo Bogart and Charles Lehman, 1973) and this study also analyzed the various other factors that effects the consumer's perception towards brand.

Products bought often and products heavily advertised are the most familiar. However, a brand high in purchase frequency is apt to be high in advertising, and vice versa, making it difficult to identify the effects of advertising alone within the marketing mix. For example, advertising entices retailers to stock merchandise and display it prominently, and product display may be a significant source of brand familiarity.

In the long run, the real usefulness of brand image data depends on the extent to which it can explain differences in buying or usage behavior for each brand. A major advertising objective might be to promote the image factors which most differentiate the consumers whom one is trying to influence from those one already has.

One who uses the brand is more aware about it and its image and also about what others are using. After sale services, discounts etc also raises the usage of the brand, cost, price, durability, quality, friend circle, financial resources, location, display, word of mouth, equity, competition, logo, purchase frequency, hoardings, billboards, status symbol, awareness, ease, advertisement effect the preference of the brand and how much one get familiar to it is also dependent on these factors.

All these factors contribute to the preference and image of the brand, that makes a brand popular among the consumers. Consumer is the ultimate king of the market, hence company should take due care of all the necessities of the consumers and heartily fulfill those, in order to survive in this competitive era. Its in the hand of the company to make such a brand that touches the heart of the user and persuade them to buy and use it, hence by satisfying the criteria of the consumers company can carry on successful brand in this global world.

Brand signifies the status of a person, or consumer prefer the brand due to his status symbol, it also offer a peace of mind, and one becomes aware about his personality, requirement, and what others are using to follow the trend in the market. Brands make a person different from the others, he becomes a point of attraction among all who is wearing or using the brand, it also offer a good comfortable level to the user that is not possible in case of non-branded product, it provide good durability, reliability to the user.

In nutshell it is ultimately the consumer who can make or break the brand, who makes it familiar when he is satisfied from it and vice versa. Also the Image of the brand and usage of the brand are positively related to each other. Good image leads to more usage and vice versa.

References

Ailawadi, K. L., Lehmann, D. R., & Neslin, S. A. (2003). Revenue premium as an outcome measure of brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(4), 1-17. American Marketing Association.

Batra, R., & Homer, P. M. (2004). The situational impact of brand image beliefs. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14(3), 318-330. Society for Consumer Psychology.

Bird, M., Channon, C., & Ehrenberg, A. S. C. (1970). Brand image and brand usage. Journal *of Marketing Research*, 7(3), 307-314. American Marketing Association.

Bogart, L., & Lehman, C. (1973). What makes a brand name familiar? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10(1), 17-22. American Marketing Association.

Buchanan, L., Simmons, C. J., & Bickart, B. A. (1999). Brand equity dilution: Retailer display and context brand effects. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36(3), 345-355. American Marketing Association.

Chaudhuri, A. (1999). Does brand loyalty mediate brand equity outcomes? *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 7(2), 136-146. M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Chen, S. F. S. (2009). A transaction cost rationale for private branding and its implications for the choice of domestic vs. offshore outsourcing. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(1), 156-175. Palgrave Macmillan Journals.

Chen, Y. S. (2010). The drivers of green brand equity: Green brand image, green satisfaction, and green trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(2), 307-319. Springer.

Cornwell, T. B., Roy, D. P., & Steinard, E. A. (2001). Exploring managers' perceptions of the impact of sponsorship on brand equity. *Journal of Advertising*, 30(2), 41-51. Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Erdem, T., Swait, J., Broniarczyk, S., Chakravarti, D., Kapferer, J. N., Keane, M., Roberts, J., Steenkamp, J. B. E. M., & Zettelmeye, F. (1999). Brand equity, consumer learning and choice. *Marketing Letters*, 10(3), 301-318.

Faircloth, J. B. (2005). Factors influencing nonprofit resource provider support decisions: Applying the brand equity concept to nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 13(3), 1-15. M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Faircloth, J. B., Capella, L. M., & Alford, B. L. (2001). The effect of brand attitude and brand image on brand equity. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 9(3), 61-75. M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Ham, P. V. (2008). Place branding: The state of the art, annals of the american academy of political and social science. *Public Diplomacy in a Changing World*, 616, 126-149. Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Hoeffler, S., & Keller, K. L. (2002). Building brand equity through corporate societal marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 21(1), 78-89. American Marketing Association.

Hsieh, M. H. (2004). Measuring global brand equity using cross-national survey data. *Journal of International Marketing*, 12(2), 28-57. American Marketing Association.

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22. American Marketing Association.

Keon, J. W. (1983). Product positioning: Trinodal mapping of brand images, ad images, and consumer preference. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(4), 380-392. American Marketing Association.

Klink, R. R. (2003). Creating meaningful brands: The relationship between brand name and brand mark. *Marketing Letters*, 14(3), 143-157. Springer.

Lai, C. S., Chiu, C. J., Yang, C. F., & Pai, D. C. (2010). The effects of corporate social responsibility on brand performance: The mediating effect of industrial brand equity and corporate reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(3), 457-469. Springer.

Lim, W. S., & Tan, S. J. (2009). Using brand equity to counter outsourcing opportunism: A game theoretic approach. *Marketing Letters*, 20(4), 369-383. Springer.

Madden, T. J., Hewett, K., & Roth, M. S. (2000). Managing images in different cultures: A cross-national study of color meanings and preferences. *Journal of International Marketing*, 8(4), 90-107. American Marketing Association.

Milberg, S. J., Park, W. C., & McCarthy, M. S. (1997). Managing negative feedback effects associated with brand extensions: The impact of alternative branding strategies. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 6(2), 119-140. Society for Consumer Psychology.

Roehm, M. L., & Brady, M. K. (2007). Consumer responses to performance failures by high-equity brands. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(4), 537-545. The University of Chicago Press.

Roth, K. P. Z., Diamantopoulos, A., & Montesinos, Á. (2008). Home country image, country brand equity and consumers' product preferences: An empirical study. *MIR: Management International Review*, 48(5), 577-602. Springer.

Roth, M. S. (1992). Depth versus breadth strategies for global brand image management. *Journal of Advertising*, 21(2), 25-36. Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Roth, M. S. (1995). The effects of culture and socioeconomics on the performance of global brand image strategies. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32(2), 163-175. American Marketing Association.

Simon, C. J., & Sullivan, M. W. (1993). The measurement and determinants of brand equity: A financial approach. *Marketing Science*, 12(1), 28-52. INFORMS.

Srinivasan, V., Park, C. S., & Chang, D. R. (2005). An approach to the measurement, analysis, and prediction of brand equity and its sources. *Management Science*, 51(9), 1433-1448. INFORMS.

Sriram, S., Balachander, S., & Kalwani, M. U. (2007). Monitoring the dynamics of brand equity using store-level data. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(2), 61-78. American Marketing Association.

Tschirhart, M., Christensen, R. K., & Perry, J. L. (2005). The Paradox of Branding and Collaboration. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 29(1), 67-84. M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Twedt, D. W. (1967). How does brand awareness-attitude affect marketing strategy? *Journal of Marketing*, 31(4), 64-66. American Marketing Association.

van Osselaer, S. M. J., & Alba, J. W. (2000). Consumer learning and brand equity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(1), 1-16. The University of Chicago Press.

Wæraas, A., & Solbakk, M. N. (2009). Defining the essence of a university: Lessons from higher education branding. *Higher Education*, 57(4), 449-462.

Washburn, J. H., & Plank, R. E. (2002). Measuring brand equity: An evaluation of a consumer-based brand equity scale. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 10(1), 46-62, M.E. Sharpe, Inc.