

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Branding

The American Marketing Association defines brand as a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them intended to identify goods or services of one seller or? group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors. Branding is endowing products and services with the power of a brand and branding is all about creating differences (Kotler and Keller via Oosterbroe, 2010, p.04).

David A Aker, in his book Managing Brand Equity states:

“A brand is distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as logo, or package design) intended to identify the good or services of either one seller or a group of sellers, and to differentiate those good or service from those of competitors. A brand thus signals to the costume the source of the product, and protects both the customer and the producer from competitors who would attempt to provide product that appear to be identical.”

David Aaker does not link the brand just to a product but extends the term to cover the source of the product - that is the company itself. The definition also makes it clear that a brand is a mark, a name or symbol, which differentiates companies, one from the other. The

brand aims to sear this mark of differentiation in the mind just as the original branding iron burned a mark onto the hide of cattle as indelible proof of ownership (B2B International, p. 28).

This non-functional benefit of the brand is sometimes referred to as an *experiential benefit*. Such benefits include *symbolic* ones such as identification with a group or even those defining the purchaser's own sense of identity. However, it would be wrong to think of these as in some way less "real" or important than functional benefits. Symbols are major motivators and not only in the buying context; think of the power of symbols in war or even wars fought for largely symbolic reasons. Experiential and symbolic benefits of a brand can be of special relevance to suppliers of undifferentiated products (B2B International, p. 29).

2.2 Brand love

Brand love is defined as warm feeling of a brand and as time running with the experiencing of a brand, it is becoming sustainable liking and passionate about it. The brands they use can be experiencing as satisfaction, loyalty or love depending on the degree of affection exhibited towards the brands. A consumer can get emotionally connected with a brand in the same manner in which he/ she can get emotionally involved with another person (Shimp and Madden, 1988; Thomson et al., 2005; Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006; Keh et al., 2007; Albert et al., 2008; Whang et al., 2004). Love relationship existing between

two individuals has a lot of similarities with the emotional relationship existing between a consumer and consumption object or brand (Shimp and Madden, 1988; Keh et al., 2007; Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006; Whang et al., 2004; Albert et al., 2008).

Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) label brand love as the level of passionate, emotional attachment in which a satisfied consumer may have for a particular trade name and its associated dimensions. Brand love may be evident in many forms i.e. brand passion, attachment, positive evaluation and emotion in response to brands and declarations to validate brand love. Brand love differs from the satisfaction because it is more effective. Brand love is not transaction- specific but the outcome of a nurtured consumer-brand relationship. Rubin (1970) and Sternberg (1986) define 'love' as a superior status of friendship. Sternberg (1986, 1997) proposed a triangular theory of love, with three main constructs - intimacy, passion and decision/commitment.

The article by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) is the third article that is discussed. In this article the authors define brand love as “the degree of passionate emotional attachment a satisfied consumer has for a particular name” (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006, p.81). Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) established five brand love dimensions: (1) passion for the brand, (2) brand attachment, (3) positive evaluation of the brand, (4) positive emotions in response to the brand, and (5) declarations of love towards the brand. The data were collected through a questionnaire. The design of the questionnaire was based on branded products and routinely

purchased products. First of all, respondents were asked to mention a brand of packaged good they were satisfied with. Then, they completed the questionnaire that referred to the chosen brand. The main finding from this study was that brand love has a positive direct effect on brand loyalty as well as on positive word of mouth. Another finding was that hedonic and self-expressive brands have a positive effect on brand love. Yet, hedonic products have a negative effect on brand loyalty.

From the three articles discussed above, it shows that brand love is always associated with a brand that a consumer has established a relationship with. Therefore, brands that consumers have established close relationships with have a higher score on brand love than neutral relationships (Reimann, Castano, Zaichkowsky, & Bechara, 2012). The three articles discussed show that all the dimensions of brand love cover the same topic. In the following paragraphs the difference between the dimensions is discussed.

The seven dimensions of brand love is explained by Batra et al. (2012). They describe a consumer's "love feeling" for a brand with a great deal of insight. Batra et al. (2012) give more richness and insight into the brand love phenomenon. The dimensions that are established by Batra et al. (2012) give a deeper insight into human characteristics and feelings that contribute to using the brand. The dimensions from Albert, Merunka, and Valette-Florence (2008) are more concerned with the attributes of the brand instead of feelings that are generated by the brand. The main weakness of this study is that it only determines that

brand love exists between a consumer and a loved brand through brand attributes like beauty, uniqueness, and attractive features of the brand. Albert et al. (2008) fail to define the feelings behind brand love. The study would have been more beneficial if the authors had included questions concerning the experience of using and/or the feeling of being separated from the loved brand. The dimensions established by Carroll & Ahuvia (2006) are concerned with feelings that are generated by the brand. However, these dimensions do not give enough insight in understanding how consumers experience brand love. To get more insight into the dimensions, Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) could have added several dimensions that address individual feelings. By using other dimensions as well, they could have given a better understanding of which emotions constitute brand love.

2.3 Prior perspectives on brand love

In other studies of brand love, Batra *et al.*, (2012) explore another theories of brand love and focus on some components of brand love; self-brand integration, passion-driven behavior, positive emotional connection, long-term relationship, anticipated separation distress, attitude valence and attitude strength. The attitudes valence segment signifies the examination of specific brand with a perfect brand which is balanced assessment. In self-brand integration, the individual assesses how much the brand picture matches with his/her self-image which is additionally rational assessment. This demonstrates brand love

is definitely not an unadulterated nonsensical idea, rather it is a mixing of rationality and irrationality. The rational part comprises of intellectual reasoning and assessment. To identify the potential of brand love concept; factors associated with the brand love, prior studies (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006; Bergkvst and Bech-Larsen,2010) defined several antecedents and outcomes of brand love, emotional factors remained unaddressed by these overt behavioral studies.

Another essential research question is to what degree brand love is basically similar to relational love? Can an individual love a brand like another human element? The subjective examinations directed by Batra et al. (2012, p. 12) reason that "this does not imply that it is improper to use the interpersonal relationship literature as a source of hypothesis, or even as supporting proof, for research on customer-brand relationship". Sternberg (1986, 1997) conceptualizes three segments of interpersonal love: intimacy, passion and commitment. Shimp and Goad (1988) express that the interpersonal love segments depicted by Sternberg (1986, 1997) are available with regards to consumer– object connections. intimacy is the sentiment of preferring to a great extent driven by emotion. Passion is driven by motivation and comprises some sources of desire. Commitment refers to the intention to keep the love in long-term.

Interpersonal love relationship contains the reciprocity angle. As the opinion some of analysts (Shimp and Enrage, 1988), this reciprocity is missing if there should arise an occurrence of consumer–

object relationship. Be that as it may, in this time of intelligent advertising and consumer-relationship management, the companies are reacting expeditiously and compassionately to the consumer building up the reciprocity.

One original contribution of this paper comes with the link between relationship, and “positive psychology” in marketing. Positive psychology, a recent branch of psychology, wants to use scientific understanding to help to achieve a satisfactory common life rather than merely treating mental illness (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Thus, this concept may be used in the definition of a complete and strong brand love relationships, as consumers best interact with products that are in line with their self-ideal. This behaviour, described as “Self Actualisation” (Maslow, 1943) was also known as the precursor to “Cognitive Dissonance Theory” (Festinger, 1962) and “Self Discrepancy Theory” (Higgins, 1987); all of which lead to describe the inherent process all consumers use to pursue the ideal way they want to be.

According to maria (2015), in their research, they discovered the antecedents of brand love in online network based communities which refers to social identity. The research revealed that social identity had strong positive impacts to brand love which people tend to identified themselves with social group to attach and made a strong relationship with the brand. Brand love had many antecedents that had been discovered as the research of Ahmed (2012), they found that brand

personality and brand images had been accepted as the antecedents of brand love and had positive impact to brand love. In thus research, showed that brand love might had many antecedents which were different in every country that had its cultures and custom from the people.

In addition, this phenomenon is supported with the other research. In india, there was a research which found that the antecedents of brand love there were brand experiences and consumers delight to a specific brand. In that research, discussed that Romanticism, brand experience, consumer delight, consumer satisfaction were posited to have positive relationships with brand love, whereas materialism was assumed to be negatively related to brand love. (Roy *et al*, 2012)

2.4 Relationship between love and loyalty

Sternberg (1986, 1997) states that affection parts (intimacy, passion and commitment) are exceedingly corresponded with one another, and in the meantime any segment can be available or missing in a relationship, regardless of the nearness of the remaining of the segments. This proposition is unrealistic, as the author did not propose any arrangement of occurrence of the psychological procedures.

Oliver (1999) recommends that person's loyalty toward any consumption object is produced through a stage by stage process. As per Oliver (1999), four stages of object loyalty improvement, to be

specific, namely, affective, conative and action, are created in the given arrangement. cognitive loyalty alludes to ideal brand observation created dependent on elective brand traits assessment. affective loyalty is the sentiment of preferring for the brand which is to a great extent equal to Sternberg's (1986, 1997) intimacy. Since, intimacy is proportional to loving in utilization setting which is to a great extent gotten from emotion (Shimp and Infuriate, 1988). As per Oliver (1999), conative devotion is the solid motivation to rebuy. This conative loyalty is identical to Sternberg's (1986, 1997) passion which is generally gotten from motivation. In this manner, affection and conation are identical to intimacy and passion, separately. At last, cognitive loyal individual will be action loyal on the off chance that he/she can conquer different exchanging impediments (Oliver, 1999).