Brand Attitude among Women

OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 6

Issue: 4

Month: October

Year: 2018

ISSN: 2320-4168

Received: 12.10.2018

Accepted: 30.10.2018

Published: 31.10.2018

Citation:
Indirapriyadharshini, B ; Giri, N & Aarthi, M. "Brand Attitude among Women."*Shanlax International Journal of Commerce*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2018, pp. 1–6.

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1473296

B.Indirapriyadharshini
Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce (E-Commerce)
Nallamuthu Gounder Mahalingam College, Pollachi, Tamil Nadu, India

N.Giri
Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce (SF)
Nallamuthu Gounder Mahalingam College, Pollachi, Tamil Nadu, India

M.Aarthi
Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce (SF)
Nallamuthu Gounder Mahalingam College, Pollachi, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract
Objective: To identify brand attitude of women in Pollachi Taluk.
Methodology: The study was descriptive, primary data have been used to accomplish the objective of the study. Data were collected from 233 women respondents, Questionnaire method was adopted and convenience sampling method is used.
Results: Chi-square test reveals that there is a significant association between the family income and their level of brand attitude.
Conclusion: The study suggests that women are aware of the different brands available in the market. Majority of the women opines brand avoids risk and meets their expectation than unbranded products.
Keywords: Brand - Women - Attitude - Impact

Introduction

Brand attitude is a state of mind that enables a consumer to view a brand through a filter. The brand attitude will tell what people think about a product or service, whether the product answers a consumer need, and just how much the product is wanted by the consumer. Compared to men, women are a brand driven segment for the marketers. They use branded products for luxury and prestige. With this notion, the present study is an attempt to identify the brand attitude of women in Pollachi Taluk. The study is conducted on the attitude of women regarding the brand generally. It's not specific to any product category.

Objectives of the Study

The following are the main objectives of the study.

- To study the socio -economic profile of the respondents.
- To determine the attitude of women towards brand in Pollachi Taluk
- To identify the level of brand attitude among women.

Overview of Literature

Sachin S. Vernekar and Preety Wadhwa (2009) attempted to focus on various steps in the journey of positioning and repositioning India as a Brand and try to analyze the core competencies required to provide a base for building Brand India.

They have tried to explain the analogy between country and a brand; it also explains the concept of taking India as a Brand as well as positioning and repositioning brand India, Metamorphosis of India's Image, and attempt has also been made to explain the progress India has made in the key areas like Economy and Business, etc. Lilly (2010) opines that in every product category, consumers have more choices, more information and higher expectations than ever before. Sang-Gun Lee and Eui-Bang Lee (2017) found that entertainment, information, irritation, and personalization in non-mobile advertisements, timing and location in mobile advertisements are the main factors influence consumers' purchase decision.

Materials and Methods

Research design adopted in the study was descriptive. The study is based on primary data and it is collected using Questionnaire method. A sample of 233 women respondents was taken into using convenience sampling technique. The secondary data was collected from the articles, journals, newspapers and various websites. Percentage analysis and Chi-square test have been employed to analyze the data collected.

Results and Discussion

Socio-Economic Profile – Percentage Analysis

The following paragraphs describe the socio-economic profile of the respondents. Percentage analysis was used to analyze the socio-economic profile and brand attitude of the respondents.

Table 1 Socio-Economic Profile

Parameters	Number of Respondents (N=230)	Percentage
Age		
Up to 20 years	56	24.03
21year-30 years	75	32.19
31 year-40 years	59	25.32
Above 41 years	43	18.45
Educational Qualification		
No formal Education	24	10.30
Up to Higher Secondary	17	7.30
Diploma	32	13.73
Under Graduates	87	37.34
Post Graduates	47	20.17
Professionals	26	11.16
Marital Status		
Married	106	45.49
Unmarried	127	54.51
Area of Residence		
Rural	160	68.67
Urban	73	31.33
Family Income per Month		
Up to Rs. 10,000	57	24.46
Rs. 10,001 to Rs. 20,000	74	31.76
Rs. 20,001 to Rs. 30,000	48	20.60
Above Rs. 30,001	54	23.18

Age

Table 1 reveals that, 56(24.03%) of the respondents are in the age group up to 20 years, 75(32.19%) of the respondents are in the age group of 21year-30 years, 59(25.32%) of the respondents are in the age group of 31 year-40 years, 43(18.45%) of the respondents are in the age group of above 41 years. Most of 75 (32.19%) of the respondents are in the age group of 21year -30 years.

Educational Qualification

The above table depicts that, 24(10.30%) of the respondents have no formal education, 17(7.30%) of the respondents completed higher secondary, 32(13.73%) of the respondents completed diploma, 87(37.34%) of the respondents completed under graduate, 47(20.17%) of the respondents completed post graduate, 26(11.16%) of the respondents are professionals. Hence, most 87(37.34%) of the respondents are under graduates.

Marital Status

Out of 233 respondents, 106(45.49%) of the respondents are married, 127(54.51%) of the respondents are unmarried. Hence, majority 127(54.51%) of the respondents are unmarried.

Area of Residence

Table 1 shows that 160 (68.67%) respondents live in rural area, 73(31.33%) respondents living in urban area. Hence, a majority of 160(68.67%) of the respondents are living in rural area.

Family Income

Out of 230 respondents, 57 (24.46%) of the respondents family income ranges from up to Rs. 10,000, 74(31.76%) of the respondents family income ranges from Rs.10, 001 to Rs. 20,000, 48(20.60%) of the respondents family income ranges from Rs.20, 001 to 30, 000, 54 (23.18%) of the respondents family income above Rs. 30,001. Hence, the most 74(31.76%) of the respondents family income ranges from Rs.10, 001 to Rs.20, 000.

Brand Attitude of the Consumer

The table below shows the Brand attitude of the consumer.

Table 2 Brand Attitude

Statement	Number of Respondents (N-233)				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Avoid risk	116	71	23	21	2
	(49.79%)	(30.47%)	(9.87%)	(9.01%)	(0.86%)
Meets customer requirements	27	133	51	21	1
	(11.59%)	(57.08%)	(21.89%)	(9.01%)	(0.43%)
Assures choice	54	84	78	16	1
	(23.18%)	(36.05%)	(33.48%)	(6.87%)	(0.43%)
Provides Choice	46	105	45	31	06
	(19.74%)	(45.06%)	(19.31%)	(13.30%)	(2.58%)
Simplifies decision making	38	91	59	28	17
	(16.31%)	(39.06%)	(25.32%)	(12.02%)	(7.30%)
Pleasures buying	44	80	57	33	19
	(18.88%)	(34.33%)	(24.46%)	(14.16%)	(8.15%)
Reflects my personality	89	66	54	17	07
	(38.20%)	(28.33%)	(23.18%)	(7.30%)	(3.00%)
Relatively Expensive	55	104	41	24	09
	(23.61%)	(44.64%)	(17.60%)	(10.30%)	(3.86%)
Too many brands lead to confusion for customers	52	85	74	17	05
	(22.32%)	(36.48%)	(31.76%)	(7.30%)	(2.15%)
Stay fixed in mind	50	72	74	31	06
	(21.46%)	(30.90%)	(31.76%)	(13.30%)	(2.58%)
Good value for money	46	81	55	34	17
	(19.74%)	(34.76%)	(23.61%)	(14.59%)	(7.30%)
Adds prestige	47	75	57	41	13
	(20.17%)	(32.19%)	(24.46%)	(17.60%)	(5.58%)
Sufficient sellers	45	75	69	31	13
	(19.31%)	(32.79%)	(29.61%)	(13.30%)	(5.58%)
Good packaging	55	97	38	24	19
	(23.61%)	(41.63%)	(16.31%)	(10.30%)	(8.15%)

Avoid Risk

It is observed from the above table 4.11, out of 233 respondents, 116 (49.79%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand avoid risk, 71(30.47%) of the respondents agree that brand avoid risk, 23(9.87%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand avoid risk, 21(9.01%) of the respondents disagree that brand avoid risk,2(0.86%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand avoid risk.

Meets Customer Requirements

Among 233 respondents 27(11.59%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand meets customer requirement, 133(57.08%) of the respondents agree that brand meets customer requirement, 51(21.89%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand meets customer requirement, 21(9.01%) of the respondents disagree that brand meets customer requirement 1(0.43%) of the consumer strongly disagree that Meets customer requirements.

Assures Choice

Out of 233 respondents 54(23.18%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand assures choice, 84(36.05%) of the respondents agree that brand assures choice, 78(33.48%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand assures choice, 16(6.87%) of the respondents disagree that brand assures choice 1(0.43%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand assurances choice.

Provides Choice

From the above table show that, out of 233 respondents, 46(19.74%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand provides choice, 105(45.06%) of the respondents agree that brand provides choice, 45(19.31%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand provides choice, 31(13.30%) of the respondents disagree that brand provides choice, 06(2.58%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand provides choice.

Simplifies Decision Making

Among 233 respondents, 38(16.31%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand simplifies decision making, 91(39.06%) of the respondents agree that brand simplifies decision making, 59(25.32%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand simplifies decision making, 28(12.02%) of the respondents disagree that brand simplifies decision making, 17(7.30%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand simplifies decision making.

Provides Pleasure of Buying

From the above table show that, out of 233 respondents, 44(18.88%) of the respondents strongly agree, 80(34.33%) of the respondents agree that provides pleasure of buying, 57(24.46%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree, 33(14.16%) of the respondents are disagree and the remaining 19(8.15%) of the respondents strongly disagree that provides pleasures of buying.

Reflects my Personality

Out of 233 respondents, 89(38.20%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand reflects my personality, 66(28.33%) of the respondents agree that brand reflects my personality, 54(23.18%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand reflects my personality, 17(7.30%) of the respondents disagree that brand reflects my personality, 07(3.00%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand reflects my personality.

Relatively Expensive

Out of 233 respondents, 55(23.61%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand relatively expensive, 104(44.64%) of the respondents agree that brand relatively expensive, 41(17.60%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand relatively expensive, 24(10.30%) of the respondents disagree that brand relatively expensive, 09(3.86%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand relatively expensive.

Too many brands lead to confusion for customers

Among 233 respondents, 52(22.32%) of the respondents strongly agree that too many brands lead to confusion for customer, 85(36.48%) of the respondents agree that too many brands lead to confusion for customer, 74(31.76%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that too many brands lead to confusion for customer, 17(7.30%) of the respondents disagree that too many brands lead to confusion for customer, 05(2.15%)of the respondents strongly disagree that too many brands lead to confusion for customers.

Stay fixed in mind

Out of 233 respondents, 50(21.46%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand stay fixed in mind, 72(30.90%) of the respondents agree that brand stay fixed in mind, 74(31.76%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand stay fixed in mind, 31(13.30%) of the respondents disagree that brand stay fixed in mind, 06(2.58%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand stay fixed in mind.

Good value for money

Out of 233 respondents, 46(19.74%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand good value for money, 81(34.76%) respondents agree that brand good value for money, 55(23.61%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand good value for money, 34(14.59%) of the respondents disagree that brand good value for money, 17(7.30%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand good value for money.

Adds prestige

Out of 233 respondents, 47(20.17%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand adds prestige, 75(32.19%) of the respondents agree that brand adds prestige, 57(24.46%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand adds prestige, 41(17.60%) of the respondents disagree that brand adds prestige, 13(5.58%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand adds prestige.

Sufficient Sellers

Among 233 respondents, 45(19.31%) of the respondents are strongly agree that brand sufficient sellers, 75(32.79%) of the respondents agree that brand sufficient sellers, 69(29.61%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that sufficient brand sellers, 31(13.30%) of the respondents disagree that brand sufficient sellers 13(5.58%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand sufficient sellers.

Good Packaging

Among 233 respondents, 55(23.61%) of the respondents strongly agree that brand good packaging, 97(41.63%) of the respondents agree that brand good packaging, 38(16.31%) of the respondents neither agree nor disagree that brand good packaging, 24(10.30%) of the respondents disagree that brand good packaging 19(8.15%) of the respondents strongly disagree that brand good packaging.

Level of brand attitude - Chi-Square test

Age

H0: There is no significant association between age and brand attitude

Table 3 Age and Level of Brand Attitude

Age	Level of Brand Attitude			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Up to 20 Years	7	39	10	56
	12.5%	69.64%	17.86%	100.00%
21 – 30 Years	10	52	13	75
	13.33%	69.33%	17.33%	100.00%
31 – 40 Years	14	35	10	59
	23.72%	59.32%	16.95%	100.00%
Above 41 Years	9	27	7	43
	20.93%	62.79%	16.28%	100.00%
Total	40	153	40	233

d. f: 6 Calculated Chi-Square Value: 3.929
Table Value at 5% Level: 12.592

Since the calculated chi-square value is less than the table value. A null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence, there is no significant association between age and the level of a brand attitude of the respondents.

Educational Qualification

H0: There is no significant association between educational qualification and brand attitude.

Table 4 Educational Qualification and Level of Brand Attitude

Educational Qualification	Level of Brand Attitude			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
No formal Education	6	15	3	24
	25.00%	62.5%	12.5%	100.00%
Up to HSC	2	11	4	17
	11.76%	64.71%	23.53%	100.00%
Diploma	5	21	6	32
	15.63%	65.62%	18.75%	100.00%
Under Graduate	10	63	14	87
	11.49%	72.41%	16.09%	100.00%
Post Graduate	9	27	8	44
	20.45%	61.36%	18.18%	100.00%
Professional	8	14	4	26
	30.77%	53.85%	15.38%	100.00%
Others	0	2	1	3
	0%	66.67%	33.33%	100.00%
Total	40	153	40	233

d. f: 12 Calculated Chi-Square Value: 9.078
Table Value at 5% Level: 21.026

Since the calculated chi-square value is less than the table value. The null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence, there is no significant association between educational qualification and the level of a brand attitude of the respondents.

Family Income

H0: There is no significant association between Family Income and brand attitude.

Table 5 Family Income and Level of Brand Attitude

Family Income	Level of Brand Attitude			Total
	Low	Medium	High	
Less than Rs. 10,000	6	34	17	57
	10.53%	59.65%	29.82%	100.00%
Rs. 10,001 to Rs. 20,000	16	47	11	74
	21.62%	63.51%	14.86%	100.00%
Rs. 20,001 to Rs. 30,000	4	34	10	48
	8.33%	70.83%	20.83%	100.00%
Above Rs. 30,001	14	38	2	54
	25.93%	70.37%	3.70%	100.00%
Total	40	153	40	233

d. f: 6 Calculated Chi-Square Value: 19.284
Table Value at 5% Level: 12.592

Table 5 shows that the calculated chi-square value is less than the table value. A null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance. Hence, there is no significant association between Family Income and the level of a brand attitude of the respondents.

Conclusion

Majority of the respondents strongly agree that branded products avoid risk, reflects their personality and adds prestige to them. The study reveals that there is a significant association between the family income of the respondents and their level of brand attitude. To understand consumers' preferences and attitude, marketers need to know what product and brand knowledge consumers have acquired and stored in the memory. They may also wish to determine how consumers organize a product category and what types of knowledge are likely to be activated by particular marketing strategies. Brand plays a vital role in the purchase decision of the buyer.

References

Books

Armstrong, G., & Kotler, K., Marketing an introduction. 9th ed 2009, New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Solomon, MR., Consumer Behavior Buying, Having and Being. 8th ed 2009, New Jersey: Pearson Education

Journals

Lilly, J. (2010). Customer Perception and Preference towards Branded Products (with Special Reference to Television Sets). *Indian Journal of Marketing*. Vol 40(2), pp 49-55

Sachin, S, Vernekar & Preety Wadhwa. (2009). Marketing India as a Brand (Brand India, an Idea Whose Time Has Come). *Indian Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 39(6), pp 30-39.

Sang-Gun Lee & Eui-Bang Lee. (2017). The influences of advertisement attitude and brand attitude on purchase intention of smart phone advertising. Industrial management and data systems. 117: 6, pp 1011-1036

Websites

https://www.thebalance.com/how-to-identify-brand-attitude-2296864