

RELATIONSHIP AMONG SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, DRIVERS AND SOURCES OF CONSUMER BASED BRAND EQUITY (CBBE) OF INDIAN E-TAILERS

Dr. S. Ilayasankar

Assistant Professor, GRD Institute of Management, Dr.GRD College of Science, Coimbatore-641014, India.

Email: ilayasankar@gmail.com

Abstract—Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) is one of the most important constructs that has been explored by marketers for a long time. Though CBBE has been researched for a long period of time, it does not lose its relevance even in this IT enabled information age. Even in the context of new age industry like E-tailing, this construct has been widely researched in multiple angles. As a brand, it is imperative for every E-tailer to build its CBBE. If a customer starts thinking about an E-tailer, as a brand, in a positive way and shows a willingness to buy from it repeatedly one can assume that the E-tailer has been succeeded in building a positive CBBE in the psyche of that customer. Hence, CBBE is an asset to an E-tailer. It ensures success. According to Aaker (1991), CBBE has certain sources like brand awareness, brand association, brand image, perceived quality, and loyalty. In the context of E-tailing, certain marketing efforts assume significance in building CBBE like functionality, fulfillment, Customer Service & Support Perceived Advertisement Spending and Price Deals. Here, the researcher tries to find out possible perceptual difference among the respondents, in the light of their gender and monthly household income, towards these sources, marketing efforts and CBBE itself. This research will help E-tailers to understand how gender and income of respondents influence various aspects of CBBE.

Keywords— *E-tailing, Sources and Drivers of CBBE, Gender and Household income.*

INTRODUCTION

Brand Equity refers to a brand's net worth, financial and otherwise. Several studies in the past have narrated brand equity through different approaches viz., Cost based, Market based, Income based, and Consumer based. Brand equity is perhaps best viewed as the sum of the intangible values that are associated with a product or a service identified by a brand name or a trademark. It has been described as the added value that a brand name bestows on the product and the service. To an E-tailer, brand equity can be viewed as the incremental cash flow or other financial return generated by the use of its website's name (brand name) to sell products and services. A strong E-tailing brand implies strong leverage in entering markets and negotiating terms. Brand equity arises from the differences in consumer response. If no distinction arises between brand names in an industry, the product or service can very well be termed as commodity. In such cases, competition will be mostly based on price comparisons. The distinguishing factors are due to consumer awareness and knowledge about that particular brand and the things that they associate or learn about the brand and gain experience over a long time. This process is greatly affected by the marketing efforts of the company as compared to their competitors. In any case, equity of the brand finally forms in the minds of customers or end consumers. This phenomenon is shortly called as Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE). It is the response given by them to the brands in the market which is mostly reflected in preferences, recommendations, perceptions, and positive behavioral aspects about the marketing of their favorite brand. According to Aaker (1991), a pioneer in the field, brand equity is a multi - dimensional concept. It is a set of assets such as name awareness, loyal customers, perceived quality, and associations that are linked to the brand (its name and symbol) and add (or subtract) value to the product or service being offered. The major component of the brand equity framework is loyalty. He defined brand loyalty as the attachment that a customer has with a brand.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Joseph Kaswengi (2014) did a study on a retail store's brand equity, in which, he found that demographic variables like gender and income of consumers could influence a retail store's brand equity. Oliver (1999) defines loyalty as "a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviour". Moutinho and Goode (1995) posited that men were more brand loyal with regard to purchasing products from retailers, but their brand loyalty may depend upon the product performance and service being offered at the store. Homburg and Giering (2001) did a survey with customers of German car manufacturers. The study revealed that male customers had made stronger repurchase intentions based on their level of satisfaction or product performance, whereas, the female customers made that intentions purely based on experience out of personal interaction or service performance of the manufacturers. Keller (2003) said that Brand Awareness is the customer's ability to recall and recognize the brand. Bettman, (1979); Solomon, (2007), identified that when consumers were out of their retail store recall became important for them as they relied on their own memory to generate requisite information about the store but when they were in a retail store wherein thousands of Stock Keeping Units (SKUs) and other in-store information drew their attention, recognition was essential at that time. According to the selectivity model proposed by Meyers-Levy (1989), men and women process information about various aspects of a retail store differently. Men use heuristics and schema, whereas, women rely on detailed elaboration to process a store related information.

Yoo et al., (2000) established that personal product or service experiences, unique needs and consumption situations were deciding factors on the consumer's perceived quality and subsequent purchase decision. Boulding, Kalra, Staelin and Zeithaml (1993) posited that quality was directly influenced only by perceptions. Consumers use cues to infer perceived quality. Brand names, price, advertisements, etc., can act as a cue for the consumer. By the same token, cues may exert greater influence on females (Lichtenstein and Burton, 1989; Rao and Monroe, 1989; Kirmani and Wright, 1989). Brand association "consists of all brand-related thoughts, feelings, perceptions, images, experiences, beliefs, and attitudes" (Kotler and Keller, 2006) and "is anything linked in memory to a brand" (Aaker, 1991). A study based on the selectivity model (Meyers-Levy, 1989) proved that men had greater brand associations. Hui-Chu Chen, D.Green, James Miller (2008) had made a study to conceptualize gender role in contributing to brand equity. They selected four hyper market retailers based on their market share viz., Carrefour, R-T Mart, Costco and Geant. They found that Carrefour, and R-T Mart had similar brand loyalty and perceived quality between men and women consumers. Female customers at Geant had significantly higher brand association and total brand equity than Males. Ries and Ries (2004) observed that gender indeed had an influence on brand equity of retail stores. There were 'Male Friendly', and 'Female Friendly' stores. Moreover, particular sets of relationships occur between men and women as far as CBBE and its sources like awareness, perceived quality, loyalty and associations.

Robert D.Green, Hui-Chu Chen (2011) did a study on the theme of "brand equity differences between consumer income groups: The role of marketing strategy". They took Taiwan's four largest hypermarkets based on their market share. They were Carrefour (35%), R-T Mart (30%), Costco (25%) and Geant (10%). They considered the retail marketing mix elements like price, advertising spending, price deals, store image and distribution intensity as the drivers of brand equity (Yoo, Donthu and Lee, 2000). They used a 23- item instrument developed by Pappu and Quester (2006) for the study. This item had brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality, and brand association as the sources of CBBE. Here the customers were divided into three categories based on their monthly income. The customers whose monthly income was less than USD 1,100 were grouped as low-income shoppers. The customers with the monthly income of USD 1,100 to 1,600 were termed as middle-income shoppers. High income shoppers had the monthly income of more than USD1,600. This study examined how shoppers' perception towards retailer's marketing strategy as related to CBBE differed in terms of their monthly income. The study found that low income consumers had significantly higher perceptions of advertising spending than their high-income counterparts and high-income shoppers had significantly higher store image perception than their low-income counterparts. Low income shoppers had a more favourable mean score on price than the other two groups. High income shoppers had more favourable mean scores on price deal, distribution intensity, brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality, brand associations and the total brand equity than the other two income groups.

East, Harris, Willson & Hammond (1995) in a British retail store study found that changes in the level of loyalty due to price changes among high income shoppers were higher than low income shoppers. Bawa and Shoemaker (1987) through their research, came to the conclusion that higher income segments prone to be more price deal than the low-income segments. Levedahl (1988) found that coupon redemption was higher among high income shoppers. More options to try different retailers and flexibility made higher income shoppers less loyal. (Crask and Reynolds 1978; Korganokar, Lund and Price, 1985; Zeithaml, 1985). Shankar et al (2003) explained that as customers with lower incomes would do more price comparisons and therefore be less loyal to a service provider than higher income groups. Hence, the impact of

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

household income on loyalty could be mixed. Cobb-Walgren, Ruble and Donthu (1995) posited that there was a high correlation between higher advertisement budget and higher level of brand equity. Subsequently, the brand with the higher equity generated greater sales performance and purchase intentions. Lower income groups had greater awareness of price and advertisements than higher income groups (Rosa-Daz, 2004).

Kanagal (2009) showed that perceived quality which positively impacted customer retention had a positive relationship with brand price and promotional expenditures. Richardson, Dick and Jain (1994) found that cues like higher price points and greater level of advertisements positively influenced perceived quality of the brand. These cues had greater influence among low income group of shoppers (Dmitrovic & Vida, 2007). For a retail store, the factors like store image (Porter and Claycomb, 1997) and product assortments (Kara, Rojas-Mendez, Kucukemiroglu & Harcar, 2009) impacted association. These associations created purchasing motivations (Porter and Claycomb, 1997). Slama & Tashchian (1985) found that middle income group tended to be associated with brands and ultimately that led to their purchase decisions.

Robert D. Green, Hui-Chu Chen (2011) did a study on the theme of “brand equity differences between consumer income groups: The role of marketing strategy”. They took Taiwan’s four largest hypermarkets based on their market share. They were Carrefour (35%), R-T Mart (30%), Costco (25%) and Geant (10%). They considered the retail marketing mix elements like price, advertising spending, price deals, store image and distribution intensity as the drivers of brand equity (Yoo, Donthu and Lee, 2000). They used a 23- item instrument developed by Pappu and Quester (2006) for the study. This item had brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality and brand association as the sources of CBBE. Here the customers were divided into three categories based on their monthly income. The customers whose monthly income was less than USD 1,100 were grouped as low-income shoppers. The customers with the monthly income of USD 1,100 to 1,600 were termed as middle-income shoppers. High income shoppers had the monthly income of more than USD1,600. This study examined how shoppers’ perception towards retailer’s marketing strategy as related to CBBE differed in terms of their monthly income. The study found that low income consumers had significantly higher perceptions of advertising spending than their high-income counterparts and high-income shoppers had significantly higher store image perception than their low-income counterparts. Low income shoppers had a more favourable mean score on price than the other two groups. High income shoppers had more favourable mean scores on price deal, distribution intensity, brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality, brand associations and the total brand equity than the other two income groups. East, Harris, Willson & Hammond (1995) in a British retail store study found that changes in the level of loyalty due to price changes among high income shoppers were higher than low income shoppers. Bawa and Shoemaker (1987) through their research, came to the conclusion that higher income segments prone to be more price deal than the low-income segments. Levedahl (1988) found that coupon redemption was higher among high income shoppers. More options to try different retailers and flexibility made higher income shoppers less loyal. (Crask and Reynolds 1978; Korganokar, Lund and Price, 1985; Zeithaml, 1985). Shankar et al (2003) explained that as customers with lower incomes would do more price comparisons and therefore be less loyal to a service provider than higher income groups. Hence, the impact of household income on loyalty could be mixed. Cobb-Walgren, Ruble and Donthu (1995) posited that there was a high correlation between higher advertisement budget and higher level of brand equity. Subsequently, the brand with the higher equity generated greater sales performance and purchase intentions. Lower income groups had greater awareness of price and advertisements than higher income groups (Rosa-Daz, 2004).

Kanagal (2009) showed that perceived quality which positively impacted customer retention had a positive relationship with brand price and promotional expenditures. Richardson, Dick and Jain (1994) found that cues like higher price points and greater level of advertisements positively influenced perceived quality of the brand. These cues had greater influence among low income group of shoppers (Dmitrovic & Vida, 2007). For a retail store, the factors like store image (Porter and Claycomb, 1997) and product assortments (Kara, Rojas-Mendez, Kucukemiroglu & Harcar, 2009) impacted association. These associations created purchasing motivations (Porter and Claycomb, 1997). Slama & Tashchian (1985) found that middle income group tended to be associated with brands and ultimately that led to their purchase decisions.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This study intends to show that how respondents from different gender and different social class (household income) respond to various drivers and sources of CBBE. It would like to pinpoint whether variables like gender and household income have any bearing on various dimensions of CBBE. Analysing CBBE from this perspective will bring about new insights that will help E-tailers to fine-tune their strategies in accordance with these insights.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

E-tailing is one such industry wherein one can find intense rivalry. As there is no much entry barriers, availability of large number of suppliers to supply various kinds of products and easy availability of capital will make anyone with certain business aptitude can start this business, at least in a smaller scale. Due to these factors, as an E-tailer, one has to compete against a large number of competitors. Presently, E-tailers are mainly focussing on attracting large number of customers to run their business. In the wake of this focus, they are forced to burn cash by compromising on their profit. This strategy will not bring about a sustainable E-tailing business. Creating and delivering unique value to customers is the only way to serve customers profitably for a long period of time. CBBE is a multidimensional construct through which an E-tailer can find many unique ways to create and deliver value to customers. Given the fact that E-tailers are predominantly patronized by customers who belong to 'youth' cohort, studying them in terms of their gender and house hold income in the context of CBBE will give a lot of insights to E-tailers in their journey of value creation. Therefore, it makes sense to know the influence of gender and household income of respondents on the various drivers and sources of CBBE.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To know the relationship between gender of respondents and choice of an E-tailer.
- To know the relationship between household income (Rs/Month) of respondents and choice of an E-tailer.
- To analyse the relationship between gender & household income of respondents and the sources, the drivers of brand equity of E-tailers.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study will help E-tailers to find relationship among gender, household income of consumers and CBBE. As a result of this study, they will be in the position to adjudge possible influence of these variables on CBBE. This will go a long way in improving their CBBE and in turn ensuring sustainability of their business. This study will also help brand managers, academics who are specialized in branding and MBA students to gain new insight over CBBE in the context of E-tailing.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The respondents for this study were MBA students who were in the age group of 20-24 Years. It did not include other consumer segments of E-tailing. As data for this study were collected with a help of a questionnaire, the respondents may be biased towards certain questions that in turn would not have revealed their true intentions and perceptions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is a descriptive research. The data were collected from MBA students who were pursuing their studies at various business schools, in and around Coimbatore city, Tamil Nadu, India, which are affiliated to Bharathiar University, Coimbatore. Based on the details given on the website of the University and the websites of the business schools, the population size was determined. The size is: 3600. By invoking the framework given by Robert V. Krejcie & Daryle W. Morgan (1970), the sample size was fixed at 530. Multistage sampling method was used to select sampling elements. The study was conducted during January 2019 to December 2019. Statistical tools like Simple Percentage analysis, Chi-square test, Z-test and ANOVA were used to analyse the data.

HYPOTHESES

- H1: There is no significant association between gender of the respondents and choice of an E-tailer
- H2: Male and Female respondents give similar importance to website functionality of E-tailers.
- H3: Male and Female respondents get similar fulfillment from E-tailers.
- H4: Male and Female respondents give similar importance to customer service & support given by E-tailers.
- H5: Male and Female respondents perceive similarly about advertisement spending by E-tailers.
- H6: Male and Female respondents have similar perception about price deals offered by E-tailers.
- H7: Male and Female respondents have similar level of awareness about E-tailers
- H8: Male and Female respondents show similar level of trust towards E-tailers

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

- H9: Male and Female respondents draw similar value from E-tailers
- H10: Male and Female respondents' perception about quality provided by E-tailers is similar.
- H11: Male and Female respondents brand image about E-tailers is similar
- H12: Male and Female respondents feel similar level of loyalty towards E-tailers
- H13: Male and Female respondents show similar level of brand equity towards E-tailers
- H14: There is no significant association between the respondents from different household incomes (Rs/Month) and the choice of an E-tailer.
- H15: There is no significant difference among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month) about their perception towards functionality of websites of the E-tailers
- H16: There is no significant difference among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month) in getting Fulfillment from the companies
- H17: There is no significant difference in perception about Customer Service & Support among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H18: There is no significant difference in Perception about Advertisement Spending among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H19: There is no significant difference in perception about Price Deals among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H20: There is no significant difference in web awareness among the respondents from various household income (Rs/Month).
- H21: There is no significant difference in value association with the companies among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H22: There is no significant difference in their trust association with the companies among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H23: There is no significant difference in the way in which quality is perceived among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H24: There is no significant difference in brand image of the E-tailers among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H25: There is no significant difference in loyalty towards the E-tailer among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)
- H26: There is no significant difference in brand equity of E-tailers among the respondents with various household income (Rs/Month)

DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

Table No: 1 General Information about the Respondents

Variables and Categories	Frequency (n = 530)	Percentage
E-tailer chosen by the respondents		
Amazon. in	162	30.6
Flipkart.com	206	38.9
Jabong.com	10	1.9

Yepme.com	8	1.5
myntra.com	32	6.0
Snapdeal.com	58	10.9
Shopclues.com	7	1.3
Homeshop18.com	4	0.8
ebay.in	15	2.8
Naaptol.com	2	0.4
Pepperfry.com	2	0.4
Firstcry.com	2	0.4
Koovs.com	4	0.8
ShoppersStop.com	2	0.4
biba.in	2	0.4
rediff.com	2	0.4
Other	12	2.3
Gender of the respondents		
Male	345	65
Female	185	35
Household income of the respondents (Rs/Month)		
Less than 20,000	10	1.9
21000-40000	209	39.4
41000-60000	155	29.2
61000-80000	53	10.0
81000-100000	39	7.4
More than 100000	64	12.1

Table No 1 shows that 38.9% of the respondents (n = 206) chose Flipkart.com, 30.6% of the respondents (n = 162) chose Amazon.in, 10.9% of the respondents (n = 58) chose Snapdeal.com, 6.0% of the respondents (n = 32) chose myntra.com, 2.8% (n = 15) of the respondents chose ebay.in, 2.3% of the respondents (n = 12) chose other E-tailers that were not given in the questionnaire, 1.9% of the respondents (n = 10) chose Jabong.com, 1.5% of the respondents (n = 8) chose Yepme.com, 1.3% of the respondents chose Shopclues.com and less than 1% of the respondents chose remaining E-tailers given in the table. From the above table, it is inferred that 65% of the respondents (n = 345) are Male and the remaining 35% of the respondents (n = 185) are Female. From the above table, it is inferred that house hold income of 39.4% of the respondents (n = 209) was 21000-40000 Rs/Month, the house hold income of 29.2% of the respondents (n = 155) was 41000-60000 Rs/Month, for 12.1% of the respondents (n = 64), the house hold income was more than 100000 Rs/Month, for 10% of the respondents (n = 53), the house hold income was 61000-80000 Rs/Month, the house hold income of 7.4% of the respondents (n = 39) was 81000-100000 Rs/Month and the remaining 1.9% of the respondents (n = 10) had the monthly income of Less than 20000 Rupees.

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

Association between Choice of an E-tailer (among Top 4 E-tailers) and Gender of the Respondents

Table No: 2 Cross Tabulation

S. No	Gender of the respondents		Name of the top- 4 E-tailers				Total
			Amazon.in	Flipkart.com	myntara.com	Snapdeal.com	
1	Male	No. of Respondents	105	141	18	45	309
		Percentage of the respondents	34.0	45.6	5.8	14.6	100
2	Female	No. of Respondents	57	65	14	13	149
		Percentage of the respondents	38.3	43.6	9.4	8.7	100
Total	Total	No. of Respondents	162	206	32	58	458
		Percentage of the respondents	35.4	45.0	7.0	12.6	100

Table No: 3 Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.149	3	0.161
Likelihood Ratio	5.242	3	0.155
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.997	1	0.318
N of Valid Cases	458		

From the above table, at Pearson Chi-Square value 5.149 and $p < 0.161$, one can come to the conclusion that gender of the respondents and choice of an E-tailer are independent variables. Hence there is no association between the gender and the choice of a company. Therefore, the hypothesis H1 is accepted.

Association between Choice of an E-tailer (among Top 4 E-tailers) and Household Income (Rs/Month) of the Respondents

Table No: 4 Cross Tabulation

S. No	Household income (Rs/Month) of the respondents		Name of the top- 4 E-tailers				Total
			Amazon.in	Flipkart.com	myntra.com	Snapdeal.com	
1	Less than 20,000	No. of Respondents	2	4	2	0	8
		Percentage of the respondents	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	100
2	21000-40000	No. of Respondents	58	87	10	28	183
		Percentage of the respondents	31.7	47.5	5.5	15.3	100
3	41000-60000	No. of Respondents	52	61	7	15	135
		Percentage of the respondents	38.5	45.2	5.2	11.1	100
4	61000-80000	No. of Respondents	19	18	4	6	47
		Percentage of the respondents	40.4	38.3	8.5	12.8	100
5	81000-100000	No. of Respondents	16	14	3	2	35
		Percentage of the respondents	45.7	40.0	8.6	5.7	100
6	More than 100000	No. of Respondents	15	22	6	7	50
		Percentage of the respondents	30.0	44.0	12.0	14.0	100
Total		No. of Respondents	162	206	32	58	458
		Percentage of the respondents	35.4	45.0	7.0	12.7	100

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

Table No: 5 Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.820	15	0.464
Likelihood Ratio	14.386	15	0.497
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.009	1	0.925
N of Valid Cases	458		

From the above table, at Pearson Chi-Square value 14.820 and $p < 0.464$, it is inferred that the choice made among one of the top 4 E-tailers and the house hold income (Rs/Month) of the respondents are independent states. They do not have any association. Therefore, the hypothesis H14 is accepted.

Z-Test for Gender of the Respondents and Sources & Drivers of Consumer Based Brand Equity of E-tailers

Table No: 6 Z-Test for Gender of the Respondents and Drivers of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of E-tailers

Sl. No	Drivers of CBBE of E-tailers	Gender of the Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t value	Level of Significance
1	Functionality	Male	345	8.12	2.570	2.518	0.012
		Female	185	7.54	2.497		
2	Fulfillment	Male	345	7.97	2.912	0.407	0.684
		Female	185	8.08	2.847		
3	Customer Service & Support	Male	345	8.85	2.696	0.955	0.340
		Female	185	9.10	3.017		
4	Perceived Advertisement Spending	Male	345	16.30	4.443	0.729	0.467
		Female	185	16.62	5.132		
5	Price Deals	Male	345	15.61	4.297	0.024	0.981
		Female	185	15.62	4.417		

From the above table, for the 'Functionality', as its 't' value is 2.518, $p < 0.012$, it is inferred that Male and Female respondents give different level of importance to functionality of websites of E-tailers. If one considers the mean values, Male respondents give more importance to the functionality than Female respondents. Therefore, the hypothesis H2 is rejected. Going by the above table, for other drivers, as their significant values are > 0.05 , one can accept the hypotheses: H3, H4, H5 and H6.

Table No: 7 Z-Test for Gender of the Respondents and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity of E-tailers

Sl. No	Sources of CBBE of E-tailers	Gender of the Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t value	Level of Significance
1	Web awareness	Male	345	7.46	2.813	1.392	0.164
		Female	185	7.11	2.658		
2	Value Association	Male	345	16.72	4.464	0.058	0.953
		Female	185	16.75	4.497		
3	Trust Association	Male	345	4.29	1.680	2.211	0.028
		Female	185	3.97	1.514		
4	Perceived Quality	Male	345	19.70	5.090	1.746	0.081
		Female	185	20.52	5.272		
5	Brand Image	Male	345	24.84	6.480	0.645	0.519
		Female	185	24.43	7.259		
6	Loyalty	Male	345	11.97	3.866	2.515	0.012
		Female	185	12.83	3.717		

The Table No: 7 throws light on dynamics between sources of online shopping companies and gender of the respondents. The source 'Trust Association' has the t value of 2.211 and $p < 0.028$ which signifies a significant difference. Therefore, one can come to the conclusion that there is a difference between male and female respondents in reposing trust towards on E-tailers. If the mean values are to be considered as a source of revelation, one could arrive this insight: Male respondents repose more trust than female respondents on E-tailers' sites. So, the hypothesis H8 is rejected. The source, 'Loyalty' also shows a significant difference with gender of the respondents at $t = 2.515$ and $p < 0.012$. Hence, there is a difference in a way in which male and female respondents feel loyalty towards E-tailers. In the light of the mean values, one can find that female respondents are more loyal than their men counterpart towards these companies. Therefore, the hypothesis H12 is rejected. As far as other sources are concerned, there is no significant difference with gender of the respondents. Hence the hypotheses H7, H9, H10 and H11 are accepted.

Table No: 8 Z-Test for Gender of the Respondents and CBBE of E-tailers

Sl. No	CBBE of E-tailers	Gender of the Respondents	N	Mean	SD	t value	Level of Significance
1	Brand Equity	Male	345	4.25	1.553	1.285	0.199
		Female	185	4.43	1.502		

From the above table, as $t = 1.285$ and $p < 0.199$, it is interpreted that Male and Female respondents show similar level of brand equity towards E-tailers, the mean values also testifies this fact. Therefore the hypothesis H13 is accepted.

Household Income of the Respondents and Drivers of Consumer Based Brand Equity of E-tailers

It is very interesting to explore the dynamics between the respondents from various household incomes (Rs/Month) and their perception towards various marketing efforts or drivers of E-tailers. In this context, ANOVA test is invoked to make a sense of this dynamics.

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

Table No: 9 Household Income of the Respondents and the Drivers of Consumer Based Brand Equity – Descriptives

Drivers of CBBE of E-tailers	Classes of Household Income (Rs/Month)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Functionality	Less than 20,000	10	9.10	1.370	0.433
	21000-40000	209	7.62	2.380	0.164
	41000-60000	155	8.18	2.811	0.225
	61000-80000	53	8.28	2.655	0.364
	81000-100000	39	8.17	2.150	0.344
	More than 100000	64	7.60	2.670	0.333
	Total	530	7.92	2.558	0.111
Fulfillment	Less than 20,000	10	7.80	3.489	1.103
	21000-40000	209	7.80	2.860	0.197
	41000-60000	155	8.01	2.891	0.232
	61000-80000	53	8.41	3.272	0.449
	81000-100000	39	8.74	2.602	0.416
	More than 100000	64	7.92	2.698	0.337
	Total	530	8.01	2.887	0.125
Customer Service & Support	Less than 20,000	10	8.80	3.735	1.181
	21000-40000	209	8.72	2.885	0.199
	41000-60000	155	9.14	2.659	0.213
	61000-80000	53	9.56	2.530	0.347
	81000-100000	39	9.64	3.166	0.507
	More than 100000	64	8.23	2.629	0.328
	Total	530	8.94	2.812	0.122
Perceived Advertisement Spending	Less than 20,000	10	18.20	2.859	0.904
	21000-40000	209	16.23	4.753	0.328
	41000-60000	155	16.90	4.578	0.367
	61000-80000	53	16.69	4.986	0.685
	81000-100000	39	16.28	3.355	0.537
	More than 100000	64	15.37	5.310	0.663
	Total	530	16.41	4.692	0.203
Price Deals	Less than 20,000	10	16.80	5.633	1.781
	21000-40000	209	15.46	4.422	0.305

	41000-60000	155	15.85	4.089	0.328
	61000-80000	53	15.01	3.973	0.545
	81000-100000	39	15.35	3.467	0.555
	More than 100000	64	16.04	5.159	0.644
	Total	530	15.62	4.335	0.188

Table No: 10 ANOVA for the Household Income of the Respondents and the Drivers of Consumer Based Brand Equity

Drivers of CBBE of E-tailers		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Functionality	Between Groups	58.207	5	11.641	1.792	0.113
	Within Groups	3404.465	524	6.497		
	Total	3462.672	529			
Fulfillment	Between Groups	39.100	5	7.820	0.937	0.456
	Within Groups	4372.832	524	8.345		
	Total	4411.932	529			
Customer Service & Support	Between Groups	88.183	5	17.637	2.256	0.048
	Within Groups	4096.119	524	7.817		
	Total	4184.302	529			
Perceived Advertisement Spending	Between Groups	150.765	5	30.153	1.374	0.232
	Within Groups	11499.915	524	21.946		
	Total	11650.679	529			
Price Deals	Between Groups	60.789	5	12.158	0.645	0.666
	Within Groups	9883.983	524	18.863		
	Total	9944.772	529			

From the above table, it is understood that apart from customer service & support, all other drivers do not have any significant difference with various household income groups. Therefore, the hypotheses H15, H16, H18 and H19 are accepted. Even with Customer Service and Support at $F = 2.256$ and $p < 0.048$, the significant difference is marginal though it indicates that there is a slight difference in perception among various household income groups towards the customer service and support. Hence the hypothesis, H17 is rejected.

Household Income of the Respondents and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity of E-Tailers

The following part of the thesis explores, with a help of ANOVA, how the respondents from various household incomes perceive or feel about various sources of brand equity.

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

Table No: 11 Household Income of the Respondents and the Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity – Descriptives

Sources of CBBE of E-tailers	Classes of Household Income (Rs/Month)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Web Awareness	Less than 20,000	10	8.00	2.494	0.788
	21000-40000	209	7.45	2.636	0.182
	41000-60000	155	7.20	2.712	0.217
	61000-80000	53	7.37	3.317	0.455
	81000-100000	39	7.71	2.327	0.372
	More than 100000	64	6.93	3.085	0.385
	Total	530	7.34	2.763	0.120
Value Association	Less than 20,000	10	17.60	4.247	1.343
	21000-40000	209	16.14	3.884	0.268
	41000-60000	155	17.11	4.559	0.366
	61000-80000	53	16.79	5.070	0.696
	81000-100000	39	17.38	4.469	0.715
	More than 100000	64	17.15	5.419	0.677
	Total	530	16.73	4.471	0.194
Trust Association	Less than 20,000	10	3.80	1.398	0.442
	21000-40000	209	3.92	1.609	0.111
	41000-60000	155	4.33	1.624	0.130
	61000-80000	53	3.92	1.491	0.204
	81000-100000	39	5.00	1.835	0.293
	More than 100000	64	4.45	1.521	0.190
	Total	530	4.18	1.630	0.070
Perceived Quality	Less than 20,000	10	20.20	2.780	0.879
	21000-40000	209	19.55	4.894	0.338
	41000-60000	155	20.11	5.102	0.409
	61000-80000	53	19.24	4.214	0.578
	81000-100000	39	21.92	6.371	1.020
	More than 100000	64	20.50	6.102	0.762
	Total	530	19.99	5.164	0.224
Brand Image	Less than 20,000	10	23.20	6.373	2.015
	21000-40000	209	24.26	6.123	0.423

	41000-60000	155	25.32	7.128	0.572
	61000-80000	53	22.92	6.702	0.920
	81000-100000	39	27.25	7.704	1.233
	More than 100000	64	24.81	6.943	0.867
	Total	530	24.70	6.758	0.293
Loyalty	Less than 20,000	10	11.00	1.763	0.557
	21000-40000	209	12.18	3.588	0.248
	41000-60000	155	12.34	4.237	0.340
	61000-80000	53	12.52	3.141	0.431
	81000-100000	39	13.30	4.752	0.761
	More than 100000	64	11.78	3.679	0.459
	Total	530	12.27	3.833	0.166

Table No: 12 ANOVA for the Household Income of the Respondents and the Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity

Sources of CBBE of E-tailers		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Web Awareness	Between Groups	25.875	5	5.175	0.676	0.642
	Within Groups	4013.312	524	7.659		
	Total	4039.187	529			
Value Association	Between Groups	129.922	5	25.984	1.303	0.261
	Within Groups	10449.097	524	19.941		
	Total	10579.019	529			
Trust Association	Between Groups	53.392	5	10.678	4.137	0.001
	Within Groups	1352.487	524	2.581		
	Total	1405.879	529			
Perceived Quality	Between Groups	233.360	5	46.672	1.763	0.119
	Within Groups	13875.593	524	26.480		
	Total	14108.953	529			
Brand Image	Between Groups	545.202	5	109.040	2.419	0.035
	Within Groups	23618.881	524	45.074		
	Total	24164.083	529			
Loyalty	Between Groups	79.360	5	15.872	1.081	0.370
	Within Groups	7696.421	524	14.688		
	Total	7775.781	529			

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

From the above table, at $F = 4.137$, $p < 0.001$, the source 'Trust Association' has significant difference among the respondents from various household income. It seems that respondents from different household incomes have different level of trust association with the companies. Hence, the hypothesis H22 is rejected. Another brand equity source, 'Brand Image' is also, at $F = 2.419$, $p < 0.035$, has significant difference with respondents from various household incomes. In the light of this fact, one can come to the conclusion that E-tailers as brands, evoke different brand image among the respondents from various household incomes. Therefore, the hypothesis, H24 is rejected. For other brand equity sources, namely, Web Awareness, Value Association, Perceived Quality and Loyalty, as they do not have any significant difference with respondents from different household incomes, the hypotheses H20, H21, H23 and H25 are accepted. There is a significant difference ($p < 0.012$) between the respondents from Rs 81000-100000/Month household income and the respondents from Rs 21000-40000/Month household income in the way in which they repose faith on E-tailers. The further analysis reveals that the respondents from Rs 81000-100000/Month household income have stronger trust association with the companies than the respondents from Rs 21000-40000/Month household income.

Household Income of the Respondents and Consumer Based Brand Equity of E-tailers

Table No: 13 Household Income of the Respondents and Consumer Based Brand Equity – Descriptives

CBBE of E-tailers	Classes of Household Income (Rs/Month)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Brand Equity	Less than 20,000	10	3.20	1.229	0.388
	21000-40000	209	4.30	1.481	0.102
	41000-60000	155	4.54	1.575	0.126
	61000-80000	53	4.30	1.539	0.211
	81000-100000	39	4.25	1.757	0.281
	More than 100000	64	4.06	1.446	0.180
	Total	530	4.32	1.536	0.066

Table No: 14 ANOVA for the Household Income of the Respondents and CBBE

CBBE of E-tailers		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brand Equity	Between Groups	24.637	5	4.927	2.108	0.063
	Within Groups	1224.835	524	2.337		
	Total	1249.472	529			

From the above ANOVA table, it is inferred that, at $F = 2.108$ and $p < 0.063$, there is no significant difference in brand equity of E-tailers among the respondents from various household income. So, the hypothesis H26 is accepted.

FINDINGS

The analysis showed that among the given E-tailers, 38.9% of the respondents chose Flipkart.com as their preferred choice and this was followed by Amazon.in (30.6%), Snapdeal.com (10.9%) and Myntra.com (6%). Among the respondents participated in the study, 65% of them were male and 35% of them were female. The monthly household income of 39.4% of the respondents were in the range of 21000-40000 rupees. 29.2 % of the respondents' monthly household income fell in the range of 41000- 60000 rupees. By combining higher income groups, the study revealed that the monthly household income of 19.5 % respondents were more than 80000 rupees. Male and female respondents give different level of importance to website functionality of E-tailers. In fact, male respondents give more importance to the functionality than female respondents. The kind of trust reposed by the respondents on an E-tailer is varied between the genders. It seems that male respondents repose more trust than female respondents on an E-tailer. By extending the same

analogy, there is a difference in a way in which male and female respondents feel loyalty towards an E-tailer. It is revealed that female respondents are more loyal than male respondents towards the company. Male and female respondents feel similar level of brand equity towards E-tailers. The household income of a respondent is nothing to do with the way in which he/she perceives various marketing efforts/drivers of CBBE of E-tailers. Respondents from different household incomes have different level of 'trust association' with E-tailers. By looking this phenomenon closely, it is understood that the respondents from Rs 81000-100000/Month household income have stronger trust association with the companies than the respondents from Rs 21000-40000/Month household income. E-tailers, as brands, evoke different 'brand image' among the respondents from various household incomes. There is no significant difference among the respondents from various household incomes as far as the way in which they feel 'brand equity' towards E-tailers. The study finds that the gender of the respondents does not influence their choice of an E-tailer. Given the analysis of this study, one can come to the conclusion that no way household income (Rs/Month) of the respondent is an influential factor for a respondent to choose an E-tailer. Through extrapolation, one can propose that all these top 4 companies attract customers across different income groups.

SUGGESTIONS

Customers from high income households repose more trust on E-tailers. The tech-oriented approach, as it gives more security to online transactions, will consolidate that trust, even it would make female customer to begin to repose trust on them. Establishing solid reward system will motivate various stake holders of online business. Sellers, employees and customers should be rewarded as per the principles of the established reward system. For instance, for loyal customers, free delivery is one of the aspects of the reward system. The research reveals that female customers are more loyal than their male counterpart. Hence, the reward system, with its ingenious ways, should give more value to this bunch of customers. People oriented approaches, like trusting and allowing employees to take decisions without any fear of being punished when that decisions go wrong which will improve customer service and spawning novel ways to bring about better service to customers and winning over trust of sellers who have unique products but do not have wherewithal to market their products, which lead to more product variety and more new customers in the fold of an E-tailer, will be the sure shot to strengthen the CBBE of E-tailers. As customers from various house hold incomes have different brand image about E-tailers, the above given suggestions will not only bring about good brand image among those sections of customers but also, by default, eliminate certain aspects that may compromise the brand image of E-tailers.

CONCLUSION

Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) is such an important construct that will help an E-tailer significantly to strengthen their brand equity. Positive brand equity is synonymous with a strong brand. Every nuances of CBBE to be researched and understood. This research shows that even demographic variables like Gender and Household income of the respondents are too important to be ignored. Even one clear new insight about CBBE will help an E-tailer to strengthen its brand.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aaker D. A. (1991), *Managing brand equity; Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*. Free Press: New York.
- [2] Akshay R. Rao and Kent B. Monroe (1989), "The Effect of Price, Brand Name, and Store Name on Buyers' Perceptions of Product Quality: An Integrative Review", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 351-357.
- [3] Amna Kirmani, Peter Wright (1989), "Money Talks: Perceived Advertising Expense and Expected Product Quality", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(3):344-53.
- [4] Bawa, K. and R. W. Shoemaker. (1987). "The Coupon-Prone Consumer: Some Findings Based on Purchase Behaviour Across Product Classes.", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.51, pp.99-110.
- [5] Bettman, James R. (1979), "An Information Processing View of Consumer Choice", New York: Addison-Wesley
- [6] Boulding, W., Kalra, A., Staelin, R., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1993). A dynamic process model of service quality: From expectations to behavioral intentions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(1), 7-27. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3172510>
- [7] Cobb-Walgren C.J., Ruble C.A. and Donthu.N (1995), "Brand Equity, Brand Preference, and Purchase Intent," *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 25-40.
- [8] Crask, M., & Reynolds, F. (1978), "An in-depth profile of the department store shopper", *Journal of Retailing*, 54 (2), 23-33.
- [9] East, R., Harris, P., Willson, G., & Hammond, K. (1995), "Correlates of First-Brand Loyalty", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(5), pp.487-497.

Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables, Drivers and Sources of Consumer Based Brand Equity (CBBE) of Indian E-Tailers

- [10] Homburg, C., & Giering, A. (2001), "Personal characteristics as moderators of the relationship between customer satisfaction and loyalty — An empirical analysis", *Psychology & Marketing*, 18(1), 43–66.
- [11] Hui-Chu Chen, D.Green, James Miller (2008)," Gender Difference Influencing Brand Equity", IABR & TLC Conference Proceedings San Juan, Puerto Rico, USA,pp1-7.
- [12] Hui-Chu Chen & Robert D. Green. (2011), "Brand Equity, Marketing Strategy, And Consumer Income: A Hypermarket Study", *Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, Vol. 8, pp.1-10.
- [13] Isabel María Rosa-Díaz, (2004) "Price knowledge: effects of consumers' attitudes towards prices, demographics, and socio-cultural characteristics", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 13 Issue: 6, pp.406-428.
- [14] Joseph Kaswengi (2014), "Store image dimensions and brand equity: the moderating role of demographic characteristics", *International Marketing Trends Conference at: Venice (Italy)*, DOI: 10.13140/2.1.3060.7687.
- [15] Kanagal, N. (2009), "Role of relationship marketing in competitive marketing strategy", *Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 2(May), 1-17.
- [16] Kara, A., Rojas-Méndez, J.I., Kucukemiroglu, O., & Harcar, T. (2009), "Consumer Preferences of Store Brands: Role of Prior Experiences and Value Consciousness", 17(2), 127-137.
- [17] Keller, K. L. (2003), "Brand synthesis: The multidimensionality of brand knowledge", *Journal of consumer research*, 29(4), 595-600.
- [18] Korganokar, P.K., Lund, D., and Price, B. (1985), "A Structural Equation Approach towards examination of store attitude and storage patronage behaviour", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.61, pp.39-60.
- [19] Kotler, P. and Keller, K. (2006)," *Marketing Management*", 12th Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- [20] Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Determining Sample Size for Research Activities*. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- [21] Levedahl, J.W. (1988), "Coupon redeemers: are they better shoppers?" *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, pp.264-283.
- [22] Meyers-Levy, J. and Tybout, A.M. (1989)," *Schema Congruity as a Basis for Product Evaluation*", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, 39-54.
- [23] Moutinho, L. & Goode, M. (1995), "Gender effects to the formation of overall product Satisfaction: A multivariate approach", *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 8 (1), 71-91.
- [24] Oliver R.L. (1999), "Whence Customer Loyalty?" *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 63, Special Issue, pp. 33-44.
- [25] Pappu, R. & Quester, P. (2006), "A consumer-based method for retailer equity measurement: Results of an empirical study", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 13,317-329.
- [26] Richardson, P. S., Dick, A. S., & Jain, A. K. (1994), "Extrinsic and intrinsic cue effects on perceptions of store brand quality", *Journal of Marketing*, 58(4), 28-36.
- [27] Ries, A., & Ries, L. (2004), "The origin of brands", New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.
- [28] Scot Burton, Donald R. Lichtenstein (1989), "Assessing the Relationship Between Perceived and Objective Price-Quality: A Replication", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Volume 17, pp. 715-722.
- [29] Slama, M. E., & Tashchian, A. (1985), "Selected socioeconomic and demographic characteristics associated with purchasing involvement", *Journal of Marketing*, 49(1), pp.72-82.
- [30] Solomon, M. R. (2007), *Consumer behavior: Buying, having and being*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- [31] Stephen S. Porter, Cindy Claycomb, (1997), "The influence of brand recognition on retail store image", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 6 Issue: 6, pp.373-387.
- [32] Tanja Dmitrovic, Irena Vida, (2007),"An examination of cross border shopping behaviour in South East Europe", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 41 Issue 3/4 pp.382-395.
- [33] Venkatesh Shankar A, Amy K. Smith B, Arvind Rangaswamy (2003)," Customer satisfaction and loyalty in online and offline environments", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 20, pp. 153 – 175.
- [34] Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. (2000), "An examination of selected marketing mix elements and brand equity", *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 28(2), pp.195-211.
- [35] Zeithaml, V.A. (1985), "A conceptual model of service quality and its implication for future research", *Journal of Marketing*, 49(Fall), 41-50.
