



Factors responsible for the convolution of the purchasing Brands and Non-Brands

Praveen Kumar Pandey

Sharda University, Greater Noida, India

Prashant Kumar Pandey

Amity University, Noida, India

Abstract

Consumer behavior is an area of study that has always attracted the attention of many research scholars. The increasing convolution in the purchasing and consumption patterns of people across the world has made the subject even more interesting and intellectually challenging. The paper is oriented around the assessment of consumers' buying behavior with respect to five identified criteria namely price, proximity, point of purchase, value consciousness, brand awareness, and channel trust. The objectives of the paper are to understand the components of consumer's purchase decision, namely, price, the proximity of the point of purchase, value consciousness, brand awareness, and channel trust, to assess the impact of demographic variables like age, gender and family income on different components of the purchase decision and on the overall purchase decision and to identify the correlation among the different components of the purchase decision, namely, price, the proximity of the point of purchase, value consciousness, brand awareness, and channel trust. The use of a structured questionnaire has been done to generate responses from different respondents. Data has been analyzed with the help of frequency tables, ANOVA and correlation. For the purpose of statistical analysis, IBM SPSS 20 has been used.

Keywords: Consumer Behavior, Proximity, Value Consciousness, Channel Trust, Point of Purchase, Price

JEL Classification: D12, M31

Paper Classification: Research Paper

Introduction

The brand is a crucial component of competitive advantage for service providers. The brand name of an organization and its visual introduction joined with limited time systems, and emblematic associations are the fundamental components of the brand (Talbot & McDonald, 2016; Berry, 2000). For procurement, brand recognition is more imperative (WurkHouse, 2018). The purest instance of brand recognition happens with alleged impulse purchases. For some, products acquired in the grocery store, there is no idea of purchasing the brand, or even the



classification, before the brand is experienced (Retention Science, 2019). They purchase because of a business approach instead of a non-verbal process, involving visual and other emotional cues. In many cases, brand recognition is a non-verbal process, including visual and other passionate prompts, mainly if the classification requires isn't squeezing (Shaw, 1998).

The awareness of the organization's name is the initial move toward customer-based brand value building and customers' choice. The purchasers initially become acquainted with the organization's name, and after that, the name frames the buyers' view on the picture and provides reason for its buy (Hoxha, 2019). On the off chance that somebody knows the brand and accurately doles out its name to a specific class of administrations, he will turn into a respective customer of that organization too. At the point when customers choose and assess products, brand awareness plays a critical role (Solution Matrix Ltd, 2019). Organizations utilize a 'brand procedure' as their primary concentration to fortify their situations in the market and to set up customer loyalty to the brand.

The brand name is one of the critical highlights in product recognition; Osler had additionally contended that the brand has a due significance identified with the brand portfolio (Osler, 2007). A study alludes, branding helps in promoting the product (Angelmar, Angelmar, & Kane, 2007). It contended that, when any consumer observes a brand that he recognizes, what happens, all the data firmly connected to that brand retrieves automatically (Sen, 1999). So, the brand has a crucial part in the recognition of specific items. A recognized brand can have an enormous effect on the customer's observation. There is a correlation between quality and acknowledgment of items. It has alluded that low-quality items are not appreciated; benefit can be expanded by enhancing the quality (Azadeh, Ghaderi, & Ahmadabad, 2007).

Gap Analysis

In evaluating the chronological-flow condition of research, we set a few examples and deficiencies identified with that is, (1) Number of inspected instruments, (2) Configuration and focus of Industry, and (3) Focus of Country. The related research works either have not analyzed a so-far comprehending set of instruments in their explorative models of study or have regarded them as control factors. This specific situation is representing a gap as the marketing mix instruments that are interrelated, and oversight of some critical tools and this could bring about perplexing impacts. An exhaustive thought of various behavioral measures is additionally uncommon, and different indirect implications of such instruments along with mediators also seem to be unusual, which counteracts comprehensive understandings of which tools influence retail—indirectly or directly, and completely. In rundown, despite the abundance of findings, a complete perspective on the impacts of marketing instruments on retail is absent. This likewise incorporates a view on the fluctuating adequacy of tools identified with various logical settings.

Objectives

- i. To understand the components of consumer's purchase decision, namely, price, the proximity of the point of purchase, value consciousness, brand awareness, and channel trust
- ii. To assess the impact of demographic variables like age, gender and family income on different components of the purchase decision and on the overall purchase decision
- iii. To identify the correlation among the different components of the purchase decision, namely, price, the proximity of the point of purchase, value consciousness, brand awareness, and channel trust.

Implication of the Study

As per the thematic analysis, gender difference has an impact on consumer behavioral aspects. It is considering how a male and a female purchasing power can help marketing retailers and managers in managing the consumer behavior. Moreover, the implications for age and income level are likewise there in the behavior of the consumer. Subsequently, it has been attempted to have a look at how gender orientation, income, and age-group impact on the practice of consumers as far as price sensitivity, proximity, brand awareness, value consciousness, and channel trust. The point of this examination is to distinguish gender differences, income, and age-group in the purchase behavior of various customers.

Review of Literature

The purchase decision made by consumers is significantly influenced by the brands (Lema & Wodaje, 2018). The individual decision making to buy any specific brand or non-brand product is said as the purchase intention of the consumer. Such a decision is made by any of the consumers after making an internal evaluation of the features that is being offered by that specific brand or non-brand. Also, one of the literatures writes in the study that the term purchase intention is one of the significant tools for the purpose of predicting customer decision-making about the purchase (Ghosh, 1990). There is an existence of many factors that have their influence on the decision-making of the customer for the brand or non-brand purchase. The factors affecting can be summed as follows:

Factors Affecting the Purchasing Behavior

Purchasing Behavior and its Categorization

If we go through the book of Eslava, re-edited in 2012, it is found that there are four different types of buying behavior that any customer show while purchasing in the market.

Eslava (2012) enumerated types from which the first behavior of customers is the 'value shopping'. Such customers make a comparison of the little too invisible attributes of the buying product, and the products of the competitors or substitutes are checked to find the quality; means they require the best quality of the product and at a low cost. The second behavior of the customer is 'Relationship shopping', such customers show a level of trust and loyalty towards the brand that they all know; such consumers don't bother for the price that a brand taking from them (Eslava, 2012). The third behavior of the customer is 'Price shopping', such customer usually don't bother to pay more for any extra attribute given along with the product; also they associated with their low-cost channels for the purchase (Giménez, Suárez, & Arribas, 2011); and the last behavior that he has written in his book is 'Comfort shopping' such consumers search for ease of purchase which includes proximity of availability of products or internet availability, such people barely compare the substitute's prices and tend to be faithful to various channels (Eslava, 2012).

Also, the paper claims that brand awareness also affects the consumer choice of product purchase (Vyas, Sharma, & Sharma, 2016). According to that study, if a customer knows about the brand very well, then there is a fair chance of purchasing the branded product as compared to the non-branded or unrecognized brands (Shahid, Hussain, & Zafar, 2017; Vyas, Sharma, & Sharma, 2016). The level of awareness appears in a consumer is related to the intense impact on the brand choice in a rehash buy buyer product setting (Macdonald & Sharp, 2000; Vyas, Sharma, & Sharma, 2016).

After analyzing the above papers, the authors can collectively say that the following factors affect the purchasing behavior of the consumers of branded or recognized products and non-branded or unrecognized brand product.

- i. Price- Consumers are balanced and look for need satisfaction in every purchase, flagging product price as a guide in their decisions. This product price will dependably need to change following those quality ascribes customers will pay for, that is, estimating the cost for value. For customers, the product price has immediate psychosomatic repercussions, and it is the esteem they give in return for the utility they get as far as time, place, possession, and data information (Mestre, 2012; Patel & Barad, 2016).
- ii. Proximity- consumers search for ease of purchase which includes proximity of availability of products or internet availability, such people barely compare the substitute's prices and tend to be faithful to various channels (Eslava, 2012)
- iii. Value-Conscious- This factor can be explained as the concern of the customer for the price that is to be paid for any specific product's brand or non-brand with relative to the quality of that particular product while making any purchase (Lichtenstein, Ridgway, & Netemeyer, 1993; Burton, Lichtenstein, Netemeyer, & Garretson, 1998). Brands that all have indeed related to extravagance, medium, and high-quality products, are presently likewise essential in less cost products or services (Eslava, 2012; Chang, 2005) (Patel & Barad, 2016).
- iv. Awareness- Brand awareness implies the capacity of a consumer that they can perceive and review a brand in various circumstances (Chi, Yeh, & Yang, 2009). Brand awareness is also related to the repeat purchase of the same brand (Macdonald & Sharp, 2000).
- v. Channel Trust- People barely compare the substitute's prices and tend to be faithful to various channels (Eslava, 2012) such as nearby retailers for their purchases and depend on their recommendations for that.

Income and Factors affecting the Purchase Decision

A study by (Saleh, Alothman, & Alhoshan, 2013) found that there is no significant difference between the income of the customers and their purchasing behavior. The study shows that every income group people prefer to purchase the branded or non-branded goods irrespective of the income group from which they belong.

Gender Effect on Buying Behavior

Consumers have not gotten away from the current monetary downturn. Approximately 33% of the youngsters are not employed in a present scenario. As they grew up with a more prominent idea of the product and administrative services, they are considered as the vital in-takers or the consumers who anticipate higher selectivity, customization, and personalization in their products and administrative functions as a whole (Sweeney, 2006). Euromonitor International research in 2015 found that 47% of the young generation extends the calculability of cash they put into an investment for the inflow of funds. A more substantial part of 18-29-years of age (55%) state they are watching they're going through 'in a close intent' nowadays, which is over 43% of 18-29 years of age who shared this view in 2006. In a macro-ecological impact, the recession of the global countries has affected the ways of managing the attributes of millennia. Yet, pre-retreat or the recession overviews recommended that they would be a frugal age (Miller and Washington, 2012). It is discovered that female students of the college were more price cognizant than their male partners, inquiring about stuff on the Internet-dependent on the value, shipping expenses,

and element determination (Valentine and Powers 2013).

Based on the gender literature reviewed above, it is expected that women will be more price-sensitive than men. Based on the reviewed research, the objectives and the hypothesis for the study have been made and later tested. The objectives were directed to assess the impact of demographic variables like age, gender and family income on different components of the purchase decision and the overall purchase decision

Hypothesis

- i. There is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to the gender of the respondents
- ii. There is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to the age of the respondents
- iii. There is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to family income of the respondents

Research Methodology

This study includes a combination of secondary and primary research. For secondary analysis on the effects of service quality and perceived value on customer satisfaction, various pertinent studies, both published and unpublished, are used. For the collection of secondary data, multiple databases such as Science-Direct, EBSCO, ProQuest, etc. are being explored. Overall, 61 works of literature have been analyzed to build the framework of the study.

The study is based on non-probability convenience sampling due to the scarcity of time and resources. The sample size was 174 drawn from the working and non-working individuals employing a controlled or closed-ended questionnaire located in Greater Noida. The study has used both primary data, which is collected with the help of a structured, multiple-choice, and close-ended questionnaire and secondary data. It was broadly divided into two parts. Part I dealt with the demographic profile of the respondents, while Part II addressed various parameters of the purchase decision, namely price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, and channel trust. In all, there were nine objective-type multiple-choice questions, based on the 5-point rating scale (ranging from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree'); 'Strongly Agree' was assigned '5' points while 'Strongly Disagree' was assigned '1' point. Respondents were personally interviewed to gather extra information. Independent variables for the study were gender, age, and family income, while dependents variables were price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust, and overall purchase decision. Data has been analyzed with the help of frequency tables, ANOVA, and correlation. For statistical analysis, IBM SPSS 20 has been used.

Reliability Analysis

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha
0.785

As the information has been gathered through the study of the data presented through a survey, so it is required to be checked for interior consistency dependability before continuing for the analysis of the report. The way toward checking the interior consistency dependability is a strategy to check whether the information gathered through the analysis is fulfilling the proposed result. Thus, the Cronbach's alpha worth has been determined (Cronbach, 1951). The various analyst recommends a base α coefficient someplace in the scope of 0.65 and 0.75 (or higher now and again), while the α coefficient under 0.5 is typically improper. In this propaganda of analysis, the alpha worth is higher than 0.75, i.e., the value of Cronbach's Alpha is 0.785, this demonstrates the information of data for this overview is "reliable" enough.

Data Analysis

Table 2: Respondents' Profile

Gender		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
			102	58.6	58.6
	Female	72	41.4	41.4	100.0
	Total	174	100.0	100.0	
Age		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Below 20 Yrs	24	13.8	13.8	13.8
	20-30 yrs	101	58.0	58.0	71.8
	30-40 yrs	29	16.7	16.7	88.5
	40-50yrs	12	6.9	6.9	95.4
	Above 50 yrs	8	4.6	4.6	100.0
	Total	174	100.0	100.0	
Family Income		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	up to 3 L pa	58	33.3	33.3	33.3
	3-5 L pa	51	29.3	29.3	62.6
	5-10 l pa	48	27.6	27.6	90.2
	>10 L pa	17	9.8	9.8	100.0
	Total	174	100.0	100.0	

From Table 2, it is inferred that 58.6% of respondents were males while 41.4% of respondents were females. Maximum respondents (58%) were in the age bracket of 20-30 years; about one-third of the respondents (58) had a family income of up to 3 lakhs per annum. Looking at the profile it is summarized that it is the general sample taken from anywhere in India.

Hypothesis Testing

- i) There is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to the gender of the respondents

Table 3: ANOVA (with respect to gender)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Proximity	Between Groups	0.584	1	0.584	0.620	0.432
	Within Groups	162.088	172	0.942		
	Total	162.672	173			
Price	Between Groups	4.970	1	4.970	4.539	0.035
	Within Groups	188.324	172	1.095		
	Total	193.293	173			
Value Consciousness	Between Groups	0.853	1	0.853	1.014	0.315
	Within Groups	144.647	172	0.841		
	Total	145.500	173			
Brand Awareness	Between Groups	0.037	1	0.037	0.028	0.867
	Within Groups	223.412	172	1.299		
	Total	223.448	173			
Channel Trust	Between Groups	1.705	1	1.705	1.370	0.243
	Within Groups	214.088	172	1.245		
	Total	215.793	173			
Purchase Decision	Between Groups	5.858	1	5.858	0.566	0.453
	Within Groups	1778.676	172	10.341		
	Total	1784.534	173			

From Table 3, it can be deduced that the hypothesis 'there is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to the gender of the respondents' cannot be rejected for all the parameter other than price where 'p' value is .035 which is less than 0.05 (level of significance). For all other cases, it is more than 0.05. It signifies that there is no significant difference in mean perception of the respondents whether they are male or female with respect to nearness from the point of purchase, value consciousness, brand-awareness, channel trust (trust on the vendor or mode of purchase), and ultimate purchase decision. But in terms of price considerations, the perception of males and females differ.

- ii) There is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to the age of the respondents

Table 4: ANOVA (with respect to Age)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Proximity	Between Groups	9.863	4	2.466	2.727	0.031
	Within Groups	152.810	169	0.904		
	Total	162.672	173			
Price	Between Groups	8.925	4	2.231	2.045	0.090
	Within Groups	184.368	169	1.091		
	Total	193.293	173			

Value-Conscious	Between Groups	6.384	4	1.596	1.939	0.106
	Within Groups	139.116	169	0.823		
	Total	145.500	173			
Brand Awareness	Between Groups	3.903	4	0.976	0.751	0.559
	Within Groups	219.545	169	1.299		
	Total	223.448	173			
Channel Trust	Between Groups	25.309	4	6.327	5.614	0.000
	Within Groups	190.484	169	1.127		
	Total	215.793	173			
Purchase Decision	Between Groups	32.592	4	8.148	0.786	0.536
	Within Groups	1751.942	169	10.367		
	Total	1784.534	173			

It can be inferred from Table 4, that the hypothesis 'there is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to the age of the respondents' is rejected for proximity and channel trust as the p-value in both cases is less than 5%. This signifies that there is a significant difference in the mean perception of respondents about proximity and channel trust with respect to age. That means people in different age brackets carry different opinions about nearness to point of purchase and reliability on the channel. For all other factors, there is no significant difference in the mean with respect to the respondents of different age brackets.

- iii) There is a significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to family income of the respondents.

Table 5: ANOVA (Family Income)

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Proximity	Between Groups	9.809	3	3.270	3.636	0.014
	Within Groups	152.864	170	0.899		
	Total	162.672	173			
Price	Between Groups	19.012	3	6.337	6.182	0.001
	Within Groups	174.281	170	1.025		
	Total	193.293	173			
Value-Conscious	Between Groups	8.493	3	2.831	3.513	0.017
	Within Groups	137.007	170	0.806		
	Total	145.500	173			
Brand Awareness	Between Groups	14.290	3	4.763	3.871	0.010
	Within Groups	209.159	170	1.230		
	Total	223.448	173			
Channel Trust	Between Groups	27.825	3	9.275	8.388	0.000
	Within Groups	187.968	170	1.106		
	Total	215.793	173			

Purchase Decision	Between Groups	66.493	3	22.164	2.193	0.091
	Within Groups	1718.041	170	10.106		
	Total	1784.534	173			

Table 5 exhibits that in terms of family income the hypothesis 'there is no significant difference in price factor, proximity factor, value consciousness, brand awareness, channel trust and overall purchase decision with respect to family income of the respondents' is rejected for all the parameters of purchase decision, wherein the p-value is less than .05. This means that there is a significant difference in the respondent's opinion with respect to proximity ($p=.014$), price ($p=.001$), value considerations ($p=.017$), brand awareness ($p=.010$) and channel trust ($p=.000$). But when it comes to an overall purchase decision, the hypothesis cannot be rejected as $p=.091$, which is greater than 0.05. That further signifies that family income doesn't influence purchase decision, but it does influence the distance of the point of purchase, price or the product, value consciousness of the customers, their brand awareness and finally on reliability on the vendor.

Test of correlation

Table 6: Correlations

		Proximity	Price	Value-Conscious	Brand Awareness	Channel Trust	Purchase Decision
Proximity	Pearson Correlation	1	0.395	0.380	0.300	0.082	0.675
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00	0.000	0.000	0.280	0.000
Price	Pearson Correlation	0.395	1	0.402	0.405	-0.028	0.697
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.710	0.000
Value Consciousness	Pearson Correlation	0.380	0.402	1	0.250	-0.152	0.468
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.00		0.001	0.045	0.000
Brand Awareness	Pearson Correlation	0.300	0.405	0.250	1	0.259	0.739
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.001		0.001	0.000
Channel Trust	Pearson Correlation	0.082	-0.028	-0.152	0.259	1	0.511
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.280	0.710	0.045	0.001		0.000
Purchase Decision	Pearson Correlation	0.675	0.697	0.468	0.739	0.511	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	

From the correlation Table 6, it is deduced that there is a significantly high and positive correlation between purchase decision and proximity ($r= 0.675$), price ($r= 0.697$) and brand awareness ($r= 0.739$). The moderate positive correlation is found between purchase decision and value consciousness ($r= 0.468$) and between purchase decision and channel trust ($r= 0.511$). The degree of relationship between purchase decision and all these parameters is significant at 0.01 levels.

A very low degree of negative correlation is identified between a channel of trust and value consciousness ($r= -0.152$), which is though not significant at the 0.01 level but is significant at 0.05 level of significance.

The table shows that customers tend to make purchases increases with respect to proximity, price considerations, and brand awareness. It is moderately affected by value consciousnesses and channels of trust.

Conclusion

Purchasing patterns and buying-behavior are highly contemplated topics by consumer-behavior researchers. Yet at the same time, there is considerably more to know as the customers and their process of purchase decision-making is getting unpredictable. Because of the developing rivalry and competition in the business sectors and differentiated products given by marketers, there is a need to ponder this point from various perspectives. Before the past was that ladies used to go shopping, and men used to furnish them with the finance, yet nowadays, conditions have changed in a considerable measure. Presently, there is an assortment of products for male buyers and that too of female buyers. Indeed, even females have replaced their old style of utilization. Both genders have begun to dissect their purchasing goals admirably and soundly. The findings also exhibit that there is no influence of gender on purchase decisions.

Earlier the propensity to purchase more was associated with the younger generation, and it was considered that they make erratic purchases without much consideration to anything else, mainly in terms of price and utility. Still, the findings from the study show that purchase decisions are not governed by the people belonging to different age brackets. Age hardly plays a role in purchase decisions.

The same viewpoint is also found concerning income or family income. It is found that there is no difference between the income or family income of the selected respondents and the buying behavior of them. This statement says that income or family income of the respondents don't have any specific effect on the buying behavior of the respondents.

Overall, it can be concluded that the purchase decisions of the brand and non-brand are not governed by gender, age, or family income.

Implications & Scope for Future Study

The research paper has opened numerous pathways for future research that could be attempted. The importance of time limitation having a more remarkable impact on a consumer being offensive can likewise be contemplated top to bottom as a part that grooms in the behavioristic approach towards the consumer strategies.

This exploration states to the awareness and perspectives of consumer purchasing conduct in the presentation showcase. The fundamental discoveries of the examination assign that the general arrangement of autonomous factors was feebly connected with the needy variable. Then again, the significant investigation discovered that social elements, physical factors, and showcasing blend components were firmly connected with the purchasing practices of Indian customers. These examinations create its capability to decide buyer basic leadership rules. Besides, our research work encouraged us to perceive various critical headings for future research.

References

- Angelmar, R., Angelmar, S., & Kane, L. (2007). Building Strong Condition Brands. *Journal of Medical Marketing: Device, Diagnostic and Pharmaceutical Marketing*, 7(4), 341-351.
- Azadeh, A., Ghaderi, S., & Ahmadabad, M. (2007). Multi-Criteria Quality Assessment Of Products By

- Integrated Dea-PCA Approach. *International Journal of Reliability, Quality and Safety Engineering*, 14(3), 201-218.
- Berry, L. L. (2000). Cultivating Service Brand Equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1), 128–137.
- Burton, S., Lichtenstein, D., Netemeyer, R., & Garretson, J. A. (1998). A scale for measuring attitude toward private label products and examination of its psychological and behavioral correlates. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 26(4), 293-306.
- Chi, D., Yeh, D., & Yang, Y. (2009). The Impact of Brand Awareness on Consumer Purchase Intention: The Mediating Effect of Perceived Quality and Brand Loyalty. *The Journal of International Management Studies*, 4(1), 135-144.
- Cronbach, L. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- Eslava, J. J. (2012). *Comercial y Ventas Pricing: Nuevas estrategias de precios (Pricing: New Price Strategies)*. ESIC Editorial.
- Ghosh, A. (1990). *Retail Management* (1st ed.). Chicago: Dryden Press.
- Giménez, J., Suárez, M., & Arribas, R. (2011). Consumer attitudes towards brands in times of great price sensitivity. Four case studies. *Innovative Marketing*, 7(2), 60-70.
- Hoxha, H. (2019, February 11). *The Importance of Top of Mind Awareness in Brand Development*. Retrieved October 16, 2019, from Medium: <https://medium.com/@hanahoxha/the-importance-of-top-of-mind-awareness-in-brand-development-d35bbb510890>
- Hsieh, A., & Chang, E. (2005). The Effect of Consumer Participation on Price Sensitivity. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 38(2), 282-296.
- Lema, L., & Wodaje, M. (2018). Factors Affecting Brand Choice of the Consumers on Bottled Water Brands. *Pacific Business Review International*, 11(3), 7-17.
- Lichtenstein, D., Ridgway, N., & Netemeyer, R. (1993). Price perceptions and consumer shopping behavior: A field study. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(2), 234-245.
- Macdonald, E., & Sharp, B. (2000). Brand Awareness Effects on Consumer Decision Making for a Common, Repeat Purchase Product:: A Replication. *Journal of Business Research*, 48(1), 5-15.
- McKinsey. (1997). *If Nike can "just do it," why can't we?* The McKinsey Quarterly.
- Mestre, M. S. (2012). *Marketing: Conceptos y estrategias (Marketing: Concepts and strategies)*. León: Piramide.
- Miller, Richard, Washington, Kelly (2012) Millennial Consumers. In: *Consumer Behavior 2012*, Chapter 49, [e-book]: Richard K. Miller and Associates, pp. 250-255.
- Osler, R. (2007). The type–role–purpose brand taxonomy. *Brand Management*, 14(6), 430–441.
- Patel, V., & Barad, K. (2016). Factors affecting consumer intention to purchase private labels in India. *Amity Business Review*, 16(2), 91-99.
- Retention Science. (2019, September 25). *Customer Loyalty vs. Brand Loyalty: Why They Matter For Customer Retention and Repurchase Rates*. Retrieved October 16, 2019, from Retention Science: <https://www.retentionscience.com/blog/customer-loyalty-vs-brand-loyalty/>
- Ročkutė, K., Minelgaitė, I., Jakštė, L., & Damaševičius, R. (2018). Brand Awareness in the Context of Mistrust: The Case Study of an Employment Agency. *Sustainability*, 10(3), 1-13.
- Saleh, M., Alothman, B., & Alhoshan, L. (2013). Impact of Gender, Age and Income on Consumers' Purchasing Responsiveness to Free-Product Samples. *Research Journal of International Studies* 1(26), 83-94.

- Samiee, S., Shimp, T., & Sharma, S. (2005). Brand origin recognition accuracy: its antecedents and consumers' cognitive limitations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4), 379-397.
- Sen, S. (1999). The Effects of Brand Name Suggestiveness and Decision Goal on the Development of Brand Knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 8(4), 431-455.
- Shahid, Z., Hussain, T., & Zafar, D. (2017). The Impact of Brand Awareness on the Consumers' Purchase Intention. *Journal of Accounting & Marketing*, 33(1), 34-38.
- Sharma, M. K. (2014). The Impact on Consumer Buying Behaviour. *Global Journal of Finance and Management*, 6(9), 833-840.
- Shaw, R. (1998). *Improving Marketing Effectiveness*. The Economist Books.
- Solution Matrix Ltd. (2019). *How Firms Establish Brands, How Branding Creates Value*. Retrieved October 16, 2019, from Business Case Analysis: <https://www.business-case-analysis.com/brand.html>
- Sweeney, R. (2006). Millennial behaviors and demographics. *Newark: New Jersey Institute of Technology*, 12(3), 10.
- Talbot, S., & McDonald, J. (2016, June 20). *The 7 key elements of brand identity design + 10 corporate identity examples*. Retrieved October 15, 2019, from Lucid Press: <https://www.lucidpress.com/blog/the-7-key-elements-of-brand-identity-design>
- Valentine, D. B., & Powers, T. L. (2013). Online product search and purchase behavior of Generation Y. *Atlantic Marketing Journal*, 2(1), 6.
- Vijayalakshmi, S., & Vijayalakshmi, V. (2013, May 31). An impact of consumer buying behavior in decision-making process in purchase of electronic home appliances in Chennai (India): an empirical study. *Elixir International Journal*, 59(1), 15267-15273.
- Vyas, R., Sharma, D., & Sharma, D. (2016). A study on consumer behavior towards select branded food items. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 18(8), 1-8.
- WurkHouse. (2018, July 25). *Why is branding important?* Retrieved from WurkHouse: <https://blog.wurkhouse.com/why-is-branding-important>
-

Author's Profile

Praveen Kumar Pandey completed his Master's in Business Administration from Sharda University, Greater Noida. His area of specialization is Marketing and Human Resource Management. He had attended workshops in PHD Chamber of Commerce, New Delhi. He had published papers in well-known National and UGC journals. Another paper of HR is under review with Journal of Health Management under Sage Publication.

Prashant Kumar Pandey has completed Bachelor's in Business Administration and Master's in Business Administration at the Amity International Business School, Amity University, Noida. He has published many papers in National and UGC journals. He has presented papers and case studies in various conferences such as in INBUSH Era World Summit, Amity University, in Praktikos SIP Competition, Jaipuria Institute of Management, I-Bizfluence International Business Summit, Amity University. His area of interest is Marketing and Human Resource Management.
