THE INFLUENCE OF BRAND EQUITY ON CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MERINO LAMINATES, CHENNAI

*Maria Alexina Vinotha Rajan **Lawrence G

*Head of the Department, Department of Commerce, St. Claret College, Jalahalli, Bangalore - 13 **Assistant Professor, PG & Research Department of Management Studies, Sacred Heart College (Autonomous), Tirupattur - 635 601

ABSTRACT

This Report examines the "The Impact of Brand Equity on Consumer Purchasing Behaviour at Merino Laminates" Consumer behavior involves the psychological processes that consumers go through in recognizing needs, finding ways to solve these needs, making purchase decisions (e.g., whether or not to purchase a product and, if so, which brand and where), interpret information, make plans, and implement these plans. Consumers often buy products not because of their attributes per se but rather because of the ultimate benefits that these attributes provide, in turn leading to the satisfaction of ultimate values. The results have been analysed and interpreted using SPSS software and the following statistical tools, Oneway Anova, Correlation, and Multiple Regression.

Key words:

Brand Attachment, Brand Experience, Brand Image, Brand loyalty, Brand Satisfaction Brand Trust, Consumer Purchase Behaviour, Perceived Quality

1. INTRODUCTION

When compared to other items, brand equity symbolizes the difference; the products will have new vibrations, and everyone must believe that such a brand has great capacity and the ability to capture specific objectives; sales will also be higher. Customers must believe that such a brand has various features and has been on the market for a long time. When a new brand is introduced, not everyone will buy it; instead, they will use it for a limited time so that they can learn about the product's features how to utilize it, and the company's history. People must be able to locate the product amid a large sale of products. Our product must have a unique feature or some type of identification so that every buyer can readily recognize it. People will tend to buy a product with good quality or features if the price is set high because they know it is worth the money. Every brand has a distinguishing quality that sets it apart from the competition. Most brands have a lot of rivals, so we have to captivate them with our ideas and our ability to handle them in the proper way to get them to buy our products. If the product does not sell well, they must change the logo or the manufacturing process. If it sells well, we'll be able to keep people coming back to buy the product on a regular basis. When people or customers buy a branded product and it does not have the

features they expected, they will be disappointed. This should be addressed by the company in a timely manner.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAME WORK



3. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Merino Laminates' concern is that they do not have direct selling in their business; instead, they have a process that they will urge other distributors to follow in order to correctly fill orders, which will then be shipped to clients. The company then has many things, both good and bad, but they address them all in a matter of days or hours in order to build the business. Even if they have many problems, they improve the business in the appropriate way. If an issue emerges in a business, the first step is to determine which section of the harm has occurred. This must not affect future sales or the business. The majority of brands have the difficulty of having the same quality or having similar appearances with the exception of the name. As a result, the company's or business top executives must exercise extreme caution while dealing with such matters.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Primary Objective

• To study the influence brand equity on consumer purchase behavior with special reference to Merino Laminates, Chennai

Secondary Objectives

- To analyze the impact of various elements of brand equity on consumer purchase behavior
- To assess the effect of demographic variables on consumer purchase behavior with special reference to Merino Laminates, Chennai

5. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Differentiating Product: Customers of the product must be able to distinguish it from others and preserve their familiarity with it. Distributors must also distinguish the goods and inform customers about the numerous types of products. In that perspective, the brand symbolizes

the consumer's real or perceived decision manifested through the decision or attitude of purchasing the brand.

Best Deal to Attract Customers: To attract clients, the organization must offer the finest prices and offers, they must target audiences and make quantifiable targets, and they must set timetables to fulfil their goals and objectives. They must assess and compare the outcomes. It is a service market using technology for selling things in the market.

Engagement: The Company keeps track of how well it interacts with customers. They can be converted into likes, comments, follows, shares, subscriptions, visitors, tags, and many other things in marketing and social media.

Share: Customers make up what percentage of the target audience. A market share goal should include a time frame and a realistic target proportion of the audience that can be reached with the given resources.

6. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Jalal Hanaysha (2016), the study assessment reveals the level of excellence they strive for when it comes to brand equity. At numerous shopping malls in Malaysia, there are 287 car users. According to the research, the brand improves the beneficial influence of brand equity. Before presenting a product, there are contexts to develop, such as brand loyalty, brand image, and brand leadership. Malaysia's car industry investigates ways to provide better service in Western countries. The data was obtained in the northern region using SEM (structural equation modelling), and the results revealed a greater association between customers and the power of brands that survive in the market. In addition, practical implications were utilized (Jalal Hanaysha, 2016).

Wai Damayanthi (2017) The impact of brand equity, according to them, is that male consumers use skin care products as a habit in their daily lives. When making purchasing selections, they take into account a variety of aspects. The scales were found to be reliable, and the assumptions for parametric tests were met. They manly focus on increasing brand awareness of the goods, and they eventually encourage male buyers by making advertisements, brand names, and creating storefronts just for males, according to the findings. They pay attention to these details so that the customer is satisfied enough to purchase the product. (WMCB WANNIYAKE, 2017).

Abdur Rakid Nayeem (2020), The most recent research Centre in brand look into compared mark associations with relational connections and built up additional investigation bearing by pointing up that a cozy, changeless, solid relationship might shape the collaboration between a brand and its customers. According to studies, people make purchases based on how they see brands and how they relate with them. The brand name imbues the brand with a spirit that is critical to the development of the brand image. It will establish the link between the component of brand equity and consumer behaviour. While consumers are aware of a product, it will be able to predict how they would react when making a purchase choice (Abdur Rakid Nayeem (2020).

Rehanhusain, Amna, et.al (2022) The increasing importance of social media channels reflects Indian luxury buyers' level of engagement. The goal of this study is to see how social media marketing activities, brand equity, trust, and status consumption affect luxury brand purchase intentions in India. Structural equation modeling was utilized in the studies to analyses the real relationships between components. The findings revealed that social media

marketing activities and brand equity have a favorable impact on luxury brand buy intention, which is more substantial in India, and that status consumption and brand trust have an impact on purchase intention in Indian customers (**Bilal,2022**)

7. RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design is a conceptual framework within which to do research. As a result, the creation of such a design enables research to be as efficient as feasible while also yielding the most information.

7.1 SAMPLING DESIGN

A sample plan specifies how a sample of a population will be obtained. It refers to the method or procedure used by the researcher to pick things for the sample.

7.2 SAMPLING FRAME

7.21. SAMPLING UNIT

A sample frame is a way of representing the population's elements. Consumer database lists were used as the study's sample frame.

7.2.2 SAMPLING METHOD

This study employs the Random Sampling method of Probability Sampling.

7.2.3 POPULATION

The definition of the population, which can be specified in terms of elements, sampling units, extent, and time, is the initial stage in the sampling process. The population of the current study was made up of all Merino Laminates consumers.

7.2.4 SAMPLE SIZE

The Sample size selected for the survey is the sample size determination was purely by intuition.

7.3 DATA SOURCE

After a research problem has been determined and a plan has been chalked out, the work of gathering data begins. The purpose of this study is to collect data from both primary and secondary sources.

7.3.1Primary Data

These are the data that are gathered from some primary sources, i.e., the data's source of origin. For any statistical study, these are collected for the first time by an investigator or an agency. The questionnaire method is used to collect data for the first time for a specified goal.

7.3.2 Secondary Data

These are data obtained from a valid resources, such as a reservation storage source, where data is gathered by one person and used by another. These are gathered as primary data and used by others as secondary data. Secondary data is information that is used in an investigation but was originally obtained for a different purpose by someone else.

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | |
|----|-------------------|---------|----------------|-------|------|------|
| | Between Group | 21.530 | 4 | 5.383 | .588 | .672 |
| BL | Within Groups | 879.104 | 96 | 9.157 | | |
| | Total | 900.634 | 100 | | | |

8. ONE WAY ANOVA EDUCATION

| | Between Group | 21.140 | 4 | 5.285 | .524 | .718 |
|-----|------------------|----------|-----|--------|------|------|
| PQ | Within Groups | 967.414 | 96 | 10.077 | | |
| | Total | 988.554 | 100 | | | |
| | Between Group | 12.162 | 4 | 3.040 | .345 | .847 |
| BE | Within Groups | 845.601 | 96 | 8.808 | | |
| | Total | 857.762 | 100 | | | |
| | Between Group | 30.726 | 4 | 7.682 | .946 | .441 |
| BI | Within Groups | 771.234 | 95 | 8.118 | | |
| | Total | 801.960 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Group | 7.186 | 4 | 1.797 | .207 | .934 |
| BS | Within Groups | 832.576 | 96 | 8.673 | | |
| | Total | 839.762 | 100 | | | |
| | Between Group | 20.696 | 4 | 5.174 | .985 | .420 |
| BT | Within Groups | 493.849 | 94 | 5.254 | | |
| | Total | 514.545 | 98 | | | |
| BA | Between Group | 12.058 | 4 | 3.015 | .384 | .819 |
| | Within Groups | 744.932 | 95 | 7.841 | | |
| | Total | 756.990 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Group | 32.859 | 4 | 8.215 | .810 | .522 |
| СВР | Within Groups | 973.339 | 96 | 10.139 | | |
| | Total | 1006.198 | 100 | | | |

INTERPRETATION

From the above split up shows the education of the respondents to know what type of educational background would have a different perception about a Spiritual tourism. Thus from above table our sample were completely from the group of PG categories

9. ONE WAY ANOVA OCCUPATION

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | |
|----|------------------|---------|-------------|--------|-------|------|
| BL | Between Group | 120.137 | 4 | 30.034 | 3.694 | .008 |

| | Within | 780.496 | 96 | 8.130 | | |
|-----|-----------------|----------|-----|--------|-------|------|
| | Groups | /80.490 | 90 | 8.130 | | |
| | Total | 900.634 | 100 | | | |
| DO | Between | 70.418 | 4 | 17.604 | 1.841 | .127 |
| PQ | Group | | | | | |
| | Within | 918.137 | 96 | 9.564 | | |
| | Groups Total | 988.554 | 100 | | | |
| | | 988.334 | 100 | | | |
| BE | Between | 63.692 | 4 | 15.923 | 1.925 | .112 |
| DL | Group Within | | | | | |
| | Groups | 794.070 | 96 | 8.272 | | |
| | Total | 857.762 | 100 | | | |
| | Between | 837.702 | 100 | | | |
| BI | Group | 89.008 | 4 | 22.252 | 2.965 | .023 |
| DI | Within | | | | | |
| | Groups | 712.952 | 95 | 7.505 | | |
| | Total | 801.960 | 99 | | | |
| | Between | | | | | |
| BS | Group | 69.806 | 4 | 17.452 | 2.176 | .077 |
| | Within | | | | | |
| | Groups | 769.956 | 96 | 8.020 | | |
| | Total | 839.762 | 100 | | | |
| | Between | 20.250 | | 0.565 | 1.000 | 110 |
| | Group | 38.260 | 4 | 9.565 | 1.888 | .119 |
| BT | Within | 476.286 | 94 | 5.067 | | |
| | Groups | 476.286 | 94 | 5.067 | | |
| | Total | 514.545 | 98 | | | |
| | Between | 85.157 | 4 | 21.289 | 3.010 | .022 |
| BA | Group | 85.157 | 4 | 21.209 | 5.010 | .022 |
| | Within | 671.833 | 95 | 7.072 | | |
| | Groups | 071.055 | | 7.072 | | |
| | Total | 756.990 | 99 | | | |
| | Between | 126.792 | 4 | 31.698 | 3.460 | .011 |
| CBP | Group | 120.172 | | 51.070 | 5.100 | |
| | Within | 879.406 | 96 | 9.160 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 1006.198 | 100 | | | |

INTERPRETATION

From the above pie chart shows the occupation of the respondents this is to know what type of educational background would have a different perception about consumer purchasing behaiour.

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | |
|-----|-------------------|----------|----------------|--------|-------|------|
| | Between Group | 70.390 | 3 | 23.463 | 2.741 | .047 |
| BL | Within Groups | 830.244 | 97 | 8.559 | | |
| | Total | 900.634 | 100 | | | |
| PQ | Between Group | 57.670 | 3 | 19.223 | 2.003 | .119 |
| | Within Groups | 930.885 | 97 | 9.597 | | |
| | Total | 988.554 | 100 | | | |
| BE | Between Group | 63.638 | 3 | 21.213 | 2.591 | .057 |
| | Within Groups | 794.124 | 97 | 8.187 | | |
| | Total | 857.762 | 100 | | | |
| BI | Between Group | 34.546 | 3 | 11.515 | 1.441 | .236 |
| | Within Groups | 767.414 | 96 | 7.994 | | |
| | Total | 801.960 | 99 | | | |
| BS | Between Group | 82.988 | 3 | 27.663 | 3.546 | .017 |
| | Within Groups | 756.775 | 97 | 7.802 | | |
| | Total | 839.762 | 100 | | | |
| | Between Group | 39.042 | 3 | 13.014 | 2.600 | .057 |
| BT | Within Groups | 475.503 | 95 | 5.005 | | |
| | Total | 514.545 | 98 | | | |
| BA | Between Group | 86.107 | 3 | 28.702 | 4.107 | .009 |
| | Within Groups | 670.883 | 96 | 6.988 | | |
| | Total | 756.990 | 99 | | | |
| CBP | Between Group | 131.012 | 3 | 43.671 | 4.840 | .004 |
| | Within Groups | 875.186 | 97 | 9.023 | | |
| | Total | 1006.198 | 100 | | | |

10. ONE WAY ANOVA EDUCATION

INTERPRETATION

From the table above we can see that 43.671% of pilgrims are fall into the category of below1 lakhs, 32.5% of pilgrims are fall into the category of between 1-5 lakhs, 4.840% of pilgrims are fall into the category of 6-10 lakhs, .004 % of pilgrims are fall into the category of more than 10 lakhs.

| | | BL | PQ | BE | BI | BS | BT | BA | CPB |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .691 | .587 | .689 | .609 | .525 | .637 | .649 |
| Brand Loyalty | Sig (2 tailed) | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 101 | 101 | 101 | 100 | 101 | 99 | 100 | 101 |
| Perceived | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .691 | .587 | .689 | .609 | .525 | .637 | .649 |
| Quality | Sig (2 tailed) | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 101 | 101 | 101 | 100 | 101 | 99 | 100 | 101 |
| Drand | Pearson Correlation | .587 | .752 | 1 | .796 | .771 | .733 | .736 | .699 |
| Brand Experience | Sig (2 tailed) | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 101 | 101 | 101 | 100 | 101 | 99 | 100 | 101 |
| Brand | Pearson Correlation | .689 | .798 | .796 | 1 | .828 | .759 | .724 | .728 |
| Interest | Sig (2 tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 98 | 99 | 100 |
| Brand | Pearson Correlation | .609 | .713 | .771 | .828 | 1 | .758 | .778 | .721 |
| Brand Satisfaction | Sig (2 tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | Ν | 101 | 101 | 101 | 100 | 101 | 99 | 100 | 101 |
| | Pearson Correlation | .525 | .700 | .733 | .759 | .758 | 1 | .710 | .772 |
| Brand Trust | Sig (2 tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 99 | 99 | 99 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 98 | 99 |
| Durand | Pearson Correlation | .637 | .703 | .736 | .724 | .778 | .710 | 1 | .869 |
| Brand Acceptance | Sig (2 tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .000 |
| | Ν | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| Consumer | Pearson Correlation | .649 | .665 | .699 | .728 | .778 | 710 | 1 | .869 |
| Purchase behavior | Sig (2 tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |

11. CORRELATION

| Ν | 101 | 101 | 101 | 100 | 101 | 99 | 100 | 101 |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|

INTERPRETATION BRAND LOYALTY VS CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR

H0: There is no evidence of a link between brand loyalty and customer purchasing behavior.

H1: Brand loyalty and consumer purchase behavior are linked in a substantial way.

According to the table above, there is a link between brand loyalty and how people who are loyal to a product influence customer purchase behavior. Because the Pearson value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

PERCEIVED QUALITY VS CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR

BRAND EXPERIENCE VS CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR

H0: There is no evidence of a link between perceived quality and customer purchasing behavior.

H1: There is a link between perceived quality and customer purchasing decisions.

According to the table above, there is a link between perceived quality and how consumers comprehend the product, which influences customer buying behavior. Because the Pearson value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

BRAND IMAGE VS CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR

Brand Satisfaction Vs Consumer Purchase behavior

H0: There is no evidence of a link between brand image and customer purchasing behavior.

H1: Brand image and customer purchase BEHAVIOUR have a significant relationship.

From the chart above, it can be deduced that there is a link between Brand Experience and how people perceive product features, which influences consumer buying behavior.

Because the Pearson value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

H0: There is no link between consumer happiness with a brand and their purchase behavior.

H1: Consumer purchase behavior and brand satisfaction have a significant relationship.

From the chart above, it can be deduced that there is a link between Brand Experience and how consumers feel about the product's quality, which influences customer buying behavior. Because the Pearson value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

BRAND TRUST VS CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR

H0: There is no correlation between customer purchase behavior and brand trust.

H1: There is a strong link between customer purchase behavior and brand trust.

According to the table above, there is a link between Brand Experience and how consumers trust the product, which influences customer buying behavior. Because the Pearson value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

BRAND ATTACHMENT VS CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR

H0: There is no link between brand attachment and purchase behavior among consumers. H1: Brand connection and customer purchase behavior have a significant relationship.

According to the table above, there is a link between Brand Experience and how individuals become attached to a product, which influences customer buying behavior. Because the Pearson value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

12. MULTIPLE REGRESSION

The goal of linear regression analysis is to produce predictions based on the connection between two variables. You can use a factual device to look at how different free elements are linked to a reliant variable. When we've figured out how all of these variables interact with your dependent variable, we can take all of the data and use it to generate significantly more precise and spectacular predictions.

REGRESSION- CONSUMER PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR VARIABLE ENTERED/ REMOVED

| Model | Variables Entered | Variables Removed | Method | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | BA, BL, BT, BE, PQ, BS, BI | | Enter | | | | | | |
| a. D | ependent Variable: CPB | | | | | | | | |
| b. A | b. All requested variables entered | | | | | | | | |

MODEL SUMMARY

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the estimated |
|-------|------|----------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | .905 | .818 | .804 | 1. 40504 |

ANOVA

| Model | | Sum Squares | of | df | Mea | n Square | F | | Sig. | |
|-------|----------------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------------|-----|--------|------|------|
| | Regressi | 1 | | .7 | 113. | 163 | 57. | 323 | .000 | |
| 1 | Residual | | | 89 | 1.974 | | | | | |
| | Total | 967.835 | | 96 | | | | | | |
| a. | Dependent Va | riable: CPB | | | | I | | | | |
| b. | Predictors (Co | onstant): BA, BL | , BT, I | BE, PQ | , BS, I | BI | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardize | ed Coe | fficien | ts | Standardize Coefficient | | t | | Sig. |
| | | В | | Std.Er | ror | Beta | | | | |
| | (Constant) | 1.630 | | 1.113 | | | | 1.464 | 1 | .147 |
| | BL | .143 | | .075 | | .133 | | 1.91 |) | .059 |
| | PQ | 103 |)3 . | | | 103 | | -1.195 | 5 | .235 |
| 1 | BE | .011 | | .092 | | 010 .088 | | 118 | ; | .906 |
| | BI | .098 | | .115 | | | | .854 | | .395 |
| | BS | 132 | | .102 | | 122 | | -1.29 | 5 | .199 |
| | BT | .485 | | .109 | | .354 | | 4.43 | 7 | .000 |
| | BA | .735 | | .093 | | .643 | | 7.918 | | .000 |
| a. | Dependent Va | riable: CPB | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 1 |

INTERPRETATION

Brand Loyalty, Perceived Quality, Brand Experience, Brand Image, Brand Satisfaction, Brand Trust, and Brand Attachment have a stronger impact on consumer purchasing behavior in the above model summary table. It's also worth noting that the R square value has changed to.818. The P value can be used to test the hypothesis. The hypotheses are that Brand Loyalty, Perceived Quality, Brand Experience, Brand Image, Brand Satisfaction, Brand Trust, and Brand Attachment are all strongly linked to the Score.

Below is a table with the coefficient values for all of the factors.

Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government Vol. 28, No. 04, 2022 https://cibgp.com/

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903 DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2022.28.04.077

BL's beta coefficient (1.910) has a p-value of.059

PQ's beta coefficient (-1.195) has a p-value of.235.

BE's beta coefficient (-.118) has a p-value of.906

BI's beta coefficient (.854) has a p-value of.395

BS's beta coefficient (-1.295) has a p-value of.

199

BT's beta coefficient (4.437) has a p-value of.000.

BA's beta coefficient (7.918) has a p-value of.000.

13. FINDINGS

- $\hfill\square$ Majority of the customers responded to the brand usage
- \square Majority of the customers have responded under the age of 18-20
- □ Majority of the customers have responded as carpenter and contractor.
- □ Majority of the customers have responded to 1-5 lakhs of annual income
- □ Majority of the customers have responded to loyal customers
- □ Majority of the customers have responded to merino has good type of materials
- \square Majority of the customers have responded to innovation of product is good
- □ Majority of the customers have responded to they have a positive opinion about merino laminates.
- \Box Majority of the customers have responded to they are concerned with the customers.
- □ Majority of the customers have responded to it is of good quality for money
- □ Majority of the customers have responded as they are satisfied with the experience with the merino laminates products
- □ Majority of the customers have responded as it is a honest brand
- □ Majority of the customers have responded they rely on the brand
- □ Majority of the customers have responded as they are comfort with the merino laminate products.

14. SUGGESTIONS

This study advises trying the same framework in various countries and industries after evaluating the relationship between different components of Brand Equity and consumer Buying Behavior. In reality, the lack of sufficient study on the relationship between consumer purchasing behavior and customer equity drives researchers to investigate this relationship using the methodology, Customers find the merino laminates products to be quite useful, and they appreciate purchasing them to the core.

15. CONCLUSION

The main goal of this research was to see if there was a link between Brand Equity elements and buyer purchasing behavior in Chennai when it came to Merino Laminates. Brand Equity is made up of four components, according to previous research by well-known researchers: Brand Association, Brand Awareness, Brand Loyalty, and Perceived Quality. The most notable consequence, when measuring the influence of brand value components, is Brand Loyalty. The company's mission is to provide excellent customer service and make them to buy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cobb-Walgren, C. J., Ruble, C. A., & Donthu, N. (1995). Brand equity, brand preference, and purchase intent. *Journal of advertising*, *24*(3), 25-40.

Moradi, H., & Zarei, A. (2011). The impact of brand equity on purchase intention and brand preference-the moderating effects of country of origin image. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, *5*(3), 539-545.

Schivinski, B., & Dąbrowski, D. (2013). The impact of brand communication on brand equity dimensions and brand purchase intention through Facebook. *GUT FME Working Paper Series A. Gdansk (Poland): Gdansk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics*, 4(4), 1-24.

Hanaysha, J. (2016). Examining the effects of employee empowerment, teamwork, and employee training on organizational commitment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 298-306.

Damayanthi, W. A. I., & Wanninayake, W. M. C. B. (2017). The Impact of Brand Equity on Purchase Intention: With Special Reference to Male Skincare Market in Sri Lanka.

Roozy, E., Arastoo, M. A., & Vazifehdust, H. O. S. S. E. I. N. (2014). Effect of brand equity on consumer purchase intention. *Indian J. Sci. Res*, *6*(1), 212-217.

Lucchetti, G., Ramakrishnan, P., Karimah, A., Oliveira, G. R., Dias, A., Rane, A., ... & Lucchetti, A. L. (2016). Spirituality, religiosity, and health: a comparison of physicians' attitudes in Brazil, India, and Indonesia. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, *23*(1), 63-70.

Bharatiraja, C., Jeevananthan, S., Latha, R., & Mohan, V. (2016). Vector selection approach- based hexagonal hysteresis space vector current controller for a three phase diode clamped MLI with capacitor voltage balancing. *IET Power Electronics*, *9*(7), 1350-1361.

Kshetri, A., & Jha, B. (2016). Online Purchase Intention: A Study of Automobile Sector in India. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 5(3), 35.

Sharma, R. (2017). Building customer-based brand equity of domestic brands: Role of brand equity dimensions. *Metamorphosis*, *16*(1), 45-59.

Ackerman, B., Adhivarahan, V., Adhlakha, S., Adodo, E., Adolphsen, J., Agarwal, A. K., ... & Anand, M. Abbott, Frederick M. 1271 Abeyratne, Ruwantissa 196-201 Acharya, Pritish 993 Acharya, Sachin 1511.

Khandelwal, U., Kulshreshtha, K., & Tripathi, V. (2019). Importance of consumer-based green brand equity: Empirical evidence. *Paradigm*, 23(1), 83-97.

Chaudhry, J. B., & Verma, P. (2020). Determinants of Consumer's Intention to Purchase Traditional Indian Apparels. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation*, *16*(4), 322-334.

Nayeem, A. R., Islam, M. S., & Akter, M. F. (2020). The Influencing Factors of Brand Equity on Consumer Purchase Intention of Cell Phones in Bangladesh. *GSJ*, 8(1).

Husain, R., Ahmad, A., & Khan, B. M. (2022). The impact of brand equity, status consumption, and brand trust on purchase intention of luxury brands. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1), 2034234.