

## Brand Image and Demographics: A Study with respect to Cream Brands

Virender Dahiya, Research Scholar, HSB, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar, Professor, HSB, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hisar

### ABSTRACT

*Consumers seek to depict themselves in their brand choices. Brands are renowned for offering consumers a unique set of perceived benefits not found in other products. Brand image is a mental construct that consumers form based on their connections and associations with the brand. The present study analyzes brand image of most preferred cream brand among users, also how demographics impact brand image. ANOVA and t-test has been applied to measure brand image among the respondents of different demographic backgrounds. Levene's statistics has been calculated before applying ANOVA or student t-test. In case of ANOVA, where the variance across groups is homogeneous F-statistic has been applied otherwise Welch-statistic, a robust test of equality of means, has been used. Post hoc test is applied for multiple comparisons of means and statistical significance of inter-group mean difference is also measured. In case of equality of means, Tukey and LSD tests have been applied and in case of inequality of means, Tamhane's T2 statistic has been applied.*

### Key words

*Brand, Brand Image, Consumer, Cream, Demographics*

### INTRODUCTION

A brand is the identity of a specific product, service, or business. A brand can take many forms, including a name, sign, symbol, color combination or slogan. The process of branding originated as a means by which a firm could differentiate its goods and services from those of its competitors (Cowley, 1991). Brands are wealth generators of 21st century. Initially, branding acted as a promise of consistency and quality for consumers (Aaker, 1996). Now, however, brands are renowned for offering consumers a unique set of perceived benefits not found in other products (Randall, 1997).

Consumers seek to depict themselves in their brand choices- they tend to approach products with images that could enhance their self-concept and avoid those products that do not (Govers and Schoormans, 2005; Karande, Zinkhan and Lum, 1997). Individuals have been thought to have a single self-image and to be interested, as consumers, in products and services that satisfy that single self, however, it is more accurate to think of consumers as having multiple selves (Markus and Nurius, 1986).

Social comparison theory explicitly encompasses the comparative aspect of self-evaluation. People have a basic need to evaluate their opinions and abilities and this need can be satisfied by comparing oneself with others. In the absence of an objective or physical basis of comparison, people utilize a social basis of comparison, such as their peers (Festinger, 1954). Sirgy (1982) postulated that consumers would approach products with images that serve to enhance and boost their self-esteem and avoid those that do not.

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The term brand image stands for brand, store, corporate, or product image. Brand image is a mental construct that consumers form based on their connections and associations with the brand. Aaker (1991) argues the value of a brand is in the set of associations occurring in the mind of the consumer. Ditcher (1985) sees brand image as the total impression in the mind of the consumer. Kotler (2000) defines brand image as the set of beliefs held about a particular brand. Keller (1993) defines brand associations as meaningful memory nodes in a memory network. Consumers form an image of the brand based on the associations they remember.

Several of the definitions are so broad that they seem to contribute little to a refined understanding of the brand image concept. While it is therefore difficult to compare

these to other more systematic definitions, it is important to acknowledge them because they are rather effective expressions of the general sense of brand image as an abstraction. Markus and Nurius (1986) argued that people from Western and Eastern cultures have strikingly different construals of the self. The Western (or independent) construal views the self as an independent, self-contained, autonomous entity. The self has a unique and stable configuration of internal attributes that governs the individual's behavior across situations. The Eastern (or interdependent) construal views the self as an interconnected entity that is most meaningful when cast within an interpersonal context. Internal attributes are seen as situation specific and, to the extent that there is recognition of invariant attributes, they tend not to be.

A research study on product image and consumer preference found that people prefer products with a product image that matches their self-image. Given this relationship between brand preference and consumers' self-images it is natural that consumers use brands to help them in their task of defining themselves. Research indicates that consumers who have strong link to a particular brand, a positive self brand connection, see such brands as representing an aspect of themselves. For marketers such connections are certainly an important step in the formation of consumer loyalty and a positive relationship with consumers (Fournier, 1998)

Abhilasha Mehta (1999) posited that how people think and feel about themselves can influence significantly how they react to a commercial's content and execution, as well as to the advertised product. Preferences may develop for certain brands because consumers perceive the particular brand as reflecting their own self-image or projecting an image that they aspire to possess. These influences can be particularly important when value-expressive attributes or image of the product rather than functional attributes and informational claims are used in the advertising. Underwood, Bond and Baer (2001) postulated that the power of a brand resides in the consumer's mind from both lived (purchase & usage) and mediated (advertising & promotion) experiences.

## OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### *Objectives of the study*

1. To study most preferred cream brand and its brand image among users.

2. To analyze impact of demographics on brand image of most preferred cream brand.

Following hypotheses have been formed to analyze respondents' demographic background and brand image of most preferred cream brand

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant difference among respondents of different age groups regarding brand image of most preferred cream brand.

**H<sub>a1</sub>:** There is a significant difference among respondents of different age groups regarding brand image of most preferred cream brand.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant difference between male and female respondents regarding brand image of most preferred cream brand.

**H<sub>a2</sub>:** There is a significant difference between male and female respondents regarding brand image of most preferred cream brand.

### *Research Methodology*

Research design of the study is descriptive cum exploratory in nature. Study has been conducted on population of Delhi and NCR. Both these regions represent characteristics of our country as people from all parts of India are settled here. Sample size for the study is 166. To measure brand image, a 15 item scale developed by N. K. Malhotra has been used. It is a semantic differential scale. The scale items have an acceptable level of test-retest reliability.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

ANOVA and t-test has been applied to measure brand image for most preferred cream brand among the respondents of different demographic backgrounds. Levene's statistics has been calculated before applying ANOVA or student t-test. In case of ANOVA, where the variance across groups is homogeneous F-statistic has been applied otherwise Welch-statistic, a robust test of equality of means, has been used.

Post hoc test is applied for multiple comparisons of means and statistical significance of inter-group mean difference is also measured. In case of equality of means, Tukey and LSD tests have been applied and in case of inequality of means, Tamhane's T2 statistic has been applied.

**Table 1: Demographic profile of respondents**

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	14-19 years	20	12.0
	20-29 years	55	33.1
	30-39 years	47	28.3
	40 years and above	44	26.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100</b>
Gender	Male	71	42.8
	Female	95	57.2
<b>Total</b>		<b>166</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Primary Data

People of different age groups show different types of consumption behaviour. So, it is important to study the behaviour of different ages. In this paper, four age groups have been studied. 12.0 percent respondents belong to 14-19 years age group, 33.1 percent from 20-29 years age group, 28.3 percent from 30-39 years of age group and remaining 26.5 percent from 40 and above age group (Table 1).

Male and female show different buying behavior, some of the products they consume are different and also they may buy the same product for different reasons. In this study, 42.8% are male respondents and 57.2% are female respondents (Table 1).

**Table 2: Most preferred cream brand**

Brand	Frequency	Percent
Amway	2	1.2
Ayur	4	2.4
Boroline	1	.6
Boroplus	2	1.2
Emami	2	1.2
Fair & Handsome	6	3.6
Fair & Lovely	9	5.4
Garnier	8	4.8
Himalaya	7	4.2
Lakme	22	13.3
L'oreal	5	3.0
Lotus	9	5.4
Maybelline	1	.6
Olay	7	4.2
Oriflame	6	3.6
Patanjali	12	7.2
Ponds	7	4.2
Vaseline	18	10.8
Vicco	2	1.2
VLCC	1	.6
Nivea	24	14.5
Charms	2	1.2

Dove	4	2.4
Dabur Gulabari	2	1.2
Label.M	1	.6
J&J	1	.6
Mark & Spencer	1	.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Primary Data

Nivea is the market leader with 14.5 percent respondents preferring it. Lakme (13.3%), Vaseline (10.8%), Patanjali (7.2%), Fair & Lovely (5.4%), Lotus (5.4%) and Garnier (4.8%) are also doing well. The top ten spots are completed with Himalaya (4.2%), Ponds (4.2%) and Olay (4.2%) (Table 2).

**Table 3: Brand image of most preferred cream brand**

Brand Image Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation
Rugged-Delicate	3.16	1.734
Excitable-Calm	4.22	1.759
Uncomfortable-Comfortable	5.57	1.276
Dominating-Submissive	3.84	1.505
Thrifty-Indulgent	3.40	1.525
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.30	1.261
Contemporary-Noncontemporary	2.60	1.427
Organized-Unorganized	2.22	1.151
Rational-Emotional	3.02	1.580
Youthful-Mature	3.39	1.956
Formal-Informal	3.05	1.685
Orthodox-Liberal	4.63	1.678
Complex-Simple	4.92	1.675
Colorless-Colorful	4.89	1.758
Modest-Vain	2.75	1.409

Source: Primary Data

Brand image for most preferred cream brand on rugged-delicate variable is 3.16, which mean that people have somewhat rugged (3.16) image for their favourite cream brand. On excitable-calm variable it is neither excitable nor calm (4.22), mostly comfortable (5.57) on uncomfortable-comfortable, neither dominating nor submissive (3.84) on dominating-submissive, somewhat thrifty (3.40) on thrifty-indulgent, mostly pleasant (2.30) on pleasant-unpleasant, somewhat contemporary (2.60) on contemporary-noncontemporary, mostly organized (2.22) on organized- unorganized, somewhat rational (3.02) on rational-emotional, somewhat youthful (3.39) on youthful-mature, somewhat formal (3.05) on formal-informal, somewhat liberal (4.63) on orthodox-liberal, somewhat simple (4.92) on complex-simple, somewhat colorful (4.89) on colorless-colorful and somewhat modest (2.75) on modest-vain variable (Table 3).

**AGE AND BRAND IMAGE FACTORS**

**Table 4: Comparison of mean score of different age groups on brand image factors**

Brand image factors	Age groups				Total
	14-19 yrs	20-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40 yrs and above	
Rugged-Delicate	2.20	2.91	3.60	3.43	3.16
Excitable-Calm	3.35	3.84	4.60	4.70	4.22
Uncomfortable-Comfortable	5.90	5.38	5.53	5.68	5.57
Dominating-Submissive	3.25	3.56	4.11	4.18	3.84
Thrifty-Indulgent	3.30	3.36	3.60	3.30	3.40
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.00	2.49	2.36	2.11	2.30
Contemporary-Noncontemporary	2.05	2.84	2.55	2.61	2.60
Organized-Unorganized	1.70	2.31	2.49	2.07	2.22
Rational-Emotional	2.30	2.96	3.30	3.14	3.02
Youthful-Mature	3.60	3.15	3.77	3.18	3.39
Formal-Informal	2.35	3.09	3.15	3.23	3.05
Orthodox-Liberal	5.10	4.64	4.87	4.16	4.63
Complex-Simple	4.10	5.09	4.98	5.00	4.92
Colorless-Colorful	4.50	4.95	4.98	4.91	4.89
Modest-Vain	2.10	2.82	2.98	2.70	2.75

Source: Primary Data

**Table 5: ANOVA test statistics for age of the respondent and brand image factors**

	Levene statistic	Sig.	F	Sig.
Rugged-Delicate	.448	.719	3.983	.009*
Excitable-Calm	1.176	.321	4.613	.004*
Uncomfortable-Comfortable	4.570	.004*	NA	
Dominating-Submissive	.058	.982	2.993	.033*
Thrifty-Indulgent	.151	.929	.361	.781
Pleasant-Unpleasant	1.490	.219	1.157	.328
Contemporary-Noncontemporary	5.508	.001*	NA	
Organized-Unorganized	2.622	.053	2.659	.050
Rational-Emotional	2.224	.087	2.008	.115
Youthful-Mature	1.548	.204	1.110	.347
Formal-Informal	1.255	.292	1.387	.249
Orthodox-Liberal	.115	.951	2.043	.110
Complex-Simple	2.125	.099	1.871	.137

Colorless-Colorful	2.995	.032*	NA	
Modest-Vain	1.462	.227	1.922	.128

Source: Primary Data

\*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test has been used on brand image factors to analyze the effect of respondents' age on these factors. Levene's test shows that variance across age groups is homogeneous for twelve factors (F-statistics is applicable) and is not homogeneous for remaining three factors (Welch statistic, more robust test of equality of means, is applicable). F-statistics has given significant results on rugged-delicate, excitable-calm and dominating-submissive factors (Table 5).

**Table 6: Robust Tests of Equality of Means- Welch Test**

	Levene statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Df1	Df2	Sig.
Uncomfortable-Comfortable	4.570	.004*	1.173	3	74.351	.326
Contemporary-Noncontemporary	5.508	.001*	2.816	3	78.896	.044*
Colorless-Colorful	2.995	.032*	.247	3	65.814	.863

Source: Primary Data

\*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Welch-statistics has given significant results on contemporary-noncontemporary factor (Table 6).

Respondents of different age groups have different brand image on 'rugged-delicate', 'excitable-calm', 'dominating-submissive' and 'contemporary-noncontemporary' factors for their most favourite cream brand, so null hypothesis is rejected for these four factors (Table 5 & 6).

Null hypothesis is accepted for other 11 factors of brand image i.e. there is no significant difference among different age groups regarding brand image for their most favourite cream brand.

**Table 7: Post Hoc Tests- Multiple Comparisons using Tukey, LSD and Tamhane Tests**

Tukey Test	Rugged-Delicate			
	14-19 yrs	20-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40 yrs and above
14-19 yrs	-	-.709	-1.396*	-1.232*
20-29 yrs		-	-.687	-.523
30-39 yrs			-	-.164

40 yrs and above				-
<b>Tukey Test</b>	<b>Excitable-Calm</b>			
Age groups	14-19 yrs	20-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40 yrs and above
14-19 yrs	-	-.486	-1.246*	-1.355*
20-29 yrs		-	-.759	-.868
30-39 yrs			-	-.109
40 yrs and above				-
<b>LSD Test</b>	<b>Dominating-Submissive</b>			
Age groups	14-19 yrs	20-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40 yrs and above
14-19 yrs	-	-.314	-.856*	-.932*
20-29 yrs		-	-.543	-.618*
30-39 yrs			-	.075
40 yrs and above				-
<b>Tamhane Test</b>	<b>Contemporary-Noncontemporary</b>			
Age groups	14-19 yrs	20-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40 yrs and above
14-19 yrs	-	-.786*	-.503	-.564
20-29 yrs		-	.283	.223
30-39 yrs			-	-.060
40 yrs and above				-

Source: Primary Data

\*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Post hoc tests help to know the significance of mean difference between two age groups whose effect is already reflected in one-way ANOVA.

**Rugged-Delicate:** Tukey test results show that the views of 14-19 yrs age group differ significantly from 30-39 yrs age group and 40 yrs and above age group. Respondents of 14-19 yrs age group view their most preferred cream brand as mostly rugged (Table 7).

**Excitable-Calm:** Tukey test results show that the views of 14-19 yrs age group differ significantly from 30-39 yrs age group and 40 yrs and above age group. Respondents of 14-19 yrs age group view their most preferred cream brand as excitable while the older age groups 30-39 yrs, and 40 yrs and above view their most preferred cream brand as calm (Table 7).

**Dominating-Submissive:** LSD test results show that the views of oldest age group 40 years and above differ significantly from 14-19 yrs age group and 20-29 yrs age group. Also views of 30-39 yrs age group differ significantly from 14-19 yrs. Respondents belonging to oldest age group and 30-39 yrs group view their most preferred cream brand as neither dominating nor submissive, while 14-19 yrs age group and 20-29 yrs view

their most preferred cream brand as somewhat dominating (Table 7).

**Contemporary-Noncontemporary:** Tamhane test results show that the views of 14-19 yrs age group differ significantly from 20-29 yrs age group. Respondents of 14-19 yrs age group view their most preferred cream brand as mostly contemporary (Table 7).

### Gender and Brand Image Factors

Table 8: T-test group statistics (Gender and Brand Image Variable)

Brand Image Variable	Gender of Respondents	Number of Respondents	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
<b>Rugged-Delicate</b>	Male	71	2.79	1.690	.201
	Female	95	3.43	1.724	.177
<b>Excitable-Calm</b>	Male	71	4.06	1.788	.212
	Female	95	4.35	1.737	.178
<b>Uncomfortable-Comfortable</b>	Male	71	5.66	1.158	.137
	Female	95	5.49	1.360	.139
<b>Dominating-Submissive</b>	Male	71	3.77	1.475	.175
	Female	95	3.89	1.533	.157
<b>Thrifty-Indulgent</b>	Male	71	3.52	1.602	.190
	Female	95	3.32	1.468	.151
<b>Pleasant-Unpleasant</b>	Male	71	2.42	1.380	.164
	Female	95	2.20	1.163	.119
<b>Contemporary-Noncontemporary</b>	Male	71	2.92	1.583	.188
	Female	95	2.37	1.255	.129
<b>Organized-Unorganized</b>	Male	71	2.23	1.311	.156
	Female	95	2.22	1.023	.105
<b>Rational-Emotional</b>	Male	71	3.11	1.498	.178
	Female	95	2.96	1.643	.169
<b>Youthful-Mature</b>	Male	71	3.55	2.069	.246
	Female	95	3.26	1.869	.192
<b>Formal-Informal</b>	Male	71	3.11	1.871	.222
	Female	95	3.01	1.540	.158
<b>Orthodox-Liberal</b>	Male	71	4.79	1.690	.201
	Female	95	4.52	1.669	.171
<b>Complex-Simple</b>	Male	71	4.92	1.645	.195
	Female	95	4.92	1.705	.175
<b>Colorless-Colorful</b>	Male	71	5.06	1.723	.204
	Female	95	4.77	1.783	.183
<b>Modest-Vain</b>	Male	71	3.00	1.502	.178
	Female	95	2.56	1.310	.134

Source: Primary Data

**Table 9: Independent samples t-test (Gender and Brand Image Variable)**

			Levene's test for equality of var.		T-test for equality of means		
			F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
<b>Rugged-Delicate</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	.000	.991	-2.397	164	.018*
		Equal var. not assumed			-2.404	152.530	.017
<b>Excitable-Calm</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	.016	.900	-1.055	164	.293
		Equal var. not assumed			-1.050	148.532	.295
<b>Uncomfortable-Comfortable</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	1.277	.260	.834	164	.405
		Equal var. not assumed			.854	161.149	.394
<b>Dominating-Submissive</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	.178	.674	-.507	164	.613
		Equal var. not assumed			-.510	153.916	.611
<b>Thrifty-Indulgent</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	.350	.555	.857	164	.393
		Equal var. not assumed			.847	143.350	.399
<b>Pleasant-Unpleasant</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	3.035	.083	1.125	164	.262
		Equal var. not assumed			1.098	135.603	.274
<b>Contemporary-Noncontemporary</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	6.160	.014*	2.483	164	.014
		Equal var. not assumed			2.401	129.865	.018*
<b>Organized-Unorganized</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	1.439	.232	.024	164	.981
		Equal var. not assumed			.023	128.365	.982
<b>Rational-Emotional</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	1.459	.229	.623	164	.534
		Equal var. not assumed			.632	157.597	.528
<b>Youthful-Mature</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	3.206	.075	.932	164	.353
		Equal var. not assumed			.918	142.088	.360
<b>Formal-Informal</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	4.083	.045*	.385	164	.700
		Equal var. not assumed			.375	133.372	.708
<b>Orthodox-Liberal</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	.049	.825	1.037	164	.301
		Equal var. not assumed			1.035	149.923	.302
<b>Complex-Simple</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	.118	.732	-.001	164	.999
		Equal var. not assumed			-.001	153.726	.999
<b>Colorless-Colorful</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	.011	.916	1.044	164	.298
		Equal var. not assumed			1.049	153.627	.296
<b>Modest-Vain</b>	Gender	Equal Var. assumed	1.767	.186	2.019	164	.045*
		Equal var. not assumed			1.980	138.818	.050

Source: Primary Data

\*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Independent samples t-test has been used on brand image factors to analyze the effect of respondents' gender on these factors. T-statistics has given significant results on rugged-delicate, contemporary-noncontemporary and modest-vain factors. It implies that males view the image of their most preferred cream brand as more rugged than viewed by females. Females view the image of their most preferred cream brand as more contemporary and more modest than viewed by males (Table 8&9).

**CONCLUSION**

Nivea, Lakme and Vaseline have emerged as the most preferred cream brands. Respondents of different age

groups have different brand image on 'rugged-delicate', 'excitable-calm', 'dominating-submissive' and 'contemporary-noncontemporary' factors for their most favourite cream brand. Respondents of 14-19 yrs age group view their most preferred cream brand as mostly rugged, contemporary, and excitable as compared to other age groups. Respondents belonging to oldest age group and 30-39 yrs group view their most preferred cream brand as neither dominating nor submissive, while 14-19 yrs age group and 20-29 yrs view their most preferred cream brand as somewhat dominating.

Males view the image of their most preferred cream brand as more rugged than viewed by females. Females view the

image of their most preferred cream brand as more contemporary and more modest than viewed by males.

**Table10: Summary of hypothesis testing on brand image of most preferred cream brand**

	<b>H<sub>01</sub></b> : There is no significant difference among respondents of <b>different age groups</b> regarding brand image of most preferred cream brand	<b>H<sub>02</sub></b> : There is no significant difference <b>between male and female</b> respondents regarding brand image of most preferred cream brand
<b>Rugged-Delicate</b>	Rejected	Rejected
<b>Excitable-Calm</b>	Rejected	Not rejected
<b>Uncomfortable-Comfortable</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Dominating-Submissive</b>	Rejected	Not rejected
<b>Thrifty-Indulgent</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Pleasant-Unpleasant</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Contemporary-Noncontemporary</b>	Rejected	Rejected
<b>Organized-Unorganized</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Rational-Emotional</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Youthful-Mature</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Formal-Informal</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Orthodox-Liberal</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Complex-Simple</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Colorless-Colorful</b>	Not rejected	Not rejected
<b>Modest-Vain</b>	Not rejected	Rejected

These insights can help cosmetics brand marketers in designing and implementing better marketing programs for their target markets.

**REFERENCES**

[1] Aaker, D. (1996). Building strong brands. Free Press. New York. NY.  
[2] Cowley, D. (1991). Understanding brands by ten people who do. Kogan Page. London.

[3] Ditcher, E. (1985). What’s in an image? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 75-81.  
[4] Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.  
[5] Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24.  
[6] Govers, P. C. M. & Schoormans, J. P. L. (2005). Product personality and its influence on consumer preference. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22, 4, 189-197.  
[7] Karande, K., Zinkhan, G. M., & Lum, A. B. (1997). Brand personality and self-concept: A replication and extension. *AMA Summer Conference*, 165-171.  
[8] Keller, K. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing consumer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 1-22.  
[9] Kotler, P. (2000). Marketing management: Analysis, planning, and control, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.  
[10] Malhotra, N. K. (1981). A scale to measure self-concepts, person concepts, and product concepts. *Journal of Marketing research*, 456-64.  
[11] Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 954-969.  
[12] Mehta, A. (1999). Using self-concept to assess advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 81-89.  
[13] Randall, G. (1997). Branding: A practical guide to planning, organizing and strategy. Kogan Page. London.  
[14] Sirgy, M. J. (1992). Self-concept in consumer behavior: A critical review. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 287-300.  
[15] Underwood, R., Bond, E., & Baer R. (2001). Building service brands via social identity: Lessons from the sports marketplace. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 1-13.