

Affecting Factors on Brand Status among organizational Employees (Case Study: Tasty Food Industry Group)

Mahmoud Reza Nemat Bakhsh^{1*}, Ali Binazir², Rashin Kooshan³

¹Correspond Author: MS Student in MBA, Isfahan University, Iran

²MS Student in MBA, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

³MS Student in MBA

Received: March 8, 2015

Accepted: May 10, 2015

ABSTRACT

Today, brand equity has become an important issue for experts and authors. Therefore, studies on brand equity are increasingly growing. An affecting factor on brand equity is marketing activities by companies. In present paper, the impact of marketing activities on brand equity aspects is studied and the aim is to find that how marketing activities increase or decrease brand equity. Initially, total brand concept as well as brand equity is defined in different angle and then its measurement by consumer and financial aspects are expressed. Present paper studies the value of Tasty Food Industry Group among its employees and it looks for employees' opinions on its brand through a scientific study. A general aim is pursued in present paper: brand equity in employees' minds. The findings of analyses indicate that propaganda has the highest positive and significant impact on organizational brand status.

KEYWORDS: Tasty Food Industry Group, brand, brand equity

1. INTRODUCTION

In today competitive conditions, brand equity plays a vital role in customers' minds. In an organization, customers are either fixed or ever – changing. Hence, one should act by considering their needs and requirements. Brand equity is an important discussion which had become too important today. In fact, what distinguishes a special product from a brand is customer feeling and conception on that product. In contrary to brand equity in USA and European countries, it is less respected in Iran and brand equity has lower importance. Brand equity is not inserted in balance sheets so it mitigates managers' focus on brand equity. At the end of present study, we hope to reveal the status of Tasty brand for its employees and to show brand equity in their minds.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The main of an organization is to establish a sustainable link between product and a certain group of customers in addition to sell its products. The outcome of such sustainable link is customer loyalty and commitment to a brand with a special brand which involves a process of customer's familiarity with the product and, consequently, its brand. If successful, such process guarantees organizational success due to customers' loyalty and disappointment of rivals. In today competitive ambience, organizations use any tool to achieve success and ideal conditions. Considering marketing activities as a tool to be in customers' minds and building intellectual properties as brands is seen as a new insight in marketing (Khalili, 2011). Currently, a few companies are operating in the field of producing added materials to oil products. However, there is an intensive competition among them and the main question is that how brand can help their activities. The role of brand equity is too important in the points which lead into competitive advantage (Shams, 2007).

2.1. Brand recognition

Brand recognition refers to people's awareness of brand type and their recognition. It includes brand and brand image.

2.2. Brand awareness

It means buyer's capability in recognizing g that brand is a member of product category to recall the brand in the scope of similar products. Brand awareness is also defined as brand attendance in customer memory. In fact, it is brand awareness that helps customer in all its decision making process and in value generation for the company (Jain, 2000).

2.3. Brand loyalty

Brand loyalty is one of the most important affecting factors in creating sustainable competitive advantage for service companies. In addition to competitive advantage, brand loyalty improves the level of productivity and employees' motivation and profitability of institute. On the other hand, permanent refusal of a company by

* Corresponding Author: Mahmoud Reza Nemat Bakhsh, MS Student in MBA, Isfahan University, Iran

customers would have catastrophic impacts on its performance. Brand image of a service company can retain customer loyalty.

2.4. Customer loyalty

Richard Oliver defines loyalty as deep commitment to repurchase or reselect the product or service constantly in a given future despite of marketing efforts and temporal impacts which can potentially changes customer behavior (Greenly, 1994). By providing a definition on customer loyalty, one can say that loyalty consists of below three elements:

- Customer behavior which is the same behavior of repeating the purchase.
- Customer attitude elements which is the same customer trust and commitment.
- Availability element which is accompanied with many options to select and purchase.

2.5. Brand generation process

To generate the brand, one should tell customer the “who the product is?” it means to give a name to it and to use other elements of the brand. Meanwhile one should tell customer that “what product does?” and “why customer should respect it?” in other words, to build a brand, it is necessary to provide the customer with a label to identify the product to give meaning to brand (Keller, 2008).

2.6. Brand meaning

In measuring the meaning of brand, qualitative techniques play a vital role in understanding brand traits which play a vital role in determining brand image. These traits may be initial attributes (i.e. sustainability, effectiveness, compatibility) or apparent attributes (i.e. personality values, experiences). For more measurement, one can calibrate brand attributes by such criteria as power, utility and uniqueness.

2.7. Brand equity concept

Brand value is considered in various writings: adding property owner’s value by brand (Hetherington, 1991), brand loyalty, brand awareness, brand cooperation and other facilities of brand ownership (Greenly, 1994), the difference of brand information impact on consumers’ response to brand marketing (Keller, 1993), surplus consumption, total consumption, difference between brand total performance and versatile performance based on measured targeted indicators (Park and Simirasan, 1994), and total quality and intention to select all indicators. There are three different attitudes toward brand equity:

1. Consumers’ base aspects
2. Financial aspects
3. Composite aspects

2.8. Brand and brand management

Within past decade, brand building literature has experienced huge changes. In past, brand was seen only as a part of new product designing process (Kotler, 2006). Therefore, attitude toward this concept was as a series of tactics (not strategies) and the ways to build brands were not similar to strategy. Today, brands are raised as the starting point of distinguishing competitive prerequisites so that they play a vital role in organizational success. Therefore, brand management is seen as a strategic (not tactical) process (Frederickson, 1996). Brand building and its role is constantly revised. More than focus on brand and the process of brand building, it is seen as a step in marketing process to sell products (Aaker, 1991). Brand is a set of intellectual and mental signs in consumers’ minds which add the perceived value of product or service. Brand is the direct ramification of strategy and market division and product distinguish (Hoon, 2011).

Table 1: changes in brand management attitude from tactic to strategy (Kim, 2003)

Brand equity strategic management	Traditional brand management
Brand representiveness	Brand management
Brand deep loyalty	Brand retain
Life time communications	Repeated exchanges
Customer commitment	Customer satisfaction
Brand income	Product income
3 – year focus	3 – month focus
Earnings from capital price	Earnings from market share
Brand functional ideas running	Brand marketing
Brand progress measures	Recall and awareness measures
Conducting the brand from outside	Conducting the brand from inside

2.9. Brand image

Brand image includes those features which customers attribute to brand in their minds (Aker, 1996). In other words, brand image is customer perception on brand features which yield into brand meaning. Brand meaning is how to perceive the brand by audiences intentionally and how to reflect the brand in semi-intentional or

unintentional levels relate to brand and its features mutually (Dean, 1996). Some articles on brand equity are as below:

1. "The impact by brand loyalty on brand equity in the view of e-card customers". In this paper, the authors asserts that loyalty, awareness and quality all impact on brand equity (Gilaninia & Moosavian, 2010).
2. "Studying the impact by brand social power on customer's intention to buy based on his/her mental readiness level". the findings indicate that brand social power various dimensions such as brand attractiveness, brand natural power, brand social power legitimacy, brand social power paradigm impact differently on customers mental readiness (Heydarzadeh, Alvani and Ghalandari, 2010).
3. "Comparative comparison of customers' attitude toward apparel global brands (case study: a comparison between Iranian, Korean and Japanese brands)." Upon examining different aspects of brand equity, the author concludes that in economic view, countries consider more value on their local brands and they attempt to use their local brands more (Doayi & Hassanzadeh, 2010).
4. "Studying brand equity determinants by a financial approach on companies admired n Tehran Stock Exchange". The author has attempted to determine brand equity by a company – oriented approach and asserts that such variables as propaganda intensity, brand age, company's age and market share all impact on brand equity (Azizi, Darvisih and Namamian, 2011).
5. "Developing a communicative model on customer – based brand equity and brand performance in market: case study: diary brands in Tehran market". The author has tried to identify brand equity constructs based on customer and brand performance in the market and to devise a model in order to study brand equity by examining the impacts of both constructs (Assadollah et al, 2011).
6. "Recognizing affecting intra-organizational factors on creating a valuable brand". It is determined that intra-organizational factors including organizational culture, core values, marketing information system, marketing intelligence, and organizational technology influence on creating brand equity. However, the highest impact is by product features (Kafashpour and Niakan, 2011).
7. "The relationship between brand equity dimensions and organizational performance by CBBE model (case study; Vehicle Body Insurance Companies)". It is found that there is a remarkable relationship between brand equity and the performance of insurance companies. More brand equity in the customers' minds of insurance companies, more performance (sales) of such companies.
8. In studies by Kyung Hoon Kim et al (2012) in Korean hospital, it was found that human capital is the main pillar of sustainable competitive advantage which impact on marketing strategy and company's image and finally on generating employees' – based brand equity.
9. In their research on the relationship between company's brand and brand equity , Hsu-Hsin Chiang(2007) found that there are communication channels to transfer brand equity to varied stakeholders including internal stakeholders (employees) and external one (shareholders, suppliers, customers and rivals) that can be divided into five factors. They include:
 - (a) Inter/intra-organizational relations: how to establish relations with colleagues and customers
 - (b) Inter – sectional coordination
 - (c) Leadership and interaction with stakeholders
 - (d) Employees' training
 - (e) Organizational culture and perspective

3. METHODOLOGY

This is an applied and descriptive correlation – type survey. The aim of applied studies is to develop knowledge in a given field. In other words, applied researches are conducted toward knowledge practical utilization (Sarmad, 2001). The aim of correlation methodology is to compare change borders of one or more variables with change borders of one or more other variables (Delavar, 2003). In present study, the aim is to use knowledge and its development in a given field and it is attempted to study the relations among variables by available information; therefore, this is an applied research while its methodology is descriptive correlation – type. Research population consists of those people or units who have at least one common feature. In all researches, studied population is usually a statistical one that author tends to study on its traits (Sarmad, 2001). Present research population consists of 25 subjects.

4. Data analysis

4.1. Demographic factors

The results from demographic information analysis indicate that over 64% and 36% of participants are female and male respectively. Over 60% of participants aged between 20 and 30 years, over 32 between 30 and 40 years and over 10% aged +40 years. 18% of participants had diploma, 50% had bachelors and 32% had masters. The results are shown in tables 2, 3 and 4.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	14	63.6	63.6	63.6
	2.00	8	36.4	36.4	100.0
	Total	22	100.0	100.0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	13	59.1	59.1	59.1
	2.00	7	31.8	31.8	90.9
	3.00	2	9.1	9.1	100.0
Total		22	100.0	100.0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	4	18.2	18.2	18.2
	2.00	11	50.0	50.0	68.2
	3.00	7	31.8	31.8	100.0
Total		22	100.0	100.0	

4.2. Average test

Below tables indicate the distribution of scores on personality, propaganda, money and quality. These descriptive statistics are shown in below figure. The highest average is quality (4.59) followed by personality (4.28), propaganda (4.15) and money (3.93). The relevant findings are shown in table 5. In table 6, one sample T test is shown for research components.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Employees' personality	22	4.2873	.38799	.08272
Propaganda	22	4.1591	.54306	.11578
Money	22	3.9318	.42386	.09037
Quality	22	4.5909	.28604	.06098

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
personality	15.562	21	.000	1.28727	1.1152	1.4593
Propaganda	10.011	21	.000	1.15909	.9183	1.3999
Money	10.312	21	.000	.93182	.7439	1.1197
Quality	26.087	21	.000	1.59091	1.4641	1.7177

4.3. Correlation test on brand status and affecting factors on it

Concerning the conducted correlation test on brand status and affecting factor on it, below results are developed. The correlation test indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between all four factors and brand status while there is no correlation between self – awareness, self – management and self – motivation and socialization. Since significance level is less than 0.05, the correlation is proved. The highest correlation coefficient is the relationship between brand status and affecting factors on it namely monetary, propaganda, quality and employees' personality factors.

Hypothesis 1: there is a relationship between employees' personality and brand status.

Findings indicate that there is a relationship between employees' personality and brand status and achieved correlation coefficient ($r = 0.447$) is less than 0.05. Therefore, hypothesis 1 on the relationship between employees' personality and brand status is supported.

Hypothesis 2: there is a relationship between propaganda and brand status.

Findings indicate that there is a relationship between propaganda and brand status and achieved correlation coefficient (r = 0.698) is less than 0.05. Therefore, hypothesis 2 on the relationship between propaganda and brand status is supported.

Hypothesis 3: there is a relationship between monetary factor and brand status.

Findings indicate that there is a relationship between monetary factor and brand status and achieved correlation coefficient (r = 0.429) is less than 0.05. Therefore, hypothesis 3 on the relationship between monetary factor and brand status is supported.

Hypothesis 4: there is a relationship between quality and brand status.

Findings indicate that there is a relationship between quality and brand status and achieved correlation coefficient (r = 0.454) is less than 0.05. Therefore, hypothesis 4 on the relationship between quality and brand status is supported.

Table 6: correlation test results

		Brand	Personality	Propaganda	Monetary	Quality
Brand	Pearson Correlation	1	.477*	.698**	.429*	.457*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.025	.000	.046	.033
	N	22	22	22	22	22
Personality	Pearson Correlation	.477*	1	.515*	.376	.511*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025		.014	.085	.015
	N	22	22	22	22	22
Propaganda	Pearson Correlation	.698**	.515*	1	.373	.439*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.014		.088	.041
	N	22	22	22	22	22
Monetary	Pearson Correlation	.429*	.376	.373	1	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	.085	.088		.813
	N	22	22	22	22	22
Quality	Pearson Correlation	.457*	.511*	.439*	.054	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.015	.041	.813	
	N	22	22	22	22	22

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
 **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.4. Multivariate regression test

Concerning the results in below table, one can conclude that all four aspects impact on organizational brand status. The results of significance level and correlation coefficient confirm these impacts and relations.

The relationship between four aspects and brand status is shown. In present study, multivariate regression analysis is used to conceive such relationship. This multivariate regression analysis is rendered in below table. Positive figures of beta in the table indicate a model as below:

$$Y = 0.336x_1 + \epsilon \quad \text{Where } x_1 = \text{propaganda.}$$

As seen in above tables, propaganda has a good relationship with brand status and such relationship is confirmed by significance level. By using above table and multivariate regression analysis, an equation is achieved which emphasizes on positive value of beta and the positive impacts of two aspects on organizational brand status.

Table 7: ANOVA^a test results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.482	4	.371	5.368	.006 ^b
	Residual	1.173	17	.069		
	Total	2.656	21			

a. Dependent Variable: brand
 b. Predictors: (Constant), quality, monetary, propaganda, personality

Table 8: multivariate regression analysis results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.763	1.054		.724	.479
	Personality	.023	.195	.025	.118	.907

Propaganda	.336	.132	.513	2.544	.021
Monetary	.182	.154	.218	1.182	.253
Quality	.258	.247	.207	1.041	.313
a. Dependent Variable: brand					

5. Conclusion

Based on analyzing gathered questionnaires, one can conclude that difference in the levels of propaganda and quality among organizational employees impact on organizational brand status significantly. as the results from correlation test and regression show, higher levels of propaganda and organizational quality among employees would increase organizational brand status similarly. It means that organizations can improve their brand status through promoting the levels of quality and propaganda in the organization. Although a mutual relationship is achieved between four mentioned factors and organizational brand status in correlation test, conducted analyses proved the positive effect b propaganda on.

REFERENCES

- Azizi, Sharyar; Darvishi, Zahra and Namamian, Farshid (2011), studying affecting factors on brand equity by a financial approach in admired companies in Tehran Stock Exchange, Commercial Management Perspective, vol. 6
- Assadullah, Hooshang & Hamidzadeh, Mohammad Reza (2011), developing a communication model between brand equity and customer – based brand performance in the market: case study: diary brands in Tehran market, Economy and Modern Commerce Quarterly
- Chiang, Hsu- Sin et al .(2007).The Multilevel Relationship between Corporate Branding and Customer-based Brand Equity: Scale Development and Qualitative Approaches, MLB,No, 10, pp80-106.
- Doaei, Habibollah and Farzaneh Hassanzadeh, Zhaleh (2010), a comparative study of customers' attitude toward apparel global brands (case study: comparing Iranian, Korean and Japanese local brands), Commercial studies, vol. 42
- Divandary, Ali (2009), improving customer – based brand equity by creating an image of functional and nonfunctional advantages (case study: Mellat Bank), Management Perspective, vol. 30
- Deshrode, R. and Zatman, G. (1982), "Factors affecting the use of market research information, a path analysis" , Journal of marketing research, Vol. 19, pp, 14-31.
- Dean, J. W. and Sharfman, M. P. (1996), "Does decision process mater? A study of strategic decision-making effectiveness", Academy of management journal, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 368-369.
- Fredrickson, J. W. and Laquinto, A. L. (1989). "creeping rationality in strategic decision processes", Academy of management Journal, Vol. 32, N. 3, PP. 516-542.
- Greenly, G. E. and B. L. Bayus (1994), "Marketing planning processes in UK and US companies" , Journal of Strategic Marketing, No. 2, PP. 140-154.
- Gilaninia, Shahram & Moosavian, Jawad (2010), the impact of brand loyalty on brand equity in the view of e-card customers, Industrial Management Quarterly, Azad Islamic University, Sanandaj, vol. 14
- Hass Robert. W (1998), Industrial Marketing Management, Fourth Edition, P, WG, Kent Publishing Company, Boston.
- Hetherington, R. W. (1991), "The effects of formalization on departments of a multi-hospital system", Academy of Management Studies, Vol. 28, No, 2, pp. 103.140.
- Hoon Kim , Kyung etal. (2011). Effective employment brand equity through sustainable competitive advantage, Journal of Business Research,NO65,p.p1612-1617.
- Heydarzadeh, Kambiz; Alvani, Seyed Mahdi & Ghalandari, Kamal (2010), Management Research Journal, vol. 86
- Jain, S. C. (2000), Marketing Planning and Strategy, South Westren Collage Publishing Clinical, Oh.
- Jobber, David, (2004), Principles and practices of marketing", Fourth Edition, McGraw, Hill.
- Jain, S. C. (2000), Marketing Planning and Strategy, South Westren Collage Publishing, Clinical, oh.
- Kottler Philip, Armstrung Gray, (1991), "Principles of marketing", Fifth Edition, Prentice Hall Inc.
- Kim,H.B.W.G.and An,J.A.(2003).The Effect of Consumer-Based Brand Equity On Firms Financial Performance. Journal of Consumer Marketing, Vol 20,No4, PP 335-351.
- Kafashpour, Azar & Niakan, Seyed Reza (2011), identifying affecting intra-organizational factors on creating a valuable brand, Commercial Management Explorations, vol. 5
- Karimi, Abbass Ali & Rahimi, Farajollah (2010), the impact of HR investment on competitive advantage: the moderating role of human capital, public management perspective, vol. 2

- Keller, Colin (2010), *Brands Strategic Management*, translated by Atiyeh Bathayi, Tehran, 1st edition, Siteh Publications.
- Khodad Hussein, Seyed Hamid & Azizi, Shahryar (2008), *A Comprehensive Approach on Strategic Management and Planning*, Tehran, Safar Publications
- Mohammad, Amin Bahrami; Vahid, Mirjalaili; Shahram, Hashemina; Mohamamd, Ranjbar & Gholam Reza, Ahmadi Tehrani (2013), *A Comparative Study of Brand Image of Public and Private Hospitals in Yazd in the Minds of Customers*, vol. 4: 9 – 16.
- Morovati Sahrifabadi, Ali; Keshvarshahi, Mohammad Kazem & Rastegar, Mahsa (2011), *The Relationship between Brand Equity and Organizational Performance based on CBBE (Case Study: Vehicle Body Insurance Companies)*, *Commercial Management Explorations Research Journal*, vol. 6.
- Peyman, Ghafari, AShtiani & Saeed, Mirpaez (2011), *Studying Brand Personality on its Outcomes (Trust, Dependency, Commitment)*, case study: Parmon Pharmaceutical Company, *Management Research Journal*
- Seyed Suleiman, Seyedi, *Evaluating Affecting Factors on Brand Equity and Brand (Case Study: Mashhad Persian Carpet Company)*.
- Seyed Mohammad, Nopasand; Smail, Malek Akhlagh & Elham, Hussieni (2013), *Affecting Factors on Brand Equity in Terms of Marketing Mix*, *Marketing Papers Bank*
- Sarmad, Zohreh; Bazargan, Abbas & Hejazi, Elaheh (2009), *Methodologies in Behavioral Science*, Tehran, 17th edition.
- Senobari, Mohammad (2009), *An Introduction on Human Capital (Concepts, Traits and Measures)*, *Human Development Bimonthly*, vol. 22