

Brand image for marketing : A critical analysis

■ M. ABDUL JAMAL AND H. YASMEEN SULTANA

Received : 01.11.2011; Accepted : 01.03.2013

ABSTRACT

People pay more for brand-name products than they do for essentially identical products lacking brand identity. Sometimes this pertains to brand as a signal of quality. However, brand-name markups are particularly pronounced in the fashion industry where functionality is less important than the brands signal of style and exclusivity. The American Marketing Association defines a brand as a “name, term, design, symbol, or any other feature that identifies one seller’s good or service as distinct from those of other sellers. The legal term for brand is trademark. A brand may identify one item, a family of items, or all items of that seller. If used for the firm as a whole, the preferred term is trade name. A Brand is a product or service made distinctive by its positioning relative to the competition and by its personality in the context of the target market”. A brand is a name or trademark connected with a product or producer. Brands have become increasingly important components of culture and the economy, now being described as “cultural accessories and personal philosophies. Strong brands help a company to maintain market share in the fact of a changing competitive environment. Most markets are dominated by two or three well known brands. It has been shown that, in turn, a strong market share is associated with above average profits. This paper makes an attempt to analyse the importance of brand image in the field of marketing.

KEY WORDS : Brand, Brand name, Brand image

How to cite this paper : Abdul Jamal, M. and Yasmeen Sultana, H. (2013). Brand image for marketing : A critical analysis. *Internat. J. Com. & Bus. Manage*, 6(1) : 114-117.

People pay more for brand-name products than they do for essentially identical products lacking brand identity. Sometimes this pertains to brand as a signal of quality. However, brand-name markups are particularly pronounced in the fashion industry where functionality is less important than the brands signal of style and exclusivity. Physically attaching a brand-name to a product costs little, so the brands capacity to command higher prices translates into substantial profit opportunities. This capacity is name-specific, merely sewing the name “Joe Smith” on a sweater won’t increase its value to anyone, except perhaps Mr. Smith. Likewise, the price-raising capacity of any given name can vary over time.

MEMBERS OF THE RESEARCH FORUM

Correspondence to:

M. ABDUL JAMAL, P.G. and Research Department of Economics,
The New College, CHENNAI (T.N.) INDIA
Email: abduljamal@gmail.com

Authors’ affiliations:

H. YASMEEN SULTANA, Department of Economics, Pondicherry
University, PUDUCHERRY (U.T.) INDIA

The name Ambergrombie and Fitch once was highly valued, being associated with the likes of Teddy Roosevelt and Ernest Hemingway. It fell upon hard times by the 1970s before being successfully resurrected by The Limited (Carbone, 2004). Hence, a particular brand’s capacity to command higher prices is like a capital asset whose magnitude varies over time and that deserves to be managed carefully. This paper models a key issue in brand management, namely the preservation of “brand image” in the face of short-term opportunities that risk “brand dilution.” The basic ideas are familiar from brand management texts, but were deliciously described in a special Fashion Survey issue of *The Economist* (March 6-12, 2004, p.7), which used the term “brand integrity” rather than “brand image”.

Like everyone else in the luxury goods market, all three (Richemont, Gucci, Pinault-Printemps-Redoute) face the challenge of maintaining “brand integrity”- analyst-speak for that indefinable aura that convinces a consumer to pay a lot of money for something he, or more likely she, could buy much more cheaply elsewhere. . . . The destroyer of brand