Measuring Customer Based Brand Equity for Premium Detergent Brands in the Indian Market

Smritishikha Choudhury*
Dr. Rinalini P. Kakati**

*Assistant Professor, School of
Professional Studies
Krishna Kanta Handiqui
State Open University, Dispur

**Associate Professor of Department
of Business Administration,
Gauhati University, Guwahati, Jalulbari

Abstract

This study focuses on the relationships between the different branding elements of Customer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) in FMCG (Premium Detergent) segment. Six brand building blocks as referred by Keller (2001) have been considered in the study - Brand Salience, Brand Imagery, Brand Performance, Brand Judgment, Brand Feelings and Brand Resonance. The Detergent Market is one of the major segments of the FMCG market in India that has high growth potential. The detergent brands selected for this study includes Ariel and Surf Excel. The empirical study conducted in this field states that brand loyalty has a greater impact on Customer Based Brand Equity in FMCG segment. The findings also reveal that brand equity of Surf Excel is much higher than Ariel in the Guwahati market. Four hypotheses were also tested regarding the existence of positive relationship between brand trust and brand affect with attitudinal loyalty and purchase loyalty and also for the Brand Preference and influence of non product related attributes in customer based brand equity. The empirical findings show that there exists a positive relationship between brand trust and brand affect with attitudinal and purchase loyalty for most of the brands.

Keywords:

Customer Based Brand Equity, Attitudinal Loyalty, Purchase Loyalty, Brand Trust, Brand Affect, Brand Preference, non product related attributes.

Introduction

Since the emergence of the term 'Brand Equity' during 1990s, the studies mainly concentrated on conceptualization aspects of brand equity. Many studies had been undertaken during this time to examine the relationships existing among various constructs of brand equity. Aaker (1991), Keller (1993), Feldwick (1996) and many others had defined brand equity from various perspectives. The Marketing Science Institute (MSI) defined brand equity "--- as both a financial asset and as a set of favourable associations and behaviours" (MSI, 1989). However Keller's (1993) Customer Based Brand Equity Model set the framework of how customers' responses help in building brand equity. A consumer perceives brand equity as the value added to the product or services by associating it with a brand name. Feldwick(1996, pp.9), states that brand equity can be measured with following basic types: price/ demand measures, behavioural measures of loyalty, attitudinal measures of loyalty, awareness/ salience measures. Keller (2001) has stated that Customer Based Brand Equity can be measured from the differential effect of the brand knowledge on the customer response to the marketing of the brand. From the earlier studies it has been observed that, most of the studies conducted on

Customer Based Brand Equity are based on customers' perceptions. Reviewing the existing literatures on brand equity, it has been found that except a handful, brand equity studies mainly concentrated on Consumer Durables.

Within the marketing literature, operationalisations of brand equity usually fall into two groups: those involving consumer perceptions (e.g., awareness, brand associations, perceived quality) and those involving consumer behaviors (e.g., brand loyalty, willingness to pay a high price). Among the perceptual measures, one technique uses consumer preference ratings for a branded product versus an unbranded equivalent (Cathy J. Cobb-Walgren, Cynthia A. Ruble, Naveen Donthu, 1995). Hence to measure Brand Equity for premium detergent brands following objective and hypothesis were formulated:

An Overview of FMCG Detergent Market

The Indian detergent market is estimated to be around 12,000 crore, comprises of Laundry soaps, synthetic detergent powders, and bars. The per capita consumption of detergents in India (2.7 kg pa) is comparable to some countries like Indonesia, China and Thailand (around 2 kg p a), it is lower than in others such as Malaysia, Philippines (3.7 kg) and the USA (10 kg). The Indian detergent market is growing at a compounded annual growth rate (CAGR) of 7-9 percent per annum in volume terms. The detergent powder market in India may be segmented on the basis of three price categories:

- **Popular segment:** Under this popular segment Nirma, Wheel and Ghari are close competitors and put together controls 45% of the volume in the market.

- **Mid priced segment**: In the Mid priced segment, the major players are Tide, Rin and Henko and the total size of the mid priced segment is 40%.

- **Premium segment**: The premium segment is dominated by the two big giants namely Surf Excel and Ariel accounting for 15% of the total market volume. Out of which, HUL (Surf Excel) dominates the market with over 60% of market share in this category and rest is largely controlled by P&G (Ariel).

Review of Literature:

Several academic studies attempted to study Brand Equity from both financial and non financial ways since its inception. Some of the significantly contributing studies are listed below:

- Aaker (1991) defines brand equity as a set of five categories of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand that add value to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service. The brand assets considered are brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality, brand associations and other proprietary assets.

- Keller (1993) conceptualized the Customer Based Brand Equity Model which basic premise is that the power of a brand lies in what customers have learned, felt, seen and heard about the brand over time. The model provides four steps for building six brand building blocks which can be used as measuring yardstick of a brand by the marketers.

- Cathy J. et al (1995), in her study on F.M.C.G. (household cleanser) suggested that Brand Equity can be measured from the Preference of the Brand and Purchase Intention of the consumer. The study found that the Brand with higher Equity generated significantly greater preference and Purchase Intentions.

- Richard L. Oliver (1999) analyses the relationship between loyalty and satisfaction of consumers with affect of social bond in a four-stage loyalty model. The analysis concludes that satisfaction is a necessary step in loyalty formation but becomes less significant as loyalty begins to set through other mechanisms.

- Chaudhuri A. and Hoolbrook M. B. (2001) conducted a study to find the relationship between brand trust, brand affect and brand performance outcomes (market share and relative price) with purchase loyalty and attitudinal loyalty and it was found that, brand trust and brand affect are both directly related to attitudinal loyalty and purchase loyalty.

- Lehmann et al (2008), in their study on F.M.C.G. (Soft drinks) found that significant relationship of Brand Performance measures with both backward and foreward looking behavioural measures. The behavioural measures being taken as past consumption and planned share of next ten purchases.

- Mishra and Datta (2011) proposes a model to discuss the importance of the effect of the brand assets treated as antecedents like brand name, awareness, personality and consequences like brand preference and purchase intention on customer based brand equity.

However all these studies have been carried mostly in the developed countries and a handful of studies have only been found in Indian market. This study wants to fill the gap by evaluating brand equity and relationship among different branding elements of certain selected F.M.C.G. (Detergent) brands.

Objective 1: To evaluate the strength of different brand building blocks for premium brand detergents by applying Customer – Based Brand Equity Model as proposed by Keller (2001).

Hypotheses:

H_1: Brand Trust is positively related to both (a) Purchase Loyalty and (b) Attitudinal Loyalty.

H_2: Brand Affect is positively related to both (a) Purchase Loyalty and (b) Attitudinal Loyalty.

H3: Global Brand Preference is positively associated with actual possession and Purchase Intentions rather than Indian brands.

H_4: Non product related attributes (packaging, price and user Imagery) will have positive impact on Brand Preference.

Methodology:

This study has been undertaken at Guwahati, which is the marketing hub of North East India. Here, almost all global and Indian brands are fighting with each other to increase their market share and also to be included in the consumers' selected list. The study employs descriptive research approach and has adopted survey method for data collection. The sample size has been determined both by qualitative and quantitative approach. By taking an error level of 10% and standard error at 0.66 (based on Likert scale range of 1to 5), quantitatively the sample size at 95% confidence level happens to be 170. As the study wants to unearth much information and also intends to use sophisticated multivariate techniques, hence, sample sizes of 250 respondents are considered for this study (only female segment of the population). The two detergent brands selected for this study includes the premium segment of the market (Ariel, Surf Excel).

Analysis for Objective 1:

This study applies Customer – Based Brand Equity Model (Keller, 2001) to evaluate the brand equity for FMCG (detergent). The specific brand elements examined under the model being described below:

The six brand building blocks as referred by Keller (2001) have been considered in the study to measure customer based brand equity, which are - Brand Salience, Brand Imagery, Brand Performance, Brand Judgment, Brand Feelings and Brand Resonance (cited by Kakati and Choudhury, 2013).

As per the Keller's model (2001), brand salience is measured by awareness level of the customers and the recall rate of the brands. It has been found that, the unaided recall value is more for Surf Excel (52%) compared to Ariel (8.4%).Again, aided recall has been done with the help of identification of the brand name. It has been found that the logo recognition is highest in case of Surf Excel (94.4%).

Table 1 reflects the value of aided and unaided recall.

Table 1: Brand name recognition for FMCG (unaided and aided recall)

Brands	Frequency(unaided)	Percent	Frequency(aided)	Percent
Surf Excel	130	52.0	244	97.6
Ariel	21	8.4	235	94.0

The following table (table 2) explains the measure of different brand building attributes for the selected detergent brands.

Table 2: Brand Performance, Brand imagery Brand judgment, Feelings and Resonance for FMCG (measured in a seven point rating scale):

Brand Performance Attributes (Intrinsic)	Ariel(mean score)	Surf excel (mean score)
Hygienic	4.71	5.76
Cleanliness	4.3	5.05
Offer	4.49	5.42
Avg. performance	**4.50**	**5.41**
Price	3.716	3.87
attractive advertisement	4.44	5.64
beautiful packaging	4.7	5.48
Avg. imagery	**4.29**	**5.00**
Quality	0.96	2.83
Credibility	1.12	3.04
Consideration	1.06	2.96
Superiority	0.96	2.67
Avg. Judgment	**1.03**	**2.88**
Warmth	1	2.79
excitement	0.96	2.8
Safety	1.052	2.93

Avg. Feelings	1.00	2.84
Next buy	0.968	2.805
intend to purchase	0.948	2.761
committed	0.872	2.574
willing to pay high price	0.752	2.215
Miss the brand	0.924	2.78
Avg. Resonance	0.89	2.63

Table 3: Brand Building Blocks for FMCG:

Attributes	Ariel	Surfex
Salience	53%	75.2%
Performance	64.48%	77.28%
Imagery	61.29%	71.43%
Judgment	20.5%	57.5%
Feelings	14.29%	40.57%
Resonance	12.71%	37%
Strength of CBBE (avg.)	37.71%	59.83%

From the above tables (table 1, 2 and 3) it has been found that the values of the Indian brand Surf excel is highest in all building blocks of the CBBE model and the strength of CBBE for Surf Excel is (59.83%)and for Ariel the strength of CBBE is 37.71%.

Analysis of Hypothesis 1:

Many researchers like (Aaker 1991; Assael 1998; Beatty and Kahle 1988; Jacoby and Chestnut 1978) have worked on Brand Loyalty stating that Brand Loyalty includes some degree of predisposition commitment towards a brand. Current literature on research indicates that marketers could be more certain about the Brand Loyalty of consumers if two dimensions are strongly indicated namely behavioural Loyalty and Attitudinal Loyalty (Choudhuri and Holbrook 2001). Hence the first hypothesis set for this study is:

H_1: **Brand Trust is positively related to both (a) Purchase Loyalty and (b) Attitudinal Loyalty.**

The Brand Trust Index has been estimated for both the Global brand Ariel and Indian detergent brand i.e. Surf excel by averaging consumer responses regarding the four statements as shown in table 4.

The ratings have been based on a five point ratings of agreement, (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). Cronbach's Alphas have been estimated for Brand Trust Index of the seven brands separately. The Cronbach's Alpha of Ariel's 0.995 ,Surf Excel's 0.992 establishing that reliability of Brand Trust Index for each brand being much higher than the acceptable level of Cronbach's Alpha of 0.60 (Nunnally , 1978).

Table 4: Brand Trust Index for all selected detergent brands

Statement	Score for Ariel	Score for Surf Excel
I trust this brand	1.164	3.096
I rely on this brand	1.08	2.984
This is an honest brand	1.096	2.833
This brand is safe	1.052	2.932
Average score	1.052	2.916

Again Purchase Loyalty Index (PL) being estimated by averaging consumer responses for five statements as shown in table 5.

The ratings have been based on a five point ratings of agreement, (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). Cronbach's Alphas have been estimated for Purchase loyalty Index of the seven brands separately. The Cronbach's Alpha of Ariel's 0.990,Surf Excel's 0.984, establishing that reliability of Purchase Loyalty Index for each brand being much higher than the acceptable level of Cronbach's Alpha of 0.60 (Nunnally , 1978).

The Attitudinal Loyalty Index (AL) also estimated by averaging consumer responses for three statements as shown in table 5.

The Cronbach's Alpha of Ariel's 0.994,Surf Excel's 0.987 establishing that reliability of Attitudinal Loyalty Index for each brand being much higher than the acceptable level of Cronbach's Alpha of 0.60 (Nunnally , 1978).

Table 5: Brand Loyalty (Purchase and Attitudinal Loyalty) Index for all selected detergent brands

Statement for Purchase Loyalty	Mean Score for Ariel	Mean Score for Surf Excel
I will buy this brand next time I buy	0.968	2.804
I intend to keep purchasing this brand	0.948	2.761
I am committed to this brand	0.872	2.573
I would be willing to pay higher price for this brand	0.752	2.21
I will miss the brand if it disappears	0.924	2.78
Statement for Attitudinal Loyalty	Score for Ariel	Score for Surf Excel
I feel good when I use this brand.	1.052	2.92
This brand makes me happy	1.00	2.79
This brand gives me pleasure	0.96	2.80

Analysis for Premium Detergent Brands:

Multiple regression analysis has been carried out in order to test Hypothesis 1 by using Brand Trust Index as dependent variable, Purchase Loyalty Index and Attitudinal Loyalty Index as independent variables.

(i) By performing multiple regression analysis for **Ariel**, it has been found that R=0.985 implying high correlation existing between Brand Trust Index with the two independent variables   i.e Purchase   Loyalty Index   and Attitudinal Loyalty Index . However only the Attitudinal Loyalty Index (β = 0.985 , p $\leq$0.00) has been found to be significant (at 5% level of significance) and   contributing to the relationship. It can be inferred that Attitudinal Loyalty have significant relationship with Brand Trust but Purchase Loyalty is not having any influence for Brand Trust in case of Ariel.

(ii) The multiple regression analysis in case of Surf Excel finds R = 0.984, thus indicating very high correlation among the variables. Both the Attitudinal Loyalty Index (β = 0.796 , p $\leq$0.00) and Purchase Loyalty Index (β = 0.492 , p $\leq$0.00) are found to be significant at 5% level of significance . However the impact of Attitudinal Loyalty Index seems to be moderately higher than Purchase Loyalty Index (β = 0.796 > β = 0.492).

Table 6: Multiple Regression Analysis for Premium Detergent Brands:

Ariel	R = 0.985	R square = 0.970	F = 4057.94	Sig.= 0.00
		Beta	T	Significance
	Att. Loyalty	0.985	89.629	0.00
	Pur. Loyalty	-0.004	-.331	0.741
Surf Excel	R = 0.984	R square = 0.968	F = 3803.860	Sig. = 0.00
		Beta	T	Significance
	Att. Loyalty	0.796	17.219	0.00
	Pur. Loyalty	0.492	4.162	0.00

The first hypothesis examines the impact of Attitudinal Loyalty and Purchase Loyalty on Brand Trust. The result of multiple regression analysis shows that for the brand Surf excel, the influence of Attitudinal Loyalty and Purchase Loyalty on Brand Trust is positive supporting our hypothesis. Further Attitudinal Loyalty is having a greater influence than Purchase Loyalty. But for the global brand Ariel, the influence of Purchase Loyalty on Brand Trust is not significant and it is significant in case of Attitudinal Loyalty, supporting our hypothesis partially.

Analysis of Hypothesis 2:

In the context of maintaining brand relationships, the emotional determinants of Brand Loyalty or commitment need to be considered separately. Gundlach, Achrol, and Mentzer (1995) suggest that commitment is associated with positive affect and that though this may prevent the exploration of other alternatives in the short run, steady customer benefits are likely to accrue from such affective bonding in the long run. Choudhuri and Holbrook (2001) stated that a positive relationship between Brand Affect and brand commitment or Loyalty is further predicated on the ties between positive emotional feelings and close interpersonal relationships. According to Dick and Basu (1994), affect explains of a valenced feeling state which influences Brand Loyalty in terms of both attitudinal and Purchase Loyalty. Under these circumstances, it is very important to establish the following hypothesis.

H$_2$: Brand Affect is positively related to both (a) Purchase Loyalty and (b) Attitudinal Loyalty.

To test hypothesis H$_2$, Brand Affect is taken as the dependent variable. Brand Affect (BA) Index has been estimated for the different detergent brands by averaging consumer responses regarding four statements as shown in table 7.

The ratings have been based on a five point ratings of agreement, (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree). Cronbach's Alphas have been estimated for Brand Affect Index of the seven brands separately. The Cronbach's Alpha of Ariel's 0.994 ,Surf Excel's 0.993 , establishing that reliability of Brand Affect Index for each brand being much higher than the acceptable level of Cronbach's Alpha of 0.60 (Nunnally , 1978).

Table 7: Brand Affect index for the Premium brand Ariel and Surf excel:

Statement	Score for Ariel	Score for Surf Excel
This is the best quality brand	0.96	2.83
This brand is very Popular	1.06	2.99
I will recommend this brand to others	1.06	2.96
This brand is very unique	0.959	2.67

Again **Purchase Loyalty Index** (PL) and **Attitudinal Loyalty Index** (AL) being estimated by averaging consumer responses as given in table 5.

Analysis for Premium Detergent Brands:

By performing multiple regression analysis for **Ariel**, it has been found that R=0.993 implying high correlation existing between Brand Affect Index with the two independent variables i.e Purchase Loyalty Index and Attitudinal Loyalty Index   . Influences of Purchase Loyalty and Attitudinal Loyalty on Brand Affect have been found to be 98.6 %. Both the Attitudinal Loyalty Index (β = 0.590 , p $\leq$0.00) and Purchase Loyalty index (β = 0.407 , p $\leq$0.00)   has been found to be significant (at 5% level of significance) and   contributing to the relationship. It can be inferred that both Attitudinal Loyalty and Purchase Loyalty have significant relationship with Brand Affect in case of Ariel.

The multiple regression analysis in case of **Surf Excel** finds R = 0.981, thus indicating very high correlation among the variables. Influences of Purchase Loyalty and Attitudinal Loyalty on Brand Affect have been found to be 96.2 %.   Both the Attitudinal Loyalty Index (β = 0.604, p $\leq$0.00) and Purchase Loyalty Index (β = 0.384 , p $\leq$0.00) are found to be significant at 5% level of significance . However the impact of Attitudinal Loyalty Index seems to be moderately higher than Purchase Loyalty Index (β = 0.604 > β = 0.384).

Table 8: Multiple Regression Analysis for Premium Detergent Brands:

Ariel	R = 0.993	R square = 0.986	F = 8893	Sig.= 0.00
		Beta	T	Significance
	Att. Loyalty	0.590	14.88	0.00
	Pur. Loyalty	0.407	10.27	0.00
Surf Excel	R = 0.981	R square = 0.962	F = 3105.973	Sig. = 0.00
		Beta	T	Significance
	Att. Loyalty	0.604	11.786	0.00
	Pur. Loyalty	0.384	7.499	0.00

Hence the present findings support the second hypothesis that for FMCG goods (both Global and Indian) Brand Affect is positively related to (a) Purchase Loyalty and (b) Attitudinal Loyalty.

Analysis of hypotheses 3 for FMCG:

Brand Preference can be regarded as consumers' predisposition towards a brand that varies depending on the salient beliefs that activated at a given point in time (cited by Rajagopal, 2009). Once customers can differentiate the product or service from the competitors, customers who believe that a product uniquely meets their needs will select that brand. This study aims to focus on whether customer's Brand Preference and actual possession and

Purchase Intention have any positive relation in FMCG goods in Indian market.

H3: Global Brand Preference is positively associated with actual possession and Purchase Intentions rather than Indian brands.

The ANCOVA technique being used to analyse this hypothesis, because, more than one independent variables being taken and these variables belong to two categories namely, categorical and metric interval scales. The dependent variable i.e. Brand Preferences (Global and Indian brands) is a metric variable.

Variable Descriptions:

The independent variables deal with Purchase Intention and Purchase Probability of a brand, which have been measured by the following two statements:

(i)   I intend to keep purchasing this brand.

(ii)   I may buy this brand in my next purchase.

These two statements are measured by using a 5 point rating interval scale (1=minimum, 5= maximum). The average score of these two statements give Purchase Preference, which is a metric independent variable. Actual Purchase is the second independent, which is measured as a categorical variable.

In order to find the proportion of the variation in the dependent variable (factor) the measure Omega Square (ω^2) has been also used.   The relative contribution of the independent variable (Detergent's Purchase Preference) is calculated by using the formula

$$\omega_{Detergent}^2 \quad \frac{SS_{Detergent} - (df \times MS_{error})}{SS_{total} + MS_{error}}$$

Table 9: Analysis of Co variance for the Premium segment of Detergent (FMCG)

Source	Sums of Squares	Df	Mean square	F	Significance
Main effect					
(combined)	1.695	3	.565	2.987	.032
Purchase Preference (Ariel)	.170	1	.170	.023	.881
Purchase Preference (Surf Excel)	.292	1	.292	.488	.004
Actual purchase	1.215	1	1.215	6.426	.012
Residual (error)	46.337	245	.169		

Table 10: Parameter estimates for Premium segment:

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	1.144	.088	12.952	.000
Ariel	.003	.017	.150	.881
Surf excel	.011	.015	.699	.004
Actual purchase	.048	.019	2.535	.000

For Premium brand detergent,
Ariel,

$$\omega_{Ariel}^2 = \frac{0.170 - (1 \times 0.169)}{1.695 + 0.169} = 0.00053$$

Similarly for Surf excel, the formula used is

$$\omega_{Surf}^2 = \frac{0.292 - (1 \times 0.169)}{1.695 + 0.169} = 0.0659$$

The relationships between dependent and independent variables

found to be significant (p=0.032≤0.05) implying that there is difference in the impact of the two independent variables on the dependent variable.

- Purchase Preference of Surf Excel (Beta= .011, p=.004≤0.05) is found to be significant implying that Brand Preference (Global and Indian brand) i.e. the dependent variable is strongly affected by the Purchase Preference of Surf Excel. Omega square of Surf Excel's Preference is 0.0659 implying that Purchase Preference of Surf Excel has contributed approximately 6.59% variation in the dependent variable. The independent variable (Actual Purchase) being found to be

significant (p=.012≤0.05).

- Purchase Preference of Ariel is found to be insignificant and the value of omega square (ω^2_{Ariel}

- =0.00053) is 0.05% only, implying that effect of Purchase Intention of Ariel on the dependent variable is very low and not significant.

  The hypothesis 3, examines, the interaction effect of Brand Preferences for Global and Indian brands and Actual Purchase being tested by using ANCOVA with special emphasis on the interaction effect.

- It has been observed that, relationships between dependent and independent variables are found to be significant (p=0.032≤0.05) implying that there is difference in the impact of the two independent variables on the dependent variable. Purchase Preference of Surf Excel is found to be significant (but insignificant for Ariel) implying that Brand Preference (Global and Indian brand) i.e. the dependent variable is strongly affected by the Purchase Preference of Surf Excel.

  The independent variable (Actual Purchase) being also found to be significant (p=≤0.05) for both the brands indicating that a customer who prefers the brand actually purchases it.

Analysis of Hypothesis 4 for FMCG:

Non-product-related attributes are defined as external aspects of the product or service that relate to its purchase or consumption. The four main types of non-product-related attributes as defined by Keller (1993) are (1) price information, (2) packaging or product appearance information, (3) user Imagery (i.e., what type of person uses the product or service), and (4) usage Imagery (i.e., where and in what types of situations the product or service is used). Hence based on the above literature, the next hypothesis stated for this study is:

H₄: Non product related attributes (packaging, price and user Imagery) will have positive impact on Brand Preference (Global and Indian Brand).

The Preference for packaging and prices were measured by 7 point rating scale. User Imagery was measured based on Income level and Occupation of the respondents. Dependent variable is taken as Brand Preference (Global and Indian brands) which is a metric variable.

Table 11: Non product related attributes for FMCG

Brand name	Statement	Mean Score	Cronbach's Alpha value
Ariel	This product is convenient to purchase.	3.716	0.736
	The packaging of this product is good	4.704	
Surf Excel	This product is convenient to purchase.	3.872	0.692
	The packaging of this product is good	5.484	

Table 12: Analysis of Covariance for Ariel

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	29.599	158	.187	.915	.690
Error	18.433	90	.205		
Total	444.000	249			
Packaging Ariel	.672	1	.672	.250	.617
Price Ariel	.683	1	.683	.283	.595
Income Ariel	9.188	1	9.188	8.334	.004
Occupation Ariel	.166	1	.166	.163	.686

For the Global brand Ariel, from the analysis it has been found that, only Income level (p=0.004≤0.05) being significant.

Table 13: Analysis of Covariance for Surf excel

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	26.327	134	.196	1.032	.433
Error	21.706	114	.190		
Total	444.000	249			
Packaging Surf excel	1.117	1	1.117	.681	.410
Price Surf excel	2.824	1	2.824	1.088	.298
Income Surf excel	9.188	1	9.188	8.334	.01
Occupation Surf excel	.166	1	.166	.163	.686

Again for the Indian brand Surf excel, from the analysis it has been found that, only Income level ($p=0.01 \leq 0.05$) being significant.

Hence we can infer from the above results that, only Income factor has a positive impact on Preference for the brand under FMCG sector (premium brand detergent), supporting our Hypothesis partially.

Conclusion

This study gives an insight to formation of Brand Equity of premium detergent brand as perceived by consumers. Since 1959, Indian consumers had been using the most popular detergent under the name Surf. However after liberalization this brand have faced stiff competition from brand belonging to powerful MNC's like Ariel, Henko etc. It had defined and redefined itself under many names by adding values and positioning itself in different segments. However since 1996 it has positioned itself as a premium brand (named as Surf Excel).From the analysis it has been found that Surf Excel enjoys medium Brand Equity, followed by Ariel in the premium segment. The detergent brands being having medium to low Brand Equity as per consumers perceptions may be because these brand have very less differentiation among themselves in the segments where they are positioned. Almost all the brands are expected to give the same functional benefits. Hence making whatever differences they have into "Points-of-Parity". It has been observed from the study that the brand Surf excel scores very high in Customer Based Brand Equity compared to the brand Ariel. Again in case of Surf excel both Brand Trust and Brand Affect has positive direct relationship with Attitudinal and Purchase Loyalty, but for Ariel there is no relationship between Brand Trust and Attitudinal Loyalty. From hypothesis 3 also, we could not found any positive relationship between the Global Brand Ariel and its Preference associated with actual possession and Purchase Intentions rather than Indian brands. On the contrary the Indian brand Surf excel is positively associated with actual possession and Purchase Intentions. For the last hypothesis, it has been found that, for both the brands only income level has a significant impact on Brand Preference.

Limitations and directions for future research

The area of survey was limited and study was limited to a single category of the detergent market. The study has been conducted for only the premium segment of detergent brand while researchers can conduct study for other brands or for other categories such as Durables or Service sector and see the variance in the results.

References

Aaker David A. (1991), Managing Brand Equity, New York: Free Press.

Aaker David A.; Jacobson Robert(2001), "The Value Relevance of Brand Attitude in High Technology Markets" *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 38, No, 4., pp. 485-493.

Aaker David A. (1972), A Measure of Brand Acceptance, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 160-167, Accessed: 12/03/2011

Aaker, D.A (1996) Building Strong Brands, New York: Free Press

Aaker D.A. and Keller K. L. (1990), Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 27 Accessed: 25/09/2010

Agarwal Noopur (2009), "Brand Equity on the wheels of Advertising" 1/e, pp 76-79, Published by A.K. Publications, Delhi, ISBN: 9789380164007

Aziz N. A. & Yasin N. M.(2010), Analyzing the Brand Equity and Resonance of Banking Services: Malaysian Consumer Perspective, *International Journal of Marketing Studies* Vol. 2, No. 2

Choudhuri A., Holbrook M. B. (2001), "The Chain Effects From Brand Trust and Brand Affect to Brand Performance" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65, No, 2., pp. 81-93.

David G.S. S. Jayakumar, Thomas B.J. and Ali S.D., (2012) Modeling the Evaluation of Customer Based Brand Equity of Two Wheelers, Asian Journal of Research in Business Economics and Management, Vol. 2, No. 5, pp. 1-12.

Dick, A. and Basu, K., (1994), Customer Loyalty: towards an integrated framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 22 (2), pp.99-113 Accessed: 20/08/2008

Farquhar, Peter H. (1989), "Managing Brand Equity," *Marketing Research*, I September), 24-33.

Feldwick P. (1996), What is Brand Equity Anyway, and How Do You Measure it? *International Journal of Market Research*,

Vol. 38 No.2. pp. 85-104

Hu, L. and Bentler, P.M. (1999), "Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives", *Structural Equation Modeling*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 1-55.

Jacoby, J. and Chestnut, R.W.(1978), Brand Loyalty: Measurement and Management (John Wiley & Sons, New York).

Jacoby. J., Chestnut, R.W. and Fisher. W.A.(1978), A Behavioral Process Approach to Information Acquisition in Nondurable Purchasing; Journal of Marketing Research, pp.532-544.

Kakati R. P. and Choudhury S. (2013), Measuring Customer-Based Brand Equity Through Brand Building Blocks for Durables, *The IUP Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. X, No. 2, pp.24-42

Keller K. L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity "*Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 1-22

Keller K. L. (2001), "Building Customer Based Brand Equity: A blue print for creating strong brands" Marketing Science Institute working paper series, Report no 01-107

Keller K. L. (2003), "Strategic Brand Management" 2/e, Published by Pearson Prentice Hall, ISBN: 8177584871

Kotler (2000), "Marketing Management" 11/e, pp 423, Published by Prentice Hall India, ISBN: 8120320832

Lauranne B., Simmons C. J., Barbara A. B.(1999), Brand Equity Dilution: Retailer Display and Context Brand Effects", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 345-355, Accessed: 20/08/2008

Lassar, W., Mittal B., Sharma A. (1995), Measuring customer-based brand equity, *The Journal of Consumer marketing*; Vol. 12, No.4; pp. 11-20

Memon S. (2011), International Brands and the Indian Consumers: A study of critical success factors with special focus on select FMCG brands, Indian *Journal of Marketing*, pp. 4-15.

Mishra P., Dutta B.(2011), Perpetual Asset Management of Customer Based Brand Equity- The PAM Evaluator, *Current Research Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 3, pp. 34-43.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill

Oliver R. L.(1999) Whence Consumer Loyalty? *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63, pp. 33 Accessed: 11/10/2010

Park, C.S. and Srinivasan, V. (1994), "A survey-based method for measuring and understanding brand equity and its extendibility", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 271-88.

Raj S.P.(1985), Striking a Balance between Brand "Popularity" and Brand Loyalty: *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49, No. 1 , pp. 53, Accessed: 16/09/2010

Ralph L. Day (1968), Preference Tests and the Management of Product Features, *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 24-Accessed: 16/09/2010

Rao S. L.(1998), Brand Building in Indian Industry, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 33, No. 40 , pp. 2566-2568, Accessed: 28/12/2010

Schuiling I. and Kapferer J. N.(2004), Real Differences between Local and International Brands: Strategic Implications for International Marketers *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 12, No. 4 , pp. 97, Accessed: 26/09/2010 04:30

Simon Carol J., Sullivan Mary W.(1993), The Measurement and Determinants of Brand Equity: A Financial Approach, *Marketing Science*, Vol. 12, pp. 28-52.

Sultana M. Nasrin & Murugan. M. S. (2011), A study on consumer buying behavior of home appliances with reference to LG Products, *Indian Journal of Marketing*

Shocker Allan D., Srivastava R. K., Ruekert R. W.(1994), Challenges and Opportunities Facing Brand Management: An Introduction to the Special Issue, Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 149-158, Accessed: 20/08/2008

Srinivasan V., Park Chan Su, Chang Dae R. (2005), An Approach to the Measurement, Analysis, and Prediction of Brand Equity and, Management Science, Vol. 51, No. 9, pp. 1433-1448, Accessed: 27/12/2010

Steenkamp Jan-Benedict E.M., Batra R. and Alden D. L. (2003), How Perceived Brand Globalness Creates Brand Value, *Journal of International Business Studies*, pp. 53-65

Tolba A.H, Hassan S.S. (2009), "Linking customer-based brand equity with brand market performance: a managerial approach", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, pp.356–366

Tong X. and Hawley J. M.(2009), "Measuring customer-based brand equity: empirical evidence from the sportswear market in China" *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 18/4 pp. 262–271.