A STUDY ON RECOGNITION AND BRAND RECALL THROUGH LOGOS OF SELECTED FMCG BRANDS

Mr. Yuvaraj Vyas,

Assistant Professor,
S. V. Institute of Management,
SV Campus, Kadi, Mehsana, Gujarat, India.

Dr. Arvind C. Brahmbhatt,

Former Professor,
Nirma Institute of Management,
Nirma University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India.

ABSTRACT

The main aim of the study was to investigate impact of logo on recognition and brand recall. Six popular FMCG brands were selected for the study. Males and females aged 15-60 were surveyed. Two things were measured. Recognition scores of respective logos were recorded. It was also recorded whether a logo is reinforcing product category recall and brand recall or not. Both unaided and aided product and brand recall were studied. The main objectives of the study were; to study recognition and brand recall through logos of popular FMCG brands marketed in India, to identify recognition and recall rate of the selected brands and to study difference between product recall and brand recall.

Keywords: Brand Awareness, Brand Elements, Recognition and Recall

INTRODUCTION:
BRAND AWARENESS:

Yoo, Donthu, & Lee (2000) mentioned that Brand loyalty, Perceived Quality, and Brand Awareness/Associations are positively related to brand equity. Customer-based brand equity occurs when the customer has a high level of awareness with the brand and holds strong, favourable, and unique brand associations in memory (Keller, 2003).

Brand awareness is the ability of a potential buyer to recognize or recall that a brand is a member of a certain product category and it is a link between product class and brand involved (Aaker, 1991). Brand awareness involves linking the brand to different associations in memory (Keller, 2003). Consumers must first be aware of a brand to later have a set of brand associations (Aaker, 1991). Brand awareness is the first step to creating brand equity and it refers to whether consumers can recall or recognize a brand and is related to the strength of a brand's presence in consumers' minds (Aaker, 1996). Also, brand awareness positively impacts perceived quality and brand associations (Buil, 2013).

BRAND ELEMENTS:

It has been said that there is a greater chance a brand will be recognised by more people if it utilizes distinctive recognition cues (Olson, 2004). The customer-based brand equity model suggests that marketers should choose brand elements to enhance brand awareness (Keller, Parameswaran, & Jacob, 2011).

Verma (2004) defines brands elements as a brand's figurative aspects like packaging, colours, logos, emblems, designs etc. Gaillard, et al. (2006) included - Brand Name, Logos, Colour, Graphics, Taglines, Typeface, Packaging, Celebrities, Music as in distinctive cues or brand elements. VanAuken (2007) writes, "When most people think about brand identity they usually think about the name, the logo, and may be the tagline. But the identity consists of so much more than that. It includes typestyles, colours, symbols, attitude and personality, brand voice and visual style, sounds and other mnemonic devices, characters etc.." The main ones are brand names, URLs, logos, symbols, characters, spokespeople, slogans, jingles, packages and signage (Keller, Parameswaran, & Jacob, 2011).

RECOGNITION AND RECALL:

Keller (1993) suggests that brand equity arises from two major elements, awareness and associations. Awareness (Recall and Recognition) rests essentially on consumers' ability to retrieve the target brand with or without associated cues. The shopper's likelihood of picking up and purchasing a product depends on, in part, on his or her ability to identify the brand (Lawrence L. Garber, Bukre, & Jones, 2000). Keller, (2003) notes, "At one extreme are brands that are unknown to most buyers in the marketplace. Then, there are brands about which buyers have a degree of awareness in the form of recall and recognition."

Brand recognition is consumers' ability to confirm prior exposure to the brand when given the brand as a cue and brand recall is consumers' ability to retrieve the brand from memory when given a cue (Keller, Parameswaran, & Jacob, 2011).

LITERATURE REVIEW:

When products and services are difficult to differentiate, a symbol can be the central element of brand equity, the key differentiating characteristic of a brand (Aaker, 1991). Logos can be a valuable way to identify a product because of their picture-like form and they tend to be often easily recognized as a result (Keller, 2003). It is believed that logo awareness occurs on two levels; a consumer remembers seeing the logo (recognition) and secondly, the logo reminds consumers of the brand or company name (recall) (Henderson and Cote, 1998). Recognition depends primarily on design, "given equal exposures, a more memorable design will be recognized more easily than a less recognizable one" (Henderson and Cote, 1998 p. 15).

Fischer et al. (1991) found a significant relationship between the age of the children and their recognition of brands through logos. Research has found that age is positively related to the overall recall and recognition of brand symbols (Henke, 1995; Roedder-John, 1999; Ross and Harredine, 2004). Ross and Harredine (2004) measured children's (four to 11 years of age) recognition and recall of sportswear brand logos. Valkenburg and Buijzen (2005) attempted to understand brand awareness in children through their study of 196 parents and their 2-8-year-old children in The Netherlands. The older children (eight years old) had almost perfect recognition of the 12 logos, but their recall rate was less than 50 percent. Mahajan (2006) studied, along with other elements,

how logos remind one brands. He found recognition and recall for selected brands. Khanna and Mishra (2013) studied Coca Cola brand with respect to five senses and found that 75 percent respondents identified Coca Cola through logo. Haung (2005) revealed that brand names and logos are more important to females than to males. Hartnett and Romaniuk (n.d.) studied distinctive cue and brands associated with that specific cue. Brennan (2005) aslo found age has an impact on recall. Kinsky and Bichard (2011) studied pre-schoolers and indicated that, while preschoolers may not know brand names, they often know the product associated with a logo.

Thus, various attempts have been made by researchers to study recognition and recall with respect to different brands. The research has been undertaken in different countries. So, a specific work in FMCG brands would contribute to the existing work on recognition and recall through logo.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Research design was descriptive single cross sectional. The main objectives of the study were 1) to study recognition and brand recall through logos of popular FMCG brands marketed in India, and 2) to identify recognition and recall rate among age and gender groups 3) to study difference between product recall and brand recall. Selection of brands was done as per Brand Equity's Most Trusted Brands Survey Conducted by Nielsen which publishes a list of 'Most Trusted 100 Brands in India'. Non-probability convenient sampling method was used. Males and females aged 15-60 were included as samples. Sampling area included various places in Gujarat state of India. Sample size was 146.

Respondents were shown the logo and were asked whether they have seen it before or not. Responses were recorded on five point scale. Then, they were required to write product category that they recall after seeing the logo and later to write name of the brand. At last, cue was given for both product category and brand as well to check aided recall.

ANALYSIS:

Among the respondents, 52 were males and 94 were females. Results are discussed in five sections as below.

Table 1: Summary of Responses

Brand	Recognition	Unaided Product Recall	Unaided Brand Recall	Aided Product Recall	Aided Brand Recall
Britannia	3.6182	62.7	54.5	77.3	69.1
Thumps up	4.764	88.8	86.5	92.1	91
Lifebuoy	4.2636	76	76	85.3	86.8
Parle	2.7658	27.8	18.4	61.4	50
Fanta	2.8394	32.1	27	62.8	58.4
Amul	2.3953	20.9	19.4	66.7	55
Source: Primary Survey by Authors					

RECOGNITION:

Recognition mean score indicates confirmation by respondents weather they have had prior exposure to the logo or not. Responses have been recorded on a five point Likert scale where 1 means "No, I have not seen" and 5 means "Yes, I have seen". Logo of Thumps up has the highest recognition score (4.764) which is the closest to maximum score of 5. Lifebuoy has logo recognition mean score 4. 2636. Britannia has moderate score with 3.6182. Parle and Amul have logo recognition mean scores less than 3. Amul has the lowest mean score (2.3953). Thus, six brands can be ranked on the basis of their recognition score for their logos as; Thumus up, Lifebuoy, Britannia, Fanta, Parle and Amul.

UNAIDED PRODUCT RECALL:

Logos of the respective brands were shown to respondents and then they were supposed to recall product category without any other aid. 10 seconds were given to respondents to recall product category name. Responses have been recorded as correct recall, incorrect recall and no recall. Once again, Thumps Up is first with 88.8 percent respondents recalling product category through logo. Second is Lifebuoy having 76 percent unaided product recall. Britannia has 62.7 percent correct recall. Amul has the lowest recall rate (20.9 percent). Looking at the popularity of both Amul and Thumps Up, it is vital difference between the two brands. Thumps

Up has product category recall rate as high as 88.8 percent whereas Amul has meager 20.9 percent.

UNAIDED BRAND RECALL :

Responses were recorded to identify capacity of a logo to remind the correct brand name. Here, there is slight reduction in correct brand name recall for Thums Up. However, it retains first rank with 86.5 percent. Britannia logo maintains product recall and brand recall rate both at 76 percent. Rest all brands have small to significant reduced rate of correct brand recall that compared to correct product recall. It means that logo is leading one to recall correct product category but it fails to make one recall the correct brand name. Unaided brand name recall rates for Britannia, Fanta, Amul and Parle are 54.5, 27, 19.4 and 18.4 percent respectively.

AIDED PRODUCT RECALL:

Responses were collected for aided product recall. Aided recall rate increased drastically for all brands. Thums Up had the highest aided product category recall rate (92.1 percent). Second is Lifebuoy whose aided product recall rate is 85.3 percent compared to its unaided product recall rate 76 percent. Next is Britannia whose aided product recall rate is found to be 77.3 percent, compared to its unaided product recall rate of 62.7 percent. Amul's logo increases its aided product recall rate to 66.7 percent from its unaided product recall rate of 20.9 percent. Fanta's logo has lead aided product recall rate to 62.8 percent to 32.8 percent. Parle's logo too had aided product recall rate at 61.4 percent. All brands' logo result into aided product recall rate more than 60 percent.

AIDED BRAND RECALL:

In aided brand name recall through logo, 91 percent respondents recalled Thums Up brand. Lifebuoy had 86.8 percent aided brand recall rate whereas that of Britannia was 69.1 percent. Fanta's, Amul's and Parle's logos had 58.4, 55 and 50 percent aided brand recall rates respectively.

INFERENTIAL STATISTICS:

Britannia:
A Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in logo recognition score between males and females. Logo recognition score was not statistically significantly different between males (Mdn = 4.00) and females (Mdn = 5.00), U = 1323, z = 1.305, p = .192.
A Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in Logo recognition score between four age groups. Distributions of Logo recognition scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. Median Logo recognition scores were statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi 2(3) = 13.834$, p = .003.
A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and gender. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi 2(2) = 6.518$, p = .038. There was a moderately strong association between Unaided Product Recall and age, Cramer's V = 0.243, p = .038.

Thumps Up:
A Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in logo recognition score between males and females. Logo recognition score was not statistically significantly different between males (Mdn = 5.00) and females (Mdn = 5.00), U = 834.55, z = -1.013, p = .311.
A Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in Logo recognition score between four age groups. Distributions of Logo recognition scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. Median Logo recognition scores were not statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi 2(3) = 4.266$, p = .234.
A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and gender. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was not a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi 2(2) = 1.692$, p = .429.

Fanta:
A Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in logo recognition score between males and females. Logo recognition score was not statistically significantly different between males (Mdn = 3.00) and females (Mdn = 3.00), U = 2,433, z = .485, p = .627.
A Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in Logo recognition score between four

age groups. Distributions of Logo recognition scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. Median Logo recognition scores were not statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi2(3) = 1.911$, p = .591.

A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and gender. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was not a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi2(2) = 2.466$, p = .291.

Parle:

A Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in logo recognition score between males and females. Logo recognition score was not statistically significantly different between males (Mdn = 2.00) and females (Mdn = 4.00), U = 2,828. 500, z = 1.797, p = .072.

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in Logo recognition score between four age groups. Distributions of Logo recognition scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. Median Logo recognition scores were not statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi2(3) = 1.702$, p = .636.

A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and gender. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was not a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi2(2) = 3.019$, p = .221.

A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and age. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi2(6) = 4.501$, p = .609.

Amul:

A Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in logo recognition score between males and females. Logo recognition score was not statistically significantly different between males (Mdn = 2.00) and females (Mdn = 2.00), U = 1,782, z = .592, p = .554.

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in Logo recognition score between four age groups. Distributions of Logo recognition scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. Median Logo recognition scores were not statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi2(3) = .769$, p = .837.

A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and gender. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was not a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi2(2) = 1.122$, p = .891.

Lifebuoy:

A Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in logo recognition score between males and females. Logo recognition score was not statistically significantly different between males (Mdn = 5.00) and females (Mdn = 5.00), U = 1,623.500, z = -.303, p = .762.

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in Logo recognition score between four age groups. Distributions of Logo recognition scores were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. Median Logo recognition scores were statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi2(3) = 14.520$, p = .002.

A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and gender. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was not a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi2(2) = 2.759$, p = .250.

A chi-square test for association was conducted for Unaided Brand Recall and age. All expected cell frequencies were greater than five. There was a statistically significant association between Unaided Brand Recall and gender, $\chi2(12) = 21.094$, p = .002.

CONCLUSION:

The study revealed that recognition score for some brands (Parle, Fanta and Amul) was found less than 3 though these are some of the most popular brands in India. Their low recognition score had a vital negative impact on unaided product recall and it was the worst for unaided brand recall. On the contrary, Britannia, Thumps Up and Lifebuoy's high recognition score for their logos had positive impact on both unaided product recall and unaided brand recall. Age and Gender were studied for their impact on recall and recognition. Age was found having significant relationship for brand recall whereas gender had mix results. Future research attempts should be made to study more brand elements; slogan, jingle, character, color, typeface etc. with respect to different product categories. Recognition and recall are prerequisites for

customer based brand equity so systematic efforts in this direction can stockpile to the body of knowledge which can be useful to brand managers.

REFERENCES:

[1] Aaker, David A. (1991). Managing Brand Equity. New York: Free Press.

[2] Aaker, D. A. (1991). Selecting, creating, and maintaining associations in managing brand equity, capitalizing on the value of a brand name. New York: The Free Press.

[3] Aaker, D. A. (1996). Building strong brands. New York: The Free Press.

[4] Brennan, S., & Webster, C. M. (n.d.). Brand Logo Design: Implications for Children's Brand Awareness.

[5] Buil, I. (2013). The influence of brand equity on consumer responses. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 30(1), 62–74. doi:10.1108/07363761311290849

[6] Fischer, P.M., Schwartz, M.P., Richards, J.W., Goldstein, A.O. and Rojas, T.H. (1991). Brand logo recognition by children aged 3 to 6 years: Mickey Mouse and old Joe the Camel, Journal of the American Marketing Association, Vol. 266, pp. 3145-8.

[7] Gaillard, E., Sharp, A., Romaniuk, J., 2006. Measuring Brand Distinctive Elements in an In- Store Packaged Goods Consumer Context. EMAC, Athens Greece.

[8] Handerson, P.W. and Cote, J.A. (1998), "Guidelines for selecting or modifying logos", Journal of Marketing, Vol. 62 No. 2, April,pp 14-30.

[9] Hartnett, N., & Romaniuk, J. (n.d.). Is Brand Distinctiveness a Separate Facet of Brand Knowledge? Ehrenberg Bass Institute, University of South Australia, 1–7.

[10] Henke, L. L., 1995. Young children's perceptions of cigarette brand advertising symbols: awareness, affect, and target market identification, Journal of Advertising, 24 (4), 13 – 29.

[11] Huang, W. (2005). Brand Awareness Of Students At The Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

[12] Keller, Kevin Lane. 1993. "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity." Journal of Marketing 57 (January): 1-22.

[13] Keller, K. (2003), Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring and Managing Brand Equity, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

[14] Keller, K. L., Parameswaran, M. G., & Jacob, I. (2011). Strategic Brand Management. New Delhi: Pearson Education.

[15] Khanna, P., & Mishra, S. (2013). THE IMPACT OF SENSORY BRANDING (FIVE SENSES) ON CONSUMER : A CASE STUDY ON "COCA COLA". VSRD International Journal of Business and Management Research, 3(4), 113–120.

[16] Kinsky, E. S., & Bichard, S. (2011). "Mom! I've seen that on a commercial!" US preschoolers' recognition of brand logos. Young Consumers: Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers, 12(2), 145–158. doi:10.1108/17473611111141605

[17] Lawrence L. Garber, J., Bukre, R. R., & Jones, J. M. (2000). garber-package-color-consumer-choice.pdf.

[18] MAHAJAN, N. (2006). What is core to a brand ? An examination of the Brand elements and their subsequent impact on the consumer.

[19] Olson, C., 2004. Maximizing brand recognition. Information Outlook 8 (1), 43.

[20] Roedder-John, D., 1999. Consumers socialisation of children: a retrospective look at twenty- five years of research, Journal of Consumer Research, 26 (3), 183 – 213.

[21] Ross, J., Harradine, R., 2004. I'm not wearing that! Branding and young children. Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management, 8 (1), 11 – 26.

[22] VanAuken, B. (2007). Branding, A reference guide to solving your toughest branding problems and strengthening your market position. Jaico Publishing House.

[23] Verma, H. V. (2004). *Brand Management.* New Delhi: Excel Books.

[24] Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. (2000). An Examination of Selected Marketing Mix Elements and Brand Equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *28*(2), 195–211.