Determining if brand familiarity can influence consumer's perceptions of quality through the use of extrinsic cues, with reference to the brands of Johnnie Walker and Carling Label.

Reece Chapman (13008924)

Supervisors's

Richard Drummond.

Samuel Enow.

Date Submitted

24th October 2016

I, Reece Chapman, (24th October) hereby declare that the Research Report submitted for the ___HSBM___ degree to The Independent Institute of Education is my own work and has not previously been submitted to another University or Higher Education Institution for degree purposes.

ABSTRACT

In today's economic climate, competition is rife and brands are constantly looking for effective methods to establish themselves as a strong competitor in a saturated market place. Therefore strategically influencing customer behaviour to generate demand is any firm's top priority in an attempt to sustain competitive advantage.

Creating and expanding this demand is done through the influencing of a customer's brand choice through extrinsic placebo like cues (Priilaid, 2006). This means, that consumer's beliefs and expectations relating to the ability of product to perform, triggers a placebo effect impacting on the consequent value of the product (Shiv, Carmon & Ariely, 2005).

To demonstrate the effects of subliminal stimuli on brand equity this study looks at the recent launch of Carling Blue Label. The campaign seemed to guide consumers into believing that this was a better product yet, upon closer inspection the only differentiator was that it was a single malt beer and it was in a green bottle rather than the traditional dark brown bottle. Many consumers felt at ease with this new product and felt that this was a superior product due to the similar brand associations (blue promoting excellence and quality) as the ever popular Johnnie Walker range.

Results from this research report and the forthcoming conclusions can hopefully assist and guide marketers in applying their own brand stimuli in order to launch successful manipulate extrinsic cues in a lawful manner so to launch thriving product extensions and sustain competitive advantage.

This research study therefore answered that there is a strategic manipulation of extrinsic cues, associated with other familiar brands and these can affect a brand's equity, with particular reference to the Launch of Carling Blue Label. There was a relationship discovered between Johnnie Walker and Carling Blue Label.

Keywords: Brand Familiarity, Brand Equity, Johnnie Walker Blue Label, Carling Blue Label, Carling Black Label, Perception of Quality, Extrinsic Cues

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 6
2 LITERATURE REVIEW 9
2.1 Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Cues 9
2.2 Placebo Effect in Marketing 10
2.3 Brand Placebo Effect 11
2.4 Brand Equity 11
2.5 Brand Familiarity 12
2.6 Strategic Manipulation of Extrinsic Cues 13
3 METHODOLOGY 14
3.1 Introduction 14
3.2 Research Method 14
3.3 Justification for Using Questionnaire 14
3.4 Population and Sample 15
3.5 Data Collection Process 16
3.6 Scales 17
3.7 Data Analysis 18
3.7.1 Reliability of the Research Instrument 18
3.7.2 Validity of the Research Instrument 18
3.8 Limitations of the Questionnaire Survey 18
3.9 Ethical Considerations 19
3.10 Chapter Summary 20
4 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS 22
4.1 Introduction 22
4.2 Demographics of the Respondents 22
4.3 Brand Familiarity of Johnnie Walker 24
4.4 Brand Equity Scale of Johnnie Walker 28
4.4.1 Is there a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality?... 29
4.4.2 Johnnie Walker Brand Familiarity Treatment 30

4.5 Brand Familiarity of Carling Blue Label 31
4.6 Brand Equity Scale of Carling Blue Label 31
4.6.1 Is there a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality? .. 33
4.6.2 Carling Blue Label Brand Familiarity Treatment 34
4.7 Brand Familiarity of Carling Black Label 34
4.8 Brand Equity Scale of Carling Black Label 35
4.8.1 Is there a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality? ... 36
4.8.2 Carling Black Label Brand Familiarity Treatment 37
4.9 Relationship between Johnnie Walker and Carling Blue Label 37
4.10 Conclusion 38
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 39
5.1 Brand Familiarity's role in influencing perception of quality 39
5.1.1 Johnnie Walker Blue Label 39
5.1.2 Carling Blue Label 40
5.1.3 Carling Black Label 40
5.2 Relationship between Johnnie Walker and Carling Blue Label 41
5.3 Limitations and Delimitations of the Research Study 42
5.4 Recommendations for Future Research 42
6 LIST OF REFERENCES 44
8 ANNEXES 47

List of Tables

Table 1: Consumption Times per Week 23
Table 2: Drink of Choice 24
Table 3: Brand Familiarity scale unpacked 25
Table 4: Knowledgeable about the brand 26
Table 5: Adverts about the Brand 27
Table 6: Brand Familiarity scale for Johnnie Walker 28
Table 7: Brand Equity Scale for Johnnie Walker 28
Table 8: Johnnie Walker Brand Familiarity Treatment 30
Table 9: Brand Familiarity of Carling Blue Label 31
Table 10: Brand Equity Scale for Carling Blue Label 32
Table 11: Carling Blue Label Brand Familiarity Treatment 33
Table 12: Brand Familiarity Scale for Carling Black Label 34
Table 13: Brand Equity Scale for Carling Black Label 36
Table 14: Carling Black Label Brand Familiarity Treatment 37
Table 15: Relationship between Carling Blue Label and Johnnie Walker 38

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaire
Appendix B: Microsoft Excel Data

1 INTRODUCTION

In today's economic climate, competition is rife and brands are constantly looking for effective methods to establish themselves as a strong competitor in a saturated market place. Strategically influencing customer behaviour to generate demand is any firm's top priority in an attempt to sustain competitive advantage. This type of behaviour is especially prevalent in markets such as; Fast Most Consumer Goods, Retail, Alcohol (Beer) and Fast Food.

Creating and expanding this demand is done through the influencing of a customer's brand choice through extrinsic placebo like cues (Priilaid, 2006). Key factors like; experienced value, brand identification and predicted value all mediate the formation of heuristic cues during the customer buying process (Solnais, 2013). Research has proven that consumers use extrinsic cues such as the brand parent, price and name to judge the quality of a product (Priilaid & van Resburg, 2010; Priilaid, 2007). This means, that consumer's beliefs and expectations relating to the ability of product to perform, triggers a placebo effect impacting on the consequent value of the product (Shiv, Carmon & Ariely, 2005).

The term placebo effect is typically used in the medical profession to describe a phenomenon where patients are falsely made to believe they are getting treatment to cure some illness (Kaptchuk, 2013). The patient's belief that the treatment will deliver the desired result subsequently leads to real changes in their health. However this term has also been explored in the marketing field. Non-medical placebo effects in marketing have important managerial implications for managers and are thus an area of great interest (Shiv *et al.,* 2005).

Recent studies on placebo effects on wine have tested effects such as brand, price, expert rating and place of origin (Priilaid & van Rensburg, 2010). However this study differentiates in focusing on brand placebo effects through examining extrinsic cues across the products Johnnie Walker Blue Label (whiskey), Carling Blue Label (beer) and Carling Black Label (beer). The study then further investigates the mediating effects of brand familiarity on brand equity.

Brand equity is the enhancement of desirability and perceived utility that a brand name confers on that particular product (Kotler, 2015). A study conducted by Thane (2004) highlighted that for certain products, such as alcoholic beverages, their intrinsic quality cannot be readily tested and thus placebo effects and extrinsic cues do well in shaping their brand equity. Priilaid *et al.* (2013) further tested that brand does have a prominent effect on shaping a consumers brand equity and that certain brands do have more of a presence in the minds of consumers.

Brand familiarity is the amount of direct and indirect product related experiences a consumer has with a particular brand (Tam, 2008). Brand familiarity has also further been found to be a huge differentiating factor between brands, and thus forms a crucial part in forecasting consumer behaviour (Narvarro & Sicilia, 2012). Familiar brands are identified and recognized more effortlessly which means they tend to hold huge communication advantages over unfamiliar brands (Lee & Laboo, 2004).

The dimensions of brand equity are essential in driving brand choice amongst consumers, thus businesses will do whatever it takes to control these dimensions in a way that can positively influence brand choice. One such technique is through the use of subliminal stimuli. Subliminal perception suggests that people's thoughts, feelings, and actions are influenced by stimuli that are perceived without any awareness of perceiving (Merikle, 2000).

Copious research has been conducted on a strong response of subliminal cues on brand choice through the implementation of subliminal stimuli in advertising noted Saegert (1987). From Moore denying its effectiveness in 1982 and to the other side of the argument where Cuperfain and Clarke (1985) and Kilboume, Painton and Ridley (1985) claimed to have demonstrated conclusively that subliminal effects could occur with advertising stimuli.

What is interesting to note is that not much research has been conducted on the weak response of subliminal stimuli. Thus this study focuses on a weak response of subliminal stimuli, which is elicited through techniques that can positively change a consumer's attitude, feelings, attractiveness or beliefs etc. (Yudelson, 1999). This can be translated into tangible brand equity as it is the feeling/attitude a consumer has with a brand (Weber, 2010). Thus subliminal stimuli can influence brand equity through the customers hold on a brand and this subsequently influences brand choice (Weber, 2010).

To demonstrate the effects of subliminal stimuli on brand equity this study looks at the recent launch of Carling Blue Label. Carling Beer recently launched a new beer named Blue Label to their already existing product line (World of Beer, 2016). The promotional campaign centred on boldness and quality and not much emphasis was placed on what differentiated it from its already existing product (Black Label). The campaign seemed to guide consumers into believing that this was a better product yet, upon closer inspection the only differentiator was that it was a single malt beer and it was in a green bottle rather than the traditional dark brown bottle. The price was also similar to that of the pre-existing Black Label (Pick n Pay, 2016). Many consumers felt at ease with this new product and felt that this was a superior product due to the similar brand associations (blue promoting excellence and quality) as the ever popular Johnnie Walker range. Johnnie Walker uses colours to promote the quality of their whiskeys, black being middle of the range and blue being more superior (Johnnie Walker, 2016).

These associations made with familiar premium brands will have an influence on the consumers purchasing decisions and hence adoption of the brand. Results from this research report and the forthcoming conclusions can hopefully assist and guide marketers in applying their own brand stimuli in order to launch successful manipulate extrinsic cues in a lawful manner so to launch thriving product extensions and sustain competitive advantage.

Objectives

This study will use an inside-out approach by evaluating a well-known Beer brand before evaluating a recent product extension by the same Beer brand (with signs of brand associations with Johnnie Walker Blue Label) and then record the perceptual quality consistencies between the two products. A questionnaire was used to access the perceptual quality consistencies between Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label using various extrinsic cues. This questionnaire also accessed the effect of brand familiarity on brand equity.

This led to the formation of the following research question which forms as the basis of this study.

How does the strategic manipulation of extrinsic cues, to associate with other familiar brands, affect a brand's equity, with particular reference to the Launch of Carling Blue Label?

In light of the above research question, the following objectives were formulated:

- To determine if brand familiarity mediates consumer's perceptions of quality for the brand, Johnnie Walker Blue Label
- To determine if brand familiarity effects consumer's perceptions of quality for the brand, Carling Blue Label
- To determine if brand familiarity effects consumer's perceptions of quality for the brand, Carling Black Label
- To determine if there is an association between consumers perception of Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label

The section to follow is a discussion around previous literature relevant to the study. In this section, the hypotheses, formulated from the above objectives will be stated and supported from findings of previous literature. Thereafter, the methodology used to conduct the study will be presented and evaluated. Following the methodology will be the results section, outlining the statistical analysis. Based on the results generated the conclusion to this study will follow. Lastly the limitations and potential areas for future research will be stipulated and discussed.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The following section will discuss the extrinsic cues that affect individual's perception of quality, as well as the strategic manipulation of extrinsic cues to illicit a certain level of quality.

2.1 Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Cues

Consumers on a daily basis form purchasing decisions without gathering the complete information about a certain product (Bettman, 1979; Vocino & Oppewal, 2009). In such scenarios, individuals turn to extrinsic cues when having to make a decision (Olson & Jacoby, 1972). Cues can be extrinsic or intrinsic. Extrinsic cues are those that do not form part of the physical attributes of the product (Veale, 2010). A change in these has no effect on the product, yet they continually act as guides in the formation of quality perception. Intrinsic cues are those that are inseparable and form part of the actual product (Kirmani & Rao, 2000). Intrinsic cues are considered domineering in the formation of quality perceptions and are thus seen as more useful and trustworthy (Purohit & Srivastava, 2001; Rao & Monroe, 1988).

Cox (1967), showed how consumer's purchases are frequently made under conditions of uncertainty in terms of the product and its characteristics. It is in these environments that consumers aim to reduce this uncertainty/risk by using heuristics (Kahneman, 2011; Kahneman & Traversky, 1974). Heuristics allow consumers to make conclusions on the quality of these products in unknown environments (Jacoby, Olson & Haddock, 1971).

Relevant cues used to form impressions of products include brand, price, packaging and store image (Jacoby *et al.,* 1971). Brand identification, is the practice of developing choice substitutes amongst a product. These preferences are formed as a result of visual cues and unconscious routines that establish consumer's decisions between alternatives (Chartrand, Huber, Shiv & Tanner, 2008; Plassmann *et al.*, 2012).

Consumers select specific information about a product that then gains preferential status in their minds. Specific aesthetic attributes of a product, namely logos, product design and advertising allow for memory processing and association in the form of advertising recall and brand awareness (Plassmann*et al.*, 2012; Delizia & McFie, 1996; Siegrist & Cousin, 2009; Solnais *et al.*, 2013). This is critical in understanding consumer behaviour.

Two types of quality can be recognized, that is objective and perceived quality (Plassmann, Ramsoy & Milosavljevic, 2012). Both of these add to the previous works on how cues affect consumer behaviour.

Objective quality is used by Monroe and Krishnan (1991) to describe the physical value of the products, and in terms of beer's objective quality, it is derived from the actual drinking of the product (Plassmann, *et al.*, 2012). Hence the continuous use of extrinsic cues to determine the quality of a product, result in consumers finding it difficult to determine the actual quality of a product. Thus perceived quality is an individual's assessment or future belief of a product founded on extrinsic cues (Zeithaml, 1988).

Solnais *et al.,* (2013) highlighted the significance of reward schemes that stem from brands and showed how consumers prefer goods that trigger certain reward pathways to the brain. In saying this, products that hold a certain degree of wealth and social status are considered rewarding and tend to have a higher ability to satisfy consumer's preferences and needs. In certain studies conducted by Plassmann *et al.*, (2008) and Siegrist and Cousin (2009) found that consumers predominantly utilise extrinsic cues such as brand and price to measure the intrinsic merit of wine.

A critical component of consumer's choice is their memory of previous exposure to the brand, most commonly referred to as remembered value (Plassmann *et al.,* 2012). This is the capability of differentiating between brands established on the consolidation and the encoding of marketing cues that have been retrieved and retained in the minds of consumers (Plassmann *et al.,* 2012). This process is largely unconscious and relies heavily on the prior consumption experience (Plassmann *et al.,* 2012). Such memories influence preferences by forming brand bias causing consumers to create product decisions based on brand familiarity (Solnais *et al.,* 2013).

A consumer's interpretation of extrinsic cues, such as brand equity influences their purchase decisions. These extrinsic cues and marketing stimuli are what consumers base their beliefs and expectations of the product on, both consciously and unconsciously (Fiszman, 2012). These expectations are derived from what is known as the placebo effect in marketing, such as brand.

2.2 Placebo Effect in Marketing

The Placebo effect is a term that is commonly used in the medical field. This is the practice where patients were falsely led to believe that they were receiving some form of treatment for an illness (Kaptchuk, 2013). The patient's expectations that the treatment would in fact lead to a desired result lead to a real change to their health (Shiv *et al.,* 2005). There has been extensive research into the non-medical placebo effects in marketing. Non- medical placebo effect is the effect that extrinsic cues, such as brand equity, have on an individual's assessment of the intrinsic quality of the product (Erdem & Swait, 1998).

A study lead by Allison and Uhl (1964) aimed to define if consumers were able to distinguish between strong beer brands when the different bottles were left unlabelled. The study concluded that during blind taste tests (no label on the bottle) correspondents stated that the brands were all very similar in taste and that there was not much to differentiate them on (Allison & Uhl, 1964). Conversely, when provided with the label a different response was elicited and respondents ranked the beers that they consumed more frequently, to having a higher quality (Allsion & Uhl, 1964). Thus many studies have established that beliefs set by brands marketing efforts and brand name can result in out setting the intrinsic quality of a product (Erdem & Swait, 1998).

2.3 Brand Placebo Effects

Research into the brand placebo effect is unfortunately limited with most of the literature coming from a study conducted by Priilaid. He also focussed specifically on the brand placebo effect on the different wineries found in the wine industry. His study established that the reputation of certain wineries lead to a brand placebo effect (Priilaid, 2010). Indicating that respondents perceived the quality of the wine differently according to how they perceived the quality of the winery (Priilaid, 2010).

2.4 Brand Equity

A brand is a unique identifier that distinguishes one from the other (King, 1973). It involves the summation as a number of attributes, for example a product logo or name, it is what a company/product lives and stands by (King, 1973). Each brand has its own unique combination of attributes, with which customers base purchase decisions on (Weber, 2010).

Brand equity is also defined by Kamakura and Russell (1991) as the differential effect of brand knowledge on individual's response to marketing activity of a brand and is conceptualised when a consumer is familiar with a brand. That is, consumers hold unique brand associations in their memory that's leads to brand loyalty and ultimately to brand extensions (Keller, 1993).

Lassar *et al.,* (1995) believes that there are also some other important components that need to be considered when defining brand equity. Such as, brand equity which is a result of consumer's perceptions more than objective qualities (Lassar *et al.,* 1995). He also believed that brand equity denotes to the global value a brand upholds, which is formed by the brand name rather than the physical aspects of the product, and is thus relative to competition (Lassar *et al.,* 1995).

Lassar *et al.*, (1995) also went on to conceptualize five dimensions of brand equity such as; social image, performance, price/value, identification, attachment and trustworthiness.

These dimensions were selected based on the fact that researchers can measure these associations at an abstract level and can identify cross-product generality rather than a particular product class only (Lassar *et al.,* 1995). Aaker (2009) further argues that brand associations, brand loyalty, perceived quality and other brand assets underlie brand equity. According to Thane (2004) the intrinsic quality of alcoholic beverages cannot be readily verified and thus extrinsic cues and placebo effects have been used to determine the brand equity of products. A study by Priilaid *et al.,* (2013) confirmed that some brands do in fact have more of a presence in the minds of consumers.

For the purpose of this study brand equity is established and defined as the perceived desirability and utility a brand name confers on a product. A key component of brand equity is brand familiarity. Brand familiarity is described as number of positive experiences and a product exposure a consumer has with a particular product so as to illicit the value offering (Aaker, 2009). The actual value the consumer attaches to the brand as a result of product exposures and positive experiences is thus known as brand equity.

2.5 Brand familiarity

Tam (2008) defined familiarity as the number of product related experiences received by a consumer. Experiences include direct or indirect experiences involving product usage, advertising, word of mouth or interactions with employees (Tam, 2008). One of the key differentiating factors among the brand is brand familiarity as it plays a crucial role in the formation of purchasing decisions of consumers (Navarro & Sicilla, 2012). This makes brand familiarity advantageous for businesses as these brands have huge communication advantages relative to unpopular/unfamiliar brands (Lee & Laboo, 2004). Additionally familiar brands are viewed as more favourable by consumers due to the fact that these brands need less effort to be identified and recognized (Lee & Laboo, 2004). Thus familiar brands have affective and cognitive advantages.

Marketing activity plays an important role in building brand familiarity, as its job is to inform, remind and persuade consumers about an organization's brand (Hasan, 2011).

Beer selection can be a complex and risky task as the intrinsic merit of the alcoholic beverage cannot be readily tested at the exact time of purchase (Peter *et al.,* 2010). Thus only a post evaluation of the intrinsic merit of an alcoholic beverage can be formed and as a result consumers turn to extrinsic cues to guide them in their choice (Peter *et al.,* 2010). One such cue is brand familiarity (Sherman & Tutan, 2011). The more a consumer is exposed to an alcoholic beverage the more they gain brand familiarity. This in turn results in the perceived risk of the purchase decision to decrease (Yuan & Jang, 2008).

Studies conducted by Priilaid & van Rensburg (2010) and Priilaid *et al.*, (2013) determined that extrinsic brand cues influence the respondents quality perception of alcoholic beverages. Not much research has been conducted on brand familiarity and its effect in mediating brand equity. Thus this paper aims to address this and determine if brand familiarity does in fact mediate brand equity. The following hypotheses were formulated:

H1: Brand familiarity mediates the perception of quality for JW Blue Label

H2: brand familiarity mediates the perception of quality for Carling Blue Label

H3: Brand familiarity mediates the perception of quality for Carling Black Label

2.6 Strategic manipulation of extrinsic cues

The dimensions of brand equity are essential in driving brand choice amongst consumers, and therefore businesses will do whatever it takes to control these dimensions in a way that can positively influence brand choice. One such technique is through the use of subliminal stimuli. Subliminal perception suggests that people's thoughts, feelings, and actions are influenced by stimuli that are perceived without any awareness of creating them (Merikle, 2000). In other words, subliminal stimuli enter our brain unconsciously. Any stimulus that is not processed consciously does not necessarily indicate that the stimuli is not processed, it just means that the consumer is not aware of the process (Weber, 2010). Many studies have shown that these stimuli do in fact have an influence on people's behaviour (Weber, 2010).

Subliminal Stimuli can arouse two different responses in a consumer, a strong or a weak response. This study focuses on influencing brand choice through arousing a weak response (Moore, 1982). A strong response means that the subliminal stimulus has a direct effect on a consumer's behaviour (Moore, 1982). This can be achieved through the practice of subliminal advertising (Moore, 1982). However a weak response is elicited through techniques that change a consumer's attitude, feelings, attractiveness or beliefs etc (Yudelson, 1999). These can subsequently be translated into brand equity as it is the feeling/attitude a consumer has with a brand (Weber, 2010).

Therefore the subliminal stimuli influence the brand equity that customers hold on to as a brand, and this brand equity positively influences their brand choice (Weber, 2010). Thus the following hypotheses are formulated:

H4: Consumers perception of quality for Johnnie Walker Blue Label influences consumers perception of quality for Carling Blue Label.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explain how the data for this research study was gathered and whether it is in fact scientifically relevant to the study. This chapter proceeds by explaining the research method and the justification for using this method and follows this by explaining the population parameters and the procedure in which a sample was obtained. The data collection process, scales used in the research and a brief breakdown of the data analysis are all touched upon. The validity and reliability of the research is then stated and finally the limitations and ethical considerations of the research instrument are noted.

3.2 Research Method

The research conducted for this study followed a conclusive research design with causal research (Malhorta, 2010). This is justified as the purpose of this study was to measure consumers perception of quality (dependent variable) on brand familiarity (independent variables), to infer whether a causal relationship existed between these two variables (Malhorta, 2010).

The research method employed in this study is a questionnaire and it is quantitative data collection method. This is because in general quantitative data collection methods tend to rely on random sampling, since one of the aims of quantitative research is to generalise results to a broader population. This study is about investigating consumer's perceptions in terms of brand associations and how companies use this to formulate successful brand equity. We also wish to compile the data collected through quantitative means and test this against hypotheses derived from previously stated theories. Therefore the purpose of this quantitative research is to find casual (cause and effect) relationships or correlations that can be generalised.

3.3 Justification for using questionnaire

This study will use a questionnaire to accurately capture the required data in the study. The unit of analysis in this study is perceived value which will be measured using brand equity through the use of recording consumer's level of response to perceived value, brand associations and awareness.

A key issue that was discussed when designing this questionnaire was that it should be able to answer the necessary questions required in this study. The questionnaire needs to be able to balance the accessibility to respondents whilst minimising the chance for human error (Malhorta, 2010).

Malhorta (2010) noted that most respondents were unwilling to devote much effort and time into providing information. Therefore with this in mind, the length of the questionnaire was designed to be reasonably short and this study made use of structured questions that specified a set of alternative responses (Malhorta, 2010).

Vega's logo appeared at the top of the first page of the questionnaire as this researcher was representing Vega during the research process. The questionnaire then started with a short introduction which explained the details and purpose of the research to respondents and also provided the necessary contact details of those involved. Respondents were kept in the dark over the true nature and purpose of the research, as it could significantly bias the results if they were to know the true purpose (Malhorta, 2010). Respondents were also made aware from the beginning that responses would remain anonymous in order for them to answer the questions more truthfully.

The questionnaire will then ask various questions to differentiate the respondents when recording the data. The questionnaire will then use a Likkert scale to measure the units of analysis. The results will then be recorded on Microsoft excel and the results will be interpreted by the researcher using deductive and inductive reasoning.

3.4 Population and Sample

The target population as defined by Malhotra (2010) is the collection of elements that possess the information sought by the researcher. In this study the target population consisted of respondents who were over the age of 18 years old, the South African legal drinking age, and were living in Cape Town. Both male and female respondents were used to form the target population of this study.

The context of the study involved measuring brand perceptions across different user profiles such as gender bands, strata, age and levels of expertise (novice, intermediate and expert). Literature suggests that ill-informed knowledge concerning alcohol products reflect negatively on consumers and results in feelings of social embarrassment (Priilaid et al., 2009). Furthermore, regular alcohol consumers claim to have the expertise and knowledge to make a perfectly informed decision regarding the alcohol products quality (Priilaid et al., 2009). Thus, respondents were not asked to provide personal information and their quality assessments remained anonymous. Anonymity increased the accuracy of quality assessment by respondents (Durant, Carey & Schroder, 2002). This study took place over the year 2016 and data collection occurred during August and September 2016.

This study will use a traditional sampling approach without replacement (Malholtra, 2010). Non-probability sampling techniques are used due to time and cost limitations.

The sample of respondents used in this study aims to include South African males and females, of ages 18 and over, above the legal drinking age of South Africa. A fairly even distribution of males and females were targeted in order to ensure that there was a fairly even split across genre bands.

This study will use a traditional sampling approach without replacement (Malholtra, 2010). In other words once a respondent is selected to be included in the sample it was removed from the sampling frame (Malhotra, 2010).

Non-probability sampling techniques are used due to time and cost limitations. Chance selection was not used in this study as the researchers personal judgement was relied upon instead (Malhotra, 2010). The least time consuming and most affordable method, convenience sampling, was used in order to obtain a sample of appropriate respondents for the research questionnaire (Malhotra, 2010). The selection of these respondents was also helped using snowball sampling. Snowball sampling was used to gain referrals of respondents who met the criteria of the target population (Malhotra, 2010).

Finally quota sampling was also used in order to ensure an equal split across gender bands. Research suggests that in typical studies of the alcoholic beverage consumption in beer, wine and spirits, the sample often falls short of being fully representative of the population due to the low response rate and under-sampling of younger drinkers and minorities (Kerr *et al.,* 2005). Therefore, in order to ensure a fair representation of drinkers over the age 18 and avoid misrepresentation, quota sampling was used in this research study. After having taken all of the above into consideration a sample size of 50 was selected.

3.5 Data Collection Process

A self-administered questionnaire (Appendix A) was used in this research study in order to investigate whether the brand associations between Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label effectively influenced consumer's perceptions over Carling Blue Label. The questionnaire also investigated the associated extrinsic cues of Carling Blue Label and Johnnie Walker Blue, and consumers perceived extrinsic differences between Carling Blue Label and Black Label. The first three questions were used as a filter questions. Filter questions are used to determine whether the respondent has the correct attributes required in order for their response to be relevant and valid (Trochim, 2006).

Questions 4 - 7 were then used to gauge the respondent's level of experience and knowledge concerning alcohol. These questions were based on the study by Priilaid *et al.,* (2013) who used these questions to calculate a respondent's level of alcohol expertise.

Questions 8.0.1 - 8.0.3, 10.0.1 - 10.0.3 and 12.0.1 - 12.0.2 were used to evaluate the respondent's level of awareness concerning the brand Johnnie Walker and the products Carling Blue Label and Carling Black Label respectively.

Questions 9.0.1 - 9.0.5 were used to evaluate the respondent's perceived opinions concerning Johnnie Walker Blue Label's price, packaging, labelling, name and other people's referrals. Questions 11.0.1 - 11.0.5 were used to evaluate the respondent's perceived opinions concerning Carling Blue Label's price, packaging, labelling, name and other peoples referrals and questions 13.0.1 - 13.0.5 covered the same concepts yet their perceptions concerning Carling Black Label were asked of instead.

Finally questions 14 and 15 were used to ask of the respondent's age and gender. This is because Malhotra noted that demographic questions are best used at the end of questionnaires as respondents have established the validity of the research. The questionnaire therefore ended with demographic questions concerning the respondent's age and gender.

3.6 Scales

In order to obtain the necessary data and evaluate what was required the questionnaire made use of two scales. The first scale (Questions 8, 10 & 12) was taken from the study conducted by Bruner (2013). Bruner (2013) used a brand familiarity scale that measured the degree to which a person is aware and knowledgeable about the brand. This scale was for this study to test the familiarity respondents have with the two brands, namely Carling Label and Johnnie Walker. More specifically it tests the familiarity of their products Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Black and Blue Label. The original scale by Bruner (2013) measured the brand familiarity construct using three seven-point semantic different scales, whereas this study uses the same seven-point semantic differential scale to measure product familiarity.

The second scale (Questions 9, 11 & 13) was taken from the study conducted by Jover *et al.,* (2003). Their study measured image, presentation, labelling and price, amongst other constructs of different red wines (Jover et al., 2003). Their study used a 7 point Likert scale that ranged from 1 - 7, with 1 being 'totally disagree' and 7 being 'totally agree' (Jover et al., 2003). If the respondents did not feel so strongly about any of the statements, then they could choose any number that came in between (Jover et al., 2003). This scale was then adapted to formulate a Likert scale measuring consumers perceptions concerning Carling Label and Johnnie Walker more specifically evaluating their respective product's image, presentation, labelling and price. Likert scales were easy to administer and were simple to create yet yielded the most accurate results from respondents (Malhorta, 2010).

3.7 Data Analysis

This study followed the work of Priilaid (2006), Priilaid *et al.,* (2013) and Priilaid and Horwitz (in press) by using descriptive statistics to report on the mean, median, mode and standard deviation of the questionnaire responses. The Spearman correlation matrix of the described variables was created showing which variables where highly correlated and which were not. The data will be then investigated using correlation and regression before final conclusions and assumptions are reached.

3.7.1 Reliability of the research instrument

Leeds and Ormord (2010) stated that the validity of a measurement instrument is the extent to which the instrument measures what it is actually intended to measure. When using quantitative research, testing the validity of the research instrument is usually required. Cohen (2010) stated that the nature of reliability involves measuring the extent to which meaningful conclusions can be drawn from the research subject. Therefore this researcher consulted their research advisor, industry experts and previous research in order to ensure the reliability of the research instrument, in this case a questionnaire.

3..7.2 Validity of the research instrument

Serumaga (2015) defined validity as the ability of an instrument to measure what it was designed to measure or the degree to which the researcher measured was set out to be measured. Serumaga (2015) went on further, noting that, it also refers to the accuracy, credibility and trustworthiness of data collection instruments, data and findings in the research. In terms of this research, validity was achieved through the use of analysing previous research and consulting numerous research advisors. It was also finally achieved through using a questionnaire based and validated on similar previously published research. It should be noted that in order to ensure the research was dependable, trustworthy and credible for quantitative analysis, the researcher controlled the questionnaire to ensure that the information captured was valid, correct and relevant. It was also explained to the respondents what the research required and how the questions were to be answered.

3.8 Limitations of the question survey

Simon (2011) defined limitations as the potential weaknesses in a study that are out of the researcher's control. One of the limitations of this study was the respondent's ages. In order to save time, convenience sampling was used. This meant the results acquired using a sample of convenience, as opposed to a random sample, cannot be generally applied to a larger population, only suggested.

The limitation of this was reduced however using quota sampling which allowed the researcher to formulate a more accurate sample of the population. The results of this study were also susceptible to the influence of the effect of order. This means, the order in which the alcohol brands were presented may have impacted the assessment of the perception of quality, indicated by the respondents (Krosnick & Alwin, 1987). In order to mitigate the potential influence of order effects, future research should present the alcohol brands in varying sequences for every ten respondents.

Other further limitation of this research included gender bias and lack of visual representation. Gender bias may have occurred unintentionally due to the snowball effect previously mentioned under population and sample. The researcher conducting this study may be slightly bias in the handing-out of questionnaires to their same gender or the opposite gender. This research negated this limitation by acquiring help from a member of the opposite gender, in order to assist with the hand-out.

The final limitation, lack of visual representation, occurred due to the assumption of the brands being very well-known and financial constraints. This research was conducted under the assumption that all respondents could recall a vague visual memory of the brands being mentioned. Carling Blue Label, however, is a fairly new introduction to the market and some respondents may have had trouble remembering this product and their responses may have been more accurate if they were given a visual representation. The printing of these product pictures on the questionnaire was also not feasible given the researchers financial constraints.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

In order to conclude the study, time needs to be taken to consider that all potential problems that could come up during the study have been resolved. One of these potential problems is known as ethical considerations. Ethical considerations involve dealing with the various stakeholders involved in the research process.

If the study was done ethically and correctly then the researcher would've acted in a professional manner with integrity and he would have adhered to the ethical principles and professional standards that are essential for practising research.

Even in the face of danger or adversity the researcher is required to treat the respondents or test subjects in a respectful and trustworthy manner. It is important to note that in this situation a stakeholder is anyone who has a vested interest

3.10 Chapter Summary

This research made use of non-probability sampling, specifically convenience sampling, through the use of a questionnaire that was administered in order to obtain a representative sample. The questionnaire made use of Likert scales in order to analysis the data using quantitative analysis. The analysis of the data will now be discussed in the following section.

4 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The following section will begin by discussing the demographic results collected from the questionnaire before an average respondent profile is compiled. An analysis of the results for the brand familiarity and brand equity of Johnnie Walker Blue Label, Carling Blue Label and Carling Black Label will then be evaluated and commented on. The research will also comment on whether there is a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality for the three respective brands. The chapter will then finally conclude with a investigation into the relationship between Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label.

4.2 Demographics of the respondents

A total of 52 questionnaires were handed out and 50 of these questionnaires were completed and returned. Of these 50, 4 were rejected based on their response to the filter questions placed at the beginning of the questionnaire. They were rejected as they either did not drink alcohol and/or had not heard of either Carling Lager or Johnnie Walker. Every respondent who received a questionnaire was above the age of 18. In terms of demographics, 30 of the respondents were male and 16 were female with an average age of 27.

The above information was determined from questions 1, 2, 3, 14 & 15 of the questionnaire. Questions 4, 5, 6 & 7 were used to determine the respondent's level of expertise in terms of alcohol consumption and their awareness of alcoholic beverages.

Question 4 specifically dealt with the respondent's alcohol knowledge and this was determined through a self-evaluation of the respondent. The self-evaluation allowed the respondent to be more truthful with their answer and allowed the researcher to gauge a better awareness of how well the respondent knew the alcohol market. Of the 46 responses; 13 answered novice, 23 answered intermediate and 10 answered expert. This meant that of all the respondents 28% of them felt they had a novice understanding of alcohol. Half of the respondents, or 50% of them, felt they had an intermediate understanding of alcohol and finally 22% of the respondents felt they were experts when it came to alcohol knowledge.

The above percentage statistics are a strong indication of the sample's knowledge base and is subsequently a good signal that a great representative sample of the population was selected.

South Africa has one of the highest drinking rates in the world and therefore a sample representing the majority of the sample as moderately well-informed alcohol knowledge will validate the results and keep the study accurate (World Health Organization, 2014).

Question 5 helps further validate the previous statement as it measures respondent's weekly alcohol intake. The respondents were asked to indicate how often they consumed alcohol through a self-evaluated chart with responses from once a week all the way up to 7 times a week. Of the responses 35 people answered less than once a week, at least once a week and twice a week.

Whilst groups of 4, 3, 1 and 3 people said they drink three times a week, four times a week, five times a week and 6 times a week respectively. From an ethical point it's important to note that no respondents drank everyday or more than once a day.

The above information is represented statistically in table 1 below:

Consumption times per week:	Frequency of response:	Percentage:
Less than once a week	10	22
At least once a week	14	30
Twice a week	11	24
Three times a week	4	9
Four times a week	3	6,5
Five times a week	1	2
Six times a week	3	6,5
Every day	0	
More than once a day	0	
AVERAGE	Twice (2) a week	

Table 1:

Source: Microsoft excel

Question 6 asked the respondents what drink they generally preferred to drink. Of the 46 responses, 26 or 56.5% of the respondents picked beer as their drink of choice. The other responses in terms of popularity were white spirits (17%), flavoured alcoholic beverages (13%), brown spirits (9%) and spirits (4.5%) respectively. These figures are represented in table 2 below:

Drink of choice:	**Frequency of response:**	**Percentage**
Beer	26	56.5
White spirits	8	17
Brown spirits	4	9
Spirits	2	4.5
Flavoured Alcoholic Beverage	6	13

Table 2

Source: Microsoft excel

The final question of the demographics section, question 7, asked the respondents how much they typically spent on alcohol. Of the responses, 9 of them or 19.5% said that they typically spent less than R100 on an alcohol purchase whilst 32 or 50% of the respondents spent between R100 and R200. Finally 14 or 30.5% of the responses said they spent more than R200 with every purchase.

To summarise the demographics section, 46 respondents met the criteria and their responses were all recorded. The average profile of the respondent would be a beer drinking 27 year old male with an intermediate understanding of alcohol. He also drinks roughly once or twice a week and spends roughly between R100 and R200 on these alcohol purchases.

4.3 Brand familiarity of Johnnie Walker

Question 8 dealt with the brand familiarity/awareness of Johnnie Walker and was broken down into 3 sub-questions. The first of these sub-questions, question 8.0.1, dealt specifically with brand familiarity and asked the respondent to rank how familiar they were with the brand, Johnnie Walker. The results can be found in table 3 below:

Johnnie Walker

The brand is very (un)familiar to me	Frequency of response	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
1. Very unfamiliar	0	0	0
2. Unfamiliar	0	0	0
3. Slightly unfamiliar	3	6.5	6.5
4. Neutral	2	4.5	11
5. Slightly familiar	13	28	39
6. Familiar	15	33	72
7. Very familiar	13	28	100

Table 3

Source: Microsoft excel

Looking at the table above, we can see that Johnnie Walker has very good brand familiarity. The table shows that 89% of the respondents answered that they were either slightly familiar, familiar or very familiar with Johnnie Walker. This is to be expected though as Johnnie Walker is a substantially large organisation with great brand awareness throughout the world due to their innovative marketing campaigns and the awareness of their logo and slogan (keep walking).

Question 8.0.2 asked how knowledgeable the respondent is about the brand, Johnnie Walker. The results of this question can be seen below in table 4.

The results from question 8.0.2 were surprisingly slightly different from that of question 8.0.1. It's surprising because 6.5% of the respondents claimed to have no knowledge whatsoever yet previously every respondent indicated that they were at least slightly familiar with the brand. This is a great indication of the strength of brand familiarity, the consumer may have no knowledge about the brand yet they are still aware and familiar of said brand. Most consumers however had at least some prior knowledge on Johnnie Walker (74%).

Johnnie Walker

I am (not) knowledgeable about the brand	Frequency of response	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
1. No knowledge whatsoever	3	6.5	6.5
2. No knowledge	0	0	6.5
3. Heard of them	3	6.5	13
4. Know of them	6	13	26
5. Little knowledge	18	39	65
6. Knowledgeable	8	17.5	82.5
7. Very knowledgeable	8	17.5	100

Table 4

Source: Microsoft excel

The final question on brand familiarity/awareness, question 8.0.3, dealt with how aware consumers were concerning Johnnie Walker's marketing efforts. The question asked the respondents to indicate whether they had seen any advertisements about this brand in the mass media. They were then required once again to answer on a scale of 1 – 7 in relation to how aware they were of said advertisements. The results are represented in the table 5 on the following page:

Johnnie Walker

I have (never) seen any adverts about this brand	Frequency of response	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
1. Never seen a single advert of any kind	0	0	0
2. Seen a advert about this brand once	3	6.5	6.5
3. Seen one or two adverts about this brand	2	4.5	11
4. Seen adverts about this brand	6	13	24
5. See adverts about this brand monthly	7	15	39
6. See adverts about this brand daily	16	35	74
7. Seen adverts about this brand multiple times a day	12	26	100

Table 5

Source: Microsoft excel

The results indicated in table 5 are very similar to that of table 4 and a case could be made that you are only knowledgeable about things that you are familiar with. This table also once again indicates that respondents are very aware and familiar (76%) with Johnnie Walker advertisements in the mass media.

In summary, question 8 showed us that Johnnie Walker has very strong brand awareness and that the respondents were very familiar with the brand. If we look at table 6 below we can see that consumers are fairly familiar and aware of this brand with averages of 5.7, 5 and 5.5 and a standard deviation of 1.129, 1.535 and 1.456 across the three familiarity questions. Another interesting point to note is that having strong brand awareness does not mean that consumers will necessarily be knowledgeable about said brand.

Johnnie Walker

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
8.0.1 The brand is very (un)familiar to me	5.7	6	6	1.129
8.0.2 I am (not) knowledgeable about the brand	5	5	5	1.535
8.0.3 I have (never) seen any adverts about this brand	5.5	6	6	1.456
Correlation coefficient between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality				**(r) = 0.355**

Table 6

Source: Microsoft excel

4.4 Brand equity scale of Johnnie Walker

Question 9 of the questionnaire dealt with the perception of quality of Johnnie Walker through the measurement of extrinsic cues such as price, bottle design, name, label and other people's referrals. Question 9.0.1 specifically measured perception of quality concerning the price whilst question 9.0.2 measured the perception of quality using the bottle design.

Question 9.0.3 measured the same previously mentioned perception just with the label as the extrinsic cue. Finally question 9.0.4 and 9.0.5 measured the perception of quality using the extrinsic cue of the product name and other people's referrals respectively. The results are tabled below:

Johnnie Walker

Extrinsic cues	**Strongly disagree (1)**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Strongly agree (7)**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Price	0	0	2	4	7	21	12	5.8	1.067
Bottle design	1	0	4	8	11	9	13	5.3	1.461
Label quality	0	0	3	9	12	10	12	5.4	1.257
Product name	1	2	5	11	7	13	7	4.9	1.532
Other people referrals	0	2	5	6	11	17	5	5.1	1.337
Total	**2**	**4**	**19**	**38**	**48**	**70**	**49**		

Table 7

Source: Microsoft excel

In order to analysis this data we need to evaluate all the figures mentioned above. The easiest way to comparatively compare Johnnie Walkers information above with the brands of Carling Label is to analyse the means and then compare them. The strongest indicator of quality mentioned above is Johnnie Walkers price. Price has a mean of 5.8 representing that the respondents really identified with Johnnie Walkers pricing strategy in relation to perception of quality.

Surprisingly the next highest perception of quality for the respondents was Label quality closely followed by bottle design. These two variables are very similar and thus very dependent on each other, these figures show that design and quality of the label is reinforcing the consumer's perception of quality. What is interesting to note is that other people's referrals and the product name resulted in the lowest perception of quality, with means of 5.1 and 4.9 respectively. It's interesting because when analysing Carling Blue & Black Label further on, these indicators were the most prevalent.

All of the indicators in table 6 are higher than the neutrality point of 3.5. This means that this brand has strong brand equity and subsequently consumer's perceptions of this brand will be perceived very favourably and to be of greater quality than their competitors. The above table supports this statement and also forms a great benchmark with which to compare other brands to.

4.4.1 Is there a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality?

The final quantitative statistic is to analyse whether there is a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality. This is determined through the correlation coefficient which is calculated on Microsoft excel using the correlation statistic. Rumsey (2016) noted that the correlation coefficient (r) measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables on a scatter plot and that the value of r is always between +1 and –1.

The correlation coefficient between brand familiarity and perception of quality in Johnnie Walker was 0.355, it's important to note that a perfect positive correlation is a value of 1. This means that there is a moderate correlation between brand familiarity and perception of quality in consumers. The reason there is only a moderate correlation may be down to the fact that consumers are very much aware/familiar of the product through various advertising and marketing efforts made by Johnnie Walker.

Thus any efforts towards increasing brand familiarity might not have such a great influence on consumer's perception of quality of the product as they are already well aware/familiar with Johnnie Walker's products.

Finally we further looked at whether brand familiarity influences how a consumer perceives Johnnie Walker Blue Label, through regression analysis to establish causality. This was done by performing the following regression analysis and can be seen below in table 7.

The output had an R squared of 12.57%. Overall the model was significant with a value of 0.015. Brand familiarity was significant with a p-value of 0.015 which is below the suggestion level of 0.05 (Ilvento, 2013). Thus, changes in the predictor's value are related to changes in the response variable. This indicated causality and that respondent's do in fact use brand familiarity to determine their perception of quality for Johnnie Walker Blue Label.

Hypothesis 1 tested if brand familiarity mediated the relationship of perception of quality. From these results we can reject the null hypothesis at a 5% level of significance and conclude that brand familiarity influences a consumer's perception of quality for Johnnie Walker Blue Label.

Johnnie Walker

SUMMARY OUTPUT		BRAND FAMILIARITY AND JW BLUE						
Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0,354504532							
R Square	0,125673463							
Adjusted R Square	0,105802405							
Standard Error	0,891229136							
Observations	46							
ANOVA								
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*			
Regression	1	5,023441519	5,023442	6,324448	0,015636952			
Residual	44	34,94873239	0,794289					
Total	45	39,97217391						
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*	*ower 95.0%*	*pper 95.0%*
Intercept	3,445070423	0,754312282	4,567167	3,97E-05	1,924853908	4,965287	1,924854	4,965287
Brand Familiarity	0,346478873	0,137773426	2,514845	0,015637	0,068814777	0,624143	0,068815	0,624143

Table 8

Source: Microsoft excel

4.4.2 Johnnie Walker Brand Familiarity treatment:

Johnnie walker perception of quality= 3.45 + 0.35*Brand Familiarity

The equation for the Johnnie Walker Brand Familiarity treatment indicated that the perception of quality is likely to be 3.45 stars if brand familiarity is kept constant (held at zero). Thus if brand familiarity increased by 1 unit this would increase a consumers perception of quality by 0.35 units.

4.5 Brand familiarity of Carling Blue Label

In question 8 we explained how the question would be broken up into 3 sub-questions in order to fully determine the extent of awareness and familiarity the consumer had towards the brand Johnnie Walker. Question 10 follows the exact same concept of question 8 except this time we ask the respondent about Carling Blue Label in order to determine his familiarity relating to this brand. The results can be seen below in table 9.

Carling Blue Label

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
10.0.1 The brand is very (un)familiar to me	4.3	4	6	1.853
10.0.2 I am (not) knowledgeable about the brand	4	4	5	1.732
10.0.3 I have (never) seen any adverts about this brand	3.9	4	5	1.848
Correlation coefficient between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality				**(r) = 0.708**

Table 9

Source: Microsoft excel

The results indicated in table 8 are substantially lower than those seen in table 6. The reason for this may be that Carling Blue Label was only introduced into the market in October 2014 and has thus not built up as much brand awareness as the world renowned Johnnie Walker brand. The average for question 10.0.1 is 4.3, if we compare this to the average in question 8.0.1 of 5.7, then we can conclude that the respondents were far more familiar with Johnnie Walker than Carling Label. The same can be seen for the averages calculated from the question 10.0.2 (mean of 4) compared with question 8.0.2 (mean of 5) and with question 10.0.3 (mean of 3.9) compared to question 8.0.3 (mean of 3.9). These results confirm that Johnnie Walker has more brand awareness and familiarity than Carling Blue Label.

4.6 Brand equity scale of Carling Blue Label

Question 11 captured consumer’s perceptions of quality in response to the extrinsic cues of Carling Blue Label and can be seen below in table 10. The extrinsic cue price resulted in a mean of 4 and a standard deviation of 1.468. The highest extrinsic cue in terms of perception of quality was, other people’s referrals with a mean of 4.8 and a standard deviation of 1.435.

The other extrinsic cues were; bottle design with a mean of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 1.46, label quality with a mean of 4.4 and a standard deviation of 1.44 and finally product name with a mean of 4.3 and a standard deviation of 1.661.

In order to analyse these results we need to compare them to the results captured from question 9 (Johnnie Walker's extrinsic cues) and seen in table 7. The averages calculated from the respondents perception of Johnnie Walker is greater than those calculated for Carling Blue Label. This is to be expected though as the familiarity of Johnnie Walker is far greater than that of Carling Blue Label. Carling Blue Label however was still perceived to be a quality product with the data captured for other peoples referrals for beer (4.8) and Carling Blue Labels name (4.3) turning out to be very similar to that found for other people's referrals for whiskey (5.1) and Johnnie Walker's product name (4.9). Surprisingly after other people's referrals, label quality (4.4) was the next highest extrinsic cue.

Carling Blue Label

Extrinsic cues	Strongly disagree (1)	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree (7)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Price	3	5	6	14	11	6	1	4	1.468
Bottle design	3	4	5	13	15	4	2	4.2	1.46
Label quality	3	1	4	16	12	7	3	4.4	1.44
Product name	4	3	5	12	9	10	3	4.3	1.661
Other people referrals	3	1	1	10	14	15	2	4.8	1.435
Total	**16**	**14**	**20**	**65**	**61**	**42**			

Table 10

Source: Microsoft excel

What is interesting to note though is that the correlation coefficient between brand familiarity and perception of quality in the responses for Carling Blue Label was in fact higher than that of the same response elicited for Johnnie Walker. The correlation coefficient (r) for Johnnie Walker was 0.355 whilst it was 0.708 for Blue Label. The reason for this may be because the respondents are not yet as aware/familiar with the relatively new product released by Carling.

This meant that any efforts to increase Carling Blue Label's brand familiarity will have a greater impact, than seen for Johnnie Walker Blue Label, on consumer's perception of quality of the product.

4.6.1 Is there a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality?

Finally we further looked at whether brand familiarity influences how a consumer perceives Carling Blue Label, through regression analysis to establish causality. This was done by performing the following regression analysis and can be seen below in table 11.

Carling Blue Label

SUMMARY OUTPUT BRAND FAMILIARITY AND CARLING BLUE

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0,7075565
R Square	0,5006362
Adjusted R Square	0,489287
Standard Error	0,8639963
Observations	46

ANOVA

	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*
Regression	1	32,92923803	32,92924	44,11212	3,84E-08
Residual	44	32,84554458	0,74649		
Total	45	65,77478261			

	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*	*.ower 95.0%*	*Jpper 95.0%*
Intercept	2,2368455	0,34302382	6,520963	5,78E-08	1,545526447	2,9281646	1,5455264	2,9281646
Brand Familiarity Carl	0,5184997	0,078067369	6,641695	3,84E-08	0,361165231	0,6758341	0,3611652	0,6758341

Table 11

Source: Microsoft excel

The output had an R squared of 5%. Overall the model was significant with a value of 3.84E-08. Brand familiarity was significant with a p-value of 3.34E-08 which is way below the suggestion level of 0.05 (Ilvento, 2013). Thus, changes in the predictor's value are related to changes in the response variable. This indicated causality and that respondent's do use brand familiarity to determine their perception of quality for Carling Blue Label.

Hypothesis 2 tested if brand familiarity mediated the relationship of perception of quality. From these results we can reject the null hypothesis at a 5% level of significance and conclude that brand familiarity does indeed influence a consumer's perception of quality in reference to Carling Blue Label.

4.6.2 Carling Blue Label Brand Familiarity treatment:

Johnnie walker perception of quality= 2.23 + 0.52*Brand Familiarity

The equation for the Carling Blue Label Familiarity treatment indicated that the perception of quality is likely to be 2.23 stars if brand familiarity is kept constant (held at zero). Thus if brand familiarity increased by 1 unit this would increase a consumers perception of quality by 0.52 units.

4.7 Brand familiarity of Carling Black Label

The final questions 12 and 13 dealt with brand familiarity and the brand equity scale of Carling Black Label respectively. Question 12 is once again, as with questions 8 and 10, broken up into three sub-questions in order to measure the brand familiarity of Carling Black Label. The results can be seen below in table 12 below.

Carling Black Label

Question	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
12.0.1 The brand is very (un)familiar to me	5.6	6	7	1.651
12.0.2 I am (not) knowledgeable about the brand	5.2	6	7	1.791
12.0.3 I have (never) seen any adverts about this brand	5.4	6	7	1.771
Correlation coefficient between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality				**(r) = 0.281**

Table 12

Source: Microsoft excel

The results seen in table 12 shows that the respondents were very much aware and well acquainted with Carling Black Label unlike the results seen for Carling Blue Label. There was a mean of 5.6 and a standard deviation of 1.651 in terms of the respondent's familiarity in relation to Carling Black Label.

The other responses from the questionnaire resulted in means of 5.2 and 5.4 and standard deviations of 1.791 and 1.771 for their knowledge (question 12.0.2) and advertisement awareness (question 12.0.3) of Carling Black Label respectively.

In order to interpret these results, we need to compare the results seen in table 10 with those collected in tables 6 and 8. The results from table 10 are very similar with those seen in table 6 which was measuring the awareness of the brand Johnnie Walker.

The means are no more than 0.2 off for all three scales. This is to be expected though as Carling Black Label is considered to be the most popular beers in South Africa with the highest market share (Business Day, 2014). It also scored considerably higher than Carling Blue Label which is once again expected as Carling Blue Label is a relatively new product to the market and has not had enough time to reach familiarity levels seen by the other two products.

4.8 Brand equity scale of Carling Black Label

Question 13 uses the same scales mentioned in sections 4.4 and 4.6, and was used to measure consumers perceptions of quality in response to the extrinsic cues found in Carling Black Label. These responses were documented and converted into descriptive statistics displaying the frequency of response, the mean and the standard deviation. The results can be seen below in table 13.

The extrinsic cue price resulted in a perception response mean of 4.3 and a standard deviation of 1.393. Other people's referral, as with table 9, was the highest average perception response with a mean of 4.4 and a standard deviation of 1.665. Label quality also once again received one of the highest perception averages with a mean of 4 and a standard deviation of 1.549. Product name surprisingly recorded a mean of 3.8 and a standard deviation 1.537. Finally bottle design elicited a mean of 3.5 and a standard deviation of 1.394.

The extrinsic cue bottle design for Carling Black Label recorded the lowest mean across all three products and people were not enthusiastic about the bottle design at all. Carling Black Label has a brown bottle design whereas Carling Blue Label has a green bottle design. Bucker (2016) noted that a green bottle is seen as being superior through the eyes of the consumer and may account for this statistic.

What is important to note though is that the respondents perceived all of Carling Black Label's extrinsic cues to be inferior to those of Carling Blue Label bar the extrinsic cue of price. The differences between the means was also fairly substantial, with Carling Blue Label reflecting higher means for bottle design (4.2), label quality (4.4), product name (4.3) and other people's referrals.

Carling Black Label

Extrinsic cues	Strongly disagree (1)	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly agree (7)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Price	2	2	9	12	11	9	1	4.3	1.393
Bottle design	4	8	11	9	12	2	0	3.5	1.394
Label quality	4	2	9	16	5	8	2	4	1.549
Product name	5	5	6	18	5	6	1	3.8	1.537
Other people referrals	5	1	6	9	13	9	3	4.4	1.665
Total	**20**	**18**	**41**	**64**	**46**	**34**	**7**		

Table 13

Source: Microsoft excel

Using the descriptive statistics previously mentioned, the correlation coefficient was calculated to be 0.281. This means that it had a lower correlation than that seen in Carling Blue Label (r = 0.708) and that of Johnnie Walker (r = 0.355). As was the case with Johnnie Walker, the low correlation could be down to the fact that the brand is very well-known and thus consumers are far more aware/familiar with the product. Thus indicating that any efforts to increase Carling Black label's brand familiarity won't have such an impact on consumer's perception of quality, as was seen with Johnnie Walker Blue Label.

4.8.1 Is there a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality?

Finally we further looked at whether brand familiarity influences how a consumer perceives Carling Black Label, through regression analysis. This was done by performing the following regression analysis and can be seen below in table 13. The output had an R squared of 7.9%. Overall the model was significant with a value of 0.06. Brand familiarity was not significant with a p-value slightly above the suggestion level of 0.05. Thus, changes in the predictor's value are not related to changes in the response variable. Indicating that respondents do not use brand familiarity to determine their perception of quality for Carling Black Label.

Hypothesis 3 tested if brand familiarity mediated the relationship of perception of quality. From these results we accept the null hypothesis at a 5% level of significance and conclude that brand familiarity does not influences a consumer's perception of quality in reference to Carling Black Label.

Carling Black Label

SUMMARY OUTPUT			BRAND FAMILIARITY AND CARLING BLACK					
Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0,280982599							
R Square	0,078951221							
Adjusted R Square	0,058018294							
Standard Error	0,970088439							
Observations	46							
ANOVA								
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*			
Regression	1	3,54937228	3,54937228	3,771628	0,058547587			
Residual	44	41,40714946	0,941071579					
Total	45	44,95652174						
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*	*Lower 95.0%*	*Upper 95.0%*
Intercept	3,026689022	0,516879011	5,855701159	5,5E-07	1,984987824	4,0683902	1,9849878	4,0683902
Brand Familiarity Black Label	0,177726188	0,091513882	1,94206807	0,058548	-0,006707922	0,3621603	-0,006708	0,3621603

Table 14

Source: Microsoft excel

<u>4.8.2 Carling Black Label Brand Familiarity treatment:</u>

Carling Black Label perception of quality= 3.03 + 0.18*Brand Familiarity

The equation for the Carling Blue Label Familiarity treatment indicated that the perception of quality is likely to be 3.03 stars if brand familiarity is kept constant (held at zero). Thus if brand familiarity increased by 1 unit this would increase a consumers perception of quality by 0.18 units.

4.9 Relationship between Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label

Finally we looked at whether there is a relationship between Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label through a regression analysis. This was done by performing the following regression analysis and can be seen below in table 13. The output had an R squared of 10.6%. Overall the model was significant with a value of 0.027. The perception of quality for Johnnie Walker Blue Label was significant with a p-value well below the suggestion level of 0.05. Thus, changes in the predictor's value are related to changes in the response variable. This indicates how the perception of quality of Johnnie Walker Blue Label influences how consumers perceive Carling Blue Label.

Hypothesis 4 tested if consumer's perception of quality for Johnnie Walker Blue Label influences consumer's perception of quality for Carling Blue Label. From these results we reject the null hypothesis at a 5% level of significance and conclude that how people perceive Johnnie Walker Blue Label influences how they perceive Carling Blue Label.

SUMMARY OUTPUT		Test Between JW BLUE LABEL and CARLING BLUE LABEL						
Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0,3262522							
R Square	0,1064405							
Adjusted R Square	0,0861323							
Standard Error	1,1557532							
Observations	46							
ANOVA								
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*			
Regression	1	7,001101787	7,001102	5,241266	0,026912059			
Residual	44	58,77368082	1,335765					
Total	45	65,77478261						
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*	*Lower 95.0%*	*Upper 95.0%*
Intercept	2,1286199	0,986082497	2,158663	0,036372	0,14130122	4,115939	0,1413012	4,1159386
Brand equity JW	0,4185085	0,182804222	2,289381	0,026912	0,050090825	0,786926	0,0500908	0,7869262

Table 15

Source: Microsoft excel

4.10 Conclusion

All of the responses gathered from the questionnaire were compiled into tables and then analysed according to what they measured. Johnnie Walker had the highest brand awareness amongst the respondents whilst the respondents also perceived Carling Blue Label to be greater than that of Carling Black Label. The next section will further discuss these results before offering any recommendations based upon these same results. Finally the study will state the limitations and any recommendations for any further research relating to the study.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Brand familiarity's role in influencing perception of quality

Tam (2008) defined brand familiarity as the number of product related experiences received by a consumer. One of the key differentiating factors among the brand is brand familiarity as it plays a crucial role in the formation of purchasing decisions of consumers (Navarro & Sicilla, 2012).

The other key differentiating factor is Brand equity. Brand equity is defined by Kamakura and Russell (1991) as the differential effect of brand knowledge on individual's response to marketing activity of a brand and is conceptualised when a consumer is familiar with a brand.

This makes brand familiarity and brand equity advantageous for businesses as these brands have huge communication advantages relative to unpopular/unfamiliar brands or brands that have weak brand equity (Lee & Laboo, 2004). Additionally familiar brands are viewed as more favourable by consumers due to the fact that these brands need less effort to be identified and recognized (Lee & Laboo, 2004). Thus familiar brands have affective and cognitive advantages.

This research study therefore conducted a regression analysis in order to determine whether there is a relationship between brand familiarity and consumers perception of quality. The brands analysed were Johnnie Walker Blue Label, Carling Blue Label and Carling Black Label.

5.1.1 Johnnie Walker Blue Label

In summary, Johnnie Walker Blue Label had very strong brand awareness and the respondents were very familiar with the brand. The results also showed that almost all of the respondents answered that they were either slightly familiar, familiar or very familiar with Johnnie Walker. This was expected though as Johnnie Walker is a substantially large organisation with great brand equity built through their innovative marketing campaigns and their overall marketing efforts i.e. logo and slogan (keep walking). Another interesting finding was that having strong brand awareness did not mean that consumers will necessarily be knowledgeable about said brand. This was because a small percentage of the respondents off our questionnaire claimed to have no knowledge of said brand, yet previously every respondent indicated that they were at least slightly familiar with said brand, Johnnie Walker Blue Label.

When we analysed brand familiarity effects on perception of quality for Johnnie Walker Blue Label, the following results were concluded. The relationship between brand familiarity and perception of quality of Johnnie Walker was found significant, thus rejecting the null hypothesis (Hypothesis 1).

With a coefficient of 0.355, this meant that there was a moderate correlation between brand familiarity and perception of quality in consumers for Johnnie Walker Blue Label. The reason for this may be down to the fact that consumers are already aware/familiar with the product through various advertising and marketing efforts made by Johnnie Walker. Hence why any increase in brand familiarity only slightly influences a consumer's perception of quality for Johnnie Walker Blue Label. Thus, brand familiarity is not such an important factor, to take into account, when developing strategic marketing plans for the product.

5.1.2 Carling Blue Label

The results of the brand familiarity test for Carling Blue Label were substantially lower than those seen for Johnnie Walker Blue Label. This was concluded that this may be due to the fact that Carling Blue Label was only introduced into the market in October 2014 and has thus not built up as much brand awareness as the world renowned Johnnie Walker brand. These results also further confirmed that Johnnie Walker Blue Label has more brand awareness and familiarity than Carling Blue Label.

The statistics calculated between brand familiarity and perception of quality in the responses for Carling Blue Label was in fact higher than that of the same response elicited for Johnnie Walker Blue Label. The relationship between brand familiarity and perception of quality of Carling Blue Label was found significant, rejecting the null hypothesis (Hypothesis 2). However the coefficient was 0.74, indicating that brand familiarity is an important factor in increasing consumer's perceptions of Carling Blue Label, and should be taken into account when developing strategic plans for the product. The reason for this may be down to the fact that respondents were not yet as familiar with the product as it had only been released by Carling in October 2014. This meant that any efforts to increase Carling Blue Label's brand familiarity will have a greater impact on a consumer's perception of quality, than that seen for Johnnie Walker Blue Label.

5.1.3 Carling Black Label

The results taken from the analysis of Carling Black Label showed that the respondents were very much aware and well acquainted with Carling Black Label unlike the results preciously seen for Carling Blue Label. The correlation coefficient was very similar with that seen for Johnnie Walker Blue Label. This can be expected as Carling Black Label is considered to be the most popular beers in South Africa with the highest market share (Business Day, 2014).

Looking at the regression statistics, on the relationship between brand familiarity and perception of quality for Carling Black Label, the relationship was found not significant. This highlighting that brand familiarity does not influence a consumer's perception of quality of the product.

Thus, brand familiarity is not an important factor for marketers to take into account when wanting to influence consumer's perceptions. Marketers should thus consider and test other factors (extrinsic cues) to determine best marketing strategies for Carling Black Label.

5.2 Relationship between Jonnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label.

The dimensions of brand equity are essential in driving brand choice amongst consumers, and therefore businesses will do whatever it takes to control these dimensions in a way that can positively influence brand choice. One such technique is through the use of subliminal stimuli. Subliminal perception suggests that people's thoughts, feelings, and actions are influenced by stimuli that are perceived without any awareness of creating them (Merikle, 2000).

This study tested if Carling Blue Label's association with Johnnie Walker Blue Label (Label name being Blue Label) unconsciously influences consumers perception of quality for Carling Blue Label. Looking at the regression output that tested the relationship between Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label, we found this relationship to be significant thus rejecting the null hypothesis (Hypothesis 4). Thus indicating how consumers perceive Johnnie Walker Blue Label will influence how people perceive Carling Blue Label.

What's interesting to note is that the respondents ranked the extrinsic cue brand label, of high importance in the formulation of their quality perceptions for both Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label. This indicates that the similarities found in brand label was the method in which Carling Blue Label unconsciously influenced their consumers perception of quality for the product.

In conclusion when marketers are preparing a brand extension they should carefully evaluate a product's extrinsic cues as these cues are what are used in the formulation of consumer's perceptions. The results of the study showed how manipulating extrinsic cues to exhibit successful associations can in fact be beneficial for the brand/product. As they positively influence how a consumer rates the quality of the product, especially in environments where the intrinsic nature of the product cannot be tested. This was the case for Carling Blue Label when using a label name that was very similar to that of Johnnie walker blue label. Furthermore marketers should place more of a strategic focus on efforts to increase a brands familiarity when a product is relativity new as this influences a consumer's perception of the product. That being said when a product/brand is well known marketing efforts should be placed elsewhere, as brand familiarity has a smaller effect in influencing a consumer's perception.

5.3 Limitations and Delimitations of Research Study.

The potential limitations of this study pertain to the fatiguing nature of the chosen experiment (Dunphy & Lockshin, 1998). Respondents were required to evaluate three brands in terms of the brand familiarity and brand equity of said brand. The large number of similar responses required and the repetitive nature of the questionnaire may have resulted in respondents experiencing fatigue or could get careless during the experiment. This fatigue is likely to affect the ratings given by respondents, which may inflate or reduce the variation between the different brand assessments. This variation may be incorrectly solely attributed to the effects of brand familiarity.

In addition to this, the results of this study were susceptible to the influence of the effect of order. That is, the order in which the brands were presented may have impacted the assessment of the brands by the respondents (Krosnick & Alwin, 1987). The impact of order effects are likely to be exacerbated by the fatigue experienced by respondents. In order to mitigate the potential influence of order effects, future research should present the brands in varying sequences for every ten respondents.

The two biggest limitations that affected the researcher and the final research study were time and budget constraints. These two limitations were time and budget constraints. It should be noted that these two limitations are likely to appear in most research studies outside of those with extensive private funding (i.e. University funded). With these constraints in mind, this research study was limited to only 50 respondents whom filled out the questionnaire. This study would have been more scientifically accurate if a larger sample size from the population was selected.

Budget restrictions also limited the scope of the research. In order to keep costs down, only the geographical location of Cape Town was used in order to select the sample. If the researcher had a larger budget, the sample may have been selected from other geographical locations in order to test whether the geographical location changes the output of results.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

If future research should be conducted then the researcher should target a wider range of respondents and offer questionnaires that vary from respondent to respondent as valuable and accurate information will emerge which will lead to further insights. Careful considerations should be placed on time constraints as any lack of awareness may result in a flawed or 'rushed' end result compiled by the researcher.

It should be noted that a good idea would be if the researcher divided the participants up by their occupations allowing the researcher the opportunity to compile a more detailed respondent profile. It is also advised that the researcher could have integrated a qualitative approach, such as the use of mixed methods, in order to better analyse the results. It would also offer the researcher a different viewpoint and will help strengthening the validity and reliability of the research. These types of interactions will provide the researcher with a deeper understanding and therefore greater insights of the respondent's behaviour which might just be missed in a purely quantitative research analysis.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Aaker, D.A. (1991), Managing brand equity; capitalizing on the value of a brand name. Available at: www.eurib.org. The Free Press, New York, N.Y. (Accessed: 2016).

Aaker, D. A. 1996. Measuring Brand Equity across products and markets. *California Management Review*, 38(3):102-122.

Allison, R. & Uhl, K. 1964. Brand identification and perception. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 1:80-85.

Ariely, D. & Norton, M. 2009. Conceptual consumption. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60:475-499.

Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. 1986. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6):1173.

Botha, E. 2014. Annexure I: Questionnaire design checklist [lecture notes]. School of Management Studies, University of Cape Town.

Brucks, M. Zeithaml, V.A. & Naylor, G. 2000. Price and brand name as indicators of quality dimensions for consumer durables. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(3):359–374.

Bruner, G. C. 2013. *Marketing scales Handbook: Multi-Item Measures for Consumer Insight Research*. Volume 7. Fortworth, Texas: GCBII Productions.

Chartrand, T. L., Huber, J., Shiv, B. & Tanner, R. J. 2008. Nonconcious goals and consumer choice. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35*(2):189-201.

Chocarro, R., Cortinas, M. & Elorz, M. 2009. The impact of product category knowledge on consumer use of extrinsic cues – A study involving agrifood products. *Food Quality and Preference*, 20(3):176–186.

Delgado-Ballester, E. Navarro, A. & Sicilia, M. 2012. Revitalising brands through communication messages: the role of brand familiarity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(1/2):31-51.

Dodds, W. (2002) *The Effects of Perceived and Objective Market Cues on Consumers' Product Evaluations.* Available at: http://marketing-bulletin.massey.ac.nz/V13/MB_V13_A2_Dodds.pdf (Accessed: 2016).

Feinberg, C. (2014) *The placebo phenomenon*. Available at: http://harvardmagazine.com/2013/01/the-placebo-phenomenon (Accessed: April 2016).

Fiszman, B. (2012, December). *More than meets the mouth: Assessing the impact of the extrinsic factors on the multi sensory perception of food products*. Retrieved 2016, from Universitat Politecnica De Valencia, https://riunet.upv.es/

Hasan, K., & Khan, R. (2011, March). *Building international brand through promotional Strategy: A case study of MEC: Active Engagement in Bangladesh*. Retrieved 2016, Available at: http://www.diva-portal.org/ (Accessed: 2016)

Ilvento, T. (2013). *Multiple Regression Analysis*. Retrieved, 2016, from University of Delaware, Available at: http://www1.udel.edu/FREC/ilvento/BUAD820/MOD504.pdf

Kamakura, W.A. &Russell, G.J. (1991), *Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Brand Quality with Scanner Data: Implications for Brand Equity, 3rd ed.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Keller, K. L. 1993. Conceptualising, Measuring and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity. *Journal of Marketing,* 57(1):1-22.

Kerr, W. C.Greenfield, T. K., Tujague, J. & Brown, E. 2005. A Drink Is A Drink? Variation in the Amount of Alcohol Contained in Beer, Wine and Spirits Drinks in a US Methodological Sample. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research,* 29 (11): 2015-2021.

Kirsh, I. 2004. Conditioning, expectancy and the placebo effect: comment on Stewart-Williams and Podd. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130:341-344.

Krosnick, J.A. & Alwin, D.F. 1987. An Evaluation of a Cognitive Theory of Responde-Order Effects in Survey Measurement. *The Public Opinion Quarterly,* 51(2):201-219.

Lassar, W. Mittal, B. & Sharma, A. 1995. Measuring customer-based brand equity. *Journal of consumer marketing, 12*(4):11-19.

Labroo, A.A. & Lee, A.Y. 2006. Between two brands: a goal fluency account of brand evaluation. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43(3):374-85.

Martz, E. (2015, December 3). *What can you say when your p-value is greater than 0.05*? Retrieved 2016, from The Minitab Blog, http://blog.minitab.com/blog/understanding-statistics/what-can-you-say-when-your-p-value-is-greater-than-005

Priiliad, D. 2007. The Placebo of place: Terroir effects in the blind and sighted quality assessments of South African varietal wines. *Journal of Wine Research*, 18(2):87-105.

Priilaid, D., Feinberg, J., Carter, O. & Ross, G. 2009. Follow the leader : how expert ratings mediate consumer assessments of hedonic quality. *South African Journal of Business Management, 40*(4):51-58.

Priilaid, D. Barendse, J. Kato-Kalule, C. & Mubangizi, A. 2013. Flies in Amber: Capturing Brand Equity Effects in South African Rose Wines. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 4(3):15-23.

Priilaid, D. & van Rensburg, P. 2010. Symbolic and functional brand effects in the hedonic assessment of South African wines. *South African Journal of Business Management,* 41(3):47-69.

Trochim, W. (2006). *Types of questions*. Retrieved 2016, from Social Research Methods, http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/questype.php

Novemsky, N. Dhar, R. Schwarz, N. & Simonson, I. 2007. Preference fluency on choice. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43:347-56.

Venkattaman, V., Clithero, J., Fitzsimons, G., & Huettel, S. 2012. New scanner data for brand marketers: how neuroscience can help better understand differences in brand preferences. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22:143-153.

Vocino, A.& Oppewal, H. 2009. What's in a name : using a cue diagnosticity framework to understand consumer product search behaviour. *Sustainable management and marketing*, 1-9

Waber, R., Shiv, B., Carmon, Z. & Ariely, D. 2008. Commercial features of placebo and therapeutic efficiency. *Journal of American Medical Association*, 299:1016-1017

ANNEXES

Questionnaire No.	

Dear respondent

I am a student at Vega currently doing my honours and am conducting research on brand associations for my research course (RESM8419). The questionnaire will only take about 5-10 minutes to complete and will be completed in sections. The questionnaire will be used to gather information regarding how consumers form brand associations based on assessments of alcohol beverages across categories of age, gender and expertise. My research advisor has approved this confidential questionnaire. Taking part in, and completing this questionnaire gives your consent for the use of your answers in an aggregate form in the research study. This questionnaire is voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any point with no consequences.
Please feel free to contact Reece Chapman (chapmanra91@gmail.com) or my supervisor Samuel Enow (enowtabot@gmail.com) if there are any questions or to clarify information.
Thank you for your assistance. (Please circle your chosen response)

1. Are you above the age of 18?

Yes
No

2. Do you consume alcohol?

Yes
No

3. Have you consumed and/or heard of either Carling Lager or Johnnie Walker?

Yes
No

*If you answered No to any of the above questions, please discontinue the questionnaire process otherwise continue to the next question (question 4).

4. With respect to your alcohol knowledge, would you consider yourself a novice, intermediate or expert?

	Novice
	Intermediate
	Expert

5. How often do you consume alcohol per week?

	Less than once a week
	At least once a week
	Twice a week
	Three times a week
	Four times a week

	Five times a week
	Six times a week
	Every day
	More than once a day

6. What you generally prefer to drink?

	Beer
	White Spirits
	Brown Spirits
	Spirits
	Flavored Alcoholic Beverages

7. How much do you typically spend on alcohol?

	Less than R100
	Between R100 and R200
	More than R200

8. How well do you know the brand Johnnie Walker?

8.0.1	The brand is very unfamiliar to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	The brand is very familiar to me
8.0.2	I'm not at all knowledgeable about this brand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I'm very knowledgeable about this brand
8.0.3	I have never seen advertisements about this brand in the mass media	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I have seen many advertisements about this brand in the mass media

9. Do you disagree or agree with the following statements about Johnnie Walker Blue Label?

The price of Johnnie Walker Blue Label is an indication of the quality of the product:									
9.0.1	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Johnnie Walker Blue Label has an elegant design and an attractive bottle and label, which influences the products excellence:									
9.0.2	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Johnnie Walker Blue Label has a good quality label and bottle:									
9.0.3	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
The product name (Blue Label), is a representation of the quality of the product:									
9.0.4	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Other people's referrals (friends or colleagues) are a good guide to telling if Johnnie Walker Blue Label is an excellent whiskey.									
9.0.5	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

10. How well do you know Carling Blue Label beer?

10.0.1	The brand is very unfamiliar to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	The brand is very familiar to me
10.0.2	I'm not at all knowledgeable about this brand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I'm very knowledgeable about this brand
10.0.3	I have never seen advertisements about this brand in the mass media	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I have seen many advertisements about this brand in the mass media

11. Do you disagree or agree with the following statements about Carling Blue Label?

The price of Carling Blue Label is an indication of the quality of the product:									
11.0.1	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Carling Blue Label has an elegant design and an attractive bottle and label, which influences the beer's excellence:									
11.0.2	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Carling Blue Label has a good quality label and bottle:									
11.0.3	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
The product name (Blue Label), is a representation of the quality of the beer:									
11.0.4	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Other people's referrals (friends or colleagues) are a good guide to telling if Carling Blue Label is an excellent beer.									
11.0.5	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

12. How well do you know the brand Carling Black Label?

12.0.1	The brand is very unfamiliar to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	The brand is very familiar to me
12.0.2	I'm not at all knowledgeable about this brand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I'm very knowledgeable about this brand
12.0.3	I have never seen advertisements about this brand in the mass media	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I have seen many advertisements about this brand in the mass media

13. Do you disagree or agree with the following statements about Carling Black Label?

The price of Carling Black Label is an indication of the quality of the product:									
13.0.1	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Carling Black Label has an elegant design and an attractive bottle and label, which influences the beer's excellence:									
13.0.2	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Carling Black Label has a good quality label and bottle:									

13.0.3	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
The product name (Black Label), is a representation of the quality of the beer:									
13.0.4	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree
Other people's referrals (friends or colleagues) are a good guide to telling if Carling Black Label is an excellent beer.									
13.0.5	Strongly disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly agree

14. What is your age? (Please fill in below)

15. What is your gender? (Please circle the correct option)

Male	Female

END

Thank you for your co-operation.

ETHICAL CLEARANCE CONSENT FORM

No research may be carried out by any student or staff member; or independent contractor or person associated with The Independent Institute of Education (The IIE) that will be associated with The Independent Institute of Education; or that involves in any way, The Independent Institute of Education; without formal ethical clearance to conduct the research having been obtained.

The process is similar for students registered on IIE qualifications or for researchers wishing to conduct research on, or at The IIE.

In order to get consent to do research associated with or on or at The IIE the following need to be submitted to the R&D Manager via the appropriate academic (normally your supervisor for internal students) or the designated academic manager at your brand if you are associated with a site and not a registered student of The IIE or the Academic Manager if you are employed in the Central Academic Team (CAT).

Please submit the following:

	Please tick
Proposal — select one:	
IIE and other registered students: Proposal as approved by supervisor with a declaration in relation to the status of the proposal at your institution where you are a student, if you are a student.	**yes**
Research by internal people who are not students: Proposal as approved by your designated academic manager or the CAT Academic Manager if you are not a student but are directly associated with The IIE.	
External researchers who are not students: Formal research proposal plus full details of the sponsoring body.	
Ethical clearance application form: Please check that all sections are complete and that the form has been signed by the person who will supervise your research and by the designated academic manager where required. If you are a student andyou are working or you are otherwise associated with The IIE and its campuses; your form needs to be signed by both the designated manager and your institutional supervisor. If you are an external researcher the form also needs to be signed by a senior manager at the sponsoring organisation.	
Participant consent form: Example ofparticipant consent form (where applicable). The original signed forms have to be provided to the supervisor after permission is granted.	

1. Identifying information

Name:	**Reece**
Surname:	**Chapman**
Student number:	**13008924**
Institution where registered:	**Vega, Cape Town**
Qualification:	**Bcom Honors, Strategic Brand Man.**
Year in which you would like to conduct research:	**2016**
Year in which you aim to graduate:	**2016**
Contact Number:	**0761890968**
E-Mail Address:	**13008924@vegaconnect.co.za**

2. Supervisor's Name and Contact Details

Name and surname and designation:	Richard Drummond (supervisor)
Contact telephone number:	
Contact e-mail address:	rdrummond@kingsley.co.za
Signature confirming that this form is being submitted with Supervisor's consent and signifying that the information submitted is accurate:	yes
Date of signature:	April 2016

3. Designated academic manager's details (if applicable)

Name and surname and designation:	
Contact telephone number:	
Contact e-mail address:	
Signature confirming that this form is being submitted with Academic Manager's consent and signifying that the information submitted is accurate:	
Date of signature:	

4. Designated manager of sponsoring organisation (if applicable)

Name and surname and designation:	
Contact telephone number:	
Contact e-mail address:	
Signature confirming that this form is being submitted with Manager's consent and signifying that the information submitted is accurate:	
Date of signature:	

5. Title of Research

Determining if brand familiarity can influence consumer's perceptions of quality through the use of extrinsic cues, with reference to the brands of Johnnie Walker and Carling Label.

6. Proposal:

If this information is contained in your attached research proposal please reference the page;if not please provide full detail.

6.1 **Abstract – no more than 250 words**

In today's economic climate, competition is rife and brands are constantly looking for effective methods to establish themselves as a strong competitor in a saturated market place. Therefore strategically influencing customer behaviour to generate demand is any firm's top priority in an attempt to sustain competitive advantage. Creating and expanding this demand is done through the influencing of a customer's brand choice through extrinsic placebo like cues (Priilaid, 2006). This means, that consumer's beliefs and expectations relating to the ability of product to perform, triggers a placebo effect impacting on the consequent value of the product (Shiv, Carmon & Ariely, 2005). To demonstrate the effects of subliminal stimuli on brand equity this study looks at the recent launch of Carling Blue Label. The campaign seemed to guide consumers into believing that this was a better product yet, upon closer inspection the only differentiator was that it was a single malt beer and it was in a green bottle rather than the traditional dark brown bottle. Many consumers felt at ease with this new product and felt that this was a superior product due to the similar brand associations (blue promoting excellence and quality) as the ever popular Johnnie Walker range. Results from this research report and the forthcoming conclusions can hopefully assist and guide marketers in applying their own brand stimuli in order to launch successful manipulate extrinsic cues in a lawful manner so to launch thriving product extensions and sustain competitive advantage. This research study therefore answered that there is a strategic manipulation of extrinsic cues, associated with other familiar brands and these can affect a brand's equity, with particular reference to the Launch of Carling Blue Label. There was a relationship discovered between Johnnie Walker and Carling Blue Label.

6.2 Research Aims/Goals/Objectives

This led to the formation of the following research question which forms as the basis of this study.

How does the strategic manipulation of extrinsic cues, to associate with other familiar brands, affect a brand's equity, with particular reference to the Launch of Carling Blue Label?

In light of the above research question, the following objectives were formulated:

- To determine if brand familiarity mediates consumer's perceptions of quality for the brand, Johnnie Walker Blue Label
- To determine if brand familiarity effects consumer's perceptions of quality for the brand, Carling Blue Label
- To determine if brand familiarity effects consumer's perceptions of quality for the brand, Carling Black Label
- To determine if there is an association between consumers perception of Johnnie Walker Blue Label and Carling Blue Label

6.3 Methodology

The research conducted for this study followed a conclusive research design with causal research (Malhorta, 2010). This is justified as the purpose of this study was to measure consumers perception of quality (dependent variable) on brand familiarity (independent variables), to infer whether a causal relationship existed between these two variables (Malhorta, 2010).

The research method employed in this study is a questionnaire and it is quantitative data collection method. This is because in general quantitative data collection methods tend to rely on random sampling, since one of the aims of quantitative research is to generalise results to a broader population. This study is about investigating consumer's perceptions in terms of brand associations and how companies use this to formulate successful brand equity. We also wish to compile the data collected through quantitative means and test this against hypotheses derived from previously stated theories. Therefore the purpose of this quantitative research is to find casual (cause and effect) relationships or correlations that can be generalised.

6.4 **Ethical considerations**

In order to conclude the study, time needs to be taken to consider that all potential problems that could come up during the study have been resolved. One of these potential problems is known as ethical considerations. Ethical considerations involve dealing with the various stakeholders involved in the research process. If the study was done ethically and correctly then the researcher would've acted in a professional manner with integrity and he would have adhered to the ethical principles and professional standards that are essential for practising research. Even in the face of danger or adversity the researcher is required to treat the respondents or test subjects in a respectful and trustworthy manner. It is important to note that in this situation a stakeholder is anyone who has a vested interest

6.5 **Research impact on people and or brand/IIE CAT(directly as participants or in terms of the use of their data or conducting research in their environment):**

If your research involves anything other than investigation of publicly available information or data or documents please detail this and the steps you are taking or will take to protect the rights of people involved. Please detail measures to avoid harm and to gain informed consent.

NA

7. **Particular elements of study:**

Please indicate which of these apply.	**Yes**	**No**
Literature survey of an environment with no interaction with participants. Use of artefacts for data collection.	yes	
Observation of an environment with no interaction with participants and no manipulation of the environment.		
Observation of an environment with no interaction with participants and with manipulation of the environment.		

Data is collected about individual participants but they are taken from existing available records (e.g.an existing report or student record).		
Data is collected about groups but they are taken from available records (e.g.an existing report) and will only be reported at the group level.		
General and/ or personal information required to be collected *de novo* from participants through interviews, surveys, questionnaires, observation, etc.	yes	
Collecting information from participants via an existing validated and approved test instruments (e.g. an approved psychometric test).	yes	
Collecting information from participants via an invalidated test instrument.	yes	

8. **Description of participants:**

Please detail the age, demographics and context of the participants. The IIE will not normally give consent for the involvement of persons who are under the age of 18 or who are vulnerable (physically, socially, mentally or psychologically) unless you are an experienced researcher with a proven track record of conducting research involving participants from these groups. You are thus encouraged to provide such evidence if your participants could be deemed to be vulnerable or under the age of 18.

In all instances informed consent would be required:

Anyone over the age of 18, who is of sound mental health and has given written consent.

9. Please describe the impact that your research may have on participantsand or the brand/IIE CAT – positive or negative and the measures you will have in place to reduce the risk of harm.

Positive impact. There is little to no chance of risk taking place to the individuals involved or the IIE.

10. **Only Masters and Doctoral students need to complete Section 10**
You will need to carry out a SABINET and NRF search to check that your topic has not been registered previously. You must confirm that such a search has been carried out by providing the following information.

I have conducted a SABINET and NRF Search

Yes	No

Date of search conducted:

Keywords used:

11. **Declaration on Ethical Conduct in Research**

I have read and understand therequirements laid out in the ethical clearance form as well as theCode of Ethics (see below) as extracted from The IIE Research Policy (IIE007)and commit to observe and uphold the principles of this Code in all aspects of the research work carried out in association with The IIE.

I confirm that all the information I have provided to enable The IIE to make a decision about my research is honest, complete and accurate and that I have not withheld any information that may adversely influence the decision.

I confirm that I will not hold The IIE liable for any action taken against me in relation to this research and its impacts and I take full legal and moral responsibility for the research and its impact.

Research Code of Ethics:

Researchers are required to:

- Familiarise themselves with ethics guidelines and observe such guidelines throughout their projects;
- Accept that they are ethically accountable for honesty, objectivity and integrity of carrying out and reporting on their research;
- Strive to conduct research of a high standard;
- Always clearly indicate the limitations of their work to provide perspective of the validity of their data and reports;
- Ensure that data is not falsified, misinterpreted, fabricating, misrepresented or changed;
- Ensure that data is collected in a manner that will not affect its validity and make known any aspects of their project that might have affected such validity of their data;
- Disclose their methodologies and processes in a transparent manner to uphold its integrity;
- Keep data safely and securely for a period of three years and produce this in support of other researchers' work or to confirm the authenticity of a project, in consideration of any agreement(s) with individuals who were part of the sample group;
- Recognise sources of information by accurately and appropriately referencing such sources and respecting the copyrights of all reference work and sources;
- Recognise fellow workers and co-workers who are part of the project;
- Be considerate and professional in dealing with individuals and sample groups, respecting their right to refuse to participate and the rights to their privacy;
- Accept responsibility to ensure that data with personal particulars of individuals and sample groups must be secured, in particular, when it is in digital format;
- Avoid placing the safety or security of participants at risk through any research that is conducted;

- Demonstrate commitment to sharing knowledge, disseminating the results of research work in an appropriate manner;
- Retain objectivity to prevent bias throughout any research project;
- Adhere to the conventions associated with publication which includes only submitting to one publisher at a time and always citing where papers have been used before.

RESEARCHER

Full name: ________Reece Chapman________________________

Identity number: _________9110025181080_______________________

Signature: ________________________________

Date: __________04/04/2016______________________

WITNESS

Full name: ___________Charmia Chapman______________________

Identity number: _______6202050033089_________________________

Signature: ________________________________

Date: ______04/04/2016__________________________

WITNESS

Full name: ________________________________

Identity number: ________________________________

Signature: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

Please note: You may not proceed with the research until you have written confirmation of approval of your study from the Postgraduate Committee of the IIE.

Research Report

Determining if brand familiarity can influence consumer's perceptions of quality through the use of extrinsic cues, with reference to the brands of Johnnie Walker and Carling Label.

Reece Chapman 13008924 Advisor:

Richard Drummond.

Samuel Enow.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: 1 Introduction Chapter 2: Literature Review Chapter 3: Method 3.1 Introduction 3.2 Research Method 3.3 Justification for using questionnaire 3.4 Population and Sample 3.5 Data Collection Process 3.6 Data Analysis 3.7 Reliability and Validity of the research 3.7.1 Reliability of the research instrument 3.7.2 Validity of the research instrument 3.8 Limitations of the questionnaire survey 3.9 Ethical Considerations 3.10 Chapter Summary Chapter 4: 1 Data Analysis and Findings Chapter 5: Conclusion Chapter 6: Presentation of arguments Bibliography:

Annexes:

Abstract This research report investigates whether brand familiarity can influence consumer's perception of quality by investigating the brands Johnnie of Walker and Carling Label and their respective extrinsic cues. Using quantitative analysis the report will then determine how familiar consumers are with these brands and whether this subsequently has an effect on their perception of specific brands equity. This report will then analysis these results and report the findings before making any recommendations.

RESM8419_2016_HSM1_VGCT1 - RESM8419_VGCT1

SafeAssign submission for Final Research Report

Reece Chapman on Sun, Oct 23 2016, 5:00 PM

2% highest match

Submission ID: c7cb06b5-03b9-44df-aa66-261c43a38613

safe assign submit 1 ...

Word Count: 12,114

Attachment ID: 139272589

2%

Citations (7/7)

1 Another student's paper
2 Another student's paper
3 Another student's paper
4 Another student's paper
5 Another student's paper
6 http://www.advertolog.co...
7 http://scaryideas.com/cont...

RESM8419_2016_HSM1_VGCT1 - RESM8419_VGCT1

SafeAssign submission for Final Research Report

Reece Chapman
on Sun, Oct 23 2016, 5:00 PM

2% highest match

Submission ID: c7cb06b5-03b9-44df-aa66-261c43a38613

Attachments (1)

safe assign submit 1 (research 4;58pm sun).docx 2%

Word Count: 12,114 Attachment ID: 139272589

safe assign submit 1 (research 4;58pm sun).docx

Research Report

Determining if brand familiarity can influence consumer's perceptions of quality through the use of extrinsic cues, with reference to the brands of Johnnie Walker and Carling Label.

Reece Chapman 13008924 Advisor:

Richard Drummond.

Samuel Enow.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: 1 INTRODUCTION CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW CHAPTER 3: Method 3.1 Introduction 3.2 Research Method 3.3 Justification for using questionnaire 3.4 Population and Sample 3.5 Data Collection Process 3.6 Data Analysis 3.7 Reliability and Validity of the research 3.7.1 Reliability of the research instrument 3.7.2 Validity of the research instrument 3.8 Limitations of the questionnaire survey 3.9 Ethical Considerations 3.10 Chapter Summary Chapter 4: 1 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS CHAPTER 5: Conclusion Chapter 6: Presentation of arguments Bibliography: