CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to Review of Literature

In this section of dissertation identification of published and unpublished work from secondary data sources on the topic of interest is done. Literature review has helped in discovering few concepts those were already thoroughly researched. A literature review has helped in preventing in waste of resources in reinventing the wheel. It has also helped in facilitating creative integration of the information gathered from structured and unstructured interviews found in earlier studies. This has given a good basic framework to proceed further with the investigation by providing the foundation for developing a comprehensive theoretical framework from which hypotheses have been developed for testing. Literature review ensured inclusion of important variables, considering issues of parsimony and stating a problem statement with precision and clarity required for enhancing testability and reliability of the findings of the current research.

While conducting literature review Data sources, Textbooks, Journals, Conference proceedings, unpublished manuscripts, Reports and Internet is accessed.

2.2 Branding in pharmaceutical industry

Kotler, Adam, Brown and Armstrong (2001) defined brand as a “name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of these, intended to identify the goods or a combination of these, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors”. AMA redefined “brand” in 2009 as “name, term, design, symbol or any other feature that identifies one seller’s goods or services as distinct from those of the other sellers. The legal term for brand is trademark. A brand may identify one
item, a family of items or all items if that sellers. If used for the firm as a whole, the preferred term is trade name” (AMA 2009). Conceptual framework, which served as the platform for the statements we used, was constituted of existing definitions for AMA.

Ambler (1992) takes a consumer-oriented approach in defining a brand as: the promise of the bundles of attributes that someone buys and provides satisfaction. The attributes that make up a brand may be real or illusory, rational or emotional, tangible or invisible.

The brand helps customers to make choices by delineating the unique qualities and value that the product or services provided to the customer (Van Auken 2003). Brand are argued to assist customers to make purchase decisions in increasingly cluttered retail environments, providing useful clue as to product quality, attributes and “personality” (Aaker, 1997; Maleswaram, Mackie, and Chaiken, 1992, Park and Srinivasan, 1974).

The definitions adopted in the research undertaken are consequential to the approaches of Kapferer, Asker, de Chernatony, Kotler, Bennett (1998) and many others, as well as to the recent research undertaken by de Chernatony and Dall’Olmo Riley.

Furthermore, we also define the Brand as it was approached by Alt & Griggs (1998); Blackston (1992); Arnold (1992); Goodyear (1993); who defined Brands as symbolic devices with personalities that users value beyond their functional utility. Gradner & Levy (1995), also offer a definition, according to which “a brand name is a complex symbol that represents a variety of ideas & attributes”, whereas Murphy (1992) suggested that “Brands are said to add values to products”.

Clark (1987) on the other hand, offered another definition relating Brands with “values”, i.e. “Brand is values that provide the important link between consumers and marketers” while Kapferer (1992), approaching Brands under a holistic view, claims that “A brand is not a
product. It is a product’s essence, its meaning and its direction and it defines its identity in
time and space, too often Brands are examined through their component parts: brand name,
logo, design or packaging, its central concept is brand identity, not brand image. Few more
definitions of brands are as follows,

“A Brand is a product of a specific producer/ manufacturer which is differentiated from the
competition by its name and its appearance”. –Definition similar to the one of AMA (1960).
The focus of this definition focuses on differentiation of the product.

“Brand is the value added on a product’, according to de Chernatony and Mc Donald
(1992), who postulate that a brand is something additional to a commodity product,
suggesting that brands and added value are to some extent synonymous.

“Brand is the combination of all of the elements (name, symbol, design and packaging) by
which the product differs from the competitors, thereby lending is a unique identity, which
represents Kapferer’s view.

“A Brand is the personality of a product, product group, or organisation, as it is formed in
terms of consumers’ perceptions evolving from tangible and non-tangible characteristics”,
(de Chernatony and McDonald proposed (1994), p.18) i.e. an identifiable product, service,
person or place augmented in such a way that the buyer or user perceives relevant unique
added values which match their needs more closely.

“A Brand is the name of a product”, is reflecting a distinctive position among the defining
elements of the Brand (Rigopoulou, 2000). In this definition name of the product is a main
aspect.
“A Brand is any symbol and/or design which is associated with a product”, which is an approach close to the references related with “legal instrument” (Crainer, 1995; Broadbent & Cooper, 1987. The emphasis is on logo, design, mark and so on.

Branding has persisted for centuries as way to distinguish one producer’s goods from another manufacturer’s products and services. It occurs when the consumer has a high level of brand awareness and strong favorable and often unique association with that brand. Pharmaceutical industry has often modeled itself on the fast moving consumer goods industry (FMCG), where brands are viewed as the key assets of a company and all resources are utilized to create and develop brands. While the core principles and strategies for branding medical products are the same as for any other product, the differences in regulations of marketing and selling drugs has challenged the pharma industry to find new strategies that are acceptable practices in healthcare is very well discussed by Zara Ladha(2005)

According to Schuiling and Moss (2004), pharma companies have not worked proactively in identifying a brand and identity for their products and in communicating this identity to consumers. They have not done market research to determine their brand identity and to verify if this is how consumers view them. Pharmaceutical companies must embrace marketing and branding strategies to a great extent than they have in the past. Even the most effective strategies implemented by a company could fail if consumers are very price conscious towards drugs. Therefore, it is important to discuss the presence of generic drugs on the market, and the effect they have on consumers’ decisions.

In particular, generic drugs in the competition, it is extremely important for pharmaceutical companies to understand the difference in consumer’s perceptions and purchase intentions between branded and generic drugs, as this understanding can help the pharmaceutical companies to better estimate the financial impact of drug when launching a more likelihood
of consumers purchasing a branded drug, the more confident a pharmaceutical company will be in making an investment in the branding process. Zara Ladha in 2007 studied perceived difference between generic and branded drugs in terms of efficacy, willingness of people to pay for branded drugs and trust of people in doctor prescribed drugs.

Important factors studied were attributes like price, name, and doctor’s prescription, past experience, advertisement and promotion. The conclusions were like the only influencing factor given more importance for prescription versus non-prescription medicines was that of physician’s. Other factors like in store promotion, price, family/friend’s, brand name and advertising play a significant role in purchase making.

Current strategies in the pharmaceuticals industry have shown significant differences compared with the FMCG sector. In the choice of brand names, the basic naming strategies are the same, but the focus on them is different. According to Schuiling and Moss, branding theory and practice in pharmaceuticals is still ten years behind the FMCG area. The authors expect that pressure towards globalization will continue, and this will effect changes in the pharmaceutical industry in time.

Pharmaceutical industry is the most regulated industry and that it is constantly under an attack from numerous interested parties trying to reduce the size of drug bill. It is true that, in other product categories, brands can exist forever if they are well managed, e.g. Coke. It is recommended that brand names be linked to corporate brand names and not exclusively to product names. There is strong need to create strong brand names with clear brand names with clear brand identity. The authors Giles Moss and Isabelle Schuiling (2004) considered that doctors would be viewed as consumers. They also look for quality, efficacy, reliability, and need to be reassured. They operate on the basis of limited information and are influenced by the image of the company, their attitude towards the disease and their patients.
They also make decisions for emotional reasons, not for rational ones secondly deciding how to communicate this in a coherent way to target customers. Further, companies need to adopt a three-step process when developing brands: first, identifying the brand identity via in-depth research (how it will be differentiated); and thirdly to regularly monitor the brand image and manage it.

On the basis of exploratory research of literature, Elements of Ethical Brand Positioning, Sagar Mahim, Singh Deepali, Agrawal D.P. (2006) identified five fundamental elements of brand positioning, namely Brand awareness, Brand Identity, Brand Image, Brand Personality, Brand Communication. All these elements of brand positioning can be then blended with the ethical elements.
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**FIGURE 2: ETHICAL BRAND POSITIONING**

Source: Conceptual framework of ethical Brand positioning Framework (Agrawal et al. 2006)
Brand Awareness consists of top of the mind recall, brand recognition, brand retention generation of faith and bond with the brand. It also says about rational and emotional metaphors associated with the brand. Elements of brand identity are products, social acceptability, consumer value satisfaction, ethical issues of pricing of the products, company’s social trust, logo name and people’s acceptance of the brand, acceptability in the society in terms of quality and delivery of required benefits, culture and geographical relevancy of the product.

Brand personality is studied as Sincerity about value delivery, technical competence, imaginative and innovative, cheerful, socially responsive and reliable. Brand image is associated thoughts with the brand, associated social metaphors, symbols, associated imagery with the brands, affordability. Brand communication is Advertisement recall, socially acceptable advertisement, culturally relevant advertisement, generation of emotional bond, no unreasonable cross brand comparison, gender sensitive advertisement, no fear appeal, sensitive for the children, no subliminal advertising, no surrogate advertising, no propagation of false and elusive claims, culturally sensitive, regional sensitivity, cross cultural sensitivity and no false association.

From the above literature on Branding few gaps were identified which are addressed in the present study. Brand personality is not studied in depth with respect to pharmaceutical companies. Further, the communication, brand imagery with respect to medicines has to be focused for further understanding.
2.2.1 Brand architecture

The theory of brand architecture came from simple beginnings - new products could be associated with the first product offered by an enterprise or by association with the company name itself, or be created as an independent brand of its own. Proliferation of brands and the mergers of consumer’s goods companies in the 1980s have then made establishing the theory behind brand architecture necessary. There are two main proponents of architecture theory, Jean-Noel Kapferer in Europe and David A. Aaker in America.

Brand architecture specifies the structure of the brand portfolio and the scope, roles and interrelationships of the portfolio brands. The goals are to create synergy, leverage, and clarity in the portfolio and relevant differentiated and energized brands. Thought has to be given to the structure of a portfolio to aide buyer recognition and understanding. In this way it will also guide the larger organization to make the right decisions through the use of rules concerning naming, symbols, colors etc. The strength of indicating the origin of the brand and the strength of product differentiation do categories the brand strategies.

Kapferer (2004) conceptualized brand identity prism, which can guide companies to develop strong brand identity for their brands. This model is based on articulating the brand based on six of the brand dimensions. Kapferer says “the identity prism derives from one basic concept that brands have the gift of speech”. The six dimensions of the prism are physique, personality, relationship, culture, self-image and reflection.
The physique of the brand denotes the physical qualities of the brand. The tangible attributes of the brand are communicated here. It is difficult to construe the relevance of “physique” in service branding. Ambience of service setting, decor, the visual appeal etc. Fall under the organization ns’s identity that the service. In services, the tangible attributes have been thus called as service escape (Lovelock, 1996). The personality of the brand is the human traits the brand demonstrates. Personality considers how brands can be ‘humanised’ through ‘traits’ and so reveals the brand’s character and attitude in a more emotionally oriented manner. Developing brand personality entails addressing questions such as if this brand was a person what type of a person would it be. Culture is that facet of the prism, which gives a peak into the values that are associated with the brand. Brand defines its relationship with its consumers by declaring that nature of relationship. A brand finds itself as a reflection of its customers. Self-image is the internal congruence of the customer with the brand.
Kapferer’s (2004) model considers the six brand identity facets from four perspectives. First and second perspectives are from the view of the sender and receiver of brand identity. Third and fourth perspectives are internal and external by nature. The company and the external perspective lie in the minds of the customers control the internal perspectives. The sender controls physical appearance and personality whilst consumer reflection and self-image are concerned with the receiver. Culture and relationship link the sender and the recipient and in this sense act as common denominator between the brand (the sender) and in this (the receiver). In terms of internalization and externalization, elements to the left of the model such as physical appearance, relationship and consumer reflection are social, provide brand with a form of external expression and are visible. Conversely, the facets to the right, which is, personality, and culture and consumer self-image are connected with the internal aspects of a brand and its ‘soul’.

Pharmaceutical equivalents that can be placed alongside their consumer counterparts. Line brand and range brands are very poorly understood in the pharma area.

Pharmaceutical industry has missed its opportunities to move out of the product attribute trap; a problem, which is common in high tech and data drive industry sectors. The product has to focus on efficacy safety and side effects.

Kapferer’s model could be studied with respect brand medicine wherein brand identity is formed by a sender pharma company and the receiver physician. The image formed is brand, company and the sales person

2.2.2 Brand Function Hierarchy

Giles D Moss, in “Pharmaceuticals where is the brand logic?” has studied branding of pharmaceuticals in detail. Author has adopted a function hierarchy with the example of
Viagra. The stages were Orientation and Charisma, need fulfillment and contract, authentication and differentiation. Gill moss has explained the brand logic by considering Viagra research example. Authentication- it's Viagra from Pfizer, Differentiation- Its Viagra not a herbal or inject able, Need fulfillment- Viagra works
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**FIGURE 4: BRAND FUNCTION HIERARCHY**

*Source: Giles D Moss, Pharmaceuticals where is the brand logic?*

Contract- Patients and their partners having their relationship helped.

Orientation- Allowing impotence to be discussed.

Charistama- A straightforward solution to a difficult problem.

From the above example is it clear that pharma brands do follow brand hierarchy where in the emphasis is lead on differentiation, need fulfillment and orientation.
2.2.3 Brand experience

Experiential marketing is an important trend in marketing thinking. Through several books and articles, Schmitt (1999, 2003) has developed the concept of customer experience management (CEM), which he defines as the process of strategically managing a customer’s entire experience with product or company. According to Schmitt, brands can help to create five different types of experiences like Sense experiences involving sensory perceptions; Feel experiences involving affect and emotions; Think experiences which are creative and cognitive; Act experiences involving physical behavior and incorporating individuals actions and lifestyles; and Relate experiences that result from connecting with a reference group or culture. Here with respect to drug the physicians touch and feel the drug whereas it is consumer who is finally going to experience it.

2.3 Brand personality

Aaker (1997) examined the personalities attributed to U.S. brands and found they fall into five main clusters: (1) sincerity, (2) excitement, (3) competence, (4) sophistication, and (5) ruggedness. Asker et al (2001) found that three of the five factors also applied to brands in both Japan and Spain, but that a “peacefulness” dimension replaced “ruggedness” both in Japan and Spain, and a “passion” dimension emerged in Spain instead of “competency”.

Aaker (1999) also found that different brand personality dimensions affected different types of people in different consumption settings. She interpreted these experimental results in terms of a “malleable self”, which is composed of self-conceptiuions that can be made salient by a social situation (see also Graeff 1996, 1997). While Azoulay and Kapferer (2003) have challenged the conceptual validity of this particular brand personality scale, the
anthromorphism of a brand is common in both casual consumer conversation (e.g., “that brand is ‘hip’”) and advertising messages.

2.3.1 Dimensions of brand personality

The brand personality framework and scale developed in this research also can be used to gain theoretical and practical insight into the antecedents and consequences of brand personality, which have received a significant amount of attention but little empirical testing. In terms of antecedents, many have suggested that brand personality is created by a variety of marketing variables (e.g., user imagery, advertising, packaging: Batra, Lehman, and Singh 1993; Levy 1959; Plummer 1985). However, the extent to which these variables independently and interdependently influence Brand Personality Scale, the variable can be manipulated systematically and their impact on a brand’s personality measured. Similarly, in terms of consequences, researchers suggest that brand personality increases consumer preference and usage (Sirgy 1982), evokes emotions in consumers (Biel 1993), and increases levels of trust and loyalty (Fournier 1994). Finally, the brand personality

The brand personality framework and scale developed here have important implications for researchers examining the perceptions of brand personality across cultures. For example, the extent to which brand personality dimensions are cross culturally generalisable must be examined. Although research has shown that the human personality dimensions remain robust across cultures (Paunonen et. Al. 1992), the same may not be so far may not be brand personality because of differences in the antecedents of two constructs. Additional research is needed to determine the extent to which these brand personality dimensions are stable across cultures, and if not, theoretically why they might be altered. Answers to these questions will shed insight into the extent to which a brand’s personality (versus the brand’s attributes) should remain constant across cultures, what dimensions of brand personality are valued
across cultures, and how consumers use brands across (Aaker and Maheswaran 1997). Finally, little is known about the psychological mechanism by which brand personality operates across cultures. However, recent researching cultural psychology suggests that the symbolic use of brands differ considerably across cultures (Aaker and Schmitt 1997).

For example, in individualist culture, where independence, autonomy, and uniqueness are valued (Markus and Kitayama 1991), consumers are more likely to use brands to express how they are different from members of their in-group. In contrast, in collectivist cultures, where interdependence, conformity, and similarity are valued (Markus and Kitayama 1991), consumers are more likely to use brands to express how they are similar to more likely to use brands to express how they are similar to members of their in-group. Such research would demonstrate that the symbolic or self-expressive use of brands is robust across cultures, while the nature of that self-expression differs significantly, (Jennifer L. Aaker 1997).

The metaphor of 'mirror' is used to demonstrate how the values with which consumers identify or to which they aspire are 'mirrored' back to them via the brand image. This is achieved by imbuing a brand with human characteristics via a brand personality (Keller, 1998). A personality provides a brand with an emotional dimension that can then reflect the consumers' 'moods and personalities' in order to positively affect purchasing behavior (de Chernatony and McDonald 1998). To understand why consumers benefit from such associations, it is important to understand the role that possessions play in developing our sense of self. Quoting the psychologist William James (1890), Belk (1988) argues that we are the sum of our possessions. He continues that identity is important for our self-esteem and possessions help to develop our sense of who we are. Possessions can be important to identity even if they possess characteristics that are different to the perceived characteristics of the self (Belk, 1988).
2.4 Brand Positioning

According to Sanjay K Rao (2009) devising and continually evolving the positioning strategies based on a scientific, market driven paradigm will make for a commercialization process that effectively defines and communicates product value at every stage of the life cycle. Utilizing state-of-the-art techniques and tools from disciplines such as strategic marketing research, marketing science and decision support sciences enables the process of translating such a paradigm into effective strategy.

According to scientific historian Thomas Kuhn for development of effective positioning paradigm following points, have to be considered. Whether the new drug is sufficiently different from others like its dimensions that matter?, Whether the new drug serves the needs of a sufficiently large number of patients?, Whether potential customers of the new drug utilize it for the right reasons?, Whether sources of value accrued because of the new product can be communicated in the best manner.

Also on likely impact of such communication on customer behavior, this helps in building up of a system that can approximate the cause and effect phenomenon attributable to the paradigm.

A clear positioning strategy, even if it is evolving, holds some benefits like Pre-defining types of patients who may benefit from the drug, describing the types of providers who will be quantified to prescribe it, Shaping the few, cogent supply paths by which a drug moves from the manufactures eventually to the patient (allowing for a search for the shortest, most effective path well ahead of launch), defining the full set of medications and treatment approaches that may be perceived as viable alternatives to the drug, enabling smart, bottom-up forecasts of eventual drug performance in the marketplace as a function of critical development and commercial market assumptions. Allowing for estimation and subsequent
evaluation of wide variety of resources that need to be deployed effectively at each stage of drug’s life cycle so as to quickly realize the potential aspirations contained in the positioning strategy.

Doctors prescribe the brand, not just generic medicine and are influenced by direct marketing techniques such as advertising, mail and sales team. The author says that pharmaceutical brands are rarely highlighted in the academic literature. Kotler in 1984 defines the brand as name, term, sign, design, symbol or a combination of all these which is intended to differentiate them from those of competitors. Moss in 2001 reviewed the drug industry in considerable detail, and his findings strongly support the existence of ‘Brands’ despite the lack of research in to pharmaceutical brand management. The industry has often talked about ‘block busting brands’ but does little in the way to establish brands properly. Tom Blackett (2001) in particular recognized the importance of marketing executive in communicating brand messages and their role in developing brand equity; this is point worthy of highlighting. Developing the strong understanding and belief in the brand among sales people allow our brands to become even stronger in the minds of customers.

Bill Robertson, president of Inter Mind L.L.C studied pharma product positioning, said almost three out of four newly introduced pharma products adopt the same brand positioning as an established competitor. Author gave important rules to develop positioning strategies, first is to establish a definition of positioning, and second is to keep it simple third Make it unique fourth is to excavate product benefits and market needs fourth to construct a credible position fifth is to ensure strong support by starting early sixth to follow the market dynamics seventh is to make positioning visible in all communication eighth is to quantitatively test alternative positioning options and not test the positioning statement itself.
Positioning a pharmaceutical product is one of the most critical yet difficult challenges faced by the marketing professional. Positioning opportunities occur throughout a brand’s life cycle, well beyond the initial launch phase, so most product managers are faced with either developing or revamping a product’s position at some point in their marketing careers. Whether it's the result of an underperforming product or a shift in the market, the positioning challenge remains a significant hurdle that must be overcome to achieve overall marketing success.

Physicians will always gravitate toward increased level of information about a product because they are more comfortable prescribing a product that they know more about. Therefore, in any testing procedure, physicians will be preferentially attracted to a longer, more inclusive positioning statement. In addition, a simpler, more focused positioning statement may not test well with data driven physicians.

Major authors and practitioners contribution summary of Literature on Branding, positioning and Trust with respect to Pharmaceutical Companies and other areas is placed in the form of summary table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Al Ries and trout</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Positioning is what you do with mind of the prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arnott</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Intangible perception of marketable objects in relation competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mc alexander et al</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Relation of positioning strategy with financial performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Brand trust assesses honesty, altruism and reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mayer et al</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Willing to accept vulnerability due to trustees behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Doney and Cannon</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>High confidence enhances transaction from both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Etzel et al</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Management ability to bring attention to a product and to differentiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ferrel</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Create and maintain certain concept of firm's offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bhat</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Unique and favorable image in consumers mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pranulis</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Scale concept to understand positioning, explanation of positioning map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alden</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Emergence of global consumer culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. No.</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kalafatis, Tsogs, Blankson</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Positioning to guide and coordinate firms efforts in the market place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Boone and Kurz</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Creation of promotion to create desired position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Boone Kurz</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Product user, product class decides positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tom Blackett</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Importance of marketing executive in communicating brand message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Schulling and Moss</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Brand identity and communication with respect to pharma company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lamb et al</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>overall perception of brand, product line and company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Grancutt Leadly</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Detail study of inadequate positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Giles Moss, Isabelle Schuiling</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Factors influencing prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Schulling Moss</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Gap between FMCG and pharmaceutical branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kotler</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Act of designing so as to occupy distinct position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Natural conclusion to sequence of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hooley et al</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Competition with respect to positioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Arora</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Positioning map and tracking of marketing strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Doyle, Stern</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Determining target audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Positioning is based on price, user competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. No.</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Vandeveer, Pines</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Customer driven positioning with special reference to positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Zahra Ladha</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>FMCG vs. Pharmaceutical marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ruta Ostaseviciute</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Process of reaching desired place in the mindsets of potential and existing customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sanjay Rao</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Process of translating paradigm to effective strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kaleel, Charles</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The company is only meaningful brand for goods or services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positioning Map is an efficient technique to see firms standing with respect to various attributes of competitor. Tracking of marketing strategy is possible if the strategic gap is found out. Company’s perception in physicians mind which results in prescription is studied. Personality positioning of the company as a strategic gap is found out and explored.

A company can take strategic decisions once its standing in the competitive scenario is placed in positioning map with researched. According to Richard B. Vanderveer 2004 most of these positioning and messaging techniques in use by the pharmaceutical industry have been unchanged since they were developed during the late 1970s and 1980s. The following are the definitions that physicians are given to use in determining which information elements play the various roles in the story or argument:

Attention-grabbers are information elements, which get a physician’s attention. Clearly, for a physician to actually hear a sales pitch, the company needs to have their attention. Typically
it has been found that attention-getting elements are new data about a brand or other brand attributes that meet the criteria of being new, interesting and clinically relevant to physicians.

Benefits are elements that characterize how a physician (and the patient) is better off now that the brand in question is available. Although benefits tend to include the various efficacy related attributes of the brand, oftentimes other benefits include tolerability, dosing and/or quality of life aspects of the drug.

Reasons to believe are elements that corroborate or substantiate the benefits and thus give credibility to the overall reason why the physician should change the behavior. Typically, we find that physicians assign such attributes as specific clinical data supporting the efficacy benefits, professional society endorsement, peer testimonials and other elements which validate the benefits to the ‘reason to believe’ category.

Hygiene factors are elements that quiet physicians’ latent or potential concerns about the brand in question. Since almost every medicine is a double-edged sword and possesses at least one feature that physicians are concerned about (e.g. Side effects, parenteral administration, safety), it is crucial to develop a message which somehow positions these concerns in their minds. In some cases, it has been found that companies must place the hygiene factors before the benefits because physicians’ level of concerns so high as to diminish their willingness to hear about the benefits of a brand.

Close to the call to action, the element or message which gives the physician direction with regard to what they should do next. The ‘close’ other specifies the patient type for which the drug is being targeted or a particularly impressive piece of data about the brand. Importantly, the close is not merely request by the physician to prescribe the drug for the next X number
of patients but is mere of a direction as to how the drug will be useful to them in their everyday practice. (Richard B. Vander veer 2004)

While it is crucial for companies to understand how the various elements of their brand map on to the above categories, it is also important to know which attributes are not important to physicians and which should be excluded from the story or argument. The ‘who cares’ category is like a waste bin for all those messages which, though important, are not altogether interesting or clinically relevant.

While the pharmaceutical industry has reached a high water mark in the volume and diversity of its communications with physicians, more focus is needed on innovative and rigorous approaches to global messaging. As this paper has shown current modes of messaging are insufficient in today’s hyper-competitive, hyper-communicated market place. Clearly, new approaches based on the principles of Message Engineering are needed to foster a more efficient, clinically relevant and ultimately productive dialogue between manufacturers and physicians as well as to move closer to that ‘holy grail” of global branding. Indeed given the current situation of the pharmaceutical industry, the authors believes that in the future only those messages which incorporates these rule, will penetrate, survive and flourish despite the noise fostered by the ongoing expansion and diversification of the pharmaceutical industry’s promotional voice.

2.4.1 Corporate Brand Positioning

The concept of positioning which is concerned with attempt to modify the tangible characteristics and intangible perception of marketable objects in relation to competition (Arnott 1992). More recently, Alden (1999) have confirmed the importance of positioning in international marketing and concluded that there is an emergence of global consumer culture positioning. Mc Alexander et al (1993) stated that selection of the positioning strategies co-

Some researchers argue that the company is the brand for services emphasizes the pre-eminence of corporate brand image, where as other advocate developing strong sub brands for specific service offerings. Aaker (2000) observed brand relationship spectrum is anchored at one end by corporations that use the company name as the- primary brand for all products offered that is branded house and at the other end by corporations that develop unique brands for each product that is house of brand. Importantly he specifies no distinction between goods and services in providing examples for each rage of the spectrum. This view places services at the branded house end of the brand relationship spectrum focusing on the parent company as the major source of brand equity. The idea is that the range of services offered by the firm should be known to the customers by singular company name rather than a collection of individual brands, because it is difficult to differentiate the details of specific offer (Boyd 1994).

As stated rather distinctly by Berry (2000) that in packaged goods product is the primary brand however with services the company is the primary brand. According to Kaleel , Charles (2009) marketing service may not be different from marketing goods. The company is only meaningful brand for services. Whether to invest in corporate brand f all products or to invest in sub- brands for each product may have more to do with the rate of technological innovation, the degree of diversification and the overall commitment to brand development, rather than whether a company is marketing a good or service.
2.4.1.1 Corporate image and reputation

Corporate image has been extensively studied in terms of conceptualization, antecedents and consequences (Biehal and Sheinin 1998 and Dowling 1994). Corporate brands—versus product brands—are more likely to evoke associations of common products and their shared attributes or benefits, people and relationships, and programs and values (Barich and Kotler 1991). Several empirical studies and show the power of a corporate brand (Argenti and Druckenmiller 2004).

Brown and Dacin (1997) distinguish between corporate associations related to corporate ability (i.e., expertise in producing and delivering product and / or service offerings) and those related to corporate social responsibility(i.e., character of the company with regard to the social issues), such as treatment of employees and impact on the environment.

Keller and Aaker (1992, 1998) define corporate credibility as the extent to which consumers believe that a company is willing and able to deliver products and services that satisfy customer needs and wants (see also Erdem and Swait 2004). They showed that successfully introduced brand extensions can lead to enhanced perceptions of corporate credibility and improved evaluations of even quite dissimilar rand extensions.

They also showed that corporate marketing activity related to product innovation produced more favorable evaluations for a corporate brand extension than corporate marketing activity related to either environment or, especially, the community (see also Gurhan-Canli and Batra 2004). In addition, Bhattacharya and Sen (2003) extended the thinking on consumer-brand relationships to consider consumer-company relationships, adopting a social identity theory perceptive to argue that perceived similarity between consumer and company identities play an important role in relationship formation. (Kevin Lane Keller and Donald R. Lehman 2006)
Historically, approaches to global optimization have fallen at the two ends of a centralization/decentralization spectrum. The pharmaceutical companies taking a centralized approach would typically develop a ‘branding’ in the U.S.A. where 60-70 percent of most pharmaceutical markets are found and then simply translate the promotional material into other languages for launch in other countries. Before Message Engineering is explored in depth, it is crucial to examine the backdrop against which existing approaches to product positioning and message development were formulated.

There is also the opportunity for some products to achieve brand success by moving from prescription-only status to over-the-counter availability post-patent (Chandler and Owen, 2002). There is increasing evidence of the power of the corporate brand in creating trust and conveying credibility (Moss, 2001; Schuiling and Moss, 2004), and Schroff (2003) describes corporate branding in the pharmaceutical industry as “an opportunity waiting to happen” (p.38). Moss and Schuiling (2004) recommend that product brand names be linked to corporate brand names and describe that doctors as well as consumers look for reassurance of quality and safety in a pharmaceutical brand, and are influenced by the image of the company. When developing a strong association between the corporate brand and the product brand, there is also the risk that if the latter fails into disrepute it may negatively impact on the corporate brand.

Danika V. Hall & Sandra C. Jones in 2007 did a study on branding of prescription medicines to Australian consumers and came out with an important conclusion. Brand development and brand management is complex in pharmaceutical sector due to the specific nature of pharmaceutical products and their lifecycles, as well as the regulation of promotional activity. The building of strong brands is becoming increasingly important for the industry, and consideration is being given to developing more expressive or emotional values of brands over traditional functional values and attributes. The brand helps customers to make choices.
by delineating the unique qualities and value that the product or services provided to the customer.

Brands can offer intangible benefits that go beyond the financial benefits of a product (Schuiling and Moss, 2004). There are numerous factors that constrain branding activity and other marketing practices in the pharmaceutical sector when compared with the traditional consumer goods sector. Prescription pharmaceutical products by name are high risk and emotionally charged and in some instances they may have life and death implications (Chandler and Owen, 2002). Pharmaceutical products have relatively short life-cycles and they have short-term patent protection and usually only hold exclusively for 15 years in the major world markets (Blackett and Harrison, 2000, Moss, 2001).

The pharmaceutical industry is one of the most regulated industries globally, and unlike other product categories, pharmaceutical brands cannot be transformed to a new product following patent expiration (Moss and Schuiling, 2004). In the past, pharmaceutical marketing has ended to concentrate on research and development (R&D), and the creation of the ‘blockbuster product’ rather than building the brands. As such, pharmaceutical companies have, until recently, focused their branding activities around products and product attributes as well as engaging in some corporate branding (Moss, 2001).

Like India Prescription pharmaceutical marketing activities in countries where DTCA is not allowed in Australia. Marketers tend to target the doctor or health care professional, rather than the actual consumer of the product (Chandler and Owen, 2002). Branding in the pharmaceutical industry has experienced considerable transformation over the post fifteen years; primarily due to the advent of generic drugs which by the early 1990s had infiltrated almost every product category (Blackett, 1992).
Stern & Ehrenberg (1993) undertook studies of prescribing habits of 240 General Practitioners (GPs) in the UK during 1986 and found that market share (as compared to individual brand attributes) provided a strong predictor of prescribing habits and brand loyalty. They also found that the degree of prescribing loyalty for a particular brand only varied slightly between brands, and that generics attracted similar loyalty to named brands (Stern and Ehrenberg, 1995).

Stern (2000) reports on behavioral data from 1998 of a sample of 290 GPs in the UK, and found that contrary to pharmaceutical industry perceptions, GPs are not either prescribers of generics or prescribers of brands, but instead prescribe both forms for the same drug. The work of Stern and Ehrenberg (1995) demonstrated a lack of brand preference among GPs in the UK. And this conceivably is one of the factors that led pharmaceutical companies to target consumers in building brand value, as patient requests for specific brands would potentially influence prescribing behavior. Since dramatic increase of DTCA in the US in the mid 1990s (Donohue, 2006) research into prescription pharmaceuticals has considered the impact of branding on consumers.

Patients ask for prescription medicines on prescribing decisions (e.g. Mintzes et al., 2002). In a survey of 288 US residents, Singh & Smith (2005) found that behavioural intentions were influenced by a greater awareness of specific branded drugs via DTCA. While brand development has not been a major focus of the industry in the past, the rise of generics and the gradual decline in product breakthroughs (Angeli, 2006) have placed pharmaceutical companies under pressure to develop enduring trademarks and brand power.

Other threats for manufacturers of prescription pharmaceutical included the push from Government and private health funds to subsidize generics, and the growing availability of generics via the Internet (Schuiling and Moss, 2004) Spence-Stone, 2002.
Pharmaceutical companies are gradually recognizing the benefits of brand-building, particularly in the post-patent stage of product’s life (Blackett and Harrison, 2001; Schuiling and Moss, 2004). There is increasing recognition within the industry that strong brands and brand names are remembered, and doctors (as well as consumers) remain loyal to them even after patent expiration.

Jon Chandler and Mike Owen in 2002 discussed rapidly advancing recognition of the importance of brands within the international pharmaceutical arena, explored what ramification recent developments in our understanding of mind, culture and brands have for the whole business of brand development. The pharmaceutical arena is often seen as distinct territory within market research. Author has pointed out some of the differences between Pharmaceuticals & FMCG:

1. Within the territory of healthcare, medical professionals (medics) are not ‘consumers’ as such, but are often specifies of the products and brand that the end use, the ‘patient’, consumes or uses. Thus there are always issues here about for whom products/brands are intended and at whom marketing is actually aimed.

2. Medical professionals, as an obvious part of the target audience, are typically highly trained and highly specialized individuals after operating within the boundaries of complex and detailed protocols, codes and so on.

3. Healthcare is an emotionally charged arena. Many of the issues it addresses are of great significance to those involved. Healthcare addresses issues which range from those concerned with personal wellbeing to those, which are, quite literally, matters of life and death.

Branding’ is increasingly becoming a higher priority in the development of new therapies. Within the healthcare territory we see an impulse towards more global branding,
more marketing promotion. Fundamentally the development and communication of a common brand identity on a more global scale offers consistency and harmonization of the messages, ideas, themes and feeling surrounding a brand. This means messages or themes expressed in one country can support rather than contradict those expressed in another. International brand identifies also offer to contribute towards corporate cohesion; an international organisation can act in concert around a single brand identity, whereas substantial local difference is a potentially divisive force.

2.4.1.2 Impact on Corporate Brand

Merck corporate brand was negatively affected following the withdrawal of its arthritis medication Vioxx in 2004; Merck was ranked 30 and 32 in the Business Week “100 Top Brands” in 2003 and 2004 respectively, however the company did not make the 100 Top Brands 2005 or 2006 (Business Week, 2004; Business Week, 2005; Business Week, 2006). When the safety of Pfizer’s cox-2 inhibitor, Celebres, also come into question, the company chose not to withdraw its product, although advertising of the product to consumers was suspended (Arnold and Hyse, 2005). Pfizer suffered in initial drop in stock prices as well as declines in new prescriptions for Celebrex, however the overall brand rating in the 100 Top Brands only fell from 29 in 2004 to 31 in 2005 (Business Week, 2004; Business Week, 2005). As well as some corporate branding, the pharmaceutical industry has focused on product-attribute branding, which can be defined as the promotion of functional values of the product (Blckett and Harrison, 2001, Schuiling and Moss, 2004).

Important for pharmaceutical products, these values include safety (for example minimal side effects) and efficacy (for example, improvement in condition compared with no treatment or other product). Other functional values include convenience (complexity of dosage) and cost effectiveness in content analysis of 320 DTCA from 1989 to 1998 in the US, Bell, Wilkes
and Kravitz (2001) found that the most common appeals used were effectiveness, symptom control, innovativeness and convenience. An example of product–attribute branding is a recent US advertisement for Replax, a migraine medicine, which emphasized efficacy.

There has been criticism that pharmaceutical branding in the past has focused too much on product attributes and functional values of the brand (e.g. Blackett and Harrison, 2001; Moss, 2001), and that it should build more expressive or emotional values that the consumer or prescriber can identify with. These authors recommend that pharmaceutical marketing should reinforce the benefits, personality and “human” values of their product.

In a content analysis of 208 DTCA from the US, Roth (2003) found that transformational messages that emphasized benefits such as happiness or social approval created greater brand awareness that informational messages, but stated that transformational messages are “used the least (relative to informational messages) and are being used less often over time” (p.189). There is considerable concern that the more emotive style of promotion for prescription pharmaceutical products will manipulate consumers, play on their vulnerabilities and encourage a “pill for every ill’ mentality (Coney, 2001; Mansfield, Mintzes, Richards, and Toop, 2005). This concern is also held for doctors and health professional—for example, a recent study in to pharmaceutical marketing practices in the UK (Delvin, Hastings, and Anderson, 2005) concluded that “brands are designed and marketed to satisfy emotional as well as rational benefits and there is a desire by the industry to exploit health professional’s emotional needs and vulnerabilities”.

There is the argument within the pharmaceutical industry that branding will never achieve for pharmaceutical the results it has for the consumer goods sector (Lerer, 2005; Schroff, 2003). The concept of branding a condition was explored by Parry (2003) with the view that “if you can define a particular condition and its associated symptoms in the minds of
physicians and patients, you can also predicate the best treatment for that condition” (p.43). Parry 2003) identifies three different strategies that can be used to brand condition and associate it with product:

Re-defining or reducing stigma relating to a disease (for example, erectile dysfunction or weight loss advertisement); or Developing a new condition to create recognition of unmet need, than introducing the product to meet that need, for example the case of restless legs syndrome in the US.

Brand building for prescription pharmaceutical product has traditionally focused on classical product or functional attribute promotion, however pharmaceutical companies are increasingly concentrating on the emotional concerns of prescribers and consumers, and reinforcing the benefits, ‘personality’ and ‘human values’ of their product. In countries more liberal in healthcare marketing and branding such as the US, there is an increase in DTCA plus DACs to consumers (Thomaselli, 2004), and considerable debate over whether this adversely affects public health.

In Australia, while DTCA is not allowed, recent cases illustrate that brand building activity for prescription pharmaceuticals is targeting consumers as well as (and often in conjunction with) the traditional audience of doctors and other health professionals. Pharmaceuticals companies’ use of branding techniques is DACs and ‘unbranded’ product advertisements such as using trademarks, logos, campaign names and spokes-characters can be seen as pseudo-branding—conveying the identity of product while not actually naming it.

Danic V. Hall & Sandra C Jones 2007 described in their paper regulation of promotion of branded prescription medicines to consumers in Australia is deficient. Further analysis of the current regulatory system, as well as the assessment of potential alternative approaches such as government regulation, is required.
Morgon and Hunt 1994 said trust means confidence on exchange partner’s reliability and integrity. Trust can also be considered as goodwill and willingness that enables the consumer to take risk. Goodwill is developed on the bases of past experience. Trust is an expression, which may cause a positive outcome, despite the possibility that it may cause a negative outcome (Worchel, 1979). So expectation of groups or teams in an event is called trust (Deutsch 1958). Trust is not a mere predictability but confidence in the face of risk (Lewis and Weigert 1985). Trust is a psychosomatic state comprising the intention to recognize susceptibility based upon constructive prospect of the intentions or behavior of another person (Rousseau et. al., 1998).

2.5 Brand Equity

Literature study indicated that Brand equity is an aspect of brand important to both consumers and firms (Farquhar 1989). The incremental cash flow that accrues to branded products over and above the cash flows which would result from sale of unbranded products is the brand equity according to Simon and Sullivan (1993). These authors estimate brands equity by deriving financial market estimates from brand related profits. Aaker (1992) defined brand equity as a set of brand assets and brand liability that can add to or subtract from the value of a product provided to customer, this definition gave a financial accounting perspective. Another dimension to financial perspective is contributed by Barwise 1993, is a key assets that increases a firms value via the added financial value that accrues to a branded product, proprietary technology, patents, trademarks and other such intangible owned by a firm.

Supporters of financial perspective defined brand equity as the ‘total value of a brand which is a separable asset- when it is sold to or included in a balance sheet (Atilgan et al., 2005) measurement from this point of view , is articulated solely in monetary terms which is called
as financial based brand equity. Based on various literatures discussed in Broyles and Schuman 2004, comprehensive model is view is presented by Samuel Allen Broyles in 2005.

**FIGURE 5: BRAND EQUITY FOR CONSUMERS,**

**SOURCE: SAMUEL ALLEN BROYLES IN 2005**
One functional antecedent is consumer’s perception of brand’s reliability (Aaker & Joachimsthaler 2000; Barnes 2003) with reliability referring to a consistency of performance over a time from purchase to purchase. Another is consumer’s perception of brand durability which is referring to an economic life of a product. How long it will last? Consumer’s effectiveness referring to how completely brands need consumer’s requirement. Consumer’s perception of brand style, which refers to its appearance (Armstrong and Kotler 2003). Brands warranty and logo are also functional antecedents of brand equity.

Brand’s association is the link between consumer’s memory and brand such as one’s life history, usage situation, lifestyle, ideal users, friends, family, social physician and professional role. Another is brand’s personality which is how people would describe the brand if it were a person (Aaker 1991). Brand’s community is another antecedent represents people that are associated with the brands, such as fellow brand users or customers or may involve employees or representatives of the company. Brand name and symbol represents consumer’s brand recognition and brand recall. Keller in 2003 defined brand recall as “Consumers ability to confirm prior exposure to a brand when a brand as a cue is offered”. Also consumer’s ability to correctly generate the brand from memory when given a relevant clue. Another brand equity element is loyalty to repeat purchase and the amount of category volume attributed to the brand, how often customers purchase a brand and how much they purchase. Attitudinal attachment to a brand may state that they love the brand, describe it as one of their favourite possession. A very important antecedent is active engagement with a brand. This refers to consumer’s “willingness to invest time, energy, money or other resources in the brand beyond those expended during purchase or consumption of the brand”, such as joining a club centered around a brand, exchanging communication other users of the brand.
2.5.1 Issues affecting brand equity

Brand equity is increasingly affected by market and competitive factors. Market factors include things such as economic downturn and recession. Consumers becoming more confident and self assured willing to be responsible for evaluating the relationship between product, price and quality. Competitive factors may include things such as technological advances enabling new brands to be quickly designed, engineered, manufactured and marketed. Globalization leading to products from around the world having similar qualities and marketing mix, to the point that it is increasingly difficult for domestic firms to develop and maintain brand equity (Aaker & Joachimsthaler 2000). Consumers are overloaded with information and increasingly characterised as having short attention span and high frequency of switching which produces volatility between consumers and products and influences their perception of brand equity for a product (Goldfinger 1997; Shocker, Srivastava and Ruekerd 1994).

2.6 Company Trust/Loyalty

Brand loyalty was revealed as a reason for prescribing more expensive branded medicines over cheaper generic alternatives. The majority of pharmaceutical companies have restructured or currently undergoing the process to make the field force teas more effective. Uncovered a significant level of change and uncertainty over the last ten years but clearly identifies the effectiveness of traditional direct marketing techniques predicts the rapid expansion of direct to consumer marketing to secure the future pharmaceutical brands.

Trust means expectation from others on specific task, and expectations vary between high and low rating scale. Variation of expectations is called risk. Trust is dependency on other parties at the level of risk with their own willingness. Trust is built up on the bases of past experiences. Trust is based on ending results. A positive ending result enhances trust and
negative results on the other hand will cause the trust to drop (Deutsch, 1958; Worchel, 1979).

Trust plays a vital role for developing and maintaining brand loyalty in both situations, i.e. consumer-to-business and business-to-business buying situation. To maintain market share and price elasticity, trust influence toward changing behavioural and attitudinal loyalty (Choudhauri, and Holbrook, 2001). Trust is belief which is focused on specific appropriate boundaries and limitations. Lewis and Weigert (1985) say that trust is not mere certainty but assurance in the expression of risk. Many other researchers have followed this idea (Deaustch, 1960; Schlenker et al., 1973; Boon and Holmes, 1991).

Boon and Holmes (19910 defined trust as a condition linking certain optimistic opportunity about another’s intention with respect to oneself in risky state of affairs. Consumer’s trust in brand is a variable that generates customers’ commitment, particularly high involvement situation, in which its effect is strong in assessment as a whole contentment (Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpade, 1992; Morgon, and Hunt, 1994; Delgado and Munuer2001).

For making a strong relationship between buyer and seller, creation of trust is a very important factor in business environment. Trust is a feeling about satisfaction because of its ability to moderate risk in the buying process (Anderson and Narus, 1990; Dawyer, Schurr and Oh, 1987). Trust shows consumer commitment and satisfaction with particular brand. An organization uses trust in brand as a risk-reduction mechanism (Doney and Cannon 1997).

Faithfulness is an everlasting wish, a readiness to do something with no computation of instant expenses and profit. Hence, faithfulness to a brand engages trust in it. In business marketing, the idea of faith is sound to develop (e.g. Ganesan, 1994; Doney and Cannon, 1997) and a great deal of endeavour has been used up in discovering methods to construct and keep it. In that background, trust is constructed on the basis of person-to-person dealings. Trust in a product is different from interpersonal trust because a brand is a sign. Unlike a
salesperson, this sign is not capable to react to the customer. To create loyalty in today’s marketplace, marketers have to hold what is becoming subsequent nature to business marketers (Donath, 1990) and focus on structuring trust in the customer-brand relationship.

The business and marketing literature reveals different ways to build trust. Trust is emphasised either as a part of linkage quality (Dwyer and Oh, 1987; Crosby, Evans, and Cowles, 1990; Anderson, Lodis, and Weitz, 1987), or as a determinant of relationship quality (Anderson and Narus, 1984, 1990; Parasuraman, Zietml, and Berry, 1985; Anderson and Weitz (1990). Doney and Cannon (1997) presented apparent trustworthiness and kindness of the object as areas of trust.

Apparent trustworthiness centres on the objective trustworthiness of the trade partner, the anticipation that the partner’s word or paper declaration can be trusted. Kindness is the level to which one partner is actually interested in the other’s benefit and forced to seek cooperative benefit. Evolution of trust is through a procedure of computation, the expenses and benefits of both sides leaving or being in the relationship.

Previously, trades in customer-product business faced larger issues as large amount of customer’s were faithful to transaction only (Donath, 1999). To triumph customer faithfulness and for imitating achievement of business, marketers started to hold the thought of making links with consumers to get their faith (Bennet, 1996). Idea of faith in the marketing text normally lacks. In the buyer market, there are number of unidentified buyers, which make it difficult to link with customers. The trade name becomes an alternate for personal link amongst the seller and buyer.

Brand description, Brand constituent, brand reputation and brand competence assist for developing consumer trust in brand. Before purchasing a brand, consumers judge brand though these characteristics (Lau and Lee, 1999). The brand’s properties have an important function in shaping consumer trust. Many buyers see other buyers to evaluate brand
capabilities in market and also evaluate the benefits which they can get from those brands. Buyers develop trust in brand on the foundation of the market worth of brands (Zucker, 1986), certainty (Remple Holmes, and Zanna, 1985) and capability (Andaleep and Anwar, 1996).

Good reputation could lead to positive expectations and bad reputation could lead to negative image of the brand (Creed and Miles, 1996). For complete understanding of brand trust, a brand must be examined, assessed and checked as to how much it is related with brand loyalty (Lau and Lee, 1999). Consumer holds brands as a part of product with value addition and that brand creates difference from other products. Basically consumers rely on brand with level of risk (Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande, 1992).

Reputation means trustworthiness, integrity, and honesty. It can be seen from past experience of third party’s trustworthiness, integrity, and honesty. Brand reputation can be judged from consumer opinion, comments, estimation and beliefs; if people are suggesting the usage of a brand then it is considered as a sign of good reputation. A brand’s reputation refers to the attitude of consumers that the brand is good and reliable. Brand reputation can be developed through advertising and public relations, and it enhances its quality. Creed and Miles (1996) established that brand standing in market creates optimistic outcomes, which result in the expansion of reciprocity between both entities.

Every organization wants to establish their competence in a few key areas, and deal with their brand within these realms. A competent brand is one that has the ability to crack a customer’s problem and to meet the need (Butler and Cantrell, 1984; Butler, 1991). Competent brand includes crucial elements for solving consumer’s problem. Utilization of brand is only one way to find out brand competency (Lau, and Lee, 1999; Christou, 2004). Consumers can find out a brand’s competency through direct usage or word-of-mouth. Good brands are that which are able to satisfy the needs of a customer and its attributes must be compatible with
customer’s needs. Brand ability is the properties of brand which are perceived by customer as value.

Butler and Cantrell (1984), Butler (1991), Deutsch (1960), Cook and Wall (1980), and Sitkin and Roth (1998) measured it as property to satisfy the needs of customer. Brand Reputation, Predictability and its Competency are the factors which affect consumer trust in brand. The analysis of the study proves that brand reputation, predictability and its competency has positive impact on trust which is developed when consumer uses that brand and gathers data about brand reputation, its predictability and competencies. When brand reputation is good, it meets the predictability of customer and it has competency to satisfy the needs of customer, and thus it develops trust of customer in brand.

In previous discussions of relationships between brands and customers, trust is usually related to a combination of brand and product or service attributes—altruism, integrity, and quality and reliability (Hess, 1995, Moorman et al, 1993, Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Garbarini and Johnson, 1999). In the world of brand and customers, however, we typically isolate perceived quality and reliability of products or services, combine them into a summary construct, and call it satisfaction. Satisfaction can either refer to transaction measures focusing on a discrete incident or a cumulative construct resulting from a series of transactions (Garbarino and Johnson, 1990).

Ongoing satisfaction, which is required for trust to develop, results from consistent satisfaction with individual transactions over time, but unlike trust, there are no illusions about the motivations of the company. Satisfaction is necessary but not sufficient for the formation of trust, and not all satisfied customers trust the brand. The remaining components of trust are altruism and integrity. Unlike quality and reliability, these reflect on the brand rather than what is produced by the brand.
Trust reflects customer’s general belief that the brand is looking out for them, will do whatever it takes to make them happy, and is responsive to their needs (Hess, 1995). Trust has previously been defined in terms of confidence in, or willingness to rely on an exchange partner, arising from perceived expertise, integrity, or intentionality (Moorman et al, 1993; Morgan and Hunt, 1994). Trust is important as the bridge between satisfaction and personal connection, transforming a positive transactional orientation toward a brand into an enduring and close personal – even committed – relationship with a brand.

Entrenched relationships characterized by feelings of personal connection depend largely on trust, while satisfaction, as an indicator of past and future meeting of expectations, is primarily an indicator of functional connection. Together, trust and satisfaction combine to provide the conditions necessary for enduring customer-brand relationships characterized by relationship commitment.

### 2.6.1 Trust based commitment process model
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**FIGURE 6: TRUST BASED COMMITMENT PROCESS MODEL**

Source: Jeff Hess & John Story 2005
The trust-based commitment relationship framework opens the door understanding previously unexplained behavior as a function of relationship motivation rather than just needs satisfaction. For instance, it explains how trust-based relationship may differentiate relatively small regional brands from more established national chain in their local markets, and why customer are willing to go out of their way to visit some retail stores but will only shop at other if convenient. It also guides companies toward targeting relationship motivation when building a basket of brand benefits. Brands which have established functional connections to the market and earned personal connections with their customers can have confidence that steps taken to build their market position will be well received by their committed base. The importance of commitment may also guide competitive pricing strategy.

Customers with strong personal connections respond differently to brand extensions as well as premium pricing. Firms with mostly disconnected customers must rely heavily on competitive pricing and sales promotion. Once relationship measures are established and measured, companies can then map their positions in competitive space, and marketing prescriptions and opportunities are implied. For instance, companies whose customers have strong functional and weak personal connections to the brand will be required to focus on performance diagnostics and innovation, while those with strong personal connections to the exclusion of functional connections must be most careful with their image.

In addition to the benefits implied by competitive market positioning, it is believed that trust-based commitment not only models a more direct connection between customers’ attitudes and behavior, but also reveals critical customer motivation previously hidden underneath a veil of anemic customer measures.

According to Hess and Story 2011 relationships are important to the businesses. As they put it, the notion “that relationship are more profitable than individual transaction is well founded
but the search for a framework to quantify, diagnose and describe the nature of such relationships has proven elusive”. As marketers we know a good customer relationship when we see one but find it hard to deconstruct such relationship so as to appreciate how they come about and what sustains the m.

Answering this question “How to strong customer-brand relationships come about? Presents a significant challenge since we are dealing with ideas that are notoriously hard to quantify. Satisfaction, trust, connection and commitment are ideas used.

Hess and Story’s first assertion-supported by the research findings- is that satisfaction with the brand, product or service is just a start to understanding the status of a relationship with the individual customer. We are able to ask our customers whether or not they are satisfied. And, since satisfaction surveys are widely understood and empirically rested, degree of confidence in the responses received. However, as Hess and Story observes, ‘satisfaction alone provide scant information about the customers will respond to competitive offers, product availability price competition or to competitive offers, product availability price competition or even product failure.”

It is necessary for a customer to be satisfied (in an overall sense) with the brand for them to trust the brand but being satisfied in not sufficient to engender trust. And it is trust that allows the customer to develop a personal relationship with the brand. What begins to emerge is that satisfaction is essentially utilization in its nature where as trust suggests a relationship beyond merely functional. Hess and Story address this by describing the two concepts as related parallel ideas sitting along the path to a strong relationship. Ultimately the string relationship implies a degree committed from the customer that extends beyond mere satisfaction and also elaborates on the idea of trust. The stage beyond satisfaction and trust is connection and the idea that the customer and the brand have a link.
Trust is at the heart of any enduring relationship (Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Hess 1993and Story, 2005; Sirdeshmukh et al, 2002). It is the central condition of personal and functional connection that turns specific brand performance into consumer investment (Breivik and Thorbijornsen, 2008; Gundlach and Murphy, 1993; Masey and Dawes, 2007). While, building enduring customer relationship carries significant rewards, it can also come at prohibitive cost and risk, and a firm’s competitive position on trust will go a long way toward defining the marginal benefit of relationship investment.

Our approach to trust defines the construct after the interpersonal view that trust is multidimensional (Hess, 1995, Johnson George and Swap, 1982; Sirdeshmukh et al, 2002). It results from exogenous personal and functional performance indicators reflecting the suitability of brand for a long term association as defined by partner’s motivation (fidelity) and competence (reliability). Brand reliability, is a generalized attitude, most often based on future performance and it indicates the likelihood that a brand will be able to deliver on product and services parameters (Hess, 1995) Johnson-George and Swap, m1982); Morgan and Hunt, 1984; Sirdeshmukh et al 2002).

Reliability can either describe a discrete transactional incident or reside as a cumulative construct resulting from a series of transactions (Garbarino and Johnson, 1999); and once established for the brand of general applies to beliefs about yet un-expected attributes. Fidelity is defined as a brand’s suitability for an invested relationship as indicated by its motivation to make the customer happy, rather than by its ability to do so, the later being the indicative of reliability. Other indicators, such as the brand” commitment to the community in which they reside and quickly responding to dissatisfaction may also be key contributors to fidelity (Johnson-George and Swap, 1982; Hess, 1995; Massey and Dawes, 2007).
Within a definition of fidelity that includes the concept of altruism one finds the justification for customer to transition from suspicious transaction partners, seeking only fair utility from each interaction, to relationship partners that suspend purely functional evaluation in favor of relationship benefits calculations (Blau, 1977; Jones and Taylor, 2007). To measure exchange we adapted scales previously used to measure exchange characteristics of consumer products (Hess and Story, 2005, Story and Hess, 2006), since the link between brand performance and relationship community is reflective of consumers’ willingness to bond with a brand in anticipation of related benefits beyond those accrued by functional performance. From a decision maker’s perspective, the fundamental advantage of a multidimensional view of consumer relationships is the ability to more precisely evaluate return on investment. In other words, service performance is a key contributor to personal aspects of brand relationship investment, expressed in this research as communality, while product performance is the primary indicator of reliability and the functional or exchange aspects of the relationship.

Both functional and personal relationship characteristics are required for full relationship investment to develop. Product oriented performance, and those aspects of consumer experience that imply brand competence, work toward evaluation of brand reliability and an exchange relationship connection.

Joreskog and Sorbom, 1989 explained that Service-oriented performance and the aspects of the experience that communicator brand care or concerns for the consumer’s interest typically engender perceptions of brand fidelity, the required condition for relationship communality and terminal investment.
2.7 Conclusions from literature review

The literature review brought out the relevance of understanding brand building in the pharmaceutical scenario. Looking at the pharma arena prescription drugs needs to be positioned in such a matter that it gives high recall in physicians mind. The absence of model connecting brand awareness and brand trust is addressed in the gap analysis. The study of literature gave insight about branding and positioning concepts in the present scenario. Pharmaceutical industry requires more attention from researchers in brand management.

2.8 Gap analysis

The pharmaceutical arena is often seen as a distinct territory with in market research. Within this a vast volume and variety of work is conducted on national and international basis. The present Research work tries to tap two important gaps, namely knowledge gap and strategic gap. As FMCG branding is extensively studies and innovated but not much is explored for pharmaceutical branding (Schulling, 2004). This study tries to explain few positioning typologies for pharmaceutical industry.

Review of extensive literature suggested that not much emphasis has been given on consumers (patients) perspective of pharmaceutical brand. Since the focus is on patients and physicians, focused efforts needs to be undertaken by marketers to design strategy. This would help in introducing new positioning typologies in various segments.

Another research gap found out in the area is the identifying dimensions and characteristics of present perception about pharmaceutical companies in physician’s mind. This type of study though is being though done in various sectors but pharmaceutical companies are left outs.
In the drug industry where brands are numerous, physicians need to be aware and should be trusting brands. This dimension of reliability is focused in this study in enhancing prescription.

This study tries to build the bridge between major players and followers to help in understanding the knowledge gap and strategic gap in streamlining their practices. The absence of research methodology to measure pharma positioning is addressed here.

These research gaps are identified and addressed through this study.