

Celebrity endorsements impact on brand building for teenagers in major cities of Gujarat

Gincy Jiju Mathew¹, Dr. Jayaashish Sethi², Jiju Mathew John³

¹(S.K. Patel Institute of Management and Computer studies, Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India)

²(Baba Farid Group of Institutions, Bhatinda, Punjab, India)

³(Bholabhai Patel College of Business Administration, Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India))

Abstract: This paper intends to study the effect of presence of celebrity in a brands communication and its impact on its brand building with special focus on teenagers in the state of Gujarat. For the study 300 teenagers were surveyed, major cities selected from Gujarat were based on census report 2011. The study focuses on impact assessment through the analysis of differential effect, taking two demographical variables for the study, location and gender of teenagers.

Keywords: Celebrity Endorsement, Brand Building, Customer based brand equity model, Advertising

I. INTRODUCTION

To create a brand identity, brand image and for better recall, companies always use the most reliable source of celebrity endorsements. These celebrity brings in an emotional connect to the brands and thereby lead to higher level of resonance(loyalty), as we know the more emotionally connected we are with any object/event/person, the more it stays in our mind and memory. Thus celebrity route has been the most sensible yet costlier option of marketing communication.

In India with bountifully growing consumers and consumerism, when we talk to mass marketing communication, celebrity endorsement serves to be the best, as it only demands an initial exercise of finding a brand-fit and match-up between the endorsed brand, the celebrity chosen and the target group, once this process is successful, at one go the communication can be made appealing the mass.

1.1 Definition of celebrity

“Any individual who enjoys public recognition and who uses this on behalf of a consumer good by appearing with it in an advertisement.”(McCracken, 1989).Celebrity endorsement is a particular strategy used by marketers to advertise a product from such a platform through which consumers can associate themselves with the brand value from the perspective of the celebrity personnel (Kotler, 2006).

1.2 Why a celebrity

Celebrity has its own brand value, which in many case is bigger than the value of brand itself. In spite of this many marketers still believe the association of celebrity and the brand will lead to an increase in the credibility factor and gain stronger belief for the product. This in fact helps in enhancing the brands personality. The personality so created further helps in making consumers personify the brand. Brand personality so created helps in increasing the brands equity value. Consumers tend to be more loyal when they are able to humanize the brand and when a common sharing of their own self personality and brands personality happens.

1.3 Why Teenagers

This type of mesmerizing effect is more often noticed with the teenagers, since they think more emotionally than their counterparts. Moreover in the country like India celebrities are idolized, and are followed blindly. When we compare the fan following and the crowd sourcing that happens for a particular star with that of a global celebrity event, it is surprisingly more seen in India.

Moreover these eras of modern marketing have noticed many brands specifically catering the teenagers, as they being the future of the nation with maximum of India’s population set, the same is visibly noticed in the state of Gujarat. This generation must be catered in a different way, as they being indigo kids, are very different in the way they understand, take up and perceive any object/event/person. They though being a digital savvy, are very rational, more informative about the brands and market. They are the generation which compares everything before the final purchase. For whom an series of compare- portals are parallel set so that consumer reviews and ratings are more transparently visible to this generation.

Since too much of brand proliferation is very commonly visible among the teens, it becomes most essential for the brands to differentiate. Since too much of competition the brands hardly find a parameter to differentiate.

Thus the best way to differentiate and to create a stronger stored image of the brand, the celebrity endorsement tool of marketing communication proves to be the best.

II. Research Methodology

1. Research Design:

Descriptive Research, Data is collected through a quantitative method with sample survey. Structured questionnaire is used as a tool for survey. Respondents ranging between 13-19 years of age group including both school and college students, from major cities of Gujarat, were opted for the survey. The major cities include Surat, Rajkot, Baroda and Ahmedabad, these cities were selected on the basis of census report 2011's metropolitan region (high in population) of Gujarat.

2. **Sample Size:** 332 teenagers

3. **Objective:** To study Celebrity endorsements impact on brand building for teenagers.

3.1 To study whether celebrities impact differ based on demographic variables.

4. Methodology

Here the demographic variables taken are location form where the teens belong and their gender. To study significant difference in the location from where the teens are and the Celebrities impact on brand building , one way annova test was used. And Student's T-Test: For group of 2 for significant difference between Male and Female with respect to the celebrity's impact on brand building. The questions or survey purpose are framed taking customer based brand equity model as base

III. Data Analysis and Interpretation

1. Hypothesis

H0: There is no significant difference between location from where the teens are and the Celebrities impact on brand building

H1: There is significant difference between location from where the teens are and the Celebrities impact on brand building

STAGES OF BRAND BUILDING	SIG. (P)	H0 ACCEPTED/ REJECTED
Salience (celebrity & my awareness towards brand)	.004	Rejected
Salience (celebrity & get deeper brand understanding)	.013	Rejected
Imagery (celebrity & brand consideration)	.002	Rejected
Performance (celebrity & brand differentiation)	.302	Accepted
Judgement (celebrity & brand liking)	.041	Rejected
Feelings (celebrity & emotional connect)	.026	Rejected
Resonance (celebrity & brand group association)	.003	Rejected
Resonance (celebrity & loyalty)	.027	Rejected

Table 1.1 Summary of Significant difference between the locations where the teens belong to on celebrity's impact on brand building

From the analysis, the significance value falls less than the alpha of .05, the table 1.1 reveals the sig (.004) and sig(.013) , thus null hypothesis gets rejected and alternative gets accepted. Therefore at a **Salience stage** of customer based brand equity model (CBBE) impact is different based on teenager's location. The significance value falls less than the alpha of .05, the table 1.1 reveals the sig (.002) and thus null hypothesis gets rejected and alternative gets accepted. Therefore at a **Imagery stage** of customer based brand equity model (CBBE) impact is different based on teenager's location. The significance value falls less than the alpha of .05, the table 1.1 reveals the sig (.302) and thus null hypothesis gets accepted and alternative gets rejected. Therefore at a **Performance stage** of customer based brand equity model (CBBE) impact is not different based on teenager's location. The significance value falls less than the alpha of .05, the table 1.1 reveals the sig (.041) and thus null hypothesis gets rejected and alternative gets accepted. Therefore at a **judgement stage** of customer based brand equity model (CBBE) impact is different based on teenager's location. The significance value falls less than the alpha of .05, the table 1.1 reveals the sig (.026) and thus null hypothesis gets rejected and

alternative gets accepted. Therefore at a **Feelings stage** of customer based brand equity model (CBBE) impact is different based on teenager’s location. The significance value falls less than the alpha of .05, the table 1.1 reveals the sig (.003) and sig (.027) and thus null hypothesis gets rejected and alternative gets accepted. Therefore at a **Resonance stage** of customer based brand equity model (CBBE) impact is different based on teenager’s location.

Overall when we evaluate each stage of brand building, majority times the null hypothesis gets rejected and alternative gets accepted, wherein we can conclude that the teenagers location does have differences of impact on how do they take a presences of celebrity and its impact on building up a brand.

2. Hypothesis

H0: M1 = M2, In the population there is no difference between the genders with respect to the celebrity’s impact on brand building

H1: M1 ≠ M2, In the population there is a difference between the genders with respect to the celebrity’s impact on brand building

STAGES OF BRAND BUILDING	SIG. (P)	H0 ACCEPTED/ REJECTED
Saliency (celebrity & my awareness towards brand)	.047	Rejected
Saliency (celebrity & get deeper brand understanding)	.006	Rejected
Imagery (celebrity & brand consideration)	.037	Rejected
Performance (celebrity & brand differentiation)	.024	Rejected
Judgement (celebrity & brand liking)	.021	Rejected
Feelings (celebrity & emotional connect)	.015	Rejected
Resonance (celebrity & brand group association)	.047	Rejected
Resonance (celebrity & loyalty)	.021	Rejected

Table 2.1 Summary of Significant difference between Male and Female with respect to the celebrity’s impact on brand building

An independent T-test was run on two group of Teenagers. The two groups are based on their gender. Overall the results significantly are different with respect to celebrity’s impact on brand building on Male and Female teenagers. Comparing the significance value (p= less than the priori alpha level), where alpha = .05. From the above table of independent t-test it is viewed that overall sig(p) values fall below the priori= 0.05, thereby would fail to accept the null hypothesis (H0: In the population there is no difference between Male and Female with respect to the celebrity’s impact on brand building), and would retain the alternative hypothesis (H1: In the population there is a difference between Male and Female with respect to the celebrity’s impact on brand building). For Saliency sig (P)= .047 and sig (P)= .006, for Imagery sig (P)= .037, for Performance Sig (P)= .024, for Judgment Sig(P)= .021, for Feelings sig (P)= .015, for Resonance Sig(P)= .047 and Sig(P)= .021 Overall when we evaluate each stage of brand building, majority times the null hypothesis gets rejected and alternative gets accepted, wherein we can conclude that the teenagers gender does have differences of impact on how do they take a presences of celebrity and its impact on building up a brand.

IV. Conclusion

The results of both One-way anova and Students T-test revealed that at each stage of brand building (Saliency stage, Imagery stage , Performance stage, Feelings, Judgment and Resonance stage) impact differs based on the location the teenagers belong to even within the state of Gujarat and also the impact differs based on male and female teenagers as well.

The results further specify that there is a strong impact of presences of celebrity on further brand building. And this impact does differ between the four cities of Gujarat. Also the impacts of celebs presence on brand building have differential effect on Male- teenagers and Female-teenagers.

V. References

- [1] Batra, R., & Homer, P. M. (2004, June 10). The Situational Impact of Brand Image Beliefs. Retrieved March 21, 2017, from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=555837
- [2] E. H., & P. D. (6-7-2008). celebrity entrepreneurship: the effect of negative celebrity information on the new venture (summary). *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 28 (13), chapter xiii. strategy, 1-16. Retrieved from <http://digitalknowledge.babson.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1333&context=fer>
- [3] Agrawal, J., W.A. Kamakura. The economic worth of celebrity endorsers: An event study analysis // *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (3), 1995. – pp. 56-62.