

Building Brand Equity with Environmental Communication

Dr. Meeta Ujjain¹

¹*Assistant Professor (Senior Scale), Department of Advertising and Public Relations,
Makhanlal Chaturvedi Rashtriya Patrakarita Vishwavidyalya - Noida.*

Abstract

Environmental communication positively influences the strength of brand environmental communication. Environmental communication practices involves take different forms of involvement to position the brand in different forms. Therefore, in this paper, the researcher mentioned the societal communication, and more specifically environmental communication, contributes to brand equity in today's scenario. Variables included are environmental communication, attitude towards environment, brand equity, awareness, quality, brand consciousness etc using Likert scale and analyzed using SPSS 20.

Keywords: Environmental Communication; Brand Equity; Societal Consciousness.

Introduction

Today's business environment is complex and lot of competitive in the world. The consumers pay more interest towards the societal responsibility while purchasing or consuming the products or services. Environmental communication positively influences the strength of brand environmental communication. Environmental communication practices involves take different forms

of involvement to position the brand in different forms. In this paper, concentrates towards to investigate the impact of environmental communication on the two main dimensions of brand associations and associations towards brand equity.

Review of Literature

Keller's (1993, 2003) brand equity framework, mentioned that “the impact of the firm's environmental communication on brand equity, and specifically its impact on brand image, through the strength and favorability of brand environmental associations”.

Erdem and Swait, (1998) Environmental communication efficiency mainly depends on the perceived credibility. This influenced the consumers' decision to interpret the message related to societal involvement.

Research Methodology

Descriptive research design was employed in this study. The sample study includes 130 respondents from various sectors. Convenience sampling technique is used for collecting the sample data. The primary data were collected using structured questionnaire through using google forms. The secondary data were collected using books, journals and magazines.

Table 1: Gender of Respondents

Gender		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	60	46.2
	Female	70	53.8
	Total	130	100.0

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority 53.8 percentage of the respondent belongs to female.

Attitude towards Environment**Table 2: Reducing Marketing Costs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very High	54	41.5	41.5	41.5
	High	46	35.4	35.4	76.9
	N	25	19.2	19.2	96.2
	Low	2	1.5	1.5	97.7
	Very Low Total	3 130	2.3 100.0	2.3 100.0	100.0

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are having high attitude towards reducing marketing costs.

Table 3: Trade Leverage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very High	38	29.2	29.2	29.2
	High	59	45.4	45.4	74.6
	N	33	25.4	25.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are having high attitude towards trade leverage.

Table 4: Attracting New Customers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very High	38	29.2	29.2	29.2
	High	48	36.9	36.9	66.2
	N	23	17.7	17.7	83.8
	Low	10	7.7	7.7	91.5
	Very Low	11	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are having high attitude towards attracting new customers.

Table 5: Time to Respond Competitive Threats

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very High	39	30.0	30.0	30.0
	High	56	43.1	43.1	73.1
	N	22	16.9	16.9	90.0
	Low	6	4.6	4.6	94.6
	Very Low	7	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are having high attitude towards time to respond competitive threats.

Brand Awareness**Table 6: Brand to be Considered**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	44	33.8	33.8	33.8
	Agree	48	36.9	36.9	70.8
	N	23	17.7	17.7	88.5
	Disagree	8	6.2	6.2	94.6
	Strongly Disagree	7	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are agreed towards Brand to be considered.**Perceived Quality****Table 7: Reason to Buy**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extremely important	36	27.7	27.7	27.7
	Very Important	51	39.2	39.2	66.9
	Moderately Important	22	16.9	16.9	83.8
	Slightly Important	9	6.9	6.9	90.8
	Not at all Important	12	9.2	9.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents mentioned very important towards reason to buy.**Table 8: Channel Member Interest**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extremely important	43	33.1	33.1	33.1
	Very Important	47	36.2	36.2	69.2
	Moderately Important	19	14.6	14.6	83.8
	Slightly Important	12	9.2	9.2	93.1
	Not at all Important	9	6.9	6.9	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents mentioned very important towards Channel member interest.

Brand Association

Table 9: Create Positive Attitude

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extremely important	40	30.8	30.8	30.8
	Very Important	51	39.2	39.2	70.0
	Moderately important	18	13.8	13.8	83.8
	Slightly Important	9	6.9	6.9	90.8
	Not at all Important	12	9.2	9.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents mentioned very important towards creating positive attitude.

Table 10: Helps to Retrieve Information

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Extremely important	38	29.2	29.2	29.2
	Very Important	51	39.2	39.2	68.5
	Moderately Important	25	19.2	19.2	87.7
	Slightly Important	11	8.5	8.5	96.2
	Not at all Important	5	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary Data

Inference: Majority of the respondents mentioned very important towards helps to retrieve information.

Consumers' Societal Consciousness

Table 11: I Try to Avoid to Purchase from Companies that Strongly Pollute

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	43	33.1	33.1	33.1
	Agree	52	40.0	40.0	73.1
	N	21	16.2	16.2	89.2
	Disagree	10	7.7	7.7	96.9
	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are agreed with avoid purchasing from companies that strongly pollute.

Table 12: I Systematically Choose the Product that has the Less Impact on the Environment.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	43	33.1	33.1	33.1
	Agree	52	40.0	40.0	73.1
	N	21	16.2	16.2	89.2
	Disagree	10	7.7	7.7	96.9
	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents is agreed with systematically choose the product that has the less impact on the environment.

**Table 13: When I have the Choice between two Equivalent Products,
I Always Wonder which one Pollutes Less before Buying**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	46	35.4	35.4	35.4
	Agree	51	39.2	39.2	74.6
	N	22	16.9	16.9	91.5
	Disagree	8	6.2	6.2	97.7
	Strongly Disagree	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents is agreed with the choice between two equivalent products, I always wonder which one pollutes less before buying

The Perceived Credibility of the Environmental Claim

Table 14: The Web Page Information are True

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Highly Satisfied	50	38.5	38.5	38.5
	Satisfied	48	36.9	36.9	75.4
	N	21	16.2	16.2	91.5
	Dissatisfied	8	6.2	6.2	97.7
	Highly dissatisfied	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are satisfied with the Web page information is true.

Table 15: I Believe in the Information Provided by this Website

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Highly Satisfied	44	33.8	33.8	33.8
	Satisfied	52	40.0	40.0	73.8
	N	22	16.9	16.9	90.8
	Dissatisfied	9	6.9	6.9	97.7
	Highly Dissatisfied	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are satisfied with the Web page information provided by this Web site.

Table 16: This Website is Fair in what is Said and Shown

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Highly Satisfied	44	33.8	33.8	33.8
	Satisfied	51	39.2	39.2	73.1
	N	22	16.9	16.9	90.0
	Dissatisfied	10	7.7	7.7	97.7
	Highly dissatisfied	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are satisfied with the Website is fair.

Value to Customers

Table 17: Confidence in Purchase Decision

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Highly Satisfied	44	33.8	33.8	33.8
	Satisfied	52	40.0	40.0	73.8
	N	21	16.2	16.2	90.0
	Dissatisfied	9	6.9	6.9	96.9
	Highly dissatisfied	4	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Inference: Majority of the respondents are satisfied with Confidence in purchase decision.

Table 18: Association between Building Brand Equity With Environmental Communication

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I try to avoid to purchase from companies that strongly pollute	Between Groups	62.334	4	15.583	25.332	.000
	Within Groups	76.897	125	.615		
	Total	139.231	129			
I systematically choose the product that has the less impact on the environment.	Between Groups	62.334	4	15.583	25.332	.000
	Within Groups	76.897	125	.615		
	Total	139.231	129			
When I have the choice between two equivalent products, I always wonder which one pollutes less before buying.	Between Groups	102.102	4	25.526	128.193	.000
	Within Groups	24.890	125	.199		
	Total	126.992	129			
The Web page information are true	Between Groups	108.842	4	27.210	161.698	.000
	Within Groups	21.035	125	.168		
	Total	129.877	129			
I believe in the information provided by this Web site	Between Groups	125.808	4	31.452	1310.497	.000
	Within Groups	3.000	125	.024		
	Total	128.808	129			
This Web site is fair in what is said and shown	Between Groups	130.892	4	32.723	2363.333	.000
	Within Groups	1.731	125	.014		
	Total	132.623	129			

Source: Computed data

Inference: All the variables are significant.
Hence it is concluded that there is an

Association between Building Brand Equity
with Environmental Communication.

Conclusion

Majority of the respondents are having high attitude towards trade leverage, attracting new customers and reducing marketing costs. Majority of the respondents are satisfied with Confidence in purchase decision. In this research it is concluded that there is a close association between Building Brand Equity with Environmental Communication. This research shown that the retailer's communication on its Website, the positive impact towards of environmental communication on brand equity have highly influenced.

References

1. Baloglu, S., 2002. Dimensions of Customer Loyalty: Separating Friends from Well Wishers, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 43, p. 47-59.
2. Banerjee B., Gulas, C.S. and Iyer, E. (1995), "Shades of Green: A Multidimensional Analysis of Environmental Advertising", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 24 No 2, pp. 22-31.
3. Bhattacharya, C.B., Smith, N.C. and Vogel, D. (2004), "Integrating Social Responsibility and Marketing Strategy: An Introduction", *California Management Review*, Vol. 47 No 1, pp. 6-8.
4. Bowen, H.R. (1953), *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*, New York: Harper & Row.
5. Erdem, T. and Swait, J. (1998), "Brand Equity as a Signaling Phenomenon", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 7 No 2, pp. 131-157.
6. Jones, P., Comfort, D. and Hillier, D. (2007), "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Case Study of the Top Ten Global Retailers", *EuroMed Journal of Business*, Vol. 2 No 1, pp. 23-35.
7. Jose, A. & Lee, S.-M. (2007). Environmental reporting of global corporations: A content analysis based on website disclosures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72(4), 307–321.
8. Keller, K.L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 No 1, pp. 1-22.
9. Keller, K.L. (2003), *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
10. Schlegelmilch, B.B. and Pollach, I. (2005), "The Perils and Opportunities of Communicating Corporate Ethics", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 21 No 3/4, pp. 267-290.