

Effect of Corporate Image on Brand Trust and Brand Affect

Nischay K. Upamannyu*¹, S.S Bhakar¹ and Mansi Gupta²

¹Prestige Institute of Management, Gwalior, India

²Alumni of PIMG, Gwalior, India

ARTICLE INFO

Received 16 Jan. 2015
Received in revised form 08 Feb. 2015
Accepted 14 Feb. 2015

Keywords:

Corporate image,
Brand trust and brand affect,
MANCOVA.

Corresponding author: Prestige
Institute of Management, Gwalior,
India.

E-mail address:
nischay.upamannyu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research article is to investigate the relationships between corporate image, Brand Trust and Brand Affect for Indian banks, based on their credit card holders' perceptions. The article also examines the effect of demographic variables such as Age, Qualification, Income and Gender on Brand trust and Brand Affect.

MANCOVA analysis was applied using PASW-18 to evaluate the effect of causal effect of corporate image on Brand Trust and Brand Affect and simultaneously the effect of categorical demographic variable on the dependent variables Brand Trust and Brand Affect. The corporate Image was found to have significant causal effect on both the dependent variables Brand Trust and Brand Affect. All the demographic variables were found to have no effect on Brand Affect and only gender was found to have significant effect on Brand Trust. Therefore, Banks must be careful while developing corporate image as it will also determine the level of trust customers have on the brand and will determine the brand affect.

© 2015 International Journal of Applied Science-Research and Review.
All rights reserved

INTRODUCTION

Many Large Banks in India use corporate names for issuing credit card to the consumers. The corporate names are likely to influence consumers positively as an endorser behind many of their products. For example, Axis Bank, Bank of Baroda, Canara Bank, Corporation Bank, HDFC, Canara bank, ICICI Bank, Indian Overseas Bank, Kotak Mahindra Bank, Punjab National Bank, SBI, Syndicate Bank, Union Bank of India and Vijya bank. These are the banks whose issues their credit card by using their brand names to get customer trust for their existing consumer. Credit cards have come to the rescue of people with hot pockets. They, nowadays, put their trust in the innovation of credit card brands where they need not carry large sums of money with them; instead simply carry a credit card which is

linked up their bank account enabling them to make payment without batting an eye.

It is trendy now, to make payment at a hotel, restaurant or departmental store/mall using a credit card. Because of the fear of one's bank account details being swiped and stolen, more and more credit cards are made secure so that even if a credit card is stolen, the money is one's bank account stay safe. Credit cards now are of various types with different fees, interest rates and rewarding programs. Such as a standard credit card, premium credit card, secured credit card, Limited purpose credit card, charge credit card, specialty credit card and prepaid credit card.

Banks, whose are issuing credit card expect from consumer to evaluate their product

more favorably by showing their corporate names together with individual product brands.

It has been reported that customer's associations with a company have influence on their product evaluations. That is, consumers' associations with a company's corporate agility and its corporate social responsibility influences product evaluations (Brown and Dacin 1997)⁵; (Sen and Bhattacharya 2001)³¹. For example, consumers will evaluate credit card having seen the bank corporate image if they feel about the banks that they honest, giving quick respond, error free work, different schemes over the cards, so customer more favorably toward the credit cards as their corporate image Improve.

This research investigates the relationship between company's corporate image, Brand Trust and Brand Affect towards various brands of credit cards in India. Data for this research were collected from 200 consumers through survey method. They were asked to provide their perceptions on various cards for each of 10 Indian Banks.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Corporate image

All the organizations have unique image and this image is formed on the basis of perception of its stakeholders, whether the organization does good jobs for them or not to do but the image of each organization would be "unique" in nature. To the greatest extent, this image influence stakeholders' reactions to specific corporate actions, products or stores. Corporate image are exclusively perceived as the mental image of an organization. Which are constituted bases on perceiving characteristics of the organization is what we refers to as the "Corporate image". Corporate image is an overall perception of the company held by different segments of the public (Corporate image is an overall perception of the company held by different segments of the public (Villanova, Zinkhan and Hyman, 1990)³⁶. Through this definition, there are two main key phrases that are keenly understandable. The first is "Overall perception" and second one is "Different segments". Overall perception is developed through what the organization is likely to do for its stakeholders in terms of

benefits, what the benefits the stakeholders seek in the view of stockholder, board director, employee, supplier, channel members, customer and community. That contributes to overall perception of these stakeholders. Second one is the how the organization deals in the different segment of public where the organization encounters with the stakeholders.

Since a corporate's image affects stakeholders' behavior, organization strives to develop and manage their image for several reasons, including just like as to excite the sales, establishing company goodwill, creating and developing employee identity, inspiring investor for investing their money for seeking their benefits, influencing financial institutions. Whenever fund is required, the fund from a financial institution can be arranged, maintain positive relation with the community, government, special interest groups and other opinion leaders and caring position having showed competitive advantage.

Brand trust

Brand trust is a security and feeling of safety of the customer that is held by the customer, wherever, customer interaction takes place with brand characteristics and that characteristic is based on promises and commitment of the brand in view of the customer in the context of reliability, sense of responsibility and benefits toward the community welfare.

In consonance with the literature review, our definition of brand trust also incorporates all-important facets of trust that researchers include in their operationalization of the construct such as beliefs about the viability and intentionality. The first dimension of viability is technical nature and concerned with the belief of individual that brand will full fill its promises. This is just a perception of an individual with the respect of the brand. In our opinion, this dimension is an integral aspect of brand trust which indicates that brand as a promise of future performance (Deighton 1992)¹⁰.

Second dimension is intentionality, reflects an emotional security on the part of individuals. An individual starts trusting on the emotional assurance which is given by brand that it will take care of the customer. McAllister

(1995)²³ defined as “the degree to which an individual is confident and eager to act on the basis of the words, actions and results of others”.

Brand affect

Brand affect and brand trust both the elements seem to be similar but there is certainly a huge difference between these two confusing dimensions. Brand affect is the power of the brand which elicit the emotional experience of the consumer. Brand affect is the relationship between consumer and brand. This relationship is developed due to strong bonding based on evaluation of attributes of the brand. This bonding is constituted due to the experience of the customer with brands.

In other words, it can be described as consumers' emotional response towards a brand in consequence of having an experience with the brand. Therefore, we suggest that the brand affect occurs under favor of close relationship with brands (Ebru Tumer Kabadayu & Alev Kocak Alan, 2012)¹⁵, (Upamannyu, Nischay & Garima Mathur, 2013)³². Brand affect is defined as the potential in a brand to elicit a positive emotional response in the average consumer as a result of its usage (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001)⁷; (Morgan & Hunt, 1994)²³. In another study, brand affect is defined as a brand's potential to elicit a positive emotional response in the average consumer as a result of its use (Moorman, Zaltman & Deshpande, 1992)²².

Review of Literature

Corporate image

Corporate image is a perception about the company and Corporate image can also be defined as the impression of an organization which is generated through communication (Bernstein, 1986)³; (Zinknan, Ganesh, Jaju, & Hayes, 2001)³⁴; (Gray & Balmer, 1998)¹⁶. Gray & Balmer (1998)¹⁶ found that corporate image is as the mental picture of the corporation formed in the minds of different section of society. Grunig (2003)¹⁷ claimed that “corporate image could be taken as concepts such as message, reputation, perception, cognition, attitude, credibility, belief, communication and relationship”.

Barich and Kotler, (1991)² found that corporate image is the overall impression made on people about an organization. Nguyen and Leblanc (2001)²⁴ stated that corporate image is concerned with physical and behavioral attribute of the firm. Physical attributes include business name, architecture, variety of products and service. Behavioral attributes include an impression of quality communicated by each person interacting with the firm's clients.

Kennedy (1977)¹⁹ found that corporate image has two principal components: functional and emotional. Functional component is concerned with tangible characteristics, while emotional component is associated with psychological dimensions that are manifested by evaluation, feeling and attitude towards a company (Barich & Kotler 1991)²; (Cohen 1963)⁸; (Dowling 1986)¹⁴; (Pharoah 1982)²⁶. LeBlanc & Nguyen (1996)²⁰ posited that corporate image is the residual of an aggregate process by which a customer compares and contrasts various attributes of a company. It is both dynamic and complex. Van Rekom (1997)³³ explored that it is the net result of the interaction of a person's beliefs, ideas, feelings and impressions about an object and exists in the mind of that person.

The key factor is the influence of corporate image that the stakeholders experience of the firm (Dowling, 1986)¹⁴. Gray and Balmer (1998)¹⁶ explained that corporate image was generated by corporate identity, Kennedy (1977)¹⁹ found that corporate image is dependent on communication through the organization and corporate image is related to tangible and intangible characteristics for instance, the functional characteristics, physical characteristics and emotional characteristics of the firm. Martineau (1958)²¹ explored that it consists of functional quality and psychological Attributes. Corporate image in a service organization includes attributes, functional consequences and symbolic meaning (Padgett and Allen, 1997)²⁶.

Brand trust

Morgan & Hunt (1994)²⁴, stated that it is conceptualized as a notable factor in the firm's success. Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001)⁷ explored that brand trust is the willingness of the

average consumer to rely on the ability of the brand to perform its stated function and brand trust has two dimensions borrowed from both psychology and marketing fields, first, perceived performance and second, consonance with needs and wants of customers. Brand trust come up after consumer's evaluation of companies' offerings. If companies exude beliefs of safety, honesty and reliability about their brands to consumers, brand trust will be generated subsequently (Doney & Cannon, 1997)¹³. It can be interpreted that brand trust is developed, created and built by direct experiences of consumers via brands.

Arjun & Morris (2001)¹ narrated that the trust can reduce the consumer's uncertainty, because the consumer not only knows that brand is worth trusting, but also feels that dependable, safe and honest consumption scenario is the important link of brand trust. Hiscock (2001)¹⁸ explored the "The ultimate goal of marketing is to generate an intense bond between the consumer and the brand, and the main ingredient of this bond is trust", but trust is an elusive concept. Blackston (1992)⁴ defined that trust is one component of consumer relationships with brands.

Dawar and Pillutla (2000)⁹ viewed that brand trust focuses on the perceived performance of the brand. And described brand trust in terms of reliability and dependability. Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande (1992)²³ incorporate the behavioral intention of willingness into their definition. In our conceptualization of brand trust, willingness is absent because, according to Morgan and Hunt's (1994)²⁴ arguments, the confidence that a consumer can rely on the brand indeed implies the behavioral intention to rely.

Upamannyu, Nischay *et al.* (2013)³¹, found in his study that brand trust is dimension which has a significant relationship with loyalty. They also explored through brand trust, customer loyalty is built. Rotter (1980)²⁸ explored that trust is an important variable affecting human relationships at all levels. Deutsch (1973)¹² explained that trust is also a confidence that makes one brand preferred over another. Urban *et al* (1996)³² found that brand trust is undoubtedly one of the strongest tools of making the relationships with the customers on

the internet. Casalo *et al.* (2007)⁶ found brand trust a cognitive tool which induces emotional response, namely brand affect. On the other hand, brand trust leads brand loyalty (Delgado-Ballester & Munuera – Aleman, 2001)¹¹. It is due to brand trust's ability for creating a highly valued relationship (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001)⁷. It shows that brand loyalty is an outcome of continual trust over the brand. It means when customer continuously uses a particular brand because he or she trust over the brand. The outcome of this practice of consumer will be loyalty that will start unintentionally.

Brand affect

Chaudhuri & Holbrook (2001)⁷ suggested that brand affect is a positive response of consumer after its usage and narrated that difference between brand trust and brand affect is thus: brand trust is viewed as a long process which can be occurred by thought and consideration of consumer experiences. While brand affect is consisted of impulsive feelings which can be formed spontaneously. Moorman *et al* (1992)²³ stated that brand affect is defined as a brand's potential to elicit a positive emotional response in the average consumer as a result of its usage.

Upamannyu and Mathur (2013)³⁰ found that brand affect is having significant effect on brand loyalty in the area of fast moving consumer goods. Because affect emerges when consumer use a particular brand so customer are influenced through using the emotional attributes of the brand.

Research problem

The research problem of the current study was to find out facts about the corporate image, does it work to create brand trust or brand affect in view of the customer?

Research gaps

Research gap in the current study existed between corporate image (independent variable), brand trust and brand affect. Researcher has built a proposed model for testing. Few important questions were raised such as:

- Will a change of a company's corporate image influence consumer attitudes toward

brand included in the company's brand portfolio?

- Will a corporate image influence brand trust and brand affect similarly?

Both marketers and marketing researchers are interested in these question considering that there are a number of different product brands in many large companies than ever before are spending money in corporate social responsibility initiatives.

Objective of the current study

- To design and re-standardize measures for evaluating corporate image, brand trust and brand affect.
- To identify the underlying factors of corporate image, Brand Trust and Brand Affect.
- To evaluate the effect of Corporate Image as independent variable & Age, Qualification, Gender, and Income as a fixed factor on Brand Trust and Brand Affect as the dependent variable.
- Open new avenues for future research.

Hypotheses framed

H₀₁- There is no effect of Corporate Image of Banks as Independent variable on Brand Trust of Credit card in India.

H₀₂- There is no effect of Corporate Image of Banks as Independent variable on Brand Affect of Credit card in India.

H₀₃- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Age' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit cards in India.

H₀₄- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Qualification' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit Cards.

H₀₅- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Income' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit Cards.

H₀₆- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit cards.

H₀₇- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Age & Qualification' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit cards.

H₀₈- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Qualification &

Income' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit cards.

H₀₉- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Income & Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand affect of Credit cards.

H₀₁₀- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Age & Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit cards.

Research Methodology

The study

The study was causal in nature and the survey method was used for data collection. The population of the current study was all the customers in FMCG sector at Gwalior region for the study.

Sample

Total Two hundred customers of varying age group from the Gwalior City in Madhya Pradesh participated in this study. Three construct were used (Corporate image, Brand Trust and Brand affect). In all, 250 questionnaires were distributed and out of them 215 were received eventually. Finally 200 questionnaires were selected as 15 were not filled properly. The descriptive study was done over categorical variable and the results indicated that Age groups were isolated into four groups e.i., 40.7% respondent in the current study was less than 25 years old. 48.2% respondent in the current study was between 26 to 38 years old. 10.6% respondent were in the current study were between 39 to 48 years old and 0.5% respondent were found to be above from 48 years old.

The Education was second categorical variable used in the current study and the data was collected over this. Education was categorized in four category i.e., 15.1% respondent in the current study were Intermediate, 44.7% respondents in the current study were Graduate, 32.7% respondent in the current study were Post Graduate and 7. % respondent were Doctorate in the current study.

The Income was third categorical variable used in the current study and the data was collected over this. Income was categorized in four different categories which were mentioned clearly i.e., 39.7% respondent in the

current were found to be below from Rs. 4000, 40.7% respondent in the current were found to be between Rs 5000 – 15000, 12.6% respondent in the current study were found to be Rs 16000 – 25000 and 7% respondent were found to be above from Rs. 26000.

The Gender was fourth categorical which used in the current study and the data was collected for analyzing over this. Gender was categorized in two different categories which were Male and Female. The 46.2% Male was used in the current study and the remaining were female.

Measures

Multi scale was used to measure the 3 constructs being investigated in the current study. The responses were collected on a Likert type scale of 1 to 5 for all the variables. The measures were tested for reliability and validity. Content validity of measures was established through a panel of judges before using the measures for collecting data for the current study.

Corporate image was assessed through the five item scale of adopted from Lemmink *et al.* (2003)²¹. The value of Croanbach's alpha for the scale was reported as 0.95 in the previous research and in the current study it was reported as 0.797 (see table 1.) The seven items were taken. The items were: (1) This company employs talented people (2) This company actively support local communities (3) This company is financially sound (4) This company often introduces new products (5) This company has the strong marketing capability (6) This company is well managed and (7) This company offer high quality products. The items were measured in previous research using a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). But little change was made in the current study regarding the sensitivity of Likert scale. The sensitivity of Likert scale was changed in the current study to see the confusion of the respondent hence, the maximum sensitivity on construct was reduced from 7 to 5.

Brand Trust was assessed through the three item scale adopted from Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001)⁷. The value of Croanbach's alpha for the scale was reported as 0.97 in the previous research and in the current study it was

reported as 0.823 (see table 1.) The five items were taken. Brand Trust used Three 7 point Likert scale items (1) Trust this brand (2) I rely on this brand (3) This is an honest brand.

Brand affect was also assessed through adapted from Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001)⁷. The value of Croanbach's alpha for the scale was reported as 0.87 in the previous research and in the current study it was reported as 0.887 (see table 1.) Three 7 point Likert scale items (1) I feel better when I use this brand (2) This brand makes me happy and (3) This brand gives me pleasure.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Reliability test of corporate image, brand trust and brand affect

Nunnally (1978)²⁷ recommended that instruments used in basic research have a reliability of about 0.70 or better. The reliability was computed by using PASW 18 software. The Croanbach's Alpha reliability test was applied to compute reliability coefficients for all the items in the questionnaire. (See table 1.)

It is considered that the reliability, value more than 0.7 is considered good enough. The Croanbach's Alpha reliability value of Corporate Image of Bank, Brand Trust and Brand Affect of credit card were found to be 0.797, 0.888 & 0.887 which are higher than the standard value 0.7. Therefore, all the questionnaires can be treated as reliable in the current study.

Factor analysis of corporate image

Kaiser Meyer Olkin Measure of sampling adequately indicated KMO Value of 0.588 which indicated that the sample size was good enough for the current study. KMO value above 0.5 are considered to be good enough to consider the data as normally distributed and therefore suitable for exploratory factor analysis. (See table 2.)

Bartlett's test of sphericity which tested the null hypothesis that the item to correlation matrix based on the responses received from responded for Corporate Image of Banks was an Identity Matrix. The Bartlett's test was evaluated through the Chi - square test which are having value of Chi-square 142.381 which is significant at 0.000 level of significance, indicating that null

hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it is clear that the item to item correlation, not an identity matrix and the data were normally distributed and data were suitable for factor analysis.

Principal component analysis of corporate image

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was applied on the corporate Image data collected on the Banks in India. The PCA with Kaiser Normalization and Varimax Rotation converged on three factors after Four iterations. (See table 3.)

Factor analysis of brand trust

Kaiser Meyer Olkin Measure of sampling adequately indicated KMO Value of 0.734 which indicated that the sample size was good enough for the current study. KMO value above 0.5 are considered to be good enough to consider the data as normally distributed and therefore suitable for exploratory factor analysis. (See table 4.)

Bartlett's test of sphericity which tested the null hypothesis that the item to correlation matrix based on the responses received from responded for Brand Trust was an Identity Matrix. The Bartlett's test was evaluated through the Chi - square test which are having value of Chi-square 347.010 which is significant at 0.000 level of significance, indicating that null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it is clear that the item to item correlation, not an identity matrix and the data were normally distributed and data were suitable for factor analysis.

Principal component analysis of brand trust

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was applied on the Brand Trust data collected on the Brand by credit card. The PCA with Kaiser Normalization and Varimax Rotation converged no iterations. (See table 5.)

Factor analysis of brand affect

Kaiser Meyer Olkin Measure of sampling adequately indicated KMO Value of 0.746 which indicated that the sample size was good enough for the current study. KMO value above 0.5 are considered to be good enough to consider the data as normally distributed and therefore suitable for exploratory factor analysis. (See table 6.)

Bartlett's test of sphericity which tested the null hypothesis that the item to correlation matrix based on the responses received from responded for Brand Affect was an Identity Matrix. The Bartlett's test was evaluated through the Chi - square test which are having value of Chi-square 332.700 which is significant at 0.000 level of significance, indicating that null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it is clear that the item to item correlation, not an identity matrix and the data were normally distributed and data were suitable for factor analysis.

Principal component analysis of brand affect

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was applied on the Brand Affect data collected on the Credit card of Indian Banks. The PCA with Kaiser Normalization and Varimax Rotation converged with no iterations. (See table 7.)

Multivariate analysis (MANCOVA)

Multivariate MANCOVA was applied to evaluate the effect of Corporate Image as independent variable and Age, Qualification, Income and Gender as fixed factors and Brand Trust and Brand Affect was treated as dependent variables. (See table 8.)

Box's test of equality of covariance matrix indicates that the value of 'F' is 1.768 which is significant at the 0 % level of significance. The null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups is therefore rejected. (See table 9.)

To select appropriate Post Hoc test Levene's test of equality of error variances was applied. The null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable (Brand Trust) is equal across groups was tested using 'F' test. The value of 'F' was found to be 1.468 which is significant at the 3.5 % level of significance, indicating that Null hypothesis is rejected at the 5 % level of significance. The null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable (Brand Affect) is equal across groups was tested using 'F' test. The value of 'F' was found to be 1.153 which is significant at the 24.9 % level of significance, indicating that Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significance. Since the no. of groups for the dependent

variable are very large ($4 \times 4 \times 4 \times 2 \times 5$), the error variance of the dependent variable was in any case likely to be unequal and post hoc tests that are available and are suitable for equal variances among groups were used. (See table 10.)

The Multivariate MANCOVA model fit is indicated by Adjusted R2 separately for all the two dependent variables under test. The adjusted R2 value of the dependent variable Brand Trust of credit card was found to be 0.256, value of adjusted R2 for dependent variable Brand Affect of Credit card was found to be 0.259 for the current model. The model fit values for all the two dependent variables were tested using an ANOVA test.

Corrected model of (Brand Trust of Credit card) has been tested for best fit using 'F' test having a value of 3.006 which is significant at 0.000 level of significance that indicating the model with Independent variable (Corporate Image), demographics variable as fixed factors and Brand Trust ad dependent variable has high fit.

Corrected model of the Brand Affect of credit card has been tested for best fit using 'F' test having a value of 3.038 which is significant at the 0.000 % level of significance; indicating that the model with the Independent, demographics variable as fixed factor and the Brand Affect of credit card as dependent variable has high fit.

H₀₁- There is no effect of Corporate Image of Bank as Independent variable on Brand Trust of Credit card of Banks

The effect of Independent variable 'Corporate Image of Bank' on Brand Trust of credit card was tested using ANOVA; the value of F was found to be 41.475, significant at the 0.000 % level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is strong significant effect of Independent variable as 'Corporate Image' of the Bank on Brand trust of credit card in respect of Bank.

H₀₂- There is no effect of Corporate Image of banks as Independent variable on Brand Affect of credit card

The effect of Independent variable 'Corporate Image of Bank' on Brand Affect of

credit card was tested using ANOVA; the value of F was found to be 51.833, significant at the 0.000 % level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is strong significant effect of Corporate image as Independent variable on Brand Affect in the context of Corporate image of the bank.

H₀₃- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Age' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Bank

The effect of Demographic variable 'Age' on Brand Trust & Brand affect of credit card was tested using ANOVA; the value of 'F' was found to be 1.277, significant at the 30.2 % level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is no effect of 'Age' on Brand trust.

The value of was 'F' found to be 1.341, significant at the 26.3 % level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is no 'Age' on Brand Affect.

H₀₄- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Qualification' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit card

The effect of Demographic variable 'Qualification' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect was tested using ANOVA; the value of 'F' was found to be 0.214, significant at the 88.6 % level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is no effect of 'Qualification' on Brand Trust.

The value of F was found to be 0.012, significant at 99.6% level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is no effect of 'Qualification' on Brand Affect of credit card.

H₀₅- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Income' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit card

The effect of Demographic variable 'Income' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit card was tested using ANOVA; the value of F was found to be.817, significant at 48.6% level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not

rejected at the 5% level of significance, indicating that there is no effect of 'Income' on Brand Trust of credit card in context of the Bank.

The value of F was found to be 1.617, significant at the 18.7% level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5% level of significance, indicating that there is no effect of 'Income' on Brand Affect of credit card.

H₀₆- There is no effect of a demographic variable as 'Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of Credit card

The effect of Demographic variable 'Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect was tested using ANOVA; the value of F was found to be 2.912, significant at the 03.6 % level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is a significant effect of 'Gender' on Brand Trust. The results indicating clearly that Male and female are having significantly varying in terms of Brand trust of credit card.

The value of F was found to be 307, significant at the 82.0 % level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significance, indicating that there is no effect of 'Gender' on the Brand affect of credit card.

H₀₇- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Age & Qualification' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit cards issued by Banks

The interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Age & Qualification' on Brand trust & Brand affect of credit card was tested using ANOVA; the value of F was found to be 0.484. Which is significant at the 78.8 % level of significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variables 'Age & Qualification' on Brand Trust of credit card.

The value of F was found to be 0.329. Which is significant at the 89.5 % level of significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Age & Qualification' on Brand Affect of credit cards of Bank.

H₀₈- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Qualification & Income' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit cards of Banks

The interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Qualification & Income' on Brand Trust & Brand affect of Credit card was tested using ANOVA; the value of F was found to be 0.742. Which is significant at the 59.3 % level of significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Qualification & Income' on Brand Trust of credit cards.

The value of F was found to be 0.379. Which is significant at the 86.3 % level of significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Qualification & Income' on Brand Affect of credit card.

H₀₉- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Income & Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit cards

The interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Income & Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit card was tested using ANOVA; the value of 'F' was found to be 0.759. Which is significant at the 58 % level of significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5 % level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Income & Gender' on Brand trust of credit cards.

The value of F was found to be 1.429. Which is significant at the 21.6% level of significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5% level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Income & Gender' on Brand Affect of credit cards.

H₀₁₀- There is no interaction effect of a demographic variable as 'Age & Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit cards.

The interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Age & Gender' on Brand Trust & Brand Affect of credit cards was tested using ANOVA; the value of F was found to be 1.877. Which is significant at the 10.1% level of

significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5% level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Income & Gender' on Brand Trust of credit cards.

The value of F was found to be 1.098. Which is significant at the 36.3% level of significance. Therefore, the Null hypothesis is not rejected at the 5% level of significances, indicating that there is no interaction effect of Demographics variable as 'Age & Gender' on Brand Affect of credit cards.

Implication & Suggestion

Implication

The finding of the current study can be used as strategic tools in the area of Marketing by Banks with respect of Credit cards. This study is useful for brand manager to take corrective appropriate action with respect of establishing corporate image. The findings of the current study indicated that there is a significant relationship between corporate image and brand affect. So if the strategy of brand affect has to be implemented over the respondent. Certainly, corporate image should be very much stronger. The other finding of the current study can also be used by the brand manager which indicating corporate image is one of the most important stimulator which effect on brand trust of customers. So, certainly, the corporations must understand the worth of image for itself. Image is the perceived by the customer which is a blend of three important stimulator i.e., Association, Personality and Value.

Suggestion

- The current study was conducted using 200 respondents so if we increase the number of respondents the result might be varied.
- To ensure the generalization of further research, the study should be carried out using the larger sampling plan.
- The selection of a demographic variable should be done basis Pilot study or Focus groups intially, so Appropriate categorical variable might be more suitable for the further research. The respondent might be more appropriate.
- Non probability purposive sampling techniques was used in the current study that

because the sample size was not bigger. But, if the sample size is kept larger in the further research so Probality random sampling techniques might be used to make this study generalized.

- The respondent which was used in the current study hail from the only Gwalior region. In making this study more generalized the selection of respondent ought to be done from all the city of India.

CONCLUSION

The current study is concluded with the finding of the current study. The results of the current study support the results of the relationship which were established. Corporate image is mental picture which are perceived by the customer in the context of the organization. Therefore, it has been considered basis of previous research that there should be the relationship between corporate image and Brand Trust.

The results of the current was found to be appropriate according previous finding regarding the relationship between corporate image and brand trust. The results in the current study were found to be in line that corporate image effect significantly on Brand trust. People first see or measure corporate image. If the corporate image is good in view of customer certainly, customer trust can be won by the brand easily. Now, the question is sprung up that how a good corporate image can be established. For those in the current study, the measure which was used to corporate image in the current study include all the dimensions which enhance the image of the corporation such as talented employee, support to local communities, financially sound, bringing a new version of the product for the customer, error free product, strong marketing capabilities.

The results of the current study also show that corporate image not only a stimulator to set the brand trust in the perspective of the customer, but also it is stimulator which also has a strong affect over brand affect. As brand affect is directly concerned with emotional aspects of the brand which are perceived by the customer. So the results of the current study precisely indicated that corporate image also effect the brand affect.

REFERENCES

1. Arjun, C., Morris, & Holbrook, B. (2001), "The Chain of Effects From Brand Trust and Brand Affect to Brand Performance: The Role of Brand Loyalty", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65, pp. 81-93.
2. Barich, H. & Kotler, P. (1991), "A framework for marketing image management", *Sloan Management Review*, 32 (2), 94-104.
3. Bernstein, D. (1986), "*Corporate image & Reality: A critique of corporate communications*", Eastbourne: Holt, Rinehart and winston Ltd.
4. Blackston, M. (1992), "A brand with an attitude: a suitable case for the treatment", *Journal of the Market Research Society*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 231-41.
5. Brown, Tom J. and Peter A. Dacin (1997), "The Company and the Product: Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses," *Journal of Marketing*, 61 (January), 68-84.
6. Casalo, L. V; Flavian, C. and Guinaliu, M (2007), "The influence of satisfaction, perceived reputation and trust on a consumer's commitment to a website", *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 13, 1-17.
7. Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001), "The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
8. Cohen, R. (1963), '*The measurement of corporate images*', in *The Corporation and Its Publics*, ed J. W. Riley, John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 48-63.
9. Dawar, N. & Pillutla, M.M. (2000), "Impact of Product-Harm Crises on Brand Equity: The Moderating Role of Consumer Expectations, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37, May, pp. 215-226.
10. Deighton, John (1992), "The Consumption of Performance", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 362-372.
11. Delgado-Ballester, E. and Munuera-Alemán, J. L. (2001), "Brand Trust in the Context of Consumer Loyalty", *European Journal of Marketing*, 35, 1238-1258.
12. Deutsch, M. (1973), "*The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*", New Haven CN: Yale University Press.
13. Doney, P. and Cannon, J.P. (1997), "An examination of the nature of trust in buyer-seller relationships", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.61, April, pp. 35 – 51.
14. Dowling, G.R. (1986), "Managing your corporate images", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 109-15.
15. Ebru Tumer Kabadayi & Alev Kocak Alan (2012), "Brand trust and Brand effect: Their strategic importance on brand loyalty". *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, June 11, 81-88.
16. Gray E R & Balmer J M T (1998), "Managing Corporate Image and Corporate Reputation", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 695-702. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301\(98\)00074-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(98)00074-0).
17. Grunig, J. (2003), "Image and substance: from symbolic to behavioural relationships", in Balmer, J.M.T., Greyser, S.A. (Eds), *Revealing the Corporation: Perspectives on Identity, Image, Reputation, Corporate Branding, and Corporate-Level Marketing*, Routledge, New York, NY.
18. Hiscock, J. (2001), 'Most trusted brand', *Marketing*, March, 32-33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255>.
19. Kennedy, S.H. (1977), "Nurturing corporate image", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 120-64.
20. LeBlanc, G., and Nguyen, Nha. (1996), "Cues Used by Customers Evaluating Corporate Image in Service Firms," *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 7(2), 44-56.
21. Lemmink, J., Schuijff, A. and Streukens, S. (2003) The Role of Corporate Image and Company Employment Image in Explaining Application Intentions. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 24, 1-15.
22. Martineau, P. (1958), "Sharper focus for the corporate image", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. November/ December, pp. 49-58.
23. McAllister, D.J. (1995), "Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations, *Academy of Management Journal*. 38(0), p.24-59.
24. Moorman, C., Zaltman, G. and Deshpande, R. (1992), "Relationships Between Providers and Users of Market Research: The Dynamics of Trust Within and Between Organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29, 314-28.
25. Morgan, Robert M. and Hunt, Shelby D. (1994), "The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (July), 20-38.
26. Nguyen N., Leblanc G. (2001), Corporate Image and Corporate Reputation in Customers' Retention Decisions in Services [J], *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 8, 227-36.
27. Nunnally, J. C. (1978), "*Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.)", New York: McGraw-Hill.

28. Padgett, D. and Allen, D, (1997), "Communicating experiences: a narrative approach to creating service brand image", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 49- 62.
29. Pharoah, N. (1982), 'Corporate image research in the brewing industry or from red revolution to country goodness in years', *Journal of Marketing Research Society*, Vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 240-56.
30. Rotter, J. B. (1980), "Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility", *American Psychologist*, 35(1), 1-7.
31. Sen, Sankar and C.B. Bhattacharya (2001), "Does Doing Good Always Lead to Doing Better? Consumer Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (May), 225-243.
32. Upamannyu, Nischay & Garima Mathur (2013), "Effect of brand trust, brand affect and brand image on customer brand loyalty & customer brand extension attitude in FMCG Sector." *Practices & Research in Marketing*, Vol. 3.
33. Upamannyu, Nischay; Amitabha Maheshwari & Pooja Bhakuni (2013), "The impact of brand trust on customer loyalty: A study of fmcg at Gwalior region". *Abhinav International monthly refereed Journal of research in Management & Technology*. Special Issue, ISSN No. 2320-0073.
34. Urban, G.L., Sultan, F., & Qualls, W.J. (2000), Placing trust at the center of your internet strategy, *Sloan Management Review*, 42, 39-49
35. Van Rekom, J. (1997), 'Deriving an operational measure of corporate identity', *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 410-422.
36. Villanova, L., Zinkhan, G.M. and Hyman, M.R. (1990) 'On Defining and Measuring Store Image', in B.J. Dunlap (ed.) *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the Academy of Marketing Science*, April, pp. 466-70. New Orleans, LA: Academy of Marketing Science.
37. Zinknan, G. M., Ganesh, J., Jaju, A., & Hayes, L. (2001), "Corporate image: A conceptual framework for strategic planning, *American Marketing Association*, pp. 152-160.

Table 1. Croanbach's Alpha reliability test

No. of Variable	Name of Variable	Croanbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Variable 1	Corporate Image	0.797	7
Variable 2	Brand Trust	0.888	3
Variable 3	Brand Affect	0.887	3

Table 2. KMO and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.588
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	142.381
	Df	21
	Sig.	.000

Table 3. Principal component analysis

Factor Name	Eigen Value	Total	Variance	Statement	Loading value
Factor one	1.195	1.627	23.246	Ci1	.859
				Ci2	.840
Factor Two	1.260	1.581	22.585	CI7	.774
				CI6	.748
				CI5	.468
Factor Three	1.150	1.156	16.517	CI4	.736
				CI3	.724

Table 4. KMO and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.734
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	347.010
	Df	3
	Sig.	.000

Table 5. Principal component analysis

Factor Name	Eigen Value	Total	Variance	Statement	Loading value
Factor one	2.458	2.458	81.939	BT1	.924
				BT2	.912
				BT3	.879

Table 6. KMO and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.746
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	332.700
	Df	3
	Sig.	.000

Table 7. Principal component analysis

Factor Name	Eigen Value	Total	Variance	Statement	Loading value
Factor one	2.450	2.450	81.676	BA1	.913
				BA2	.904
				BA3	.894

Table 8. Box's test of equality of covariance Matrices^a

Box's M	174.444
F	1.768
df1	75
df2	2951.713
Sig.	.000
Tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups.	

a. Design: Intercept + corporate image + age + qualification + income + gender + age * qualification + qualification * income + income * gender + age * gender

Table 9. Levene's test of equality of error Variances^a

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Brand trust	1.468	58	140	.035
Brand affect	1.153	58	140	.249
Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.				

a. Design: Intercept + corporate image + age + qualification + income + gender + age * qualification + qualification * income + income * gender + age * gender

Table 10. Tests of between-subjects effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Corrected model	dimension1	Brand trust	343.066 ^a	34	10.090	3.006	.000
		Brand affect	317.656 ^b	34	9.343	3.038	.000
Intercept	dimension1	Brand trust	5.016	1	5.016	1.494	.223
		Brand affect	6.290	1	6.290	2.046	.155
Corporate image	dimension1	Brand trust	139.203	1	139.203	41.475	.000
		Brand affect	159.396	1	159.396	51.833	.000
Age	dimension1	Brand trust	12.351	3	4.117	1.227	.302
		Brand affect	12.369	3	4.123	1.341	.263
Qualification	dimension1	Brand trust	2.159	3	.720	.214	.886
		Brand affect	.108	3	.036	.012	.998
Income	dimension1	Brand trust	8.225	3	2.742	.817	.486
		Brand affect	14.920	3	4.973	1.617	.187
Gender	dimension1	Brand trust	29.319	3	9.773	2.912	.036
		Brand affect	2.832	3	.944	.307	.820
Age * Qualification	dimension1	Brand trust	8.114	5	1.623	.484	.788
		Brand affect	5.064	5	1.013	.329	.895
Qualification * Income	dimension1	Brand trust	12.454	5	2.491	.742	.593
		Brand affect	5.830	5	1.166	.379	.863
Income * Gender	dimension1	Brand trust	12.742	5	2.548	.759	.580
		Brand affect	21.969	5	4.394	1.429	.216
Age * Gender	dimension1	Brand trust	31.503	5	6.301	1.877	.101
		Brand affect	16.888	5	3.378	1.098	.363
Error	dimension1	Brand trust	550.442	164	3.356		
		Brand affect	504.334	164	3.075		
Total	dimension1	Brand trust	28151.000	199			
		Brand affect	29000.000	199			
Corrected Total	dimension1	Brand trust	893.508	198			
		Brand affect	821.990	198			

a. R Squared = .384 (Adjusted R Squared = .256)

b. R Squared = .386 (Adjusted R Squared = .259)