



BRAND EQUITY OF GODREJ INTERIO PRODUCTS IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS:A STUDY OF JAMMU & KASHMIR

Taiba Musadiq Sahaf

Research Scholar, The Business School, University of Kashmir, Srinagar.

Abstract

Branding was earlier considered the forte of B2C marketers but B2B firms too are jumping onto the bandwagon to rein in the advantages of brands. Emotional influences earlier thought to be all too pervasive in consumer markets are now being touted as significant influences in industrial segments as well. Amidst overwhelming support for branding in the latter, brand building research has emerged to the fore to guide firms in their endeavor to build strong brands. Brand equity whether customer based or employee based is all set to act as a harbinger in this new era of nearly devastating competition. This paper is an attempt in the direction of understanding internal (employee-based brand equity) and external (customer based brand equity) brand equity and how this phenomenon pans out in the cost conscious institutional (higher education) segment of Godrej Interio in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

Key Words: *Branding, Internal Brand Equity, External Brand Equity, Godrej Interio, Brand Measurement.*

Introduction

Brands provide distinctive competencies to companies both through differentiation from competitors and their perception as unique/distinct by consumers.. The views on the strategic relevance of the brand are supplemented by Kay (2004) who argues that the primary function of branding is to distinguish the said brand from competitors and thereby identify the products and services comprising it while at the same time building awareness among customers. These comments bring to light the influence that brands wield on the stakeholders of the marketplace and to that extent highlight their strategic relevance are also corroborated by Albaum, Duerr and Standskov (2005). Although brand plays a strategic role in the growth of a business in both B2C as well as B2B segments given that such segments are inundated with suppliers conforming to the rational specifications. While research studies in the past have focused on the nature and relevance of branding in the B2B sector (Lindgreen et al., 2010), not much attention has been paid to brand building in the same. The lack of creative research in the field of B2B brand building and measurement provided the necessary stimulus to this research and as a consequence thereby, the scholar decided to carry out an application specific measurement of the brand equity in the B2B sector.

Research Gap

The present study differs from similar studies in that it seeks to measure the brand building efforts of a national brand with a strong presence in B2B educational sector with regard to furniture needs. The study attempts to take a balanced view of brand building as based on internal as well as external processes measured respectively by the dimensions of customer-based brand equity and internal brand-building. It bases its dimensions of external brand equity on the conceptual framework propounded by Aaker (1991). The concept of internal brand-building in this paper is based on the first empirically tested model of EBBE (Employee-based Brand Equity) in the works of King and Grace (2010). It is an endeavor at objectively measuring these constructs in the higher education sector in Jammu and Kashmir and provides a basis for research in this area in a broader geographical scope.

Understanding Brand Equity and Measurement

Most research studies concur with Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) and are, more or less, repetitions of the seminal models provided by them. Aaker (1991) attributes five underlying assets with brand equity: brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, propitiatory assets and perceived quality.

Authors focus on factors influencing external brand building that act as determinants of brand equity, help measure changes in brand equity and highlight the measures that firms can take to leverage strong brands within the marketplace. This set of measures provides a guiding framework for the study in question and helps in the measurement of brand equity for a B2B organization as an independent variable. The B2B organization will be measured for various dimensions of this construct to determine why educational institutions prefer Godrej Interio to other brands in the market.

It is also important to view brand equity in the light of employees because the brand promise is fulfilled and the brand associations delivered when employees understand their role in brand management and consequently alter their organizational behaviors to positively reflect organizational priorities (Parker, 2007). Therefore, brand equity literature needs



to take a break from the inside out perspectives inherent in CBBE and financial perspective of brand equity and describe EBBE or internal brand equity as the starting point of any research on the subject (King and Grace 2010).

Objectives of the Study

The basic objectives of the present study are summarized:

1. To determine and describe the position of Godrej Interio across the dimensions of brand equity: brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived loyalty
2. To determine the strength of internal brand building initiatives within Godrej.
3. To understand the cumulative impact of CBBE and EBBE on the overall brand equity enjoyed by Godrej Interio in the higher educational institutions of Kaashmir Province.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were laid down for the present study:

1. The external brand building or customer-based brand equity for Godrej Interio in the institutions of higher learning is excellent.
2. The internal brand building or employee-based brand equity for Godrej Interio in the institutions of higher learning is excellent.
3. Overall brand equity for Godrej Interio is excellent as derived from external and internal brand equities.

Rationale and Scope of the Present Study

The present study is focused on the measurement of brand equity for Godrej Interio in the institutions of higher learning in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. In fact, the study covers all dimensions of a well-known national brand Godrej Interio that has a strong presence in the B2B sector. The basis for the selection of Godrej Interio though self-evident must be clearly explicated to render authenticity to the present work. The original "Make in India" movement, Godrej was the first to introduce branded premium furniture wares in the country. As an apposite representative of B2B conglomerate, it demonstrated the grit and the gumption to tap a high-potential institutional segment: the educational sector.

Research Methods

Sampling

For the purpose of this study, two surveys were conducted to measure respectively the employee and customer-based brand equity. The population for the customer based brand equity survey (henceforth referred to as survey I) comprised of members of central/departmental purchasing committees of universities and all executives and officials involved in purchasing decisions of institutions of higher learning in the Jammu and Kashmir State. The sample comprised of 100 decision makers from 10 leading institutions of higher learning in Jammu and Kashmir. Demographic details such as years of experience lesser than or greater than ten years were used to analyze data at a greater detail. The sample to measure EBBE (henceforth referred to as survey II), comprised of 90 employees from Godrej Interio office, Chandigarh, Jammu and Srinagar representing an adequate mix from both lower and middle echelons of sales management. Sales management was chosen because of their undeniably strong role in representing the face of the brand to the buyers. The level of management to which the respondent belonged in survey II was used to calculate the perceptual gap with respect to the dimensions of EBBE. Out of the hundred respondents from the first sample, responses were received from eighty executives resulting in an 80 % response rate and out of ninety respondents comprising the second sample, eighty five responded representing a 94.44% response rate. Due to dearth of resources, paucity of time and the nature of study undertaken, the researcher was constrained in her choice of sampling technique. The method, therefore, used was judgement sampling.

Data Collection Methods and Procedures

The present study used two sets of questionnaires i.e. a 30-item inventory--- the instrument for survey I and an 84-item inventory---the instrument for survey II. The questionnaires for survey I were administered to faculty members and administrative heads. Online questionnaires were electronically transmitted to employees of Godrej Interio through Google Forms for survey II.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaires developed by Goi Chai Lee and Fayrene Chieng Yew Leh (2011) and King and Grace (2010) were used respectively to measure CBBE and EBBE. Three statements (Statements 77, 82 and 83) from the standardized questionnaire for survey II were deleted because they were judged irrelevant for the current work. All negative statements were converted into positives in order to prevent reverse coding during analysis.

Technique of Data Analysis

The examination of data was carried out through the software tools of MS-Excel and accordingly the data was entered into spreadsheets. Formulas relied upon were =SUM(Range)/Number of respondents and =COUNTIF(Range, ">value)/number of respondents to calculate mean scores and number of respondents in agreement with the statements respectively. Individual responses to Google forms were considered and summary responses and other accompanying analysis were ignored. Statistical analysis included descriptive statistics, inferential analysis as well as tabular representation.

Analysis, Discussion and Results

The main tool for analysis of primary data used was mean score. To make the data more comprehensive, the measure percentage of mean score was calculated simply by multiplying the mean score of the question by 20. In a five point likert scale, for example, a mean score of 1 represents the score out of five, therefore in order to calculate the percentage mean score, we multiply 1/5 by 100 which equals 20%. Similarly, a mean score of 2 equals 40%, 3 is 60%, 4 represents 80% and 5 100%. These scores are interpreted respectively from 1 to 5 or from 20% to 100% as follows:

<2.5	<50%	Poor
2.5-<3	50-60%	Moderate
3-<4	60-<80%	High
4<5	80% and above	Excellent

Overall, the brand equity of Godrej Interio was adjudged to be high standing at 70.37% with a mean score of 3.52. While the internal brand equity was excellent at 83.849% with a mean score of 4.192, the resulting overall brand equity tends towards the lesser score calculated due to the average score of external brand equity which was estimated at 2.99 or 59.9%.

Also, percentage of respondents agreeing with a particular set of statements with relevance for managerial implementation have also been calculated. This has been interpreted as follows:

up to 30% of population	poorly agreed
>30% to 70%	moderate acceptance
>70%	high acceptance

External Brand Equity

Out of the four dimensions of external brand equity as shown in Table 1, only that of perceived quality stands out at 4.07 or 81.4% whereas the other dimension score between 40-60% as percentage composite mean scores. This implies that Godrej Interio's external brand equity is strongly tied to its operational performance or consumer perceptions of its functional specifications and to that extent, it suffers from moderate levels of awareness, strength of associations and poor levels of brand loyalty. Table 1 shows that the trend remained unchanged for the two sub-groups in the sample of buyers: those having experience less than ten years and those with more than 10 years' experience. People with more organizational purchasing experience are relatively less loyal to the brand.

Dimensions	Less than 10yrs		More than 10yrs		Perceptual Gap	
Brand Awareness	51%	2.55	53.75%	2.68	2.75	0.14
Perceived Quality	80.8%	4.04	82%	4.1	1.2	0.06
Brand Associations	57.35%	2.86	59.7% %	2.99	2.35	0.12
Brand Loyalty	46%	2.3	45%	2.25	-1	-0.05

Dimension/Statement	Mean Score	%Mean Score	% of Respondents in Agreement
Brand Awareness	2.36	47.13	
We can easily imagine Godrej Interio in our mind	2.075	41.5	2.5

We can recognize Godrej Interio among competing brands	2.43	48.5	30
Godrej Interio is the only brand recalled when we need to make a purchase decision on the product	2.6	52	30
Godrej Interio comes first to mind when we need to make a purchase decision on the product	2.33	46.5	25
Perceived Quality	4.07	81.4	
Godrej Interio is of good quality	4.6	92	97.5
We can expect superior performance from Godrej Interio	4.15	83	92.5
Godrej Interio is very reliable	4.275	85.5	90
We find all the relevant information about Godrej Interio brands/products respectively	4.35	87	92.5
Godrej Interio is better as compared to other brand(s) of the product in terms of the finish/design/color/form/appearance	2.98	59.5	40
Brand Associations	2.99	59.91	
Godrej Interio enables us to work trouble free.	3.83	76.5	70
Godrej Interio is safe to use/consume.	4.33	86.5	90
During use, the brand is highly unlikely to be defective.	4.25	85	100
We can quickly recall the logo of Godrej Interio.	2.58	51.5	32.5
In its status and style, Godrej Interio matches our organizational personality.	2.25	45	25
Godrej Interio is well regarded by my peers.	3.88	77.5	82.5
We are proud to own a product of Godrej Interio.	2.93	58.5	47.5
We consider the company and people who stand behind Godrej Interio as very trustworthy.	3.6	72	65
Godrej Interio is well priced.	1.13	22.5	2.5
Considering what we pay for the brand, we get much more than our money's worth.	2.68	53.5	30
We can get better value from Godrej Interio when compared to the local brand(s).	1.78	35.5	17.5
We buy/use this brand of product because it is an Indian brand.	2.43	48.5	27.5
The brand's country of origin/manufacture is important in choosing this product.	2.88	57.5	45
We consider the company and people who stand behind the brand as having expertise in producing the product.	3.95	79	77.5
We believe that this company and people who stand behind Godrej Interio are socially responsible.	2.98	59.5	50
We believe that this company does not take undue advantage of consumers.	2.55	51	32.5
We believe that this company is contributing to the society.	2.95	59	57.5
Brand Loyalty	1.99	39.75	
After Using the brand we grew fond of it.	2.98	59.5	37.5
We will definitely buy this brand of product again	1.1	22	2.5
We will definitely buy Godrej Interio products although its price is higher than the other brand(s) of the product that offer similar benefits	2.15	43	37.5
We will not buy other brands, when Godrej Interio is available	1.75	35	30

A cursory look of Table 2 demonstrates that awareness levels were, on the whole, poor for Godrej Interio among decision makers of the educational institutions. The composite mean score for the dimension came out to be 2.36 with a % composite mean score of 47.13%. From the analysis of Table 2, it can be concluded that Godrej Interio enjoys poor brand recognition and recall and therefore, ranks low in aided as well as unaided recall.

Perceived Quality had an overall composite score of 4.07 and an equivalent percentage mean score of 81.4%. The strength of Godrej Interio's brand equity is based on astonishingly high levels of perceived quality as a B2B brand proved empirically both by mean scores, percentage mean scores and percentage of respondents agreeing with the statement recorded for the dimension as a whole and its constituent statements illustrated by Table 2.

The strength, favourability and uniqueness of Godrej Interio brand associations was moderate with the dimension enjoying a moderate mean score and percentage mean score of 2.99 and 59.91% respectively. However, statements comprising this dimension were both high and low and therefore overall brand associations regressed towards the mean. Respondents, therefore held positive associations with respect to durability and safety while use about the Godrej Interio brand. Thus, the study of Table 2 reveals that the brand associations of Godrej Interio are moderately strong.

Out of the four dimensions of brand equity, brand loyalty ranks the lowest at 39.75% (1.94) mean scores. Acceptance ranging from poor to moderate among the population was registered for brand loyalty across statements that reflected the dimension as a measure of repeat purchases.

Internal Brand Equity

Employee-based Brand Equity or internal brand equity for the Godrej Interio brand stood at an average of 4.192 or its percentage equivalent 83.849. While 11 dimensions out of the thirteen that were used to measure this construct had percentage mean scores greater than or equal to 80%, two dimensions, information generation and employee involvement tended towards high results as opposed to excellent ratings for others in terms of the same measures. The sample of employees chosen to administer the online survey for measuring EBBE could be divided into two group based on the managerial level to which the respondent belonged: senior management and junior management. Though the perceptual gap was negligible, it was noticed that junior managers' responses to statements comprising information generation, employee involvement had high mean scores reiterating the pattern already observed and explaining the relatively lesser mean scores for these constructs highlighted above. In addition and not to forget in contravention to the dominating trend noticed, they had high mean and percentage mean scores for knowledge dissemination as also employee intention to stay. A comprehensive gist of the relative percentage mean scores has been illustrated below in Table 3. For the sake of simplicity, the mean scores have not been shown:

Dimension	Senior Managers (in %)	Junior Managers (in %)
Information Generation	82.66	75.2
Knowledge Dissemination	84.19	78.85
Role Clarity	86.33	83.33
Brand Commitment	88.88	83.47
Brand Citizenship Behaviour	85.9	85.52
Employee Satisfaction	89.86	87.73
Employee Intention to stay	84	78.33
Positive Employee Word of Mouth	87	83.66
Management Support	86.9	84.5
Organizational Socialization	86.8	84.3
Employee Attitudes towards the job	82.8	81.5
Employee Involvement	81.33	76
H Factor	86.67	84

Another fact to be noted is that the percentage mean scores for junior managers are consecutively lower than those of the senior management.

The Table 4 illustrated henceforth depicts each constituent dimension of internal brand equity separately with their statements and their corresponding mean scores, percentage mean scores and number of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement.

Dimension/Statement	Mean Score	%Mean Score	% of Respondents in Agreement
Information Generation	3.94	78.95	
In the organization I work for, management interacts directly with employees to find out how to make them more satisfied.	3.96	78.6	66
In the organization I work for, management meet with employees to find out	3.67	73.33	50



what expectations they have of their job for the future.			
When at work, my manager tries to find out what we, as employees, want from the organization.	4.16	83.33	80
The organization I work for uses data gathered from employees to improve their jobs and to develop strategy for the organization.	4.07	81.33	70
In the organization I work for we have staff appraisals/reviews in which we discuss what employees want.	3.87	77.33	76.67
In the organization I work for, we do a lot of employee research.	3.73	74.67	63.33
The organization I work for gathers information from employee feedback.	4.2	84	76.66
Knowledge Dissemination	4.08	81.52	
The organization I work for communicates its brand promise well to its employees.	4.3	86	83.33
The information provided to me when I was employed helped me to understand my role in the context of what the organization is trying to achieve.	4.2	84	83.33
The organization I work for teaches us why we should do things and not just how we should do things.	3.7	74	63.33
The organization I work for communicates the importance of my role in delivering the brand promise.	3.93	78.67	73.33
My manager regularly reports back to us about issues affecting our work environment.	3.96	79.33	83.33
My manager regularly meets with all of his/her employees to report about issues relating to the whole organization.	3.97	79.33	76.66
Skill and knowledge development of employees happens as an ongoing process in the organization I work for.	4.47	89.33	93.33
Role Clarity	4.25	85	
I know how I should behave while I am on the job.	4.26	85.3	96.67
I know exactly what output is expected of me on the job.	4.16	83.3	90
I know how to deliver the brand promise for the organization I work for.	4.07	81.33	76.67
I understand what is expected of me because I have information about my organization's brand.	4.3	86	100
Information about my organization's brand improved my basic understanding of my job.	4.4	88	93.33
I feel that I am making an important contribution in the organization I work for.	4.3	86	80
I know what I am expected to achieve in my job.	4.2	84	90
I know how I am expected to handle unusual problems and situations while on the job.	4.33	86.67	93.33
Brand Commitment	4.306	86.1	
I am proud to be a part of the organization I work for.	4.6	92	96.67
I really care about the fate of the organization I work for.	4.46	89.33	96.67
I feel like I really fit in where I work.	4.03	80.67	80
I am willing to put in extra effort beyond what is expected to make the organization I work for successful.	4.3	86	93.33
My values are similar to those of the organization I work for.	4.13	82.67	76.67
Brand Citizenship Behaviour	4.29	85.71	
I am always interested to learn about my organization's brand and what it means for me in my role.	4.23	84.67	86.67
I demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the brand promise of the organization I work for.	4.26	85.33	90
I regularly recommend the organization I work for to family and friends i.e. non job related acquaintances.	4.43	88.66	90
If given the opportunity, I pass on my knowledge about my organization's brand to new employees.	4.33	86.67	90
I take responsibility for tasks outside of my own area if necessary e.g. following up on customer requests etc.	4.17	83.33	90

I show extra initiative to ensure that my behavior remains consistent with the brand promise of the organization I work for.	4.3	86	86.67
I consider the impact on my organization's brand before communicating or taking action in any situation	4.47	85.33	86.67
Employee Satisfaction	4.44	88.8	
I feel reasonably satisfied with my job.	4.53	90.67	96.67
I am satisfied with my overall job.	4.53	90.67	93.33
I do enjoy my job.	4.5	90	96.67
I feel a great sense of satisfaction with my job	4.43	88.67	93.33
I would not consider leaving my current job should another job opportunity be presented to me.	4.2	84	80
Employee Intention to Stay	4.05	81.16	
I would turn down an offer from another organization if it came tomorrow.	4.17	83.33	80
I plan to stay with the organization I work for.	4.17	83.33	76.67
I plan to be with the organization I work for, for a while.	4.13	82.67	73.33
I plan to be with the organization I work for five years from now.	3.77	75.33	50
Positive Employee Word of Mouth	4.26	85.33	
I would recommend the organization I work for to someone who seeks my advice.	4.26	85.33	90
I talk positively about the organization I work for to others.	4.33	86.66	93.33
I enjoy talking about the organization I work for to others.	4.2	84	86.67
I say positive things about the organization I work for to others.	4.26	85.33	83.33
Management Support	4.27	85.52	
My manager is willing to extend themselves in order to help me to perform my job to the best of my ability.	4.26	85.33	86.67
My manager understands my problems and needs.	4.26	85.33	90
The organization I work for acknowledges the efforts of employees	4.37	87.33	96.67
The organization I work for values my contribution to its well-being.	4.43	88.67	90
The organization I work for strongly considers my goals and values.	4.2	84	76.67
The organization I work for tries to make my job as interesting as possible.	4.3	86	93.33
Help is available from the organization I work for when I have a problem.	4.1	82	80
Organizational Socialization	4.28	85.61	
The organization I work for has provided excellent job training for me.	4.26	85.33	90
The training in the organization I work for has enabled me to do my job well.	4.37	87.3	96.67
My co-workers are usually willing to offer their assistance or advice.	4.4	88	96.67
My co-workers have done a great deal to help me to adjust to my organization.	4.26	85.33	93.33
My work environment helps me to understand how I should behave in my job.	4.03	80.67	80
The goals of the organization I work for are very clear.	4.4	88	86.67
The instructions given by my manager have been valuable in helping me to do better work.	4.23	84.67	86.67
H Factor	4.26	85.33	
I feel that a good deal of cooperation exists between management and the employees of the organization I work for.	4.13	82.67	83.33
Overall, I would suggest excellent communication exists within the organization I work for.	4.13	82.66	83.33
I feel that I am a respected and valued member of the organization I work for.	4.3	86.67	86.67
I feel that I can trust the management of the organization I work for.	4.57	91.33	96.67
I feel that the organization I work for is considerate, (to the best of their ability); of the impact their decisions have on me.	4.2	84	90
I feel that the organization I work for trusts me to do a good job.	4.23	84.67	83.33

Overall Analysis

This study was aimed at determining the strength and favourability of Godrej Interio products as a function of brand equity. Overall brand equity was estimated to be 70.37% with a mean score of 3.52 based on its two constituents of CBBE (Customer-based Brand Equity) and EBBE (Employee-based Brand Equity). The overall brand equity of Godrej Interio furniture products has a high mean score of 70.37% whereas ideally the score should have been in the range of excellence for a conglomerate with the first mover advantage in the industry. Based on the positive correlation between brand equity and brand preference (Cobb- Walgren et al., 1995; Agarwal and Rao, 1996; Myers 2003; Lavidge, 1961; Mackay 2001b; Vakratsas & Ambler 1999; Tolba, 2011), it can safely be concluded that Godrej Interio enjoys brand preference but does not rank excellent on this parameter. While it's internal brand equity stands high at 84% or 4.192 approximately, the reason for the decline in overall brand equity can be safely attributed to the moderate mean scores (59.9% or 2.99) of external brand equity. This is an area of grave concern for a furniture brand that aims to become a USD one-billion company by the end of this year.

Findings and Recommendations

From the above analysis, the findings that can be derived are summarized below. The findings clearly reveal that there is enough scope for improvement in branding at Godrej Interio. To improve the branding, both internal as well as external, the following recommendations are made:

1. While perceived quality with respect to technical specifications remains unequivocally high, consumers perceive Godrej Interio products to be equal in design, finish, appearance etc to other furniture products. This is corroborated by the poor recognition of the Godrej Interio brand logo and products among competing brands. If Godrej Interio positions its products as ergonomically convenient and aesthetically beautiful, then it's positioning has failed with respect to the latter. The team of managers must ensure that decision makers in educational institutions perceive differentiation of Godrej Interio products from local brands in terms of manufacturing design.
2. Brand loyalty to Godrej Interio Products remains abysmally low relative to other parameters. This is largely due to perceived switching cost loyalty among decision makers for local brands. The products under Interio are perceived as negligibly different from what is available locally. This can be countered through rigorous promotion aimed at the higher education sector by creating top-of-mind brand awareness.
3. Government and institutional markets offer high potential, high-volume market segments in B2b marketing. Overlooking such niche segments to competitors due to consumers' convenience loyalty to the latter would translate to losses to bottom-line profitability. Godrej can enter convenience channels by developing products for the lower end and entering tendering bids from departments in the university as well as colleges.
4. However, though not surprisingly, a very low percentage of consumers thought that Godrej Interio was well-priced and that it offered more than money's worth to them. The ability to charge price premium to consumers as a result of branding efforts is somewhat constrained. Either the consumers be made to change their evaluation criteria by making quality the paramount positioning attribute or the company introduce lower end products to cater to the needs of state educational institutions characterized by dearth of funds.
5. While it can be said that EBBE is positive based on the parameters of internal brand equity that showed results interpreted as high and excellent, certain aspects need to be paid attention to. Junior managers showed relatively lower scores for each of the dimensions measured as opposed to senior management. This might indicate a need to enhance interaction and communication across managerial levels.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was confined to the Jammu & Kashmir province in general and the Srinagar and Jammu experiences in particular which limits the generalization of findings to other districts and states.
2. The questionnaires were borrowed to ensure the use of reliable, valid and empirically validated scales in the study. The questionnaires were developed for different conditions and to that extent may be lacking with respect to the research climate in the sub-continent. However, the questionnaires were modified to some extent in keeping with local conditions.
3. The respondents in survey I were not exposed to so many brands and may not have been in a position to clearly evaluate and decide between different competing brands.

Future Research

The scope for future research can be gauged from the weak points of this present work. A comparative study of the brand equity of different furniture brands needs to be undertaken to understand fully the import of brand equity and its influence on Godrej Interio's demand. A more accurate research study would first proceed with understanding the relationship and



correlation between internal and external brand equity, their ties with brand preference and ultimately how all of this unfolds for Godrej Interio.

References

1. Aaker, D.A., (1991) *Managing Brand Equity*, Free Press, New York.
2. Agarwal, M. K., Rao, V. R., (1996) An Empirical Comparison of Consumer-Based Measures of Brand Equity, *Marketing Letters*, 7, 3.
3. Albaum, G., Duerr, E., and Strandskov, J., (2005) *International Marketing and Export Management*, London: Pearson Education Limited
4. Chai, L. G., & Yew, L. F. C. (2011). Dimensions of Customer-Based Brand Equity: A Study on Malaysian Brands. *Journal of Marketing Research and Case Studies*, Article ID, 821981(10).
5. Cobb-Walgren, C., Ruble, C., Donthu, N., (1995) Brand Equity, Brand Preference, and Purchase Intent, *Journal Of Advertising*, 24, 3 (Fall).
6. Kay, M.J., (2004) Strong Brands and Corporate Brands, *The European Journal of Marketing* 40(7/8)
7. Keller, K.L., (1993) Branding and Brand Equity, *Relevant Knowledge Series Marketing Science Institute (MSI)*, 152
8. King, C., Grace, D., (2010) Building and Measuring Employee-Based Brand Equity, *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(7/8).
9. Lavidge, R., (1961) A Model for Predictive Measurements of Advertising Effectiveness, *Journal of Marketing*, 25, 6, October.
10. Lindgreen, A., Beverland, M. B., Farrelly, F., (2010) From Strategy to Tactics: Building, Implementing, and Managing Brand Equity in Business Markets, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39 (8).
11. Mackay, M., (2001b) Application of Brand Equity Measures in Service Markets, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 15, 3.
12. Myers, C., (2003) Managing Brand Equity: A Look at the Impact of Attributes, *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 12.
13. Parker, S., K., (2007) 'That is My Job': How Employees' Role Orientation Affects their Job Performance, *Human Relations*, 60(3).
14. Tolba, A.H., (2011) The Impact of Distribution Intensity on Brand Preference & Brand Loyalty, *International Journal of Marketing Studies* , Vol. 3, No. 3; August
15. Vakratsas, D., Tim, A., (1999) How Advertising Works: What Do We Really Know? *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 1 (January). [Online] Available: [Http://Www.Jstor.Org/Stable/1251999](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1251999).