Migration Letters
May 2023
Volume: 20, No: 3, pp. 477-491
ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)
www.migrationletters.com

Received: 22 March 2023 Accepted: 25 April 2023

DOI: 10.47059/ml.v20i3.2932

Implications of Lovemark Theory: A Study on Discreet Brands

D David Winster Praveenraj[1], Megha Pandey[2], Melvin Victor[3], Aarthy Chellasam[4] and Aishwarya Nagarathinam[5]

Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze whether discreet brands can be a Lovemark by using empirical research methods. Discreet brands are unspoken by people. Nowadays, almost everything is labelled in the world of product use, and every user has a favourite brand to which they have emotional bonding referred to as Love marks. It takes more than a commercial these days to keep customers loyal to a company. Consumers must be able to connect on a more personal level. There is a deep-seated passion that has lasted for a long time, making the luxury brand customer one of the most loyal consumers all over the world. As a result; customers evaluate what a Lovemark is and why they continue to repurchase the brand, resulting in a kind of ongoing relationship of brand with the customer. The aim of this dissertation is to investigate why consumers form emotional attachments and loyalty to brands, resulting in a long-term, devoted relationship between them. Particularly selected is the discreet product - Sanitary Napkins from top brands in India.

Keywords: *Lovemark, Favorites Brand, Brand Love, Brand Loyalty, User Emotions.*

Introduction

Love Mark

Lovemark is a concept of marketing, intended to replace the idea of brands**,** Originally Publishedin 2004, Author Kevin Roberts. Kevin explained the relationship between the Lovemark and the other one is selling concepts through a simple schema based on respect and

[1]Assistant Professor, School of Business & Management, CHRSIT (Deemed to be University), Bangalore.
E-mail: david.winster@christuniversity.in
[2]Assistant Professor, School of Business & Management, CHRSIT (Deemed to be University), Bangalore.
E-mail: pandeymeghaa@gmail.com
[3]Assistant Professor, School of Business & Management, CHRSIT (Deemed to be University), Bangalore.
E-mail: melvin.victor@christuniversity.in
[4]Assistant Professor, School of Business & Management, CHRSIT (Deemed to be University), Bangalore.
E-mail: aarthy.c@christuniversity.in
[5]Assistant Professor, School of Business & Management, CHRSIT (Deemed to be University), Bangalore.
E-mail: aishwarya.n@christuniversity.in

love. Lovemark is not created overnight. It took more time and also the marketers need to know about them where they stood in the beginning and how they are doing in their way to build a Lovemark.

Kevin Ducans worked on the concepts in traditional marketing terms: "Two axes", "One runs from low to high respect and the other is from low to high love". Early Brand Love now became the "Lovemark" category, which reflects the two axes concept. In one sentence, we said the idea of Duncans described as "Creating the Loyalty beyond the reasons because it generates the high love and respect of the particular brands. The word Loyalty is one of the marketing strategies. This study is an empirical study about Brand Love to "Lovemark" because numerous brands are now in the market. All products reflect by Particular Brands name. So the values of the Brands gradually decreased. In this competitive world, we move to the next step, Lovemark.

Brand Personality

Brand Personality refers to a particular set of human traits that are associated with a brand name. It is something to which the consumer can set forth.

Brand Equity (CBBE Model)

CBBE Model (Customer-Based Brand Equity) is also known as Keller's Brand Equity. Brand Equity is a marketing term that describes every Brand value. It measures the value, comparing the price difference between branded and generic products. Then they identify the problems and move to further steps to increase their brands' and products' market value. Brand equity is significant because it allows companies to engage their customers through brand loyalty, and brand trust enables the business to grow further.

The Brand Equity pyramid tries to explain ways to enhance Brand Equity by understanding our customers and effectuating strategies. The interrelation between the brand and the consumer forms a positive Brand Equity. It acquires a greater probability of procuring and persisting customers, providing a great privilege to the companies and products considered brands. Keller creates a CBBE model Pyramid Shape in this model to highlight their Brands in Markets. The CBBE model framework has four key levels to elevate their brands successfully. The CBBE model knows the right strategies and how to implement them properly. This was used to maintain a strong relationship between the customer and their brands. These kinds of experiences create the wow factor in the audience.

Review of Literature

Zhang, Ping Peng et al. (2020) studied Explicit relationships between brands, brand love and brand loyalty for tablet PCs to create a sustainable brand. They examined three avenues for the impact of brand love and brand trust. They collected data from three cosmopolitan customers who use tablet PCs. They tested 383 samples with 89% accuracy. The result showed as the

undistinguished brand relationship has two passive mediating variables, brand trust and brand love, which impactbrand loyalty. **Batra, Ahuviaet al. (2012) discussed** the basic theory approach and explored the nature and implications of brand love. They conduct two quality studies to identify different components of the brand love consumer model. A high-ranking model presents seven criticalelements like self-brand integration, interest-driven behaviour, beneficial emotional engagement, long-termengagement, positive overall vantage pointarbitrariness, attitude promise and confidence and prolepsis of severance stress, in addition to the seven key elements of brand love, faultless brand love and brand loyalty, word of mouth, and quality trust as a predecessor to consequences such as resistance to negative facts. The study concluded by presenting theoretical and administrative implications.

Albert, Merunkaet al. (2008) discussed the consumer who evolves love for certain brands. In their study, eleven dimensions are revealed through the correspondence analysis, multiple correspondence analysis, and cluster analysis, which respondents use to describe their sense of love and their special relationship with the brands they like. These dimensions identified in France are comparable to those of love found in previous research conducted in the United States.

Sharon Richey (2020) studied how users keep a few brands close to their emotions. And it says about how the brand gets itself by doting the brand fans, enviable net promoter scores, and some other soaring profits to boots. Marketers should strive to build a relevant engagement with love based on trust, loyalty, assertiveness, and reciprocity. This research concluded that 70% of consumers think brands' motives are based on self-servicing desires to increase profits rather than genuine commitments to their consumers.

Fuchs and Prandelli et al. (2013) investigated the body of research which involves users rather than international designers in the development of new products that may benefit businesses because the resulting products effectively meet consumer needs, the researcher looks at a few different strategies that luxury brands can use to combat the negative user-design effect. They finally concluded that adverse user design outcomes are mitigated for luxury fashion products not used for status signaling, i.e., product categories of luxury brands with lower consumer status importance.

Stockburger, Ratneshwar and Sen (2008) studied the formation of a strong relationship between consumers and brands, which is the concept of identification. They invented consumer brand recognition model and tested conceptuality and empirically with the two main research objectives. This paper suggests the need for caution in accepting the direct transferability of relational love hypotheses to clarify customerattitude. **Keller (2001),** Studied the blue-chip brands, which are the target of many organizations. This paper argued the challenge of a marketer who makes a major brand that promises the customer has the correct type of experience with the product and services with accompanying marketing programs and the desires, views, emotions,

images, expectations, and opinions that became related to the brand. This paper ended with how the brand was created and handled.

Chunling, Ping and Haizhong (2008) discussed user-based brand value (CBBE) had been widely concentrated in promoting local places. Integral to the investigation of CBBE are its construction and estimation. This paper centers around the elements of CBBE, the interrelationships among them, and the scientific procedure of the estimation model. The researcher concluded that the CBBE estimation model is built, and the implications of the model are examined. Ideas are likewise accommodated brand the executives and headings for future examination.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study whether there is Brand Resonance for brands in Sanitary Napkins through CBBE Model.
2. To study whether the Brand Resonance is instrumented in Brand Love and Lovemarks.
3. To find out whether people consider brands they use as Lovemarks and it ultimately results in Customer Advocacy

Research Methodology

Confirmatory Research Design - It is carried out to evaluate an established hypothesis. In this type of research, the researcher has an idea about what is happening. It means the researcher has a view and aims to expose the features that assist the thesis.

Sample Design - The investigation has chosen a systematic sampling technique for the present study.

Population - The population of the present study consists of females only above the age of 15. Due to time constraints, I have only taken part of the population of Tamil Nadu.

Sampling Frame - The sampling frame can be described as a list of people inside the target population who can participate in the research. In this study, the sampling frame is targeted towards females above the age of 15.

Sample Size -The sample size consists of 550 respondents, which include females mentioned above age. These respondents were systematically picked out of the general population.

Statistical Package - SPSS, Excel

Tools of Analysis - Methods are used for performing research. It may consist of data-gathering techniques through questionnaires and statistical tools for evaluating the data. Friedman Test, Mann- Whitney test, Kruskal Wallis Test, Homogeneity test and Stepwise Regressions are used.

Analysis & Interpretation

As we are majorly focusing on the following three brands: Whisper, Sofy and Stayfree.

Friedman's Test – "Friedman Test is a non-parametric test used instead of One- way ANOVA with repeated measures. It tests the difference in groups (three or more paired groups), at least when the dependent variable is ordinal." **According to Investopedia**. Friedman Test is best used for repeated measures to determine that a particular factor also has its effect. The Significance level of the Friedman Test is 0.05.

Table 1. Ranks

Particulars	Mean Rank
BE_SAL_TOT	4.92
BE_PER_TOT	8.64
BE_JUD_TOT	8.05
BE_RES_TOT	2.92
LM_BLE_TOT	5.22
LM_BT_TOT	3.60
LM_BD_TOT	3.62
LM_BL_TOT	1.75
LM_BP_TOT	6.28

Table 2. Statistics

N	550
Chi-Square	3213.231
Df	8
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Hypothesis

1- Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant difference between Brand Equity and Lovemark.
2- Alternate Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant difference between Brand Equity and Lovemark.

Interpretation

From the above table, we observe that the value is less than 0.05, which means we accept the alternate hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis.

Hence, there exists a Statistical difference between Brand Equity and Lovemark.

Mann Whitney U Test – "Mann Whitney U test comparesdifferences between two independent groups when the dependent variable is either ordinal or continuous but not normally distributed." According to Springer link

Table 3. Mann Whitney Test

Factors	Occupation	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
BE_PER_TOT	Student	432	217.67	94035.50
	Other	2	179.75	359.50
	Total	434		
BE_JUD_TOT	Student	432	217.83	94101.50
	Other	2	146.75	293.50
	Total	434		
LM_BP_TOT	Student	432	217.98	94169.00
	Other	2	113.00	226.00
	Total	434		

Table 4. Mann-Whitney U Test

Factors	BE_PER_TOT	BE_JUD_TOT	LM_BP_TOT
Mann-Whitney U	356.500	290.500	223.000
Wilcoxon W	359.500	293.500	226.000
Z	-.427	-.801	-1.184
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.669	.423	.236

Hypothesis

2) Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant difference between brand performance, judgement and personality based on respondents' ratings in different occupations.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant difference between brand performance, judgement and personality.

Interpretation

- The above table shows that the P Value of BE Performance Total is more significant than 0.05. Hence Null hypothesis is accepted.
- The above table shows that the P-Value of BE Judgment Total is more significant than 0.05. Hence Null hypothesis is accepted.
- The above table shows that the P value of LM Brand Personality Total is more significant than 0.05. Hence Null hypothesis is accepted.
- By this, there is no statistical difference between brand performance, judgment and personality.

Kruskal Wallis Test - Kruskal Wallis Test is a non-parametric test used when the assumptions for one-way Anova is not met. Both these tests are done to find out the statistical difference between the continuous dependent variable by categorical independent variable. For Kruskal Wallis the independent variables group must be more than two. Kruskal Wallis can be used for both continuous and ordinal dependent variable. The P-Value for Kruskal Wallis is 0.05.

Table 5. Kruskal Wallis Test

Factors	Age	N	Mean Rank
BE_PER_TOT	15-20	246	274.54
	21-25	237	275.85
	26-30	38	292.74
	31-35	15	252.80
	above 35	14	263.89
	Total	550	
BE_JUD_TOT	15-20	246	279.82
	21-25	237	271.31
	26-30	38	291.37
	31-35	15	259.03
	above 35	14	245.14
	Total	550	
LM_BP_TOT	15-20	246	279.01
	21-25	237	271.24
	26-30	38	300.05
	31-35	15	243.70
	above 35	14	253.32
	Total	550	

Table 6. Chi-Square Test

	BE_PER_TOT	BE_JUD_TOT	LM_BP_TOT
Chi-Square	0.839	1.401	2.082
Df	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	.933	.844	.721

Hypothesis

3) Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant difference between brand performance, judgement and personality.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1): There is a significance difference between brand performance, judgement and personality

Interpretation

1. From the above table, we can see that P value of BE PER TOT is greater than 0.05, Hence Null Hypothesis is Accepted.
2. From the above table, we can see that P value of BE JUD TOT is greater than 0.05, Hence Null Hypothesis is Accepted.
3. From the above table, we can see that P value of LM BP TOT is greater than 0.05, Hence Null Hypothesis is Accepted.
4. From this we can say that there is no statistical difference between the three variables.

Test of Homogeneity

Table 7. Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Particualrs	Levene Statistic	Sig.
BE_SAL_TOT	0.713	0.583
BE_PER_TOT	1.618	0.168
BE_JUD_TOT	2.103	0.079
BE_RES_TOT	0.871	0.481
LM_BLE_TOT	0.871	0.481
LM_BT_TOT	0.253	0.908
LM_BD_TOT	1.205	0.307
LM_BL_TOT	0.729	0.572
LM_BP_TOT	2.672	0.051
CD_TOT	0.305	0.874

4) Null Hypothesis H_0: The groups all have equal population variance.

Alternate Hypothesis H_A: The groups all have different population variances.

Interpretation

Since the p-value is greater than 0.05 in the above table. Hence, we can say that the groups have equal population variance.

Regression

Regression Analysis refers to the statistical method which is used to measure the affiliation between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. It is used for forecasting or prediction.

Table 8. Variables Entered/Removed

	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	LM_BP_TOT, BE_SAL_TOT, BE_PER_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_RES_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BL_TOT, LM_BLE_TOT[a]	.	Enter
a. All requested variables entered.			

In the above table it is found that the factors are included for regression analysis in the enter method.

Table 9. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.886[a]	.786	.782	4.277
a. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, BE_SAL_TOT, BE_PER_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_RES_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BL_TOT, LM_BLE_TOT				
b. Dependent Variable: CD_TOT				

Interpretation

From the above table we can observe that the R Square value is 0.786. This means that 78.6% of variance in Customer Advocacy can be predicted from the variables mentioned above. It is an overall measurement of association and does not showcase how each independent variable is associated with the dependent variable.

Table 10. Anova

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	36240.831	9	4026.759	220.169	.000[a]
	Residual	9876.260	540	18.289		
	Total	46117.091	549			
a. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, BE_SAL_TOT, BE_PER_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_RES_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BL_TOT, LM_BLE_TOT						
b. Dependent Variable: CD_TOT						

The above table showcases those nine variables can be explained by the independent variables and 540 variables cannot be explained by the independent variables. The p-value is less than 0.05 hence it can be said that the nine variables reliably predict the dependent variable.

Table 11. Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.368	.722		-1.051	1.787
	BE_SAL_TOT	-.007	109	-.003	-.222	.208
	BE_PER_TOT	-.088	.041	-.081	-.168	-.008
	BE_JUD_TOT	.171	.062	.118	.049	.293
	BE_RES_TOT	.155	.132	.050	-.103	.414
	LM_BLE_TOT	-.076	.078	-.052	-.230	.077
	LM_BT_TOT	.269	.096	.145	.080	.458
	LM_BD_TOT	.297	.080	.159	.140	.453
	LM_BL_TOT	.217	.121	.091	-.022	.455
	LM_BP_TOT	.692	.051	.531	.593	.792

a. Dependent Variable: CD_TOT

The table explains the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The equation can be formed on this. The equation is as follows,

CD_TOT = 0.368 - 0.07 BE_SAL_TOT – 0.88 BE_PER_TOT + 0.171 BE_JUD_TOT + 0.155 BE_RES_TOT – 0.76 LM_BLE_TOT + 0.269 LM_BT_TOT + 0.297 LM_BD_TOT + 0.217 LM_BL_TOT + 0.692 LM_BP_TOT

Stepwise: Stepwise Regression is the stepwise repetitive structure of a regression model that comprises the selection of independent variables to be used in a final model. It consists of including or eliminating potential explanatory variables in succession and testing for statistical significance after each recurrence.

Table 11. Variables Entered/ Removed

Model	Variables Entered	Method
1	LM_BP_TOT	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	LM_BT_TOT	
3	LM_BD_TOT	
4	BE_JUD_TOT	
5	BE_PER_TOT	
a. Dependent Variable: CD_TOT		

From this above table we can see that the above-mentioned variables are the strongest predictors of the dependent variable.

Table 12. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.861[a]	.741	0.740	4.669
2	0.878[b]	.770	.769	4.400
3	.881[c]	.777	.776	4.342
4	.884[d]	.782	.780	4.296
5	.885[e]	.784	.782	4.283
a. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT				
b. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT				
c. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT				
d. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT				
e. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT, BE_PER_TOT				

Interpretation

From the above table we can say that the SPSS model is built in five steps. The final adjusted r square is 0.78 which means the predictors account for 78% of the variance. The adjusted r square is leveling off while adding each predictor. When the final predictor is added to the previous four results increase only by 0.02 points. Hence there is no point in adding further predictors.

Table 13. Anova

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	34171.420	1	34171.420	1567.592	.000[a]
	Residual	11945.670	548	21.799		
	Total	46117.091	549			
2	Regression	35525.187	2	17762.593	917.317	.000[b]
	Residual	10591.904	547	19.364		
	Total	46117.091	549			
3	Regression	35824.871	3	11941.624	633.501	.000[c]
	Residual	10292.220	546	18.850		
	Total	46117.091	549			
4	Regression	36056.537	4	9014.134	488.313	.000[d]
	Residual	10060.554	545	18.460		
	Total	46117.091	549			
5	Regression	36137.300	5	7227.460	393.970	.000[e]
	Residual	9979.791	544	18.345		
	Total	46117.091	549			
a. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT						
b. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT						
c. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT						
d. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT						
e. Predictors: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT, BE_PER_TOT						
f. Dependent Variable: CD_TOT						

Interpretation

The above table shows that the final model was built in five steps. The df column states that one variable was added during each step. It is presumed that no variables were removed from the model since the count of predictors in the model steadily increases from 1 to 5.

Table 14. Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.225	.479		6.733	.000
	LM_BP_TOT	1.123	.028	.861	39.593	.000
2	(Constant)	2.288	.465		4.920	.000
	LM_BP_TOT	.819	.045	.628	18.143	.000
	LM_BT_TOT	.535	.064	.289	8.361	.000
3	(Constant)	2.020	.464		4.354	.000
	LM_BP_TOT	.735	.049	.563	14.905	.000
	LM_BT_TOT	.380	.074	.206	5.133	.000
	LM_BD_TOT	.303	.076	.162	3.987	.000
4	(Constant)	.350	.658		.531	.595
	LM_BP_TOT	.713	.049	.546	14.499	.000
	LM_BT_TOT	.284	.078	.154	3.634	.000

	LM_BD_TOT	.291	.075	.156	3.855	.000
	BE_JUD_TOT	.147	.041	.101	3.543	.000
5	(Constant)	.552	.663		.833	.405
	LM_BP_TOT	.716	.049	.549	14.604	.000
	LM_BT_TOT	.316	.079	.171	3.982	.000
	LM_BD_TOT	.305	.075	.163	4.038	.000
	BE_JUD_TOT	.204	.050	.141	4.122	.000
	BE_PER_TOT	-.080	.038	-.074	-2.098	.036
a. Dependent Variable: CD_TOT						

Interpretation

From the coefficient table we can infer the regression equation. The equation be like,

CD_TOT = 0.552 + 0.716 LM_BP_TOT + 0.316 LM_BT_TOT + 0.305 LM_BD_TOT + 0.204 BE_JUD_TOT - 0.080 BE_PER_TOT

The strongest predictor is LM_BP_TOT as its one-point increase will increase the CD_TOT by 0.716. This means Customer Advocacy is mostly influenced by Brand Personality, which includes elements such as customers' views on their brand involvement, brand superiority, willingness to pay high price for their brand and few others.

Table 15. Excluded Variables

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
						Tolerance
1	BE_SAL_TOT	.133[a]	5.131	.000	.214	.676
	BE_PER_TOT	.115[a]	4.112	.000	.173	.583
	BE_JUD_TOT	.181[a]	6.680	.000	.275	.597
	BE_RES_TOT	.140[a]	5.338	.000	.223	.653
	LM_BLE_TOT	.217[a]	6.428	.000	.265	.388
	LM_BT_TOT	.289[a]	8.361	.000	.337	.351
	LM_BD_TOT	.272[a]	7.659	.000	.311	.340
	LM_BL_TOT	.276[a]	7.640	.000	.311	.329
2	BE_SAL_TOT	.071[b]	2.720	.007	.116	.602
	BE_PER_TOT	.018[b]	.595	.552	.025	.465
	BE_JUD_TOT	.106[b]	3.685	.000	.156	.492
	BE_RES_TOT	.068[b]	2.484	.013	.106	.555
	LM_BLE_TOT	.046[b]	1.002	.317	.043	.197
	LM_BD_TOT	.162[b]	3.987	.000	.168	.246
	LM_BL_TOT	.140[b]	2.966	.003	.126	.187
3	BE_SAL_TOT	.076[c]	2.947	.003	.125	.600
	BE_PER_TOT	.006[c]	.205	.837	.009	.460
	BE_JUD_TOT	.101[c]	3.543	.000	.150	.491
	BE_RES_TOT	.075[c]	2.784	.006	.118	.552

	LM_BLE_TOT	.006[c]	.138	.891	.006	.187
	LM_BL_TOT	.096[c]	1.975	.049	.084	.173
4	BE_SAL_TOT	.024[d]	.661	.509	.028	.305
	BE_PER_TOT	-.074[d]	-2.098	.036	-.090	.320
	BE_RES_TOT	.036[d]	1.157	.248	.050	.410
	LM_BLE_TOT	-.045[d]	-.935	.350	-.040	.171
	LM_BL_TOT	.062[d]	1.269	.205	.054	.165
5	BE_SAL_TOT	.036[e]	.973	.331	.042	.299
	BE_RES_TOT	.046[e]	1.452	.147	.062	.403
	LM_BLE_TOT	-.014[e]	-.284	.777	-.012	.154
	LM_BL_TOT	.085[e]	1.710	.088	.073	.159
a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT						
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT						
c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT						
d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT						
e. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), LM_BP_TOT, LM_BT_TOT, LM_BD_TOT, BE_JUD_TOT, BE_PER_TOT						
f. Dependent Variable: CD_TOT						

The table says that there are eight variables excluded variables.

Findings

i. The Correlation matrix says that all the variables are Valid.
ii. The frequency says out of the respondents collected most of them prefer to use Whisper. It also says that respondents using a particular brand are using it for more than 3 years.
iii. The frequency table says that most of the respondents agree that they are comfortable with their brand.
iv. The Fried Mann test proves that there is a statistical difference between brand Equity and Love mark. We come to this conclusion as the p-value is less than 0.05. Hence we accept the alternate hypothesis.
v. The Mann- Whitney U test proves that there is no statistical difference between the three variables that are ranked high in Fried Man. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, we accept the null hypothesis.
vi. The Kruskal-Wallis Test confirms that there is no statistical difference between the three variables. We come to this conclusion as the p-value is greater than 0.05.
vii. The Regression states that there are five independent variables for one dependent variable i.e., Customer Advocacy.

Suggestions

i. With the point that the three brands are performing well in the market, we have considered those for the study. The factors that are disagreed by the respondents can be concentrated by the brands so that it can enhance their brand love and customer advocacy.

ii. Since customer advocacy is strongly associated with brand differentiation, brand trust, brand performance, brand judgment and brand personality, companies can concentrate on these areas in order to enhance their customer advocacy.

iii. Since brand love and brand loyalty are qualitative factors, there is no such hard and fast rule to enhance these. The company can adopt any suitable strategies to achieve it.

Conclusion

Brand Loyalty is the propensity of consumers to persistently buy a brand's products in spite of another. Brand Trust is a concept which computes the amount of conviction the customers have in a particular brand. The research is conducted in order to find out whether discreet products have Love Mark. For this purpose, the researcher has considered three top-performing brands of sanitary napkins. The researcher has conducted confirmatory research. The researcher has collected primary data for the research. The analysis and interpretation are conducted using various non-parametric tests viz. Friedman, Man Whitney U Test and Kruskal Wallis. It also used Regression Analysis in order to find out the independent variables. The findings say that the independent variables for the dependent variable customer advocacy are brand differentiation, brand trust, brand performance, brand judgment and brand personality. Based on the analysis and findings relevant suggestions are given as follows. The companies can concentrate on the factors that do not satisfy the customers such as security, customer interaction, etc. The companies can concentrate on the predicting variables in order to enhance customer advocacy.

References

Zhang, S., Peng, M. Y. P., Peng, Y., Zhang, Y., Ren, G., & Chen, C. C. (2020). Expressive brand relationship, brand love, and brand loyalty for tablet pcs: Building a sustainable brand. *Frontiers in psychology*, *11*, 1-10.

Albert, N., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2008). When consumers love their brands: Exploring the concept and its dimensions. *Journal of Business research*, *61*(10), 1062-1075.

Fuchs, C., Prandelli, E., Schreier, M., & Dahl, D.W. (2013). All that is users might not be gold: How labeling products as user designed backfires in the context of luxury fashion brands. *Journal of Marketing*, *77*(5), 75-91.

Popp, B., & Woratschek, H. (2017). Consumers' relationships with brands and brand communities–The multifaceted roles of identification and satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *35*, 46-56.

Keller, K.L. (2009). Building strong brands in a modern marketing communications environment. *Journal of marketing communications*, *15*(2-3), 139-155.

Chunling, Y.U., Ping, Z.H.A.O., & Haizhong, W.A.N.G. (2008). An empirical evaluation of a customer-based brand equity model and its managerial implications. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, *2*(4), 553-570.

Batra, R., Ahuvia, A., & Bagozzi, R.P. (2012). Brand love. *Journal of marketing*, *76*(2), 1-16.

Albert, N., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2008). When consumers love their brands: Exploring the concept and its dimensions. *Journal of Business research*, *61*(10), 1062-1075.

Fuchs, C., Prandelli, E., Schreier, M., & Dahl, D.W. (2013). All that is users might not be gold: How labeling products as user designed backfires in the context of luxury fashion brands. *Journal of Marketing*, *77*(5), 75-91.

Melewar, T.C., Foroudi, P., Gupta, S., Kitchen, P.J., & Foroudi, M.M. (2017). Integrating identity, strategy and communications for trust, loyalty and commitment. *European Journal of Marketing*, *51*(3), 572-604.

Farjam, S., & Hongyi, X. (2015). Reviewing the concept of brand equity and evaluating consumer-based brand equity (CBBE) models. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, *1*(8), 14-29.

Batra, R., Ahuvia, A., & Bagozzi, R.P. (2012). Brand love. *Journal of marketing*, *76*(2), 1-16.

Albert, N., & Merunka, D. (2013). The role of brand love in consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of consumer marketing*, *30*(3), 258-266.

Lawer, C., & Knox, S. (2006). Customer advocacy and brand development. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *15*(2), 121-129.

Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M.B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. *Journal of marketing*, *65*(2), 81-93.

Laroche, M., Habibi, M.R., & Richard, M.O. (2013). To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media? *International journal of information management*, *33*(1), 76-82.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.07.003.

(https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0268401212000916)

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00231/full#B67

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1509/jm.09.0339

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0148296307002871?via%3Dihub

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.09.014.

(https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296307002871)

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00231/full#T2

https://www.becausexm.com/blog/the-importance-of-brand-love

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1509/jm.11.0330

https://www.emerald.com/insight/publication/issn/1061-0421

https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/EJM-08-2015-0616/full/html

https://researchleap.com/reviewing-the-concept-of-brand-equity-and-evaluating-consumer-based-brand-equity-cbbe-models/

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281258084_Brand_love_Towards_an_integrative_model

http://anandahussein.lecture.ub.ac.id/files/2015/09/article-4.pdf

https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs11782-008-0031-6.pdf

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234777767_Brand_Love

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263730936_The_role_of_brand_love_in_consumer-brand_relationships

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235299614_Customer_advocacy_and_brand_development

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/002224376800500101

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0268401212000916

www.investopedia.com