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ABSTRACT

One of the hottest topics in marketing in recent years has been Brand Equity. A strong and powerful brand with affirmative brand equity has several rewards such as high margins, brand extension opportunities, more powerful and effective communications and higher consumer preferences and purchase intentions and many others. Further, there are certain scales like the one proposed by Yoo & Donthu for evaluating the brand performance have certainly proved to be milestone in the direction. Thus this paper is an attempt to reinforce the scales and evaluates the global brands and their performance in the Indian environment.
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Today’s extremely competitive and globalized environment the creation and maintenance of brands is becoming increasingly imperative. There exists a fierce alteration of brand portfolios in favor of global brands by several multinational corporations (Seetharaman et al., 2001, Steenkamp et al., 2002 and Wulf et al., 2005). One such example is the telecom giant, Vodafone, replacing the local brand names in many countries by the global Vodafone (in India Hutch to Vodafone). One of the major factors that are causing a shift from the local to global brand adoption is globalization (Steenkamp et al., 2002). Apart from yielding economies of scale, globalization practically increases consumers around the world to develop similar preferences and speeds up a brand’s time to market globally instead of domestic modifications (Hassen and Katsanis, 1994 and Yip, 1995). The shift towards global brands is also attributed to the consumers’ preference for brands with global image over local competitors that have resulted in to evaluation of brand equity of such brands vis-a-vis with their global counter part.

Method

Research Background

The purpose of the research is to study the awareness, preference and the purchase pattern of the select Global Brands. Further, it focuses on the performance of the select Global Brands and their reasons for success and less success of the brands. It further focuses on to evaluate the brands' journey on several parameters and scales of Customer Based Brand Equity Model of David Aaker propounded by Yoo & Donthu. Thus, the primary purpose is to analyze, evaluate the critical success factors for global brands to succeed in India for which online survey was conduction of experts. The select FMCG brands are hereunder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Global Company</th>
<th>Market Share 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coca Cola</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nestle</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HUL</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives of the Research

The objectives of the research are as follows:

1. To identify group of key success factors from among the successful and less successful International Brands.
2. To apply and analyze the Customer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) Model on the successful and less successful consumable FMCG Global Brands

Literature Review & Conceptual Framework

Development of Instrument

The items used in Expert Opinion survey instrument were adapted from the related literature. For instance, perceived quality statements were derived from the studies of Paramasuraman et al. (1985), Aaker (1991, 1996), and Erdem and Swait (1993); brand loyalty statements were resulted from the studies of Yoo et al. (2000) and Keller (2003). Brand associations and awareness statements were tailored from the studies of Agarwal and Rao (1996), Aaker (1996) and Yoo et al. (2000). For brand awareness, used separate statement referring to brand recall (recall the symbol or logo), top of mind awareness (first-name brand), and brand knowledge (knowing the productized and beverage assortment). Brand trust statements were derived from the studies of Erdem and Swait (1998) and Delgado Ballister et al. (2003). Here, author referred to brand reliability (the consumer’s belief that the brand accomplishes its value promise), brand intentions (the consumer’s belief that the brand would hold the consumer’s interest when unexpected problems with the consumption arise), and credibility (truthfulness and dependability). For brand association / differentiation measures, the researcher used Aaker’s (1996) “brand-as-product” and “brand-as-organization” perspectives.
The former focuses on the brand’s value proposition, which involves a functional benefit (value for money and reasons to buy the brand over competitors). The latter plays an important role by showing that a brand represents more than products and services. Organizational associations are particularly helpful when brands are similar in terms of attributes, when the organization is visible or when a corporate brand is involved. In determining the specific words in the brand association statements, I relied on the slogans used as well as the brands’ general global performance.

Data Collection

Table 2 Experts’ Bifurcation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Manager</th>
<th>Brand Manager</th>
<th>Marketing Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
<td>Marketing Professors</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the survey was online and there was no gone for judgmental sampling wherein, the online link was mailed to the Experts for their opinion. However, the total responses collected were 114 responses out of which got qualified to be analyzed. The bifurcation of the experts in terms of their profession is given above, wherein the highest being Marketing Managers and Marketing Professors followed by Sales Managers, Brand Managers, Product Managers & Consultants.

Results And Analysis

Colgate Vs Pepsodent

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant difference in the Perceived Quality from Colgate to Pepsodent.

PQ1: I think that the taste of Colgate/Pepsodent is delicious

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Perceived Quality of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Perceived Quality from Colgate (4.52, 1.187) to Pepsodent (4.20, 0.957), t(100) = 7.856, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Perceived quality was 0.72 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.531 to 0.909. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

PQ2: Quality of Colgate/Pepsodent is satisfactory

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Perceived Quality of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Perceived Quality from Colgate (5.36, 1.381) to Pepsodent (4.36, 1.415), t(100) = 6.124, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Perceived quality was 1.0 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.563 to 1.337. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

PQ3: Colgate/Pepsodent has well designed color & package

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Perceived Quality of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Perceived Quality from Colgate (5.44, 0.981) to Pepsodent (4.68, 0.9), t(100) = 6.718, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Perceived quality was 0.75 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.58 to 0.94. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

PQ4: Even the quality is consistent

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Perceived Quality of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Perceived Quality from Colgate (5.36, 0.86) to Pepsodent (4.36, 0.81), t(100) = 7.32, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Perceived quality was 1.0 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.881 to 1.119. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Here HYPOTHESIS is accepted. As PQ3 & PQ4 are having highest eta effects, they will be selected for further use.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant decrease in the Brand Loyalty from Colgate to Pepsodent

BL5: I really love Colgate/Pepsodent

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from Colgate (4.56, 1.369) to Pepsodent (4.04, 0.935), t(100) = 5.662, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 0.52 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.555 to 1.255. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL6: Colgate/Pepsodent is my first choice in oral care

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from Colgate (4.68, 1.52) to Pepsodent (4.20, 1.384), t(100) = 3.847, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 0.48 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.21 to 0.75. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL7: I do not prefer to purchase any other product then Colgate/Pepsodent

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from Colgate (4.2, 1.8) to Pepsodent (3.6, 1.4), t(100) = 2.683, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 0.6 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.14 to 1.1. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL8: I consider myself as Loyalty Customer of Colgate/Pepsodent

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from Colgate (4.16, 1.75) to Pepsodent (3.56, 1.35), t(100) = 2.586, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 0.6 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.12 to 1.08. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL9: My friends and family prefer/want Colgate/Pepsodent

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from Colgate (4.56, 1.23) to Pepsodent (3.92, 0.997), t(100) = 6.532, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 0.64 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.44 to 0.85. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL10: I think, Colgate/Pepsodent is superior to other products

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from Colgate (4.24, 1.23) to Pepsodent (3.84, 1.38), t(100) = 2.45, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 0.4 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.06 to 0.74. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Here HYPOTHESIS will be accepted, as BL1 & BL5 are having highest eta effects.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference in the Brand Association from Colgate to Pepsodent

BA11: "Success" is one of the words that describes Colgate/Pepsodent

A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Association of Colgate & Pepsodent Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Association from Colgate (4.56, 1.5) to Pepsodent (3.95, 0.6), t(100) = 4.73, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Association was 1.04 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.99 to 1.1. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.
A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand association of Colgate & Pepsodent brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand association from Colgate (5.2, 1.35) to Pepsodent (4.12, 1.13), t(100) = 10.56, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand association was 1.08 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.88 to 1.26. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BA13: Colgate responds itself according to the environmental circumstances. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand association of Colgate & Pepsodent brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand association from Colgate (5.04, 1.06) to Pepsodent (4.2, 0.98), t(100) = 2.21, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand association was 0.84 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.61 to 1.07. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BA14: “Germiloch” is one of the words that describes Colgate/Pepsodent business philosophy. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand association of Colgate & Pepsodent brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand association from Colgate (5.2, 1.08) to Pepsodent (4.6, 1.3), t(100) = 7.58, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand association was 0.84 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.61 to 1.07. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Here, HYPOTHESIS will be accepted, as BA2 & BA3 are having highest eta effects.

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant decrease in the brand trust from Colgate to Pepsodent.

BT15: I trust Colgate/Pepsodent as a brand. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand trust of Colgate & Pepsodent brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand trust from Colgate (5.52, 0.87) to Pepsodent (3.76, 1.48), t(100) = 9.08, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand trust was 1.76 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 1.39 to 2.14. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BT16: Colgate/Pepsodent provides quality as per promised. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand trust of Colgate & Pepsodent brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand trust from Colgate (5.76, 1.09) to Pepsodent (4.04, 1.57), t(100) = 4.82, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand trust was 1.72 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 1.34 to 2.14. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BT17: Quality is always continuous and consistent. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand trust of Colgate & Pepsodent brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand trust from Colgate (5.56, 0.71) to Pepsodent (4.2, 1.0), t(100) = 10.66, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand trust was 1.36 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 1.12 to 1.6. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BT18: It provides Oral Care solution as promised in the advertisement. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand trust of Colgate & Pepsodent brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand trust from Colgate (5.2, 1.04) to Pepsodent (4.12, 0.97), t(100) = 4.43, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand trust was 1.08 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.82 to 1.34. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Here, HYPOTHESIS is accepted, as BT1 & BT3 are having highest eta effects.

Hypothesis 1: There is significant decrease in the Perceived Quality from Maggi to Heinz.

PO1: I think that the taste of Maggi/Heinz is delicious. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the perceived quality of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in perceived quality from Maggi-Ketchup (4.56, 1.16) to Heinz (4.16, 0.62), t(100) = 2.83, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in perceived quality was 0.4 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.11 to 0.69. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

PO2: Quality of Maggi/Heinz is satisfactory. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the perceived quality of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in perceived quality from Maggi-Ketchup (4.8, 1) to Heinz (4.16, 0.62), t(100) = 5.3, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in perceived quality was 0.64 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.44 to 0.84. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

PO3: Maggi/Heinz has well designed bottle layout. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the perceived quality of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in perceived quality from Maggi-Ketchup (4.56, 0.92) to Heinz (4.28, 0.68), t(100) = 3.66, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in perceived quality was 0.76 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.49 to 1.03. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

PO4: Even the quality is consistent. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the perceived quality of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in perceived quality from Maggi-Ketchup (4.8, 1) to Heinz (4.04, 0.54), t(100) = 5.73, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in perceived quality was 0.76 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.49 to 1.03. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Here, HYPOTHESIS will be accepted as PO2 & PO4 are having highest eta effects.

Hypothesis 5: There is significant decrease in the Brand Loyalty from Maggi to Heinz.

BL5: I really love Maggi Ketchup/Heinz. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand loyalty of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand loyalty from Maggi-Ketchup (4.56, 1.39) to Heinz (4.04, 0.84), t(100) = 2.59, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand loyalty was 0.72 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.11 to 0.93. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL6: Maggi/Heinz is my first choice in sauces. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand loyalty of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand loyalty from Maggi-Ketchup (4.68, 1.25) to Heinz (3.48, 0.83), t(100) = 2.53, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand loyalty was 1.2 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.93 to 1.47. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL7: I do not prefer to purchase any other brand than Maggi/Heinz. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand loyalty of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand loyalty from Maggi-Ketchup (4.92, 1.08) to Heinz (3.2, 1.12), t(100) = 18.27, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand loyalty was 1.72 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 1.53 to 1.91. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL8: I consider myself as Loyal Customer of Maggi/Heinz. A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the brand loyalty of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in brand loyalty from Maggi-Ketchup (4.08, 0.95) to Heinz (3.4, 1), t(100) = 3.39, p < 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in brand loyalty was 1.68 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 1.42 to 1.94. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.
BL9: My friends and family prefer/ want Maggi/Heinz
A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from having highest effect sizes. Maggi-Ketchup (4.8, 1.22) to Heinz (3.8, 0.5), t(100)=9.35, p< 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 1 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.64 to 1.35. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BL10: Think, Maggi/Heinz is superior to other products
A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Loyalty of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Loyalty from having highest effect sizes. Maggi-Ketchup (4.8, 1.22) to Heinz (3.8, 0.5), t(100)=9.35, p< 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Loyalty was 1 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.64 to 1.35. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Hypothesis 1: There is significant decrease in the Brand Association of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Association was 0.48 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.21 to 0.75. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Hypothesis 2: “Purity” is one of the words that describes Maggi/Heinz brand
A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Association of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Association was 0.48 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.21 to 0.75. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BT15: Trust Maggi/Heinz as a brand
A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Trust of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Trust from having highest effect sizes. Maggi-Ketchup (4.8, 2.04) to Heinz (3.92, 0.4), t(100)=6.65, p< 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Trust was 1.08 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.74 to 1.34. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BT16: Maggi/Heinz provides quality as per promised
A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Trust of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Trust from having highest effect sizes. Maggi-Ketchup (4.8, 2.04) to Heinz (3.92, 0.4), t(100)=7.17, p< 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Trust was 1.12 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.8 to 1.44. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

BT17: Quality is always continuous and consistent
A Paired-Samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the Brand Trust of Maggi-Ketchup & Heinz Brands. There was a statistically significant decrease in Brand Trust from having highest effect sizes. Maggi-Ketchup (4.8, 2.04) to Heinz (3.92, 0.4), t(100)=7.17, p< 0.05 (two-tailed). The mean decrease in Brand Trust was 1.12 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.8 to 1.44. The eta squared statistics indicated a large effect size.

Conclusions
Author believes that couture marketing strategies according to these variables is critical in designing global consumer solutions. For managers, brand trust in particular deserves special attention, not only because it is a major dimension of brand equity as confirmed in this research but also it is directly related to several dimensions of global brands and company reputation. More specifically, managers should elaborate on trust-building aspects of the marketing mix with a view on social and environmental responsibility programs. Today’s revenues of some global corporations have begun to exceed the gross national product of many of the less developed countries where they do business (Potts & Matuszczek, 2004).

Table 3: Critical Success Factors of Successful Brands over Less-Successful Brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>COLOG HEINZ</th>
<th>COLG KETCHUP</th>
<th>KOLG HEINZ</th>
<th>MAGG KETCHUP</th>
<th>MAGG HEINZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P27</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P28</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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