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Abstract

Exploration of Consumer Brand Name Equity for Established Products and Services: Using a Global Marketing Induced Change Analysis Approach

The objective of the study is the exploration of consumer brand name equity for established products and services. There is little research on consumer brand name equity for established products, despite the general assumption within the literature of the central importance to consumers of the brand name element.

To achieve isolation of the brand name element the study focuses on name changes brought about by global marketing. Adopting both a critical realist position and a functional based approach towards consumer brand equity, a mixed methods three stage sequential study design is employed.

The first stage of the research focuses on the theoretical literature relevant to consumer brand name equity. In particular it seeks to derive a theoretical model of the consumer impact of a change in brand name for an established product. The second stage of the research uses qualitative analysis to empirically explore established product brand name functions. The model developed in the first stage of research is used as a framework but research is not limited to the empirical exploration of this model. The final stage of the research uses quantitative analysis to empirically explore the importance of the brand name of established product to consumers.

The research makes a number of contributions to the existing literature. It empirically identifies a number of ways in which the brand name of established products can provide equity to consumers; specifically through rational, relationship, habitual and symbolic functions. One key finding is the discovery that much of the symbolic value appears to be customer rather than corporate driven. A further contribution from the quantitative work is an indication that the overall importance of the brand name of established products holds significant variance. A minority of research participants placed great importance on the brand name element, whilst for the majority the brand name held little importance. This places in context the above functions of the brand name element.

Key implications from this study are that the accepted centrality of the brand name element within branding needs qualification and the active role of the consumer within brand equity creation requires greater recognition. In addition, whilst the research findings provide a good rationale for why corporations are able to change the brand name of their products with minimal impact for most of their customers, it also suggests that for a minority of customers this name change will cause an insurmountable long term problem, which will have to be borne by the corporation.

David Round   The University of Manchester   Doctor of Philosophy   2012
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1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This Chapter provides an introduction to the research. It looks at where the idea behind the research originated and how this was transformed into a research objective. It also provides an outline of the methodology and research design adopted, which is subsequently covered in detail in later chapters. Finally a structure of the thesis is provided.

1.1.1 Consumer Brand Equity or Consumer Brand Value?

The term brand equity is typically used in a corporate perspective to refer to the additional worth arising from the ownership of brands (Aaker, 1991). When branding is looked at from the viewpoint of the consumer the same terminology tends to be used, albeit with the word consumer or customer placed in front (Keller, 2008). This is not particularly satisfactory. The use of the word equity derives from financial asset nomenclature (Kapferer, 2008). This is highly appropriate for a corporation, where the benefit from a brand is seen to typically derive from ownership (i.e. as a non-financial asset). It is less appropriate for consumers, where in contrast the benefit from a brand often derives from its use; the financial terminology analogue being as a revenue rather than an asset item.

Consequently alternative descriptive terminology has been suggested. Utility is one term from the economics discipline but this thesis will typically use the term consumer brand value\(^1\), as the term utility is sometimes assumed to refer to a narrow definition of rational benefit (Graham, 2008). The term consumer brand value embraces neutrality about whether the benefits to the consumer are short or long term in nature. Not using the term equity also reinforces to the reader the consumer, as opposed to corporate, centred nature of this research.

---

\(^1\) with the exception of the title. The importance of appropriate external classification of this research within the academic literature is also understood.
1.2 Background to the Research

1.2.1 Accepted Importance of Brand Name

Within the branding domain academic theory asserts that branding is of fundamental importance to consumers and that brand name is a fundamental element of branding.

“Of all the marketing variables it is the brand name which receives the most attention by consumers.”
(de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006: p.96)

“For many businesses the brand name and what it represents are its most important asset...”

“Consider brand names-perhaps the most central of all brand elements...”
(Keller, 2008: p.145)

This importance is assumed to occur because of the value that the brand name provides to consumers, through the various rational and emotional functions that it performs (Keller, 2008; Kapferer, 2008). There is general consensus of brand name importance from academics of both orthodox and contemporary persuasions (Elliott and Wattanasuwan, 1998; Fournier, 1998; Brown, 1995).

It appeared to the author that it would logically follow from the above that a change in brand name would be expected to have a major and noticeable impact on the behaviour of consumers. However anecdotally this does not appear to be the case (Edwards, 2010). Corporations continue to change brand names, both at the corporate and product level. Some of the most notable UK examples since the start of this research have been Norwich Union to Aviva (corporate and product), Bounty to Plenty (product) and Charmin to Cushelle (product). It appears reasonable to assume that corporations would not continue with this activity if significant consumer behavioural impact was occurring.
1.2.2 Lack of Brand Name Research for Established Products

In order to gain understanding into this apparent inconsistency between literature and practice empirical work was then reviewed that specifically considered the roles and importance that brand name played within consumer brand equity/value. This revealed that little empirical work has been undertaken and that this suffers from methodological limitations, resulting from being limited to new or fictitious brands (Friedman and Dipple, 1978; Mehrabian and Wetter, 1987; Peterson and Ross, 1972; Gibson, 2005), or from centring research on the brand entity rather than the brand name in isolation (Jaju et al., 2006; Muzellec and Lambkin, 2006). A problematic gap in the literature was therefore discovered relating to the value that consumers receive from the brand names of established products and services. It cannot be logically presumed that the brand name element retains its importance as a product moves from new to established and it has been argued that the accrued effect of marketing communication programme investment supersedes the role of the brand name (Riezebos, 1994).

To recap, doubts about the importance of the brand name for established products, initially arising from anecdotal empirical observation, could not be overcome through a review of extant research because this was essentially absent.

1.2.3 Isolation of the Brand Name Element

A major difficulty in the empirical consideration of the role of brand name for established products and services is how the brand name element can be isolated for examination. The author determined that a segregational device to achieve this could be found in global marketing induced brand name change and that this could be employed within the research.

Global marketing induced brand name change can be defined as a change to the name of a product or service resulting from a corporate desire for the same name to be used globally, as opposed to any brand performance issues. Well known historic examples within the UK include the change of Marathon to
Snickers and Jif to Cif and some more contemporary examples are mentioned in Section 1.2.1. Visual examples are shown in Figure 1 on the following page. What is particularly important is that corporations engaging in such branding activities generally deliberately endeavour to maintain unchanged all the other aspects and elements of the brand (Pottker, 1995; Kapferer, 2008). By so doing any impact on the consumer identified from the name change can reasonably be attributed to the brand name element. By focusing the research on this type of name change an opportunity is therefore created for the brand name element to be isolated for study to a greater extent than typically available within branding research.

Thus it is argued that the role and importance of brand name to the consumer emerge through such research, thereby increasing understanding of its position within consumer brand value.

As an alternative one could simply ask consumers what roles brand name performed for them. However, it is unlikely that consumers could meaningfully separate out the brand name element from all the other aspects of the brand entity.

By adopting the approach of this research of asking consumers to consider the change in functions of brand name that resulted from a change in name it appears far more reasonable to assume that resultant data could be attributed to the brand name element and not generally to the brand entity.

To reiterate, although the research is focused on looking at changes to brand names this is primarily in order to increase overall understanding about the brand name element rather than simply to increase understanding of name changes.
1.3 Research Objective

As a consequence of the identification of the fundamental problematic research gap and in recognition of the merits of the utilisation of a global marketing induced change analysis approach (as discussed in Section 1.2.3), it was determined that the overall objective of the research should be:

Exploration of consumer brand name equity for established products and services: Using a global marketing induced change analysis approach

To meet this overall objective the research focuses on (but is not strictly limited to) two research questions:
1-In what ways does the brand name of established products and services provide value to consumers and what implications does this have?

2-What is the relative importance of the brand name of established products and services for consumers?

These questions are related in that how brand name provides equity/value should be considered in the context of how much equity/value it provides.

1.4 Methodology and Research Design

1.4.1 Philosophical Position

A critical realist position has been adopted for this research. Whilst this is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 this stance has a number of implications that are important in order to understand the adopted research design.

Firstly as critical realism argues that as “true knowledge of reality does not lie at the empirical surface but requires methodological digging” (Collier, 1994: p.50) no particular research method is automatically privileged. Accordingly, the use of mixed methods, consisting of both qualitative and quantitative analysis, may be more productive in the obtaining and creation of knowledge.

Secondly the customary division of research designs into exploratory/discovery and conclusive/justification (Malhotra and Birks, 2007; Hunt, 1983) may be unhelpful. Critical realism does not rule out research aimed at providing a degree of justification but the research methods deemed most appropriate to achieve this are, as a consequence of critical realism’s inherent epistemological cautiousness, likely to also unearth discoveries at the same time (Potter, 2000).

Finally the dichotomy between social world research aiming at causal explanation and aiming at understanding is regarded as artificial and erroneous. Given that reason is generally accepted as a cause within critical realism, causal explanation is often regarded as a possible research objective. However
it is argued that to achieve this initially requires understanding (Bhaskar, 1979; Potter, 2000).

1.4.2 Function-based Approach towards Consumer Brand Value

The research employs a function based approach towards consumer brand value, arguing that this is preferable to one based solely on corporate-driven brand awareness and associations. The detailed argument in support of this approach is included within Chapter 2 following a critique of relevant literature.

Such an approach has a number of advantages. Firstly it better supports exploration of the various types of value that a consumer can receive from a brand (e.g. rational, symbolic, habitual). Secondly it avoids the implicit assumption that consumer brand value is always created by the corporation. Finally it provides a valuable complement to research carried out using a corporate approach.

1.4.3 Other Methodological Matters

For the sake of brevity the thesis will use the term product to refer to both product and service unless otherwise stated. Similarly unless stated otherwise products are assumed to be established rather than new.

As is discussed in Chapter 2 confusion can arise from conflation between the use of two distinct terms brand name and brand. A brand name is one of the elements of the brand entity (e.g. the brand entity Sony has the name Sony as one of its elements in the same way that it also has a slogan as another of its elements). The use of a brand name also identifies a specific brand entity (e.g. Sony) but the brand name is not the brand entity. For absolute clarity this research is specifically focused on the brand name rather than the total brand entity.

1.4.4 Research Design

The research design was developed to meet the research objective as stated in Section 1.3, in the context of the overall methodology.
Research was planned and performed in three stages. In this section each of these stages is described at summary level. They are discussed in greater detail later in the thesis.

1.4.4.1 Stage 1-Development of Brand Name Change Theoretical Model

In line with the reasoning discussed in Section 1.2.3 the research concentrates on looking at change in brand name. The first stage of the research is the review and synthesis of the academic literature in order to develop a theoretical model for the impact of a change in a brand name on the consumer. This stage is essentially inductive in nature with the development of theory arising from the synthesis of the existing literature, rather than the observation of empirical data.

Research conducted during this stage has the following two objectives:

a-The obtaining of a clearer and fuller understanding of the academic thinking about the brand name element, through the exploration, analysis and synthesis of the literature.

b-The provision of a theoretical framework for the empirical work in the following two stages of research.

1.4.4.2 Stage 2-Emprical Exploration of Brand Name Value Dimensions

The second stage of the research subjects the variables and relationships contained within the model derived in Stage 1 to empirical exploration using qualitative analysis. The specific research method employed is a series of semi-structured interviews. These are subsequently analysed using template analysis and NVivo software. This stage is essentially deductive in nature. This approach is believed to be the most appropriate method and was in line with the adopted overall methodology. The empirical data obtained is not limited to that concerned with model confirmation but also explores the research domain.

Research conducted during this stage has the following objective:
a-The obtaining of greater understanding of the various roles that the brand name of established products and services play for consumers and the implications of this for their behaviour.

It was anticipated that this objective would primarily but not exclusively be met through empirical confirmation or disconfirmation of the extant theory as developed in Stage 1 of the research.

1.4.4.3 Stage 3-Empirical Exploration of Brand Name Importance

The final stage of the research attempts to obtain a measure of the relative importance of the brand name element of established products for consumers. The specific research method employed is a series of participant experiments using the statistical technique of conjoint analysis supported by Sawtooth SSI software, with the results subsequently statistically analysed using SPSS16 software. This stage is also essentially deductive in nature, although without precluding the discovery of new empirical data that may be relevant to the overall research objective.

This stage of research has the specific objective of obtaining greater understanding about the relative importance of brand name for established products. This objective assists in placing in context the findings about brand name roles obtained from the previous stages of the research.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

The Thesis is structured as follows.

Chapter 2 provides a critical review of the relevant literature. The development of the Brand Name Change theoretical model from the literature is left until Chapter 4.

Chapter 3 consists of consideration of the methodological issues. In particular, it provides a comparison of critical realism with alternative ontological and epistemological positions and discusses the merits and assumptions of the
adopted approach. It also considers the extent to which the research design and findings may be considered to be of worth under alternative philosophical approaches. The overall research design is included within this chapter, whilst detailed description of the various research methods employed is covered within the relevant research stage chapter.

Chapters 4 to 6 consist of individual chapters for each of the three stages of the research study. The research method and findings for each of the individual stages are discussed in detail.

Chapter 7 brings together all of the research findings and considers the extent to which the research objective has been met. It highlights the key contributions of the research to the extant literature, together with consideration of limitations of the research. It also provides discussion of various additional issues and topics emergent from the research and makes recommendations for future work.

1.5.1 Justification for Thesis Structure

There are two ways in which the structure of this thesis differs from what might be expected. These are described below and the justification provided.

Firstly the detailed research methods are not included with the methodology chapter (which discusses the methods at summary level) but within the chapter for the relevant stage of the research. The reason for this is that the detailed methods for the later stages were dependent upon the results of the previous stage of research. For reader clarity it is preferable that the thesis deals with the results of one stage before discussing in detail the method of the following stage.

Secondly the chapter about the first stage of the research could have been appended onto the literature review. The reason that it has not been is that it is considered preferable to consider first the overall methodology and design behind this stage of research. Accordingly this research stage follows the methodology chapter.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Purpose

The literature review has three aims. These result from the overall objective of the research being the exploration of consumer brand name equity.

The first aim is to specifically demonstrate the gap within the literature that this research study fills, thereby providing justification for its research objective. In particular the literature review aims to show the following: theoretical literature from separate strands within the branding domain views the brand name element as of substantial importance but, in the case of established products, there is scant empirical work to support this view.

The second aim is the exploration, synthesis and critique of key relevant academic thinking within the branding domain. This is necessarily focused on the brand name element and brand name change. For both the researcher and reader it is important to understand and appreciate the context of the research study.

The final aim is to show how material from the existing literature is reflected within the research design employed by the study.

2.2 Format

Mindful of these three aims the following literature review has the following format.

The first Section 2.3 reviews and critiques literature that is concerned with theory about how consumers receive value from branding. In particular it compares and contrasts approaches that are based on functions of branding with approaches based on equity from branding. It also considers issues of the variability of the importance and role of branding for the consumer and how branding value might be measured.
None of the literature within this first section relates specifically to the brand name element. However the second Section 2.4 considers literature that is concerned with the role and importance of brand name within branding. In particular two streams of literature are considered. The first examines academic thought that is concerned with brand name within brand value creation. The second examines academic literature concerned with the impact of brand names either on the asserted antecedents to consumer brand value or directly on consumer brand value.

Taking Sections 2.3 and 2.4 together the clear conclusion is that the theory within the branding academy overwhelmingly regards brand name as important and a key source of brand value.

The next Section 2.5 reviews empirical work within the literature relating to brand name and ascertains that little of this work relates to established brand names or alternatively that it suffers from other methodological weaknesses. By so doing the literature review achieves its aim of demonstrating the existence of the research gap for this study; that is a lack of empirical backing for the theoretical position of the brand name element for established products.

Having established this research gap the literature review then continues the exploration and critique of other relevant areas within the academic literature. Literature relating to brand name change is examined in Section 2.6. Literature that is relevant to the relationship between brand name value and brand purchase behaviour is discussed in Section 2.7. There are two reasons why these particular areas of literature are reviewed. Firstly given that the overall approach of the research study is concerned with changes in brand name it is important that any relevant theoretical and empirical academic literature on this topic is considered. Secondly the research objective includes implications of provision of brand name value and a key resulting question is the impact that this has on consumer purchase behaviour.
Section 2.8 discusses the conclusions from the literature review on the research study.

2.3 Consumer Value from Branding

2.3.1 Introduction

Two key approaches to consumer value from branding are found within the literature. The first consists of consideration of the various value generating functions that branding can perform for consumers. The second consists of approaches that are labelled as brand equity. These are discussed in turn and critiqued below in Section 2.3.4.

2.3.2 Brand Function Approach

There is broad agreement within the literature about two points. Firstly there is general consensus about the predisposition of branding to provide value to customers. Secondly there is concurrence over the composition of the various functions performed by branding. Less agreement is apparent about which of these functions are dominant. The literature might be divided into that of the orthodox hegemony, which tends to see the rational functions of branding dominating and that of a more contemporary nature, which stresses its symbolic, emotional and cultural aspects.

Writing by Keller (2008) can be taken as an exemplar for the orthodox camp and he identifies six distinct functions of branding. The first four of these are primarily rational or functional in nature, whilst the final two are essentially symbolic in nature. These are discussed in turn below. It is generally acknowledged that different functions are likely to be most relevant for different products and individuals and this is discussed in Section 2.3.5.2.

2.3.2.1 Rational Functions

Firstly branding can perform an identification function, enabling a consumer to quickly identify a product or service with which they are familiar (Farquhar, 1989; Kapferer, 2008). For example branding might allow a consumer to be
aware that a product called Fairy Liquid would satisfy their functional need for cleaning dishes.

This identification function supports the second key branding function of search cost reduction (Aaker, 1991; Jacoby et al., 1977; Kapferer, 2008). Branding can simplify the purchase process not only for products with which consumers are already familiar but also for new products. This is because the branding process facilitates and enables the encapsulation of relevant purchase information, through brand communication and association. For example the association of a brand with particular service attributes, such as speed, allows a consumer to make a quick decision about whether it would meet their functional needs. Thanks to branding much of the search process has already been performed for consumers, providing them with time and energy resource saving value.

Thirdly branding is seen as having a specific role to play in the signalling of quality (Jacoby et al., 1971; Kapferer, 2008). This is particularly the case for goods and services whose attributes cannot be assessed prior to purchase. In support of this, empirical work carried out has confirmed the use by consumers of brand for the judgement of quality (Brucks et al., 2000; Lavenka, 1991). This identifies that quality signalling could primarily meet functional needs, such as ease of use and durability, or alternatively be prestige related, primarily meeting symbolic needs.

Fourthly brands can perform a risk reduction function (Aaker, 1991; Roselius, 1971). For example a consumer might not have prior experience of a Sony television but their positive experience with a Sony DVD might reduce the perceived risk that they have about their planned television purchase. Alternatively branding could provide a consistency guarantee that a product would be the same whenever and wherever purchased. Risk reduction might not simply be concerned with functional benefits but could relate to the social risk needs of a consumer. For example branding might ensure that the clothes a consumer wears do not alienate him from group membership.
2.3.2.2 Symbolic Function

Fifthly the purchase of certain brands might provide value to consumers through the symbolic associations that a brand might possess for these consumers (Aaker, 1991). As stated above this aspect tends to be stressed by contemporary commentators. It has been claimed that goods are rarely wanted for utilitarian reasons but for the cultural meanings they possess (Douglas and Isherwood, 1996; McCracken, 1986). For example it is asserted that many of the consumers purchasing Nike footwear are not driven by functionality. Academics such as Elliott and Wattanasuwan (1998) argue that brands are predominantly used by consumers to develop their internal and social identities, thereby gaining meaning in their lives and hence value.

A seminal work that endorses this branding function is the study by McAlexander et al. (2002) on the Harley-Davidson community, where the primary base of community identification is the brand. Other examples of symbolic benefits from brands within the literature are those relating to ethics (Kapferer, 2008), where consumers obtain value from the responsible behaviour of a brand in its relationship with society (e.g. Body Shop), those relating to nostalgia (Brown et al., 2003), where consumers receive nostalgia value from a brand reminding them of their youth (e.g. VW Beetle) and iconic brands (Holt, 2004), that are seen as expressing particular values prized by members of a society (e.g. Coca-Cola).

2.3.2.3 Relationship Function

Branding could enable an ongoing relationship or emotional attachment between a brand and a consumer (Kapferer, 2008). Typically within this relationship consumers place their trust and loyalty in a brand on the implicit understanding that the brand will satisfy their needs on an ongoing basis. This is conceptualised as a separate branding function in its own right because consumers are seen to obtain value from the relationship in its own right. Scholars of a contemporary persuasion, such as Fournier (1998), regard this as the main function of branding and of growing importance as a provider of stability and authenticity in a rapidly changing world. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006)
have taken this further with the development of the concept of brand love, where consumers are presumed to have love-like feelings for brands rather than simply those of loyalty. A quotation from Roberts (2005: p.22) illustrates:

“For more years than I can remember I have used the same shampoo: Head & Shoulders. Ridiculous, isn’t it? I mean it’s a shampoo to remove dandruff, which it does. But I’ve no hair, let alone dandruff! Still I love Head & Shoulders. I won’t buy or use anything else.”

2.3.2.4 Habitual Function

A habitual function for branding has also been suggested because of its ability to support habitual behaviour. This can be found where actions require minimal thought to implement, reflecting routine repetition of past acts that are cued by stable features in the environment (Wood et al., 2002). An example might be where a consumer goes into the same shop everyday for their usual newspaper and chocolate bar. Habitual behaviour offers the benefit to the consumer of reduced cognitive activity requirement, thereby allowing other activities to be carried out and also leading to stress reduction (Lin and Chang, 2003; Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

Despite the difference in emphasis by different authors it appears reasonable to accept these various functions of branding as a fair synthesis of academic thinking within the branding domain. To assist the reader the above is summarised in the following Table 1 Functions of Branding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-Rational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification function</td>
<td>Enables consumer to quickly identify product/service with which they are familiar</td>
<td>Keller (2008), Kapferer (2008); Farquhar (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search cost reduction function</td>
<td>Simplifies purchase process providing them with time and resource saving benefits</td>
<td>Keller (2008), Kapferer (2008), Aaker (1991); Jacoby et al. (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality signalling function</td>
<td>Enables consumer to establish quality attribute for goods and services whose attributes cannot be assessed prior to purchase</td>
<td>Keller (2008), Kapferer (2008), Brucks et al. (2000); Jacoby et al. (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk reduction function</td>
<td>Reduces perceived functional or symbolic risk from purchase</td>
<td>Keller (2008), Aaker (1991); Roselius (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-Symbolic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship function</td>
<td>Provides benefit to consumers of ongoing relationship and emotional attachment</td>
<td>Keller (2008), Kapferer (2008), Fournier (1991), Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) brand love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-Habitual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual function</td>
<td>Supports habitual behaviour with benefit of reduced cognitive activity</td>
<td>Wood et al. (2002), Lin and Chang (2003), Berger and Luckmann (1966)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.3 Brand Equity Labelled Approaches

In contrast to the brand function approach towards consumer value from branding are approaches labelled brand equity.

Much has been written about brand equity since it came to prominence (Keller, 2008; Kapferer, 2008) with research tending to be concentrated on two questions. Firstly how can it be measured? Secondly how can it be created? Two distinct approaches have developed. One is financially based and focuses on how brands should be valued by corporations (Keller, 1993; Kapferer, 2008). As such it is tangential to this particular research study. However the other approach is labelled customer based. This considers that questions of measurement and creation need to be centred on the customer/consumer.

Research adopting the second approach has tended to look at what corporations should do to create brand value for the consumer and to measure how successful they are at achieving this (Na et al., 1999). For example this research has often concentrated on the constructs of brand awareness and brand association (Friedman and Dipple, 1978; McCracken and Macklin, 1998; Meyers-Levy, 1987; Robertson, 1989). It is arguable whether this second approach is genuinely customer centric, as it tends to focus on what a corporation is doing rather than what a consumer considers that they are getting. Two key conceptualisations in this area are those by Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993).

In the case of Aaker customer brand equity/value is considered to consist of brand loyalty, name awareness, perceived quality and brand associations. In his conceptualisation these various assets (that it is assumed are created by a corporation) result in a brand holding value. This in turn enables the brand to perform various functions to the customer. In fact Aaker’s conceptualisation is in opposition to a brand function approach. A brand function approach regards customer brand value as resulting from the ability of the brand to perform functions, as opposed to Aaker’s where the brand performs functions as a result of the brand holding equity/value. In the brand function approach the customer
brand value results from the functions whilst for Aaker the customer brand value results from the corporately created assets.

Another key conceptualisation is Keller’s Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) model (1993; 2008). This is discussed in detail in Section 2.4.2. At this stage it is worth pointing out that customer brand equity/value is assumed within this model to result from consumer brand knowledge. This is considered to be multidimensional in nature but to depend primarily upon the dimensions of brand awareness and associations (Keller and Lehmann, 2003).

2.3.4 Integration of Brand Function and Brand Equity Approaches

It is noticeable in the literature that brand function and brand equity approaches are generally discussed and developed separately and not combined. This appears to the author to be a weakness as constructs such as brand awareness and brand associations seem closely tied to brand functions, with all connected to consumer brand value. Does the act of creating brand associations by a corporation generate value for a consumer in itself unless and until this corporate action performs a value-generating function for the consumer?

With this criticism in mind this research has adopted a function-based approach to consumer based brand value. It is premised on the logical reasoning that a brand only provides value to a consumer/customer if the brand performs a role or function for the customer. This is shown diagrammatically in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2 Mediating Brand Functions
Under this approach brand awareness and brand associations are not regarded as direct antecedents of consumer brand value, as assumed with the brand equity approach, but as intermediate variables. Their effects are mediated through their impact on the ability of the brand to perform various functions for the consumer. In other words brand associations enable a brand to perform a function but the value to customer comes from the performed function and not the brand associations per se.

Aaker’s conceptualisation of consumer brand equity includes brand awareness and brand associations as well as other dimensions. It is appropriate to consider how his other dimensions of perceived quality and brand loyalty would be incorporated into this integrated approach. Firstly perceived quality from a consumer viewpoint is simply a rational function of branding (as per Table 1). Secondly brand loyalty as conceptualised by Aaker is considered as a benefit to the corporation from branding. The analogue from the consumer viewpoint is located within the relationship function.

2.3.5 Branding Variability

This section looks at academic literature concerned with whether the potential total value from branding and the functions of branding vary for different types of products. This is examined because extant findings may be relevant for the research study.

2.3.5.1 Brand Value Variation by Product Type

There have been a number of studies arguing that the potential value from branding varies for different types of products.

The work by Riezebos (1994) is one of the most comprehensive. He argues that products can be split into those that have revealed intrinsic cues and those that have hidden intrinsic cues, where intrinsic relates to characteristics about the actual product; in other words a division between search goods and services and experience goods and services. In the case of revealed intrinsic cues they are revealed to consumers during the product search process, whilst hidden
intrinsic cues only become clear during the experience of a product. He therefore claims that the potential value from branding is greater for products with hidden characteristics, as extrinsic brand cues can be developed for these products to inform the customer about the hidden characteristics. In contrast for products with revealed intrinsic cues the branding process is essentially concerned with the communication of these intrinsic features. He also considers other factors that influence the potential value from branding and empirically demonstrates that the potential added value from branding is lower for predominantly functional products rather than predominantly expressive products.

Other work has argued that the potential for value from branding is reduced by consumer involvement (Bello and Holbrook, 1995) and products for private as opposed to public consumption (Bristow et al., 2002).

2.3.5.2 Brand Function Variation by Product Type

Another concern is the variation of branding functions by product type. Commentators such as Keller (2008: p.77) have held that a brand should appeal to both the “heart and the head” and Macrae (1996) notes that Sir Adrian Cadbury considered that chocolate should be marketed on grounds of both function and fashion.

There is literature that considers whether the predominant functions of branding differ for different types of product. Much of this research concentrates on the dyadic split between functional and symbolic and reaches the conclusion that for any given product one of these roles will tend to predominate (Bhat and Reddy, 1998). Robertson (1989) takes the view that there are emotional products and product categories, such as perfume, for which branding performs exclusively a symbolic role. A similar point is made by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006), who see brand love as confined to products in hedonic categories. As far as the quality signal function of branding is concerned, Maheswaran et al. (1992) carried out research showing that this only arises in low involvement situations. Brucks et al. (2000) performed work that disclosed that the quality
function of branding is potentially most important for experience goods and least so for search goods.

2.3.6 Measurement of Consumer Value from Branding

This topic is examined because of its relevance to the research objective’s concern with the importance of brand name.

In contrast to, for example, branding functions, where it appears reasonable to acknowledge a consensus view, a successful and consistent approach to the measurement of consumer brand value has proved elusive. Indeed de Chernatony and McDonald (2006) declare that one of the key challenges facing researchers in this domain is contending with the numerous different qualitative and quantitative approaches.

In his review of brand value measurement studies Keller (1993) notes that some attempts at measurement have looked at the totality of a brand whilst others have attempted to measure individual elements within a brand and then performed summation. Aaker (1996a) carried out a review of recommended measures within the literature and concludes that the measure of price premium that a brand commands is most fitting. He acknowledges that, depending on market conditions, such a measure is not always easy to obtain and elsewhere (Aaker, 1991) suggests trade-off analysis and consumer research as alternative measurement approaches. Other academics have employed Likert scale measures (Yoo and Donthu, 2001; Vazquez et al., 2002; Kocak et al., 2007) and consumer purchase data (Vazquez et al., 2002; Dyson et al., 1996; Na et al., 1999).

There are also many examples of consultancies such as Interbrand (2007) measuring the values of brands with various alternative methodologies (Aaker, 1996b; Conley, 2008). However these invariably approach the task at a macro corporate level rather than from the viewpoint of the individual consumer. They are therefore of limited relevance to this specific research study.
In addition to no agreed preferred technique for measurement of consumer brand value there are also no generally agreed units of measurement (£s/utils/positive attitude?). A fundamental issue is whether failure to achieve consensus should act as a barrier to research in this area. The view of the author is that this should not be the case. As an epistemological stance critical realism is “more aware of the limitations of...what we can achieve, concerning knowledge” (Potter, 2000: p.207). In other words agreement will probably never be reached on these issues but progress can and should be made to increase knowledge about brand name regardless.

2.3.7 Summary

Despite little agreement about how value from branding should be measured and only limited understanding about the variability of branding, established various functions of branding are apparent within the literature. It is argued that the equity and functional based approaches towards consumer brand value should not be regarded as exclusive but as related.

It should not be forgotten that this reviewed literature is concerned with functions of the brand entity rather than the brand name per se. The status of the brand name within branding and therefore by implication the assumed functions of brand name are discussed in the following Section 2.4.

2.4 The Importance of Brand Name within Branding

“A name is a simple thing, it is a label. But there is something mysterious and magical about a name.”
(Collins, 1977)

2.4.1 Introduction

A review of the academic literature identifies several streams of material relating to the role of brand name within branding. These are now examined in turn. Section 2.4.2 looks at alternative views about the creation of consumer brand value and the extent to which brand name is regarded as playing a key role within this. A second stream 2.4.3 consists of a review of literature that has
specifically looked at impacts on branding resulting from the choice of a particular brand name.

2.4.2 The Role of Brand Name within Brand Value Creation

Brand value creation is an area where a split is apparent between orthodox and contemporary scholars. The orthodox perspective tends to see brand value as essentially created by a corporation, whilst a contemporary position tends to regard creation as primarily or partially consumer-led.

2.4.2.1 The Orthodox Perspective

Different scholars tend to regard a particular concept as key for the creation of brand value. Ries and Trout (1986) assert that positioning against competition is fundamental. Riezebos (1994) maintains the overriding importance of differentiation. Other authors such as Hankinson and Cowking (1996) stress the importance of the development of brand personality, defined as the core functional and symbolic values of a product. Whilst the author acknowledges the importance of these concepts they do not seem sufficient to provide explanation for how a brand can be developed so that it is able to deliver the value generating functions previously described in Section 2.3.2.

However a number of models have been developed within the orthodox arena that attempt to account for the brand value process in a more comprehensive way than simply concentration on a single construct. Keller’s (2008) is probably the most comprehensive. Christened the Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) model its richness makes its worthy of description and critique (see Figure 3 on the following page).
2.4.2.2 The Customer-Based Brand Equity model—Description

According to this model there are two requirements to convert an initial positioning and personality of a brand into actual brand value (or equity). These are firstly the development of brand awareness and secondly the development of brand associations. A key insight offered is that brand associations are valueless without brand awareness and vice versa.

Brand awareness is conceptualised as consisting of brand recognition and brand recall and is seen as providing two key advantages. Firstly it is a precondition for brand association. Secondly it makes it more likely that a brand will be within a purchase consideration set, as empirical research has shown that consumers tend to have a preference for the familiar. Baker (2003) contends that brand awareness does not only impact the cognitive activity of a consumer but often also influences consumer behaviour unconsciously. The CBBE model identifies three requirements of brand associations; namely that they should be strong, favourable and unique.

The CBBE model argues that the creation of brand awareness and brand associations requires the adoption of an appropriate four step strategy, making use of three sets of tools in a series of stages. The three sets of tools are: firstly the development and use of marketing programmes including marketing mix and communication variables, secondly the leverage of available secondary...
associations, such as country of origin and celebrity endorsement and finally the choice and use of brand elements, such as brand name, logo, packaging and slogans.

The four steps of the strategy within the CBBE model are as follows. The first stage is the development of brand identity. This is followed by the generation of brand meaning, which is seen as building the performance and image associations of the brand. The third stage is to increase brand response, consisting of the consumer judgement and emotional feelings towards the brand. Finally brand relationship is established and cultivated, which is concerned with the level and type of relationship that consumers have with the brand.

The CBBE model has received some support from a number of empirical studies. Chung and Szymanski (1997) demonstrate that brand choice in low involvement situations is positively impacted through prior exposure to the brand. Hutchinson et al. (1994) performed research that confirmed a link between brand awareness and brand preference. Riezebos (1994) shows empirically that the selection of alternative marketing mix components impacts brand value. Other supporting research is discussed within Sections 2.4.3.2 and 2.4.3.3.

2.4.2.3 The Customer-Based Brand Equity model-Critique

The author has two criticisms. Firstly some of the strategic steps within the model do not appear focused on either brand awareness or brand association development. Secondly the model is vague about the relative importance of consumer judgement and emotional feelings. As far as orthodox academic literature is concerned, the main criticism has come from those who regard the usage of a product as a key additional stage within the creation of brand value (Farquhar, 1990; Park et al., 1986).

Nevertheless, even taking into account these criticisms, the CBBE model appears to be a reasonable representation of orthodox thought.
2.4.2.4 Alternative Orthodox Models

For the sake of completeness it is of benefit to consider the other key models within this domain. Aaker (1991) offers a model with many similarities to the CBBE. He also argues for the development of brand awareness, brand quality associations and other brand associations. In addition he also asserts that corporations should specifically develop brand loyalty. The importance of brand name within his brand value creation process is clearly recognised as it is seen to be the basis for awareness and communication efforts as well as the generation of associations, arguing that “...the name can actually form the essence of the brand concept” (Aaker, 1991: p.187).

Kapferer offers a less prescriptive approach towards the activities by which corporations generate brand value. Instead he emphasises the importance of the appropriate identity and positioning of a brand for brand value and offers a model to assist with this task. Brand name is regarded as central to brand value creation as “...one of the most powerful sources of identity” (Kapferer, 2008: p.193).

2.4.2.5 Contemporary Views on Brand Value Creation

It is often asserted by contemporary academics that brand value is a creation of the consumer in addition to the corporation (Vargo and Lusch, 2004), where neither consumer nor corporation have complete control over brand meaning (Batey, 2008) and therefore value to the consumer. For example Elliott and Wattanasuwan (1998) argue that the value of a brand to a consumer is negotiated between the individual and the brand, based on mediated and lived-in experience. Similarly Hatch and Rubin (2006) assert that the authorial intention of the brand creator only accounts for part of a brand’s value.

Various arguments are made in support of this viewpoint. Firstly it is claimed that consumers have been driven to find meaning and identity in brand because of the lack of stability and certainty elsewhere in their lives. Secondly corporations have discovered that encouraging consumers to develop brands themselves potentially increases the value to them as well as the consumer.
Finally Service-Dominant Logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004) is premised on the proposition that the consumer is always a co-creator of value due to its assumptions that firstly the interaction of the consumer is always required for the full potential value of a service to arise and secondly that which is considered to be a product within orthodox marketing is essentially a service.

Whilst sympathetic to the sentiments behind these arguments, the author does not consider that the case has been made for the complete abandonment of the orthodox approach. There is little in the way of quantitative evidence to support the assertion that brand value is generally the creation of consumers. Instead there are simply a number of examples offered where this appears to be the case. A preferred approach might be for the synthesis of these contemporary views into the CBBE model, in acknowledgement of a viewpoint that brand value creation can be driven from the corporate and the consumer. There appears to be no reasoning from the literature why the choice of specific brand elements, including that of the brand name, would not also be of importance for consumer led brand value creation.

2.4.2.6 Summary

As an orthodox exemplar the CBBE model regards the brand name element as an important tool in the creation of customer brand value by a corporation. Other orthodox models also include the importance of the brand name element. Such models could be adapted to incorporate consumer engagement in brand value creation without difficulty.

2.4.3 Brand Name Impacts

Some literature considers the impact of different brand names on brand value, whilst other research has focused on the impact on variables that are generally considered to be the precursors of brand value (i.e. brand awareness and brand associations).
2.4.3.1 Impact of Brand Name on Brand Value

A number of academics have maintained that brand name is very important for new products. For example Zaltman and Wallendorf (1979) assert that 40% of the success of a new product is due to brand name, whilst Robertson (1989) states that the naming decision is the most important that one can make. Empirical research has looked at the impact of using established brand names for new product extensions and identified significant sales increases compared to the use of a fictitious new brand name (Gibson, 2005; Isen et al., 2004).

Literature often points out the general importance of brand name for all products. For example Murphy (1990) asserts that brand name is the core of brand personality, with other elements such as logo and packaging simply used to establish and communicate this personality.

This view of the importance of brand name emanates from leading academics, both of orthodox and contemporary persuasion. Indeed much academic literature does not properly distinguish between brand and brand name, treating them interchangeably, which in itself suggests that many academics implicitly regard brand name as fundamental to branding. A sample of pertinent quotations is provided to demonstrate this widely held view of the importance of brand name:

“Of all the marketing variables it is the brand name which receives the most attention by consumers.”
(de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006: p.96)

“For many businesses the brand name and what it represents are its most important asset...”

“Consider brand names-perhaps the most central of all brand elements...”
(Keller, 2008: p.145)

“The truth of objects and products is their brand name.”

2 It has been suggested that in this quotation the authors actually mean to refer to the entire brand entity. If this were the case this supports the point previously made about the implicit importance of brand name through treating brand entity and brand name interchangeably.
“The brand name is the supersign...”

(Baudrillard, 1990: p.148)

2.4.3.2 Impact of Brand Name on Brand Awareness

A number of authors have argued that different lexical brand names lead to different levels of brand awareness. It has been asserted that various aspects of brand name impact brand awareness. These include meaningfulness (Kanungo, 1968; Robertson, 1989), simplicity and distinctiveness (Robertson, 1989), fittingness (Kanungo, 1968), link to visual cue and product category (McCracken and Macklin, 1998) and number of associations (Meyers-Levy, 1987). Other commentators such as Lowrey et al. (2003) and Batey (2008) have considered specific linguistic characteristics of brand name that aid memory. Examples of relevant empirical work are discussed in Section 2.5.2.3.

The overriding weakness of the literature is that its empirical backing is based only on the brand name of new products. Whilst it might demonstrate that the choice of a particular brand name has a key impact on the initial awareness of a product, the link between brand name and brand awareness for established products is ignored.

2.4.3.3 Impact of Brand Name on Brand Associations

“Shakespeare was wrong. A rose by any other name would not taste as sweet.”

(Ries and Trout, 1986: p.71)

A number of authors have argued that different lexical brand names lead to different brand associations.

Robertson (1989) asserts that certain brand name characteristics support positive brand image, specifically a brand name having appropriate meaning, the use of repetitive sounds (see also Argo et al. (2010)) and the use of
morphemes\textsuperscript{3} and phonemes\textsuperscript{4}. This use of sound symbolism to derive meaning from unfamiliar words is also argued by Yorkston and Menon (2004). Friedman and Dipple (1978) researched the impact of using masculine and feminine brand names on the perceived taste of a cigarette. This demonstrates that people give a much more positive evaluation to a product when it is given a name of their gender, arguing that it tastes better and giving it a much higher intent to purchase rating.

Mehrabian and Wetter (1987) performed research that indicates that different brand names produce different emotional states in consumers’ minds. It is argued that an effective brand name for a product should offer the same emotional state through its associations as that desired by consumers from that product. Another area that has been subject to research has been that concerned with whether brand names can hold unintentional brand associations. Peterson and Ross (1972) performed empirical work with randomly generated names and discovered that some of these were perceived as more remindful of particular product categories than others. Examples of relevant empirical work are discussed in Section 2.5.2.2.

As is the case with the brand awareness research empirical backing derives from new or fictitious brand names. The discussion has concentrated on the importance of the lexical components of a brand name as opposed to consideration of associations that may be bestowed onto a brand name through marketing programmes. Whilst the non-neutral nature of the lexical aspect of a brand name is of importance, research has not considered the relative importance of this compared with bestowed associations. For example a key lexical association of the Virgin brand name is “a person who has never had sexual intercourse”. It is debatable whether this is still the primary association held by the Virgin brand name and the importance of this initial lexical association.

\textsuperscript{3} A morpheme is a meaningful linguistic unit consisting of a word, such as man, or a word element, such as –ed in walked, that cannot be divided into smaller meaningful parts.  
\textsuperscript{4} A phoneme is the smallest phonetic unit in a language that is capable of conveying a distinction in meaning, such as the m of mat and the b of bat in English.
2.4.3.4 Temporal Aspects of Brand Name Impact

A number of academics have considered how the impact from the brand name element might change over time as a product becomes established. Keller et al. (1998) reason that, whilst a brand name that includes a particular attribute or benefit may be beneficial for the creation of initial brand associations, such a name might inhibit subsequent associations at a later date after the brand has become established. Riezebos (1994), maintains that, however important brand name is at product launch, over time the marketing mix and marketing communications become more important in the determination of brand value and the brand name can become largely irrelevant.

These two points from the literature appear to be oppositional. The first argues that one is a slave to the initial brand name choice, whilst the second asserts that the initial brand name becomes irrelevant over time. Perhaps it is important to highlight their use of the qualifiers “might” and “could”. The key worth of this research stream is the acknowledgement of the temporal aspect of brand name impact and the potential influence of the past on the present.

2.4.3.5 Challenges to Brand Name Impact

The key challenges to brand name impact lie in viewpoints that brand name is a relatively unimportant part of the overall brand entity. Saunders and Watt (1979) carried out empirical research looking at industrial (B2B) products and found no brand name impact. However a closer examination of this research identifies that it is concerned with the entire brand entity rather than the brand name element. This is discussed further in Section 2.5.4.

Eisiminger and Idol (1984) performed an exhaustive study looking at the origin of the brand names of the most successful U.S. brands. This identifies a wide variety of origin types. Some followed the normative recommendations discussed in previous sections whilst others are highly idiosyncratic (e.g. Snickers was named after Mr. Mars’ dog). The varied origin of the brand name suggested to them that brand name might not be of importance.
2.4.3.6 Summary

Whilst branding as a discipline may suffer from a plethora of competing approaches, terminologies and have a paucity of developed models, it is difficult to escape from a general conclusion that brand name is regarded as occupying a central role within branding. This is particularly indicated by its inclusion within the CBBE and other similar models, the research linking brand name to brand awareness and brand associations and the statements by leading academics.

As such it appears reasonable to assume that the value generating functions of branding discussed in Section 2.3 are also applicable to the brand name element. In other words, as an example, branding performs a rational function and part of that function is carried out by the brand name element.

However it should be recalled that much of this thinking about brand name has been based on research related to new rather than established product brand names. Extant key empirical research that lies behind the academic thinking relating to brand name is now discussed in more detail in the following section.

2.5 Brand Name Empirical Research

2.5.1 Introduction

There are a number of ways in which a taxonomy of brand name research can be created. In order to help demonstrate the research gap discussed in Section 2.1 the following approach has been employed. Firstly the review is separated into research focused on fictitious (or proposed or new) brand names and research focused on established brand names. Secondly research where apparent brand name research is in reality part of brand entity research is reviewed.

2.5.2 Key Fictitious Brand Name Research

Research in this area can be divided into research concerned with brand value, with brand association and with brand awareness.
2.5.2.1 Brand Name and Brand Value Research

Gibson (2005) carried out a series of experiments using a research technique called Product STEP. Consumers received a test sample through the post for a proposed product, using either a brand name existing within the market or a decoy fictitious brand name. Several weeks later the same consumers received a booklet inviting them to make a complementary choice from amongst the various products offered within. The choice included the product for which they had previously received a test sample. The experiments revealed that on average the use of an existing brand name increased selection by an average of 55% compared with the use of a decoy brand name. This research is important because it demonstrates the power of existing brand names for proposed products. However, as discussed elsewhere these findings may not be relevant for established products.

2.5.2.2 Brand Name and Brand Association Research

Peterson and Ross (1972) tested whether consumers tended to associate words with particular product categories, even when the words are fictitious. Twenty-five words were created using a random combination of syllables. Four hundred subjects were then asked the extent to which each of these words reminded them of two specific product categories and results were recorded using a seven point Likert scale. Statistical analysis demonstrated an association between certain of the fictitious words for each of the product categories. This research is valuable in that it demonstrates words (and hence brand names) can carry inherent associations. It would have been useful if the reasoning behind these identified associations had been explored.

Mehrabian and Wetter (1987) carried out research with three hundred undergraduate students that looked at the impact of brand names with different emotional connotations. They assumed that all emotional connotations could be characterised in terms of three dimensions; pleasure-displeasure, arousal-non arousal and dominance-submissiveness. Subjects initially rated their ideal emotional state whilst using certain products, using a semantic differential Likert type scale. Products were then assigned brand names with different emotional
connotations and subjects were asked to state how they would feel about using the product, using the same emotional dimension scale as above. Finally preferences were sought for the various product/brand name combinations using a twelve item Likert preference scale. Statistical analysis revealed that 30% of the variance in preference could be accounted for by the discrepancy between the ideal emotional state when using the product and the emotional connotations associated with a particular product/brand combination. This research is interesting not only because it demonstrates the inherent associations that a brand name can carry but also that such associations do not need to have rational characteristics to be impactful.

Friedman and Dipple (1978) carried out an experiment with one hundred male and one hundred female participants, in which they were asked to evaluate a proposed cigarette product. For a proportion of subjects this was presented with a fictitious male brand name “Frontiersman” and for a proportion it was presented with a fictitious female brand name “April”. Subjects were asked to evaluate the product using a seven item eight point Likert scale that included intention to purchase. Statistical analysis revealed substantially more positive evaluation occurred where subjects were evaluating the cigarette with the brand name of their own gender. This research is important in highlighting the powerful influence of the inherent associations of a brand name.

2.5.2.3 Brand Name and Brand Awareness Research

Kanungo (1968) carried out an experiment using 48 students looking at whether brand awareness was better where brand names were fitting and meaningful. His definition of fitting was a name that readily evoked associations of the product. Initially fictitious brand names were created with different degrees of meaning and fitting. Subjects were then exposed to products with these various brand names and were asked to attempt to recall them when subsequently presented with the appropriate product. The conclusion of the research was that a brand name with high fittingness and meaningfulness was almost twice as likely to be recalled as one with low fittingness and meaningfulness. This research is useful for the demonstration that brand names are not inherently equal in their tendency to promote recall, a key dimension of brand awareness.
Meyers-Levy (1987) performed a series of experiments looking at the impact of both a brand name’s association set size and its word frequency characteristics on name recall and recognition. Word frequency refers to the typical frequency used by consumers. Fictitious brand names were devised with a mixture of high and low association sets and word frequencies. Mock radio advertisements were created for each of these brand names. One hundred participants listened to these advertisements and were tested for brand name recall and recognition. Subsequent statistical analysis revealed that for brand names with a high word frequency both recall and recognition were greater when the association set was lower. The research contrasted the brand name Jif with the brand name Peter Pan, highlighting the large number of associations of Peter Pan. This research is useful as a further demonstration that brand names are not inherently equal in their tendency to lead to promote recall and recognition; both dimensions of brand awareness.

McCracken and Macklin (1998) carried out a couple of experiments with undergraduate students looking at whether brand name recall was assisted where the name was associated with a visual cue or product attribute. Subjects were given booklets to read, which included products with alternative brand name manipulations. Shortly afterwards they were asked to recall as many names as possible. In the cases of both visual cue and product attribute association statistical analysis demonstrated that brand name recall was improved. This research is important because of the linkage between recall and brand awareness. However as acknowledged by the authors their results using fictitious brand names may not be replicable with established brand names.

2.5.3 Key Established Brand Name Research

In the field of neuropsychology Gontijo et al. (2002) examined whether brand names were processed in the same way as proper names and nouns. They carried out a series of experiments involving 48 undergraduates in which the subjects had to state whether strings of letters presented to them were real words or not. They discovered that brand names were processed more slowly and less accurately than common nouns and from this concluded that subjects
adopted a different process strategy for brand names. This research is interesting in that it lends weight to the argument that brand names are special. However no evidence was obtained on the causes of this difference or its implications.

Lavenka (1991) provides a rare study that is concerned with the value of brand name for established products. A convenience sample of thirty respondents was asked to provide a quality rating for fourteen chocolate bars. These were tasted blind and then a further rating was obtained once the brand name was revealed. The results typically showed a modest increase in rating where the brand name was known. Whilst the research is useful it was limited to consideration of quality, which is only one of the functions of brand name.

2.5.4 Key Brand Name as part of Brand Entity Research

Saunders and Watt (1979) performed case study research looking at the man-made fibres market. They compared consumers’ perceptions of how products with different brand names differed from experts' views of the differences in order to identify whether brand names were effective in differentiating the products. One hundred consumers and thirty textile experts were questioned on eight man-made fibres. Results were recorded using a five point semantic differential scale. These were subsequently transformed into perceptual maps. As the perceptual map produced from the consumers was very different from the perceptual map produced from the experts the authors concluded that brand names had been unsuccessful in their role. This conclusion is debatable. The views of the textile experts were based on the functional aspects of each man-made fibre, whilst the comparison made by the consumers was based on perceptions, which might not have been functionally based. However the makers of the man-made fibres might have intended the branding to have developed on a non-functional basis. Therefore the results from the case study should not be interpreted as a failure of branding. More importantly this research is essentially looking at the brand entity rather than simply at the brand name element.
As part of a study looking at corporate rebranding Muzellec and Lambkin (2006) carried out case study research on the impact of the change of brand name of the Irish telecommunications company from Telecom Éireann to Eircom. This study included interviews with ten customers and two ex-members of staff. It was identified that customers had mixed views on the impact of the name change. However the name change was only part of a large change to the organisation in terms of its functionality and brand identity, resulting from its transfer from state to private ownership. Consequently it is not possible to separate the impact of the change in brand name from all the other changes to the brand entity.

Muzellec and Lambkin (2007) carried out a further case study looking at the impact that the change in corporate brand name from Guinness to Diageo had on its perceived image. A questionnaire was completed by 433 undergraduates in Ireland using a corporate character scale with seven dimensions, which concluded that it did significantly impact image of the corporate body, although not the product. Unfortunately the reasons for this were not explored. However from the perspective of this thesis the change from Guinness to Diageo was far more than that of brand name change and it is impossible to separate the name change impact from that of the change in brand entity.

As part of a research project Isen et al. (2004) compared the affect for an established product with and without its brand name revealed. This was carried out under experimental conditions using twenty-five undergraduate subjects. The subjects were divided into two groups and sampled iced tea, with the branded iced tea bottle displayed for one of these groups. Affect was measured using a bespoke test and a Likert scale measure. Statistical analysis demonstrated that revealing the brand name did have a positive impact on affect. However they did not examine the reason for this nor is it easy to quantify the impact from the measures used. Although the sample size was somewhat questionable the main problem is methodological. Were they revealing the brand name or revealing the brand entity? What if the name on the iced tea bottle had been covered over?
Jaju et al. (2006) carried out research using an online survey with three thousand respondents. This compared the brand equity of a corporation pre and post merger, with a variety of merger partners with different degrees of perceived fit and with a variety of brand name alternatives. All of these mergers were fictitious although the corporations were real (e.g. Dell merging with Sony to form a new brand SonyDell). Brand equity measures were calculated from the average of attitude towards brand, belief in brand industry leadership and purchase intention. Statistical analysis revealed that brand equity post-merger decreased even where the perceived fit was high. Despite the brand name change element being predominantly included within this research it is essentially reporting on consumers’ attitude to changes to the brand entity.

2.5.5 Discussion

The bulk of empirical work has researched the implications of brand name where the brand name is fictitious. In other words the brand name does not exist within the marketplace for the product with which it has been associated for research purposes. This research stream is certainly persuasive that different brand names do have different implications for consumers and their behaviour. Using the brand function approach discussed in Section 2.3.2, different brand names appear to perform various consumer functions with differing degrees of success and therefore provide consumers with different amounts of brand value. In addition the research suggests that this impact is of a material rather than marginal nature. It is therefore consistent with the oft-expressed literature viewpoint that brand name performs a major role in the determination of consumer brand equity.

However the pertinent point is whether all or any of these empirical findings can be generalised to established brand names. In other words can new brand names be accepted as representative of all brand names without the need for further empirical work?

“It is very tempting to see...findings having a more pervasive applicability.”
(Bryman and Bell, 2007: p.170).
A key consideration is whether there are reasonable doubts that established brand names are the same as fictitious/proposed/new brand names. Doubts come from two fronts. Firstly there are reservations expressed within the literature. As stated in Section 2.4.3.4 Riezebos argues that the brand name becomes less important, and thus less consumer value generating, as a product moves from new to established. Secondly hesitancy arises from a review of the marketplace. Established corporate and product brand name changes are constant events. Whilst it can be argued that some of these changes occur for reasons not associated with corporate and consumer value (Muzellec and Lambkin, 2006) it leaves open the other possibility that corporations can and do change established brand names because established brand names actually offer little value to consumers. (e.g. Edwards (2010)).

The review of the literature contained within the past few sections meets the first aim of this literature review by demonstrating the research gap. It can be seen that the brand name element is overwhelmingly regarded as important within the branding literature. It has also shown that any empirical backing for such a viewpoint as far as established products is concerned is essentially absent.

The literature review now moves to the other aims and considers other literature central to the research study.

### 2.6 Changes in Brand Name

“A brand transfer is always an act of violence...One does not lose a friend without harm and pain, even resentment.”

(Kapferer, 2008: p.434)

#### 2.6.1 Introduction

Given that the research study aims to gain a greater understanding about the brand name element through the consideration of changes in brand name, as discussed in Section 1.2.3, it is important to review academic literature on this topic.
2.6.2 Brand Name Change Literature

Very little has been studied in this area and it is acknowledged that empirical studies are either scarce or private and confidential (Keller, 1993; Gibson, 2005; Kapferer, 2008).

Both Aaker (1991) and Kapferer (2008) discuss a number of examples of name changes at the product and corporate level. For example Aaker considers Datsun to Nissan in the early 1980s and Kapferer looks at Philips to Whirlpool and Chambourcy to Nestle. However limitations around this writing must be recognised. It is essentially high level post-hoc interpretation of events, using authorial expertise and knowledge but with little corporate input and no consumer input. Whilst useful background reading it cannot properly be considered to be researched.

As an exemplar a case study by Kapferer (2008) is provided, looking at the globalisation driven change of the Raider product name to Twix in Germany by Mars.

Figure 4 Raider to Twix

[Image: Raider to Twix]

This was presented as an example of best practice, asserting that other similarly initiated brand name changes should conform to this approach. The
name change from Raider to Twix was carried out over a twelve month period with packaging and promotional activities used as primary methods of communication to consumers. Initially the packaging on the Raider product informed consumers of the global name for the product (i.e. Twix). Following the name change the packaging displayed the message “formally known as Raider”. The case study argues that Mars had four clear communication objectives. Firstly they wanted to communicate clearly and simply that only the name was changing. As Pottker (1995) points out, Mars had previous experience of changing more than one element at once (i.e. Treets to M&Ms) and this had proved to be highly problematic and disruptive to consumers, despite the maintenance of the brand slogan (Dru, 1996). Secondly they wished transfer of Raider’s brand values across to Twix. Thirdly they wanted to achieve high awareness of the change and finally they wished promotion of the consumer benefit (as they saw it) of global branding.

At the point of name changeover corporations typically employ significant marketing resource, advertising and promoting the name change to consumers, highlighting the unchanged nature of the product. As well as the Raider to Twix name change there are a number of other examples within the literature. Pottker (1995) describes a very similar approach adopted by Mars in late 1990 for the UK change from Marathon to Snickers. At the point of changeover from Jif to Cif in 2001 products carried the slogan “C” the only difference”
Some work has been carried out looking at corporate brand name changes. Muzellec and Lambkin (2006) identified four key drivers for such a change: change in ownership structure, change in corporate strategy, change in competitive position and change in external environment. Unfortunately regarding the impact on the consumer they only examined one corporate brand name change in detail (Telecom Eireann to eircom). They concluded that the view of consumers about the corporation changed but were not able to identify the reason for this. Muzellec and Lambkin (2007) subsequently carried out a second case study and looked at the impact on the Irish consumer of the corporate name change from Guinness to Diageo. They concluded that this led to a change in the image of the corporate entity but it did not impact the image of the Guinness product.

Jaju et al. (2006) carried out an empirical study looking at how the value of a brand would be impacted by merger and acquisition activity, using theoretical entities (e.g. DellSony). Their overall conclusion was that there was often a reduction in consumer brand value. However there are methodological weaknesses in their approach. A change in brand name is only part of the major rebranding that is likely to occur with merger and acquisitional activity. For this
reason it is not possible to attribute the change in brand value that they identified to the change in the brand name element. Their empirical work was discussed in more detail in Section 2.5.4.

2.6.3 Summary

There has clearly been limited empirical work relating to changes in brand name that can be directly employed within this research study. However a number of points should be taken away from literature in this area and included within the research design. Firstly the fact that corporations involved in brand name change initiatives generally engage in advertising and promotional activity to support the name change needs to be considered within any research. Secondly the examples of corporate brand name change research and the resultant difficulties in separation of the brand name and brand entity endorse an approach based on isolating the brand name element through concentrating on global marketing induced name changes.

2.7 Brand Name Value and Brand Purchase Behaviour Relationship

2.7.1 Introduction

So far the literature review has considered how consumers receive value from brands and the role of brand name within this value. It has also looked at literature concerned with name change. However consumer brand value cannot always be directly observed within the marketplace but is assumed to be reflected in consumer purchase behaviour. Indeed one of the arguments made in Section 1.2.1 against the brand name of an established product holding value is that no discernible impact on sales is observed from a change in brand name.

The key research questions include obtaining greater understanding of the implications of brand name value and one main implication is its impact on purchase behaviour. Accordingly, the research study considers the impact on sales from brand name change. Extant literature was therefore reviewed to identify how brand name value and brand purchase behaviour could be
theoretically linked and this is discussed below in the context of a change in brand name.

This section therefore looks at theoretical links between changes in consumer brand name value and brand purchase behaviour. Different approaches within the literature are considered in Sections 2.7.2 and 2.7.3, whilst Section 2.7.4 develops an argument for the use of a unified framework in the case of brand name change.

There are several approaches within the literature that conceptualise how consumers decide to purchase specific branded products. It is generally argued that each of the approaches is only applicable in certain circumstances. The next section examines approaches based on extended problem solving, with particular emphasis on the Theory of Planned Behaviour, whilst the section following considers brand purchase behaviour where the consumer engages in limited problem solving.

2.7.2 Extended Problem Solving

It is argued that where a consumer has a high degree of involvement with a product or where a product holds significant personal relevance they will tend to engage in extended problem solving in their purchasing decisions (Chaiken et al., 1989). Typically this is conceptualised as purchase behaviour being mediated by attitude towards brand purchase, whose determination is considered next.

2.7.2.1 Brand Purchase Attitude

Attitude has been variously defined but is generally considered to involve the expression of an evaluative judgement about an object. A typical definition is “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favour or disfavour” (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993: p.1). Generally it is regarded as a multidimensional construct, comprising cognitive, affective and behavioural components (McGuire, 1969), although empirical work privileging this over a one-dimensional approach has yielded mixed results.
(Bagozzi and Burnkraut, 1985). Cognitive, affective and behavioural aspects have generally been found to be highly correlated, suggesting this debate may be of somewhat tangential relevance. Attitude also has strength and valence (Maio and Haddock, 2009).

Where extended problem solving is assumed, the key theoretical model within literature concerned with attitude and behaviour is the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPD). This was developed by Ajzen (1985) and was based on the seminal work by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980). Whilst not universally accepted it is the usual theoretical framework for discussion within this domain and is shown in Figure 6 below.

Figure 6 Theory of Planned Behaviour Model

![Diagram](image.png)

Source: Ajzen (1985)

The TPB model takes a multi-attribute expectancy-value approach towards the determination of attitude, where attitude is proportional to the summation of the strength of belief that an object holds a particular attribute multiplied by the subjective evaluation of this attribute, for each and every attribute of the object. Subjective evaluation will include both the importance to the consumer and the favourability of the attribute.

Mathematically this can be represented as:
Equation 1

\[ A \propto \sum b_i e_i \]

where \( A \) is attitude towards object, \( b \) is strength of belief that the object has this attitude and \( e \) is subjective evaluation of this attribute for attributes 1 to \( i \).

### 2.7.2.2 Implications for Brand Purchase Attitude from Change in Consumer Brand Name Value

It has been asserted earlier in Table 1 that brand name value results from various functions.

Where the relevant attitude under consideration within the TPB model is the attitude towards the behaviour of the purchase of a brand, the implications of a change in consumer brand name value can be determined. A change in brand name value (for example from a change in brand name) will lead to a change in \( b_i \), strength of belief or more likely in \( e_i \), subjective evaluation. From Equation 1 this will in turn lead to a change in the attitude towards the behaviour of purchasing the brand. For example, if the brand name value of a product was reduced due to a change in brand name having caused a loss of symbolic associations, then a consumer would reduce their subjective evaluation of some of the attributes of this product. This in turn would lead to a less positive attitude towards purchase of the brand.

A link between consumer brand name value and brand purchase attitude implicit within the theoretical literature can therefore be demonstrated.

### 2.7.2.3 Brand Purchase Behaviour

This section reviews the literature linking attitude and behaviour in the context of brand purchase and argues that the implication of mainstream literature is that a change in consumer brand name value could be expected to impact brand purchase behaviour.
It is clear from the literature that the development of a link between attitude and behaviour which holds reasonable levels of empirical support has been troublesome. This has been a particular problem with general attitudes (Ajzen and Fishbein, 2005). Whilst some work (Fazio, 1990) has continued to work with general attitudes, theoretical discussion has tended to revolve around the Theory of Planned Behaviour model.

A central requirement of the TPB model is that the attitude construct must have close and specific correspondence with the behaviour, rather than being general in nature (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1977). As well as attitude towards the behaviour, behaviour is also regarded as dependent on subjective norms and perceived control. Behaviour is also mediated by behavioural intention (see Figure 6 on page 66).

The TPB model and its predecessor have been subject to intensive empirical testing with generally very encouraging results (Ajzen and Fishbein, 2005). However a number of issues have been raised regarding the model. Fazio et al. (1989) have argued, with empirical support, that this model only applies where attitude is accessible, where accessibility is defined as a strong association between their evaluation of an attitude object and their mental representation of the object (Fazio, 1990). In other words even if a consumer’s attitude has arisen from extended problem solving this will not be reflected in their purchase behaviour without attitude accessibility. Without attitude accessibility the processes described below in Section 2.7.3 will tend to apply.

Another criticism made by scholars, such as Laroche and Brisoux (1989) and Antola (1975), is concerned with the fact that the TPB model does not include explicit consideration of consumer choice. For example many consumer decisions are not concerned with, for example, whether or not to buy Nescafe but whether to buy either Nescafe or buy the alternative of Maxwell House.
2.7.2.4 Implications for Brand Purchase Behaviour from Change in Consumer Brand Name Value

In the context of the TPB model the link from consumer brand name value can therefore be seen as extendable from brand purchase attitude to brand purchase behaviour. If the attitude towards brand purchase becomes more positive due to an increase in consumer brand name value it seems reasonable to assume that a positive change in behavioural intent and brand purchase behaviour would result.  

2.7.3 Limited Problem Solving

The Theory of Planned Behaviour has received criticism from various academics. It has been argued that consumers do not generally perform the detailed calculations assumed within the model (de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006) for the calculation of attitude. It has also been asserted that for many routine purchases decisions behaviour is not based on attitude. This viewpoint asserts that routine consumer purchase behaviour processes do not follow the Theory of Planned Behaviour model, with consumers instead engaging in limited problem solving and employing a number of short cuts (Assael, 1987).

Firstly some academics claim that, instead of a detailed evaluation, consumers will often base their attitude towards brand purchase on a number of peripheral associative cues and on their existing purchasing behaviour. This notion that consumers will often only engage in limited problem solving is integral to well regarded models such as the Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986), which asserts that motivation and ability to extensively process detailed information will vary.

Secondly it is sometimes argued that brand purchase behaviour may not even consider attitude but will also be based on peripheral associative cues and existing habitual purchase behaviour. This is highlighted in Fazio’s (1990) MODE model, which asserts that consumers engaging in spontaneous

5 On the reasonable assumption that subjective norm and perceived behavioural control would remain unaltered.
information processing (i.e. limited problem solving) will only show high levels of attitude behaviour correspondence where their attitude is accessible.

2.7.3.1 Implications for Brand Purchase Attitude and Behaviour from Change in Consumer Brand Name Value

The implications of a change in brand name can be explored in the context of limited problem solving. If a brand changes its name then this will impact on the functions it provides. Rational and symbolic functions support the peripheral cues used in consumer decision making shortcuts and therefore a change in brand name will impact on both brand purchase attitude and brand purchase behaviour that are reliant upon them. Similarly a change in brand name will impact the ability of a brand to perform its habitual function and therefore on a consumer's ability to rely on their existing purchase behaviour for the determination of their attitude and behaviour.

In other words where limited problem solving occurs a link between consumer brand name value, brand purchase attitude and consumer brand purchase can be demonstrated from the theoretical literature, as is the case with extended problem solving.

2.7.4 The Argument for a Unified Framework

In the context of a change in brand name the differences between the two approaches of extended and limited problem solving appear to be reduced. As demonstrated above under both approaches it can be argued that a change in brand name value brought about by a change in brand name would lead to a change in brand purchase attitude and brand purchase behaviour.

In addition given the importance bestowed upon the brand name element within the literature it can be asserted that a change in brand name would cause a major impact on brand name functions and value. It could be argued that the scale of this impact would be such that it would force consumers to engage in extended problem solving, even if limited problem solving was the norm.
Taking both these points into consideration it could therefore be argued that the TPD model would be an appropriate framework for use in the context of a change in brand name.

The criticism about consideration of consumer choice is more problematic. It is unclear how a consumer’s attitude towards brand purchase can be connected to brand purchase behaviour in isolation of their attitude towards the purchase of a close substitute brand purchase.

In other words, if the attitude towards a brand purchase is made less favourable through a reduction in brand name value it may not impact brand purchase behaviour if the attitude remains more positive, even after the reduction, than their attitude towards the closest purchase substitute.

2.7.5 Summary

There are several frameworks within the literature in this area. Either of these frameworks suggests the linking of consumer brand name value to brand purchase attitude and brand purchase behaviour. In the context of brand name change it could be argued that a valid parsimonious approach would be to use the Theory of Planned Behaviour model as the overarching framework. However the implicit assumption within this dominant domain model that consumers consider a single potential purchase at a time rather than engage in a choice process is less than helpful.

2.8 Conclusions from Literature Review

2.8.1 Confirmation of Research Gap and Intended Contribution to Literature from Research Study

A key contribution from the literature review is that overriding consensus views can be identified within the theoretical literature and particular:

- Brand name is assumed to play an important role in performing functions for and providing brand equity/value to consumers (from Sections 2.3 and 2.4)
b-Consumer brand value is regarded as a key determinant of brand purchase behaviour (from Section 2.7)

However importantly it confirms the gap within the literature that forms the basis of the overall research objective, as stated in Section 1.3. Empirical research to date (Section 2.5) has not typically examined the brand name element for established products regarding consumer brand equity/value.

The intended contribution to literature is therefore the filling of this research gap from empirical data revealed by the research study, relating to the brand name value/equity of established products and in line with the research questions contained in Section 1.3.

2.8.2 Implications for Research Design

The key implication for the format of the research project arising from the consensus found within the existing literature is that instead of exploring the research topic area from scratch with no assumed preconceptions (as might be the case with, say, the use of grounded theory) a preferable approach would be to use the theoretical literature to provide a framework for the empirical work within the research project. In other words a key role of the research study is an attempt to provide some empirical support for the extant theory found within the literature. Accordingly the first stage of the research project sought to synthesize the relevant literature within this review to create a theoretical model of the impact of brand name change, taking particular account of literature reviewed in Section 2.5. This could then be used as a framework for subsequent empirical investigation. This is discussed in Chapter 4.

However before this is presented to the reader Chapter 3 offers the overall research methodology and research design, both being necessary precursors. The contribution to theory that results from the research project and its place within existing academic literature is considered in Chapter 7.
3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter commences in Section 3.2 with discussion of various approaches to methodology selection that are apparent within the literature and argues in favour of an approach grounded by the adoption of a specific philosophical position. Section 3.3 describes the key features of various predominant philosophical stances and Section 3.4 discusses the chosen position of critical realism, with particular reference to its implications for research methodology and design.

Attention then turns to this particular research study. Sections 3.5 and 3.6 examine the adopted research methodology and research design, together with the summary research methods employed. Finally the value of the research from the viewpoint of alternative philosophical paradigms is considered.

3.2 Approach to Methodology Selection

A review of the literature suggests that there are two factors that are key determinants in selection of a research methodology. These are firstly the research objective and secondly the philosophical position, worldview or paradigm adopted. However the relative importance of these two factors is not consistently regarded.

One general approach concentrates on the determination of how the research objective can best be met. Often the philosophical aspect of the methodology is entirely ignored or implicitly assumed to be that which is predominant within a particular research domain (Eriksson and Kovalainen, 2008). An approach that positively privileges the research question is that of pragmatism. Adopting a credo of “what works” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998: p.21) pragmatism asserts that any underlying worldview “hardly enters the picture”. From this perspective all research methods are available for the answering of a research question and the methodology should be selected that best matches the question.
A second approach adopts an essentially oppositional approach to the first, arguing that research methodology and methods adopted must be determined from the research paradigm (Staller et al., 2008).

“Questions of method are secondary to questions of paradigm, which we define as the basic belief system or worldview that guides the investigation, not only in choices of method but in ontological and epistemologically fundamental ways.” (Guba and Lincoln, 1994: p.105)

This approach was taken to extreme during the “paradigm wars” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998) when it was argued that different research paradigms were incompatible (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Smith and Heshusius, 1986) and, to the extent that research methods were regarded as paradigm specific, the adopted research methodology must therefore limit itself to the inclusion of only certain types of research methods. A key implication that results from the determination of the research methodology by the research paradigm is that, for certain paradigms, some research objectives may not be meaningfully achievable (Potter, 2000).

In the author’s opinion this second approach has merit. Avoiding the ontological and epistemological issues does not mean that they are not still present. Furthermore, working within a declared worldview has the advantage of providing a clear framework for further discussion and research, even for those from an alternative philosophical persuasion. The viewpoint that whatever “works” is good research misses the point that it may only be under certain research worldviews that this research does indeed “work”.

However the selection of a methodological approach based on a worldview is not a trivial task as it is still dependent upon the adoption of a particular worldview. Groff (2004) argues that worldview choice should be made cognitively, although each paradigm “cannot be proven or disproven in any foundational sense; if that were possible there would be no doubt about how to practice inquiry” (Guba, 1990: p.18).
3.3 Various Philosophical Positions

A discussion of various different philosophical positions is more complicated than when positivism was overwhelmingly predominant (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998). Indeed a review of the literature reveals that there is much disagreement about which paradigms are relevant for research methodology choice. However a balanced synthesized summary is provided below in Sections 3.3.1 to 3.3.5.

3.3.1 Realist Paradigms

A number of paradigms can be grouped together as a consequence of their realist ontology. These typically consist of positivism, postpositivism and critical realism. The latter two are most commonly regarded as successors to positivism, in the sense that they are seen to maintain the core of its beliefs whilst attempting to address its weaknesses.

3.3.1.1 Positivism

Positivism is often still regarded as the mainstream philosophical position within business research (Johnson and Duberley, 2000). It asserts that knowledge of the world, which is an independent reality, should be obtained based on the use of the scientific methods of empirical observation and measurement. As a scientific endeavour research should also be value free.

3.3.1.2 Postpositivism

Postpositivism is sometimes regarded as a philosophical position in its own right or alternatively is used to refer to a variety of positions. It is in essence a reformed version of positivism, asserting in particular firstly that the producer of knowledge cannot be totally independent from reality and secondly that reality can be difficult to ascertain empirically. The implications of such a position tend to be firstly the championing of a number of research methods in addition to those historically regarded as scientific and secondly holding greater caution about any findings. Whilst postpositivism should be applauded for seeking to address the well-known shortcomings of positivism it tends to suffer as a result
of its underdevelopment as a coherent paradigm. For example Guba and Lincoln (2005) describe its ontology as critical realist but not its epistemology, without an explanation of how this can be possible. This apparent lack of clarity weakens it as a framework.

3.3.1.3 Critical Realism

Critical realism is sometimes regarded as a “midway” paradigm. At a high level it argues for a realist ontology, whilst asserting that knowledge about this real world is socially constructed. As such it appears similar to postpositivism and for this reason is not always acknowledged as a separate paradigm (e.g. Cresswell (2009)). However it appears to this author to be more coherently developed as a paradigm. In particular through offering an alternative realist ontology to positivism, based on structures and causal powers, it attempts to proactively address some of positivism’s philosophical weaknesses (Bhaskar, 1979).

The implications for research methodology are similar to postpositivism. Obtaining knowledge about the real world is not regarded as straightforward (Collier, 1994), a variety of methods may be desirable (Johnson and Duberley, 2000) and knowledge claims are likely to be provisional and partial (Potter, 2000). A key difference from positivism and postpositivism is that it holds critique of society as one of its objectives. In other words it asserts that we can “deduce ought from is” (Sayer, 1992: p.156). As such it has links to the next grouping of paradigms discussed below.

3.3.2 Critical Paradigms

A second grouping consists of paradigms that are essentially critical or emancipatory in nature. Paradigms falling into this group include those described as critical theorist or advocacy/participatory. Although often realist in ontology they differ significantly from the first grouping of paradigms in terms of their epistemological purpose. Typically they reject freedom from values, pursuing ideologically orientated research and employing methodologies that are transformative by nature (Guba, 1990). Critical research distances itself from the managerial and business perspective as a starting point for research
(Eriksson and Kovalainen, 2008). Section 3.4.4.3 considers how critical realism differs from this grouping.

3.3.3 Constructivist Paradigms

A third core grouping consists of those paradigms that are essentially anti-realist in ontology. These include constructivism, interpretivism and postmodernism. Reality is regarded as existing in the form of multiple mental constructions. The implication of this is that knowledge is subjective in nature. Research methodologies should therefore be concerned with understanding these various social constructions; that is looking at how people interpret social phenomenon and construct meaning rather than attempting to determine causes and effects (Kavanagh, 1994). Measurement typically plays a minor role within the research methods employed. Though clearly a gross simplification, postmodernism could be positioned as an extreme constructivist paradigm. However literature often argues that postmodernism is on the wane as an active paradigm for business research (Eriksson and Kovalainen, 2008).

3.3.4 Pragmatic Paradigm

A final position is the pragmatic paradigm. Whilst this is sometimes compared with other paradigms based on aspects such as epistemology and ontology, it is perhaps better regarded as an anti-philosophical position, as described in Section 3.2 above.
3.3.5 Summary

The various positions are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Summary of Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Realist Paradigms</th>
<th>Critical Paradigms</th>
<th>Constructivist Paradigms</th>
<th>Pragmatic Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Post positivism</td>
<td>Critical Realism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Naive Realism</td>
<td>Critical realism</td>
<td>Generally realist</td>
<td>Relativist; Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Modified Objective</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Experimental; manipulative; empirical observation; chiefly quantitative</td>
<td>Modified experimental / manipulative; mixed methods</td>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>Hermeneutical; chiefly qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axiology</td>
<td>Value free</td>
<td>Value free or bound</td>
<td>Value bound</td>
<td>Value bound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Guba and Lincoln (2005), Cresswell (2009), Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998)

3.3.6 Selection of Paradigm for Research Study

As discussed in Section 3.2 there are a number of factors involved in the selection of a research methodology. For this author it was important that it should be determined by the worldview. Whilst acknowledging that it cannot be proven the author’s preference is for a realist ontology. The desire for a paradigm with both a developed framework and without positivism’s well-discussed problems (Potter, 2000) led to the selection of critical realism as the adopted worldview. The worth of the research methodology employed from the viewpoint of alternative paradigms is discussed in Section 3.7.

Critical realism is examined in more detail in the following section.
3.4 Critical Realism

3.4.1 Introduction

Critical realism is a relatively recent research paradigm. Its development as a philosophical stance has been driven by the work of Roy Bhaskar and has been described as “transforming the intellectual scene” (Archer et al., 1998). Critical realism has a very specific ontological view, which determines what the nature of knowledge is and how it should be obtained. Originally developed as a general philosophy of science (Bhaskar, 1975) its ontological and epistemological positions were then adapted for social science, taking into consideration its particular characteristics (Bhaskar, 1979).

The key principles of critical realism are detailed below in Section 3.4.2. This is followed by consideration of the specific applicability of critical realism to social science and business research. In Section 3.4.4 critical realism is contrasted with other key research paradigms in order to aid reader understanding. Finally the implications for research methodology and design are discussed. Much of this section is based on Bhaskar’s (1975; 1979) work.

3.4.2 Key Principles

Critical realism has a number of key ontological principles.

Firstly it distinguishes between subjective transitive and objective intransitive objects of science. It asserts that the models and concepts that make up our knowledge about the world are independent of and different from the real entities that actually are the world. It also argues that knowledge production is a social process and consequently its content will be influenced by conditions of the production of knowledge, giving it a subjective nature.

Secondly it asserts that reality consists not only of experiences and actual events but also of structures, mechanisms, tendencies and causal powers that lie beneath the empirical surface. It argues that the real world is stratified with
different levels and with distinct real, actual and empirical domains. Consequently reality is not generally the same as the perception of reality.

A third key principle is that of the concept of causal power. Critical realism asserts that objects possess causal powers by natural necessity. However these causal powers may not be exercised regularly and their effect may depend upon contingent conditions; that is with which other objects they are interacting (Potter, 2000). Objects and structures of objects may or may not be contingently or necessarily related. However, as it is also asserted that systems are generally open in nature, the empirical detection of these underlying structures or generative mechanisms is very difficult.

Key epistemological principles result from these ontological principles. Firstly scientific knowledge development should not be either empirically or theoretically driven but should instead focus on better understanding reality. Secondly knowledge development should concentrate on the investigation and increased understanding of these underlying real structures and generative mechanisms.

3.4.3 Application to Social Science

3.4.3.1 Development of Social Ontology

Bhaskar (1979) applied critical realism philosophy to social science in order to develop a social ontology. He conceived of society as having an essentially relational nature. In other words, he asserted that it does not simply consist of individuals and groups but also includes the relations between individuals and the consequences of these relations. As such it rejects both the individualism found within the Utilitarian and Weberian philosophical traditions and the collectivism of the Durkheimian tradition.

Society is regarded as an ensemble of structures, practices and conventions that individuals reproduce or transform via activity. However the competencies, skills and habits needed for this reproduction or transformation are themselves obtained from society. This means that society is neither independent of nor the
product of human activity. In other words human agency and social structures are regarded as bound by a conceptual system of relationally linked positions and practices. Given this conception of society a common overall ontology for the social and natural worlds is claimed. The implication of such a claim is that the key ontological and epistemological principles discussed in Sections 3.4.2 are also essentially applicable to social science.

3.4.3.2 Differences between Social and Natural Science

A number of differences are however conceded. Firstly it is argued that social structures differ from natural structures in that they do not exist independently of the activities that they govern or of human agents’ conceptions of what they are doing in their activity. For these reasons critical realism acknowledges that meaning plays a role within social science and that reason is generally accepted as a cause. Secondly because social structures are social products they are open to transformation. For this reason they are only relatively enduring in nature.

3.4.3.3 Epistemological Implication and Issues

The essential epistemological implication of the social science critical realism ontology is that social science knowledge should be essentially regarded in the same way as that of natural science. Knowledge therefore arises from gaining understanding of the underlying mechanisms, tendencies, causal powers and structures of real society, rather than simply from either social phenomena or alternatively human interpretation. However accepted differences between social and natural structures need to be considered within the type and method of knowledge acquisition adopted.

A number of specific epistemological issues can be identified with critical realism for social science. The first is concerned with the role of experimentation. Critical realism regards closed systems as rare within social science. This means that decisive tests are not available for theory testing and alternative explanatory criteria must be used which will be only tentative. Accordingly Outhwaite (1987) argues that a good explanation in social science
is one where firstly the postulated causal mechanism is capable of explaining
the phenomenon, secondly there is good reason to believe in its existence and
finally equally good alternative explanations cannot be developed.

A second epistemological issue is that as the nature of social structure is only
relatively enduring any knowledge about it is likely to be time/space limited.
Thirdly as social structure is not independent of the activities it governs or
human agents’ conceptions of what they are doing in this activity, these
activities and concepts are available to assist in the development of knowledge
about the social structure. This means the acquisition of knowledge requires
obtaining interpretive understanding as well as seeking causal explanation
(Potter, 2000).

A final epistemological issue is that social science is considered by critical
realism to be a critique.

“Social practices are informed by ideas which may or may not be
ture and whether or not they are true may have some bearing
upon what happens...If social scientific accounts differ from those
of actors then they cannot help but be critical of lay thought and
action. Furthermore...to identify understandings in society as
false, and hence actions informed by them as falsely based, is to
imply that...those beliefs and actions ought to be changed.”
(Sayer, 2000: p.19)

3.4.4 Comparison with Key Alternative Research Paradigms

3.4.4.1 Positivism

Positivism rejects the key principles of critical realism. Whilst acknowledging the
reality of things it denies the existence of underlying structures, mechanisms or
powers. Instead it holds the doctrine of atomism, in which reality is assumed to
consist of atomic, independent items and it regards atomistic events as the
ultimate object of knowledge (Potter, 2000). Positivism does not accept the
concept of the different domains of real, actual and empirical nor the difference
between transitive knowledge and the intransitive world. Typically it does not recognise the subjective nature of the knowledge production process and the potential for observations to be theory laden. Similarly it does not recognise the subjective within the social world. Reality is seen in empirical events and for this reason causation is recognised through the regular succession of the cause event and the effect event. No internal relations between things are recognised nor is the difference between open and closed systems acknowledged.

Positivism’s epistemology is based on empirical investigation, gathering of data and the use of deductivism and falsification in the testing of hypotheses empirically. This limits the research problems with which it can engage (Potter, 2000).

Bhaskar (1975) describes positivism’s approach of taking ontological questions about what there is and reducing them to epistemic questions about what we can know as an “epistemic fallacy”. Collier (1994: p.50) uses metaphors to contrast the knowledge development processes of positivism and critical realism; for positivism “science collects discrete bits of knowledge and accumulates them in its mental bucket”, whilst for critical realism “science consists of digging deeper”.

3.4.4.2 Constructivism and Anti-Realist Paradigms

Anti-realist philosophies accept critical realism’s assertion of the subjectivity of knowledge. However because, unlike critical realism, no objective reality is assumed it is argued that they find it difficult to determine which interpretation is better or indeed whether such a choice should even be attempted. Although constructivism may make use of ideas such as structures, mechanisms and powers this is within the context of artificial rather than real constructs. Like critical realism it views social phenomena as concept-dependent and requiring understanding. However unlike critical realism it rejects causal explanation within social science (Potter, 2000).

These paradigms share a view with critical realism that the world is open, diverse and complex, which means that it is difficult to test theories and gain
reliable knowledge. However it is argued that they have a tendency to react to this difficulty "by giving up all hope of distinguishing better from worse explanations, let alone true or false ones" (Stones, 1996: p.6), whilst critical realism argues that despite difficulties it is possible to develop reliable knowledge and progress understanding. Critical realism rejects the idea that all knowledge claims are equally well founded (Groff, 2004).

Collier's (1994: p.50) equivalent metaphor for science within anti-realism is "coming to see the world differently".

3.4.4.3 Critical Theory

There is some discussion within the literature on how critical realism interacts with critical theory. Potter (2000) asserts that both firstly acknowledge that power relations within the production of knowledge can lead erroneous understanding and secondly that conditions within society that lead to these errors should be changed, thereby leading to a degree of emancipation. Where difference appears to reside at a fundamental level is with the relative emphasis afforded to seeking the truth about reality as opposed to emancipation. Critical realism generally argues that the former is an essential precursor of the latter and that this is not always present within the critical theory paradigm.

"The unavoidability of critical social science is at last being recognised, but too often the unavoidability of understanding 'what is' and choosing appropriate methods of study is simply forgotten."

(Sayer, 1992: p.257)

3.4.5 Implications for Research Methodology and Design

The selection of critical realism has a number of implications for the research methodology and design.

It suggests that the use of a variety of methods may be appropriate. This is not specifically in order to enjoy triangulation benefits, as suggested by the pragmatic paradigm (Denzin, 1978; Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2002; Webb et al.,
1966). Instead it is because of the asserted difficulty in the obtaining of knowledge about reality and the requirement for consideration of both explanation and understanding within the social world.

Knowledge may be considered to have advanced when there has been some improvement in confidence about the nature of reality. This should be contrasted with a requirement for research to be conclusive or justificatory in character to be meaningful. Critical realism asserts that knowledge enhancing discovery is likely to occur at the same time as research aimed at justification. As a consequence the customary choice of a research design as either exploratory/discovery or conclusive/justificatory (Malhotra and Birks, 2007; Hunt, 1983) is regarded as somewhat artificial.

Finally consideration of what the social world ought to be like should not be excluded from the study. However this needs to be grounded in the enhanced understanding of the research domain. This research project is looking at social phenomena from the perspective of consumers as opposed to a business perspective. A critical realism approach permits appropriate critique of the position of consumers to be made.

From a critical realist viewpoint the adopted research approach of focusing on the change in brand name has additional merit. Bhaskar (1979) asserts that underlying generative social structures become more visible and thereby more accessible to knowledge in times of transition. In the context of branding this appears analogous to the assertion that the time when it is most productive to learn about the brand name element is when it changes.

3.5 Summary of Adopted Research Methodology

Given a critical realist stance, the research objective and the key research questions the concern was how this objective could best be achieved. To remind the reader the overall objective of the research was:
Exploration of consumer brand name equity for established products and services: Using a global marketing induced change analysis approach

with the following key research questions:

1-In what ways does the brand name of established products and services provide value to consumers and what implications does this have?

2-What is the relative importance of the brand name of established products and services for consumers?

There appear to be two halves to obtaining of increased understanding of this domain. Firstly there was obtaining greater understanding about the dimensions of the domain; in other words its various aspects, as presented in Research Question 1. To obtain this type of greater understanding implies an increase in knowledge of a qualitative nature. Secondly there was obtaining greater understanding about its importance, as in Research Question 2. There is a clear measurement aspect to obtaining greater understanding in this area, which suggests an increase in knowledge of a quantitative nature. In addition the lack of research in this area demanded the foregrounding of an exploratory approach.

Taking all these considerations together led to the adoption of a mixed methods three stage sequential study (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998), employing primarily qualitative methods for the dimensional perspective and primarily quantitative methods for the importance perspective, whilst building on the extant theoretical literature. The research design is discussed in the next section.

3.6 Research Design and Summary Research Methods

The first stage of the research focuses on the theoretical literature relevant to consumer brand name equity/value. In particular it derives a theoretical model
of the consumer impact from a change in brand name for an established product.

The second stage of the research uses qualitative analysis to empirically explore the dimensions of brand name value. The model developed in the first stage of research is used as a framework but research was not limited to the empirical exploration of this model.

The third stage of the research uses quantitative analysis to empirically explore the importance of the brand name of established product to consumers. Again this is carried out within the context of global marketing induced name change.

These research stages are shown in Figure 7.

**Figure 7 Stages of Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST STAGE</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT OF BRAND NAME CHANGE THEORETICAL MODEL (CH 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECOND STAGE</td>
<td>EMPIRICAL EXPLORATION OF BRAND NAME VALUE DIMENSIONS (CH 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD STAGE</td>
<td>EMPIRICAL EXPLORATION OF BRAND NAME IMPORTANCE (CH 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three stages are discussed below at an overview level. However, as the methods employed in each of the three stages differ greatly and the detailed methods employed in the second and third stages are dependent on the findings of the first stage, for the sake of reader clarity the detailed methods for each stage are included in the relevant research stage chapter (i.e. 4, 5 or 6, as shown in Figure 7).
3.6.1 First Stage-Development of Brand Name Change
Theoretical Model

3.6.1.1 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 1 the research objective was the exploration of consumer brand name equity, using a global marketing induced change analysis approach. It was asserted in Chapter 1 that firstly little empirical work had been carried out in this area and that secondly global marketing induced name change provided a useful empirical approach to progress knowledge in this domain.

3.6.1.2 Description

Instead of commencing the research at the empirical stage it was decided to review the literature to develop a model for what might be theoretically expected to occur. This is considered to be a valid and fruitful methodological approach (Cresswell, 2009). Whilst there is no explicit theory of brand name change within the literature in the sense that there is, for example, a Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980), there are various coherent reasoned sets of ideas within this domain. This permitted a model to be derived which could be regarded as a representative synthesis of the academic literature.

Such an approach enables two beneficial objectives to be met. Firstly it ensures that a clear and full understanding is obtained of the academic thinking about the brand name element, through the exploration, analysis and synthesis of the literature. Secondly it provides a valuable framework for the empirical work in the following two stages of research.

Essentially this stage is inductive in nature but with the development of theory arising from the synthesis of the existing literature rather than from observation of empirical data as might occur with, for example, grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).
The output from the first stage is a model consisting of the expected impact from a change in brand name on consumer brand name value and consumer behaviour, together with the various dimensions of brand name value and other key variables and relationships. This is shown in Section 4.5. This model is then used in the subsequent empirical research stages.

3.6.1.3 Challenges

This stage was not without a number of challenges. One issue was the extent to which the review of literature behind the model could be considered to be all-embracing. The question of the scale and type of literature review is common to all research (Dunleavy, 2003). Nevertheless a number of strategies were employed to address this concern. There are recognised authors and seminal texts within the branding domain and these were used as initial signposts towards further relevant literature. Relevant keyword searches were also employed.

A second issue was the extent to which the developed model was an appropriate interpretation of academic thinking. Critical realism acknowledges the inevitable subjective nature of knowledge development, without going as far as requiring one to “celebrate subjectivity” (Guba, 1990: p.17). The author regards any interpretative creativity contained within the developed model as an asset (Krathwohl and Smith, 2005). It should also be recalled that the developed model was subjected to empirical review in the further stages of research, thereby providing some control over any erroneous initial interpretation.

Finally the existing literature consists of work from a number of different philosophical paradigms. However critical realism acknowledges merit in a variety of research traditions and thereby permits synthesis of this work.

This research stage is covered in detail in Chapter 4.
3.6.2 Second Stage-Empirical Exploration of Brand Name Value Dimensions

3.6.2.1 Introduction

There are two aspects to obtaining greater understanding about consumer brand name equity. The first consists of understanding the key elements that make up these constructs, together with the variables that impact and are impacted by them. The second consists of understanding their importance to consumers. Consideration is required about which research methods should be employed for each of the aspects.

The first aspect lends itself to qualitative analysis whilst the second, by virtue of its concern with measurement, requires a quantitative approach. The first aspect is the concern of the second stage of the research and is discussed below. The second aspect is covered within the third stage of the research and is considered in Section 3.6.3 below.

3.6.2.2 Description

Qualitative analysis is used to explore brand name value in the context of global marketing induced brand name changes. The specific research method employed is a series of semi-structured recorded in-depth interviews. Interview structure and contents are based on, but not limited to, the model developed in the first stage of research, using actual examples of global marketing induced brand name changes. In particular participants are asked about ways in which they perceived that they had been impacted by global marketing induced name change, the influence of associated brand name change advertising and promotional activity, their cognitive and emotional responses and attitudinal/behavioural change.

Participants were recruited from both within and outwith the University of Manchester, who considered that they had been impacted by a change in brand name. This selection criterion is employed in order to maximise the obtained benefit from the interviews. Subsequent analysis of the interviews is then
performed using template analysis with NVivo8 software. Template analysis is broadly a grounded approach that is used for the thematic organisation and analysis of textual data. However unlike grounded theory initial themes are generally generated from the extant theory (Dey, 1993). Following the approach of King (2004) an initial thematic coding template is created for transcription analysis. This template is subsequently amended through consideration of the data.

This stage can be considered to be partly deductive and partly inductive or alternatively as a mixture of justification and discovery. It can be regarded as justificatory in the sense that empirical evidence is being sought in support of a developed theoretical model. Given the selection criteria of the participants and research methods employed it would be unlikely to be considered justificatory from a positivist viewpoint. However critical realism would accept the empirical evidence as providing a degree of justification. It can also be considered as discovery research because it does not limit itself to the validation of the developed theoretical model.

This research stage including detailed method is covered in Chapter 5. This Chapter includes justification and discussion of the various specific aspects within this qualitative research stage.

3.6.3 Third Stage-Empirical Exploration of Brand Name Importance

3.6.3.1 Introduction

Obtaining information relating to the salient dimensions of brand name value is clearly necessary. However this understanding needs to be within the context of the overall importance of the brand name element. In other words the implications of the findings from the first two stages are very different if the brand name element of established products is shown to be of major importance to consumers, as opposed to minor importance.

It was not considered appropriate to carry out this research within the second stage because of the requirement for a different selection criteria of the
participants used. The third stage was therefore carried out as a separate piece of research.

3.6.3.2 Description

The final stage of the research obtains a measure of the relative importance of the brand name element of established products for consumers. The specific research method used is a series of participant experiments employing the decompositional statistical technique of pairwise full-profile conjoint analysis, supported by Sawtooth CiW and CVA software. Results are subsequently statistically analysed using SPSS16.

A broad cross-section of participants was recruited from both within and outwith the university for the experiments. These were carried out in a controlled face to face environment, using laptop computers. Participants were initially asked to select their favourite brand in a product category in which they were active purchasers. As part of the conjoint analysis experiment the level of price increase that they would be prepared to pay in order for the brand name to remain unchanged was indirectly obtained, thereby providing a measure for the importance placed on the current brand name by the participant.

This phase is essentially deductive in nature, although it does not preclude the discovery of new empirical data that might be relevant to the overall research objective.

This stage of the research and detailed method is covered in Chapter 6. This Chapter includes justification and discussion of the various specific aspects within this quantitative research stage.

3.7 Value of Research from Alternative Paradigm Viewpoints

This section looks at the value of the research from alternative paradigm viewpoints to that of critical realism.
As far as the first stage of the research is concerned the principle of inductive theory development should meet with general acceptance. However to the extent that existing literature has been produced within a particular research tradition some of it may not be afforded merit by other traditions.

It is unlikely that researchers working under the positivist paradigm would regard the findings of the second stage as holding any confirmatory power. Nevertheless the exploratory worth of the research would be acknowledged. Whilst recognising their value, constructivist researchers would view the findings differently from critical realism researchers. For them the research provides information on a variety of individual meanings that consumers hold for social phenomena, such as brand name. From a critical realism perspective the research provides information, albeit imperfect and partial, relating to real social world entities.

The findings of the third stage should carry value for all. Although constructivists tend to place a lower priority on measurement, the obtaining of a better understanding of the importance of the brand name element for established products should be seen as worthwhile. Positivists may be critical about the extent to which its findings are generalisable, although limits to generalisation are overt or covert within most quantitative work (Bryman and Bell, 2007).

3.8 Detailed Research Stage Chapters

The following Chapters 4, 5 and 6 provide details in turn of the three stages of the research that made up the mixed methods sequential study, including detailed methods and findings.
4 First Stage-Development of Brand Name Change Theoretical Model

4.1 Introduction

As discussed in Section 3.6.1, for the first stage of the research study a theoretical model of the impact of brand name change is developed from a synthesis of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2.

The model is built up as follows. In Section 4.2 the theoretical impact of brand name change on the ability of a brand name to perform its various functions (and therefore provide consumer brand name value) is considered. The potential moderating influence of a corporation’s advertising and promotional activity relating to a name change is discussed in Section 4.3. In Section 4.4 the model is extended from consumer brand name value to consumer brand purchase attitude and behaviour. Finally in Section 4.5 the derived model is presented and discussed.

4.2 Theoretical Impact of Brand Name Change on Brand Name Value

In Chapter 2 the various functions of brand name located within the theoretical literature were discussed. Given the integral role of brand name within the brand value literature it was asserted that the theoretical functions of brand name for a consumer could be assumed to be the same as the functions of an overall brand entity. These are now considered in the context of a change in brand name.

4.2.1 Rational Functions

If a brand name does perform rational functions; namely identification, search cost reduction, quality signalling and risk reduction, then it could be expected that a change in name would reduce its ability to perform these functions. This is because the rational functions are dependent on the consumer being able to
link the brand name to the brand entity. A change in name will interfere with this linkage.

4.2.2 Symbolic Function

If a brand name does perform a symbolic function then it could be expected that a change in name would impact on its ability to perform this. This is because the capability to perform this function is dependent on the associations of a particular name and will therefore be impacted by a brand name change. Collins (1977) argues that any new name will never be neutral but will automatically embody resonances and values.

Whilst the loss of the associations of the old brand name might have a negative impact on consumer brand value, it is possible that the new name might hold inherently more positive symbolic associations than the old brand name. This means brand name change could, in certain circumstances, have a positive impact on consumer brand name value.

4.2.3 Relationship Function

If a brand name does fulfil a relationship function then it could be expected that this would be negatively impacted by a change in brand name. This is because a consumer would generally regard a change of name, in which they had no input into the relevant decision-making process, as inconsistent with a close brand relationship.

4.2.4 Habitual Function

If a brand name does perform a habitual function then it would be expected that a change in brand name would have negative impact because this would force a break in the habit, with consequential cognitive burden.

In summary, from a review of the theoretical literature, it would be expected that a change in brand name would have a generally negative impact on the ability of the brand name to perform various functions. The only function where a positive impact appears possible is the symbolic function. In line with the
discussions in Chapter 2 it would be expected that this fundamental impact would accordingly be translated into a reduction in consumer brand name value.

4.3 Moderating Influence of Advertising and Promotion

As discussed in Section 2.6.2, when brand name change results from global marketing decisions it is generally expected that corporations would employ advertising and promotion programmes in association with the name change in order to mitigate against negative impacts. It is therefore important that any brand name change model takes account of such moderating influences.

The expected moderating impact of advertising and promotion on each of the functions of brand name is considered in turn.

4.3.1 Rational Functions

It would be expected that an advertising and promotional programme would be able to moderate the negative impact on the rational function, through making consumers aware of the link between the new brand name and the existing brand entity. However because of the accrued investment in the original brand name, it may take time for the rational role transfer to the new brand name to be fully effective. Consumers may need to engage in translation activity that, because of its cognitive requirements, is unlikely to be value-generating. A successful transfer will also require the consumer to both be exposed to the advertising and promotional activity and also retain this information in memory.

Literature invariably considers persuasion in the context of attempted attitude change, whilst this is an example of corporations using persuasion to attempt to keep attitude the same. Nevertheless it ties in well with seminal thinking within the domain (Hovland et al., 1953; McGuire, 1968), which asserts that for a persuasive message to succeed it must be attended, understood, accepted and remembered.

In addition literature argues that different lexical brand names inherently hold different levels of brand awareness (Meyers-Levy, 1987; Kanungo, 1968;
Robertson, 1989; McCracken and Macklin, 1998). Consequently the required programme of advertising and promotion may need to be substantial to support a new brand name that has a significantly lower inherent propensity for awareness than the original name.

Inclusion of the reasoning behind the name change within the advertising and promotion campaign is unlikely to impact its level of moderating influence on rational function.

4.3.2 Symbolic Function

Advertising and promotion can be used to provide a brand name with associations that allow it to perform symbolic functions. A brand name change advertising and promotional campaign can therefore be expected to be used to provide the new brand name with the symbolic values of the old. However some symbolic associations will be inextricably linked to the specificity of a brand name and will not be able to be transferred across to a new name, regardless of the size of the advertising and promotional activity. Similarly a new brand name will inevitably carry additional associations. This therefore means that the associations and symbolic functions of the new name will never be identical to those of the old name.

Inclusion of the reasoning behind the name change within the advertising and promotion campaign is unlikely to impact its level of moderating influence on symbolic function.

4.3.3 Relationship Function

The relationship role is predicated on a consumer expectation that a brand will meet their needs. A unilateral change in brand name is unlikely to be in line with these expectations. Accordingly it remains doubtful whether any advertising and promotion about a brand name change will be able to transfer the strength of the relationship function to the new brand name.
It could be argued that the inclusion of the reasoning behind the name change, where this reasoning is acceptable to consumers, within an advertising and promotional programme could lead to some mitigation of negative impact on relationship function.

4.3.4 Habitual Function

Advertising and promotion attempt to seamlessly transfer the consumer from the old to the new brand name. However it is difficult to see how the reassessment by the consumer of their purchasing behaviour can be avoided, as inevitably brand name change breaks their habit.

Inclusion of the reasoning behind the name change within the advertising and promotional activity is unlikely to impact its lack of moderating influence on the habitual function.

4.3.5 Summary

Based on the analysis and synthesis of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 a theoretical model can be derived linking a change in brand name to a change in consumer brand name value. This is shown in Figure 8 on the following page. A change in brand name has impacts on its various brand name functions. In the case of rational and symbolic functions, this may be moderated by corporate name change advertising and promotional activity. As a result of the link between brand function and value discussed in Chapter 2 the impact on the brand name functions leads in turn to an impact in the value received by the consumer from the brand name.
Developed from summary of literature discussed in Sections 2.3 to 2.6 (e.g. Keller, 2008; Aaker, 1991; Kapferer, 2008; Wood et al., 2002)

4.4 Theoretical Impact of Brand Name Change on Brand Purchase Attitude and Behaviour

4.4.1 Incorporation of Brand Purchase Attitude and Behaviour

In Section 2.7 brand purchase attitude and behaviour were discussed. It was argued that in the case of brand name change the Theory of Planned Behaviour model was an appropriate framework. The argument was also developed that consumer brand name value could be linked to brand purchase attitude.

The consequence of asserting this link between consumer brand name value and brand purchase attitude is that a theoretical brand name change model can be extended from consumer brand name value to brand purchase attitude and behaviour, through the incorporation of an adapted Theory of Planned Behaviour model.

4.4.2 Consideration of Consumer Choice

As discussed in Section 2.7.2.3 one regular criticism of the Theory of Planned Behaviour model is that it ignores consumer choice. In other words in its consideration of purchase behaviour of product A the model incorporates, amongst other variables, attitude towards product A purchase but not the attitude towards close substitute product B purchase. In recognition of this
criticism a variable of close substitute purchase attitude has been included within the developed brand name change model.

4.4.3 Summary

The derived model linking changes in consumer brand name value to brand purchase attitude and behaviour is shown below in Figure 9. A change in consumer brand name value impacts their attitude towards brand purchase. Depending on how this changed attitude towards brand purchase compares with the existing attitude towards purchase of the closest substitute, this attitude change may in turn impact brand purchase behavioural intention and brand purchase behaviour. As the Theory of Planned Behaviour variables of subjective norm and perceived behavioural control are assumed to be unaffected by any change in brand name value they have been excluded from the model.

Figure 9 Derived Model of Consumer Brand Name Value Change on Brand Purchase Attitude and Brand Purchase Behaviour

Adapted from Ajzen (1985)
4.5 Derived Model of Brand Name Change Impact on Consumer

The models developed in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 can be combined to provide a summary derived model of brand name change impact on the consumer. This is shown in Figure 10 on the following page.
Developed from summary of literature discussed in Sections 2.3 to 2.7 (e.g. Keller, 2008; Aaker, 1991; Kapferer, 2008; Wood et al., 2002; Ajzen, 1985)
This model represents a synthesis of the theoretical literature relating to brand name. As discussed in Section 3.6.1.2 there were two aims behind the development of such a model in order to meet an overall research objective of the exploration of consumer brand name equity.

The first objective was to obtain a clearer and fuller understanding of the academic thinking about the brand name element, through the exploration, analysis and synthesis of the literature. Certainly this has been met in that a swathe of literature has been summarised on a single sheet of A4.

The second objective was to provide a theoretical framework for use within the empirical stages of this research study.

It should be recalled that the literature grounding this model has been based on brand equity and new brand name empirical research. As such its applicability for established brand names is uncertain. Accordingly the model, its variables and relationships are used as the basis of empirical exploration. This forms the focus of the following two stages of research and is covered in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.
5 Second Stage-Empirical Exploration of Brand Name Value Dimensions

5.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the second stage of the research, as previously discussed in Section 3.6.2.

The objective of this stage is discussed in Section 5.2. This is followed by detailed consideration of the research methods adopted. The method employed has three key aspects; namely semi-structured interview, sampling and recruitment and analysis. These are discussed in turn in Sections 5.3 to 5.5. Section 5.6 considers issues of validity, reliability and generalisability. Findings are discussed in Section 5.7 and summarised in the context of the overall research objective in Section 5.8.

5.2 Objective

The primary objective of this stage of the research was to gain greater understanding of the various roles that the brand name of established products and services play for consumers and the implications for their behaviour. This is one of the key research questions, discussed in Section 1.3.

The Brand Name Change Impact model, developed from extant theory in the first stage of the research and previously shown in Figure 10, was used as the fundamental framework. Its development was discussed in Chapter 4.

5.3 Method-Semi-Structured interview

The first section looks at why this method was chosen for the research. The overall theme of the interview is then discussed in Section 5.3.2. This is followed by consideration of the initial and final interview guides.
5.3.1 Rationale for Selection

As the research was primarily exploratory in nature a qualitative technique was considered to be most appropriate to provide the richness and depth to meet the objective in Section 5.2.

The technique of in-depth semi-structured interview was selected. This technique has the advantage of ensuring all topics that are required to be discussed are covered within the interview, whilst at the same time providing the flexibility to ensure other information that the participant considers to be relevant is not excluded. The primary method of control was the use of an interview guide.

Focus groups, defined by Bryman and Bell (2007: p.511) as “a group interview with several participants emphasising the questioning of a fairly tight topic with significant interaction within the group”, were considered but were rejected. It was thought that brand name impacts may vary too much by individual for benefit to result from discussion within a group setting.

Completely structured interviews (Malhotra and Birks, 2007) were also rejected because they limit the opportunity to gather data outside of the pre-determined questions. Given the exploratory nature of the research and the adopted overall methodological stance this was felt to be inappropriate.

Employing a qualitative technique does have generalisability limitations (Bryman and Bell, 2007). However obtaining some confirmation and identification of all relevant variables is a constructive antecedent to any future quantitative activity. It is also more amenable to theory generation, as befits exploratory work.

5.3.2 Overall Theme of Interview

The overall theme of the interview was to explore with participants how they perceived that they had been impacted when a brand they used had changed its name. In order to maximise the isolation of the brand name change element,
brand name changes included within the interviews were centred on those that had resulted from global marketing. The interview was based around the variables and relationships contained within the developed Brand Name Change Impact model.

An initial interview guide was piloted and was then reviewed and amended before use in the qualitative study. Piloting is recommended (Oppenheim, 2005; Saunders et al., 2003) because it may identify areas of questioning that are unclear or have been omitted from the initial interview guide.

5.3.3 Initial Interview Guide

An initial interview guide was produced, highlighting themes to be discussed, the desired direction of the conversation together with indicative questions. This was based on the variables and relationships contained within the Summary Derived Model of Brand Name Change, which developed in the first stage of the research. The initial interview guide is shown in Appendix 1.

The planned structure of the interview was as follows. After an introduction the interview would commence with consideration of the functions of the brand name prior to the name change. This would be followed by discussion of the name change itself, with this section of the interview covering the impacts of the name change together with promotional and advertising moderating factors. The second half of the interview would concentrate on post-name change aspects. This included brand value impact and changes in attitude toward brand purchase and brand purchase behaviour. It would also discuss close substitute products and other consumer behaviour. The interview would then conclude with discussion of any other themes deemed relevant.

This initial interview guide was used in an initial pilot of five interviewees. This identified a number of additional themes that were not included within the initial interview guide namely:

- reasoning behind the name change
- cultural aspects (i.e. issues concerned with global v local)
- specificity of the original and new brand name
- consumer perception of ownership of brand name
- impact on general attitude to corporations and advertising

In addition both positive and negative views tended to be expressed about the impact of promotional and advertising activity at the point of name change.

The pilot also revealed that the conversation flow within the interview guide was sub-optimal. Rather than the planned structure discussed above, conversations tended to flow more naturally from pre-name discussion to post-name and then returning to the name change event. Consequently the interview guide was amended for the main study.

5.3.4 Final Interview Guide

This was used in the main study and shows the topic areas, indicative questions and purpose of questions. This is shown in Appendix 2. The differences between the initial and final interview guides are shown in Appendix 3.

These changes to the interview guide did not invalidate the data obtained from the five pilot interviewees and this obtained data was included within the quantitative analysis. Figure 11 on the following page shows the Brand Name Change Impact model developed in Chapter 4 annotated with the Final Interview Guide question numbers. This shows how this stage of the research is linked to the previous one.
Figure 11 Brand Name Change Impact Model annotated with Interview Guide Question Numbers

Developed from summary of literature discussed in Sections 2.3 to 2.7 (e.g. Keller, 2008; Aaker, 1991; Kapferer, 2008; Wood et al., 2002; Ajzen, 1985)
5.4 Method-Sampling and Recruitment

The first section looks at the overall sampling and recruitment strategy. This is followed in Sections 5.4.2 to 5.4.6 by consideration of the recruitment channels used. Finally a summary is provided of the actual recruitment achieved.

5.4.1 Overall Strategy

The objective of this research stage was to explore the impact of changes in brand name with UK adult participants. Whilst there may be apparent advantages in engaging as many research participants as possible there were also cost and time constraints to consider in the determination of the sample size. Griffen and Hauser (1993) argue that between 90% and 95% of relevant themes will be uncovered with between twenty and thirty qualitative interviews, whilst Sandelowski (1995: p.183) asserts that “determining adequate sample size in qualitative research is ultimately a matter of judgement”. A common approach is that of theoretical saturation (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) where data is collected until saturation has occurred; in essence where additional qualitative research yields no additional data.

Taking all of the above into account a sample size of 25 was determined, with the proviso that if interviews at the end of the process were still yielding additional data further recruitment could take place.

As the topic area was impact from brand name change, recruitment was limited to those who considered that they had actually been impacted by a change in brand name. The reason for this was straightforward. This stage of research was not concerned with measuring the value of brand name. Consequently including participants within the interviews who did not consider that they had ever been impacted by a brand name change would simply lead to a large number of interviews yielding no relevant information for this stage of the research project, whilst incurring time and money costs. The theoretical population was therefore any UK adult who considered that they had been impacted by a brand name change.
There were a number of other considerations within the recruitment strategy. Firstly it appeared beneficial to maximise the richness and depth of the data, through not limiting recruitment to university students. Secondly the finite research budget meant that any recruitment channels used needed to be cost-effective. Finally interviews needed to be recorded for subsequent analysis, which meant that it was a requirement for interviews to be carried out face to face or by telephone. Given the above and the desire for cost effectiveness various options for recruitment were considered.

The original intention was to recruit exclusively through the use of newspaper advertisements. However a review of literature suggested the value of using online advertisements (Gordon et al., 2006). In addition another cost-effective option was identified in the University of Manchester’s own volunteer webpage. Finally a number of potential participants who met the criteria had been identified from prior research. The adopted recruitment strategy therefore was the use of each of these channels concurrently. The individual channels are described below.

It was also desirable that participants were well informed about the study during the recruitment process. This helped to ensure that participants met the appropriate criteria and also facilitated the obtaining of informed consent. In order to meet these aims a website www.brandnamechange.co.uk was created, with details of the research study. This website address was included within the recruitment material. The website also provided the facility for potential participants to make contact. Appendix 4 contains a screen capture of the home page at the time of the recruitment process.

In order to obtain the required number of participants a small reward was offered as compensation for time taken.

5.4.2 Recruitment via Newspaper

A newspaper advertisement was placed in one issue of the Manchester Evening News and two issues of Private Eye. The first publication was selected because it was local to the research site, given the desirability for as many
interviews as possible to be undertaken face to face. The second publication was selected because its target audience (i.e. male, mature, middle class) provided a useful contrast to those participants likely to be recruited through university channels. These advertisements directed potential respondents to the website discussed in the previous section. Appendix 5 shows a sample newspaper advertisement.

Results from the two publications were very different. There were no respondents to the advertisement in the Manchester Evening News. However the Private Eye advertisements generated around twenty replies, which resulted in five interviews. In all cases these interviews were carried out by telephone, with consent obtained by post/email.

5.4.3 Recruitment via Internet

In order to assist recruitment from the internet, listings for the website www.brandnamechange.co.uk were obtained in leading search engines, such as Google and Yahoo, through the use of SEO services such as Google Tools and Fasthosts TrafficDriver. This resulted in around thirty enquiries. However only one of these enquiries led to an actual interview being carried out. It can be speculated why this recruitment method was less successful than other channels. Arguably responses received via other channels required a greater level of interest in participation within the study than those received from the internet.

5.4.4 Recruitment via University

A request for volunteers was placed on the University of Manchester volunteer webpage, where it was advertised for several months. A copy of the wording used is shown in Appendix 6. Potential participants were asked to make contact. They were then given further information and where applicable face to face interviews were arranged. There were around fifty responses via this channel leading to fourteen interviews. The volunteer webpage is used not only by university students but also by administration staff at the university.
Accordingly the majority of these fourteen interviews were not actually undertaken with students.

5.4.5 Recruitment from Prior Research Contacts

Five interviews were carried out with appropriate previous research contacts, who satisfied the recruitment criteria. With one exception these were carried out face to face.

5.4.6 Comparison of Face to Face and Telephone Interviews

The implication of the use of certain of these recruitment channels was that some of the interviews needed to be performed by telephone rather than face to face. Conducting qualitative interviews by telephone is often seen as appropriate only for short or structured interviews (Harvey, 1988; Fontana and Frey, 1994) and has the drawback of depriving the researcher of seeing non verbal communication from the participant (Cresswell, 1998).

Nevertheless most studies that have compared the two modes have concluded that there are no significant differences in the qualitative data collected (Miller, 1995; Tausig and Freeman, 1988; Sobin et al., 1993). Sturges and Hanrahan (2004) argue that the telephone mode has two key benefits. Firstly it may provide access to hard to reach respondent groups. Secondly it may provide cost advantages. Given the above and the fact that the use of telephone interviewing did indeed allow the exploration of the research topic to be carried out with a different participant type, it was considered that the use of multiple interview modes was justified.
5.4.7 Sample Characteristics

The demographics of the participants recruited were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE RANGE</th>
<th>n=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>n=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECRUITMENT METHOD</th>
<th>n=25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-Student</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Admin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows a good degree of variety, given the relatively small number of participants. However clearly there is no attempt at generalisability. In particular there are geographical and socio-economic biases in the sampling frame due to the location of the university in North West England and the higher level socio-economic participants likely to be attracted by many of the recruitment channels.

Nevertheless it should be remembered that this is an exploratory research stage concerned with the identification rather than the quantification of dimensions relating to brand name value. In the quantitative stage of research that follows attempts are made to achieve a greater degree of generalisability through the adopted population sampling strategy.
Table 3 on the following pages provides key characteristics of the individual recruited participants.
### Table 3 Key Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Brand Name Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Administration</td>
<td>Immac to Veet, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Gillian</td>
<td>Recruitment Administrator</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Administration</td>
<td>Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Administration</td>
<td>Coco Pops to Choco Krispies, Jif to Cif, Oil of Olay to Opal Fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Student</td>
<td>Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Administration</td>
<td>Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers, Oil of Olay to Oil of Olay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Administration</td>
<td>Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers, Oil of Olay to Oil of Olay, Starburst to Opal Fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Student</td>
<td>Coco Pops to Choco Krispies, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Student</td>
<td>Marathon to Snickers, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>University- Student</td>
<td>Marathon to Snickers, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Company Director</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Previous Research</td>
<td>Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>Previous Research</td>
<td>Marathon to Snickers, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Previous Research</td>
<td>Immac to Veet, Oil of Olay to Oil of Olay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Regulatory Affairs Specialist</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>High Wycombe</td>
<td>Previous Research</td>
<td>Marathon to Snickers, Oil of Olay to Oil of Olay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Previous Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>High Wycombe</td>
<td>Previous Research, Marathon to Snickers, Oil of Ulay to Oil of Olay, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Advertisement, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Advertisement, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Graphic Designer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Internet, Marathon to Snickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>University- Student, Marathon to Snickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Stalybridge</td>
<td>University- Administration, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers, Oil of Ulay to Oil of Olay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Francesca</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Student, Oil of Ulay to Oil of Olay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Student, Jif to Cif, Opal Fruits to Starburst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Advertisement, Marathon to Snickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Part time Administrator</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>University- Administration, Immac to Veet, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers, Opal Fruits to Starburst, Century FM to Real Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Advertisement, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Local Government Officer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Advertisement, Jif to Cif, Marathon to Snickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.8 Summary

25 interviews were carried out in total. Fourteen of these were carried out face to face in Manchester Business School, with another four carried out in a variety of other locations. A further seven were carried out by telephone. Each interview took between twenty and thirty minutes. All interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed into MS Word.

5.5 Method-Analysis

This section looks at the methods used for analysis of the qualitative data. Firstly section 5.5.1 looks at the technique of template analysis. This is followed in the next two sections by discussion of the coding structure used. Finally in section 5.5.4 the NVivo software that was used is considered.

5.5.1 Template Analysis

Template analysis is a technique for the organisation and analysis of text data based on themes contained within this data, where a coding template containing various themes is used. Typically coding is organised hierarchically so that similar low level codes can be combined to produce additional data at a higher level of coding. The approach has some similarities to grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). However one major difference and perceived advantage for this research is that it does not require the use of the other detailed and formalised procedures demanded by grounded theory. In contrast to grounded theory the initial themes within template analysis coding are generally generated from the extant theory (Dey, 1993).

A second advantage is that template analysis does not closely ally itself to a particular epistemological position (unlike for example discourse analysis) and therefore would not conflict with the overall methodology adopted by this research. The technique is not without its drawbacks; the main one being that the fragmentation of the data may result in the loss of meaning (Bryman and Bell, 2007).
Following the approach of King (2004) an initial thematic coding template was created for transcription analysis. This is shown in Appendix 7 and was based around the variables and relationships contained within the Brand Name Change Impact model developed in Chapter 4. In light of themes emerging from the data, this was subsequently amended during the course of the coding. The final coding template is shown in Table 4 below, following which the structure of the coding and the various themes are discussed.

Table 4 Final Coding Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRAND BASED TOPICS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>ORIGINAL BRANDED PRODUCT/SERVICE BEFORE NAME CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Branded Product/Service Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Thoughts on branded product/service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Relationship to substitute products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Close substitute readily available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2.1</td>
<td>Close substitute not readily available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Frequency of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Brand Name Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Function of brand name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.1</td>
<td>Rational function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.2</td>
<td>Symbolic function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.2.1</td>
<td>Symbolic personal association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.2.2</td>
<td>Symbolic semantic association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.2.3</td>
<td>Symbolic corporate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.2.4</td>
<td>Symbolic phonological association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.3</td>
<td>Emotional/ relationship function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.4</td>
<td>Habitual function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1.5</td>
<td>Metaphysical function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Importance of brand name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>POST NAME CHANGE-NEW BRAND NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Change in Value from Brand Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Change in functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.1</td>
<td>Change in relationship function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.2</td>
<td>Change in habitual function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.3</td>
<td>Change in symbolic function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.3.1</td>
<td>Change in symbolic semantic association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.3.2</td>
<td>Change in symbolic corporate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.3.3</td>
<td>Change in symbolic phonological association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.3.4</td>
<td>Change in symbolic personal association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.4</td>
<td>Change in metaphysical function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1.5</td>
<td>Change in rational function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Change in importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Use of translation strategies to maintain value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Change in Attitude towards Branded Product/Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Degree of change in attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Type of change in attitude
2.2.3 Reason for change in attitude

2.3 Change in Branded Product/Service Purchase Behaviour
2.3.1 Degree of change in purchase behaviour
2.3.2 Reason for change in purchase behaviour
2.3.3 Role of substitute product

3 NAME CHANGE EVENT
3.1 Description of Name Change Event
3.2 Views of Name Change Event
3.3 Reasoning behind Change
   3.3.1 What do you think was the reasoning?
   3.3.2 What do you think about this reasoning?
   3.3.3 Cultural aspect
3.4 Specific Names Involved
3.5 Change in Views over Time
3.6 Promotional/Advertising Moderators
   3.6.1 Awareness of promotion/advertising
      3.6.1.1 Positive
      3.6.1.2 Negative
   3.6.2 Impact of promotion/advertising
      3.6.2.1 Positive
      3.6.2.2 Negative

CORPORATE BASED TOPICS
4 CORPORATE BEHAVIOUR
4.1 Corporations should produce what Consumers want
   4.1.1 Positive
   4.1.2 Negative
4.2 Corporations do produce what Consumers want
   4.2.1 Positive
   4.2.2 Negative
4.3 General Attitude towards Marketing and Consumerism

5 BRAND OWNERSHIP
5.1 Right of Corporation to change Name
   5.1.1 Positive
   5.1.2 Negative
5.2 Corporation owns the Brand
   5.2.1 Positive
   5.2.2 Negative
5.3 Corporation/Consumer Relationship

6 POST NAME CHANGE-NON-PURCHASE IMPACTS
6.1 Attitude towards Corporations
6.2 Attitude towards Advertising
6.3 Non-Purchase Behaviour
5.5.2 Final Coding Structure-Overview

The final coding structure for the analysis of the qualitative data used six high level themes. The first three were based around the branded product with the remainder corporate based.

The three high level branded product based themes were:

   a Original branded product/service before name change
   b Post name change-new brand name
   c Name change event

A dual approach was therefore adopted in consideration of the brand name change. This is because some participants found it easier to discuss the product before the name change and then after the name change, whilst other participants preferred to focus on the change itself.

The three high level corporate based themes were:

   d Corporate behaviour
   e Brand ownership
   f Post name change-non-purchase impacts

These were added as themes in order to include participants’ general views on corporations and brand ownership as these might provide information relevant for the study.

5.5.3 Final Coding Structure-Detail

The detail of the final coding structure is discussed below.

1 Original Branded Product/Service Before Name Change

Code 1.1-Branded Product/Service Dimensions
This theme includes participants’ general thoughts on the branded product before the change in name. In particular this covers participant perception of
close substitute availability for the branded product and frequency of brand use.

There are two particular important purposes of this theme. Firstly the availability of a close substitute is included in the Brand Name Change Impact model as a factor that might explain whether a change in name would lead to a change in purchase behaviour. Secondly frequency of use is suggestive of the relevance of a branded product to the participant. Capturing information about brand usage acts as a control measure to ensure that the data analysed only refers to branded products regularly used by participants.

**Code 1.2-Brand Name Dimensions**

This theme includes the functions and the importance of the brand name from the perception of the participant before the change in name. As lower level themes the functions performed by the brand name are also captured by type of function performed; namely rational, symbolic, relationship, habitual and metaphysical. The symbolic function theme is also sub-divided into those where the associations are personal, semantic, corporate or phonological in origin. This is important because the research is concerned with whether the functions of brand name are impacted by a change in name. This split of the symbolic function was not included within the initial coding structure but was suggested by the data subsequently captured. The metaphysical function was also suggested by the data and relates to the idea that a particular brand name is so integral to the existence of a brand that it is essentially metaphysical in character.

**2 Post Name Change-New Brand Name**

**Code 2.1-Change in Value from Brand Name**

This theme captures changes in the functions and importance of brand name, as a result of the brand name changing. As with Code 1.2, different types of symbolic functions are recorded in sub-themes. One sub-theme to emerge from the data was the use of translation strategies to deal with the impact of the new brand name, where participants apparently translated from the new to the old brand name. These themes capture useful information because a key aspect of the research is whether a change in brand name leads to change in brand
value. The emergence of translation strategies is also important because it identifies a potential method by which participants may seek to maintain brand value in the light of a brand name change.

*Code 2.2-Change in Attitude towards Branded Product/Service*
This theme encompasses the degree, type and reason for any change of attitude towards a branded product caused by a change in brand name. This is important because this relates to an important relationship within the Brand Name Change Impact model.

*Code 2.3-Change in Branded Product/Service Purchase Behaviour*
This theme embraces the degree and reasons for any change in purchase behaviour caused by a change in brand name. It also covers the role that substitute products might play in the determination of any change in purchase behaviour. This is also an important theme because it is a key component of the Brand Name Change Impact model.

3 Name Change Event

*Code 3.1-Description of Name Change Event*
This theme covers anything that participants recall about the name change event. This theme is mainly exploratory in nature but may suggest other areas of interest to the research.

*Code 3.2-Views of Name Change Event*
This theme comprises participant views regarding the name change event. The code includes general participant views about the name change event and covers material that is less specific than Codes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3.

*Code 3.3-Reasoning behind Change*
This theme includes participant views on what they considered to be the reasons behind the name change. It also covers participants’ opinions about these reasons. A sub-theme that emerged from the data was that of cultural aspect, highlighting global versus local culture issues.
Code 3.4-Specific Names Involved
This code includes participant views on the specific brand names that were involved in the name change. This is valuable because it gathers data on whether it is the particular choice of brand name to which a name changes, rather than the change itself, that is important.

Code 3.5-Change of Views over Time
This theme includes text on whether participants’ views about the name change varied over time. This is important, as it might indicate whether the Brand Name Change Impact model should include a temporal dimension.

Code 3.6-Promotional/Advertising Moderators
This code consists of material covering all aspects of the corporate promotional/advertising moderators that occur as part of a brand name change. Sub-themes look at the awareness of this promotional/advertising activity and its impact upon participants. This theme is important because it forms a key variable within the Brand Name Change Impact model.

4 Corporate Behaviour

Code 4.1-Corporations should produce what Consumers want
This code captures participants’ views on whether corporations should produce what consumers want or whether they can hold completely different objectives.

Code 4.2-Corporations do produce what Consumers want
This code captures participants’ views on whether or not corporations actually produce what consumers want.

Code 4.3-General Attitude towards Marketing and Consumerism
This theme covers text relating to participants’ general attitude towards marketing and consumerism. As the participant group included within the qualitative interviewing was not random by design, this code may capture information that highlighted aspects of unrepresentativeness. An argument
could be advanced that consumers who considered that they had been impacted by a brand name change may tend to be those who hold a more negative general attitude towards marketing and consumerism. Information captured within this code may also suggest new spheres of research.

5 Brand Ownership

Code 5.1-Right of Corporation to change Name
This includes participant comments on whether corporations have the right to change the name of a brand.

Code 5.2-Corporation owns the Brand
This captures participant views on whether they consider that corporations own a brand.

Code 5.3-Corporation/Consumer Relationship
This theme includes material that is concerned with the perceived relationship between consumers and corporations.

6 Post Name Change-Non-Purchase Impacts

Code 6.1-Attitude towards Corporations
This theme captures participant views on how their attitude towards corporations is impacted by the change in brand name.

Code 6.2-Attitude towards Advertising
This theme captures how the attitude of participants towards advertising is impacted by the change in brand name.

Code 6.3-Non-Purchase Behaviour
This code includes material from participants relating to non-purchase behaviour resulting from the change in brand name.
5.5.4 Use of NVivo8 software

This section discusses the use of NVivo8 software in the analysis of the data. Following an overview in Section 5.5.4.1 and consideration of some of its criticisms in Section 5.5.4.2, the key features of the software are considered in Section 5.5.4.3. In Section 5.5.4.4 its specific use within the research project is described.

5.5.4.1 Overview

NVivo is one of the leading programs of Computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) (Lee and Fielding, 1991). It removes many of the clerical tasks associated with coding and retrieving data and assists in the management and querying of data and ideas (Bryman and Bell, 2007; Bazeley, 2007). It does not interpret the qualitative data nor does it determine the coding structure. However its data management capabilities arguably improve the quality of analysis that can be undertaken. In particular the ability of the software to quantify data occurrence can help counter criticisms that are sometimes made that qualitative data analysis is overly anecdotal (Silverman, 1985). In addition its support for a hierarchical approach towards coding increases the number of levels of abstraction at which analysis can be undertaken. NVivo8 is a recent version of this software and was current at the time of the research.

5.5.4.2 Criticisms

Criticisms of NVivo and other CAQDAS software tend to be similar to those for template analysis; namely that its use tends to fragment the data by taking it out of its narrative flow and context. As far as this research project was concerned such criticisms were addressed through the review of each of the 25 transcribed interviews separately, in addition to the use of NVivo.

5.5.4.3 Key Features

The key features of NVivo are straightforward. A Project is set up for each qualitative data analysis project. Documents, typically individual interview
transcripts within MSWord, are loaded onto the software and stored as separate internal Sources (i.e. transcript of interview 1 is stored as document 1). Individual codes are then input into the software into (what NVivo calls) individual Tree Nodes. The user then links these together in the desired hierarchy to form the overall coding structure. Individual Tree Nodes are then populated with text through the Documents being subjected to coding. When coding is completed analysis can take place at the level of individual Tree Node or at a higher level. The coding structure can be adjusted at any time to take account of themes that emerge from the data.

5.5.4.4 Specific Use within Research Project

This section details how NVivo was used during the Research Project with sample screenshots included within the Appendix. The Project was set up as bncmar09 and the 25 transcribed interviews were loaded into NVivo as Int1 to Int25. An example transcript is shown as Appendix 8. The coding structure from the Final Coding Template was then input into NVivo, including its associated hierarchical code structure. This is shown in Appendix 9 (where sources refer to the number of participants against a particular code and references refer to the number of pieces of text against the particular code). Finally the interviews were coded using this structure and text was recorded against individual nodes.

An example is shown in Appendix 10 of text coded to a particular node. Above each section of text is an identifier that indicates the transcript from which it has been coded. In this particular example the identifier starts with <Internals\Int07\Int007>. This indicates that it is from the seventh interview. Below this is a Reference number for each section of text from the interview. In this example no more than one piece of text comes from any interview and therefore only Reference 1 is shown.
5.6 Validity, Reliability and Generalisability

These are addressed as follows, within the context of a qualitative piece of research, applying the criteria developed by LeCompte and Goetz (1982) and mindful of the alternative approach of Lincoln and Guba (1985).

External Reliability

The research was structured so that it was capable of replication.

Internal Reliability

The degree of structure within the study strengthened the internal reliability or dependability of the study. Interviews were compared holistically with the results from the template analysis in order to check for consistency in the interpretation of the data. Full records were kept throughout the research stage including details of participants, taped recordings, interview transcripts, interview guides and analytical templates used, in order to provide a complete audit trail (Guba and Lincoln, 1994).

Internal Validity

Issues of internal validity or research credibility (Bryman and Bell, 2007) were addressed through the use of questionnaire piloting, interview guides, template analysis and NVivo software in order to provide structure to the analysis and reduce the degree of subjectivity. In addition the main purpose of the interview was not provided in advance to participants in order to minimise demand bias (Malhotra and Birks, 2007).

Whilst participants were not provided with an account of the research findings, the semi-structured and interactive nature of the interviews meant that confirmation was obtained from the participants that the interviewer had obtained a correct understanding from them.

In addition a degree of triangulation was performed through the quantitative stage of the research.
Confirmability

The research study was peer-reviewed at all stages to ensure that the researcher acted in good faith and that the research was not unduly influenced by personal values.

Generalisability

In common with much qualitative research (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982) the findings are not strictly generalisable. As well as the particular recruitment channels adopted for research participation the obtained data was dependent upon the perceptions of the participants, based on their recollection of events. However this issue is essentially addressed in the third quantitative stage of the research, where neither of these restrictions applies.

5.7 Findings

This section covers the findings of the study. Generally they are presented in line with the structure of the Brand Name Change Impact model but this has been modified where appropriate in the interests of clarity and efficacy. Direct quotations from participants [P] are used throughout.

5.7.1 Name Change Event

5.7.1.1 Description of Name Change

Participants were asked to describe the name change event. This highlighted a number of themes.

The name change was sometimes unexpected and unwelcome.

“Well, I don’t remember ever hearing that it was going to happen. One day, what’s this thing on the shelf? It looks like a Marathon bar, the wrapper’s the same, the colour’s the same, but what’s this weird name, where did this come from? Nobody told me” [P05].

The new brand name is described as “weird” but it is clear from what the participant says next “Nobody told me” that this is not the only cause of unhappiness. Unhappiness results from having been excluded from the name
change decision. It is reasonable to consider why they might have expected to have been included. Two approaches can be taken. The first centres on the brand name relationship function, where the consumer would expect to have been kept informed. The second is to approach this from a brand ownership perspective, arguing that a degree of consumer perceived ownership could explain the reaction of this participant.

The name change event sometimes encompassed a social dimension. In the example below it was a discussion topic on mass-market breakfast television.

“I remember there being a bit of backlash about it. I remember that about Opal Fruits as well. There was maybe not a massive thing, but on programmes at the time, I remember Johnny Vaughan sitting on the Big Breakfast about the Opal Fruits thing and why are they changing the name? He said about Marathon as well. Yeah, he said it was an American thing as well, ‘All these Americans changing our British names,’ about Marathon. He said that was such a strong name for a <laughs> chocolate bar because it had nuts in and everything and then it changed to Snickers, what kind of name’s Snickers? I do remember that” [P07].

Leaving aside the global/local issues, perhaps this can be seen as an example of how consumers can contest ownership of the brand? The growth of the internet has increased the opportunity for consumers to speak out against the corporation rather than simply displaying their behaviour through product purchase. The appearance of a name change event as a topic on a leading television programme also suggests that the brand name must be of some importance to individual consumers and society in general.

5.7.1.2 Views on Name Change

Given the selection criteria adopted for the participants, it is perhaps not surprising that views about the name change event were overwhelmingly negative. Responses to the change were both rational and emotional in character.

From a rational dimension frequently expressed views were that there was “no need for change”, that it was “unnecessary” or a “waste of money and resources”.

“It’s a waste of money and resources; I don’t see it’s necessary to do that. I think they should channel their energy to do something else, maybe improve a product or think of a new product” [P04].
This participant’s view argued that the name change might be neutral for the consumer but it was not seen to be in the corporate interest. This raises the question of why consumers should care, if it is only the corporation that suffers and whether this response conceals a more personal concern.

Other participants perceived a negative rather than a neutral impact on consumers from the change. The name change was described as dishonest, destructive or worse.

“They seem to think that we, the buying public, can be fooled into something by a transparent device like changing the name. It just strikes me as a transparent device and it annoys me that they think I’m the sort of person that could be fooled by this” [P12].

“It felt like a betrayal” [P22].

An emotional response to the name change was almost as common as a rational response. Participants described being upset, annoyed and shocked at the name change event. Indeed there were examples that could be considered somewhat extreme.

“It reminded me of when I was a first year at university and Coco Pops wanted to become Choco Krispies, and my housemate had bought a box of Coco Pops with the new label on and was so outraged that he crossed out the name and wrote Coco Pops” [P03].

Such a response is clearly suggestive of a brand name holding value for a consumer.

Another common theme to emerge was that of a general feeling of discomfort from not understanding what is happening or why it is happening.

[Talking about a name change] “That’s one, where you think what, why, why on earth have they changed that?” [P01].

This is perhaps more of an issue of the communication between the corporation and the consumer regarding the name change and does not in itself demonstrate that the name change had a detrimental impact on the consumer. This aspect is covered in Section 5.7.2.
5.7.1.3 Reasoning behind Name Change

Participants were asked what they considered to be the reasoning behind the name change. In addition they were asked whether knowing the actual reasoning would have impacted their reaction to the change. Bearing in mind that all of the name changes within the research were global marketing induced, a surprising number of alternative reasons were offered by participants. One common view was that the corporation had been taken over or had experienced legal problems. Another was that the name change was simply to gain publicity for the product. In addition a substantial minority of participants could not suggest any reasoning for the change.

Participants were then provided with the reasoning behind the name change and asked whether they thought that knowing this would have influenced their reaction to the name change. Results were mixed. For some consumers the reasoning was acceptable and made them more comfortable with the name change.

“... a product that has a different name in different countries, by making it the same everywhere then everybody will know what it is whether you’re coming from England and going to Germany and looking for that then at least you know the label’s the same, the name is the same, you don’t have to bother trying to figure out, is that possibly the same thing even though it looks the same?” [P03].

However for most participants the provision of the explanation had the opposite effect. The approach of providing detailed reasoning for a name change does not appear to be a panacea for corporations wanting to change brand names without any negative impact.

“I think I object to it because it just strikes me as unnecessary globalisation... I think my objection to it is that it looks so much like a marketing driven change rather than a product or consumer driven change. You imagine that the marketing people sit there and think how can we make life more convenient for us, how can we position ourselves in the global market and all this sort of bollocks? Whereas actually I feel that you’d be far better off trying to make actually a better product and actually manufacture something that’s good or reduce the price or something” [P12].

There are global/local issues associated with these name changes and the points raised by participants tended to be consistent with those expected to be expressed from both sides of this debate. A minority could see benefits from a single global name citing functional aspects, such as making a product easier to
find when abroad. However many regarded the benefits from a global name as minimal or purely for the corporation. There was a particular objection to the local UK product being apparently usurped by a global product, especially when this was perceived as “Americanisation”.

“It’s like I feel, in a way, that if it’s an American company like Olay, that they don’t consider little us in Britain, we’re nothing so we don’t count so it doesn’t matter if we change the name. For them, they’re just this little old peasant country, you know. That’s how I feel, it’s a kind of … I don’t know what the word is, not quite despised, but certainly don’t consider the feelings of the indigenous population who are now having to lose the name that they’re familiar with” [P24].

“...and then for it to change name to something that seemed generic and not particularly British or even European for the sake of saving money for, I think it’s Mars that make it. It felt like a betrayal” [P22].

It is important not to overstate the globalisation aspect. As stated above many participants were not even aware that this was the motive behind the name change. In addition it should be remembered that the research primarily used this particular type of name change as a device for isolation of the brand name rather than as a study focused on globalisation.

5.7.2 Advertising and Promotional Activity

Participants were asked whether they had been aware of advertising and promotional activity concerned with the name change. They were also asked what they thought the general impact was on them of such corporate activity.

5.7.2.1 Awareness of Advertising and Promotional Activity

There was a mixed response from participants to this question. Some people had become aware of the name change directly through television advertising. Others became aware indirectly from commentary about the name change within newspapers and magazines. It is worth highlighting this point that awareness of the change often did not emanate directly from the corporation. For example in Section 5.7.1.1 above a discussion on breakfast television was mentioned. This indirect communication meant that the corporate body had less control over the message being received by the consumer and there is more opportunity for a mismatch to result between the intended and received communication.
A substantial number of the participants stated that they had not been aware of any advertising or promotional activity, even though they often acknowledged that it must have occurred.

"Nobody told me" [P05].

"Absolutely not, in the sense that not even one, not few or… Maybe I didn’t pay attention, I don’t know, but at least in some magazine I guess I would have noticed it. I mean they were there for sure, I cannot believe that the brand changed the name and doesn’t advertise it" [P20].

This provides a counterbalance to a view that advertising and promotion are inevitably effective methods of addressing brand name changes.

5.7.2.2 Impact of Advertising and Promotional Activity

There was a majority view that such activity was effective in reducing the impact of brand name change, primarily because it could reduce the shock of the change. It could also be effective at increasing consumer acceptance for the change, where an acceptable reason to the consumer was provided. However it was clear from some of the participants that advertising and promotional activity could not be guaranteed to eliminate all negative impact from name change. Some commented that such advertising and promotional activity would have no moderating effect; for example where the new name was disliked

"I don’t think it would have made much difference. I think it was the (new) name itself that irritated me" [P06].

or could even make things worse if the explanations provided were not considered acceptable.

"If the publicity explained why they were making the change, they were honest about the change rather than saying it was not money orientated, that might help, because I know from Starburst, in America they were always Starburst, and that’s why they made the change. But then you think well, why not have Starburst in America and Opal Fruits here? And you just think obviously it’s done for money purposes, like manufacturing, but I think if they just tell it in that way, if they didn’t make a big deal out of it, then it would be better than to do a big publicity stunt about it but not really give you any answers" [P02].

"So it sounds like what you’re saying is the actual publicity might not help, it might actually make you more...bothered I guess?" [Int. to P02].

"Yeah, exactly" [P02].

The assumption within the Brand Name Change Impact model is that advertising and promotion moderates but does not eliminate the impact of a
change in brand name. Findings within this Section tend to support this. Although there was awareness of the campaign this was in no way universal. In addition its impact was not always as intended by the corporation.

5.7.3 Brand Name Functions-Rational

Chapter 2 discusses various theoretical rational functions for brand name that can be derived from the literature; namely identification, search cost reduction, quality signalling and risk reduction. Material from the participants provided empirical support for these functions.

5.7.3.1 Issues Relating to Product Recognition

One key issue that was raised within the interviews was concern about finding the product after the name had changed, thereby lending credence to the identification function of the brand name.

“So just in general, what do you think a brand name actually gives you?” [Int. to P10].

“It's an identity and it helps you identify something you can relate to with. Something I suppose you can put a lot of stock in eventually” [P10].

“I don’t think it actually says very much in the name, Ulay, but everybody knew what it was...” [P19].

The above quotations emphasize the role that brand name plays as an identifier. As highlighted by the quotation from Participant 19 the actual choice of name might not matter for this role to be performed. Although identification might appear basic in nature, it is fundamental to the support of the other functions that a brand name might perform.

“To me it seemed crazy that you spend your time building a brand and advertising it and encouraging people to buy it, and then you change its name <laughs> and then people can’t recognise it and probably stop buying it even, if they don’t recognise it as the thing they had before” [P24].

“Yes, if I’d walked into the shop looking for one and I hadn’t heard through the grapevine that the name’s changed I might not have realised, I might have thought, ‘Oh well maybe the colours on that chocolate bar look a bit like Marathon but it’s called something else’ and I might have walked away” [P13].

These participants talk about the consequences of not being able to identify or recognise the product. This demonstrates the role that a brand name can play
in search cost reduction. Without recognition of a desired product the search for the consumer becomes more complicated.

5.7.3.2 Issues Relating to Product Characteristics

A second key issue raised from the change in the brand name was whether the functional benefits of the product had changed, thereby lending credence to the other two theoretical rational functions of brand name.

“I think the name was part and parcel of the product and then you change one element of the product and basically think what else have they changed?” [P10].

“I don’t know if that actually means that the products are going to change as well as just the name. They’re trying to make it sound as if it won’t change, but you still have that thing niggling at you” [P23].

The above participants are concerned that the product will have changed and therefore that there is a risk that it will no longer meet their needs, whether functional or emotional. This demonstrates the risk reduction function of brand name.

“So you always suspect that something’s changing because there’s a problem” [P18].

In this above example the participant’s concern is not simply that of a change to a product but also that it has become inferior. Other interviewees suggested that a change in brand name might be accompanied by a price increase or a reduction in product size. The above quotations provide illustrations of the quality signalling function that a brand name can offer. The brand name is seen as providing assurance to the consumer. This quality signalling function was variously described by participants as the provision of reliability, dependability or trustworthiness.

In the above quotations consumers appear suspicious about the motives behind a change in name. Another consumer response to a brand name change was an assumption that the renamed brand was a fake:

“...then I couldn’t find Oil of Ulay anymore...and there was Oil of Olay and I thought it was someone trying to mimic the product...there is this fake brand that I’m not going to buy so I changed the product (switched brands)” [P20].

Concern that a brand might be perceived as fake is heightened in a marketplace where brand mimicry is commonplace. The above participant was
talking about her experience in Italy but such practices are prevalent elsewhere; for example amongst UK supermarket own-brands. Appendix 11 provides a recent description of these so-called parasite brands (Poulter, 2011).

5.7.3.3 Moderation by Advertising and Promotion

These rational function impacts were prominent within the interviews despite intensive advertising and promotional campaigns having taken place about the name change. Indeed the rational functions of brand name were second in terms of mentioned impacts from name change with fourteen of the 25 participants including them, albeit rarely as the only function identified. A number of reasons were suggested for the failure of advertising and promotion to achieve a full transfer of rational functions from the old to the new name. Firstly, as stated in Section 5.7.2.1, not all consumers had been aware of the advertising and promotion relating to the name change. Secondly the original brand name sometimes continued to cause cognitive interference due to accrued awareness investment:

“I'm always aware that even though they're called Starburst now, what I'm getting is an Opal Fruit. If someone asked me to describe a Starburst I'd say 'well it was an Opal Fruit'” [P02].

“...because I've known it as Jif for years and years, so I'm not suddenly going to start changing it to Cif because it, to me, it's Jif <laughs> It always will be” [P19].

As well as demonstrating cognitive interference, these quotations are also of significance because they reveal the active role of the consumer within the branding process. Despite best corporate endeavours these consumers cognitively exclude the new brand name from the current brand entity.

5.7.4 Brand Name Functions-Relationship

Another theoretical function for brand name discussed in Chapter 2 is that of relationship. Consideration of the change in brand name provoked comments from some of the participants that provided empirical support for this function. The relationship dimension was expressed in a variety of ways.
5.7.4.1 Perceived Diminution in Relationship from Name Change

One of the key reasons interviewees felt that they had experienced an impact from the change in brand name was a perceived diminution in the relationship that they felt they had with the brand under its new name:

“...does the new name mean something different to you than Opal Fruits?” [Int. to P02].

“Yes, ‘cause even though I know that it’s the same sweet inside it’s lost that history behind it, so it’s almost like a new sweet, and the sweet might be the same and it tastes the same but you’ve got to start again with all that why you’d buy them as opposed to another sweet. It’s now all the brands that were second and third behind Opal Fruits now have got more history than the Starbursts” [P02].

The language used by the above participant uses relationship terminology; in particular note the use of the expression “start again”. They also make an interesting comment about Starburst having to go to the back of the relationship queue, expressing a position that regards strength of a relationship as closely associated with the length of a relationship.

“I just felt it had absolutely no customer benefit whatsoever, and a brand is all about the relationship that you strike with the customer...A brand is something which you trust, you must rely upon. It’s something that you would miss if it wasn’t there. And with Marathon, the Marathon brand wasn’t there anymore, and I’m sure that a lot of people felt slightly let down or confused, I suppose, as to why this change should take place because there was no direct customer benefit to this” [P10].

In the above quotation the participant’s view is that their brand relationship effectively ended with the change in name away from Marathon, because it no longer exists as a brand entity.

5.7.4.2 Realisation of One Sided Nature of Relationship

“...I think on that emotional side you do feel a degree of loyalty and belonging with that, that identifies that brand and the question that, as I say, what have they done to my brand? Why have they done this? They haven’t asked me” [P10].

“I suppose I perceive that because of my past purchases there’s a perceived loyalty which is two-sided, which is maybe thought on my side, that I probably want to buy the product again. I’ve invested money in these purchases in the past. The manufacturer hasn’t consulted me, hadn’t considered what my feelings are when they decide they’re going to dispense with that loyalty and maybe they are going to continue wishing that I continue to buy their product but they’re not consulting me about the change” [P14].

The quotations above highlight a grievance that the relationship that had been perceived as two-sided was revealed as not being so in practice. It also
emphasizes that a key difference between relationship and loyalty is the dyadic nature of the loyalty within a relationship.

5.7.4.3 Control Dimension within Relationship Function

Another participant framed the relationship function in terms of the provision of a degree of control over a product.

“Just because you feel like all these other products, they’re just going to keep changing and you’re not going to have any kind of control over them. So there might be a sense of controlling it” [P02].

In other words the value from a relationship for this interviewee was not from any emotional attachment, which is a typical portrayal within the literature, but rather from a degree of perceived control that a relationship permits over the other party within the relationship. This control dimension could be linked to the concept of consumer brand name ownership as it suggests a reason why consumers may desire ownership.

5.7.4.4 Exploring the Meaning of Brand Name Relationship Function

It is clear from above that the change in brand name can impact the relationship that a consumer holds with a brand. However whilst it is fairly straightforward to appreciate how the rational functions of brand name might work it appears harder to understand the mechanisms by which brand name impacts the relationship with consumers. In what sense does a consumer have a relationship with the brand name element rather than the brand entity?

Two alternatives are suggested. The first approach is to regard the brand name as an integral part of a brand entity. When a brand name changes the original brand entity ceases to exist. Consequently it is not surprising that the relationship that a consumer holds with a brand is impacted, as the brand entity dies and the relationship therefore ceases. The second approach is to consider an unchanging brand name as symbolic of an ongoing relationship between brand and consumer. A changed brand name is consequently perceived as a change in the brand relationship. In a sense the first approach sees the brand name as part of the brand, whilst in the second approach the brand name
represents the brand. This unusual duality of the brand name element is considered further within the Contribution and Discussion chapter in Section 7.2.2.1.

5.7.5 Brand Name Functions-Habitual

In Chapter 2 the habitual function of brand name within the theoretical literature was discussed. Empirical support for this was obtained from the participants, although it was mentioned by far fewer participants than other brand name functions.

5.7.5.1 Implications of Brand Name Change

Interviewees talked about the disbenefit that they felt as a consequence of having to address the implications of the name change.

“So do you think that’s part of it; the fact that with the name change it has forced you to change your habits?” [Int. to P05].

“Yes I think it’s almost pulled me up short. Instead of say focusing in with my blinkers on, now it comes back in your face almost that and you think ooh no, maybe not!” [P05].

“...I think probably the reasons for not liking it (the name change) is (sic) a sort of laziness. You get used to something and then it changes and you have to grapple with that...” [P06].

“...but over time people just become accustomed to things because people are habitual, aren't they?...and it's a change in habit” [P11].

All of the above quotations talk about the fact that the brand name change has led to a break in participant habits and that this had been unwelcome. The discomfort surrounding the change in name can be ascertained from the physicality of some of the language used: “pulled up short”, “back in your face”, “grapple”.

5.7.5.2 Nature of Brand Name Habitual Function

A brand name provides habitual value through being unchanged. A constant brand name both identifies and causes an unchanged brand. In this sense a similar duality within the brand name element can be ascertained as that discussed in Section 5.7.4.4.
5.7.6 Brand Name Functions-Symbolic

In Chapter 2 many different types of symbolic brand function located within the literature were discussed. During the research participants talked about how the change in brand name had impacted them as a result of changes to the symbolic associations and roles performed by the brand name. The symbolic functions of brand name were the most frequent function mentioned within the interview. One of the key findings was that many of these symbolic functions were driven by the consumer rather than the corporation.

5.7.6.1 Corporate Driven Symbolic Functions

Few of the symbolic functions mentioned by the interviewees appeared to have emanated from the corporation; for example as a result of associations developed through advertising or desired associations from the choice of brand name selected. This is surprising because the interviews provided many opportunities for discussions of these functions, as they considered the product both pre- and post-name change as well as the impact of the name change itself. However there were a number of examples that could be considered as potential providers of corporate driven symbolic value.

“...the advert that pops up in my head of slightly over-acting people unwrapping the end of a Marathon bar in a very staged manner.” [P22].

“Well obviously the road race, I think I would guess would be the first thing to spring to mind. Yeah the London Marathon...” [P16].

“...because Opal Fruits, weren’t they made to make your mouth water?” [P16].

“They even had the little rhyme to go ‘Coco Pops is a bowful of fun’” [P07].

Perhaps the selection criteria of the participants and their desire to talk about a large number of consumer driven symbolic functions might explain why little of the interviews was devoted to corporate driven symbolic functions.

5.7.6.2 Consumer Driven Symbolic Functions

Over half of the consumers taking part in the research revealed that they had established their own symbolic functions for the brand name, based on their own personal non-corporate driven associations. These could be divided into
associations linked to the specificity of the brand name, associations linked to meaningful events in consumers’ lives and other associations.

**Personal Associations-Specificity of Brand Name**

One category of personal associations was linked to the specificity of a particular name. The choice of brand name is often used by corporations to provide symbolic associations. However this is different because the associations were not those desired by the corporation. For example one participant associated Jif with “in a Jiffy”, that carries the meaning “performing a task quickly”, whilst another participant regarded Cif as shorthand for a venereal disease.

> “Jif to me comes from jiffy; so you’ll do it in a jiffy; so you’ll do it quickly. It helps you do it quickly” [P16].

> “Cif, it doesn’t mean anything. It’s like the beginning of syphilis to be honest…”[P24].

Starburst was associated with fireworks. Marathon was seen to have connotations of Greek battle, whilst Oil of Olay was associated in the consumer’s mind with the Olay plant (that does not actually exist!).

> “I mean I just thought it was some natural product coming from some Olay plant” [P20].

Examples were offered where the personal associations of a brand name added symbolic value to the brand.

> “They just sound more magical to me than Starburst” [P04].

> “In what way?” [Int. to P04].

> “Opal Fruits, they just sound, ‘cause opals are precious and they glitter and shimmer in a strange way and so if you can put them into sweets…” [P04].

Conversely brand name personal associations often subtracted symbolic value from the brand.

*(Talking about Snickers)* “And to be honest it sounds like knickers doesn’t it? <Laughs> It’s just absolutely ridiculous. There’s no street cred. in that at all. It’s an embarrassment” [P05].

*(Talking about Snickers)* “Well it’s very American and it smells…it doesn’t smell at all it smacks of trainers <laughter>, sneakers” [P10].

*(Talking about Snickers)* “It sounds like sniggers which is a negative thing…” [P13].
A second category of personal associations consisted of meaningful events in consumers' lives, which had become linked with the name. Often a particular brand name was associated with a happy childhood memory.

“It's just a sense of comfort really. You know, you got picked up after school and your mum gave you some Opal Fruits. It was always that nice kind of history behind it that you want to carry on, so you keep buying Opal Fruits to get that feeling again” [P02].

“Just tell me what Opal Fruits means to you?” [Int.to P04].

“Days in the park. I remember we used to go to the park on a Sunday and my dad would buy them for us” [P04].

“I think a lot of the brand names...go back to childhood and it's like a comfort thing” [P16].

“...and I think it's that relationship between the emotional attachment to their childhood rather than the actual taste of the sweet...” [P17].

On other occasions the name was associated with a particular location, where the consumer had used the product.

“When I hear the name Veet, however, it reminds me of when I spent a year abroad in France and Spain because Veet was what I saw then...and so Veet doesn't sound true to me that it should be Veet here. To me, Veet's European and it should be abroad...It does touch a few personal heart-strings...” [P23].

Sometimes the associations were idiosyncratic, whilst at the same time highly meaningful. In the quotation below, highlighting a change in meaning brought about by a change in brand name, the name Century FM is associated with the pleasure of winning a competition and this is represented in physical form in the guise of a branded toaster. This example is unusual in that the original brand name continues its physical existence co-temporally with the new brand name.

“...Like for me I won...a Century FM toaster...but I was thinking in a few years' time when my children are older and they open the box and they see Century FM they're going to say 'Well, what's that?'...When I say 'Well Real Radio that I listen to, that used to be called Century FM' but it doesn’t mean the same, you know” [P23].

These personal associations appeared to differ from simple recall of product use as they impacted the participants' regard for the product through association rather than simply awareness. As discussed in Chapter 2 academic literature portrays examples of corporations attempting to increase the value of a brand through nostalgia value bestowal. However the associations identified
here are conceptually different as there was no corporate involvement. The importance of this symbolic value should not be underestimated. For example from consideration of the quotation above by participant 02, the fact that the personal symbolic association was powerful enough in itself for product purchase holds significance.

It is important that these findings provide a fair view of the comments from participants. One interviewee challenged the importance of nostalgic symbolic value from brand names. They argued that this symbolic value had resulted because of the name change and would not be generally applicable to products.

“...I don’t know necessarily if Marathon would have such an appeal to older people if it continued under the brand Marathon...I think Marathon actually has a brand strength because...it is a memory rather than the realisation of the product...So I think if Marathon had stayed as Marathon I wouldn’t meet people doing my job today and they go, ‘Oh! Yeah I used to love Marathon’ ... I don’t think that comment...would ever be raised” [P17].

The value of defunct brand names is considered further within the Contribution and Discussion chapter in Section 7.2.2.8.

**Personal Associations-Other**

For one participant the brand name symbolic function appeared to reach deeper into their own identity.

*(Talking about brand name changes)* “After I’d written that email to you I was thinking ‘Why am I so bothered?’...And I thought that it’s probably something to do with all that kind of thing defining you. It’s your sort of safety net and it’s your identity and when people start pulling bits away it’s undermining your identity...That might be analysing it too much, but when I thought that it suddenly seemed to make more sense” [P22].

**5.7.6.3 Attribution to Brand Name Element**

The attribution of these symbolic functions to the brand name element, as opposed to the brand entity, was given support by interviewees’ reactions to the name change.

“...it shatters childhood memories as well, because when I was little I really liked Opal Fruits and they remind me of happy times...if I was given the choice to choose between Starburst and Opal Fruits, I would ask for Opal Fruits to come back” [P04].
“Opal Fruits was a product I must have bought when I was, I guess, a child up to probably a young adult, so in changing its name, I suppose, it’s nothing I’m buying. I suppose I’m losing connection with my childhood” [P14].

“Marathon didn’t mean anything in terms of the literal meaning of the word, but it identified a product that I associated with growing up and for the name to be changed was...cutting off my childhood for commercial reasons” [P22].

In other words participants are stating that the symbolic associations and role are altered by the change in name, thereby confirming their attribution to the brand name.

5.7.6.4 Summary

The importance of brand name personal symbolic function is an important finding from the research, as is the paucity of empirical evidence for corporate symbolic function.

5.7.7 Impact of Brand Name Change on Brand Name Value

Participants were asked whether they considered that the change in brand name had impacted the value that they received from the brand. This is an area that has already arisen within the discussed findings. For example it was established in Section 5.7.1.2 that thoughts on the name change were generally negative. The discussion in the previous sections about the various brand name functions also highlighted that there had often been an impact on consumer brand value, as a result of changes to the functions received from the brand name. However, given the importance of the construct of consumer brand name value within the Brand Name Change Impact model, it was important that this issue is specifically considered.

For some participants, although the name change was regarded as unwelcome and unnecessary, it led to minimal change in the regard for the brand.

“That is upsetting for many people, not too upsetting for me...” [P14].

“...I think by changing your brand name you have to rebuild...And with Snickers to Marathon, yeah, I think that over time that they've managed to do that...” [P11].

Nevertheless for many participants the name change resulted in a more substantial reduction in brand value. In general this was not due to rational
reasons. However Section 5.7.3.2 includes the example of Participant 20 who assumed that the renamed Oil of Olay was a fake. For this participant the change in name clearly significantly reduced brand name value, for perceived rational reasons.

“And in any case I've stopped using them because I thought they were fake and they were imitation or something” [P20].

Another example provided in Section 5.7.1.2 is that of the flatmate who crossed out the name Choco Krispies on their cereal box. This appears to be a good example of a reduction in brand value caused by deterioration in the relationship with the brand resulting from the name change.

“He just said, ‘It’s not Choco Krispies, it’s Coco Pops.’ And I think for him maybe he was just very indignant about it because that’s what it had always been called, why does the name need to change?...it’s like changing the name of somebody from your childhood or something like that” [P03].

The last sentence merits comment. If a brand is generally considered to have personality (Aaker, 1997), being the “human characteristics or traits that can be attributed to a brand” (Keller, 2008: p.369) then is the change in its name not the equivalent to that of a person, with comparable expected impact?

“I mean a name is a personality kind of thing in terms of human beings. It’s like your name, my name, I suppose, it’s what you relate to, so name is really important because it defines what something is in terms of identity” [P09]

Generally it was the change to symbolic functions that led to a change in the value of the brand name and some of these have been discussed in Section 5.7.6.2. For example in the case of Participant 04 this was because Opal Fruits was associated with happy childhood memories and Starburst wasn’t.

“...if I was given the choice between Starburst and Opal Fruits, I would ask for Opal Fruits to come back” [P04].

Section 5.7.6.2 also provides the example of Participant 23 who won a toaster from Century FM and then suffered a perceived reduction in its value due to name change.

“Because the toaster says Century FM so when I’m, I don’t know, sixty and losing my marbles a bit, am I going to remember that actually I used to listen to Century FM and that’s now Real Radio? It’s kind of like...I don’t know. I don’t know, I just think am I going to know who Century FM was? Are other people going to know, like my children? You
know, to my children, if they show it to a friend or something and let’s say one of them goes to university and they want a toaster ‘There you go, have that’ ‘What’s Century FM?’” [P23].

Examples were also provided of a new brand name undermining an individual’s [P22] identity.

For some participants it was clear that the change in name had changed something about the brand name value but they found it difficult to articulate.

“If I say the word Starburst, again what comes to mind?” [Int. to P21].

“Well, like a fruit based, fruit flavoured sweet that’s chewy and pleasurable to eat and regularly purchased if I <laughter> was ever going to buy sweets of that nature. I don’t know if it’s sometimes, it almost doesn’t quite sound right, if that makes any sense, because it sounds such an insignificant thing, doesn’t it, change it back, talking about <laughter> brand name of a confectionery brand, but, actually it just doesn’t sound right saying Starburst, it’s kind of because you always associated that product with that name or whatever. And there’s me having to say Starburst, or going in the shop and seeing Starburst and stuff, it’s slightly different” [P21].

Note the phrase highlighted in bold. It doesn’t gel well with the general flow of the conversation. Perhaps the apparent interjection truly captures the true thoughts of the participant6.

5.7.7.1 Use of Translation Strategies

One notable finding from the research was the widespread use of translation strategies. A significant number of research participants stated that they translated the changed brand name back to its old name for purchasing and usage decisions.

“I’m always aware that even though they’re called Starburst now, what I’m getting is an Opal Fruit. If somebody asked me to describe a Starburst I’d say ‘well it was an Opal Fruit’ [P02].

“...because I look at it and I think, “That’s Jif; I’ll get some Jif from the cupboard” [P25].

“So it sounds like you’re sort of translating as you go when you see it?” [Int. to P25].

“Yes, Yeah, I remember the old name, absolutely right, I remember the old name. So, no you’re quite right, I am translating it and so it’s kind of hard wired in my brain as Jif. Yeah, there’s no question about that. Actually no, I hadn’t thought of that before” [P25].

---

6 Shortly before this research Opal Fruits were actually revived for a twelve week promotion within Asda Supermarkets. This event was not mentioned by this or any other participant.
It was difficult to ascertain whether such strategies were deliberate or accidental. Its consequence was that consumers continued to interact with the old brand name, almost as if the name had not been changed.

“Oh, I know what it is, even if it calls itself Cif, I know it’s Jif and therefore I buy it” [P24].

“So Olay, the word means nothing and I don’t use it” [P19].

“You don’t use it as a word?” [Int. to P19].

“No <laughs>” [P19].

“Is that because you kind of translate it without thinking?” [Int. to P19].

“Automatically do it without thinking, I don’t say it. If I buy a product of Ulay’s I automatically say Ulay <laughs> [P19].

From the perspective of these consumers brand value had not been impacted by the change in name, as the change had not been accepted or acknowledged.

5.7.7.2 Relevance of Specific Names

One of the topics discussed within the interviews was whether the impact of the name change would have occurred with any new name or whether it was considered that the impact resulted from the specific names involved; for example because the specific name Snickers had been selected by the corporation.

Participants offered a variety of views. A significant proportion stated that the impact would have occurred with any choice of name

“Do you think it would have been different if they had chosen a different name to Snickers?” [Int. to P11]

“No, I think it was just the fact that they had changed the name.” [P11].

“But what happens if they’d just changed it to another global name? Let’s say to Ilay, would that have made any difference? [Int. to P19].

“No!” [P19].

whilst others regarded the choice of name as a key mediating variable.
“If they had come up with a different name, do you think that would have made any difference to you, or do you think you’d have still felt...” [Int. to P05].

“Affronted! <Laughs> Yes. Yeah” [P05].

“You would still have felt affronted, or it would have been different?” [Int. to P05].

“Depends on how different the word was” [P05].

“Do you think if it had been a different name you might have had a different view or was it just the fact that the name changed?” [Int. to P06].

“I think if it had a different name I might have preferred it, I just thought Snickers was a fairly ridiculous one.” [P06].

5.7.7.3 Change in Impact over Time

A further area that was considered within the interviews was the temporal dimension of the brand name change impact. In other words did the identified examples of brand name value reduction and translation strategy only apply in the short term?

As far as translation strategies were concerned it became clear that these had been in place for many years, which is unsurprising given that the name changes considered within the research had often taken place many years ago.

“I just really don’t like the new name. You still get some weird looks in shops when you go ‘Have you got any Opal Fruits?’ ‘No we haven’t <laughs> had any since 1995’ or something” [P08].

Whilst this does not show that the use of translation strategies is commonplace, bearing in mind the selection criteria of the participants, nevertheless it identifies an interesting phenomenon.

For many participants there was a perceived reduction in the negative impact of the name change over time.

“You get used to it, don’t you?...Well I think anything that changes...I find it quite irritating...then you get used to it” [P06].

“How much do you feel the same now that maybe you did at the time?” [Int. to P11].

“I ain’t so bothered now <laughs>...Looking back now I don’t think it’s a big deal” [P11].

However this reduction over time was by no means universal.
“It sounds like when it happened, you said in 1995, whenever it was that you were not very keen on it and it sounds like you’re still not very keen on it <laughs>” [Int. to P08].

“No. I know it’s one of these grudges I’ve got from childhood I think” [P08].

“Do you think it actually grows over time or do you think it’s just a thing that’s unresolved that never resolves?” [Int. to P08].

“I don’t know. My mum’s still upset that Marathon changed their name <laughs> so I don’t think you ever get over it” [P08].

“Every time I buy it, I must say I’m a bit pernickety, being a book editor, every time I buy it, I have a feeling of irritation that it’s been changed” [P24].

5.7.7.4 Summary

The research shows that for some of the participants the change in brand name led to a reduction in brand value received, albeit tending to diminish over time. Some interviewees adopted translation strategies as an alternative to acceptance of this reduction in brand value.

5.7.8 Impact of Brand Name Change on Attitude towards Brand Purchase

Participants were asked whether the change in name had impacted their attitude towards purchasing the product. The Brand Name Change Impact model assumes that a reduction in brand name value, received by the consumer as a result of brand name change, would have a negative impact on a consumer’s attitude to purchase. The previous Section 5.7.7 identifies examples of consumer brand name value reduction, as well as occasions where the reduction is short-lived or avoided through translation strategies.

Overall the change in brand name did not appear to greatly impact the attitude towards brand purchase for many of the participants. There are three factors that provide a degree of understanding of this finding; limited reduction in brand value, consideration of product utilities and use of translation strategy. These are discussed in turn below.
5.7.8.1 Limited Reduction in Brand Value

For many participants the change in name did appear to reduce the brand value received from the product. However this reduction was often only a small proportion of the total brand value received and therefore only had a minor or temporally limited impact on their attitude towards brand purchase.

“So we know Opal Fruits changed its name to Starburst, do you think it changed your attitude to the product at all?” [Int. to P21].

“I think after realising that they were essentially the same product, which took a couple of years to realise...then no...I’d still consume it on a regular basis now...regardless of the name change I guess. But then of course that took a bit of time to get into your head.” [P21].

“Do you think it has affected your attitude in any way?” [Int. to P11].

“Hmm... I would like to say yes but it probably hasn’t in a big way no...I think...at the time it did affect the way I shopped <laughs. The amount of Starburst or Opal Fruits or Snickers or Marathon that I bought was probably affected at the time” [P11].

“...I became slightly biased against it so now I have to think ‘Well, actually it’s quite a good product despite the stupid name,’ rather than thinking it’s just a perfectly nice product” [P12].

The above comment by Participant 11 ‘I would like to say yes’ is worth noting. They appear to be acknowledging that their attitude to brand purchase is not consistent with their attitude to the change in brand name. The use of the qualifier ‘slightly’ by Participant 12 also emphasises the point about the limited nature of the reduction of brand value experienced.

This is an important finding because it appears to challenge some of the views expressed within the literature, discussed in Chapter 2, about the importance of brand name element. The importance of the brand name element is examined in more detail in Chapter 6, which is concerned with research specifically focused on the measurement of its importance.

5.7.8.2 Consideration of Product Utilities

Perhaps more importantly it became clear that when consumers were considering product purchase, although all of the elements relating to branding
were considered, significant weight was generally given to the product itself; in other words what is often defined as ‘product utilities’.

There is some debate within the literature about whether product utilities in themselves should be regarded as within the brand or whether the brand is separate from the product utilities. Kapferer (2008: p.508) discusses this and, in his argument for the inclusion of product utilities within the brand, offers the example of BMW, where its appeal lies as much with its “unique performance as it does to the image of its owners that the brand conveys”.

Whether or not product utilities are defined as being within the brand is perhaps not the issue here. Consumers being interviewed had certainly considered the product utilities, whether within or outwith the brand, in their attitude towards brand purchase and these remained unchanged by the change in name.

“So clearly the name changed to something that you didn’t like as much, but what do you think about it as a product?” [Int. to P05].

“Well in itself it is completely unchanged” [P05].

[Talking about the name change] “Do you think that changed your attitude towards the brand when it changed?” [Int. to P15].

“Not really no...Well it’s still the same product, it’s just that I couldn’t really quite see what the purpose of the name change was...but it seemed a bit of an odd name for a bar of chocolate to me, but it’s still the same product and so I would periodically buy one” [P15].

This emergent finding may help to explain the apparent paradox described in Chapter 1 of brand name being regarded as an important part of branding, whilst at the same time brand name changes not appearing to impact product sales. This paradox is represented in the example quotation below:

“Jif, I always used, but still use it as Chif or whatever the hell it’s called now” [P24].

Firstly it is self-evident that the respondent greatly prefers the original name of the brand. This can be seen from the deliberate (?) mispronunciation of the new name, followed by its unsubtle denigration ‘whatever the hell’ by the participant. However despite this it is also clear that the respondent ‘always’ and ‘still’ uses the product.
If the bulk of the value that a consumer receives from a product results from the utilities of the product then even a large reduction in consumer brand value from a name change will only have a small impact on the total value that a consumer receives from the product. As a consequence product sales may not be impacted. This point is further considered within the Contribution and Discussion chapter in Section 7.2.2.4.

5.7.8.3 Use of Translation Strategy

Finally as discussed in the previous section some participants employed a translation strategy in order to maintain consumer brand value. In these cases it is possible that a large reduction in brand value occurred with the brand name change but the strategy of the consumer makes this irrelevant for brand purchase attitude.

5.7.8.4 Summary

Little change in the attitude to brand purchase was observed. Factors that help explain this were a limited reduction in brand value from the name change and the use of translation strategy to preserve brand value. In addition consideration of product utilities may help to provide an explanation for how the brand name element can form a major part of branding, whilst change to this name may have a small impact on product sales.

5.7.9 Impact of Brand Name Change on Brand Purchase Behaviour

5.7.9.1 Introduction

It proved difficult to separate findings relating to brand purchase behaviour from those relating to attitude to brand purchase. Attitude/behaviour research typically looks at each of these at separate points in time; for example measuring attitude and then subsequently measuring corresponding behaviour shortly afterwards. For this study both attitude and behaviour were considered retrospectively over a significant time period and therefore it was difficult to separate these constructs in the recollections of the participants. In addition as
this research was of a qualitative nature the type of measurement precision often found within attitude/behaviour research was not present.

Findings in this area tended to mirror those of the previous section. In other words they identified limited reduction in brand value, consumers’ consideration of product utilities and the use of translation strategies. However a number of other points arose and these are discussed below.

5.7.9.2 Material Impact on Brand Purchase Behaviour

A number of participants stated that the brand name change had impacted their purchase behaviour in a more extreme way:

“Do you think it’s affected your purchase behaviour with the product?” [Int. to P05].

“Yeah I would say I’ve bought less over the years, in fact if anything I would then err towards a shop’s own equivalent” [P05].

“So the fact it’s changed its name, it sounds like there’s an element of not quite boycott..?” [Int. to P05].

“Definitely, yeah” [P05].

“But almost of avoiding it?” [Int. to P05].

“Well you almost recoil from it now...” [P05].

Note the use of the word “recoil” by the participant. This has a degree of physicality associated with it. The use of this linguistic style by participants has been noted elsewhere within the findings.

[Talking about product usage] “I don’t think I do, once they changed the name, because there’s other new products coming out. I’m more likely to consider those ones as well, rather than stick with that one brand” [P02].

“But if the name hadn’t changed what do you think would happen then?” [Int. to P02].

“I’d probably stick with the original brand a lot more” [P02].

“I didn’t buy it for years, it so annoyed me <laughs>...It certainly took quite a few years for me to go back and buy it” [P16].

“...You said that perhaps there was a while where you kind of didn’t buy the product...Did that just stop because you just...?” [Int. to P16].

“I suppose it was so long afterwards. I mean probably it was ten years or so that I didn’t buy it and I just fancied a bar that...I think it was probably a hard day at work and I’d
gone to get a coffee and I thought ‘Sod it, if I want it, I’ll buy it’, so almost arguing with myself, although obviously I didn’t have that kind of thought process consciously anyway” [P16].

The inner conflict described by Participant 16 in the above quotation is noteworthy. In a sense the participant weighed up the product utilities against the mainly non-rational brand value disbenefits from the name change, concluded the first now outweighed the second and therefore justified making a purchase of the product.

5.7.9.3 Role of Close Substitute Products

Empirical evidence of an additional relevant factor was obtained; namely that of the presence or absence of close substitute products. In the discussion relating to the Brand Name Change Impact model it was suggested that this might be a relevant variable.

Respondents stated that one of the key reasons why they continued to purchase a product after a name change was the lack of a perceived close substitute.

“I’m disinclined to change <laughs> the dishwasher tablets because I don’t want the chance of them not working. I mean I guess it’s the same really, with Jif moving to Cif...” [P25].

The above quotation provides a good example, highlighting that a key issue may not be whether there is actually a close substitute available but whether this availability is perceived. Participant 25 is unlikely to have investigated all of the products in the market and rationally determined whether or not they would provide a good substitute or not for Jif. Instead the participant simply perceives that there are no available substitutes.

“OK, so you said about how the name changed and even though it changed some time ago you’re annoyed by the people who did this...you still have the same kind of view of the product?” [Int. to P19].

“I’ve still got to use those products, haven’t I, really?” [P19].

Participant 19 emphasizes a slightly different point; specifically the necessity to continue to use a product, given the perception of a lack of alternative.
"...say there’s only two products available and I know that Cif is better than the other one or Cif’s at a better value for money price, then I’m going to go with Cif. I may not actually <laughter> really like it but you know if needs must then I will" [P23].

Invariably interviewees said that they would prefer to purchase the product with its old brand name rather than with its new brand name but clearly this option was not available to them. Given the lack of this option and the absence of a perceived close substitute, purchasing the product with the new brand name remained their best alternative. This is demonstrated in the above quotation by Participant 23 “if needs must”.

However it was not the case that close substitutes were never perceived to be available.

“...If you were to go into a store and you’ve got it in your head ‘Right, I’m going to have a Marathon/Snickers’ and they didn’t have it in stock...But if you had to go for a substitute what would you feel about that?” [Int. to P12].

“Hmm, pretty indifferent to be honest...” [P12].

[Talking about if first choice product was not available] “I don’t think it would matter really...” [P14].

5.7.9.4 Summary

Interviews centred on this topic contributed to the overall findings through the revelation of a number of instances of material impacts on brand purchase behaviour from the change in brand name, together with empirical support for the place of close substitute products within the Brand Name Change Impact model.

5.7.10 Brand Name Ownership

Interviews approached the topic from a variety of directions. Firstly interviewees were asked whether they considered that a corporation had the right to change a brand name. The purpose of this was to investigate the topic of consumer perceived brand name ownership using an indirect approach. This was followed by direct questioning about whether or not they perceived that a brand was owned by a corporation. Finally respondents were asked about their general
attitude to marketing and consumerism, in order to explore whether this was of relevance for the overall research.

5.7.10.1 Right of Corporation to change Brand Name

Participants’ views on brand name ownership often contained complexity. This can be seen in the apparent contradictions present in some of the answers provided.

“Do you think that a company’s entitled to change the name of a product?” [Int. to P19].

“Yeah, it’s their product. It’s not really our product, although I do have some sort of <laughs> ownership of these products, I feel…” [P19].

“So…who does the brand belong to then?” [Int. to P09]

“I would say the brand belongs to… I know it’s difficult, you get into philosophical questions because once things become a brand they effectively belong to the people, but I suppose the power of the brand…I suppose I’d say that the brand belongs to the people maybe but the power behind it is the people who own it. I don’t know if that makes sense” [P09].

Nevertheless the vast majority of participants considered that a corporation had the right to change the brand name of one of its products.

“Do you think a company is entitled to change the name of a product?” [Int. to P01, P04, P05].

“Oh yes, of course. That’s up to them” [P01].

“I think it’s a matter for the shareholders” [P04].

“Well I suppose at the end of the day legally they own it, it’s entirely up to them…” [P05].

These above exemplar comments are aligned with a traditional view of ownership, centred on a legalistic paradigm.

However this belief in the right of a corporation to change a brand name was not held by everyone, for several reasons.

[Talking about right of corporation to change name] “I suppose it depends on the product. I mean if it’s a well known product with either a particular demographic or a large group of people whether they’re old or young, and it’s been like that for years and they’ve grown up with it then I would think not” [P02].
Participant 2’s argument above appears to be that consumers earn some claim over a brand name by virtue of longstanding use of a product. Participant 18 broadens the discussion through consideration of employees.

“Do you think in general companies are entitled to change the brand name?” [Int. to P18].

“If they’re successful, no...I think they owe it to the employees at the bottom of the pile, as it were, in that company to spread the profits as opposed to wasting loads of money on re- advertise something that’s been successful anyway in the past” [P18].

Despite the existence of divergent views there was general consensus that it would be unwise of a corporation to make a brand name change that was not supported by its customers.

“Well they’re the producer so...I think it’s foolish of them not to carry on producing something that people want or that they like in its current form. If there’s nothing wrong with it, why change it? If people like it the way it is, fine, why change it?” [P01].

“It’s their product and they can change as they see fit. I mean they’re not dictated to by the consumer but they need to obviously be aware that the consumer has the final say on the success of the brand” [P17].

“Well at the end of the day it owns that brand as a brand owner or brand custodian...What I would say is...the brand owner is custodian of something which has not just a rational but also an emotional relationship with end customers. It’s almost like you really need to understand the impact of what you’re doing and how that might alter the relationship with your customers. So tread carefully, go with caution, proceed with caution” [P10].

This dialogue raises a number of questions. Firstly can corporations that change brand names be considered to be marketing orientated? Secondly is one way of synthesizing the presented arguments to make the assertion that marketing orientated corporations should voluntarily forgo their right to exclusive ownership? Participant 10’s quotation makes use of the word custodian. This has a dictionary definition of “a person who has responsibility for or looks after something”. Perhaps this provides a better approach for a marketing-led corporation than an approach centred on ownership?

5.7.10.2 Corporate Ownership of the Brand Name

Presenting the question of corporate brand name ownership directly produced less equivocal support for the dominance of the corporation, although this was still the view of the majority. Whilst comments supporting corporate ownership
of the brand name were similar to those discussed in the previous section, consideration is worthwhile below of the views of some of the participants who took the minority position.

“At the end of the day I suppose you feel a sense of ownership of that brand as a consumer, yes, you do” [P10].

“I’ve used it for years <laughs> so I feel like it’s ours, it’s my product. So although they produce it, I do feel that by buying it…we should have some sort of say in the products as well, we’re the consumers” [P19].

“Not in the literal sense, obviously, but I suppose in a sort of emotional sense” [P15].

An important point of note here is that ownership is apparently felt emotionally by these participants rather than regarded as necessarily rational. This endorses an alternative approach to ownership from that provided through the legalistic lens.

Participant 2 provides an interesting viewpoint.

“To what extent do you feel that a brand like Opal Fruits belongs to you?” [Int. to P02].

“Oh yeah, as a customer that's what it’s all based on really…” [P02]

For this participant consumer perceived ownership is “what it's all based on”. This should be contrasted with the majority view that considers ownership to be that of the corporation and therefore presumably for them not at all what it’s based on!

Finally a quotation from Participant 22

[Talking about ownership of a brand] “I think all the consumers at the time have some kind of collective ownership of it, but no power” [P22].

Is it meaningful or possible to conceptualise ownership without power?

5.7.10.3 General Attitude of Participants to Marketing, Consumerism and to Corporate Behaviour

Views on marketing, consumerism and corporate behaviour were sought from participants. One of the key questions asked was whether they considered that
corporations should produce what consumers want. A large majority of the participants responded in the affirmative, illustrated by the following quote.

“Should businesses produce what consumers want?” [Int. to P11].

“I think business should ask consumers what they want...at the end of the day the consumer, we’re the end user, aren’t we? So we want to get goods and services that we require, not things that companies tell us we require” [P11].

When this question was modified to ask whether participants considered corporations did actually produce what consumers wanted the responses were more evenly divided.

“Do you think corporations generally do produce what consumers want? [Int. to P21, P02, P19].

“Generally I say, on the whole, yeah. Because I think otherwise if they didn’t, then somebody else just would go in and set up and produce something they saw a gap in the market for” [P21].

“I think they do consider it, but their budget overrides that” [P02].

“They do, but then they try and tell us what we want as well. So they'll...try and create a need. So they will try and make products for us that perhaps we'd never have thought we needed or wanted until they’d advertised it” [P19].

The importance of findings in this area does not lie in the direct provision of greater illumination about consumer brand name value. However they are suggestive of a participant base that holds a variety of views, rather than being conspicuously anti-marketing and anti-corporation. This provides comfort that the findings within the qualitative research about brand name value and brand name ownership may have more general applicability.

5.7.10.4 Summary

Whilst a legalistic view that regarded ownership as exclusively corporate was dominant, other views that included the consumer holding a role within ownership were also expressed. This topic will be reflected upon further within the Contribution and Discussion chapter in Section 7.2.2.6.
5.7.11 Other Consumer Behaviour

Finally participants were asked whether the change in brand name had led to any other changes that were not of a purchase related nature.

Few impacts were reported. One that was mentioned by several participants was the development of a more negative attitude towards the corporate body responsible for the name change. This impact appeared to be independent of any impact of the brand name change on consumer brand value and brand purchase behaviour.

5.8 Summary of Findings

The main objective of this stage of research was the gaining of greater understanding of the functions of brand name, primarily through obtaining empirical confirmation or disconfirmation of elements within the Brand Name Change Impact model. This was in line with one of the two key research questions from Section 1.3.

This summary looks at which parts of the model received empirical support from the qualitative work and conversely areas where empirical confirmation was lacking. It also considers the additional relevant themes that were identified. Finally matters that will be explored further within the Contribution and Discussion chapter, following the findings from the quantitative research stage, are identified.

5.8.1 Corporate Name Change Advertising/Promotional Activity

The Brand Name Change Impact model starts with an assumption that corporate name change advertising and promotional activity would moderate but not eliminate the impact of a change in brand name on the consumer. This was broadly supported by the research. In particular efforts by the corporate body appeared to reduce the impact on the rational functions of the brand name. However impact was not completely eliminated as awareness of the corporate name change activity was not universal and accrued investment in consumer awareness of the original brand name required substantial corporate
activity to be overcome. Given the growing fragmentation of the media available for customer communication this is likely to become an increasing issue for businesses wishing to communicate change in brand name.

Less expected was the discovery that corporate name change marketing activity could have a negative impact on some consumers, particularly regarding the relationship function of the brand name, if handled inappropriately. The dilemma for corporations is that, whilst most participants wished to be provided with the reasoning behind a change in name (e.g. “That’s one, where you think what, why, why on earth have they changed that? (P01)”), where a consumer is not comfortable with this reasoning the negative impact of the name change could actually increase, as demonstrated in Sections 5.7.1.3 and 5.7.2.2. In terms of the Brand Name Change Impact model the inclusion of corporate advertising/promotional name change activity as a key intermediary variable appears appropriate.

5.8.2 Brand Name Functions

Of clear importance was empirical support for the various functions performed by the brand name element. Participants were able to provide a variety of examples that demonstrated how the brand name element performed rational, symbolic, relationship and habitual functions for them. The approach of focusing on name change examples was fundamental for the provision of these findings. It provided strong empirical support that these roles were performed specifically by the brand name element, rather than by the brand entity. The findings also suggested that different specific name changes have different impacts. This is consistent with particular brand names being associated with the provision of particular combinations of functions.

An additional theme that emerged from the qualitative work was the discovery that much of the symbolic role performed by the brand name was the creation of the consumer rather than the corporation. It should not be forgotten that the participants within the research were not necessarily representative of consumers in general because of the selection criteria employed. Accordingly it
could be argued that brand name changes that occur for products where a consumer has created a symbolic role for the brand name may be those that cause the most impact and therefore this is why this finding has occurred within the qualitative research. Nevertheless it is still an important finding due to its inclusion of the consumer at the heart of the brand function and value creation process. The implications of this are considered further within the Contribution and Discussion chapter.

As far as the Brand Name Change Impact model is concerned, its assumption that a change in brand name would have an impact on these various brand name functions was given empirical support.

5.8.3 Consumer Brand Name Value

The construct that follows within the Brand Name Change Impact model is that of Consumer Brand Name Value and the assumption contained within the model is that changes to the functions performed by brand name would lead to changes in the brand name value received by the consumer. Obtained empirical evidence provided support for this relationship for many of the participants. It was also suggested in the findings that the impact of a change in name on consumer brand value tends to diminish over time. This is likely to be because the brand name change impact on the functions of the brand name, in particular on its rational functions, reduces with time. An interesting discovery was the regular use of translation strategies to minimise the impact of a change in brand name and this is considered further within the Contribution and Discussion chapter in Section 7.2.2.7.

The key implication that results from the empirical evidence that a change in brand name can lead to a change in consumer brand value is that it logically follows that the brand name element can be a determinant of consumer brand value.
5.8.4 Attitude towards Brand Purchase

Although this is a distinct variable within the Brand Name Change Impact model from the Brand Purchase Behaviour variable it was difficult in practice to separate findings relating to purchase behaviour from those relating to attitude to purchase. Similarly behavioural intention and behaviour proved difficult to separate in the context of a retrospective qualitative empirical study. For these reasons it may be more appropriate to consider findings for these variables together.

The Brand Name Change Impact model assumes that a change in consumer brand name value will lead to a change in the attitude towards brand purchase. Empirical evidence obtained for this relationship was weaker than obtained for other constructs within the model. There appeared to be two reasons for this. Firstly some participants reported that only a limited change in consumer brand value had resulted from the name change. Secondly some participants reported limited impact because they were satisfied that the underlying utilities of the product had not altered. If product utilities provide the major part of the value that a consumer receives from a product then even a large reduction in brand value will have a relatively small impact on the total value that a consumer receives from the product. In such circumstances the impact on attitude to brand purchase would be expected to be limited.

As this part of the research project is qualitative in nature it is not the most appropriate arena for detailed discussion of quantitative matters. This will be addressed in the next section of the research. Nevertheless it highlights the point that branding theory tends to under-emphasise aspects of the product that are not closely associated with branding. As stated in Section 5.7.8.2 the underlying utilities of a product are sometimes regarded as falling outside the brand within the literature. However they may be fundamental to the determination of the attitude towards brand purchase. This will be considered further in the Contribution and Discussion chapter, incorporating the findings from the quantitative research stage.
5.8.5 Brand Purchase Behaviour

There were examples provided of a change in brand name leading to a material change in brand purchase behaviour. Taking findings from Sections 5.8.4 and 5.8.5 together provides a degree of empirical support for the relevant relationships assumed within the Brand Name Change Impact model.

The key implication that results from empirical evidence that a change in brand name can lead to a change in brand purchase behaviour is that it logically follows that the brand name element can be a determinant of brand purchase behaviour.

5.8.6 Attitude towards Closest Substitute Product

Evidence from the qualitative interviews indicated that the perceived lack of a close substitute was often a key factor in determining whether a consumer continued to purchase a brand after its name had changed. This suggests a potential explanation for why brand name change only had an impact on purchase behaviour for some of the participants. These findings also provided a degree of confirmation for its inclusion as a variable within the Brand Name Change Impact model.

5.8.7 Implications

Overall the qualitative research provided empirical support for the Brand Name Change model developed in Chapter 4.

Although this model is concerned with a change in brand name it logically follows that the variables in the model must have general relevance for the brand name element. In other words empirical evidence that a change in brand name may lead to a change in brand value must mean that the brand name is a factor in the determination of brand value. Similarly if a change in brand name leads to a change in the brand functions that it performs then it logically follows that the brand name element must perform these functions.
It should be recalled from Section 1.2.3 that the focusing of the research on changes to brand name did not mean that the objective of the research was primarily concerned with better understanding of the name change process. These empirical findings clearly have wider significance in terms of the overall objective of gaining greater understanding of consumer brand name value and thereby addressing the first of the Research questions from Section 1.3, which forms a key part of the overall Research objective. This will be considered further in the Contribution and Discussion chapter taking account of the findings from the quantitative research, which is the subject of the following chapter.

This Chapter formed the basis for a paper published in the European Journal of Marketing, included as Appendix 18.
6 Third Stage-Empirical Exploration of Brand Name Importance

6.1 Introduction

This Chapter covers the final stage of the research, as previously discussed in Section 3.6.3. The objective of this stage of research is discussed in Section 6.2. This is followed in Section 6.3 by consideration of the overview and justification of the approach adopted to meet this objective. Section 6.4 presents details of the experimental study performed with the findings summarised in Section 6.5, in the context of the overall research objective.

6.2 Objective of Research Stage

The primary objective of this stage of the research was to gain greater understanding of the importance that the brand name of established products plays for consumers and the implications for their behaviour. This is one of the key research questions discussed in Section 1.3.

The previous two stages of the research explored the various roles that the brand name of established products can perform. However in order to meet the overall research objective it is important that these findings are placed in some sort of quantitative context. In other words the implications of the brand name performing a variety of roles to consumers are very different if the brand name element is of little overall importance, compared to a position where the brand name element carries significant importance.

The various quotations in Section 1.2.1 by de Chernatony and McDonald, Aaker and Keller should be brought to mind. These strongly suggest that general importance of the brand name element should be able to be empirically demonstrated. The previous stage of research did identify examples of the brand name element assuming significant importance to a consumer. However, as discussed in Section 5.4.7 it must be recognised that the selection criteria employed for participants within that research stage means that these findings
should not be assumed to be generalisable. For that reason a different approach was adopted for this stage of research.

6.3 Overview and Justification of Adopted Approach

6.3.1 Overview

In order to explore the overall importance of the brand name element and meet the research objective for this stage, participants took part in a face to face experimental study. This employed the technique of conjoint analysis and was supported through the use of Sawtooth SSI software. The results from the conjoint analysis were subsequently statistically analysed using SPSS16 software.

The main purpose of this experiment was the acquisition of the relative monetary value for a current brand name held by an individual, based on their first choice branded product in a selected product category. As it was expected that there would be differences by individual, the experiment was developed to be carried out by multiple participants.

6.3.2 Justification

6.3.2.1 Reasoning behind Use of Conjoint Analysis

One of the challenges facing researchers attempting to look at the importance of an attribute of a product (such as its brand name) is the identification of a technique that can be used to measure this empirically. Conjoint analysis is a technique that is primarily used to identify the relative importance that consumers place on different attributes of an item under study, typically a product or brand (Malhotra and Birks, 2007). Its essential feature is that research participants are directed to compare products made up of attributes (e.g. size, colour) with different levels (e.g. different sizes, different colours). Statistical techniques are then used to determine the relative importance of each attribute and the importance of level within each attribute. It employs a decompositional approach, based on a view that consumers cannot directly state how much they value separate features of a product if this information is
explicitly sought but this can be “teased” out through the use of an indirect approach (Orme, 2006: p.25).

Since development in the 1970s (Green and Wind, 1975) conjoint analysis has grown in importance and has been employed within many academic studies within and outwith the marketing domain (Dickson, 2005; Thomas-Miller et al., 2000; Carroll and Green, 1995; Vriens, 1994).

The reason why a decompositional technique, such as conjoint analysis, is of importance for this particular research study is that it offers an approach for the exploration of the importance of the brand name element for established products and services. In essence it can be used to investigate the importance of the current brand name attribute relative to the current price attribute. Through calculating how much extra a consumer would be prepared to pay as a trade off for keeping the current brand name of a product unchanged the relative monetary value of the current brand name for the consumer can be obtained.

If the brand name element of established products is indeed of importance to consumers, through the provision of significant brand value, then it would be expected that consumers would be prepared to incur a significant increase in the price for a product in order to keep the brand name of the product unchanged. On the other hand if the brand name element offers little in the way of brand value then consumers would be expected to be unwilling to suffer an increase in price in order to maintain the current brand name.

Expressing the worth of brand name in relative monetary value is not the only theoretical measurement approach available; for example measures have been suggested based on brand awareness or “utiles”; (a theoretical measure representing utility) (Orme, 2006). However it should be appreciated that the specific measure used is actually of minor importance as it is essentially a means to an end in order to satisfy the research objective.
The main alternative to conjoint analysis consists of the self-explicated approach (Sattler and Hensel-Borner, 2000). This would attempt to obtain a measure of the importance of a product attribute through direct enquiry of the participant. This type of approach was rejected for this experimental research because of two inherent weaknesses. Firstly approaches that involve asking participants directly how much they value the brand name element of a brand entity are problematic, because people tend to find it difficult to consider the brand name element in isolation. On the other hand conjoint analysis is supportive of a brand name change approach which can, as discussed in Chapter 1, achieve a high degree of isolation of the brand name element for analysis. Secondly approaches that directly ask consumers for the importance that they place on the brand name element have demand bias issues. These can be minimised with the use of conjoint analysis as this obtains the desired information in a more covert and less obvious manner.

6.3.2.2 Detailed Methodological Justification

This section considers the detailed methodological justification for the use of conjoint analysis in this research study. Section 6.3.2.2.1 details how the assumption of the additive nature of product value permits the impact of a change in brand name to be theoretically expressed in relative monetary value. Section 6.3.2.2.2 discusses how conjoint analysis estimates consumer value functions and thereby enables actual relative monetary valuations of brand name change to be made.

6.3.2.2.1 Assumption of Additive Nature of Product Value

The use of the technique of conjoint analysis is premised on the assumptions of Multiattribute Utility Theory. This postulates that the value \(^7\) from a product is an additive function of the specific levels of its various elements or attributes (Herrmann et al., 2000). In other words the value a consumer receives from a product comes in part from its functional use attribute, part from its brand name, part from its packaging and so on.

\(^7\) Value could alternatively be described as utility, equity or preference.
This can be represented mathematically as:

\[ Vp = \sum_{a=1}^{n} VAa \]  

(Equation 2)

where \( Vp \) is the total value of the product and \( VAa \) is the value from attribute \( a \) where there are \( n \) attributes.

The value obtained from each individual attribute is assumed to be determined by its level. For example the levels for the size of a pack of potato crisps could be 25g, 30g and 35g, with value expected to increase as the size level increases. Levels may be quantitative in nature, such as in the above potato crisp example or alternatively qualitative. In other words for the attribute of product packaging the qualitative levels could be current packaging and revised packaging.

In this research experiment the two key product attributes of interest are brand name and price. Following Equation 2 it can therefore be assumed that the value of a product \( (Vp) \) for a participant in the experiment can be expressed as:

\[ VA(brand \ name) + VA(price) + VA_3 + VA_4 + ... + VA_n \]  

(Equation 3)

where the value of the brand name and price attributes will be determined by their respective levels. Equation 3 provides an example of a consumer value (or utility) function.

Following Equation 3 the marginal value from a current brand name compared with a new brand name can be obtained through the comparison of

\[ Vp_1 = VA(current \ brand \ name) + VA(existing \ price) + VA_3 + VA_4 + ... + VA_n \]

with

\[ Vp_2 = VA(new \ brand \ name) + VA(existing \ price) + VA_3 + VA_4 + ... + VA_n \]

In other words marginal impact on value from the brand name change

\[ = Vp_1 - Vp_2 \]  

(Equation 4)
Similarly the marginal value from the current price compared with a new price can be obtained through the comparison of

\[ V_{p1} = VA(\text{current brand name}) + VA(\text{existing price}) + VA_3 + VA_4 \ldots VA_n \]

with

\[ V_{p3} = VA(\text{current brand name}) + VA(\text{new price}) + VA_3 + VA_4 \ldots VA_n \]

In other words the marginal impact on value from the price change

\[ = V_{p1} - V_{p3} \quad \text{(Equation 5)} \]

By rearranging Equations 4 and 5 the marginal value from a change in brand name can therefore be expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Marginal value from price change}^* &\left( \frac{V_{p1} - V_{p2}}{V_{p1} - V_{p3}} \right) \\
\text{Marginal value from price change}^* &\left( \frac{V_{p1} - V_{p2}}{V_{p1} - V_{p3}} \right) \quad \text{(Equation 6)}
\end{align*}
\]

Assuming that there is a constant relationship between change in price and change in value then if \( V_{p1}, V_{p2} \) and \( V_{p3} \) are known the impact of a brand name change can be obtained as the equivalent of a particular change in price. For example the impact of a change in brand name might be calculated as being equivalent to a 6% increase in price. Note that in Equation 6 \( (V_{p1} - V_{p2}) \) is divided by \( (V_{p1} - V_{p3}) \). This means that the issue of the unit of measurement of consumer product value disappears, as it becomes a numerical fraction.

The above demonstrates that, with the assumption of the additive nature of product value, the impact of a change in brand name can be theoretically expressed in relative monetary value provided specific information can be obtained. Section 6.3.2.2.2 describes how conjoint analysis can obtain \( V_{p1}, V_{p2} \) and \( V_{p3} \) through its estimation of consumer value functions, thereby allowing actual relative monetary valuations of brand name change to be calculated.

6.3.2.2.2 Obtaining Consumer Value Functions through Conjoint Analysis
The principal approach employed by conjoint analysis is the obtaining of relative preferences for theoretical products made up of attributes with different levels. In other words, in reference to Equation 2 above, it seeks to obtain the individual values for every possible combination of attribute and level. In conjoint analysis terminology these individual combinations are known as part-worths (Orme, 2006).

In parallel with the calculation of these part-worths conjoint analysis creates a series of customer value functions for all attribute/level combinations. In an experiment where brand name and price are two of these attributes these obtained value functions provide the information required for a relative monetary valuation of a brand name change, as discussed in Section 6.3.2.2.2.

In theory these relative preferences for theoretical products could be obtained by asking participants to rate all possible attribute/level combinations. However, except for small quantities, this exercise is a difficult task to perform. For example if a product has four attributes that could each have four separate levels there would be 4*4*4*4= 256 combinations requiring rating. For this reason conjoint analysis typically requires participants to consider only a proportion of the possible combinations. Through the use of a selection of well balanced and orthogonal attribute/level options within the participant ratings part-worths and consumer value functions can be estimated, with results similar to those that would result if all possible combinations had been included within the participant rating task.

From the obtained preference data conjoint analysis typically uses Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) “dummy variable” multiple regression to produce an overall regression equation. In other words a solution is found to the mathematical equation which minimises the sum of squares of the errors of all observations. This obtained regression equation is in actuality equivalent to the required series of consumer value functions.

An example is now provided in order to assist understanding. Let it be assumed that participants are providing preference data for product combinations where
two of the attributes are brand name and price. For brand name the two levels considered are current brand name and new brand name and for price the two levels considered are current price and current price+10%. In this case the overall regression equation obtained through the technique of conjoint analysis would consist of:

\[ V_p = b_0 + b_1(\text{current brand name}) + b_2(\text{new brand name}) + b_3(\text{current price}) + b_4(\text{current price+10%}) + \ldots + \epsilon \]

where \( V_p \) = value (or preference) and \( b_0 \) etc consist of the individual part-worths.

From this regression equation the individual consumer value functions \( V_{p1}, V_{p2} \) and \( V_{p3} \), shown as required in Section 6.3.2.2.1, can be obtained, remembering that \( b_1, b_2 \) etc. are variables that take the value of zero if they are not applicable within a particular consumer value function.

For each regression equation obtained an R-squared figure is calculated from the multiple regression to provide a measure of the degree of fit of the regression equation to the observations.

In summary the above demonstrates that as a technique conjoint analysis can produce the consumer value functions which, as demonstrated in Section 6.3.2.2.1, enable a relative monetary value for a change in brand name to be calculated.

**6.3.3 Validity, Reliability and Generalisability**

A number of measures were built into the experiment in consideration of validity, reliability and generalisability.

Churchill (1979) argues that in order to establish the construct validity of a measure the extent to which it correlates with other measures designed to determine the same thing should be investigated. In addition the measure should be assessed to see whether it behaves as expected.
Concerning this first point, as part of the conjoint analysis task the relative value that participants placed on brand name was captured and calculated as quantitative data. In order to provide validation of this data, participants were asked a series of qualitative questions on the same topic after completion of the conjoint analysis task. A high correspondence between this quantitative and qualitative data would provide a degree of validation for the quantitative data obtained through conjoint analysis. This is discussed in Section 6.4.5.1.

Regarding the second point there is no direct meaningful measure that can be used for comparative purposes. However findings from the conjoint analysis relating to the price attribute were assessed to see whether they behaved as expected, using the argument that if one attribute was shown to behave as expected then it would be reasonable for this to be the case for all attributes. This is discussed in Section 6.4.5.2.

Conjoint analysis as a method is regarded as holding validity (Green and Srinivasan, 1990). Demand bias was reduced through not providing participants with the full objective of the experiment until the end.

Reliability was built into the experiment through obtaining multiple data from each participant. These were subsequently statistically assessed for consistency.

A wide cross-section of participants was included with a mixture of different age groups, gender and students/non-students. This allowed the findings to be analysed to see whether they differed for specific demographic characteristics. However the sample of participants was not specifically representative of the UK consumer population.

6.4 Experimental Study

This section provides details of the experimental study carried out employing a recommended format (Hair et al., 2010). In Section 6.4.1 the various design aspects of the experimental study are discussed. This is followed by the key
assumptions behind the experiment. Section 6.4.3 looks at the various conjoint analysis models obtained from the experiment and assesses their goodness of fit. Section 6.4.4 details the results of the experimental study. The final Section looks at validation activity performed.

6.4.1 Design

The key design aspects are the conjoint analysis method and parameters, consideration of product involvement, presentation, data capture and participant/product selection. These are now discussed in turn.

6.4.1.1 Conjoint Analysis Method and Parameters

This section discusses the specific conjoint analysis method that was selected for the experimental study, together with the parameters used within the conjoint analysis. It also details the software that was used.

6.4.1.1.1 Conjoint Analysis Method Selection

Section 6.3.2 includes consideration of conjoint analysis as a technique and how use can be made of consumer preference data. However there are a variety of methods of obtaining this preference data from consumers and a specific method of conjoint analysis had to be selected for the experimental study.

The original conjoint analysis method employed a full profile approach, where all of the relevant attributes of a product are presented at the same time to consumers during the conjoint analysis task. This is the recommended method where there are six or fewer attributes (Green and Srinivasan, 1990), as is the case in this research and was therefore chosen. However within this full profile approach there are other choices that need to be made.

The first major choice is between pairwise comparison and single concept (Orme, 2006). With pairwise comparison research participants are presented with two products with different attribute levels at the same time side by side and asked to state a preference. With a single concept approach participants
are presented with products with different attribute levels one at a time. The major advantage of pairwise comparison for this study is that it ties in well with a brand name change approach. In other words it provides an opportunity for comparison to be made by the research participant between a product with a current and new brand name. Consequently this approach was selected.

The second major choice is between the capture of preference either through the ranking or through the rating of alternatives. It has been argued within the literature that these alternatives produce similar results (Huber et al., 2000). However rating has the advantage of supporting the use of Ordinary Least Squares multiple regression and therefore is appropriate for this research. One standard assumption required is that data captured on a rating scale can be treated as metric data (Gustafsson et al., 2000).

Accordingly pairwise full-profile conjoint analysis using rating was selected as the conjoint method for this research.

Except for problems of a very small scale, conjoint analysis requires the use of computer software. The software used within this research was Sawtooth CiW module and Sawtooth CVA module. These were obtained from Sawtooth Software, who is the world’s leading specialist conjoint analysis software company. Unlike SPSS, who offer conjoint analysis only as an add-in module to its standard product suite, Sawtooth Software focuses exclusively on software for conjoint analysis. Although the statistical techniques employed by the software products of both companies are very similar Sawtooth has the advantage of offering an integrated conjoint analysis experiment development module (CiW), which directly links into a statistical analysis module (CVA). For the above reasons Sawtooth Software was selected.

6.4.1.1.2 Use of Multiple Attributes for Demand Bias Reduction

In order to remove demand bias it was determined that participants would not be presented with product options only involving changes to the attributes of brand name and price but would also be presented with changes to size and
packaging. These additional attributes would not be included within any analysis but would simply serve as “dummy” variables.

6.4.1.1.3 Consideration of New Brand Name Alternatives

In line with the approach presented in Chapter 1, the focus of the experiments centred on scenarios where the brand name of an actual established product was changed. Research participants in this stage of the research would therefore be presented with choices involving a product with its current name and options where this product had been given a new name. This differed from the previous qualitative stage of the research where only brand name changes that had actually occurred were examined, as this current stage investigated theoretical changes in brand name. However the requirement to employ theoretical brand name changes provided the opportunity to increase research output through the inclusion of a variety of types of theoretical new brand names within the experiments.

The three alternative types included were:-

a-change of a single letter to an existing brand name. The reason for including this option is that it reflects the type of name change often seen within the marketplace (e.g. Jif to Cif).

b-a new brand name that bears no resemblance to the existing brand name. Again this is also seen to occur within the marketplace (e.g. Marathon to Snickers). It could be argued that a radical change in name may have greater impact on the consumer than one simply involving a single letter.

c-informing the participant that the brand name was being changed but not declaring what the new brand name would be. The provision of actual new brand names adds a degree of realism to the experimental design. However inclusion of this alternative approach may be useful in the exploration of whether participants’ reported value of the current brand name is impacted by the specificity of the new brand name.
These three alternatives were operationalised as follows. In one third of cases the participant would be informed that the brand name had been changed but was not informed in words or visually what this new brand name was. In one third of cases the brand name was changed by one letter. For example Pepsi was renamed Pipsi. In one third of cases the new brand name was Power/Powers or Power’s. This name was chosen to represent a radical change in brand name. It was chosen for the experiment as it appeared feasible and offered multiple meanings to consumers (e.g. Power as a source of energy, Power as the name of the owner).

6.4.1.1.4 Examination of Importance of Close Substitute Product

One of the variables within the theoretical Brand Name Change Impact model, which was explored within the qualitative research, was the potential role of close substitute product availability in the determination of whether a change in brand name led to a change in brand purchasing behaviour. Bearing this in mind the experimental design incorporated consideration of a participant’s second branded product choice, as well as first choice branded product from their chosen product category.

This enabled a comparison to be made between:

a-the typical difference in value to consumers between first and second choice branded products with their current brand names

b-the difference in value to consumers between the first choice branded product with its current brand name and the first choice branded product with its changed brand name.

If the first difference was generally greater than the second difference then this would provide support for the premise that a reason why consumers tend not to change the purchase behaviour after a change in brand name is not necessarily because they have not been impacted. Rather the reduction in value which they have experienced is less than what would result from switching purchasing to
their second choice product. Consequently remaining with their first choice even after a change in brand name remains their better option.

Accordingly the levels for the brand name attribute within the experimental task were determined to be:

a-first choice branded product with existing name
b-first choice branded product with new name
c-second choice branded product with existing name

6.4.1.1.5 Conjoint Analysis Attributes and Levels

Taking account of all the above considerations the following conjoint analysis attributes/levels matrix was employed.

Table 5 Conjoint Analysis Attributes/Level Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>LEVELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAND NAME</td>
<td>CURRENT FAVOURITE -EXISTING NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>CURRENT + 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>CURRENT +10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACKAGING</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.1.1.6 Factorial Design

Given a attributes/levels matrix a decision needs to be made about which of these combinations are included in the profiles within the experiment, given that a maximum of only thirty different profiles is recommended (Hair et al., 2010). The subset of profiles included needs to be orthogonal and balanced to maximise the quality of data obtained (Orme, 2006).
The factorial design used in the experiment was generated automatically by the Sawtooth CVA software through the selection of the combination of profiles that maximised factorial design efficiency.

6.4.1.2 Consideration of Product Involvement

There is much merit in the approach of research participants considering products for which they are regular purchasers. However one drawback of such an approach is that these products may vary in importance to individuals. It appears reasonable to presume that the value that a participant places on the brand name element might be heavily influenced by this importance. One construct often used to capture this personal importance is that of involvement with the product; for which a standard academic definition is “a person’s perceived relevance of the object based on inherent needs, values and interests” (Zaichkowsky, 1985: p.342).

In acknowledgement of the wide variety of products included within the study it was therefore determined that an involvement score would be obtained for every participant/first choice branded product combination. This would permit exploration of whether this variable was relevant in the subsequent analysis of the importance placed on the brand name element.

In order to achieve this Sawtooth Software CiW was used to create a task that could be presented to participants on a laptop computer. This task was based on the Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) scale, that was developed by Zaichkowsky (1985) and is the standard scale within the domain (Bruner et al., 2005). It is a twenty item seven-point semantic differential scale, measuring the enduring relevance of an object to a person. This is shown in Table 6 on the following page.
Table 6 Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) Scale

Based on how participant perceives particular product
Using seven-point response format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of no concern to me</td>
<td>Of concern to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means nothing to me</td>
<td>Means a lot to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivial</td>
<td>Fundamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not beneficial</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t matter to me</td>
<td>Matters to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninterested</td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfluous</td>
<td>Vital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexciting</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing</td>
<td>Appealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundane</td>
<td>Fascinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonessential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted</td>
<td>Wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needed</td>
<td>Needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.1.3 Presentation and Data Capture

6.4.1.3.1 Involvement Task

The task was developed so that each participant was presented, via a laptop computer screen, with a series of questions about each of these scale items in turn. One word was presented on the left hand side of the screen and the other oppositional word on the right hand side, with the seven point scale displayed beneath. For each item participants were required to select the position on the seven point scale that best represented their perception of which of the two words was most appropriate for their first choice branded product.
For example in the case of the first question a participant who very strongly felt that “important” was the most appropriate word would be expected to select the far left point on the seven point scale. A participant who was indifferent between “important” and “unimportant” would be expected to select one of the points in the middle of the scale. After making a selection the participant would move onto the next scale item question.

The task would be completed after all twenty questions had been presented to and answered by the participant. This information was captured by the Sawtooth CiW software. In addition in order to ensure an audit trail for data analysis the task was developed with the requirement for the participant number to be entered on screen at the commencement of the task. Screenshots relating to the introductory and final screens together with sample involvement scale data capture screens are shown in Appendix 12.

The responses by participants were captured by Sawtooth Software CiW. Data capture for a sample participant is shown below in Table 7.

Table 7 Sample Involvement Scale Data Capture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>q1_r1</th>
<th>q2_r1</th>
<th>q3_r1</th>
<th>q4_r1</th>
<th>q5_r1</th>
<th>q6_r1</th>
<th>q7_r1</th>
<th>q8_r1</th>
<th>q9_r1</th>
<th>q10_r1</th>
<th>q11_r1</th>
<th>q12_r1</th>
<th>q13_r1</th>
<th>q14_r1</th>
<th>q15_r1</th>
<th>q16_r1</th>
<th>q17_r1</th>
<th>q18_r1</th>
<th>q19_r1</th>
<th>q20_r1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sys_UserAgent,Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 8.0; Windows NT 6.0; Trident/4.0; GTB6; SLCC1; .NET CLR 2.0.50727; Media Center PC 5.0; .NET CLR 3.5.30729; InfoPath.2; .NET CLR 3.0.30729) sys_Browser,MSIE 8.0 sys_OperatingSystem,Windows Vista sys_IPAddress,127.0.0.1 sys_UserJavaScript,1 pn,68
pn consists of participant number, which is a unique identifier for each individual participant. In this case this is 68. q1 to q20 consist of answers to the twenty involvement questions with the associated number by each question representing their selected point on the scale. For example for question 1, where the left hand choice was *important* and the right hand choice *unimportant*, this participant chose the first point on the scale which is as close to *important* as is possible to choose.

**6.4.1.3.2 Conjoint Analysis Task**

The task was personalised for each participant based on their first and second choice branded products. Relevant product names and associated visual material were input into the software. To support cases of new brand names, appropriate visuals were created using Adobe Photoshop software. Examples are shown below in Figure 12.

**Figure 12 Examples of Graphics used in Conjoint Analysis Task**

![Examples of Graphics](image)
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This customisation took around one hour per participant. It can be seen that branding visual aspects, with the exception of the brand name, remained unchanged.

The Sawtooth CVA software produced a task consisting of thirty questions that asked participants to compare products with different mixes of attributes and levels. As discussed in Section 6.4.1.1.6 these thirty specific questions were determined by the CVA software as the most appropriate, in order to obtain the part-worths and the consumer value function for each participant. All
participants received the same thirty questions, although they were obviously adapted to relate to their specific product choices.

For each of these thirty questions the participant was presented in written form and visually with two products with different attribute levels. These were presented with one to the left of the screen and one to the right of the screen. In all cases all the attributes of brand name, price, packaging and size were included in both alternatives. Participants were asked to indicate on the screen which of these alternatives they preferred, using a nine-point scale ranging from Strongly Prefer Left through Somewhat Prefer Left, Indifferent, Somewhat Prefer Right to Strongly Prefer Right.

In addition in order to ensure that the appropriate quotas were obtained a number of introductory screens required the participant to provide details of their age and gender. The introductory screens that provided information to the participant about the task, together with an example of all the screenshots presented to a participant, including the thirty conjoint analysis task questions, is provided in Appendix 13.

Questions were presented in a different order to different participants to minimise order effects.

The responses by participants were captured by Sawtooth Software CVA. Data capture for a sample participant is shown on the following page in Table 8.
Table 8 Sample Conjoint Analysis Data Capture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>nski</th>
<th>51264075968</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>438443</th>
<th>1264075394</th>
<th>finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sys_UserAgent, Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 8.0; Windows NT 6.0; Trident/4.0; GTB6; SLCC1; .NET CLR 2.0.50727; Media Center PC 5.0; .NET CLR 3.5.30729; InfoPath.2; .NET CLR 3.0.30729)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sys_Browser, MSIE 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sys_OperatingSystem, Windows Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sys_IPAddress, 127.0.0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sys_UserJavaScript, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS, 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as3, F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sys_CVADesignID_CVA, CVA1_1254144882_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sys_CVAVersion_CVA, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA1, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA4, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA5, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA6, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA7, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA8, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA9, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA10, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA11, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA12, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA13, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA14, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA15, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA16, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA17, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA18, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA19, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA20, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA21, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA22, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA23, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA24, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA25, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA26, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA27, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA28, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA29, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA30, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is data from study pi95. Line 8 captures age and line 9 captures gender (i.e. a 26 year old woman). Lines 10 and 11 are for internal system use and record the conjoint analysis design used by the CVA software.

The following thirty lines consist of the answers to the conjoint analysis task with the associated number representing their selected point on the scale for each question. For example for question 6 the participant chose the 8th position on the scale, which is the point between Somewhat Prefer Right and Strongly Prefer Right.

6.4.1.3.3 Qualitative Validation Task

The final section of the experimental tasks consisted of participants answering a number of qualitative questions. As stated in Section 6.3.3 this allowed the
answers from the quantitative conjoint analysis task to be compared with answers to the qualitative questions, in order to examine the degree of consistency. In addition answers to the qualitative questions provide useful information in their own right. The completion of these questions was treated as an extension of the conjoint analysis task for the participant.

It was therefore determined that the following questions would be asked:

a-“One of the scenarios that you have been asked to consider is a change in brand name. If that were to happen to your favourite brand how do you think that it would impact you?”

b-“Do you think a change in brand name of your favourite product would be a good or bad thing? Why do you think that?”

c-“Do you think a company should change the brand name of its products? Why/Why not?”

In addition the following question was asked:

d-“In the choice questions that you answered the name of your favourite product was changed. Would you have made any different choices if different new brand names had been selected?”

The purpose of this final question was the exploration of the role and importance of the specificity of the new brand name.

Using Sawtooth CiW software these questions were added to end of the conjoint analysis task. All of the qualitative questions are shown in Appendix 13 as they were presented to participants. Participants were required to answer these questions using a free response answer box provided with each question.

---

8 This was worded slightly differently depending on the type of new brand name provided to the participant. (See Section 6.4.1.1.3.)
The responses by participants were captured by Sawtooth Software CVA. Data capture for a sample participant is shown below in Table 9.

Table 9 Sample Qualitative Questions Data Capture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oe5</td>
<td>No, the name doesn't matter to me, it is more to do with the brand itself, so the slight name change didn't matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe1</td>
<td>I think I would still buy the product, as I have done in the past when brand names changed e.g. starburst/opal fruits or oil of ulay/oil of olay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe2</td>
<td>I don't think it is a bad thing for me, but I think it might put some consumers off who are used to a particular brand looking a particular way, and we recognise products based on colours/designs of boxes etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe3</td>
<td>No, because customers might not be able to find it so easily and therefore might change products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative questions were analysed using template analysis and NVivo8 software in a similar manner to that described in Chapter 5. The following coding template was used:

Table 10 Coding Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 BRAND VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 TYPES OF IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 REASONS FOR LACK OF IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 METHODS OF MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC BRAND NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 REASONS FOR IMPORTANCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.1.4 Participant Selection

This section looks at the selection of participants for the experimental study, provides justification for the sampling strategy adopted and offers a summary of the characteristics of the actual participants.

6.4.1.4.1 Sampling Strategy-Overview and Justification

The overall objective of this stage of research was to gain greater understanding of the importance that the brand name of established products plays for consumers. Two key implications for the selection of participants arise from this. Firstly participants should be as representative as possible as the overall UK adult population in order to achieve a degree of generalisability.
Secondly confidence in any findings is likely to increase with the size of the sample.

Set against these, the sampling strategy had to consider a number of constraints. Firstly in order to ensure appropriate control over the experiment it was determined that it needed to be carried out in a face to face setting. Secondly the research had to operate within cost and time budget constraints. Both of these constraints limited the number of participants that could be included within the experiment. The adopted sampling strategy therefore aimed at the achievement of a reasonably sized, reasonably general sample within these constraints and is justified in this context.

Quota sampling was employed, with age and gender used as key quota variables, in order to obtain a mix of research participants. The inclusion of older participants avoided the difficulty in the interpretation of findings, which often occurs with the use of (invariably young) undergraduate based “convenience” samples. Whilst quota sampling is not strictly a probability sampling technique, and therefore subject to various generalisability criticisms in the literature (Bryman and Bell, 2007), it does facilitate the analysis of data by quota variable (e.g. by age). Findings that are consistent regardless of the value of the quota variable are also suggestive of findings that carry a degree of generalisability.

Taking the above into account the number of participants recruited was 100. This could perhaps be considered slightly lower than the ideal (Malhotra and Birks, 2007) but appears perfectly acceptable (Hair et al., 2010) in the context of an essentially exploratory piece of research. It should be recalled that the objective was to gain a greater understanding of the importance of the brand name element for established products (in other words essentially is it nil, small, medium or large?) rather than conclusive quantification (in other words is it, say, 22.6% rather than 21.6%), where a larger participatory size may be required.
Recruitment during the second stage of the research had identified both national magazine advertisements and the University of Manchester’s own volunteer webpage as effective recruitment channels. However the requirement for the experiment to be carried out face to face effectively ruled out national magazine advertisements. In addition as it was perceived that it would be difficult to obtain the entire older age quota of participants exclusively through the University channel, participants were also recruited from existing researcher contacts.

In order to obtain the required number of participants a small reward was offered as compensation for time taken.

6.4.1.4.2 Recruitment via University

A request for volunteers was placed on the University of Manchester volunteer webpage, where it remained for several months. A copy of the wording used is shown in Appendix 14. In order to reduce demand bias the exact objectives of the research were not provided to participants until after completion of the experiment. For this reason the recruitment material was generic in nature, where the brand name element was simply included amongst other brand and product variables that the study planned to examine.

Potential participants were asked to make contact. They were then given further information and asked to provide their first and second branded product choices in a product category in which they were active purchasers. Appointments to perform the experimental study at Manchester Business School were subsequently made and each of the participants was seen individually by the researcher. There were around 150 responses through this channel, leading to seventy participants. The volunteer webpage is not only used by university students but also by administration staff at the university. Accordingly eighteen of the participants recruited through this channel were not students.

6.4.1.4.3 Other Recruitment
The remaining thirty participants were recruited outside of university channels. Generally these participants did not complete the experimental tasks at Manchester Business School, but they were all carried out in a controlled face to face setting; individually and in the presence of the researcher.

6.4.1.4.4 Recruitment Demographics

The demographics of the participants recruited were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE RANGE</th>
<th>n=100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>n=100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECRUITMENT METHOD</th>
<th>n=100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-Student</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Admin</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows a good deal of variety. However there are geographical and socio-economic biases in the sampling frame due to the location of the university in North West England and the higher level socio-economic participants likely to be attracted by many of the recruitment channels.

6.4.1.5 Product Selection

At the time of recruitment participants were asked to provide first and second branded product choices within product categories in which they were active purchasers. These specific choices were included within the experiment for each individual, with the experiment personalised accordingly. The reason for
adopting this approach was to ensure that experiments considered branded products that had relevance to the participants. The alternative of using the same product in the experiment for all participants (e.g. the branded product Stella Artois) would have the major drawback of many participants having no interest in or knowledge of this product and therefore being able to make little meaningful contribution to the research.

A wide variety of product categories was selected by participants as follows:

Table 11 Product Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PRODUCT</th>
<th>NO. TIMES SELECTED</th>
<th>TYPE OF PRODUCT</th>
<th>NO. TIMES SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEVERAGES</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLOTHING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled Water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CLOTHING-TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD GOODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEVERAGES-TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nappies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOODSTUFFS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washing Powder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Cereals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD GOODS-TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PRODUCTS-MISC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baked Beans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Musical Instruments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal Computers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Sauces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoghurt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRODUCTS-MISC.-TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Cream</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STORES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Booksellers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOODSTUFFS-TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL GOODS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>STORES-TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RESTAURANTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Restaurants-General</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confectionery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coffee House</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL GOODS-TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>RESTAURANTS-TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OVERALL TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full details of the product categories, first and second choices by individual participant within the experiment are shown in Appendix 15. This also provides age and gender information.

6.4.2 Key Assumptions

It is assumed that the value of the product can be meaningfully decomposed into the various elements that make up the product. The use of this type of multiattribute approach is common within marketing theory. For example it is used within the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1985). It would be expected that if this decompositional approach is inappropriate then the goodness of fit of the calculated consumer value functions would be poor. A goodness of fit measure was calculated and reviewed as part of the research.

It is assumed that the impact of price on product value is linear. In other words it is assumed that a 10% increase in price will have twice the impact on product value as a 5% increase in price. This is a simplification and is probably less likely to be applicable for large variations in price. For this reason the experiment only considers relatively small price changes (<+/-20%).

It is assumed that information captured using a rating scale can be treated as metric data. It is assumed that scale spacing is similar, given appropriate graphical representation. In other words it is assumed, for example, that the difference in rating between the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} point on the rating scale is the same as that between the 8\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} point.

It is assumed that information obtained from participants in the experimental study is a true reflection of their behaviour within the real world. Whilst steps were incorporated within the experiment to increase its realism, this is unfortunately always a limitation of experimental activity.
6.4.3 Model Estimation, Data Calculation and Model Fit Assessment

After the preparations for the various experimental tasks had been completed the experimental tasks were performed by the participants. This took place over a three month period; in the majority of cases at Manchester Business School. In all cases the tasks were supervised and participants were not informed of the full objectives of the task until completion.

6.4.3.1 Model Estimation and Data Calculation

The CVA system automatically analysed participant responses and calculated part-worths for each attribute level and produced a separate conjoint analysis preference model, using ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression, for each participant. An overall goodness of fit figure was calculated for each participant’s answers.

Example output is shown in Table 12 on the following page with interpretation.
Table 12 Sample CVA System Conjoint Analysis Task Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Nos</th>
<th>R-Sq</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>galaxy</th>
<th>Mcalloy</th>
<th>Cadbury</th>
<th>...with its price increased by 20%</th>
<th>...with its price increased by 10%</th>
<th>...at the current price</th>
<th>...with its price reduced by 20%</th>
<th>...with its price reduced by 10%</th>
<th>...at its current size</th>
<th>...with its size increased by 10%</th>
<th>...with its size reduced by 10%</th>
<th>...at its current packaging</th>
<th>...with new packaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>490831</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.13792</td>
<td>0.41520</td>
<td>-2.06562</td>
<td>1.07702</td>
<td>1.75158</td>
<td>1.57506</td>
<td>3.51574</td>
<td>1.07702</td>
<td>0.15790</td>
<td>-0.34328</td>
<td>1.07702</td>
<td>1.13955</td>
<td>1.13955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous page shows the data from the CVA module software for one sample participant. Column 2 provides the R squared value. Columns 4 to 16 show the part-worths for the various variables contained within the regression equation/value function calculated for this participant. Columns 4 to 6 contain brand name variables. Column 4 shows the existing brand name of the first choice branded product (in this case Galaxy). Column 5 shows the renamed first choice branded product (in this case Calaxy) and Column 6 shows the second choice branded product (in this case Cadbury).

Data calculations were then performed to obtain the information required from this experiment.

It can be seen that the change in the brand name from Galaxy to Calaxy leads to a reduction of

\[ 0.41920 - 1.10792 = -0.68872 \quad \text{Column 5-Column 4} \]

Similarly it can be seen that the second choice branded product (Cadbury) as compared with the first choice branded product (Galaxy) leads to a reduction of

\[ -2.06562 - 1.10792 = -3.17354 \quad \text{Column 6-Column 4} \]

In order to translate these changes into relative monetary values an average impact on value from a change in price is calculated from the part-worths contained in Columns 7 to 12, the price variables.

In other words given that participant value has been calculated at five separate price points, the impact of a 10% change in price can be estimated as the average of:

\[
\begin{align*}
    a & = -0.324565 \quad \text{(Column 12-Column 9)/2} \\
    b & = 0.23241 \quad \text{(Column 8-Column 9)} \\
    c & = -0.61855 \quad \text{(Column 9-Column 10)} \\
    d & = -0.87935 \quad \text{(Column 9-Column 11)/2}
\end{align*}
\]
which is \[ 0.39751 \]

The change in brand name is therefore estimated as the equivalent to an increase in price of

\[ -0.68872 \times 10\% = 17.33\% \]
\[ -0.39751 \]

Similarly the second choice branded product instead of the first choice branded product is equivalent to an increase in price of

\[ -3.17354 \times 10\% = 80.64\% \]
\[ -0.39751 \]

From the conjoint analysis models, obtained for each of the participants, similar data calculations were performed so that relative monetary values were calculated for the impact of a change in brand name and between the first and second choice branded products.

The obtained conjoint analysis model parameters and calculated data for each participant are shown on the following pages in Table 13.
Table 13 Estimated Conjoint Analysis Model Parameters and Calculated Data by Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Involvement Score</th>
<th>r squared</th>
<th>part-worth current name</th>
<th>part-worth current New Name</th>
<th>part-worth 2nd choice</th>
<th>part-worth current price</th>
<th>part-worth price +10%</th>
<th>part-worth price +20%</th>
<th>part-worth price -10%</th>
<th>part-worth price -20%</th>
<th>average price per 10%</th>
<th>price change choice monetary equiv.</th>
<th>monetary equiv.</th>
<th>name change monetary equiv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.67218</td>
<td>1.19021</td>
<td>3.29665</td>
<td>2.11227</td>
<td>1.24970</td>
<td>5.22093</td>
<td>5.65299</td>
<td>-1.32758</td>
<td>4.350%</td>
<td>0.448%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.30884</td>
<td>-0.10201</td>
<td>1.16869</td>
<td>3.70521</td>
<td>3.14490</td>
<td>4.79927</td>
<td>6.56825</td>
<td>-1.07102</td>
<td>13.173%</td>
<td>1.309%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.25654</td>
<td>1.00757</td>
<td>3.06213</td>
<td>2.26036</td>
<td>1.42145</td>
<td>3.43793</td>
<td>4.79547</td>
<td>-0.71615</td>
<td>-11.661%</td>
<td>5.779%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.84370</td>
<td>0.15093</td>
<td>2.38078</td>
<td>0.91841</td>
<td>3.10100</td>
<td>3.11383</td>
<td>3.51411</td>
<td>-0.82436</td>
<td>-6.473%</td>
<td>14.062%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.92918</td>
<td>0.33310</td>
<td>3.25582</td>
<td>1.82894</td>
<td>3.32511</td>
<td>3.81605</td>
<td>4.37914</td>
<td>-0.87761</td>
<td>11.388%</td>
<td>4.596%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.22786</td>
<td>0.51664</td>
<td>3.31614</td>
<td>2.18317</td>
<td>1.22238</td>
<td>4.91578</td>
<td>6.27657</td>
<td>-1.31492</td>
<td>7.563%</td>
<td>5.367%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.97605</td>
<td>-2.25195</td>
<td>2.52386</td>
<td>0.96814</td>
<td>1.40002</td>
<td>3.81605</td>
<td>4.37914</td>
<td>-0.82436</td>
<td>7.582%</td>
<td>63.590%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.24589</td>
<td>-2.58431</td>
<td>1.88454</td>
<td>1.10124</td>
<td>1.24589</td>
<td>2.30649</td>
<td>2.21788</td>
<td>-0.42281</td>
<td>90.589%</td>
<td>53.227%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-0.06094</td>
<td>1.03337</td>
<td>3.62140</td>
<td>2.05478</td>
<td>1.27762</td>
<td>4.84433</td>
<td>5.36620</td>
<td>-1.20846</td>
<td>11.077%</td>
<td>2.021%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.24592</td>
<td>-2.18155</td>
<td>3.29367</td>
<td>1.62181</td>
<td>1.21721</td>
<td>3.17533</td>
<td>3.49367</td>
<td>-0.67294</td>
<td>14.434%</td>
<td>50.506%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.61327</td>
<td>0.67215</td>
<td>3.52700</td>
<td>1.87968</td>
<td>1.32308</td>
<td>4.17432</td>
<td>5.06426</td>
<td>-1.04131</td>
<td>-2.787%</td>
<td>6.251%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.70405</td>
<td>-0.35828</td>
<td>3.70032</td>
<td>3.03434</td>
<td>1.26633</td>
<td>5.66361</td>
<td>5.23365</td>
<td>-1.08573</td>
<td>5.179%</td>
<td>14.963%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.69681</td>
<td>1.21402</td>
<td>3.50653</td>
<td>2.07245</td>
<td>1.20802</td>
<td>4.07395</td>
<td>4.67172</td>
<td>-0.93334</td>
<td>-5.237%</td>
<td>-0.064%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.73446</td>
<td>-0.44359</td>
<td>4.41623</td>
<td>2.56794</td>
<td>1.39463</td>
<td>4.76901</td>
<td>5.21269</td>
<td>-1.02753</td>
<td>-3.307%</td>
<td>17.890%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.10186</td>
<td>0.44602</td>
<td>2.66489</td>
<td>1.57759</td>
<td>1.22629</td>
<td>3.62030</td>
<td>3.79058</td>
<td>-0.83121</td>
<td>1.497%</td>
<td>9.387%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.05762</td>
<td>0.52020</td>
<td>4.29891</td>
<td>3.75240</td>
<td>1.31334</td>
<td>4.52163</td>
<td>6.08798</td>
<td>-0.78914</td>
<td>3.240%</td>
<td>10.051%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.44205</td>
<td>0.39795</td>
<td>3.64702</td>
<td>1.57140</td>
<td>1.16367</td>
<td>4.23700</td>
<td>3.92430</td>
<td>-1.01148</td>
<td>7.134%</td>
<td>7.570%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.08505</td>
<td>-0.13817</td>
<td>3.03410</td>
<td>1.99517</td>
<td>1.29256</td>
<td>3.89158</td>
<td>5.10079</td>
<td>-0.95013</td>
<td>12.709%</td>
<td>15.058%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.98847</td>
<td>1.50637</td>
<td>2.62595</td>
<td>2.26265</td>
<td>1.31667</td>
<td>3.71540</td>
<td>3.39256</td>
<td>-0.62267</td>
<td>5.271%</td>
<td>-3.047%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.77968</td>
<td>0.75842</td>
<td>3.47833</td>
<td>1.82895</td>
<td>1.32535</td>
<td>4.48721</td>
<td>5.22270</td>
<td>-1.15173</td>
<td>4.738%</td>
<td>4.922%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.77749</td>
<td>-1.57008</td>
<td>2.19381</td>
<td>1.66936</td>
<td>1.29746</td>
<td>2.94436</td>
<td>4.12319</td>
<td>-0.67197</td>
<td>7.738%</td>
<td>42.674%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.37444</td>
<td>-0.81579</td>
<td>2.95207</td>
<td>2.31501</td>
<td>1.18150</td>
<td>4.05580</td>
<td>4.58932</td>
<td>-0.86118</td>
<td>18.068%</td>
<td>23.193%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-0.05924</td>
<td>-0.43563</td>
<td>2.47889</td>
<td>2.05264</td>
<td>1.17065</td>
<td>3.01338</td>
<td>4.01222</td>
<td>-0.59538</td>
<td>20.657%</td>
<td>26.979%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>1.49187</td>
<td>1.38078</td>
<td>1.02517</td>
<td>4.39738</td>
<td>3.02302</td>
<td>1.49187</td>
<td>4.51116</td>
<td>6.07385</td>
<td>-0.94478</td>
<td>1.176%</td>
<td>4.940%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1.15229</td>
<td>0.86330</td>
<td>1.42702</td>
<td>3.66257</td>
<td>2.95414</td>
<td>1.15229</td>
<td>3.95889</td>
<td>4.99241</td>
<td>-0.7312</td>
<td>3.952%</td>
<td>-3.757%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1.32500</td>
<td>0.88685</td>
<td>1.53480</td>
<td>2.54326</td>
<td>2.20565</td>
<td>1.32500</td>
<td>2.83513</td>
<td>3.90256</td>
<td>-0.36707</td>
<td>11.937%</td>
<td>-5.716%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1.23842</td>
<td>-0.26166</td>
<td>0.13852</td>
<td>3.37608</td>
<td>2.50212</td>
<td>1.23842</td>
<td>3.70458</td>
<td>4.81375</td>
<td>-0.74753</td>
<td>20.067%</td>
<td>14.714%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>1.26535</td>
<td>1.00612</td>
<td>-0.62357</td>
<td>2.89493</td>
<td>2.01264</td>
<td>1.26535</td>
<td>3.95889</td>
<td>4.99241</td>
<td>-0.58493</td>
<td>4.432%</td>
<td>32.293%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1.30387</td>
<td>0.31393</td>
<td>-1.70821</td>
<td>3.53525</td>
<td>3.45132</td>
<td>1.30387</td>
<td>5.15343</td>
<td>5.28153</td>
<td>-0.92274</td>
<td>10.728%</td>
<td>32.643%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1.29656</td>
<td>1.42361</td>
<td>0.17871</td>
<td>2.24697</td>
<td>1.22956</td>
<td>1.29656</td>
<td>2.88145</td>
<td>3.24697</td>
<td>-0.65677</td>
<td>-1.934%</td>
<td>17.020%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1.23436</td>
<td>0.86070</td>
<td>-1.39363</td>
<td>2.59244</td>
<td>2.23419</td>
<td>1.23436</td>
<td>3.35068</td>
<td>3.55051</td>
<td>-0.56864</td>
<td>6.571%</td>
<td>46.215%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1.25056</td>
<td>1.27218</td>
<td>0.13667</td>
<td>2.90820</td>
<td>0.91579</td>
<td>1.25056</td>
<td>2.75823</td>
<td>3.70820</td>
<td>-0.76782</td>
<td>-0.282%</td>
<td>14.507%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1.29524</td>
<td>0.64626</td>
<td>-1.98709</td>
<td>1.96898</td>
<td>1.29524</td>
<td>3.70458</td>
<td>4.81375</td>
<td>2.64272</td>
<td>-0.6734</td>
<td>9.637%</td>
<td>48.743%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1.17523</td>
<td>0.30443</td>
<td>1.20258</td>
<td>2.85646</td>
<td>2.00050</td>
<td>1.17523</td>
<td>3.95889</td>
<td>4.99241</td>
<td>-0.82354</td>
<td>4.444%</td>
<td>9.062%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>1.26340</td>
<td>1.18010</td>
<td>1.32362</td>
<td>2.89667</td>
<td>1.63225</td>
<td>1.26340</td>
<td>3.95889</td>
<td>4.99241</td>
<td>-0.78293</td>
<td>3.772%</td>
<td>34.786%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1.28720</td>
<td>0.93766</td>
<td>0.54089</td>
<td>2.92741</td>
<td>1.64384</td>
<td>1.28720</td>
<td>3.84545</td>
<td>4.39408</td>
<td>-0.82354</td>
<td>4.444%</td>
<td>9.062%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1.26575</td>
<td>0.97040</td>
<td>-1.45772</td>
<td>2.85646</td>
<td>2.28873</td>
<td>1.26575</td>
<td>3.96469</td>
<td>4.17724</td>
<td>-0.78293</td>
<td>3.772%</td>
<td>34.786%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1.21534</td>
<td>1.04192</td>
<td>1.12168</td>
<td>2.96080</td>
<td>2.26621</td>
<td>1.21534</td>
<td>3.82149</td>
<td>4.67651</td>
<td>-0.82147</td>
<td>2.111%</td>
<td>1.140%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.20539</td>
<td>-0.66197</td>
<td>-1.03301</td>
<td>1.36653</td>
<td>1.20539</td>
<td>3.95889</td>
<td>4.99241</td>
<td>-0.82147</td>
<td>2.111%</td>
<td>1.140%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1.35315</td>
<td>1.07847</td>
<td>-0.41723</td>
<td>4.56131</td>
<td>2.94310</td>
<td>1.35315</td>
<td>5.27359</td>
<td>7.20537</td>
<td>-1.31415</td>
<td>2.090%</td>
<td>13.472%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1.35603</td>
<td>1.20755</td>
<td>1.06774</td>
<td>3.81338</td>
<td>2.23260</td>
<td>1.35603</td>
<td>4.65150</td>
<td>6.68004</td>
<td>-1.27023</td>
<td>1.169%</td>
<td>2.270%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1.16624</td>
<td>0.80099</td>
<td>-0.33029</td>
<td>3.71108</td>
<td>1.75199</td>
<td>1.16624</td>
<td>4.64072</td>
<td>4.60946</td>
<td>-1.15259</td>
<td>3.169%</td>
<td>12.984%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>1.17973</td>
<td>1.13406</td>
<td>0.70282</td>
<td>2.53774</td>
<td>1.79897</td>
<td>1.17973</td>
<td>4.64096</td>
<td>5.45602</td>
<td>-1.24503</td>
<td>0.367%</td>
<td>3.830%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1.28073</td>
<td>-0.52188</td>
<td>-1.07898</td>
<td>1.59792</td>
<td>1.47775</td>
<td>1.28073</td>
<td>1.87469</td>
<td>1.18178</td>
<td>-0.06438</td>
<td>279.979%</td>
<td>366.507%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1.40515</td>
<td>-0.49370</td>
<td>-0.97706</td>
<td>2.96029</td>
<td>2.17780</td>
<td>1.40515</td>
<td>4.68414</td>
<td>4.99636</td>
<td>-1.06649</td>
<td>17.805%</td>
<td>22.337%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1.28656</td>
<td>0.77825</td>
<td>-2.90347</td>
<td>1.32693</td>
<td>0.76615</td>
<td>1.28656</td>
<td>1.41210</td>
<td>3.66945</td>
<td>-0.45935</td>
<td>11.336%</td>
<td>91.217%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1.29934</td>
<td>0.95253</td>
<td>-0.77987</td>
<td>3.87142</td>
<td>2.36431</td>
<td>1.29934</td>
<td>5.06418</td>
<td>4.90641</td>
<td>-1.12585</td>
<td>3.080%</td>
<td>18.468%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1.21358</td>
<td>0.22222</td>
<td>-1.09678</td>
<td>3.04760</td>
<td>2.83097</td>
<td>1.21358</td>
<td>4.17532</td>
<td>6.17634</td>
<td>-0.95643</td>
<td>10.365%</td>
<td>24.156%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1.25209</td>
<td>0.58237</td>
<td>1.71806</td>
<td>3.50222</td>
<td>2.65124</td>
<td>1.25209</td>
<td>3.93666</td>
<td>4.50222</td>
<td>-0.72762</td>
<td>9.204%</td>
<td>-6.404%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1.40594</td>
<td>1.57147</td>
<td>-0.47221</td>
<td>3.47489</td>
<td>1.46033</td>
<td>1.40594</td>
<td>5.12472</td>
<td>5.53314</td>
<td>-1.432</td>
<td>-1.156%</td>
<td>13.116%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1.16475</td>
<td>0.78241</td>
<td>0.05511</td>
<td>3.04960</td>
<td>2.12357</td>
<td>1.16475</td>
<td>3.39380</td>
<td>4.51626</td>
<td>-0.7365</td>
<td>5.191%</td>
<td>15.066%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1.30540</td>
<td>1.43186</td>
<td>-0.31158</td>
<td>3.92250</td>
<td>1.86427</td>
<td>1.30540</td>
<td>3.71407</td>
<td>5.13961</td>
<td>-0.94173</td>
<td>-1.343%</td>
<td>17.170%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1.17246</td>
<td>0.88528</td>
<td>0.82611</td>
<td>2.58032</td>
<td>1.39974</td>
<td>1.17246</td>
<td>3.70213</td>
<td>4.01813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1.17251</td>
<td>1.64973</td>
<td>0.37654</td>
<td>4.28763</td>
<td>2.71944</td>
<td>1.17251</td>
<td>5.38914</td>
<td>7.20275</td>
<td>-1.42121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>1.24423</td>
<td>0.71742</td>
<td>-1.02057</td>
<td>2.84009</td>
<td>2.27163</td>
<td>1.24423</td>
<td>3.20854</td>
<td>3.63595</td>
<td>-0.53319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1.15678</td>
<td>0.61847</td>
<td>-0.78850</td>
<td>3.58917</td>
<td>1.52510</td>
<td>1.15678</td>
<td>3.20721</td>
<td>3.72445</td>
<td>-0.74036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1.17533</td>
<td>1.31508</td>
<td>-2.37122</td>
<td>0.39624</td>
<td>0.49934</td>
<td>1.17533</td>
<td>0.84738</td>
<td>0.79257</td>
<td>-0.03129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1.39584</td>
<td>1.41947</td>
<td>-2.22874</td>
<td>2.94857</td>
<td>1.96671</td>
<td>1.39584</td>
<td>4.08065</td>
<td>4.01461</td>
<td>-0.85583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1.35196</td>
<td>0.42971</td>
<td>-1.41324</td>
<td>2.17416</td>
<td>1.37971</td>
<td>1.35196</td>
<td>2.40832</td>
<td>2.30902</td>
<td>-0.37679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>1.25833</td>
<td>1.30632</td>
<td>-1.47358</td>
<td>2.55215</td>
<td>1.87621</td>
<td>1.25833</td>
<td>2.88739</td>
<td>3.14029</td>
<td>-0.48804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1.29760</td>
<td>0.82995</td>
<td>-1.02602</td>
<td>2.80008</td>
<td>2.24253</td>
<td>1.29760</td>
<td>3.51052</td>
<td>4.88989</td>
<td>-0.76075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1.28994</td>
<td>0.08599</td>
<td>-1.24606</td>
<td>3.49153</td>
<td>2.23784</td>
<td>1.28994</td>
<td>3.61348</td>
<td>4.15819</td>
<td>-0.70244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1.18951</td>
<td>1.23384</td>
<td>-0.04078</td>
<td>1.72336</td>
<td>1.12185</td>
<td>1.18951</td>
<td>1.94482</td>
<td>-0.05711</td>
<td>-7.67296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1.07843</td>
<td>1.04067</td>
<td>0.91583</td>
<td>3.47553</td>
<td>1.97618</td>
<td>1.07843</td>
<td>4.76418</td>
<td>-0.81397</td>
<td>0.42019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1.11842</td>
<td>1.39803</td>
<td>0.73747</td>
<td>3.35920</td>
<td>2.66486</td>
<td>1.11842</td>
<td>4.09074</td>
<td>5.55831</td>
<td>-0.91146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1.45537</td>
<td>-1.37315</td>
<td>-1.05041</td>
<td>4.36312</td>
<td>3.53829</td>
<td>1.45537</td>
<td>4.06236</td>
<td>3.09078</td>
<td>-0.33544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>1.17841</td>
<td>1.40594</td>
<td>-1.29859</td>
<td>2.07163</td>
<td>2.44695</td>
<td>1.17841</td>
<td>4.58080</td>
<td>-0.40039</td>
<td>-5.68311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1.21085</td>
<td>-1.94833</td>
<td>-1.29490</td>
<td>2.06545</td>
<td>1.02147</td>
<td>1.21085</td>
<td>1.86545</td>
<td>-0.36747</td>
<td>85.97247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1.15354</td>
<td>-0.62326</td>
<td>1.13120</td>
<td>3.64046</td>
<td>1.72854</td>
<td>1.15354</td>
<td>4.24162</td>
<td>4.10771</td>
<td>-0.99754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1.13452</td>
<td>-1.31778</td>
<td>-0.51600</td>
<td>1.72131</td>
<td>0.89801</td>
<td>1.13452</td>
<td>2.45464</td>
<td>-0.37336</td>
<td>65.68248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>1.24915</td>
<td>1.05014</td>
<td>1.00512</td>
<td>2.31384</td>
<td>0.78781</td>
<td>1.24915</td>
<td>4.18979</td>
<td>4.55181</td>
<td>-1.26333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1.26134</td>
<td>0.26257</td>
<td>0.25986</td>
<td>2.75905</td>
<td>2.33914</td>
<td>1.26134</td>
<td>5.30258</td>
<td>3.82575</td>
<td>-1.06141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1.33347</td>
<td>-0.18263</td>
<td>1.16644</td>
<td>2.66999</td>
<td>1.56255</td>
<td>1.33347</td>
<td>4.08156</td>
<td>4.56464</td>
<td>-1.03365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1.28552</td>
<td>-1.19785</td>
<td>-1.33863</td>
<td>2.12154</td>
<td>2.08932</td>
<td>1.28552</td>
<td>2.55377</td>
<td>2.55757</td>
<td>-0.27512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1.28175</td>
<td>0.80357</td>
<td>0.09117</td>
<td>3.15655</td>
<td>1.74904</td>
<td>1.28175</td>
<td>3.68694</td>
<td>4.56779</td>
<td>-0.89523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1.25093</td>
<td>1.10693</td>
<td>1.36225</td>
<td>3.52824</td>
<td>2.35536</td>
<td>1.25093</td>
<td>3.93728</td>
<td>4.42534</td>
<td>-0.79228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1.34194</td>
<td>0.88124</td>
<td>-2.85165</td>
<td>2.42935</td>
<td>1.39056</td>
<td>1.34194</td>
<td>2.62222</td>
<td>2.69602</td>
<td>-0.47718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1.31164</td>
<td>1.36673</td>
<td>0.89540</td>
<td>3.18846</td>
<td>2.67148</td>
<td>1.31164</td>
<td>4.70024</td>
<td>3.68327</td>
<td>-0.80364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1.19568</td>
<td>1.44667</td>
<td>0.70611</td>
<td>2.54585</td>
<td>1.77614</td>
<td>1.19568</td>
<td>3.88375</td>
<td>4.95239</td>
<td>-0.99649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1.19544</td>
<td>0.63688</td>
<td>-1.20567</td>
<td>2.90707</td>
<td>1.86844</td>
<td>1.19544</td>
<td>3.79065</td>
<td>4.10707</td>
<td>-0.84451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1.26364</td>
<td>-1.58467</td>
<td>-0.41840</td>
<td>2.48300</td>
<td>1.86438</td>
<td>1.26364</td>
<td>2.96338</td>
<td>-0.33992</td>
<td>83.79484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.4.3.2 Model Fit Assessment

The calculated R-squared value for the individual participants ranged from 0.58 to 0.94 with a mean of 0.82 and a standard deviation of 0.074. This is shown in Figure 13 below. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic indicates that these values are not normally distributed, as significance is less than 0.05. A high negative value for skewness indicates a clustering of values towards the high end of the scale. A high positive value for kurtosis shows a peaked distribution around the mean.

Figure 13 Distribution of R-squared Scores
Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov a</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rsquared</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rsquared</td>
<td>.81818</td>
<td>.007415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>.83900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.074153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.954</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis was subsequently performed to examine whether the R-squared value was linked to other variables. In particular relationships between the R-squared value and Involvement score, age band and gender were explored. However no statistically significant links were found.

In the case of Involvement score the relationship was investigated using Spearman’s rho (a non-parametric statistic was used as the R-squared variable is not normally distributed). As shown in Figure 14 on the following page the relationship is not statistically significant, as rho is greater than 0.05. (rho=.1, n=100, p=0.925)
Figure 14 Relationship between R-squared Value and Involvement Score

Scatterplot

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Involvement_score</th>
<th>Rsquared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsquared</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the case of age bands the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was performed to compare the R-squared value for the three different age bands. As shown in Figure 15 below there is no statistically significant difference across them, as the significance level is 0.781 which is greater than 0.05 ($\chi^2(2)=0.495$, $p=.781$). The 18-24 age band ($n=34$) has a median value of 0.842, the 25-40 age band ($n=33$) 0.833 and the 40+ age band ($n=33$) 0.84.

Figure 15 Relationship between R-squared Value and Age Band

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ageband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics$^{a,b}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rsquared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: ageband

In the case of gender the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the R-squared value for males ($Md=0.857$, $n=40$) and females ($Md=0.824$, $n=60$). As shown in Figure 16 on the following page there is no statistically significant difference, as the significance level is 0.103 which is greater than 0.05 ($U= 968$, $z= -1.63$, $p= .103$)
**6.4.3.2.1 Commentary**

The R-squared figure obtained for most participants was high and for all participants was respectable (Pallant, 2007). This indicates that a significant degree of goodness of fit exists for the models of consumer preference created by the conjoint analysis for each participant.

A number of implications result from this finding. Firstly it demonstrates that participants were providing answers with a high degree of consistency and not engaging in activities such as always selecting the left hand point on the scale or alternatively simply answering randomly. Secondly it suggests that a high degree of reliability can be placed on the data output from the conjoint analysis task. Encouragement can also be taken from the point that this is the case regardless of age, gender or product involvement.

Given the results of the analysis of the obtained R-squared values it was decided not to eliminate any participants from the results based on their R-squared value.
6.4.4 Results

Quantitative findings and output following SPSS16 analysis are shown below in Sections 6.4.4.1 to 6.4.4.8. Qualitative findings following NVivo8 analysis are described in Section 6.4.4.9.

6.4.4.1 Involvement

Data captured relating to the involvement scale was transferred to an Excel spreadsheet and converted to an overall Involvement score by scoring the response to each of the twenty questions between 1 and 7, as per the Personal Involvement Inventory Scale (Zaichkowsky, 1985). This led to a minimum possible score of 20 and a maximum of 140. A number of the questions required reverse scoring.

The PII involvement score of the participants ranged from 58 to 134 with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 14.9. This is shown in Figure 17 on the following page. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic indicates that these scores are normally distributed, as significance is greater than 0.05. This mean score is ten points higher than that obtained by Zaichkowsky (1985) in her original research. This difference could be rationalised as resulting from asking participants in this research to consider involvement with branded products (e.g. Kellogg’s cornflakes) rather than products (e.g. cornflakes).
6.4.4.1.1 Commentary

As previously discussed analysis of the PII involvement score confirms a wide variation in the degree of involvement between participant and their chosen first choice branded product. This finding supports the inclusion of this involvement variable within the analysis of the importance of the brand name element, so that its relevance can be explored.
6.4.4.2 Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name

The relative monetary value of the current brand name was calculated from the conjoint analysis data through the comparison of the change in consumer value which resulted from the change in name with the change in consumer value which resulted from a change in price. This was calculated for each individual participant.

The distribution of the relative monetary value of the current brand name is shown in Figure 18 below. This distribution has a mean of 20.92 and the standard deviation of 48.18. The median of the distribution is 6.59. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic indicates that these values are not normally distributed, as significance is less than 0.05. A reasonably high value for kurtosis indicates a peaked distribution around the mean.

Figure 18 Distribution of Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name
### Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name Value</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Lilliefors Significance Correction*

### Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Value</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.91788</td>
<td>4.818387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6.59250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>2321.686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>48.183872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-44.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>279.979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>324.642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>3.556</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>14.491</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.4.4.2.1 Commentary

The analysis shows that on average the existing brand name is valued as having the relative monetary value of 20.9% of the existing price of the product. In other words participants on average would be indifferent between the product increasing its price by 20.9% and the product changing its brand name.

However it can be seen from the standard deviation and the shape of Figure 18 that it would be inappropriate to simply consider this finding at the level of the mean but the variability of the relative monetary value of current brand name should be acknowledged and explored.
In particular three separate groups of participants can be identified.

a-Nil Value Group

There are nineteen participants for whom the conjoint analysis suggests that the existing brand name has negative value. For thirteen of these participants the negative value was less than 5% of existing price. For four of the participants it was between 5% and 10% and there were two outliers with greater values.

There are a number of interpretations of this finding. Firstly participants may have had a preference for the suggested replacement brand name. Such a preference would manifest itself in the conjoint analysis data as a calculated negative value for the current brand name. However no specific new name was actually suggested to eight of the nineteen within this group. Secondly this finding might have resulted from inconsistencies in some of the participants’ preference choices. As discussed in Section 6.4.4.2 the average R-squared goodness of fit value was 0.82. However this still grants a degree of discrepancy. There is nothing within a multiple regression approach that forces the value of a variable within the regression equation to be negative or positive. Consequently a participant who in actuality regards the existing brand name as of no importance but also displays a degree of inconsistency within their conjoint analysis task answers may appear to place a small negative value on the current brand name.

Given that, with the exception of a couple of outliers, the negative values within the group are modest this finding appears to be consistent with the identification of a group of participants who place no value on the brand name element.

b-Moderate Positive Value Group

68 participants held a modest positive value for the existing brand name (0 to 30%). For 57 of these participants this value was less than 15% of existing price.
These participants form a distinctive group who place some limited importance on the existing brand name. This group makes up the clear majority of the participants.

c-Substantial Positive Value Group

Thirteen participants placed a substantial positive value on the existing brand name. There is a clear distinction between this group of participants and the Moderate Positive Value Group, as the value placed on the current brand name by participants within this group ranges from over 60% to almost 285% of current price.

Even allowing for some inconsistency in the answers provided, the size of the relative monetary value placed on brand name by this group of participants is such that a high degree of confidence can be placed on this finding.

The next section analyses the relationship between relative monetary value of current brand name and other variables.

6.4.4.3 Relationship between the Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name and Involvement Score

Analysis was performed to explore whether the relative monetary value of current brand name was linked to the Involvement Score. No statistically significant links were found. The relationship was investigated using Spearman’s rho (a non-parametric statistic was used as the Relative Monetary Value of Brand Name is not normally distributed). As shown in Figure 19 on the following page the relationship is not statistically significant, as it is greater than 0.05 (rho=-.045, n=100, p=0.66).
Figure 19 Relationship between Relative Value of Current Brand Name and Involvement Score-(by Correlation)

Scatterplot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Involvement_score</th>
<th>Name Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Name Value | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | -.045 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |                   | .660 | . |
| N             |                   | 100 | 100 |
6.4.4.3.1 Commentary

This finding was somewhat surprising as it appears reasonable to assume that an individual for whom a product holds a high involvement score would be more concerned with the brand name of this product. However such a relationship was not discernible from the statistical analysis. For instance if the Figure 19 scatterplot is examined it can be seen that whilst some of the points representing high relative monetary value of brand name are indeed associated with a high involvement score there are also counter-examples to the left of the figure.

As this result differed from what might be expected a second statistical analysis was undertaken as a double check. This compared the involvement score of the Substantial Positive Value group of participants (as defined in Section 6.4.4.2.1) with the involvement score of all other participants, using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test. As shown in Figure 20 below there was no statistically significant difference between Substantial Positive Value participants (Md=101, n=13) and other participants (Md=101, n=87), as the significance level is 0.704 which is greater than 0.05 (U=528.5, z=-3.79, p=.704).

Figure 20 Relationship between Relative Value of Current Brand Name and Involvement Score (by Brand Name Value Group)

Mann-Whitney Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nvgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-S</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>101.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics(^a)</th>
<th>Involvementscore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>528.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>4356.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Grouping Variable: nvgroup
6.4.4.4 Relationship between the Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name and Age Band

Analysis was performed to explore whether the relative monetary value of current brand name was linked to age.

The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was performed to compare the relative monetary value of current brand name for the three different age bands. As shown in Figure 21 below there was no statistically significant difference across them, as the significance level is 0.235 which is greater than 0.05 ($\chi^2(2)=2.896$, $p=.235$). The 18-24 age band (n=34) has a median value of 4.959, the 25-40 age band (n=33) 9.204 and the 40+ age band (n=33) 6.097.

Figure 21 Relationship between Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name and Age

Kruskal-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.9585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.0970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.5925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4.4.1 Commentary

It might be considered reasonable to assume that concern with brand name would be stronger amongst older consumers, given that the brand name may contain nostalgia value. However age was a variable where no relationship was established statistically with brand name value.
6.4.4.5 Relationship between the Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name and Gender

Analysis was performed to explore whether the relative monetary value of current brand name was linked to gender.

The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the R-squared value for males ($Md=7.3485, n=40$) and females ($Md=5.9560, n=60$). As shown in Figure 22 below there was no statistically significant difference, as the significance level is 0.406 which is greater than 0.05. ($U= 1082, z= .83, p=.406$)

Figure 22 Relationship between Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name and Gender

Mann-Whitney Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.3485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.9560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.5925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4.5.1 Commentary

From the statistical analysis gender does not appear to be of relevance for the determination of the value placed on brand name by consumers.

6.4.4.6 Relationship between the Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name and Type of New Brand Name

As discussed in Section 6.4.1.1.3 different types of new brand name were included within the experiment. Analysis was carried out to see whether this had an impact on the value placed on the current name. It could be argued that where the change in brand name is only one letter (single letter) participants
might regard the change in name as less radical in nature than a *(new name)* brand name and be less prepared to pay a higher price to avoid the change in name. It was uncertain how these two types of new brand name would compare with the change where a new name was not provided *(none given)*.

The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was performed to compare the relative monetary value of current brand name for the three different types of new brand name. As shown in Figure 23 below a statistically significant difference across them was found, as the significance level is 0.011 which is less than 0.05. ($\chi^2(2)=0.8942$, $p=.011$). The *none given* new brand name ($n=33$) has a median value of 3.169, the *single letter* new brand name ($n=34$) 8.4865 and the *new name* new brand name ($n=33$) 9.655.

**Figure 23 Relationship between Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name and Type of New Brand Name**

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Value</th>
<th>Chtype</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>single letter</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.4865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new name</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.5925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However this test is insufficient in itself to demonstrate that all three of the groups are statistically different. For this it is required to perform a series of Mann-Whitney U tests between the three pairs of groups.

The first comparison was between *none given* new brand name ($Md=3.169$, $n=33$) and *single letter* new brand name ($Md=8.4865$, $n=34$). As shown in Figure 24 on the following page a statistically significant difference was found,
as the significance level is 0.024 which is less than 0.05. (U= 381, z= -2.257, p= .024)

Figure 24 Comparison of None Given New Brand Name and Single Letter New Brand Name

Mann-Whitney Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
<th>Name Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>381.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>942.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: chgtype

The second comparison was between none given new brand name (Md=3.169, n=33) and new name new brand name (Md=9.655, n=33). As shown in Figure 25 below a statistically significant difference was found, as the significance level was 0.005 which is less than 0.05. (U= 327, z= -2.789, p= .005).

Figure 25 Comparison of None Given New Brand Name and New Name New Brand Name

Mann-Whitney Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
<th>Name Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>327.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>888.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: chgtype

The third comparison was between single letter new brand name (Md=8.4865, n=34) and new name new brand name (Md=9.655, n=33). As shown in Figure 26 on the following page no statistically significant difference was found, as the
significance level is 0.467 which is greater than 0.05. (U= 503, z= -0.727, p= .467)

Figure 26 Comparison of *Single Letter New Brand Name and New Name New Brand Name*

**Mann-Whitney Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>503.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>1098.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: chgtype

Given the results from these three Mann-Whitney Tests it appears the key difference in the groups is that between where a new brand name was provided within the conjoint analysis experiment (*given*) and where a new brand name was not provided (*not given*). In order to examine the effect size of this difference a final Mann-Whitney Test was carried out between these two groups.

As shown in Figure 27 on the following page a statistically significant difference was found between *not given* new brand name (Md=3.169, n=33) and *given* new brand name (Md=9.41, n=67), as the significance level was 0.004 which is less than 0.05. (U= 708, z= -2.914, p= .004). The effect size is estimated as \( z/\sqrt{N} \) where \( N \) is the total number of cases =\(-2.914/10=\)-.2914. Using the criteria of Cohen (1988) this is considered to be a medium effect size.
### Figure 27 Comparison of *Not Given* New Brand Name and *Given* New Brand Name

#### Mann-Whitney Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Value</th>
<th>chgtypesim</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not given</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.1690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.4100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.5925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Value</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chgtypesim</td>
<td>708.0</td>
<td>1269.0</td>
<td>-2.914</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: chgtypesim

#### 6.4.4.6.1 Commentary

Statistical analysis shows that where a new brand name was provided participants in the conjoint analysis task tended to afford a higher relative monetary value to the current brand name. This can be seen visually in Figure 28 on the following page, where the name value distribution is presented side by side for participants where a new brand name was not given and for participants where a new brand name was given. It should be visually apparent that in the right hand graph there is a general shift in the distribution towards the right hand side of the graph.
The interpretation and implications of this finding are now discussed. In theory it would be expected that the value of a brand name to a consumer should be independent of firstly of whether or not it was to change and secondly the specificity of the new brand name. How can this finding be accounted for, where the value placed on the current brand name appears to increase where a new brand name is provided?

One interpretation is that inclusion of a specific changed brand name within the conjoint analysis task, as opposed to simply stating that there was to be a change in brand name, increased the realism of the task for the participant. This resulted in a more elevated consideration of the value and importance of the current brand name. It could be argued that this more considered approach provides a more accurate measure of current brand name element importance.
6.4.4.7 Comparison of First and Second Choice Branded Products

The first and second choice branded products of participants were included within the conjoint analysis trade off selection tasks. This allowed the relative monetary value of first choice in comparison with second choice to be calculated for each participant. The resultant distribution is shown in Figure 29 on the following page.

This distribution has a mean of 47.102 and the standard deviation of 125.66. The median of the distribution is 16.347. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic indicates that these values are not normally distributed, as the significance is less than 0.05. A high value for kurtosis indicates a peaked distribution around the mean.
Figure 29 Distribution of Relative Monetary Value of First Choice Branded Product compared with Second Choice Branded Product

Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov$^a$</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secchoice</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Lilliefors Significance Correction

Mean = 47.162
Std. Dev. = 125.5651
N = 100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>secchoice</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>16.34700</td>
<td>47.10194</td>
<td>12.566514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var.</td>
<td>15791.726</td>
<td>16.34700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>125.665136</td>
<td>16.34700</td>
<td>12.566514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>-6.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>1139.849</td>
<td>1133.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1139.849</td>
<td>1133.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>7.063</td>
<td></td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>57.949</td>
<td></td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4.7.1 Commentary

This measure estimates the percentage increase in price which would need to occur in the first choice branded product for the participant to be indifferent between their first and second choices. Although the distribution clearly shows a wide range there are some points to note.

Firstly it can be seen that for eight of the participants the second choice product is apparently of more value than their first choice product. However the maximum negative value was 6% and for most of these participants the negative value was less than 1%. Using a similar argument to the one discussed in Section 6.4.4.2.1 this can be rationalised through a general indifference of these participants between their first and second choices and some inconsistency in their answers provided within the conjoint analysis task.

Secondly the distribution shows that for over half of the participants a greater than a 16% increase in price would be required in the price of their first choice product in order for their second choice product to become of greater value to them. For a sizeable minority of participants a price rise of over 50% would be
required. Overall this suggests that for many participants a close substitute for their first choice branded product does not exist.

6.4.4.8 Comparison of the Impact of New Brand Name and the Impact of Second Choice Product

For each participant a comparison was made between the change in value from a change in the brand name of their first choice branded product and the change in value from replacing their first choice with their second choice branded product. The difference was calculated and expressed in relative monetary value with the resulting distribution shown in Figure 30 on the following page.

This distribution has a mean of 26.18 and the standard deviation of 121.942. The median of the distribution is 7.924. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic indicates that these values are not normally distributed, as the significance is less than 0.05. A high value for kurtosis indicates a peaked distribution around the mean.
Figure 30 Distribution of Difference between Impact of New Brand Name and Second Choice Product

Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comp 2nd/new</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Lilliefors Significance Correction
### Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comp 2nd/new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.18406</td>
<td>12.194153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>7.92400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>14869736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>121.941526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-74.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>1178.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1252.864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>8.719</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>82.465</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.4.4.8.1 Commentary

Cases to the left of the origin represent participants where the reduction in value from a change in brand name would be greater than that resulting from substituting their second choice for their first choice. In other words if the brand name of their first choice product did change then it would be preferable for them to switch their purchasing to their second choice product.

In the above distribution 25 participants fall into such a category. This is substantially fewer than the 81 participants discussed in Section 6.4.4.2.1, who placed some importance on the current brand name. In addition it is only for around half of these participants where this difference is material (i.e. >10%).

Assuming that this finding carries validity and generalisability, it provides an answer to the apparent anomaly discussed in Chapter 1; namely how the brand name element could be regarded as important whilst at the same time a change in the brand name does not appear to have a major impact on branded product sales.
6.4.4.9 Analysis of Qualitative Responses

“Sometimes the name makes the brand” [P22].

Findings are summarized under four sections and complement the findings from the previous phase of the research discussed in Chapter 5. Quotations from participants [P] are used to clarify and emphasise some of the findings. Firstly section 6.4.4.9.1 looks at participant perceived impacts from a change in brand name. This is followed by reasons stated by some participants for a lack of impact. Thirdly section 6.4.4.9.3 discusses factors that were considered by participants to moderate the impact of brand name change. Finally in section 6.4.4.9.4 the specificity of brand name is discussed.

6.4.4.9.1 Impacts from Change in Brand Name

Five different types of impact were apparent within the responses.

**Recognition Impact**

One key impact highlighted was the perceived difficulty in product location following a name change. This impact was alternatively articulated as the addition of confusion to the purchase process.

“If it is very well established then I don’t think the name should be changed as people have got so used to saying the current name and a new name would merely confuse them” [P32].

**Risk Reduction Impact**

Participants expressed concerns that the brand might have changed. In particular there was concern that a reduction in quality might have occurred.

“From my experience a change in the product name has very often caused a dramatic decrease in quality or a change in design...which made me to stop (sic) using that product” [P06].

There was also concern raised that a product with a new name might be a fake. The risk reduction impact was regarded as leading to a diminution in the security or comfort from the brand.
Brand Familiarity Impact

Another view expressed was that a name change could interfere with the familiarity of a product, where familiarity was regarded as encompassing more than simply recognition. A quotation from Participant 14 emphasises how a change of name can make the most familiar unfamiliar.

“Cif to me will never be the same as Jif. Same with Marathon becoming Snickers. It’s like having to get to know a whole new product” [P14] [emphasis added].

Participant 34 described how a product might feel unfamiliar and distant after a change in name.

“I believe a company should really consider the consequences before changing the brand name of its products as customers grow accustomed and familiar with them. Therefore, if this is changed, the customers may feel unfamiliar and distant with the store and its clothing” [P34].

Brand Loyalty Impact

Loyalty to the brand was seen as impacted for reasons in addition to those relating to recognition and risk reduction. Participants talked about loyalty being reduced because they did not like the feeling of being manipulated.

“Initially feel irritated that my favourite thing had been messed around with. I want to feel that the product exists in its own right, not as the whim of someone trying to manipulate the market. That diminishes the brand for me” [P49].

There was concern that the product might feel different, even if it was functionally the same and this might also impact loyalty. One participant was concerned that a change in brand name might signal that the brand was going to being targeted at a different type of person. A similar concern was articulated as follows:

“I would feel that it had “left me” somewhat” [P74].

In other words as the brand was seen as being less loyal to the participant, this was reciprocated through reduced loyalty from the participant to the brand.
**Brand Associations Impact**

Many participants responded that they believed that a change in brand name would impact the associations that they held with the brand. Some of the associations were regarded as inherently linked to the specificity of a name, such as a place of origin. Types of corporate associations mentioned included those relating to heritage, tradition, perceived corporate qualities and the product creator. Alternatively brand name associations were seen as consumer created, being of a personal nature such as childhood, nostalgia or other positive personal experiences.

“...I am very used to the current brand name and I like it – I remember my Grandmother using Lurpak and my view of the brand has been coloured by my early memories” [P100].

“...I’m used to the old name, which I’m very likely to recognise well and associate with some good personal experiences” [P06].

In addition to impacts from the loss of existing associations, concerns were expressed about new associations of a new brand name. It was considered that these might be unappealing, “lower the tone” or suggest attraction to a different target market.

“If it was a less attractive name or a tacky name then it would lose lots of its appeal. Brand names are part of the attraction to a store in the sense that certain target markets will avoid the store if the name is seemingly too young/old/dull” [P34].

**Brand Relationship Impact**

One impact from a change in brand name was a weakening of the relationship between consumer and the brand. Participant 08 regarded the name change in itself as a relationship diminisher.

“It seems really silly but I don’t know if I’d want to be seen wearing a brand that changed its name (and put all the effort into changing its name) when it didn’t really need to!” [P08].

For another participant a change in brand name also changed the perception of their role within the relationship.
"It makes me feel like a consumer and I don’t want to be reminded that I am part of the market for that product, I want to “feel” as though I am an individual making my own choices" [P49].

**Impact on View of Corporation**

Unlike the above impact types this primarily refers directly to the corporation rather than the brand. Concern was raised about the reasons why a corporation might want to change the brand name of its product and whether this would be as a result of changes in their ethical stance

*(Writing about brand name change)* “I wouldn’t know what else had changed—perhaps the ingredients or the ethics of the company, which are the reasons I buy the product to begin with” [P95].

or corporate financial weakness

*(Writing about brand name change)* “It also suggests business frailty in either the product or the company. If the product is that good why change the brand name?” [P89].

**6.4.4.9.2 Reasons for Lack of Impact**

Various reasons were provided by some participants for why they considered that they would not be impacted by a change in brand name. These are detailed below under several headings.

**Secondary Role of Name within Branding**

Some participants asserted that the name was an unimportant part of overall branding and therefore brand value would not be impacted by a change in name.

“As Coca-Cola have already established the brand (which incorporates much more than just the name) I believe that any changes to the product’s name would have little impact on me, the consumer. The reputation of the brand is more significant...” [P03].

“Usually though it’s the look that counts so the name doesn’t really matter so much.” [P09].

**Primary Concern with Product Functionality**
Some participants stated that they considered they would not be impacted by a change in brand name because they were only concerned with the functionality or price of a product. This is highlighted by a quotation from Participant 17.

“Whether I used a particular company doesn’t depend very highly on their name – more on the product, value for money and service that they offer” [P17].

As a result of this the brand name element was not perceived as adding any value to the product and therefore any change would be irrelevant.

**Existing Brand Loyalty**

One participant felt that the loyalty that they had already built up with a brand shielded them from any impact from changes in brand name.

**6.4.4.9.3 Moderators of Brand Name Change Impact**

Various factors were suggested by participants as potential moderators of the impact of a change in brand name and these are discussed below.

**Promotion of the Name Change**

Being informed about the name change, either through advertising and promotion or through word of mouth, was seen as an important factor in the reduction of the impact of a change in name.

“As long as I was aware before the change happened...” [P95].

“I would probably choose an alternative brand until I had heard from a friend it was OK, or read/saw some kind of press release reassuring me it is the same as before” [P02].

**Assurance of Unchanged Nature of Product**

Reassurance about the unchanged nature of the product and in particular its quality was considered important.

“If the brand name changes, I need to know that the product itself is going to stay the same.” [P06].

**Adoption of Translation Strategy**
One method for avoiding the impact of a brand name change was the adoption of a translation strategy.

“I would probably refer to the company by their old name instead of their new one in conversations etc.” [P17].

In other words such participants continued to use the original name and ignore the new one, thereby limiting the impact of the name change.

Reason for Change

Some participants stated that they considered impact from the name change could be mitigated if they had been given the reasoning behind it, where this reason was one with which they were comfortable.

“It would bother me less if I felt the brand name had been changed to come into line with Europe rather than America” [P21].

6.4.4.9.4 Specificity of New Brand Name

Only eleven of the participants stated that they would make different conjoint analysis choices based on the actual specificity of the new brand name. A further twelve wrote that it might influence their choices.

For those participants for whom specificity of brand name matters there were a number of factors that were important. For some it was important to like or at least not dislike the new brand name.

“...so long as it doesn’t sound weird and doesn’t ruin the look of the shoes” [P09].

“...if the name was stupid or offensive I wouldn’t purchase it” [P55].

For others the desire was for the name to be as close to the old brand name as possible.

“...depends on how much the brand name changed from its current name...and if it was obvious it was still linked to the old brand name” [P45].

“ARAL-B is very similar to ORAL-B and I believe that I would be able to come to terms with this change very simply. If the name had been changed to something completely
different, then I feel that it would take me longer to trust the new brand as much as I do ORAL-B\textsuperscript* [P46].

6.4.4.9.5 Commentary

The analysis of the answers to the qualitative questions revealed similar themes about the role of brand name of established products to those discussed in Chapter 5. In particular rational, relationship and symbolic functions of the brand name were acknowledged, as were some of the moderating influences on brand name change impact. This is encouraging given that different selection criteria for participants were adopted for the two research stages.

6.4.5 Validation

Two specific methods were employed to validate the results from the conjoint analysis. These are looked at in turn below.

6.4.5.1 Comparison of Quantitative and Qualitative Answers

A key output from the conjoint analysis task was the calculation of the relative monetary value which participants placed on the current brand name element. In order to provide validation of this quantitative data, participants were asked a related qualitative question after completion of the conjoint analysis trade-off questions.

A high degree of correspondence between this quantitative and qualitative data would provide a degree of validation of the conjoint analysis experimental task.

As part of the conjoint analysis task the relative monetary value which participants placed on the current brand name was calculated. From this participants were placed in three quantitative groups

a-Nil: Participants placed no value on the current brand name
(19 participants brand name value \(\leq 0\))

b-Moderate: Participants placed a moderate value on the current brand name
(68 participants brand name value >0 and <30%)

c-Substantial: Participants placed a substantial value on the current brand name
(13 participants brand name value >30%)

After completion of the conjoint analysis all participants were asked to answer the following question:

“If a change in brand name were to happen to your favourite brand how do you think it would impact you?”

Answers to this question were analysed and participants were categorised into three qualitative groups (Nil, Moderate and Substantial). These categories were then compared with the corresponding conjoint analysis task quantitative classification.

The following coding system was used to categorise the answers to the qualitative question.

Participants who answered that it would not impact them were placed into the Nil group.

Participants who answered that impact was highly likely were placed into the Substantial group.

Where there was a high degree of conditionality within the answer provided (e.g. might, probably, little, it would depend) participants were placed in the Moderate group.

Examples of answers coded into these three classifications are shown on the following page:
NIL GROUP

“Personally, I believe that the name of the brand is not of great importance when selecting this product. As Coca-Cola have already established the brand (which incorporates much more than just the name) I believe that any changes to the product’s name would have little impact on me, the consumer. The reputation of the brand is more significant in this instance” [P03].

“I think that if the brand was essentially the same, then it would not impact the way I respond to it greatly. However it would take getting used to the new name but I don’t think that would take too long. I would still purchase the product” [P04].

“I don’t think it would have much of an impact as I know I like the chocolate already, so I doubt it would put me off continuing to buy the product” [P13].

MODERATE GROUP

“It may put me off the product. I’d be wondering if the product itself had changed and would probably choose an alternative brand until I had heard from a friend it was OK, or read/saw some kind of press release reassuring me it is the same as before” [P12].

“I wouldn’t really mind, as long as the quality of the product did not change. However, especially with my example of Coca-Cola, a brand I have grown up with, I may be prepared to pay a small extra amount to see it stay the way it is today rather than see it completely rebranded” [P14].

“I don’t feel it would impact on me too much, the product would still be the same, and it is the high proven quality of the product which makes me favour this brand even though the branding suits my taste as well. I would prefer it if the branding stayed the same and I think I would choose an old pair of ‘Dr Denim’ jeans rather than the rebranded ‘Power’ jeans because I know them and have faith in the product” [P18]

SUBSTANTIAL GROUP

“I don’t think I would buy it, because it is such a well known brand and it would be really weird if it had a name change like this! I would probably carry on wearing my original Nike items for sports because I like the items themselves! It seems really silly but I don’t know if I’d want to be seen wearing a brand that changed its name (and put all the effort into changing its name) when it didn’t really need to!” [P08].

“Very much, names are important” [P70].

“I think I would reconsider buying that product...especially if the name was Fantene...I really didn’t like that name!” [P85]
In general a high degree of correspondence was observed between classifications from the quantitative data and the qualitative data. Overall 74% of participants were consistently classified. The main area of discrepancy consisted of participants classified as Moderate by the quantitative analysis but Nil by the qualitative analysis. Particularly high consistency was observed amongst the Substantial group.

Results are shown in Table 14 below.

Table 14 Comparison of Quantitative and Qualitative Data Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION FROM QUANTITATIVE DATA</th>
<th>NIL</th>
<th>MOD</th>
<th>SUB</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inevitably there is an element of subjectivity relating to the interpretation of the qualitative data. Nevertheless much of the classification, particularly for the Nil and Substantial categories, lacked contentiousness.

It could be argued that complete correspondence between the quantitative and qualitative data might not be expected as the conjoint analysis is based on revealed preference behavioural actions, whilst the qualitative data reflects intention. This might explain the main discrepancies observed and in particular account for those participants who state brand name is of no importance but for whom revealed preference identified their actual behaviour to be different.
Nevertheless overall the analysis of the qualitative data revealed correspondence with data from the qualitative conjoint analysis and therefore provided validity support.

6.4.5.2 Impact of Varying Price Attribute within Conjoint Analysis

The impact of varying the price attribute within the conjoint analysis on calculated consumer value functions was examined. It would be reasonably expected that increasing price would reduce calculated consumer value and reducing price would increase calculated consumer value. To put it another way, all other things being equal, lower priced product profiles should be calculated by the conjoint analysis as preferred to higher priced product profiles.

An examination was carried out of the price attribute part-worths calculated by the conjoint analysis for each of the 100 individual conjoint analysis models. This showed that in every case the average impact of varying the price variable on consumer value was as described above. The calculations are shown in Appendix 16.

The finding that the conjoint analysis technique calculated the impact of price attribute in line with what would reasonably be expected provides a degree of validation for the figures produced by the conjoint analysis for the other attributes; in particular those relating to the brand name attribute.

6.5 Summary of Findings

The main objective of this phase of research was the gaining of greater understanding about the importance of brand name. This is significant in its own right and is one of the key research questions discussed in Section 1.3. It also places the research findings from the previous research stages into context.

This summary of findings highlights what was indicated about the importance of the brand name element from the empirical research. In addition matters that will be explored in the Contribution and Discussion chapter are identified.
6.5.1 Overall Importance of Brand Name Element

The empirical work suggests that the brand name element is of some considerable importance to consumers, not simply for new products as identified in extant research but also for those that are established. This was revealed through obtaining from participants the price that they would be prepared to pay in order to keep the current brand name unchanged. As a headline number this was calculated to be a 20.9% increase in the current price.

It is worthwhile reflecting upon the meaning of this finding. Firstly it is clearly a theoretical calculation. In practice participants would never have the opportunity to display such behaviour in the marketplace, as the price and product choices that can be artificially created with the technique of conjoint analysis do not generally exist in the marketplace. Secondly it is a calculation prior to any corporate activity, such as advertising and promotional activity, which is likely to moderate the impact of any name change. Accordingly it provides a purer value of the brand name of an established product to a consumer.

6.5.2 Variability of Importance of Brand Name Element

Whilst results such as that obtained in this research are often only reported at the headline average value (e.g. Aaker (1991), such an approach obscures the finding that there was considerable variability in the value of the importance of the brand name element held by participants. Importance varied from nil to 280% of the current product price. The proportion of the participants who placed a substantial value on the current brand name was only 13%. In other words for the vast majority of the participants the brand name of an established product (that it should be recalled was also a product that they used regularly) appeared to have little importance, despite the various potential roles for the brand name element identified in the previous stages of research.

On the other hand for a minority of the participants the brand name element appeared to be of primary and potentially overwhelming importance.
This finding of the extreme variability in the importance of the brand name element for established products suggests that the type of statements discussed in Chapter 1 (de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006; Aaker, 1991; Keller, 2008) require significant qualification. Whilst these statements are not strictly inaccurate they could be considered to be misleading. This research suggests that brand name is a far more complex element than typically treated within the literature. In Section 7.2.2.9 within the Contribution and Discussion chapter the idea of a lifecycle model for brand name is considered.

6.5.3 Cause of Variability in Importance of Brand Name Element

As well as the observed variability in the importance attached to the brand name element of established products, an important finding from the research is the lack of an obvious cause for this variability. Neither age nor gender appears as influences on brand name element importance nor does individual product involvements.

Table 15 on the following page summarises details of those thirteen participants placed in the Substantial Value group for Brand Name Element importance. This is followed by details of their responses to the question “If a change in brand name were to happen to your favourite brand now do you think it would impact you?” With the exception of a preponderance of people within the middle age bracket nothing immediately appears to be particularly noteworthy about these participants.
# Table 15 Details of Participants in Substantial Value Brand Name Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No.</th>
<th>Relative Monetary Value(%)</th>
<th>Involvement Score</th>
<th>Rsquared Value</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Product Category</th>
<th>First Choice</th>
<th>Second Choice</th>
<th>First Choice-New Brand Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>90.589</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Clothing-Sports</td>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Adidas</td>
<td>Ike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>167.900</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Pepsi Max</td>
<td>Diet Coke</td>
<td>Not Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>279.979</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Warburton's</td>
<td>Hovis</td>
<td>Arburton's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>84.322</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Rubicon</td>
<td>Sundrop</td>
<td>Not Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>85.972</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>Walker’s</td>
<td>Hula Hoops</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>65.682</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>Pringles</td>
<td>Doritos</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>90.265</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>83.794</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>Gordon’s Gin</td>
<td>Beefeater Gin</td>
<td>Power’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>71.973</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Pantene</td>
<td>Tresemme</td>
<td>Fantene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>261.364</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Stores-Beauty</td>
<td>Body Shop</td>
<td>Boots</td>
<td>Power Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>115.586</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>NikNaks</td>
<td>Walker’s</td>
<td>NakNaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>70.845</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Clothing-Sports</td>
<td>Adidas</td>
<td>Fred Perry</td>
<td>Badidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>152.008</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don't think I would buy it, because it is such a well known brand and it would be really weird if it had a name change like this! I would probably carry on wearing my original Nike items for sport because I like the items themselves. It seems really silly, but I don't know if I'd want to be seen wearing a brand that changed its name (and put all the effort into changing its name) when it didn't really need to! [P08].

Very positively [P39].

I would have to be sure the core values of the company hadn't changed (which often happens when a brand changes or is bought over. If I was sure, then it wouldn't affect me [P44].

In general I would hesitate to buy if the product brand name changes. Because, I have seen a different quality and taste for my favourite fruit juice while the company collaborated with another brand. If I get the same or similar taste and quality with the new brand name then it's OK with me [P66].

Negatively, I would doubt the product quality [P68].

Very much, names are important [P70].

I would feel that it had 'left me' somewhat even if external factors had prompted the change - e.g. standardising for a world market a la Marathon / Snickers. I would not necessarily desert the brand [P74].

It would deter me from identifying with the product i.e. Snickers (what's that?) [P81].

I think I would reconsider buying that product...especially if the name was Fantene... I really didn't like that name! [P85].

I would consider transferring to another product completely [P87].

Very little, so long as the product itself hadn't changed [P105].

May have an effect on whether I purchased the brand or not. This would depend on what the name was changed to [P108].

---

10 In the context of the participant's other answers this should be interpreted as a large impact rather than a beneficial impact.
This leaves a number of possibilities for consideration. Firstly there may be other variables, which were not examined as part of the empirical research, that are key determinants of the importance attached to the brand name element. Secondly the variability in the importance of the brand name element may be accounted for by individual differences. In Section 7.5 within the Contribution and Discussion chapter some suggestions for future research in this area are made.

6.5.4 Relationship between Impact of Brand Name Change and Second Choice Branded Product

An important finding from the research is the relationship that participants typically hold with their second choice branded product in each product category. This research reveals that for many participants the second choice product could not be considered to be a close substitute for their first choice. As a consequence in only 25% of cases is a change in brand name sufficient to make their second choice product the preferred option. Possible reasons for this finding and its implications are considered within the Contribution and Discussion chapter in Section 7.2.2.3.

This Chapter formed the basis for a Conference Paper, included as Appendix 19.
7 Contribution and Discussion

7.1 Introduction

This chapter commences with a discussion of findings taking all of the various research stages together. This discussion is in two sections. Firstly those findings that are closely related to the research objective are examined and the achievement of this objective is considered. Secondly a number of other ideas that emerged from the research are explored. Section 7.3 looks at the key contributions of the research and situates them within the extant literature. Section 7.4 highlights limitations of the study. Various potential research streams that could follow on from this study are the subject of Section 7.5. Finally personal reflections on the research experience are provided in Section 7.6.

7.2 Discussion of Findings

7.2.1 Research Objective Related

As stated in Chapter 1 the overall objective of the research is:

Exploration of consumer brand name equity for established products and services: Using a global marketing induced change analysis approach

This required focus on the consideration of the following questions:

a-In what ways does the brand name of established products and services provide value to consumers and what implications does this have?

b-What is the relative importance of the brand name of established products and services for consumers?

The research found that the brand name of established products and services has the potential to provide value to consumers, through the performance of
various value-generating functions. The various categories of general branding functions within the literature (Keller, 2008; Kapferer, 2008), namely rational, symbolic, relationship and habitual were all observed. However the research also suggests that for many consumers the relative importance of these functions is small. In other words the brand name of an established product may indeed perform one or more of these functions but they are of minor consequence relative to the value assigned to the totality of the branded product. This lack of importance contradicts the literature (Aaker, 1991; de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006; Keller, 2008), which is based on empirical findings relating to the brand names of new products.

However the findings of the research are not quite as straightforward as this. Firstly a significant minority of participants were found to place substantial importance on the established product brand name. The result of this was that overall the importance assigned to the brand name was broadly in line with expectations from the literature...but this resulted from an amalgam of consumers with very different positions. The notion that individuals may have different propensities to be impacted by branding is essentially absent from the current literature but these research findings suggest that this may be an interesting angle to pursue. Certainly this research did not identify age, gender or product involvement as variables to explain such differences.

Secondly the research suggests that symbolic value from an established brand name may often be the creation of the consumer rather than the corporate body. There are two salient points here. The first is that the importance of this finding does not lie in the identification and acknowledgement of co-creation of brand meaning and value, as this is found within existing literature (Brown, 1995; Firat and Venkatesh, 1995; Ligas and Cotte, 1999; Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Cova et al., 2007), but in its identification of applicability for a brand name. To be more precise, as an example, for some consumers because Cif is called Cif it holds negative symbolic value that originates from the consumer. This negative symbolic value can be located specifically within the brand name.
element. The second salient point is that such consumer created brand value is not acknowledged within much branding literature (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 2008). A comparison is shown in Figure 31 below between a corporate creation approach as reflected for example in Keller (2008)’s Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) model and a co-creation approach.

Figure 31 Comparison of Corporate creation and Co-Creation models of Consumer Brand Name Value Creation

a-Corporate creation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Name Choice - Corporate Intended Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSUMER BRAND NAME VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORPORATE LED

b-Corporate/Consumer co-creation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Name Choice - Corporate Intended Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSUMER BRAND NAME VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORPORATE LED CONSUMER LED

12 Within the literature review I used the terms orthodox and contemporary to distinguish literature streams. Here I am talking about orthodox literature. The term managerial might be preferred but this literature stream still has (in my opinion) the greatest influence within the branding domain and hence my terminology.
A number of implications are seen to result from the provision of value-generating functions by an established brand name. The existence of such functions impacts brand purchase behaviour. Where a name was changed the research showed that consumers sometimes stopped purchasing the product, citing the change in name as the cause of the purchase cessation. This finding is very much in line with what would be expected from Ajzen (1985)’s Theory of Planned Behaviour model. However the research from both the qualitative and quantitative stages suggests that perception or lack of perception of a close substitute product plays a key role in determining whether a brand name change leads to a change in purchase behaviour. This consideration of choice is not specifically considered by Ajzen (1985). In other words one of the reasons why changing the brand name of Marathon to Snickers did not have a material impact on product sales was that consumers did not perceive that they had an alternative product to which to turn. This research therefore provides a potential way for how the importance of the brand name of an established product and a lack of sales impact when this name is changed can be reconciled.

The brand name change model that was developed from the literature (Keller, 2008; Aaker, 1991; Ajzen, 1985) received support from other stages of the research. The key variable within the model not already discussed is that of corporate advertising/promotional activity concerning the name change. Findings suggested that such activity is only likely to be partially effective in seamlessly moving consumers from the old to the new brand name. The new name taking over the rational functions of the old name appears achievable, provided consumers are aware of the advertising/promotional activity. Transferring the other functions of the brand name (symbolic, relationship, habitual) appears more problematic. In other words for some consumers the name Starburst can never fulfil the non-rational functions of Opal Fruits brand name.

Consideration of whether the objective of this research has been met needs to be made in the context of the overall research methodology. In other words, as discussed in Section 3.4.5, has there been an improvement in confidence about
the nature of reality? Given the above findings the research objective can be seen to have been met.

### 7.2.2 Emergent Ideas from Research

As well as key findings that resulted from addressing the research questions a number of other ideas emerged from the research and these are discussed in turn below. In all cases these are presented as propositions by the author for discussion rather than proven from the study.

#### 7.2.2.1 Dual Nature of Brand Name

One important point that emerged from focusing on the brand name element was the degree of ambiguity that exists with how the term is used. This ambiguity tends not to be acknowledged or recognised within the literature.

The first use is an identifier for the totality of a brand. In other words Nike is used to refer to a total brand entity, which consists of various elements. It is accepted that other brand elements may identify a brand but nevertheless the brand name is almost always the primary default identifier.

The second use is as one of a number of elements that make up a brand entity; in the same way that the logo is another of the elements. In other words part of what comprises the brand entity Nike is derived from the fact that it is actually called Nike.

These different uses make the exploration of the link between brand name and consumer brand value more complex because it is not always clear within the academic literature which use is being discussed.

It could be argued that brand name would be better conceptualised as having a dual nature; firstly as a brand identifier and secondly as a brand element. This is shown in Figure 32 on the following page.
Within this conceptualisation brand name is used as the identifier for the whole brand entity. In addition it refers to one of the elements that make up the brand entity. In the first instance the primary role of brand name is an identifier for an entity which holds brand value. In the second instance it is a source of value for this entity.

Some interesting observations result if consumer brand name value and the functions of brand name are considered from a dual nature of brand name perspective.

Considering rational functions first it may appear reasonable to assume that these are fulfilled primarily by the entire brand entity holistically rather than by the individual brand elements. However the choice of brand name as an
identifier influences how well a brand entity is able to perform these rational functions, particularly because of how the choice of name impacts brand awareness. This suggests that consumer brand value from the brand name for rational functions is driven by brand name as an identifier, rather than as a brand element. Similarly habitual and relationship functions appear to reside with the entire brand entity rather than the individual brand elements. However an unchanged brand name acts as an identifier of an unchanged brand entity and thereby provides habitual and relationship value to the consumer.

However the relationship between symbolic functions and brand name appears to differ from the other functions. It is as an element of the brand entity rather than as an identifier that the symbolic functions of the brand name provide value to the consumer, through the associations that the brand name gives to the brand entity.

This dual nature conceptualisation can also be used to explore the impact of a change in brand name.

A change in brand name will lead to a change in the brand elements that make up a brand entity. This is because a change in the symbolic functions provided to the brand entity from the brand name element means that this brand entity is altered. In other words a change in brand name from Marathon to Snickers means that the brand entity is no longer the same. At the same time a change in brand name also leads to a change in how the brand entity is identified.

But it is not simply that Marathon is now identified as Snickers. The dual nature of brand name approach clarifies that it is not simply what the brand entity is called that is changed (i.e. change to the brand identifier) but that the brand entity itself has been changed by the change in name (i.e. change to the brand element). In other words following a change in name we are now calling a different brand entity something different.

A Snickers is therefore not a Marathon with a different name but a different, separate brand. This does not preclude Marathon continuing as a brand entity
in its own right, albeit without an accompanying physical product. This is discussed further in Section 7.2.2.8.

The above section suggests an approach for future development of literature within this area.

7.2.2.2 Comparison of the Equity and Function Approaches towards Brand Value Creation

In Chapters 1 and 2 two alternative approaches towards examination of how consumers obtain value from a brand name were discussed. As this has wider ramifications within the branding domain, than simply for the brand name element, this is discussed further below.

The mainstream approach towards consumer brand equity regards the brand entity as a sort of metaphorical beach ball that is inflated through financial marketing investment in the brand. This investment in brand awareness and brand associations is seen to increase the value of the brand entity in the eyes of consumers, compared to a product that has not enjoyed such investment. It is then implicitly or explicitly assumed that this investment in consumer brand equity means that the brand entity can better perform its various brand functions towards the consumer (i.e. rational, symbolic etc.).

But where has the added value of the brand in the perception of the consumers come from? Why should a consumer value more highly a brand that has received investment? Certainly it cannot simply be because a corporation has chosen to commit financial resources to a brand. There is plainly no direct link between financial output on the part of the corporation and an increase in value on the part of the consumer. Given that the expenditure by the corporation is often directed towards the development of brand awareness and brand associations consideration moves to whether it follows that such brand development will automatically increase the value of the brand to the consumer.
Let it be assumed that because of corporate investment a consumer becomes more aware of a brand. Should that in itself mean that the consumer values the brand more highly? The author asserts that this does not follow. Simply being aware of something is not sufficient to create value. There appears to the author to be a missing link and that is of function. If a consumer becomes more aware of a brand and this increased awareness increases the ability of the brand to perform a function for the consumer (e.g. search cost reduction) then this will increase the value of the brand in the mind of the consumer.

There are two implications of this. Firstly function and equity should not be considered as alternative or sufficient approaches towards looking at the value of a brand to consumers. They are inextricably linked. The equity approach has merit because it focuses on what has been performed by a corporation that might make a brand of more value to the consumer. However the function approach focuses on what it is that makes the brand more valuable to the consumer. Secondly the beach ball metaphor described above is very dangerous because it suggests that a brand performs value generating functions as a result of holding equity for a consumer, when in fact, surely it is the other way around? A brand holds equity for a consumer as a result of performing value generating functions.

This is discussed further in Section 7.3.4 in the context of contribution to existing literature.

7.2.2.3 Reason for Lack of Close Substitutes

The research study identifies that the existence or non-existence of perceived close substitute products appears important in the determination of consumer behaviour in the event of a change in brand name. In other words where a brand was not perceived as having a close substitute a reduction in the value of the brand caused by a change in brand name was less likely to cause a switch in consumer purchase behaviour from the first to their second choice.
Mention has already been made in Section 2.7.2.3 of whether it is helpful that Azjen’s Theory of Planned Behaviour (1985) does not explicitly consider consumer choice alternatives. However there is another point that merits discussion. The question arises about what might cause a consumer to have the perception that no close substitute is available for their favourite product. If some of the first and second choices made by participants in Chapter 6 are considered then, taking a rational stance, the choices look fairly similar in many cases. For example Coca-Cola and Pepsi Cola are both caramel based caffeinated carbonated soft drinks. Where does the perception therefore arise that one is not a good substitute for the other?

An argument can be made that this is as a result of their first choice holding greater overall brand value than their substitute product, as opposed to any inherent functional difference between the products. This has a key implication. It suggests that where a corporation has invested in brand development it may be able to painlessly change the name of this brand because the accrued investment within the brand entity will shield it from any loss in brand value resulting from the name change. However for this to be the case the brand name specific proportion of the overall value of the brand would need to be low\(^\text{13}\). This assertion is consistent with the Brand Name Lifecycle approach discussed in Section 7.2.2.9, which argues that brand name becomes less important as a product becomes established but is contrary to the mainstream literature view that the brand name is always of central importance (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 2008).

7.2.2.4 Relative Importance of Product Utilities

In Section 5.7.8.2 the issue of product utilities was discussed in the context of a reason why a changed brand name may not lead to any change in brand purchase behaviour. In other words where the functional or utilitarian aspects of the product remain unchanged and where these also make up the bulk of the reason for purchase then a change in brand name would only have a minimal impact on overall value received by the consumer from the product.

\(^{13}\) or alternatively the overall value of the brand would need to be very high.
The quantitative findings in Chapter 6 are based on consideration of the importance of brand name relative to the total value received from the product\textsuperscript{14}, including both value from the branding and value from the product utilities.

Branding literature has a tendency to significantly background the utility from a product which is not related to branding. Alternatively attempts have been made to co-opt all utility into the brand but even with the adoption of this approach the existence of utility that is essentially functional still remains (Kapferer, 2008). In other words, taking the example of Heinz Tomato Soup, the branded entity Heinz provides value to the consumer through the various functions that it performs (e.g. rational, symbolic etc.) and some of this will be probably originate specifically from the brand name element. However an important reason why a consumer wants to utilise this particular product is because of a want for a meal or snack consisting of tomato soup. Clearly the proportion of value from the product utilities and the proportion from brand value will vary by product and by individual. Often this split is hard to discover but in this particular example a rough estimate can be obtained through the comparison of the price of Heinz Tomato Soup with an equivalent unbranded version.

The point being made here is whilst this research has explored the importance of brand name this cannot ultimately be entirely separated from the relative overall importance of branding for the consumer.

7.2.2.5 Implications from Individual Differences for Established Product Brand Name Value

One of the key findings from the research was that a wide variation was observed in the importance that consumers placed on the brand name of established products. No apparent reason was found for this variation and one suggested research stream is the examination of the impact of individual differences (Cooper, 2002).

\textsuperscript{14} on the assumption that total value is reflected in price.
This finding has wider ramifications. Empirical work looking at the importance of brand name for new products has typically only reported mean values. It would be interesting to know whether there was also significant variability behind these average figures. In other words is there a general propensity to be influenced by brand name, which varies by individual?

Indeed the whole issue of the variability of branding (as opposed to brand name) impact by individual has barely been broached by the literature (Bristow et al., 2002; Farquhar, 1990; Aaker, 1997). If branding does indeed vary in its roles and importance by individual then, given the widespread use of segmented marketing strategies, there may be merit in the exploration of the concept of segmented branding strategies and what such a concept might mean in practice.

7.2.2.6 Consumer Perceived Brand Name Ownership

One of the constructs that appears relevant in discussion about consumer brand name value is that of consumer perceived brand name ownership. There is little within the literature relating to such a construct. However authors such as Belk (1988) have argued that the maker of an object is entitled to ownership of it and Ellis (1985) has asserted that ownership should not be regarded as an absolute concept but as a continuum.

If these arguments are coupled with a co-creation approach towards brand name value, as discussed in Section 7.2.1, then it could be argued that consumers do or should perceive part ownership of brands and brand name because they are part-creators (Lury, 2004; O'Guinn and Muniz, 2005; Metz et al., 2009). This might explain why consumers may be unhappy with corporations changing brand names, as they do not regard corporations as total owners of the brand and therefore having the right to do so.

This section suggests an area where existing branding literature could be developed in the future.
7.2.2.7 Brand Name Translation Activity

One of the findings discussed in Section 5.7.7.1 was the widespread use of brand name translation activity, where, following a change in brand name, upon presentation of the new brand name to the consumer it was translated by them into the old brand name. The result of this was that no change in brand value was experienced by the consumer as no brand name change was regarded as having occurred. The argument was made that this was a strategy by the consumer to avoid experiencing a reduction in brand name value.

However a number of other points can be made in relation to this translation activity. Firstly it could be argued that instead of it being a method of brand name value reduction avoidance it is actually an attempt by the consumer to exercise a degree of ownership over the brand name. A consumer is unable to legally stop the corporation changing the name of the brand name. However the corporation cannot prevent the consumer continuing to use the old brand name. Through the use of translation activity the consumer is sending out a message that control over how the brand name is perceived and used by the consumer is determined by the consumer.

Secondly regardless of whether the activity is reckoned to be value reduction avoidance or ownership expression it might be considered that the act of translation is at considerable cognitive cost to the consumer. Many of the participants who engaged in translation activity said that they had done so for many years, against a background of ongoing marketing and promotional activity for the new brand name. If it is assumed that this translation effort would be only be expended if the benefits exceeded the cost of the effort involved, this suggests that the brand value emanating from the original brand name and its associated consumer perceived brand name ownership must be substantial for these participants.

Brand name translation is an activity absent from current branding literature.
7.2.2.8 The Status of Defunct Brand Names

Academic literature is generally concerned with brand names that are currently in use; the implicit assumption being that these are the only ones that provide value to consumers. However, given the discussion in Section 7.2.2.7 on translation activity, this can be challenged. The brand names used by those participants who engage in translation activity do not have an associated current physical product but nevertheless continue to provide value to these consumers.

Indeed outside of this translation activity defunct brand names appear to continue to fulfil a variety of roles. One point that is apparent from the examination of the internet is the existence of social groups focused around a defunct brand name. For example Facebook reveals at least eight social groups centred on Marathon, including the Marathon bars Fan Club and I loved Marathon Bars! In a sense these groups are fulfilling a similar value generating role to that within the seminal Harley-Davidson research described in Section 2.3.2.2. The crucial difference being that of course in this instance the physical product no longer exists.

A further interesting example can be seen in the case of Pan Am, which was regarded as an iconic American airline brand until its collapse in 1991. The airline’s travel bags however have been resurrected as a fashion accessory shown in Figure 33 below.

Figure 33 Pan Am Travel bag-available from www.panambrands.com
The brand name is clearly still providing value to consumers although the principal physical service to which the brand name refers has long been defunct. It might be recalled that one of the participants in the qualitative research made an interesting comment that withdrawing a product may actually increase the worth of its brand name amongst certain people.

Through a semiotic lens the examples here point to instances of brand name being a “floating signifier”, defined as a signifier with a vague, highly variable, unspecifiable or non-existent signified (Chandler, 2007: p.79). The growth of the internet seems to provide myriad opportunities for uses to be made of brand names that no longer have physical products or services.

Given that defunct brand names appear on occasions to provide value to consumers to whom do they belong? The Pan-Am example seems straightforward in the sense that the promoters of the travel bags have acquired some legal ownership of the brand name but what of the above example of Marathon? Does the company who used to manufacture the chocolate bar have any control over it? It could be argued that through the elimination of the physical manifestation of a product the corporation actually hands over effective ownership of the brand name to the consumer. The only control that the corporation can exercise is not to reintroduce the physical product. The rise of the internet seems to provide a sea-change in the opportunity for consumers to assert and exercise brand name ownership in such circumstances.

This is another area absent from existing branding literature.

7.2.2.9 Brand Name Lifecycle

This research suggests that for most of the participants in the study the brand name of an established product was of little importance. This finding needs to be considered in the light of various empirical studies that have found a

---

15 The application of semiotics to brand name appears not entirely straightforward. If brand name is solely considered to be an identifier then the brand name being the signifier and the branded product being the signified seems logical. However as discussed above in Section 7.2.2.1 brand name is not simply an identifier but is also an element of the branded product. As such brand name appears to be both a signifier and a signified.
significant importance for brand name when a product is new, as discussed in Chapter 2. One way of reconciling these different findings is to assert that the brand name element operates within a lifecycle. In other words when a product is being established the choice of an appropriate brand name is important because of the implications for brand awareness and associations and the consequent impact that this choice of name has on the brand value perceived by consumers. However as a product ages and moves from being new to being established the importance of the brand name decreases relatively, as a result both of brand entity marketing activity and customer experience of the product. This is in line with the writings of Riezebos (1994) but his views were not based on focused empirical findings nor to the knowledge of this author has this lifecycle effect been previously empirically demonstrated.

7.3 Key Research Contributions

This section considers the key contributions that this research makes, with particular consideration of situating these contributions within the existing literature.

7.3.1 Consideration of Consumer Brand Name Equity for Established Products

The most important contribution has been that this research has looked at consumer brand name equity for established products. Existing literature research is concerned with brand names of new products (Meyers-Levy, 1987; Gibson, 2005) and this is typically extrapolated within the literature as being applicable to all products (Aaker, 1991; de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006). As discussed in Section 7.2.1, this study has confirmed that the types of value generating functions performed by the brand name of established products are in line with those suggested within the extant literature. However it suggests something very different about the importance of these brand name functions to consumers from that located in the literature, qualifying the assumption of centrality of the brand name element within branding. The study develops a new concept of the brand name lifecycle, as discussed in Section 7.2.2.9, as a way
of reconciling the difference in the importance of the brand name between established and new products.

As such this study in part makes a supportive contribution to the existing literature, through the provision of empirical information but in part makes a different contribution through challenging the literature and does so with the benefit of empirical data.

7.3.2 Improved Understanding of Brand Name Change process

A further key contribution that this research makes to the literature is improved understanding about the brand name change process. This is an important contribution as brand name change is regarded within the literature as an area of theoretical underdevelopment (Kapferer, 2008). This improved understanding comes from two aspects.

The first aspect is the development of a model depicting the impact of a change in brand name on the consumer. This is shown in Figure 34 on the following page.
Developed from summary of literature discussed in Sections 2.3 to 2.7 (e.g. Keller, 2008; Aaker, 1991; Kapferer, 2008; Wood et al., 2002; Ajzen, 1985)
Literature does not currently have an analytical framework for brand name change. As such the model complements the existing case study literature in this domain (Aaker, 1991; Kapferer, 2008), through the provision of a theoretical framework, which has been subjected to qualitative evaluation.

This model makes a further contribution to the literature as it was derived through taking Ajzen (1985)’s Theory of Planned Behaviour model and extended it backwards into the consumer brand equity domain. The contribution to the branding literature lies in the demonstration of the potential relevance of Ajzen’s work to this domain.

The second aspect of improving understanding of the brand name change process is highlighting of the importance of perceived close substitute products for consumer behaviour in the event of a brand name change. Where no close substitutes are perceived consumers are unlikely to change their purchase behaviour even with the loss of a brand name important to them, as this would reduce their obtained consumer value. This is a key contribution as it offers an explanation for consumer marketplace behaviour often observed after a change in brand name. Existing literature on brand name change is primarily descriptive (Aaker, 1991; Kapferer, 2008) whilst this research contributes through the provision of explanation.

7.3.3 Identification of Co-Creation of Brand Name Symbolic Value

A further contribution to the literature comes from the empirical identification of the consumer as a co-creator of symbolic value within the brand name of established products. Clearly the concept of co-creation of brand value by the corporation and consumer is found within various streams of literature such as postmodern, service dominant logic and consumer tribe (Brown, 1995; Firat and Venkatesh, 1995; Ligas and Cotte, 1999; Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Cova et al., 2007) but this activity has not been reported in the literature as pertinent to the brand name element.
7.3.4 Development of Functional Approach towards Consumer Brand Value

A final key contribution to the branding literature lies in the development and use of a functional approach towards consumer brand value. Existing literature is concerned with the value generating functions that branding performs for consumers (Farquhar, 1989; Jacoby et al., 1977; Brucks et al., 2000; Keller, 2008; Kapferer, 2008) but does not use them in the analysis of consumer brand value. Instead other constructs, brand awareness and brand associations (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993), that result from activities that corporations perform on brands (and perhaps more appropriate to corporate rather than consumer analysis) are employed.

This research develops an alternative functional approach towards consideration of consumer brand value grounded in the above literature. It demonstrates, in Section 2.3.4, how this approach is linked to the constructs of brand awareness and association and successfully employs the approach in a study. As such this study offers the existing branding domain literature an additional beneficial approach for the consideration of consumer brand equity.

7.3.5 Business Implications

This section considers key implications of the research contributions from a business perspective.

7.3.5.1 General Limited Impact of Brand Name Change

One of the key outputs from the study is a better understanding of how and why corporations are able to change the brand name of a product without any significant detrimental effect. The results obtained from the quantitative work were before any promotional and marketing activity surrounding the change in name and therefore present a view of the importance of the brand name element prior to mitigation activity. The number of participants placing a substantial value on brand name prior to such mitigation activity is relatively low (at 13%). Therefore based on this research a corporation performing a name
change, accompanied by supporting name change promotional activity, could expect to migrate the vast majority of its existing customers to the new name without difficulty. This is an important finding and is consistent with the observation that corporations continue to choose to change brand names regularly.

7.3.5.2 Issues relating to Minority of Customers after Brand Name Change

Nevertheless the quantitative research also suggests that for a minority of customers the name change will be regarded as more than a minor inconvenience. This was also borne out in the qualitative findings. Evidence from both the qualitative and quantitative work also suggests that brand name change may lead to a reduction in purchasing of the product whose name has changed. In addition this reduction may be long term in nature.

Corporations also need to be aware of extra-purchase consumer behaviour associated with brand name change, consisting of consumers acting to proactively defend the existing brand name in ways that could be detrimental to the corporation. Although little evidence was found of this by participants within the study, examples of such activity can be found online. Its potential impact can be great despite being the actions of a small minority. An example by CARP (2007) is provided in Appendix 17.

The study suggests that corporations making name change decisions will have to deal with unhappy, vocal and active customers. Clearly the development of the internet makes it much easier for consumers to make their individual voices heard. Consumers of the type within the Substantial Value group in the quantitative analysis do not like the name change because they perceive that they lose out from it. Consequently corporations need to consider very carefully whether making a name change is worthwhile, even if it does not impact the majority of their customers.

7.4 Limitations
Inevitably this research study has its limitations; some of which are more immediately apparent than others. Accordingly these need to be borne in mind during consideration of the findings of the research. This section discusses these in turn.

7.4.1 Relative Importance of Various Functions of Brand Name

Although the qualitative work indicated that the brand name provided various functions and the quantitative work indicated that the brand name provided some importance the research did not consider the relative importance of the various functions. In other words it is not possible to ascertain from the research whether the importance of the brand name tends to be typically driven by one particular function or whether a variety of relevant functions tend to be typically in operation.

This has a number of implications. It may that some of the functions, whilst prevalent within the literature, are actually rare in practice. It may also be the case that the importance of particular functions varies significantly by product and by individual. Whilst this is a limitation of the research it should be appreciated that the lack of extant research within this domain required that study initially be performed at a broader level.

7.4.2 Validity and Population Sampling Limitations

There are some limitations around the validity of the findings. Validity issues stem primarily from the artificiality caused by the use of experimentation and the concern that this is not reflective of real life. Such limitations are often present, if not always made overt and explicit, within experimental research and how the study attempted to address these has been discussed in previous chapters.

The makeup of the population samples in the research is not strictly generalisable. There are a number of factors within the effective sampling frame that could have skewed the samples away from the population as a whole; in particular geographical location (research participants were predominantly
based in North West England) and socio-economic status (many participants were linked to the University).

7.4.3 Impact of Different Types of Brand Entity within Research

Although the fact that a variety of branded products and services was included within the quantitative research was acknowledged it was only incorporated into the results analysis at a high level, through the use of the product involvement variable.

There are other branded product variables that might potentially influence the importance of brand name to consumers. Brand entities differ in terms of the typical role that they perform. Some will perform a predominantly functional role, whilst for others the symbolic aspect will be much more important. An argument could be made that branded products whose role is primarily symbolic will tend to hold a greater proportion of their value within branding and brand name.

An alternative research approach would be to attempt to incorporate the type of brand entity as a potential explanatory variable.

7.4.4 Implications of Amalgamation of Qualitative and Quantitative Research Findings

The findings from the research are based on the amalgamation of findings from a qualitative stage of research and findings from a quantitative stage of research. Quite apart from the obvious differences between the two approaches, different participants selected using different criteria and considering different products, took part in each of the stages. Whilst there were good reasons for this approach and some confirmatory qualitative research was also included within the quantitative work, this overall approach could be perceived as having limitations.

7.4.5 Reasons for Importance of Brand Name Element

Although the research obtained information about the importance of the value of a brand name of an established product for participants it did not explore in
great detail what caused the degree of importance for each individual participant. Information obtained was limited to qualitative answers at the end of the quantitative research stage.

7.4.6 Selection of New Brand Name within Quantitative Experiment

In the quantitative experiment participants were asked to compare an existing brand name with a fictitious new brand name. In particular two options examined for the new brand name were a single letter change (i.e. Pepsi to Pipsi) or a radical change to Power/s. The appropriateness or otherwise of the proposed new brand name may have impacted the participant’s view of the worth of the existing brand name. However one option presented to participants did not specify the proposed new brand name and similar overall results were obtained from this subset of participants.

7.5 Future Research

There are various future research streams that are apparent as a result of this study. Some of these reflect the limitations discussed in the previous section whilst others result from the emergent ideas discussed in Section 7.2.2.

7.5.1 Reasons for Importance of Brand Name Element

One future research stream would attempt to address one of the limitations of the existing research by exploring in greater detail what it is that makes a brand name important or unimportant. The quantitative analysis to date has not uncovered reasons for the large variability in the importance of the brand name element. Detailed exploratory qualitative work may identify a number of potential variables for consideration. In particular a great deal of reward is likely to result from detailed interviews with the thirteen participants placed within the Substantial Value group.

7.5.2 Longitudinal Study of Brand Name Change

One of the difficulties of this research study has been how to account for the temporal aspect of brand name change. The qualitative stage asked
participants to consider back in time, whilst the quantitative stage avoided the temporal dimension. However one key finding was that the impact of brand name change varied over time. Typically the impact was found to reduce over time although not always to the point of elimination.

One way to explore the temporal aspect of brand name change would be to engage in a longitudinal study. This would explore aspects of brand name from a consumer viewpoint pre-change, during change and after change. The after name change part of such a study should consider multiple time points.

This research stream is not without its challenges; not least being able to identify a branded product before its name is changed. One possibility would be to work with a corporation planning a brand name change before this information were made available to the general public. Another challenge lies in the likely case study nature of such research. This inevitably carries with it a number of generalisability issues (Saunders et al., 2003).

7.5.3 Exploration of Relevance of Individual Differences

One of the suggestions made in this research is that the observed variability in the importance of the brand name element may be due to individual differences. One possible future research stream would be the exploration of the relevance of individual differences. There are a number of possible ways to approach this.

The relevance of personality traits could be explored using the ‘Big Five’ or Five-Factor model (Digman, 1990); namely extroversion, neuroticism, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Alternatively a more focused approach could be employed using a measure such as that of consumer attitude towards marketing and consumerism (Barksdale and Darden, 1972), which is a well regarded scale (Bearden et al., 1998). In other words a consumer with a highly positive attitude towards marketing may be more amenable towards obtaining value from a brand name and therefore may typically regard the brand name as more important.
Another approach would be to build on the work carried out by Love et al. (2010), that has looked at how the regulatory focus of individual consumers impacts the value that they receive from brands; regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997) being conceptualised as an individual’s orientation towards the obtaining of desired end-goals.

7.5.4 Exploration of Relevance of Branded Product Characteristics

A further research stream would be the exploration of the relevance of branded product characteristics on the role and importance of the brand name element. In the current research only the branded product involvement variable was included and no statistical relevance was identified. Some extant empirical work, as discussed in Section 2.3.5.1, has asserted that overall brand strength varies by product type.

In addition perhaps the use of a more focused measured variable, such as brand commitment (Beatty et al., 1988), might prove to be more rewarding. Some recent research (Walsh et al., 2010) has shown this to be a statistically significant moderator of the impact of brand logo change.

A similar exercise to the quantitative work within this research study could be carried out but with product characteristics classified and included as potential explanatory variables. This is likely to require a larger participant size as well as more comprehensive statistical analysis.

7.5.5 Exploration of Psychological Role and Importance of Personal Name for Humans

One potential research stream offers a very different yet complementary and worthwhile approach. Literature often considers that brands hold personality (Aaker, 1997). On the assumption that this is a valid approach, one possible study could consist of the exploration of the role and importance of name to humans. In other words what are the implications for Fred Smith as a result of being called Fred Smith and not Piers Hollingwood? What are the implications for a person changing their name? An exploration of this from a human
perspective may provide analogous insights that might be useful for the consideration of branded products and their names.

Although this research stream is likely to involve qualitative research an initial step would be the review of relevant extant literature.

7.6 Reflection

“Research in marketing gives the impression of being based on a conceptually sterile and unimaginative positivism...The consequence...is that most of the resources are directed toward less significant issues, over explaining what we already know, and toward supporting and legitimizing the status quo.” (Arndt, 1980: p.399)

By chance I stumbled across the above quotation shortly before I started to reflect on my time engaged in doctoral study and it certainly resonated clearly with me.

The two most challenging aspects of my research were the obtaining of initial acceptance of my research topic and the development of an appropriate research methodology. One of my first and least enjoyable experiences of my academic voyage to date was at an university interview (not Manchester Business School!!) where I was informed in no uncertain terms that my planned doctoral topic was “non researchable”. It took many months of reading and contemplation before I felt in a position to counter the arguments that had been presented to me. The key defence was provided to me during my first year at Manchester Business School.

Although I accept that I may be in a small minority I found the compulsory Philosophy and Methodology first year course to be life-changing and enhancing; certainly in terms of my approach towards knowledge. Whilst embracing a barely concealed antidote to positivism subtext it equipped me with the framework and language to help determine for myself whether and how research can be productive. It also stressed the importance of research having
explicit philosophical underpinning. I’d like to think that I have made it clear within my thesis what lies beneath this research and how and why I consequently consider that it makes a worthwhile contribution to knowledge.

Returning to the initial quotation and the issue of alleged non-researchability, it appears to me undeniable that the adoption of a fundamentalist positivist approach (which in retrospect I can see was that being adopted by the University department referred to in the paragraph above) tends to limit questions available for research. Can this be right? Are we really saying that we should only attempt to answer the questions that lend themselves to quantitative analysis and scientific hypothesis testing, even if they are the least interesting questions?

Even after I was convinced my chosen topic area could be meaningfully researched I struggled to clarify in my own mind the appropriate research methodology. There is an overriding issue about the research methods that predominate within the Marketing academic domain. I suggest that legitimacy is primarily granted to methods through their ubiquitous use within the field, regardless of any obvious shortcomings.

Two examples will suffice here. The first is the widespread use of convenience sampling. It appears to me that the use of sophisticated statistical techniques and highly formalised scientific methods are greatly if not fatally compromised if they are coupled with samples drawn exclusively from 18 to 21 year undergraduates. To elucidate one can use the analogy of the multiplication together of two numbers b and c. If b is estimated as a “ballpark number” (i.e. a convenience sample) then the estimation of c to (say) six as opposed to (say) one decimal place (i.e. the use of sophisticated statistical sampling) achieves essentially nothing in terms of the achieved accuracy of the product bc.\(^{19}\)

Secondly consider the case study method. Again this is a popular research approach despite it having an apparent drawback of often utilising a statistical sample of one. In my opinion this research method has been greatly

---

\(^{19}\) My supervisor informs me that at least one leading European journal has banned the use of student convenience samples.
popularised through the ability of researchers to offer an off-the-shelf template justification developed essentially from the writings of one academic (for example Yin (2008)).

How can one account for the concentration of research on a number of methods that are clearly not flawless? One enlightening book that I read during my studies that suggested an answer was written by Chris Hackley (2001), currently Professor of Marketing at Royal Holloway College. He argues convincingly and with conviction that Marketing as an academic discipline is fundamentally socially constructed. One result of this is that accepted research methods tend to be self-perpetuating.

It took time for me to gain the confidence to develop my own methodological approach for the research. My mixed methods approach is not particularly modish within current Marketing study. Nevertheless I regard it as the most appropriate to meet the research objective and improve knowledge in this area. I would urge fellow researchers to start with consideration of which methods are most likely to meet their research objectives, rather than simply use those most in evidence.

Compared to the initial stages of the research the experimental stages were much more enjoyable. The qualitative interviews proved to be full of interest; not least because of the energy from the participants, who were particularly vocal about their particular brand names and the fate that had befallen them. The use of written quotations within this thesis cannot convey the power of the actual interview tapes, in which the importance and roles of the brand name to these participants come across very strongly in their manner of speech.

The quantitative stage was not without its challenges. In particular this included the obtaining of access to the appropriate software. An SPSS conjoint analysis module was freely available at the University. However the vastly superior Sawtooth Software was not. Accordingly one year of my research expenses was required to obtain a licence for this. Having purchased this software a significant amount of time was subsequently required in self-training in order to
be able to make best use of it. Obtaining the 100 participants for the experiment was also very time consuming, particularly for those outside the University, where individual visits had to be performed.

The highlights of the research were probably the opportunities to present my findings at several conferences. The first at Cambridge in 2009 on my qualitative work and my second at Oxford in 2011 on my quantitative work not only forced me to learn to organise and streamline my thoughts for presentational purposes but also gave me the chance to meet researchers with similar interests.

In conclusion I trust that this thesis can be seen not only as a piece of work that meets its own research objective but also as a fruitful document in its own right. This proved to be a domain that is, if not under-researched, certainly not well-researched. I undoubtedly understand the brand name a lot more than at the start of my research and for that reason alone I consider my research study to have succeeded.
## Appendix 1-Stage 2-Initial Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>TOPIC AREA</th>
<th>INDICATIVE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>a-Tell me a little about yourself</td>
<td>a-To provide contextual background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Tell me why you got in touch with me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BRAND DIMENSIONS-PRE NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-Tell me a little about your thoughts on Brand X</td>
<td>a-To gain an understanding of why the consumer used the brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-What was it that made you use Brand X rather than a similar product?</td>
<td>b-To gain an understanding of how important the brand was to the consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c-Were you a frequent user of Brand X?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d-How often did you use an alternative product?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BRAND FUNCTIONS-PRE NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-What do you think it was that Brand X gave you compared with the same product but unbranded?</td>
<td>a-To explore which functions the brand fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Explore functions of brand not mentioned i.e. Rational, Symbolic, Emotional, Behavioural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NAME CHANGE-GENERAL</td>
<td>a-Tell me what you thought about the name change</td>
<td>a-To explore the extent to which name change had an impact not reflected in brand value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Do you think the same now as when the change happened?</td>
<td>b-To explore the reasons for unhappiness with name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NAME CHANGE-PROMOTIONAL/ADVERTISING MODERATORS</td>
<td>a-At the time of the name change there was a big publicity campaign about it-were you aware of this?</td>
<td>a-To explore the impact of promotional and advertising moderators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Can you recall what it consisted of?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c-To what extent did this make you more comfortable about the name change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BRAND FUNCTIONS-POST NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-Before we talked about what you thought the brand gave you-did that change when the name changed?</td>
<td>a-To explore the impact on brand value from name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-How/Why/How Much?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BRAND ATTITUDE-POST NAME</td>
<td>a-So did the change in brand name change your attitude towards the brand?</td>
<td>a-To explore the impact on attitude towards the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHANGE | b-In what ways?  
c-How large a change in attitude do you think it was? | brand from name change |
|---|---|---|
| 8 BRAND PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR-POST NAME CHANGE | a-Did the change in brand name change your purchase behaviour of the product?  
b-In what way?  
c-Why do you think that was? | a-To explore the impact on brand purchase behaviour from name change |
| 9 ROLE OF SUBSTITUTE PRODUCT | a-Before we talked about similar products to Brand X, do you think you purchase more of similar products after the change in name?  
b-Why/Why not? | a-To explore the role of substitute product |
| 10 OTHER CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR-POST NAME CHANGE | a-Do you think the change in brand name has affected your attitude or behaviour in any other ways?  
b-Can you elaborate on this? | a-To explore the impact of name change on other consumer behaviour |
| 11 ANY OTHER INFORMATION AND CONCLUSION | a-Finally is there anything else that you would like to say on the subject? | a-To identify any other key issues/variables |
## Appendix 2-Stage 2-Final Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>TOPIC AREA</th>
<th>INDICATIVE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>a-Tell me a little about yourself</td>
<td>a-To provide contextual background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Tell me why you got in touch with me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BRAND DIMENSIONS-PRE NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-Tell me a little about your thoughts on Brand X</td>
<td>a-To gain an understanding of why the consumer used the brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Were you a frequent user of Brand X?</td>
<td>b-To gain an understanding of how important the brand was to the customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c-Was there a close substitute product?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d-What was it that made you use Brand X rather than a similar product?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BRAND FUNCTIONS- PRE NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-What do you think it was that Brand X gave you compared with the same product but unbranded?</td>
<td>a-To explore which functions the brand fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Explore functions of brand not mentioned i.e. Rational, Symbolic, Emotional, Habitual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c-So how important do you think Brand Name X was?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BRAND FUNCTIONS-POST NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-Before we talked about what you thought the brand name gave you-did that change when the name changed?</td>
<td>a-To explore the impact on brand value from name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-How/Why/How much?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BRAND PURCHASE ATTITUDE-POST NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-So did the change in brand name change your attitude towards the brand?</td>
<td>a-To explore the impact on attitude towards the brand from name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-In what ways?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c-How large a change in attitude do you think it was?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d-Why do you think this was?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BRAND PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR-POST NAME CHANGE</td>
<td>a-Did the change in brand name change your purchase behaviour of the product?</td>
<td>a-To explore the impact on brand purchase behaviour from name change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Why do you think that was?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ROLE OF SUBSTITUTE PRODUCT</td>
<td>a-Before we talked about similar products to Brand X, do you think you purchase more of similar products after the change in name?</td>
<td>a-To explore the role of substitute product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b-Why/Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8 | NAME CHANGE-GENERAL | a-Tell me what you remember about the name change  
b-What did you think about this?  
c-What do you think was the reasoning for the change?  
d-What do you think about that?  
e-Would it have been different with a different name?  
f-Do you think the same now as when the change happened? | a-To explore other aspects of name change not reflected in brand value  
b-To explore the reasons for unhappiness with name change |
| 9 | NAME CHANGE-PROMOTIONAL/ADVERTISING MODERATORS | a-At the time of the name change there was a big publicity campaign about it-were you aware of this?  
b-Can you recall what it consisted of?  
c-To what extent did this make you more comfortable about the name change? | a-To explore the impact of promotional and advertising moderators |
| 10 | CORPORATE BEHAVIOUR | a-Should corporations produce what consumers want?  
b-Why/Why not?  
c-Do corporations produce what consumers want?  
d-Why/Why not? | a-To explore the relationship between the corporation and the consumer |
| 11 | BRAND OWNERSHIP | a-Do you believe that the company was entitled to change the name of the product?  
b-Why/Why not?  
c-So who does the brand belong to?  
d-Do you feel it belongs to you at all? | a-To explore consumer perceptions of ownership of brand name |
| 12 | OTHER CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR-POST NAME CHANGE | a-Do you think the change in brand name has affected your attitude or behaviour in any other ways?  
b-Can you elaborate on this?  
c-What about your attitude towards corporations?  
d-What about your attitude towards advertising? | a-To explore the impact of name change on other consumer behaviour |
| 13 | ANY OTHER INFORMATION AND CONCLUSION | a-Finally is there anything else that you would like to say on the subject? | a-To identify any other key issues/variables |
### Appendix 3-Comparison of Initial and Final Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD SECTION</th>
<th>REVISED NUMBERING</th>
<th>TOPIC AREA</th>
<th>INDICATIVE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace “How often did you use an alternative product?” with “Was there a close substitute product?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add “So how important do you think Brand Name X was?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Replace All</td>
<td>Replace “To explore the extent to which name change had an impact not reflected in brand value” with “To explore other impacts of name change not reflected in brand value”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace “To explore the impact of promotional and advertising moderators” with “To explore promotional and advertising moderators”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Change “Brand Attitude” to “Brand Purchase Attitude”</td>
<td>Add “Why do you think that was?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete “In what way?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Move questions c,d,e,f to new section 10</td>
<td>To explore the relationship between the corporation and consumer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW SECTION 10</td>
<td>Corporate Behaviour</td>
<td>Questions c,d,e,f from old section 10</td>
<td>To explore consumer perceptions of ownership of brand name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW SECTION 11</td>
<td>Brand Ownership</td>
<td>Add “Do you believe that the company was entitled to change the name of the product?, “Why/Why not?”, “So who does the brand belong to?” and “Do you feel it belongs to you at all?”</td>
<td>To explore consumer perceptions of ownership of brand name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Add “What about your attitude towards corporations?” and “What about your attitude towards advertising?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 - Stage 2 - Research Website - www.brandnamechange.co.uk

BRAND NAME CHANGE RESEARCH STUDY 2008/9

Does it bother you when a brand changes its name? For example when Jif became Cif or Marathon became Snickers? There are probably some other brand names you can think of!

In 2008-9 we are carrying out a research study on this topic and are looking for volunteers to interview. You would need to be 18 and over, live in the UK and be prepared to be interviewed in person or by telephone.

We would meet out of pocket expenses as well as make a small contribution to show our appreciation. But the main benefit for you would be to make a difference to a research study and get stuff about brands off your chest!

If you would like to be involved simply fill in your contact details in the box below and leave a contact email and we will be in touch.

Thank you in advance

Giff Round

GET INVOLVED BELOW!
Appendix 5-Stage 2-Sample Newspaper Recruitment Advertisement
Appendix 6-Stage 2-University Recruitment Advertisement

StudentNet

Does it bother you when brands change their name?

Description

For example when Jif became Cif or Marathon became Snickers? There are probably some other brand names you can think of!

I am carrying out a research study on this topic and am looking for volunteers to interview. You need to be based permanently in the UK, bothered when brands change their name and be prepared to be interviewed for half an hour at the University.

I will pay £10 to show appreciation and compensate you for your time.

Further details are at www.brandnamechange.co.uk

Simply contact me as shown below

Name of Research Ethics Committee:
MBS PGR

University Ethics Committee number and/or NHS Reference number (if applicable): n/a

Contact Details

Griff Round
Manchester Business School PhD student

- tel: 07908 255748
- email: David.Round@postgrad.mbs.ac.uk

---

http://www.studentnet.manchester.ac.uk/volunteer/display/index.htm?id=143141 05/03/2009
Appendix 7-Stage 2-Initial Coding Template

1 PRE NAME CHANGE
1.1 DIMENSIONS
   1.1.1 Thoughts on Brand
   1.1.2 Comparison with similar products
   1.1.3 Frequency of Use
   1.1.4 Usage of alternative products
1.2 FUNCTIONS
   1.2.1 Functional comparison with similar product
   1.2.2 Rational function
   1.2.3 Symbolic function
   1.2.4 Emotional function
   1.2.5 Habitual function

2 NAME CHANGE
2.1 GENERAL
   2.1.1 Thoughts on name change at time
   2.1.2 Thoughts on name change now
2.2 PROMOTIONAL/ADVERTISING MODERATORS
   2.2.1 Awareness of promotion/advertising
   2.2.2 Recall of promotion/advertising
   2.2.3 Impact of promotion/advertising

3 POST NAME CHANGE
3.1 FUNCTION
   3.1.1 Degree of change in function
   3.1.2 Type of change in function
3.2 ATTITUDE
   3.2.1 Degree of change in attitude
   3.2.2 Type of change in attitude
3.3 PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR
   3.3.1 Degree of change in purchase behaviour
   3.3.2 Type of change in purchase behaviour
   3.3.3 Reason for change in purchase behaviour
3.4 ROLE OF SUBSTITUTE PRODUCT
  3.4.1 Change in purchase behaviour for substitute product
  3.4.2 Reasons for change in purchase behaviour for substitute product

4 BRAND OWNERSHIP
  4.1 Entitlement of company to change name
  4.2 Requirement to take account of what consumers want
  4.3 Whether companies try to produce what consumers want
  4.4 Who the brand belongs to

5 OTHER CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR POST NAME CHANGE

6 OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION
Appendix 8-Stage 2-Sample Transcript

Interview 001

Key

GR: = Griff Round
P: = Participant
[time e.g. 5:22] = inaudible word at this time
[IA 5:22] = inaudible section at this time
[word] = best guess at word

GR: OK, well to start with can you just tell me a little bit about yourself and maybe why you got in touch with me?
P: I participate in quite a lot of research studies when they look interesting. I consume a lot, so I thought that’s one I can do! <Laughs>

GR: And what do you do work-wise?
P: I’m a secretary.

GR: At the university?
P: Yeah, on a research project at the university.

GR: As you know, the topic today is looking at companies when they change the name of brands, so basically that’s what we’re going to be talking about. I guess obviously you wouldn’t have got in touch with me unless you’d thought of a number of examples where something had happened?
P: Yeah, I can think of a few. <Pause> <Laughs>

GR: I don’t want to put words into your mouth.
P: There’s a women’s product called … for removing hair <Laughs> which is famous, which used to be called Immac, and it changed its name to Veet. I thought how ridiculous. What’s that about? And my mother said, ‘That used to be called Veet.’ This must have been many, many years ago, and she said, ‘Oh, it must be something to do with … what’s the word? Some company change or something like that, so they’ve had to change the name or something. So that was quite intriguing. That’s one, where you think what, why, why on earth have they changed that? It doesn’t convey anything about what it does, it’s just annoying perhaps, if you were looking for that.
GR: So was that a product that you’d used?

P: No, not something that I’d used recently, but it’s one that they advertise frequently. It’s just one of those things that you know of, that exists. That’s just one popped into my head ’cause there was no reason for that. There appeared to be no reason for that one.

And the other one I can think of, but I think you mentioned it in your details or your website or something, when Mars changed … not Mars, I’ve forgotten what it was called now, it changed its name to Snickers and everyone thought that was stupid, but that was the European name, wasn’t it? It was what it was known by in Europe.

GR: Well kind of. It used to be called Marathon.

P: Marathon, yeah. I didn’t like them anyway; again I’m not that bothered or actually want to use it, don’t particularly like those but …

GR: There was a couple of examples there of products where they’ve changed the name and you haven’t liked it – even though they’re not necessarily products you actually use.

P: Yeah, it’s one that you know of, that’s familiar; you think why have they done that? It doesn’t sound better, it doesn’t convey anything.

GR: So when you think of a name of a product that you do use, what do you think that means to you?

P: Right – well if they change say KitKat that would be really upsetting. A KitKat is a KitKat.

GR: So is that a product you eat?

P: <Laughs>

GR: Yes, so tell me a little bit about what KitKat means to you.

P: It’s been around for ages, forever I think, and you know what you’re getting. It’s like they changed the wrapper, didn’t they, and that upset people. A KitKat’s a KitKat, and I know it will still taste the same but if they gave it a different name I’d be a bit annoyed. I suspect when they do it that it’s to bring attention, it’s just an excuse for doing their advertising. It’s just something to give the advertising a … you know; it’s a new thing to put in their advertising.

GR: So if we talk about KitKat then, when you think about purchasing KitKat do you weigh it up against other similar products?

P: Very much so, yes.

GR: So what other products do you think about at the same time?
P: Well I think a lot about Twirl and Cadbury’s Dairy Milk and … Time Out bars and Galaxy bars.

GR: Chocolate-based products.

P: Indeed.

GR: So what is it about KitKat do you think that swings it in favour when you buy that?

P: You have to be in the mood for it, actually think well that’s one product where there’s so many choices that it is very specific. You think, ‘I would like …’ you know exactly what you would like and you know exactly what you’re looking for, but you usually have a second choice if you can’t get it.

GR: Right, so you’ve got a second choice but that’s to do with you definitely want a KitKat and if you can’t find it you’d accept an alternative.

P: Oh yes, yes.

GR: So the other products that you mentioned, ‘cause you like Twirl and Cadbury’s Dairy Milk, are they other ones where you feel it just feels right at the time?

P: That’s right. You have a specific, a thought pops into your head you want that specific one, which tastes a little bit different to the others, but there’s always a second choice, something that’s nearly as good as that at that particular time.

GR: So if we talk about KitKat again, if you compared that with a Supermarket’s own-brand alternative, what would your view be on those?

P: I’ll try anything once. <Pause> Say I want a KitKat, if I couldn’t get a KitKat but I could get one of those Fair Trade chocolate wafers that they sell around the university, those are very good, or a Time Out bar, but they’re rarer, occasionally see those in the chocolate machine.

GR: But if you found something that wasn’t called KitKat but it was pretty much the same product …

P: It would have to taste exactly the same. If a supermarket could recreate that formula of a KitKat and call it AdaKat or something <laughs> that would be fine if I knew it tasted exactly the same.

GR: So I think you’re using KitKat as a, without putting words in your mouth, KitKat tells you what you’re going to get, really.

P: Exactly what you’re going to get, yeah. With chocolate bars you know exactly which one you want.
OK. So we’ll use the example of KitKat ‘cause what I’m interested in is product that people use, what would you think if the name of KitKat was changed say to, just a daft example, to KatKit.

KatKit, that’s not bad actually, but … I’d think they’re doing that to get attention, they don’t really need the advertising, I don’t think they really need to keep advertising a product like that, I think people would buy it anyway. And if I didn’t like the name I would be annoyed, they’ve already messed with the wrapper, don’t mess with the name!

You said you’d be annoyed. Do you think that would change how you’d feel about the product?

I’d still eat it if I fancied one. <Laughs>

So although you didn’t like the name change, you wouldn’t be put off actually purchasing the product?

No. If it was what I wanted at the time, and if it was soap powder or anything, if I liked the product and I didn’t like the alternatives I’d still get that one even though it had changed its name.

So when you say it annoys you, do you think you do something with that annoyance; do you think it makes you behave any differently or change your views on things?

Well everyone’s a bit cynical about adverts, aren’t they, and they can be very annoying, and it’s part of that really. You think why are they doing that. If you don’t like it … if you liked the name change that would be alright maybe, but … KatKit’s quite good, by the way.

But if you don’t like it, it’s just like an annoying advert then, I think it’s that kind of … it’s like are they making so much profit that they’ve got to waste it changing the name and advertising it?

So it seems that it wouldn’t stop you buying the product …

No

But it makes you feel more cynical about advertising in general and stuff like that?

Yes, that’s right.

So we’ve had a bit of this conversation, which is to do with KitKat, and you talked about the fact that you had to be in a particular mood for KitKat and if you were in that particular mood there wasn’t a substitute that was as good as. You’d trade down maybe if you couldn’t get it.

That’s right.
GR: OK. And do you think that’s true for a lot of products, or do you think that’s true for chocolaty type products?

P: <Pause> Yeah, that could be true for a lot of products. I mean if you genuinely need it and you’ve got to get it … then if you can’t find the one you want you’ll have to get something else.

GR: So let’s take the example of KitKat and you have to find something else. How good a substitute would it be? Would it be almost as good or …

P: Yeah, it would be almost as good, yeah. If you need something right away then you’d have to get a substitute but say I was shopping for something I didn’t need right away, I suppose I would wait until I could track down the thing I really wanted, unless I was in a hurry to get something.

GR: The other area I want to talk about, we’ve touched on it, is when companies change the name of products. Just to give some examples, you’ve given one there about the Immac/Veet, and there’s Marathon/Snickers and another one is Jif/Cif.

P: Oh yes, that one.

GR: And another one is Ulay/Olay, the Oil of Ulay became the Oil of Olay.

P: I didn’t notice that, but I never use it.

GR: You’ve talked about how it irritates you but it wouldn’t necessarily change you purchasing the product. Do you think a company is entitled to change the name of a product?

P: Oh yes, of course. That’s up to them.

GR: So linked to that is to what extent do you think companies should take into account what consumers think?

P: Well they basically want sales don’t they, so they don’t want to upset customers, ’cause people do get brand loyal. I think they probably think very carefully before they change the name, but I just think they do it to get publicity.

GR: So you think that if they change the name, because of the publicity at the time of the name change in particular that actually generates extra business?

P: They probably think it does.

GR: And what do you think?

P: It depends whether it’s something that you would buy anyway, I think. I don’t think extra publicity influences me to buy something that’s been around for a long time. I would probably have bought it already, tried it
once ... if I'd wanted to. Like with Jif and Cif, I did know about that one but I don't think I've ever bought any Jif but I knew what it was. <Laughs> So <pause> no, it doesn't make me more likely to buy stuff because they've recently advertised a change of name.

GR: So you think companies do think about these decisions and take into account what consumers ...

P: I think they probably have a panel of consumers and ask them what they think before they do anything, unless they're changing it because of some obscure reason to do with legislation and company names and that kind of thing, which I wouldn't understand.

GR: So let's take KitKat again. Obviously you've talked a bit about what KitKat means to you. Do you feel that it belongs to you in any sense of the word?

P: Products like that, that have been around for a very long time, yes, I think people do get very attached to them.

GR: So what is it about ... we said before about how companies were entitled to change things, but then on the other hand I've said does it belong to you and you said kind of, so how do you square the two?

P: Well it's their product, and they produce it so they can stop producing if they want, as with the Cadbury's Whisper, which has recently reappeared and then disappeared again, quite upsetting when it disappeared again <laughs> so they can play with you like that, they can dangle this thing in front of you saying, 'We're bringing it back' and then they take it away again, but that's up to them.

GR: So are you happy that it's up to them?

P: Well they're the producer, so ... I think it's foolish of them not to carry on producing something that people want or that they like in its current form. If there's nothing wrong with it, why change it, if people like it the way it is, fine, why change it?

GR: OK. One of the things that we talked about before was when products change their name you said it probably won't affect whether I buy it or not but it perhaps makes me a bit more cynical about advertising and things. Can we just talk a bit about whether that affects how you behave or your general attitude to marketing or advertising? Without putting words into your mouth, does being cynical about it mean that you're less likely to believe what you're told or less likely to buy something?

P: Ooh ... I think I believe what I'm told up to a point because they're not allowed to ... they're not really allowed to lie too much, they can mislead ... I mean you try something once and you either like it or you don't and you don't have to buy it again if you don't like it. I don't mind advertising if it's entertaining or informative. I don't object to advertising,
I mean it does alert you to things that you might actually want to use. I’m not sure if I answered that question.

GR: If I take the example of advertising again, I think you said that you basically believe it because they can’t lie because of the fact that they wouldn’t be allowed to or something like that.

P: Yeah, they’d get found out if they lie. <laughs> They can mislead slightly.

GR: So when you look at something like advertising, you’d basically believe it, but maybe you doubt the more extreme elements of it? Would that be fair?

P: Well I believe it when I use it, so say it’s a washing powder, say it was to get stains out, if I use it and it doesn’t get stains out then I’ll know it wasn’t quite as wonderful as it said it was. <laughs> So until you’ve tried it you don’t know. If something says it does this, I’ll probably believe it probably does do that and try it, try it once if it’s something new.

GR: So your attitude to advertising is I would describe fairly positive.

P: Yeah, fairly positive. I don’t massively object to advertising really. Everyone complains about adverts they don’t like, but then there’s adverts that you do like and I think they can be genuinely informative but you always … have that little bit of disbelief, that they’re bound to be exaggerating so don’t completely fall for it, but … you think well, it’s worth a try. So if they bring out a new chocolate bar and say, ‘This tastes absolutely delicious,’ of course I’m going to try it, but if I don’t like it I wouldn’t get it again.

GR: OK. I think the final area I wanted to explore again is this issue about substitute products. So we talked about KitKat and said quite often it’s difficult to find a close substitute. If I talk about some categories of products, let’s take the example of washing powder, do you have a favourite washing powder?

P: I have several favourites. I like a supermarket own brand one, which is an Asda one. That’s a first choice. And Ecover, so those two that I use regularly, and I look for those two and I wouldn’t really be happy about a substitute.

GR: And what is it about a substitute that you’d be unhappy about?

P: Because I don’t know what it’s going to be like. I’ve occasionally tried other ones and a free sample is always good actually, but because you don’t know you’re not going to invest in a big box of something if you think it’s going to smell of … don’t know, more strongly than you want it to or something like that. I think they’re probably all basically the same but they all smell different. And it’s good if they say they’re eco friendly, relatively eco friendly, that’s something I look for as well.
GR: Do you think there are some categories of food or products where really you’re not that bothered, you just pick anything?

P: When anything will do … well … <Pause> No, I think I do look for brands. There’s certain things I pick from different supermarkets that go in at different times and get things that I know I like from one and things that I know I like from another. I’m trying to think of something where it doesn’t matter … no, it does matter quite a lot actually. I’ll try different things, but I generally look for the same thing.

GR: Right. So typically when you go on your supermarket shop, in your head you’ve got ‘I need this particular type of product, and this is my favourite.’

P: Usually, yes.

GR: And quite often if you have to go with a substitute it is something that you don’t regard as good.

P: Yeah, probably. Yeah. Usually, unless it’s something like say kitchen roll, it doesn’t matter as long as it’s recycled. And tissues, things like that; as long as it’s recycled I probably haven’t got much of a preference.

GR: OK. I think I’m coming to the end of this. We’ve talked a bit about brand names and changes, and things like that. Is there anything that you can think of that you’d like to say, to add to this?

P: I thought of something but it’s gone! <Pause> It wasn’t specifically about brand names. It’s when they change the packaging, that’s really annoying, ‘cause I think they’re wasting money doing that. It’s something Boots do a lot with like shampoo bottles and things like that, and they just … it’s not changing the brand, they’re not changing the name, but they’re just changing the colour and … they just change the packaging. And I think what’s the point? You look for the last one that you liked and they’ve changed it. It just seems a bit pointless, that’s what I think, they’re wasting money doing that. I just wonder why they do that. So they’re not actually changing the brand name.

GR: So you said it seems like a waste of money, but is that also because the other thing you said is it may be harder to actually find it?

P: Mm. Yeah.

GR: So when you’re looking for something, and you’ve described how typically in your shopping you’ve got your favourites that you typically have and you’re trying to hunt them down. Do you think there’s something you look for, in your brain, to find it?

P: Yeah, you know what it looks like, and you want to know where to find it as well on the shelf.
GR: So if you had to choose between is it the packaging you notice or the name, what would you say to that?

P: <Pause> It’s both. You know what it looks like … and if they’ve changed it then it’s harder to locate, because there are so many products, but they also like, these big stores like to move everything around physically as well quite often. So it makes it easier to find so it looks the same.

GR: So I guess if they’ve changed the packaging, you’re then relying on the name. If they’ve changed the name you’re relying on the packaging really. But if they’ve changed both at the same time you’re really in the dark.

P: Well say it’s an own brand product, like say it’s Boots, there’s a certain Boots hand cream for example, and I look for that and they don’t always have it, but it hasn’t really got a name, it just says barrier cream. Well it’s in a cream-coloured tube and I recognise it by the cream-coloured tube and there’s so many others that I’m looking for that colour, and if they change the colour on it that would be really difficult … which they haven’t done, but if they did that really would be annoying. But it’s not a brand name as such, ‘cause it’s own brand.

GR: Yeah, but I think it’s quite interesting in terms of as you say, how you track something down, as you say, if they change the packaging then it just makes it that much harder to track it down, and then obviously you’ve got the name as well. So take the example of KitKat, yes you’ve got the packaging and you’ve got the name, but if they change both at the same time, then it would totally throw you.

P: Yes, it would.

GR: ‘cause you can almost cope with one if they leave one the same.

P: Yeah, I suppose so.

GR: But not both.

P: But you might have been alerted to that by advert though.

GR: But just going onto the KitKat, the packaging, I mean that has changed and it was publicised, so obviously, I think you said something like, ‘they messed with the packaging.’

P: Yeah, a lot of people complained about that. <Laughs>

GR: But is that because … I mean the two things we’ve talked about around packaging is 1) it’s just a waste of money 2) is it harder to find? Is there anything about it, why you don’t like the packaging changing?
P: Well, you get attached to things, don’t you? I’ve sort of got used to the packaging on a KitKat but it’s still not the same as when it was silver paper with the paper thing.

GR: And why do you think it’s not the same?

P: Well … <pause>…

GR: Because obviously the chocolate’s the same.

P: The chocolate’s the same but you used to be able to … you’d take the paper wrapper off and it’s got the silver paper and you make grooves in the silver paper and snap off one by one, but a lot of people have talked about that, it’s a ritual. They’ve changed that, so people’s ritual has changed. I’ve got over it!

<Laughter>

GR: So ‘cause it forces you to change your habit, that seems to be …

P: I suppose so. I suppose … it’s such a familiar product that’s been around for such a long time … <pause> I can’t think of another one actually that’s changed as much as that one. Oh, unless it was for marmite that they put in squeezy jars.

GR: Oh yeah, but you can still get the original one.

P: Yes, you can, can’t you? So … yeah.

GR: So it’s quite interesting, ‘cause you’ve said it forces people to change their behaviour, with that, but it also feels that the way you describe it, not necessarily for you now but for other people, it’s something that they actually lose a part of the experience.

P: Yeah, I think they did with that one, yeah. <Laughs>

GR: Different people have used different arguments for that. One argument is it’s like a nostalgic thing, ‘cause it reminds you of when you …

P: Oh yeah, yeah …

GR: But the other is it’s just something that you get … you’ve almost got like a relationship with it, and that’s how you react.

P: Mm

GR: Do you think it’s a bit of both, or do you think it’s a nostalgia kick or …

P: It’s a bit of both. It’s because it’s something that’s been around since a lot of people were children, and you play around with your food, don’t you, <Laughs> so it’s all that kind of thing. And … <pause> yeah, it’s funny, KitKat there was something about the packaging, definitely, even
though you know you’re going to eat it all at once you still break it off bit by bit.

GR: But you still feel that they’re totally within their rights to do that, to change it?

P: Yeah, at their peril.

GR: So you basically think they’re entitled to do that, but obviously if they do something that consumers don’t like, then it’s going to hurt them in the end really.

P: Well there’s always other products, and you might find something you like better than that.

GR: OK. Well I think that’s fine. Thank you very much.

P: Pleasure

GR: I shall just stop the tape now.
### Tree Nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAND NAME DIMENSIONS</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of brand name</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural function</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmotionalRelation function</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysical function</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial function</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>?5</td>
<td>07/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic function</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic phonological association</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symboliccorporateass</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolicconassociation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cym/PersonalAssociation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important of brand name</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAND OWNERSHIP</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation owns the brand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation right to change name</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation/Consumer relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRANDED PRODUCT-SERVICE DIME</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIP TO SUBSTITUTE P</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close substitute not readily available</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close substitute readily available</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>07/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts on Branded Product Servic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORPORATE BEHAVIOUR</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do corporations produce what consu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General attitude towards marketing a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11/03/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should corporations produce what co</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>03/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL ATTITUDE TO LIFE</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13/03/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAME CHANGE EVENT</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in thoughts over time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of name change event</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional/Advertising moderators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of promotion. advertising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of promotion. advertising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning behind change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural aspect</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think about the reason</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think was the reason</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific names involved</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts on name change event</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST NAMF (CHANGE FPSW BRAND N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN ATTITUDE TOWARDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of change in attitude</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for change in attitude</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of change in attitude</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN BRANDED PRODUCT S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of change in purchase ben</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for change in purchase ben</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of substitute product</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN VALUE FROM BRAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in behavioural function</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in metaphysical function</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in rational function</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in relationship emotional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in symbolic function</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in symbolic personal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in symbolic phonologi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in symbolic word ass</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in symbolic corporate assets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of translation strategies to mai</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST NAME CHANGE NON PURCHA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards advertising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards corporations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-purchase behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>03/11/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10-Stage 2-Example of Node Coding in NVivo

So in some ways you’re saying that the consumers can be their own worst enemies because they want things but they’re not thinking about the long-term consequences of [10,24] on the brand.

P: Yeah.

should corporations produce what consumers want?

P: That’s a difficult one. I think, yeah, and there is accountability to the consumer, but at the same time I get the idea that you can’t be constrained by the mob, as it were. It’s a difficult one, but I do think that companies should be accountable to people and give them what they want.

Should businesses produce what consumers want?

P: <Laughter> Yes and no. Yes, of course they should, but equally this is the classic [17,22] market research in many ways, actually, is that you ask a customer what they want and they won’t be able to articulate it. You show them something which you think they might want and then they can tell you how to refine it. So I think businesses should produce what customers want, but equally their new product development programme needs to be informed by a sense of, I suppose, innovation from within which is then moulded, refined, adjusted according to whatever consumer reaction one gets to do that innovation through research.
Appendix 11 - Supermarket Parasite Brands

Can You Tell the Difference?

- Lurpak Spreadable
- Sainsbury’s Buttersoft
- Fairy Liquid
- Magnum Premium Washing Up Liquid
- Gillette Mach 3 Turbo blades
- I Can’t Believe It’s Not Butter
- Red Bull
- Asda Blue Charge
- Original Source Lime shower wash
- Wake Up!
- Dove Silk
- Boots Blade 3
- Boots Skin Silk Moisture Rich Cream Body Wash
- Radox Shower Smoothies
- Asda You’d Butter Believe It!
- Boots Smooth Me
Can you tell the difference? The ‘parasite’ own brands designed to rip off best-sellers

By Sean Poulter
Last updated at 12:47 PM on 5th March 2011

Supermarkets have been accused of using ‘parasite packaging’ – copying big brands – to steal sales.

The British Brands Group has published research naming and shaming stores including Tesco, Sainsbury’s, Asda and Boots.

It claims brands such as Head & Shoulders, Lurpak, Utterly Butterly, Lynx, Gillette, Red Bull, Radox, Dove, Vicks and Sarsons vinegar are being ripped off on a massive scale.

Confusing: Supermarket products are packaged to resemble top-selling brands, according to critics

The trade body says the Government should use a current review of intellectual property (IP) rules to stamp out what it says is blatant theft.

Big-brand manufacturers spend millions developing images and packaging for their products, which are then promoted through advertising.

However, supermarkets can cash in by simply copying best-selling products for a fraction of the price.

The more packaging looks like familiar brands, the more likely shoppers are to buy them by mistake, according to research published in 2009.

The brands group complained: ‘The copy benefits from a reputation it does not warrant, increasing its appeal to shoppers and allowing it to command higher prices.’

BBG director John Noble said: ‘At a time when household budgets are under such severe pressure, shoppers must have confidence in what they are buying.

‘People do not want the wool pulled over their eyes. Companies should be able to help themselves and shoppers by stamping out misleading packaging.

‘In the UK this is simply not possible – a situation which is in stark contrast to most other countries. The Government’s IP review offers a perfect opportunity to rectify this.’

A previous review in 2006 concluded that big brands have little protection. It suggested the firms should be given power through the civil courts to take action against copycat rivals.

At the time, the Government refused to allow this and, instead, said policing should be put in the hands of the Office of Fair Trading and Trading Standards. But critics say they do not have the time or money to pursue such cases.

The British Retail Consortium said the success of own-label products was based on their quality rather than any similarity to big brands.

Its food director, Andrew Opie, said: ‘The success of own-brands has not come from packaging. It’s come from retailers putting their own names and reputations behind innovation and development of quality products.’
Welcome to the questionnaire. We are going to ask you a series of questions about your first choice product.

We need you to judge it against a series of descriptive scales.

If you feel your first choice product is very closely related to one end of the scale then mark a box at that end.

If you feel that your first choice product seems only slightly related to one end of the scale you should mark a box near the centre.

Press next to move onto the next page.
Appendix 12-Stage 3-Involvement Task-Introductory Screen 2

Please answer every question. Do not miss any out.
Think about each item separately and independently.
Work at fairly high speed through the questions.

Don’t worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate feelings about the items that you want.

On the other hand please don’t be careless because we want your true impressions.

0% 100%

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School
Appendix 12-Stage 3-Involvement Task-Sample Scale Screen
Appendix 12-Stage 3-Involvement Task-Final Screen

Thank you for your time.

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School
Appendix 13-Stage 3-Conjoint Analysis Task Complete Screenshots

The following 38 pages show the complete conjoint analysis task screenshot, as presented to participants within the research study. Differences would occur based on the specific products under consideration by each individual and the type of new brand name assumed.
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study! We are asking people to think about various aspects of their favourite products. In particular:

**Whether the price, packaging or size of a product matters**

**Whether changing the name of a product matters**

**Whether being the favourite matters**

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School
You have already given me your favourite and second favourite products and you should base your answers on these.

You will shortly be asked to make choices based on a number of changes being made to these products. The possible changes are:

a. the price of the product is increased or reduced from what it currently is
b. the product is unchanged except it is given a new brand name
c. the size of the product is increased or reduced from what it currently is
d. the product is unchanged except it is given new packaging

You will be asked to decide which option you prefer and by how much.

You should answer all questions until you are asked to stop. It should take around 20 minutes.

If you have any queries please ask!

Click on the Next button to continue...
What is your age?

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School
What gender are you? (M/F)
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Anchor
  - with its price increased by 10%
  - with its size reduced by 10%
  - with new packaging

- Lurpak renamed Power
  - with its price reduced by 10%
  - at its current size
  - with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0%...100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Anchor
  - with its price increased by 10%
  - at its current size
  - with its current packaging

or

- Lurpak renamed Power
  - with its price increased by 20%
  - with its size increased by 10%
  - with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Lurpak renamed Power... with its price increased by 10%... at its current size... with new packaging

or

- Anchor... at the current price... with its size increased by 10%... with its current packaging

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak renamed Power
- with its price increased by 20%
- at its current size
- with its current packaging

or

Lurpak
- with its price increased by 10%
- with its size reduced by 10%
- with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0% 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Lurpak renamed Power
  - with its price increased by 20%
  - with its size increased by 10%
  - with its current packaging

or

- Lurpak
  - with its price reduced by 10%
  - at its current size
  - with new packaging

Choose your preference:

- Strongly Prefer Left
- Somewhat Prefer Left
- Indifferent
- Somewhat Prefer Right
- Strongly Prefer Right

0% - 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Anchor
  - with its price increased by 20%
  - with its size increased by 10%
  - with its current packaging

- Lurpak
  - at the current price
  - at its current size
  - with new packaging

- Strongly Prefer Left
- Somewhat Prefer Left
- Indifferent
- Somewhat Prefer Right
- Strongly Prefer Right
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak renamed Power
...at the current price
...at its current size
...with new packaging

or

Lurpak
...with its price increased by 10%
...with its size increased by 10%
...with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak renamed Power
...with its price reduced by 10%
...with its size reduced by 10%
...with its current packaging

or

Lurpak
...with its price increased by 10%
...at its current size
...with new packaging

Strongly
Prefer
Left

Somewhat
Prefer
Left

Indifferent

Somewhat
Prefer
Right

Strongly
Prefer
Right

0%

100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak
... with its price increased by 20%
... with its size reduced by 10%
... with new packaging

Lurpak
or
renamed
Power
... with its price reduced by 20%
... at its current size
... with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0%
100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

**Anchor**
- with its price increased by 20%
- at its current size
- with its current packaging

**Lurpak renamed Power**
- at the current price
- with its size increased by 10%
- with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School

0% 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- **Anchor**
  - with its price reduced by 10%
  - at its current size
  - with its current packaging

- **Lurpak renamed Power**
  - at the current price
  - with its size reduced by 10%
  - with new packaging

Choose your preference on the scale provided.
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Lurpak renamed Power
  - with its price increased by 10%
  - with its size increased by 10%
  - with new packaging

- Lurpak
  - with its price reduced by 20%
  - with its size reduced by 10%
  - with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School

Done
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Lurpak
  - with its price reduced by 10%
  - with its size reduced by 10%
  - with new packaging

or

- Anchor
  - at the current price
  - at its current size
  - with its current packaging

Which of the following would you prefer?

Anchor

...with its price reduced by 20%
...with its size increased by 10%
...with new packaging

or

Lurpak renamed Power

...with its price reduced by 10%
...with its size reduced by 10%
...with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right
Which of the following would you prefer?

Anchor
...at the current price
...with its size reduced by 10%
...with its current packaging

or

Lurpak renamed Power
...with its price reduced by 20%
...with its size increased by 10%
...with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0% 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Anchor
  - with its price reduced by 10%
  - with its size reduced by 10%
  - with new packaging

- Lurpak renamed Power
  - with its price increased by 10%
  - at its current size
  - with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0% | 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak
- with its price reduced by 20%
- with its size reduced by 10%
- with its current packaging

or

Anchor
- with its price reduced by 10%
- with its size increased by 10%
- with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0% 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Anchor
  - at the current price
  - with its size reduced by 10%
  - with new packaging

- Lurpak
  - with its price increased by 20%
  - at its current size
  - with its current packaging

[Option selection scale]
Which of the following would you prefer?

LURPAK
... with its price reduced by 20%  
... at its current size 
... with new packaging

or

ANCHOR
... with its price increased by 10%  
... with its size increased by 10% 
... with its current packaging


The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School

0%  100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak
...at the current price
...with its size increased by 10%
...with new packaging

or

Anchor
...with its price reduced by 20%
...with its size reduced by 10%
...with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left.
Somewhat Prefer Left.
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right.
Strongly Prefer Right.

0% 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- LURPAK
  - with its price reduced by 20%
  - with its size increased by 10%
  - with new packaging

- ANCHOR
  - at the current price
  - at its current size
  - with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left.
Somewhat Prefer Left.
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right.
Strongly Prefer Right.

The University of Manchester
Manchester Business School
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Anchor
  - ...with its price reduced by 20%
  - ...at its current size
  - ...with new packaging

  or

- Lurpak
  - ...with its price increased by 20%
  - ...with its size reduced by 10%
  - ...with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak renamed Power
- with its price increased by 10%
- with its size reduced by 10%
- with its current packaging

or

Anchor
- with its price reduced by 20%
- with its size increased by 10%
- with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right.
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Lurpak renamed Power
  - with its price increased by 20%
  - at its current size
  - with new packaging

- Lurpak
  - with its price reduced by 10%
  - with its size increased by 10%
  - with its current packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0% 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

Lurpak
...with its price reduced by 20%
...with its size reduced by 10%
...with its current packaging

or

Anchor
...with its price increased by 20%
...with its size increased by 10%
...with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right

0% 100%
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Lurpak renamed Power
  - with its price increased by 10%
  - with its size increased by 10%
  - with its current packaging

- Anchor
  - with its price increased by 20%
  - with its size reduced by 10%
  - with new packaging

[Scale for preference: Strongly Prefer Left, Somewhat Prefer Left, Indifferent, Somewhat Prefer Right, Strongly Prefer Right]
Which of the following would you prefer?

- Lurpak
  ...at the current price
  ...with its size increased by 10%
  ...with its current packaging

- Lurpak renamed
  Power
  ...with its price reduced by 10%
  ...with its size reduced by 10%
  ...with new packaging

Strongly Prefer Left
Somewhat Prefer Left
Indifferent
Somewhat Prefer Right
Strongly Prefer Right
In the choice questions you answered the name of your favourite product was changed to Power/s. Would you have made any different choices if a different name had been chosen?
One of the scenarios that you have been asked to consider is a change in brand name. If that were to happen to your favourite brand how do you think that it would impact you?
Do you think a change in brand name of your favourite product would be a good or bad thing? Why do you think that?
Do you think a company should change the brand name of its products? Why/Why not?
Thank you very much for your time!
Appendix 14-Stage 3-University Recruitment Advertisement

Would you still buy your favourite brand if its price went up?

Description
Or if it changed its name, size or packaging?
I am carrying out a research study on this topic and am looking for volunteers to complete a questionnaire. You need to be based permanently in the UK, over 18 and be prepared to complete a computer-based questionnaire at the University.
I will pay £10 to show appreciation and compensate you for your time.
Simply contact me as shown below

Contact Details
Griff Round-Manchester Business School PhD student
Tel: 07908 255748
Email: David.Round@postgrad.mbs.ac.uk
## Appendix 15-Stage 3-Participant Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No.</th>
<th>Age band</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Product Category</th>
<th>First choice</th>
<th>Second choice</th>
<th>New brand name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola Zero</td>
<td>Sprite Zero</td>
<td>Cola-Cola Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>Dove</td>
<td>Pure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Cola-Cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Fanta</td>
<td>Cola-Cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>dellion and Burdock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Schweppes</td>
<td>Cola-Cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bottled Water</td>
<td>Vittel</td>
<td>Evian</td>
<td>Vital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Adidas</td>
<td>Ike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Clothing-Sports</td>
<td>Converse</td>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Onverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Pepsi Max</td>
<td>Diet Pepsi</td>
<td>Pipsi Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Breakfast Cereals</td>
<td>Weetabix</td>
<td>Kellogg’s</td>
<td>Eetabix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Fanta</td>
<td>Cola-Cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Madbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>Marlboro</td>
<td>Benson and Hedges</td>
<td>Arlboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Pepsi Max</td>
<td>Coca-Cola Zero</td>
<td>Pipsi Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>Carlsberg</td>
<td>Stella Artois</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Clothing-Fashion</td>
<td>Dr Denim</td>
<td>Levis</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>Guinness</td>
<td>Kronenbourg</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>Kettle Chips</td>
<td>McCoy’s</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Britvic</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Booksellers</td>
<td>Waterstones</td>
<td>W.H.Smith’s</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>Tropicana</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Baked Beans</td>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>Branston</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Nestle</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>Tetley</td>
<td>P.G.Tips</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Brand 1</td>
<td>Brand 2</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Cadbury’s Dairy Milk</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>Twining’s</td>
<td>Supermarket own-brand</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Kit Kat Chunky</td>
<td>Twix</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Musical Instruments</td>
<td>Van Doren</td>
<td>Rico Royal</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Clothes-Fashion</td>
<td>H and M</td>
<td>Moto</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>Lipton’s</td>
<td>Twining’s</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>P.G.Tips</td>
<td>Tetley</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yoghurt</td>
<td>Muller Light</td>
<td>Activia</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>Audi</td>
<td>VW</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Pepsi Max</td>
<td>Diet Coke</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Stores-Clothes</td>
<td>Clarks</td>
<td>Marks and Spencer</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Dove</td>
<td>Nivea</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Nestle</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Trevor Sorbie</td>
<td>Toni and Guy</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>Warburton’s</td>
<td>Hovis</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Head and Shoulders</td>
<td>Wash and Go</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Oral B</td>
<td>Colgate</td>
<td>Aral B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Rimmel London</td>
<td>Collection 20</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bottled Water</td>
<td>Brecon Carrig</td>
<td>Evian</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cooking Sauces</td>
<td>Paul Newman</td>
<td>Hellman’s</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>Asda</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Azda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Breakfast Cereals</td>
<td>Weetabix</td>
<td>Alpen</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yoghurt</td>
<td>Danone</td>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Coffee House</td>
<td>Cafe Nero</td>
<td>Costa</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>Sainsbury’s</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>Boddingtons</td>
<td>Spaten</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ice Cream</td>
<td>Hiagen Daz</td>
<td>Breyers</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Breakfast Cereals</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Personal Computers</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Fenjal</td>
<td>Imperial Leather</td>
<td>Jenjal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Pepsi Max</td>
<td>Coke Zero</td>
<td>Pipsi Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Lindt</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Sindt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Lindt</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Sindt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca Cola</td>
<td>Dr. Pepper</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nappies</td>
<td>Huggies</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>Doritos</td>
<td>McCoy’s</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Rubicon</td>
<td>Sundrop</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Baked Beans</td>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>Asda</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Brand 1</td>
<td>Brand 2</td>
<td>Brand 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>Walker’s</td>
<td>Hula Hoops</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>Grolsch</td>
<td>Becks</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>Pringles</td>
<td>Doritos</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Aquafresh</td>
<td>Colgate</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Soft Drinks/Juices</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Dr. Pepper</td>
<td>Cola-Cola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Stores-Clothes</td>
<td>Fat Face</td>
<td>White Stuff</td>
<td>Fit Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Tresemme</td>
<td>Pantene</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Breakfast Cereals</td>
<td>Kellogg’s</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Telegraph</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Soup</td>
<td>Heinz</td>
<td>Baxters</td>
<td>Power’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Confectionery</td>
<td>Trebor Extra</td>
<td>Fox’s XXX Mints</td>
<td>Power’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>PG Tips</td>
<td>Typhoo</td>
<td>VG Tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>Gordon’s Gin</td>
<td>Beefeater Gin</td>
<td>Power’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>Stores-Clothes</td>
<td>Zara</td>
<td>Reiss</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Breakfast Cereals</td>
<td>Oats So Simple</td>
<td>Weetabix</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Nestle</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Toiletries</td>
<td>Pantene</td>
<td>Tresemme</td>
<td>Fantene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>Gusto</td>
<td>Pizza Express</td>
<td>Gasto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Stores-Beauty</td>
<td>Body Shop</td>
<td>Boots</td>
<td>Power Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Breakfast Cereals</td>
<td>Kellogg’s</td>
<td>Sainsbury’s</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Clothing-Sports</td>
<td>Haglofs</td>
<td>Lowe Alpine</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>Potato Crisps</td>
<td>NikNaks</td>
<td>Walker’s</td>
<td>NakNaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>Yorkshire Tea</td>
<td>Tetley Tea</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>Clothing-Sports</td>
<td>Adidas</td>
<td>Fred Perry</td>
<td>Badidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverages</td>
<td>Stella Artois</td>
<td>Becks</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Calaxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Green and Black</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Coffee House</td>
<td>Starbucks</td>
<td>Cafe Nero</td>
<td>Barbucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>Cadbury</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>099</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>PG Tips</td>
<td>Typhoo</td>
<td>VG Tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>Lurpak</td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 16: Stage 3 - Average impact on Consumer Value from Price Increase obtained from Conjoint Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>part-worth current price</th>
<th>part-worth +10%</th>
<th>part-worth +20%</th>
<th>part-worth -10%</th>
<th>part-worth -20%</th>
<th>Average impact on consumer value from 10% price Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29665</td>
<td>2.11227</td>
<td>1.24970</td>
<td>5.22093</td>
<td>5.65299</td>
<td>-1.32758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.70521</td>
<td>3.14490</td>
<td>1.30884</td>
<td>4.79927</td>
<td>6.56825</td>
<td>-1.07102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06213</td>
<td>2.26036</td>
<td>1.42145</td>
<td>3.43793</td>
<td>4.79547</td>
<td>-0.71615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38078</td>
<td>0.91841</td>
<td>1.31010</td>
<td>3.11383</td>
<td>3.51411</td>
<td>-0.82436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25582</td>
<td>1.82894</td>
<td>1.33251</td>
<td>3.81605</td>
<td>4.37914</td>
<td>-0.87761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.31614</td>
<td>2.18317</td>
<td>1.22238</td>
<td>4.91578</td>
<td>6.27657</td>
<td>-1.31493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.52386</td>
<td>0.96814</td>
<td>1.40002</td>
<td>2.87007</td>
<td>2.19052</td>
<td>-0.5743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.88454</td>
<td>1.10124</td>
<td>1.24589</td>
<td>2.30649</td>
<td>2.21788</td>
<td>-0.42281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.62140</td>
<td>2.05478</td>
<td>1.27762</td>
<td>4.84433</td>
<td>5.36620</td>
<td>-1.20846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.29367</td>
<td>1.62181</td>
<td>1.21721</td>
<td>3.17533</td>
<td>3.49367</td>
<td>-0.67294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.52700</td>
<td>1.87968</td>
<td>1.32308</td>
<td>4.17432</td>
<td>5.06426</td>
<td>-1.04131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.70032</td>
<td>3.30434</td>
<td>1.26633</td>
<td>5.66361</td>
<td>5.23536</td>
<td>-1.08573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.50653</td>
<td>2.07245</td>
<td>1.20802</td>
<td>4.07395</td>
<td>4.67172</td>
<td>-0.93334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.41623</td>
<td>2.56794</td>
<td>1.39463</td>
<td>4.76901</td>
<td>5.21269</td>
<td>-1.02753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.66489</td>
<td>1.57759</td>
<td>1.22629</td>
<td>3.62030</td>
<td>3.79058</td>
<td>-0.83121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.29891</td>
<td>3.75240</td>
<td>1.31334</td>
<td>4.52163</td>
<td>6.08798</td>
<td>-0.78914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.64702</td>
<td>1.57140</td>
<td>1.16367</td>
<td>4.23700</td>
<td>3.92403</td>
<td>-1.01148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.03410</td>
<td>1.99517</td>
<td>1.29256</td>
<td>3.89158</td>
<td>5.10079</td>
<td>-0.95013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.62595</td>
<td>2.26265</td>
<td>1.31667</td>
<td>3.71540</td>
<td>3.39256</td>
<td>-0.62267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.47833</td>
<td>1.82895</td>
<td>1.32535</td>
<td>4.48721</td>
<td>5.22270</td>
<td>-1.15173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.19381</td>
<td>1.66936</td>
<td>1.29746</td>
<td>2.94436</td>
<td>4.12319</td>
<td>-0.67197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.95207</td>
<td>2.31501</td>
<td>1.18150</td>
<td>4.05580</td>
<td>4.58932</td>
<td>-0.86118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.47889</td>
<td>2.05264</td>
<td>1.17065</td>
<td>3.01338</td>
<td>4.01222</td>
<td>-0.59538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.39738</td>
<td>3.02302</td>
<td>1.49187</td>
<td>4.51116</td>
<td>6.07385</td>
<td>-0.94478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.66257</td>
<td>2.95414</td>
<td>1.15229</td>
<td>3.95888</td>
<td>4.99241</td>
<td>-0.7312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.54326</td>
<td>2.20565</td>
<td>1.32500</td>
<td>2.38513</td>
<td>3.90256</td>
<td>-0.36707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.37608</td>
<td>2.50212</td>
<td>1.23842</td>
<td>3.70458</td>
<td>4.81375</td>
<td>-0.74753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.89493</td>
<td>2.01264</td>
<td>1.26535</td>
<td>3.08592</td>
<td>3.79824</td>
<td>-0.58493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.53525</td>
<td>3.45132</td>
<td>1.30387</td>
<td>5.15343</td>
<td>5.28153</td>
<td>-0.92274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.24697</td>
<td>1.29566</td>
<td>1.29656</td>
<td>2.88145</td>
<td>3.24697</td>
<td>-0.65677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.59244</td>
<td>2.23419</td>
<td>1.23436</td>
<td>3.35068</td>
<td>3.55051</td>
<td>-0.56864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.90820</td>
<td>0.91579</td>
<td>1.25056</td>
<td>2.75823</td>
<td>3.70820</td>
<td>-0.76782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.96898</td>
<td>1.45905</td>
<td>1.29524</td>
<td>3.47891</td>
<td>2.64272</td>
<td>-0.6734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.25017</td>
<td>2.00050</td>
<td>1.17523</td>
<td>3.92557</td>
<td>5.75453</td>
<td>-1.05368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.89667</td>
<td>1.63225</td>
<td>1.26340</td>
<td>4.19923</td>
<td>4.41462</td>
<td>-1.03565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.92741</td>
<td>1.64384</td>
<td>1.27397</td>
<td>1.49695</td>
<td>1.64918</td>
<td>-0.11122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.85646</td>
<td>2.28873</td>
<td>1.26575</td>
<td>3.96469</td>
<td>4.17724</td>
<td>-0.78293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.96080</td>
<td>2.26621</td>
<td>1.21534</td>
<td>3.82149</td>
<td>4.67651</td>
<td>-0.82147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.36653</td>
<td>1.27937</td>
<td>1.20539</td>
<td>1.49695</td>
<td>1.64918</td>
<td>-0.11122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.56131</td>
<td>2.94310</td>
<td>1.35315</td>
<td>5.27359</td>
<td>7.20537</td>
<td>-1.31415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.81338</td>
<td>2.23260</td>
<td>1.35603</td>
<td>4.65150</td>
<td>6.68004</td>
<td>-1.27023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.71108</td>
<td>1.75199</td>
<td>1.16624</td>
<td>4.64072</td>
<td>4.60946</td>
<td>-1.15259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.53774</td>
<td>1.79897</td>
<td>1.17973</td>
<td>4.64096</td>
<td>5.45602</td>
<td>-1.24503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.59792</td>
<td>1.47775</td>
<td>1.28073</td>
<td>1.78476</td>
<td>1.8178</td>
<td>-0.06438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.96029</td>
<td>2.17780</td>
<td>1.21055</td>
<td>4.64814</td>
<td>4.99636</td>
<td>-1.06649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.32693</td>
<td>0.76615</td>
<td>1.28656</td>
<td>1.41210</td>
<td>3.66945</td>
<td>-0.45935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.87142</td>
<td>2.36431</td>
<td>1.29934</td>
<td>5.06418</td>
<td>4.90641</td>
<td>-1.12585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.04760</td>
<td>2.83097</td>
<td>1.21358</td>
<td>4.17532</td>
<td>6.17634</td>
<td>-0.95643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.50222</td>
<td>2.65124</td>
<td>1.25209</td>
<td>3.93666</td>
<td>4.50222</td>
<td>-0.72762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.47489</td>
<td>1.46033</td>
<td>1.40594</td>
<td>5.12472</td>
<td>5.53314</td>
<td>-1.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.04960</td>
<td>2.12357</td>
<td>1.16475</td>
<td>3.39380</td>
<td>4.51626</td>
<td>-0.7365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.92250</td>
<td>1.86427</td>
<td>1.30540</td>
<td>3.71407</td>
<td>5.13961</td>
<td>-0.94173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.58032</td>
<td>1.39974</td>
<td>1.17246</td>
<td>3.70213</td>
<td>4.01813</td>
<td>-0.93131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.28763</td>
<td>2.71944</td>
<td>1.17251</td>
<td>5.38914</td>
<td>7.20725</td>
<td>-1.42121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.84009</td>
<td>2.27163</td>
<td>1.24423</td>
<td>3.20854</td>
<td>3.63595</td>
<td>-0.53319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.58917</td>
<td>1.52510</td>
<td>1.15678</td>
<td>3.20271</td>
<td>3.72445</td>
<td>-0.74036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.39624</td>
<td>0.49934</td>
<td>1.17533</td>
<td>0.84738</td>
<td>0.72957</td>
<td>-0.03129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.94857</td>
<td>1.96671</td>
<td>1.39584</td>
<td>4.08065</td>
<td>4.01461</td>
<td>-0.85583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.17416</td>
<td>1.37971</td>
<td>1.35196</td>
<td>2.40832</td>
<td>2.30902</td>
<td>-0.37679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.55215</td>
<td>1.87621</td>
<td>1.25833</td>
<td>2.88739</td>
<td>3.14029</td>
<td>-0.48804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.80008</td>
<td>2.24253</td>
<td>1.29760</td>
<td>3.51502</td>
<td>4.88898</td>
<td>-0.76705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.49153</td>
<td>2.23784</td>
<td>1.28994</td>
<td>3.61348</td>
<td>4.15819</td>
<td>-0.70244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.72336</td>
<td>1.21285</td>
<td>1.18951</td>
<td>1.06365</td>
<td>1.94482</td>
<td>-0.05711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.47553</td>
<td>1.97618</td>
<td>1.07483</td>
<td>3.38739</td>
<td>4.76418</td>
<td>-0.81397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.35920</td>
<td>2.66846</td>
<td>1.11842</td>
<td>4.09074</td>
<td>5.55831</td>
<td>-0.91146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.36312</td>
<td>3.53829</td>
<td>1.45537</td>
<td>4.06236</td>
<td>3.09788</td>
<td>-0.33544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.07163</td>
<td>2.44695</td>
<td>1.17841</td>
<td>2.34731</td>
<td>4.58080</td>
<td>-0.40039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.06545</td>
<td>1.02147</td>
<td>1.21085</td>
<td>2.16403</td>
<td>1.86545</td>
<td>-0.36747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.64046</td>
<td>1.72854</td>
<td>1.15354</td>
<td>4.24162</td>
<td>4.10771</td>
<td>-0.99754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.72131</td>
<td>0.89801</td>
<td>1.13452</td>
<td>1.73139</td>
<td>2.45464</td>
<td>-0.37336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.31384</td>
<td>0.78781</td>
<td>1.24915</td>
<td>4.18979</td>
<td>4.55181</td>
<td>-1.26333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.75905</td>
<td>2.39914</td>
<td>1.26134</td>
<td>5.30258</td>
<td>3.82575</td>
<td>-1.06141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.66999</td>
<td>1.56255</td>
<td>1.33347</td>
<td>4.08156</td>
<td>4.56464</td>
<td>-1.03365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.12154</td>
<td>2.08932</td>
<td>1.28552</td>
<td>2.55377</td>
<td>2.55757</td>
<td>-0.27512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.15655</td>
<td>1.74904</td>
<td>1.28175</td>
<td>3.68694</td>
<td>4.56779</td>
<td>-0.89523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.52824</td>
<td>2.35536</td>
<td>1.25093</td>
<td>3.93728</td>
<td>4.42534</td>
<td>-0.79228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.42935</td>
<td>1.39056</td>
<td>1.34194</td>
<td>2.62223</td>
<td>2.69602</td>
<td>-0.47718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.18846</td>
<td>2.67148</td>
<td>1.31164</td>
<td>4.70024</td>
<td>3.68327</td>
<td>-0.80364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.54585</td>
<td>1.77614</td>
<td>1.19568</td>
<td>3.88375</td>
<td>4.95239</td>
<td>-0.99649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.90707</td>
<td>1.86844</td>
<td>1.19544</td>
<td>3.79065</td>
<td>4.10707</td>
<td>-0.84451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.48300</td>
<td>1.86438</td>
<td>1.26364</td>
<td>2.37418</td>
<td>2.96338</td>
<td>-0.33992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.37009</td>
<td>2.27475</td>
<td>1.16571</td>
<td>5.33703</td>
<td>6.28689</td>
<td>-1.40572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.96415</td>
<td>2.03027</td>
<td>1.26135</td>
<td>3.56470</td>
<td>3.33362</td>
<td>-0.64264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.91087</td>
<td>2.53330</td>
<td>1.25228</td>
<td>3.95511</td>
<td>4.56945</td>
<td>-0.7701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.46929</td>
<td>1.75094</td>
<td>1.19690</td>
<td>2.18765</td>
<td>3.40835</td>
<td>-0.38561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.11830</td>
<td>1.82423</td>
<td>1.33480</td>
<td>3.10740</td>
<td>3.84618</td>
<td>-0.63472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.29482</td>
<td>1.49538</td>
<td>1.20737</td>
<td>1.88265</td>
<td>1.23012</td>
<td>-0.09966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.83788</td>
<td>2.95638</td>
<td>1.25833</td>
<td>4.69002</td>
<td>5.37262</td>
<td>-0.9477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.62360</td>
<td>1.09597</td>
<td>1.26908</td>
<td>2.76826</td>
<td>5.30338</td>
<td>-0.92236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.48782</td>
<td>2.85643</td>
<td>1.37327</td>
<td>2.48906</td>
<td>3.06896</td>
<td>-0.12012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.33275</td>
<td>2.30400</td>
<td>1.29522</td>
<td>3.66568</td>
<td>4.39941</td>
<td>-0.72844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.72404</td>
<td>2.45810</td>
<td>1.35294</td>
<td>2.76108</td>
<td>3.65737</td>
<td>-0.3638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.72158</td>
<td>2.06839</td>
<td>1.11819</td>
<td>3.51149</td>
<td>4.52158</td>
<td>-0.7862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.75705</td>
<td>1.98946</td>
<td>1.10792</td>
<td>2.37560</td>
<td>3.51574</td>
<td>-0.39751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.98730</td>
<td>1.58744</td>
<td>1.20815</td>
<td>2.34162</td>
<td>2.86446</td>
<td>-0.39558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.28689</td>
<td>1.98551</td>
<td>1.33457</td>
<td>3.22260</td>
<td>3.82185</td>
<td>-0.62018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.96693</td>
<td>2.72859</td>
<td>1.19372</td>
<td>4.10000</td>
<td>5.35704</td>
<td>-0.86327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.40612</td>
<td>1.59031</td>
<td>1.18313</td>
<td>2.03563</td>
<td>2.38919</td>
<td>-0.26209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.58476</td>
<td>1.80668</td>
<td>1.37365</td>
<td>2.12905</td>
<td>3.66855</td>
<td>-0.36746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.20554</td>
<td>1.10447</td>
<td>1.17500</td>
<td>3.54858</td>
<td>5.15543</td>
<td>-1.10858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 17 Example of Consumer Website against Brand Name Change

C.A.R.P:
Campaign Against Renaming Products.

C.A.R.P. is a semi-militant group opposed to the renaming of popular products by large companies. Formed after the Marathon incident of 1993, when the great Marathon bar was renamed Snickers, C.A.R.P. continues to fight against change on the shop shelves.

MARATHON.

For those poor souls too young to remember, there was once a time when the sweet-toothed could enter any respectable confectioners and purchase a delicious peanut-based chocolate bar with the powerful name Marathon. Then, one fateful day, they were told, 'Oh, you mean a Snickers'. Yes, Marathon was replaced by Snickers.

C.A.R.P. says NO
C.A.R.P. says MARATHON.
CARP says 'NO'.
CARP says 'MARATHON'.

OPAL FRUITS.

In the same respectable confectioners in which a Marathon could be purchased, sweet-lovers could also treat themselves to a packet of Opal Fruits. Yes, the sweet to make your mouth water. Then, the 'marketing department' took it into their heads to rename Opal Fruits 'StarBurst'.
CARP says 'NO'.
CARP says 'OPAL FRUITS'.

We will remember.

CARP says 'NO', and appeals to you to refer to them as OPAL FRUITS at all times.
CARP says 'NO', and appeals to you to refer to them as OPAL FRUITS at all times.

**JIF**

One of the most recent massacres, by the marketing department of Unilever International, that all-powerful domestic germ buster Jif has been renamed 'Cif'. This is because apparently Slovenians cannot pronounce 'Jif'.

CARP says 'DON'T CHANGE JIF, CHANGE SLOVENIANS'.

CARP says 'NO'.

CARP says 'JIF'.

**OIL OF ULAY**

Why oh why did some IDIOT go to the trouble of changing Ulay to Olay?? CARP doesn't know, and CARP doesn't care as long as they change it back NOW.

CARP says 'WHY? FOR THE SAKE OF A VOWEL, WHY??'

CARP says 'NO'.

CARP says 'ULAY'.

CARP also objects to:

The Artist Formerly known as Prince:

CARP says 'NO'.

CARP says 'PRINCE'.

Remember: Ask for JIF.

Maybe an executive got stressed, or an advertiser got pissed? Whatever the reason for it, CARP says 'Don't use 'O'.
CARP says 'EMMERDALE FARM'.
CARP says 'NO'.
CARP says 'THE SOVIET UNION'.

A CARP SUCCESS

Who remembers the short life of 'CHOCO KRISPIES' in 1998? Yes, for a brief period, Kellogg changed Coco Pops to 'Choco Krispies'.

But CARP knows that they had already made the decision to change back, and the voting was a marketing stunt. As Kellogg well knows, CARP forced them to change back. A CARP Kellogg insider kidnapped Coco the Monkey, and CARP told, not threatened, told Kelloggs that if Coco Pops were not reinstated then we would be making a one-off cereal called 'Monkey Paws', with a tree, blood-stained blue baseball cap. Kelloggs promptly backed down, and Coco and his cap were returned safe and well. Coco actually supported our campaign and was quite willing to lay down his life.

Kelloggs called the vote and rigged it to cover up CARP's security breach.

CARP gets results.

CARP says 'NO'.

KELLOGGS said 'COCO POPS'.

JOIN CARP NOW.

CARP needs committed shoppers to back our campaigns. Click below and send your email address and name to receive your free membership card.

JOIN HERE

Also click above to inform CARP of any name changes you are unhappy with. Be it a product, place-name, TV show Title, celebrity band name, or anything else you feel warrants a CARP campaign, tell CARP about it NOW.
Exploring consumer brand name equity: gaining insight through the investigation of response to name change

Abstract

Purpose - Academic literature generally regards the brand name element as central to consumer brand equity (e.g. Keller, 2003). Unfortunately scant research has been carried out to justify such a position for established products and services. The purpose of this study was to address this research gap.

Methodology - A series of 25 semi-structured qualitative interviews was carried out with consumers, exploring functions performed by the brand name for established products and services. In order to isolate the brand name element this focused upon global marketing induced brand name changes.

Findings - Many of the corporate led functions performed by the brand name within the literature received validation. This suggests that a concept of consumer brand name equity for established products and services can be justified. The study also indicated that a material proportion of the equity from a brand name was determined by the consumer. It revealed that many consumers had created their own associations for the brand name, positive and negative, independent of and different from those driven by the corporation.

Originality/value - It provides needed empirical support for the concept of consumer brand name equity for established products and services. It also suggests that this may be usefully considered as a co-creation between corporation and consumer.
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Introduction

Do consumers care what name a brand possesses? Or to use the language of branding does the brand name element provide equity in its own right? An examination of the branding literature would leave the reader in no doubt about the importance generally accorded to the brand name element.

Of all the marketing variables it is the brand name which receives the most attention by consumers. (de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006)

For many businesses the brand name and what it represents are its most important asset... (Aaker, 1991)

Consider brand names-perhaps the most central of all brand elements... (Keller, 2003)

It would be reasonable to assume that the brand name’s proclaimed importance is supported with empirical data. Surprisingly this is not the case. Such research that there
has been limited itself to new or fictitious brands (Friedman and Dipple, 1978; Gibson, 2005; Mehrabian and Wetter, 1978) or was centred on the entire brand entity rather than the brand name in isolation (Muzellec and Lambkin, 2006; Jaju et al., 2006). In addition doubts arise about whether such importance in the brand name is justifiable when the ongoing name change activity by corporations is considered (i.e. Marathon to Snickers, Bounty to Plenty etc.), given the lack of obvious ill-effects from such changes (e.g. Edwards, 2010).

There is plainly a problematic research gap covering the preponderance of products and services in the market; namely those that are already established. Can we justify giving worth to the brand name element of established products when empirical research has solely looked at new products? It cannot be logically presumed that the brand name element retains its importance as a product moves from new to established and it has been argued that the accrual of the effect of marketing communication programmes supersedes the role of the brand name (Riezebos, 1994).

In order to address this a project was initiated with the research objective of gaining insight into the dimensions and importance of consumer brand name equity for established products and services. This report results from the initial exploratory stage of research. It highlights the methodological considerations, relevant theory and the approach adopted. Findings from the empirical study undertaken are then presented and implications are discussed.

**Literature review**

**Approach to research objective**

The branding literature was reviewed to determine the theoretical dimensions of consumer brand name equity. Following this, empirical work was performed centred on, but not limited to, confirmation or disconfirmation of this theory. However novel approaches were required to progress both the theoretical and the empirical.

**Methodological issues**

The first methodological consideration was that specific theory does not exist for the brand name element. Another issue was how consumer brand name equity could be identified empirically. To address these issues it was decided to adopt a function-based approach towards consumer brand equity, with theoretical consumer functions of brand name being derived from a synthesis of the brand equity literature. This approach is discussed below. A further issue was how the brand name element could be isolated for empirical study. Global marketing induced brand name change was identified as a segregational device that could best achieve this and this is also discussed below.

**Function-based approach towards consumer brand equity**

Since brand equity came to prominence (Keller, 2003; Kapferer, 2004) research has tended to be concentrated on two questions. Firstly how can it be measured? Secondly how can it be created? Two distinct approaches have developed. The first is financially based and focuses on how brands should be valued by corporations (Kapferer, 2004; Keller, 1993). The other approach is labelled customer based and considers that
questions of measurement and creation need to be centred on the customer/consumer.

Work within the second approach has tended to look at what corporations should do to create brand equity for the consumer and to measure how successful they are at achieving this (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993; Nae et al., 1999). For example brand equity research has often concentrated on the constructs of brand awareness and brand association (McCracken and Macklin, 1998; Friedman and Dipple, 1978).

It is arguable whether this latter approach is genuinely customer centric, as it tends to focus on what a corporation is doing rather than what consumers consider that they are getting. Indeed does the act of creating brand awareness by a corporation generate value for a consumer *in itself* unless and until this corporate action performs a value-generating function for the consumer? With this criticism in mind this research adopted a function-based approach towards customer based brand equity. It is premised on the logical reasoning that a brand only provides equity to a customer if the brand performs a function for the customer. This is shown diagrammatically in Figure 1.

**Take in Figure 1: Mediating brand functions**

Under this approach brand awareness and brand associations should not be regarded as direct antecedents of consumer brand equity. Their effects are mediated through their impact on the ability of the brand to perform various functions for the consumer. The adoption of this approach provided a fertile way to explore the dimensions of brand name equity from the consumer perspective.

**Theoretical consumer functions of the brand name**

Academic literature typically considers the brand name as an integral element of the brand (Keller, 2003; Aaker, 1991; de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006) and as such it appears acceptable to assume that the functions of the brand name for the consumer are those of the brand entity.

Four functions of brand that can broadly be described as rational can be ascertained within the literature. Firstly branding can perform an identification function (Farquhar, 1989), enabling a consumer to quickly identify a product or service with which they are familiar. This identification function supports a second key brand function of search cost reduction (Jacoby et al., 1977). Branding can simplify the purchase process not only for products with which consumers are already familiar but also for new products. This is because the branding process facilitates and enables the encapsulation of relevant purchase information, through brand communication and association. For example the association of a brand with particular service attributes, such as speed, allows a consumer to make a quick decision about whether it would meet their functional needs. Thirdly brand is often considered as having a specific role to play in signalling quality (Jacoby et al., 1971; Kapferer, 2004; Brucks et al., 2000), particularly for goods and services whose attributes cannot be assessed prior to purchase. Quality signalling can meet functional needs, such as durability, or be prestige related, meeting symbolic needs. Finally brands can perform a risk reduction function (Roselius, 1971; Aaker, 1991) through the provision of functional consistency or social
risk reduction. For example, branding can ensure that the clothes worn by a consumer do not alienate them from group membership.

A brand is sometimes believed to fulfill a relationship function, through the enablement of an ongoing relationship or emotional attachment between itself and a consumer. In such a relationship, consumers place their trust and loyalty in a brand on the implicit understanding that the brand will satisfy their needs on an ongoing basis. Some scholars, such as Fournier (1991), see this as the main function of branding and of growing importance as a provider of stability and authenticity in a rapidly changing world. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) have taken this notion further with the development of the brand love concept, where consumers are presumed to have love-like feelings for brands. A quotation contained within Roberts (2005) illustrates:

For more years than I can remember I have used the same shampoo: Head & Shoulders. Ridiculous, isn’t it? I mean it’s a shampoo to remove dandruff, which it does. But I’ve no hair, let alone dandruff! Still I love Head & Shoulders. I won’t buy or use anything else.

A habitual function for branding has also been suggested because of its ability to support habitual consumer behaviour. This can be found where actions require minimal thought to implement, reflecting routine repetition of past acts that are cued by stable features in the environment (Wood et al., 2002). An example might be where a consumer goes into the same shop everyday for their newspaper and a chocolate bar. Habitual behaviour offers the benefit to the consumer of reduced cognitive activity requirement thereby allowing other activities to be carried out and leading to stress reduction (Lin and Chang, 2003; Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

Finally, it is asserted within the literature that the purchase of certain brands might perform a symbolic function to consumers through symbolic or psychological associations. It has been claimed that goods are rarely wanted for utilitarian reasons but for the meanings they possess (Douglas and Isherwood, 1996; McCracken, 1986), which provide consumer value. It is likely that many of the consumers purchasing Nike footwear are not driven by functionality. In particular, it is argued that brands are used by consumers for identity development, both in terms of self-regard and perception within the social arena (Elliott and Wattanasuwan, 1998). For example, such uses of brand are very prominent in the McAlexander et al. (2002) study on the Harley-Davidson community. Other examples of brands fulfilling symbolic functions can be found in Kapferer (2004) (ethics—where consumers obtain value from the responsible behaviour of a brand in its societal relationship) and Brown et al. (2003) (nostalgia).

Functions of the brand name contained within scholarly literature can therefore be synthesized into the following typology (Table I).
### Table I. Theoretical consumer functions of brand name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Authors-(examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-Rational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification function</td>
<td>Enables consumer to quickly identify product/service with which they are familiar</td>
<td>Farquhar (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search cost reduction function</td>
<td>Simplifies purchase process providing them with time and resource saving benefits</td>
<td>Jacoby et al. (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality signalling function</td>
<td>Enables consumer to establish quality attribute for goods and services whose attributes cannot be assessed prior to purchase</td>
<td>Jacoby et al. (1971), Kapferer (2004), Brucks et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk reduction function</td>
<td>Reduces perceived functional or symbolic risk from purchase</td>
<td>Roselius (1971), Aaker (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship function</td>
<td>Provides benefit to consumers of ongoing relationship and emotional attachment</td>
<td>Fournier (1998), Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) <code>brand love</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-Habitual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual function</td>
<td>Supports habitual behaviour with benefit of reduced cognitive activity</td>
<td>Wood et al. (2002), Lin and Chang (2003), Berger and Luckmann (1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-Symbolic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Isolation of brand name element for empirical study**

Global marketing induced brand name change can be defined as a change to the name of a product or service resulting from a corporate desire for the same name to be used globally, as opposed to any brand performance issues. Examples within the UK include the change of Marathon to Snickers and Jif to Cif. Typically corporations engaging in this exercise deliberately endeavour to maintain unchanged all the other aspects and elements of the brand (Kapferer, 2004; Potter, 1995). By so doing any impacts on the consumer from the change can reasonably be attributed to the brand name element. This means that if the examination of this type of name change reveals that a change in function performed by the brand to the consumer has occurred then this would give reasoned support for the brand name element being involved in the provision of this particular function. Consequently empirical support for equity being provided by the brand name element to the customer is obtained.

**Theoretical impact of brand name change and mitigation by corporate activity**

In theory it would be expected that the ability of a brand name to perform the various
functions shown in Table I would be impacted by a change in its name. For example the ability of a brand name to fulfil its rational identification function would be reduced if the name were to be changed from a well known to an unknown one.

However it is well documented that corporations engaged in global marketing induced name change employ advertising and promotional programmes in an endeavour to transfer awareness and associations from the old to the new name (Kapferer, 2004; Pottker, 1995; Viscose, 2006). Does this mean that no change in the functions performed by brands would be expected to occur and therefore make empirical study pointless? It was decided that this mitigation by corporate activity did not a priori invalidate the approach of this study i.e. comparison of the original and changed brand name. In the case of rational functions it was argued that significant time and resources would be required to mitigate the impact of the name change due to the level of investment accrued in the original name. In the case of the habitual and relationship functions the very act of name change would be expected in itself to impact the ability of a brand name to perform these functions. A name change by definition forces the breaking of habit. The relationship function is predicated on a consumer expectation that the brand will meet their needs. A unilateral corporate imposed change in brand name is unlikely to be in line with these expectations. Kapferer (2004) sums this up graphically:

A brand transfer is always an act of violence...One does not lose a friend without harm and pain, even resentment

Finally symbolic associations are often linked to the particularity of a name (Collins, 1977) and will not be able to be transferred across to a new name regardless of the intensity of the advertising and promotional programme. As an example it would be difficult to transfer the Norwich (as a city) associations of Norwich Union to Aviva. For some customers of Norwich Union the loss of such associations is likely to be of importance. To recap, despite mitigation by corporate activity we could in theory still expect a change in brand name to cause a change in consumer functions performed.

Summary
In light of the various methodological considerations the overall approach of the research became:

a-the determination of the theoretical consumer functions of the brand name for established products, where functions are regarded as sources of brand equity to consumers. This is shown in Table I.

b-an empirical study centred on, but not limited to, confirmation or disconfirmation of this theory. This was primarily through the comparison of the consumer functions provided by a brand before and after a global marketing induced brand name change, where an identified change in function gave reasoned empirical support for the brand name element providing this function to the consumer. This empirical study is discussed next.
The study
As this is clearly not an area that has been well-researched (Kapferer, 2004; Keller, 1993) qualitative study was desirable to provide the necessary richness and depth for the subject. Whilst the limitations of such an approach are well discussed (Bryman and Bell, 2003) it is a constructive antecedent to any quantitative activity.

A series of 25 in-depth semi-structured interviews was carried out with consumers who considered that they had been impacted by a change in the brand name. The demographic breakdown of those interviewed was 15 female and ten male, with seven aged under 25, nine aged between 25 and 40 and nine aged over 40. Participants were recruited through a variety of channels; university students (six), university administration staff (eight), newspaper and magazine advertisements (six) and previous research contacts (five).

Participants were asked about the ways in which they perceived that they had been impacted by global marketing induced name change, the influence of associated brand name change advertising and promotional activity, their cognitive and emotional responses and attitudinal/behavioural change.

All interviews were audio recorded, transcribed into NVivo8 software and analysed using template analysis. Template analysis is broadly a grounded approach that is used for the thematic organization and analysis of textual data. However unlike grounded theory initial themes are generally generated from the extant theory (Dey, 1993). Following the approach of King (2004) an initial thematic coding template was created for transcription analysis. This template was subsequently amended through consideration of the data. As an example one coding theme used was habitual function impact. The outcome of this analysis is discussed in the next section.

Findings-The functions of the brand name

A-Rational functions
Empirical support was provided for various rational functions performed by the brand name. One issue raised by participants [P] regarding the change of the brand name was concern over finding the product, thereby providing confirmation for its identification and search cost reduction functions. This is illustrated in quotations from two of the participants:

I don’t think it actually says very much in the name, Ulay, but everybody knew what it was...[P19].

To me it seemed crazy that you spend your time building a brand and advertising it and encouraging people to buy it, and then you change its name <laughs> and then people can’t recognise it and probably stop buying it even, if they don’t recognise it as the thing they had before [P24].

A second issue provoked by name change was concern that the functional benefits of the product had changed, thereby revealing confirmation of the risk reduction and quality signalling functions of the brand name:
I think the name was part and parcel of the product and then you change one element of the product and basically think what else have they changed? [P10].

So you always suspect that something’s changing because there’s a problem [P18].

The above two quotations demonstrate suspicions about the motivation behind a change in name. Another consumer response to a brand name change was an assumption that the renamed brand was a fake:

..then I couldn’t find Oil of Ulay anymore...and there was Oil of Olay and I thought it was someone trying to mimic the product...there is this fake brand that I’m not going to buy so I changed the product (switched brands)[P20].

Concern that a brand might be perceived as fake is heightened in a marketplace where brand mimicry is commonplace. The above participant was talking about her experience in Italy but such practices are prevalent elsewhere; for example amongst UK supermarket own-brands.

These rational function impacts were prominent within the interviews despite intensive advertising and promotional campaigns about the name change. Indeed the rational functions of brand name were second in terms of mentioned impacts, albeit rarely the only function identified. A number of reasons were suggested for the failure of advertising and promotion to achieve a full transfer of rational functions from the old to the new name. Firstly not all consumers had been aware of the advertising and promotion relating to the name change, as illustrated by the following two quotations:

I think it’s probably something I wasn’t aware of directly because I wouldn’t have been looking...the first time I’d have been aware of it was probably when someone mentioned it in conversation, certainly not something I would have discovered myself [P14].

But you certainly weren’t aware of it? [Int. to P20].

No, not at all and, I don’t know, I mean I was reading in any case magazines, like feminine magazines...and I mean I’m not a careful reader of advertisements but when there is an advertisement maybe concerning the product or something, I have a look at this so I think I would have noticed [P20].

Secondly the original brand name continued to cause cognitive interference due to accrued awareness investment:

I’m always aware that even though they’re called Starburst now, what I’m getting is an Opal Fruit. If someone asked me to describe a Starburst I’d say ‘well it was an Opal Fruit’ [P02].

...because I’ve known it as Jif for years and years, so I’m not suddenly going to start changing it to Cif because it, to me, it’s Jif <laughs> It always will be [P19].
As well as demonstrating cognitive interference, these quotations are also of significance because they reveal the active role of the consumer within the branding process. Despite best corporate endeavours these consumers cognitively exclude the new brand name from the current brand entity.

B-Relationship function
Empirical support was obtained for the consumer brand name function of providing relationship benefit. One of the key reasons interviewees felt that they had experienced an impact from the change in the brand name was a perceived diminution in the relationship that they felt they had with the brand under its new name:

...does the new name mean something different to you than Opal Fruits? [Int. to P02].

Yeah, ‘cause even though I know that it’s the same sweet inside it’s lost that history behind it, so it’s almost like a new sweet, and the sweet might be the same and it tastes the same but you’ve got to start again with all that why you’d buy them as opposed to another sweet. It’s now all the brands that were second and third behind Opal Fruits now have got more history than the Starbursts [P02].

Note the language used by the above participant “start again”: very much a relationship expression. The notion that Starburst has to go to the back of the relationship queue is also thought-provoking.

...I think on that emotional side you do feel a degree of loyalty and belonging with that, that identifies that brand and the question that, as I say, what have they done to my brand? Why have they done this? They haven’t asked me [P10].

The quotation above highlights a grievance that the brand relationship that had been perceived as two-way was revealed as not actually so.

C-Habitual function
Empirical support was obtained for the habitual function of the brand name.
Interviewees talked about the disbenefit that they felt as a consequence of having to address the implications of the name change:

So do you think that’s part of it; the fact that with the name change it has forced you to change your habits? [Int. to P05].

Yes I think it’s almost pulled me up short. Instead of say focusing in with my blinkers on, now it comes back in your face almost that and you think ooh no, maybe not! [P05]

...I think probably the reasons for not liking it (the name change) is a sort of laziness. You get used to something and then it changes and you have to grapple with that...[P06].

..but over time people just become accustomed to things because people are habitual, aren’t they?..and it’s a change in habit [P11].
Note the physicality of some of the language used: “pulled up short”, “back in your face”, “grapple”. This suggests that the change of name is uncomfortable for these consumers.

**D-Symbolic function**
Limited evidence was obtained for the symbolic function of a brand name as far as corporate driven symbolic functions were concerned. As discussed above corporations involved in brand name change use advertising and promotion to attempt to transfer symbolic associations across to the new name and this makes the paucity of empirical evidence plausible. However an important additional dimension of the symbolic function of the brand name was identified and is discussed below.

**Findings-Symbolic function and personal associations**
For over half of the consumers taking part in the research centreing of the discussion on brand name change revealed that they had established their own symbolic functions for the brand name, based on their own personal non-corporate driven associations.

One category of personal associations was linked to the specificity of a particular name. For example Jif was associated with “in a Jiffy” whilst Cif was taken as shorthand for a venereal disease.

Jif to me comes from jiffy; so you’ll do it in a jiffy; so you’ll do it quickly. It helps you do it quickly [P16].

Cif, it doesn’t mean anything. It’s like the beginning of syphilis to be honest...[P24].

Opal Fruits were associated with precious gemstones whilst Oil of Olay was associated in the consumer’s mind with the Olay plant (which does not actually exist!).

I mean I just thought it was some natural product coming from some Olay plant [P20].

Although these symbolic associations can be seen to be closely linked to a specific brand name they are not creations of the corporation. Despite this they add

They just sound more magical to me than Starburst [P04].

In what way? [Int. to P04].

Opal Fruits, they just sound, ’cause opals are precious and they glitter and shimmer in a strange way and so if you can put them into sweets...[P04].

or subtract symbolic value from the brand:

*(Talking about Snickers)* And to be honest it sounds like knickers doesn’t it? <Laughs> It’s just absolutely ridiculous. There’s no street cred in that at all. It’s an embarrassment [P05].
(Talking about Snickers) Well it’s very American and it smells...it doesn’t smell at all it smacks of trainers <laughter>, sneakers [P10].

A second category of personal associations consisted of meaningful events in consumers' lives, which had become associated with the name. For example a particular brand name might be associated with a happy childhood memory:

It’s just a sense of comfort really. You know, you got picked up after school and your mum gave you some Opal Fruits. It was always that nice kind of history behind it that you want to carry on, so you keep buying Opal Fruits to get that feeling again [P02].

or a particular location where the consumer used the product:

When I hear the name Veet, however, it reminds me of when I spent a year abroad in France and Spain because Veet was what I saw then...and so Veet doesn’t sound true to me that it should be Veet here. To me, Veet’s European and it should be abroad [P23].

This association was different to a simple recall of product use. In the literature are examples of corporations attempting to increase the equity of a brand through nostalgia value bestowal (Brown et al., 2003). Associations identified here are conceptually different as there was no corporate involvement. The idiosyncratic yet meaningful nature of the associations should be noted. In the above quote by participant P02 the fact that the personal symbolic association was powerful enough in itself for product purchase is worth contemplation. In a final quotation below, highlighting the change in meaning brought about by a change in the brand name, the name Century FM is associated with the pleasure of winning a competition and this is represented in physical form in the guise of a branded toaster. This example is unusual in that the original brand name continues its physical existence co-temporally with the new brand name.

Like for me I won...a Century FM toaster...but I was thinking in a few years’ time when my children are older and they open the box and they see Century FM they’re going to say ‘Well, what’s that’...When I say ‘Well Real Radio that I listen to, that used to be called Century FM’ but it doesn’t mean the same, you know [P23].

Discussion
It is worth reiterating why this research is considered significant and the merit of the approach adopted. No extant empirical work has investigated the brand name element for established products. Whilst importance is generally assumed within the literature, others raise doubts about whether it is actually of any value. Understanding the role and importance that the brand name element plays is not only vital for branding theory but also for managers making decisions about their brands.

The adopted approach of looking at global marketing induced brand name change, where only the name changes, ensures that the consumer functions identified in the empirical study relate to the brand name element rather than the brand entity as a whole. This can be confirmed through consideration of the participants’ comments within the previous section. This empirical study offers support for a variety of
functions that consumers perceive emanate from the brand name element; namely the brand name serves rational, relationship, habitual and symbolic functions. The findings from the study are notable in highlighting the non-rational functions that a brand name holds for consumers, evidenced in the discomfort caused by the change in name. If we accept that a brand holds personality (Aaker, 1997) then can this not be likened to changing a person’s name and all the issues that would arise from that? It is highly unlikely that a parent would change the name of their child once a name had been given, yet this is something that brands have a history of doing. This paper provides qualitative evidence of some of the distress that such changes may induce.

An objection might be raised about whether the provision of a function is equivalent to the provision of equity. Semantic differences aside, this approach proved to be very helpful for exploring the dimensions of consumer brand name equity, compared with alternative approaches such as brand awareness and brand associations or that of simply calculating a brand equity value.

Adopting this approach reveals the frequent personal symbolic associations that consumers hold with brand names. This suggests that much of the symbolic function of the brand name is determined by the consumer rather than the corporation and therefore also its equity. The active role of the consumer within the production/consumption creation process has long been recognised (e.g. Brown, 1995; Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Ligas and Cotte, 1999). Nevertheless the active consumer often tends to be marginalised within consumer brand equity literature.

Although the initial premise of the Customer Based Brand Equity model (Keller, 1993) asserts that brand equity lies “in the minds of customers”, the focus of the model is the creation and management of this brand equity by corporations. Other leading authorities in the field devote a substantial part of their writing to “creating and sustaining brand equity” (Kapferer, 2004) or “…how brand equity should be managed: How should it be created, maintained and protected? How should it be exploited?” (Aaker, 1991).

Findings from this study provide empirical backing for the view that the equity from a brand name may be more fruitfully considered as determined partially by the corporation and partially by the consumer. This is elaborated in Figure 2 below. Figure 2a represents a mainstream managerial view of the use of associations to create brand name equity. A corporation selects a brand name that inherently holds intended associations and then uses marketing programmes to reinforce this and develop new “strong, favourable and unique brand associations” (Keller, 2003). Figure 2b represents a co-creation process where the activities of the corporation are blended with the idiosyncratic and personal associations of the individual consumer to determine the equity of the brand name.

Take in Figure 2-Development of Brand Name Equity through Symbolic Associations

The foregrounding of the consumer within the brand equity creation process has wider ramifications, in particular for brand ownership. Even without attempting a detailed conceptualisation of such an ownership construct, it appears problematic to
reconcile a position that regards ownership of a brand as exclusively that of a corporation with one where the corporation is not exclusively responsible for the creation of the brand equity. Belk (1988) argues that the maker of an object is entitled to ownership of it. To the extent that a consumer determines the equity of a brand name are they not also its maker?

Returning to the original question of whether consumers care what name a brand possesses, perhaps it is because the equity in the brand name has been co-created that causes consumers to care? Certainly this exploratory study starts to reveal a true richness and depth to the topic of consumer brand name equity.

**Conclusion and future research**
The research objective of the study was gaining insight into the dimensions and importance of brand name equity for established products and services. This has been met in that qualitative evidence for most of the theoretical functions of the brand name was obtained, thereby providing justification for consumer brand name equity as a concept. In addition the active role of the consumer within this process emerged. No attempt was made to quantify the importance of consumer brand name equity. However this will be addressed through future quantitative experimental work, building on this research. This will specifically examine the importance of the brand name element of established products to consumers, thereby placing the findings of this study within context.
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Figure 1: Mediating brand functions
a-Corporate creation model

[Diagram of the corporate creation model showing Brand Name Choice, Corporate Intended Associations, Consumer Brand Name Equity, and Marketing Programmes.

b-Corporate/Consumer co-creation model

[Diagram of the corporate/consumer co-creation model showing Brand Name Choice, Corporate Intended Associations, Consumer Selected Associations, Personal Associations, and Marketing Programmes.
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Purpose

The brand name element is generally regarded as an integral part of the brand entity of a product or service (Aaker, 1991: p.14; Keller, 2003: p.181; de Chernatony and McDonald, 2006: p.96). Empirical research looking at the worth of the brand name element has typically confirmed its importance. However this work has invariably looked at new, proposed or fictitious brands, rather than those already established within the marketplace (Friedman and Dipple, 1978; Gibson, 2005; Mehrabian and Wetter, 1978).

Riezebos (1994: p.69) asserted that the relative importance of the brand name element would decline as a brand became established, as a result of the cumulative impact of corporate marketing activity. Following this argument it should not be assumed that the extant empirical work on the importance of the brand name element should be automatically applicable to established products.

Given that established products make up the bulk of products in the marketplace the lack of empirical work is problematic. Following exploratory qualitative work a research study was initiated with the purpose of investigating the importance of the brand name element for established products and services. The remainder of this extended abstract provides details of the method employed, the major findings and the contribution to knowledge from the research study.

Method

A key challenge was how the brand name element could be isolated for investigation from the other brand elements and the brand entity as a whole. An experimental technique that seeks to achieve this and has been increasingly used within academic studies within and outwith the marketing domain is conjoint analysis (Dickson, 2005; Thomas-Miller et al., 2000; Carroll and Green, 1995; Vriens, 1994). This has also generally been regarded as holding validity (Green and Srinivasan, 1990). It employs a decompositional approach, based on a belief that consumers cannot directly state how much they value separate features of a product if this information is explicitly sought but this can be “teased” out through the use of an indirect approach (Orme, 2006: p.25). Often it is used to identify the relative importance that consumers place on different attributes of an item under study, typically a product or brand (Malhotra and Birks, 2007: p.704). Its essential feature is that a research participant is directed to compare products made up of attributes (e.g. size, colour) with different levels (e.g. different sizes, different colours) and multiple regression based statistical techniques are then
used to derive a preference function which provides the relative importance of each attribute and the importance of level within each attribute.

Accordingly conjoint analysis was used to investigate the importance of the current brand name attribute relative to the current price attribute of the brand. Through calculating how much extra a consumer would be prepared to pay as a trade off for keeping the current brand name of a product unchanged a relative monetary value for the current brand name was obtained. If the brand name element of established products is indeed of importance to consumers then it would be expected that consumers would be prepared to incur a significant increase in the price for a product in order to keep the brand name of the product unchanged.

One hundred adult participants from North West England were recruited for this experiment from a wide cross-section of the population base. All participants provided their favourite brand in a product category in which they were active. A wide range of products was selected including beverages, foodstuffs, personal goods and clothing. Firstly an involvement score was obtained from each participant based on the Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) scale, developed by Zaichkowsky (1985) and the standard scale within the domain (Bruner et al., 2005: p.287). This is a twenty item seven-point semantic differential scale, measuring the enduring relevance of an object to a person.

Secondly each participant was presented on a computer screen, visually and in written form, with sixty product options presented side by side two at a time. Participants were required to state their relative preference for one product option against another for each of these pairs using a nine-point scale. The product options consisted of their chosen product but with the brand name and price attributes at various levels. In order to minimise demand bias, size and packaging attribute levels were also varied. Participants were also not told the full purpose of the task until completion.

In the case of brand name the levels consisted of existing brand name, alternative choice brand name and new brand name. For some participants an actual new brand name was given, whilst others were simply told that the brand name had been changed. In the case of price the levels varied between +/- 20% of the existing product price. Sawtooth Software CiW and CVA modules were used to develop the experiment and analyse the captured data using the pairwise full-profile conjoint analysis technique. Finally participants completed a series of qualitative questions about the impact that they considered a change in the brand name of their selected product would have on them.

The conjoint analysis software used ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression to estimate the value placed on each attribute level by individual participant. Statistical analysis on all the obtained quantitative data was subsequently performed using SPSS16.

Reliability was built into the experiment in two ways. Firstly Sawtooth CVA calculated an R-squared measure based on how consistent participants were in their product option preferences. Secondly quantitative and qualitative data from each participant was compared to determine the degree of correspondence. The calculated R-squared value for each of the hundred participants ranged from 0.58 to 0.94 with a mean of 0.82 and a standard deviation of 0.074. 74% of participants were identically classified from their
quantitative and qualitative data. Taken together these indicate that the study carried a high degree of reliability.

**Major Findings**

The obtained distribution of the relative monetary value of the current brand name is shown below in Figure 1. This distribution is not normally distributed and has a mean of 20.92 and the standard deviation of 48.18. This obtained distribution shows that on average the existing brand name was valued by the participants as having the relative monetary value of 20.9% of the existing price of the product. In other words participants on average would be indifferent between either a product increasing its price by 20.9% or the product changing its brand name.

However it can be seen from the standard deviation and the shape of Figure 1 that it would be inappropriate to simply consider this finding at the level of the mean but this variability of the relative monetary value of current brand name should be acknowledged and explored. In particular three separate groups of participants can be identified. For 19 of the participants the existing brand name had Nil or a small negative value. 68 participants held a Moderate positive value for the existing brand name (0 to 30%); with 57 of these 68 holding a value less than 15% of existing price. 13 participants placed a significant positive value on the existing brand name. There is a clear distinction between this final group of participants and the Moderate positive value group, as the value placed on the current brand name by participants within this group ranged from over 60% to almost 285% of current price.

This variability in value placed on brand name could not be statistically related to age or gender. Surprisingly an investigation using Spearman rho correlation coefficient also revealed no statistical correlation between brand name value and the associated involvement score (rho= -.045, n= 100, p= 0.66).

However a Mann-Whitney test revealed a statistically significant difference in value placed on brand name between where a new brand name was not given to participants (Md=3.169, n=33) and where a new brand name was given to participants (Md=9.41, n=67), (U= 708, z= -2.914, p= .004). One interpretation of this finding is that inclusion of an actual changed brand name within the conjoint analysis task, as opposed to simply the discussion of the idea of a change in brand name, increased the realism of the task to the participant and resulted in a more elevated consideration of the value of the current brand name to them. It could be argued that the more considered approach provides a more accurate measure of brand name element value.

**Contribution**

The research provides a rare and required insight into the importance placed on the brand name element for established products and services by consumers. It also highlights that there is significance variance in this value, which cannot be explained by some of the more obvious variables and requires additional research including its generalisability.

In particular it suggests that some of the statements made within the mainstream branding literature such as Keller (2003: p.181) ‘Consider brand names—perhaps the
most central of all brand elements...’ may require qualification. The overall assumption that brand name plays a central role for established products appears to mask firstly a large proportion of consumers where it has a minimal role and secondly a minority of consumers where its role is overwhelming.

Figure 1 Distribution of Relative Monetary Value of Current Brand Name
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