

BRANDS AND BRANDING: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND FUTURE PRIORITIES

S.KRISHNA PRASATH¹, Sathiya Priya. M², SriMathi.B³

¹. Mr. M.COM.MBA (HR), DOA., Sri Krishna Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, Tamil nadu, India.

² (I M.Com) Sri Krishna Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, Tamil nadu, India.

³. (I M.Com) Sri Krishna Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, Tamil nadu, India.

ABSTRACT

Branding has emerged as a top management priority in the last decade due to the growing Realization that brands are one of the most valuable intangible assets that firms have. Driven in Part by this intense industry interest, academic researchers have explored a number of different Brand-related topics in recent years, generating scores of papers, articles, research reports, and Books. This paper identifies some of the influential work in the branding area, highlighting what Has been learned from an academic perspective on important topics such as brand positioning, Brand integration, brand equity measurement, brand growth, and brand management. The paper Also outlines some gaps that exist in the research of branding and brand equity and formulates a Series of related research questions. Choice modeling implications of the branding concept and the challenges of incorporating main and interaction effects of branding as well as the impact of Competition is discussed.

Key words: Brand, Branding, Brand growth, Brand positioning.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Brands serve several valuable functions. At their most basic level, brands serve as markers for the offerings of a firm. For customers, brands can simplify choice, promise a particular quality level, reduce risk, and/or engender trust. Brands are built on the product itself, the accompanying marketing activity, and the use (or non-use) by customers as well as others. Brands thus reflect the complete experience that customers have with products. Brands also play an important role in determining the effectiveness of marketing efforts such as advertising and channel placement. Finally, brands are an asset in the financial sense. Thus, brands manifest their impact at three primary levels – customer-market, product-market, and financial-market. The value accrued by these various benefits is often called brand equity. Our primary goal in this paper is to both selectively highlight relevant research on building, measuring, and managing brand equity and to identify gaps in our understanding of these topics. We put considerable emphasis on the latter and suggest numerous areas of future research.

Five basic topics that align with the brand management decisions and tasks frequently performed by marketing executives are discussed in detail:

- 1) Developing brand positioning,
- 2) Integrating brand marketing;
- 3) Assessing brand performance;
- 4) Growing brands; and
- 5) Strategically managing the brand.

1.2 BRANDING DECISIONS AND TASKS DEVELOPING BRAND POSITIONING

Brand positioning sets the direction of marketing activities and programs – what the brand should and should not do with its marketing. Brand positioning involves establishing key brand associations in the minds of customers and other important constituents to differentiate the brand and establish (to the extent possible) competitive superiority (Keller et al. 2002). Besides the obvious issue of selecting tangible product attribute levels

(e.g., horsepower in a car), two particularly relevant areas to positioning are the role of brand intangibles and the role of corporate images and reputation.

Brand Relationships:

Research has also explored the personal component of the relationship between a brand and its customers. Fournier (1998) examined the nature of relationships that customers have – as well as want to have – with companies (see also Fournier and Yao (1997) and Fournier, et al. (1998)). Fournier views brand relationship quality as multifaceted and consisting of six dimensions beyond loyalty or commitment along which consumer brand relationships vary:

- 1) Self-concept connection,
- 2) Commitment or nostalgic attachment,
- 3) Behavioral interdependence,
- 4) love/passion,
- 5) Intimacy, and
- 6) Brand partner quality.

Brand Experience:

Experiential marketing is an important trend in marketing thinking. Through several books and articles, Schmitt (1999, 2003) has developed the concept of Customer Experience Management (CEM), which he defines as the process of strategically managing a customer's entire experience with a product or company. According to Schmitt, brands can help to create five different types of experiences:

- Sense experiences involving sensory perception,
- Feel experiences involving affect and emotions,
- Think experiences which are creative and cognitive;
- Act experiences involving physical behavior and incorporating individual actions and lifestyles, and
- Relate experiences that result from connecting with a reference group or culture.

INTEGRATING BRAND MARKETING:

A variety of branding and marketing activities can be conducted to help achieve the desired brand positioning and build brand equity. Their ultimate success depends to a significant extent not only on how well they work singularly, but also on how they work in combination, such that synergistic results occur. In other words, marketing activities have interaction effects among themselves as well as main effects and interaction effects with brand equity. Three noteworthy sub-areas of this topic are the brand-building contribution of brand elements; the impact of coordinated communication and channel strategies on brand equity; and the interaction of company-controlled and external events.

Integrating Brand Elements:

Brands identify and differentiate a company's offerings to customers and other parties. A brand is more than a name (or "mark"). Other brand elements such as logos and symbols (Nike's swoosh and McDonald's golden arches), packaging (Coke's contour bottle and Kodak's yellow and black film box), and slogans (BMW's "Ultimate Driving Machine" and Visa's "It's Everywhere You Want to Be") play an important branding role as well. A number of broad criteria are useful for choosing and designing brand elements to build brand equity (Keller 2003):

- 1) memorability; 2) meaningfulness; 3) aesthetic appeal; 4) transferability (both within and across product categories and across geographical and cultural boundaries and market segments); 5) adaptability and flexibility over time; and 6) legal and competitive protectability and defensibility. Brand elements vary in their verbal vs. visual content and product specificity. Although a robust industry exists to help firms design and implement these various brand elements (Kohli and LaBahn 1997).

Integrating Marketing Channels & Communications:

Marketers employ an increasingly varied means of communication (e.g., various forms of broadcast, print, and interactive advertising, trade and consumer promotions, direct response, sponsorship, public relations, etc.) and multiple means of going to market (via retailers, company-owned stores or outlets, telephone, Internet, mail, etc.). Some marketers have attempted to orchestrate these activities to create synergistic effects (Duncan 2002). Research

has shown that coordinating marketing activities can lead to beneficial results (Naik and Raman 2003). For example, print and radio reinforcement of TV ads – where the video and audio components of a TV ad serve as the basis for print and radio ads – has been shown to leverage existing communication effects from TV ad exposure and more strongly link them to the brand (Edell and Keller 1989, 1999). Cueing a TV ad with an explicitly linked radio or print ad can create similar or even enhanced processing outcomes of the radio or print ad that can substitute for additional TV ad exposures.

Measuring Brand Equity:

In recognition of the value of brands as intangible assets, increased emphasis has been placed on understanding how to build, measure, and manage brand equity (Kapferer 2005; Keller 1993, 2003). There are three principal and distinct perspectives that have been taken by academics to study brand equity.

1. **Customer-based:** From the customer's point of view, brand equity is part of the attraction to – or repulsion from – a particular product from a particular company generated by the "non-objective" part of the product offering, i.e., not by the product attributes per se. While initially a brand may be synonymous with the product it makes, over time, through advertising, usage experience, and other activities and influences, it can develop a series of attachments and associations that exist over and beyond the objective product. Importantly, brand equity can be built on attributes that have no inherent value.
2. **Company-based:** From the company's point of view, a strong brand serves many purposes, including making advertising and promotion more effective, helping secure distribution, insulating a product from competition, and facilitating growth and expansion into other product categories. Brand equity from the company perspective is therefore the additional value (i.e., discounted cashflow) that accrues to a firm because of the presence of the brand name that would not accrue to an equivalent unbranded product. In economic terms, brand equity can be seen as the degree of "market inefficiency" that the firm is able to capture with its brands.
3. **Financial-based:** From a financial market's point of view, brands are assets that, like plant and equipment, can, and frequently are, bought and sold. The financial worth of a brand is therefore the price it brings or could bring in the financial market. Presumably this price reflects expectations about the discounted value of future cashflows. In the absence of a market transaction, it can be estimated, albeit with great difficulty.

Product-Market Level: A number of approaches have been developed to assess the impact of brand equity in the product-market. These include measures of price premiums, increased advertising elasticity, decreased sensitivity to competitors' prices, and the ability to secure and maintain distribution through channels (Hoeffler and Keller 2003). Several studies have demonstrated that leading brands can command large price differences (Simon 1979; Agrawal 1996; Park and Srinivasan 1994; Sethuraman 1996) and advertising may play a role in decreasing price sensitivity (Kanetkar, Weinberg, and Weiss 1992). Consumers who are highly loyal to a brand have been shown to increase purchases when advertising for the brand increased (Raj 1982, Hsu and Liu 2000). Research suggests that stores are more likely to feature well known brands if they convey a high quality image (Lal and Narasimhan 1996). Fader and Schmittlein (1993) proposed that differences in retail availability may be a key component of the higher repeat purchase rates for higher share brands.

Financial-Market Level: A different approach to measuring brand equity is based on financial market performance (Amir and Lev 1996; Barth et al. 1998). One measure that has been proposed uses the component of market value unexplained by financial assets and results (i.e., profits). Using Tobin's Q (the market value of assets divided by their replacement value as estimated by book value) as a proxy of brand equity, Lindenberg and Ross (1981) found that consumer goods companies such as Coca-Cola, Pepsico, Kellogg's, and General Foods had Tobin Q's greater than 2, suggesting that these companies had considerable intangible value. On the other hand, more commodity-like manufacturers such as metal producers and paper products companies had Tobin Q's of about 1. Simon and Sullivan (1993) decomposed firm value into tangible and intangible components: Tangible components reflected replacement costs and included assets such as plant and equipment and net receivables; intangible components were broken down into industry-wide, cost, and brand factors. The brand factors were derived from a market share equation using an instrumental variables approach (i.e., brand value was determined by order-of-entry and advertising). As a percent of replacement values, brand equity ranged from a low of essentially zero for categories such as paper and allied products; petroleum and coal; stone, glass, and coal; and primary and fabricated metals to as much as 61% for apparel, 58% for printing and publishing, and 46% for tobacco. Firms for which brand value exceeded replacement cost included Dreyer's Ice Cream, Tootsie Roll, and Smucker. Another approach to assessing the financial value of a brand involves taking customer mindset measures and relating them to stock market values. This approach is used by Stern Stewart's Brand Economics which link Young & Rubicam's Brand Asset Valuator, a survey-based.

STRATEGICALLY MANAGING THE BRAND:

In many firms, the CEO is effectively the Chief Brand Officer (CBO) as well. Regardless of who (if anyone) is in charge of managing the brand, several general strategic issues arise: the optimal design of brand architecture; the effects of co-branding and brand alliances; and cross-cultural and global branding strategies.

A SYSTEMS MODEL OF BRAND ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES:

A number of brand dashboards have been developed by firms which capture, but rarely link, many aspects of brand equity and performance. For branding research to be scientifically rigorous, it is important to develop a comprehensive model of how brand equity operates and to develop estimates of the various cause-and-effects links within it. To that end, we expand on the notion of a "brand value chain" (Keller and Lehmann 2003) discussed earlier. The chain focuses on the following four major stages:

1. **What Companies Do:** Marketing programs, as well as other company actions, form the controllable antecedents to the brand value chain. Importantly, these activities can be characterized along two separate dimensions: quantitative factors such as the type and amount marketing expenditures (e.g. dollars spent on media advertising) and qualitative factors such as the clarity, relevance, distinctiveness, and consistency of the marketing program, both over time and across marketing activities.
2. **What Customers Think & Feel:** Customer mind set consists of the "Five A's" discussed above. Importantly, there are feedback effects here, as demonstrated by the "halo effect" where brand attitudes affect perceptions of brand associations (Beckwith and Lehmann 1975, 1976). Moreover, what customers think and feel about brands is obviously not under the sole, or often even primary, control of the company.
3. **What Customers Do:** The primary payoff from customer thoughts and feelings is the purchases that they make. This product-market result is what generates revenue, share, and other metrics commonly used to evaluate the effectiveness of marketing programs. Of course, other things customers do, especially word of mouth, impact future product-market results and need to be considered in any comprehensive model.
4. **How Financial Markets React:** For a publicly held company, stock price and market capitalization, as well as related measures such as Tobin's Q, are critical metrics. In essence, these measures are the ultimate bottom line. As such, they are relevant at the CFO and CEO level, unlike most marketing metrics which are at the customer-level or product market-level. Importantly, stock price is impacted by a number of other variables, such as the growth potential of the industry as a whole, general economic trends, and stock market dynamics, which need to be controlled for in assessing the financial value of brands.

2. CONCLUSION

Branding and brand management has clearly become an important management priority for all types of organizations. Academic research has covered a number of different topics and conducted a number of different studies that have collectively advanced our understanding of brands. Table 1 summarizes some of the generalizations that have emerged from these research studies that were reviewed in this paper. Upon reflection, it may seem that some of these research questions are fairly uncontroversial. Further, there undoubtedly exists some research which bears, at least tangentially, on all of them. Nevertheless, they are worthy research questions because: 1) the issues have not been fully resolved at the level of "laws" or empirical generalizations and 2) the issues are frequently raised by practitioners, suggesting that as a field, our communications, if not our findings, have failed to reach and impact an important constituency.