RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSUMER TRUST AND CONSUMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY OF LAUNDRY DETERGENTS IN BURU BURU ESTATE, NAIROBI CITY COUNTY

ALLAN AGUNDA CHAHASI

A MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROJECT PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE, FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

2021

DECLARATION

I declare that this proposal is my original work and has not been submitted in any other institution

…………………………………………….

ALLAN AGUNDA CHAHASI

D65/12418/2018

This Project has been submitted with my authority as the University supervisor

23/11/2021

DR. MUYA NDAMBUKI

LECTURER, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to my mother who has done all possible to get me to this point in life

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank God almighty for this far I have come in my academic life. I am sincerely grateful to my Supervisor, Dr. Muya Ndambuki for his tireless guidance throughout this study. To my classmates in the MSC, Marketing Class, you provided me with assurance even matters appeared impossible. Thank you. To my Family, I can't thank you enough.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between consumer trust and consumer-based brand equity for laundry detergents in Nairobi City County's Buru Buru Estate. The Howard-Model Sheth's of Consumer Choice and the Social Identity Theory of Branding were used to ground the study. A descriptive cross-sectional survey was used in this study. All of the houses in Buru Buru Estate were counted as part of the population. Within each phase, the researcher chose two courts to serve as the basis for clustering. This resulted in ten courts being chosen, and five households were chosen at random within each court. As a result, the total number of respondent households was 50. This number served as the basis for the sample. A structured questionnaire was used to collect the survey's primary data. A simple regression analysis was used to determine the statistical significance of the relationships between the variables. The findings show that respondents moderately agree that brand characteristics influence their view on the brand equity of laundry detergents, which is supported by the distribution's low standard deviation. According to the mean and low dispersion of the data set examined, respondents agree that company characteristics influence their view of brand equity. At the same time, respondents agree that consumer brand characteristics influence their perception of brand equity, which is supported by the standard deviation's low dispersion. The regression results show that consumer brand characteristics, brand characteristics, and company characteristics explain 29 percent of the variation in brand equity, but it is interesting to note that other factors explain 71 percent of the variation in brand equity. Furthermore, the ANOVA test results show that respondents' perceptions of laundry detergent brand equity in relation to brand characteristics, company brand characteristics, and consumer brand characteristics are insignificant. It is recommended that additional studies be conducted to improve the validity of the current study by using the same or different approaches in terms of sample size, study design, brand, and domain of scope.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Consumer trust is primarily founded on individual perspective and the assumption that one cannot be tricked. The more a manufacturer's trust, the stronger brand loyalty to its goods (Madura, Stecko & Mentel, 2016). (Madura, Stecko & Mentel, 2016). It impacts the establishment and growth of interpersonal relationships, in which trust is a crucial and integral aspect. One sort of alliance is market trade relationships, which are mostly built on trust. Mainstream economics is insufficient until it can clarify why economic actors regularly trust each other and why trust is frequently returned. A long-term connection with customers maintains a company's market viability, and trust is a key component of this partnership, offering significant economic advantages (Madura, Stecko & Mentel, 2016). (Madura, Stecko & Mentel, 2016).

Trust is an important success factor for a brand. This is defined as the average customer's desire to rely on the brand's capabilities to achieve its set goals (Kabadayi & Alan, 2012). (Kabadayi & Alan, 2012). In most situations, brand trust is developed and grown as a consequence of direct consumer encounters with companies. As a consequence, if organizations can supply brand safety, honesty, and trustworthy values, brand trust will be developed. Trust has long been acknowledged as a vital component in understanding brand loyalty, repurchase behavior, and word-of-mouth in both conventional and online channels.

Previously, most study concentrated on the direct consequences of customer satisfaction on immediate desired behavior. However, a growing number of scholars are stressing the role of satisfaction on trust. Trust is a critical variable in relationships, according to Komunda and Osarenkhoe (2012), both philosophically and experimentally. In a competitive market, clients who do not trust a supplier are unlikely to remain loyal. Trust and loyalty are both connected with repurchase activity.

Thus, trust is described by Chiu et al. (2009) as a combination of beliefs about another party's compassion, expertise, and honesty. Benevolence refers to the idea that the trustee (for example, the supplier) will not behave opportunistically. Competition refers to the expectation that the trustee will be able to accomplish its tasks as anticipated. Integrity relates to the assumption that the trustee will be genuine and honourable to their community. Consumers will avoid making purchases from firms that lack trustworthiness (Chiu et al., 2009). (Chiu et al., 2009).

Trust is also vital when it comes to relationship development. Trust fosters devotion and loyalty, all of which are essential for a successful customer connection to be built. As a consequence, trusted brands may produce greater buying power, as well as higher sales, revenue, and market share. Because trust is such a crucial aspect in customer retention, brand trust research in the brand literature has proven unsuccessful.

Tajfel's brand social identification theory will be the topic of this research (1982). (1982). According to the hypothesis, persons who have a strong consumer-brand connection have a strong social psychology and social identity. The Howard-Sheth model illustrates market customer choice. Both theories will be relevant in this research since they both strive to understand the reasons behind purchasers' product choices. According to the idea, the customer is at the core of a variety of information processing processes that producers must understand and exploit in order to guarantee that their goods are the consumer's preferred option.

As a consequence of greater customer knowledge of value and shorter product life cycles, laundry detergent makers, like other fast-growing consumer goods businesses in Kenya, face increased competition in terms of both price competition and deteriorating brand loyalty. As a consequence, customer purchase habits are irregular as severe competition chips away at the Kenyan brand of laundry detergent. All of these new risks have caused several detergent brand producers to adopt alternate survival tactics in order to impress and keep their client base. Understanding customer confidence will assist to design strategies targeted at boosting the brand's long-term survival and performance in the Kenyan market.

1.1.1 Consumer Trust

Trust is an important success factor for a brand. This is defined as the average customer's desire to rely on the brand's capabilities to achieve its set goals (Kabadayi & Alan, 2012). If a person expects an event to occur, they have to trust in it occurring. The readiness to depend on another person in the face of adversity is characterized as trust. This willingness stems from a past comprehension of the other person. It also contains the hope that the other party's actions will result in a beneficial conclusion, despite the possibility that the action might lead to undesirable consequence (Worchel, 1979). (Worchel, 1979).

Trust is an anticipation that is put within certain contextual bounds and restrictions. Thus, according Lewis and Weigert (1985), trust is more than simply predictability; it is assurance in the face of peril. This position is shared by other scientists (Deustch, 1960;

Schlenker et al., 1973; Boon and Holmes, 1991). According to Boon and Holmes (1991), trust is defined as a state of confident expectation of others' intentions for themselves in dangerous situations.

1.1.2 Consumer Based Brand Equity

Aaker (1996) defines brand equity as "a collection of assets associated with a brand's name and symbol that enhances the value that a product or service gives to the company and its customers." Aaker (1996) defines brand equity as a manageable asset of the company. As a result, it is reasonable to expect that the company will need to commit resources in order to properly maintain and enhance brand equity. Brand equity adds value to both the firm and the customer. As a result, brand equity results may be divided into two categories: organizational, such as financial success and market share, and consumer-oriented, such as perceptions or behaviour. Brand equity provides extra value to the consumer in both the perception of brand-related information and the consumer's confidence in the actual purchase choice. Because the suggested assets or liabilities are clearly connected to the artwork or brand name, strategic manipulation of the brand name or artwork can impact the brand's value to customers and the firm as a whole. A company's brand value may be created through a mix of four major asset categories: brand recognition, perceived quality, brand loyalty, and brand associations (Aaker, 1996).

Scholars discuss the benefits of financial-based brand equity and consumer-based brand equity (Chieng & Lee, 2011). Financial-based brand equity evaluates the value of a brand (Farquhar et al. 1990), and customer-based brand equity evaluates consumer reaction to a particular brand

(Keller, 1993). Aaker (1991) has developed five frameworks for assessing consumer-based brand value. This includes brand awareness, brand loyalty, recognized brand quality, brand associations, and other distinctive brand features. This approach is often used to assess consumer-based brand equity (Agarwal & Rao, 1991; Na, Marshall & Keller, 1999).

1.1.3 Laundry Detergents

The Laundry Report (2016) demonstrates that the laundry detergent sector in Kenya is semi-regulated with a significant portion of roughly 20 percent being unregistered firms. In contrast to unbranded detergents, consumers show a high degree of faith in corporate brands (Angasa et al., 2013). (Angasa et al., 2013). The market of the laundries' brands is controlled by five big producers; Unilever East Africa, Haco Tiger, Bidco, PZ Cussons and Blue Ring Products. 70 percent of corporate brands are concentrated in Nairobi City County and 30 percent in other significant cities like as Mombasa, Kisumu, Nakuru and Eldoret (Laundry study, 2016). (Laundry report, 2016). Buyer Insight's Reja Shopper study finds that Ariel, which is made by Procter and Gamble, has a 25 percent market share, while Unilever's two laundry detergents, Omo and Sunlight, have 18 percent and 17 percent correspondingly.

Ariel was revived in 2009 after 10 years of non-market presence. P&G removed the cleaner from Kenya after flaunting a conflict with Omo it couldn't sustain. In any event, it returned, began without any preparation with a strategy that totally prevailed and gained its part of the whole business of numerous cleaners, including long-time competitor Omo, to reach the forefront. Brands created locally by firms contending for the homewares market include Kapa Oil's Toss, which owns 6 percent of the market, and Bidco's Gental, which controls 5 percent of the market, while Power Kid, another brand of Bidco, has a market share of 3 percent. Other prominent brands include Henkel's Persil with a 4 percent market share. PZ Cusson's Ushindi Garment Cleaner has a 6 percent market share. Ushindi arrives in a decent position. This brand is depending on the wide interest of the middle to upper class.

The home care equipment manufacturers are among the top sponsors and are among the greatest marketers in their attempts to promote their goods. Home care firms have bemoaned the business-unfriendly climate that raises their prices and renders their goods uncompetitive domestically and in export markets. However, there are manufacturing facilities in the nation for Unilever, Kapa Oils and Bidco, while P&G imports their goods it is one of the market leaders.

1.2 Research Problem

Brand equity has gained substantial attention in the marketing literature. The power of brands to create multiple business benefits such as preference, goodwill, and market share motivates scientists to concentrate on elements that impact brand equity (Herrero-Crespo, G. & Garcia-Salmones, 2016). (Herrero-Crespo, G. & Garcia-Salmones, 2016). The potential of brand trust to produce higher consumer loyalty and loyalty while depending on perceived quality and brand associations demands additional research of the terms and the integration of brand trust in the domain of brand equity. Bronnberg et al. (2017) suggested that advertisement plays a vital role in conveying product information, building a brand image in the mind of the customer, and that the consumer depends on the opinions and experiences of the firm brand to make purchase choices.

The rapidly selling consumer goods (FMCG) subsector in Kenya is highly lively with numerous firms. Some of the laundry detergents offered at Kenyan retail establishments are foreign while others are locally made. The explosion of detergent brands restricts the promotional techniques of the marketers, the consequence of which there is a lot of duplication of marketing efforts. Brand uniqueness obviously becomes a problem and creating trust remains a feasible method of not only attracting new clients but also maintaining the present ones. It is also worth mentioning that the technology for making several of these detergents are similar. Many manufacturers have sought to separate their brands from those of rivals by usage of smells which has again been duplicated across the board and hence cannot be a point of differentiation.

Studies evaluated indicate conceptual, methodological, and contextual flaws. Angasa et al. (2013) explored variables determining East African customers' opinions of Kenya's manufacture of fast-moving consumer items. The research focussed on the washing product category and offered light on the relevance of brand trust for marketing management, especially in terms of brand equity. This study focused on one aspect of the envisioned metrics of consumer-based brand equity.

Liao (2015) mediates trust in brand loyalty and brand equity by examining cognitive and empirical factors, their direct impact on brand loyalty and brand equity, and the indirect impact of trust. Statistics show that each of the above three characteristics has had a significant impact on brand loyalty and brand fairness. This study examined the concept of trust as an intermediary. Han, Nguyen and Lee (2015) used a chain of brand values in consumer-based restaurants to examine the mediating effect of a brand's reputation on the relationship between

CBBE and brand trust. Using Structural Comparative Modeling Analysis (SEM), researchers found that CBBE components, including food and service quality, brand impact, brand awareness, and brand association, have a positive impact on brand reputation (SEM). Found to give. In addition, the results show that brand reputation has a positive impact on brand credibility, and brand reputation partially reflects the impact of food and service quality, brand impact, and brand awareness on brand credibility.

Using the case study of Uganda Breweries Limited, Kamwokya, Nabukenya (2018), we will consider the relationship between coupons being promoted and consumer purchasing behaviour, the impact of discounts, and promotion of brewed products to customer brand loyalty. I investigated the impact. Consumer buying behaviour during promotion, and the relationship between free samples and consumer buying behaviour. The research population consisted both male and female Uganda Breweries Limited users in Kamwokya, Kampala District, and was done using a quasi-experimental quantitative technique. ANOVA found a high association between the sales promotion, the coupons, and the free sample, demonstrating that sales promotions had a major impact on consumer behaviour.

Despite the literature's agreement on the relationship between trust and brand equity, there has been little investigation on generating trust assessments. As a consequence, the objective of this study is to expand understanding in this area by answering the following research question: What is the connection between laundry detergent brand trust and consumer-based brand equity in Buru Buru, Nairobi City County?

1.3 The Objective of Study

The purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between consumer trust and laundry detergent brand equity in the Buru Buru Estate in Nairobi County.

1.4 The value of Study

The results of the survey contribute to the current state of knowledge by filling the gaps found during the survey. The results on the goals will assist to strengthen the theoretical framework or models applied in the research. The study's results will be utilized by scholars to perform additional research and provide knowledge to the present corpus of ideas. Consultants and practitioners in the marketplace will employ the results in training courses on the significance of gaining client trust as a strategic marketing strategy. Policy makers are often taught by the outcomes of research, which tries to explain a subject or fill a current knowledge vacuum.

The suggestions for policy of this study will increase the feasibility of policy making by the relevant institutions, since judgments concerning policy approaches are backed by genuine research. The government of Kenya and the trade association might adopt intentional policy adjustments for local, regional and international competence of laundry detergent manufacturers. Kenyan cleaning sector investors and other market participants will have access to information, which is especially helpful in upgrading strategies to promote vertical development.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the literature on consumer trust and brand equity. This chapter provides a theoretical overview focusing on Howard Model Chess's Consumer Choice Theory and Branding's Social Identity Theory. Next, this chapter reviews a survey of brand characteristics as a precursor to brand trust, corporate characteristics as precursors to brand trust, consumer brand characteristics as precursors to brand trust, empirical evaluation, and a summary of the materials surveyed.

2.2 Theoretical Review

The Howard-Sheth framework and the Social Theorists of Branding are covered in this section. The Howard-Sheth framework is one of the models for understanding market consumer behaviour. It seeks to explain the rationale of product selection by customers in the face of poor information and constrained throughput. It explores the observable expressions of conduct, emotions, and mental processes that cannot be directly experienced. Social identity theory, on the other hand, is a behaviour-based theory having significant applicability in human-based research areas. Its origins are in psychology, and it involves business, social behaviour, and marketing. The relationship between customer trust and brand equity is described using both theories.

2.2.1 Howard-Sheth Model of Consumer Choice

The Howard-Sheth model of consumer choice was first postulated by Howard-Sheth (1968). This model recommends three levels of basic leadership: The master level shows broad critical thinking. The shopper has no crucial data or information about the brand and has no inclinations towards a product. In this situation, the buyer collects data on all the differentiators of the brand before purchasing. The next step is to keep the reaction constant. At this point, the customer knows the different brands and the different features of each item exceptionally well in order to be able to purchase a particular item from an informed perspective. According to the Howard-Sheth model, there are input and income factors. These information factors include three specific types of shock data sources in the buyer's condition. The advertiser provides physical brand qualities and verbal or visual article attributes. The third type arises from the buyer's social situation; Family, reference meetings and social class. Each of the three types of boosts gives the respective buyer input regarding the item class or specific brand (Howard-Sheth, 1968).

The outcomes are the effects of the perceptual and learning factors and how buyers respond to these factors; Consideration, brand appreciation, behaviour and intention. Exogenous factors are not specifically part of the basic leadership process. In any case, some major exogenous elements consolidate purchase size, customer characteristics, religion, and time constraints. The essential administrative process that Howard-Sheth Model wants to clarify. The model complements essential aspects, such as cost and quality, for both the signifier and the delegated assistance. These shocks do not fit every population (Fitzerpatrik, Ibrahim & Rehman, 2011).

2.2.2 Social Identity Theory of Branding

Tajfel presented the social identity theory of branding first (1982). (1982). Strong consumer-brand links, according to the notion, may be linked to psychology and social identity. The cornerstone of this idea is that, via intergroup homogeneity and intergroup diversity, the individual's group within society generates meaningful self-definition. Other scientists have subsequently developed the theory, but Tajfel's (1982) work has garnered a lot of academic attention in recent years. Bhattacharya and Sen (2003) elaborated on this by developing the idea of consumer company identification, hypothesizing that customers may identify with businesses outside of formal membership links.

The theory emerged from studies conducted in the early 1970s using the minimal group paradigm, which revealed people's seemingly inherent desire to differentiate themselves from others based on group membership, as well as their willingness to forego absolute rewards in order to maintain relative superiority over members of other groups. For example, study participants might accept decreased ingroup financial incentives if the outgroup pay-outs were significantly smaller. Based on these findings, Tajfel and Turner (1979) constructed the social identity theory, an expanded model of how individual identity-related motivations predict individual dispositions toward discriminating across groups. The model also shows how these individual identification processes predict both individual and collective reactions to group status at the society level.

2.3 Brand Characteristics and Trust in a Brand

Brand attributes are important elements for buyers to trust a brand. Consumers rate a brand before deciding whether to like it, just as they rate people before deciding who to make friends with. According to research on interpersonal trust, people are trusted for their reputation, credibility, and ability (Francioni Curina, Hegner, Sabrina and Cioppi, 2020). Brand reputation, on the other hand, is related to others' perceptions of brand quality and integrity. Advertising and public relations help build branding, but product quality and performance are just as important. According to Francioni et al. (2020) Political party reputation can lead to positive expectations that can help political parties build reciprocal relationships. When customers find that others value the brand, consumers are more likely to buy it. When a brand meets or exceeds consumer expectations based on user experience, it gains reputation and builds customer trust. Customers are more likely to be sceptical of brands that do not have a solid reputation.

As a result of your increased association with a brand, you can discover potential weaknesses in the brand. This makes it difficult to trust the brand (Movafegh and Fotoohi, 2015). Brand predictability refers to the ability of one party to predict the behaviour of a brand. Predictable trademarks are trademarks that allow trademark users to reasonably predict how they will behave under their respective conditions of use (Hasan, Khan, Rehman, Ali & Sobia, 2009). This predictability can be attributed to the consistently superior quality of the product. Frequent interactions with one party making and keeping promises, and advertising with one party learning more about the other, promote predictability.

According to Shapiro et al. (1992), there are three forms of trust that are active: Deterrence-trust, identification-based-trust, and knowledge-based-trust. For example, the knowledge-based-trust is based on the predictability of behaviour and occurs when one party fully understands the other party, understands the expected behaviour, and expects reliable behaviour. Predictability promotes trust because it is predictable how trust will be abused, even if others cannot trust it. Brand predictability creates trust because customers know that nothing unexpected happens while using the brand. Thus, brand predictability promotes brand credibility, and predictability promotes positive expectations (Hasan et al., 2009).

Competent brand can solve consumer problems and meet their expectations. Competency refers to the traits and characteristics that allow a party to exercise power within a domain and is an important factor influencing trust (Wang & Liu, 2020). Customers can learn brand expertise through direct use or word-of-mouth. If the customer believes that the brand can solve the problem, the customer may be willing to rely on the brand

2.4 Firm Characteristics and Brand Trust

Consumer confidence in a brand can also be influenced by the quality of the manufacturer. The consumer's view of the brand can be influenced by the business behind the branding expertise (Barijan, Ariningsih & Rahmawati, 2021). Consumer confidence in a business, business reputation, business perceived motivation, and business perceived integrity are attributes of a business designed to influence consumer confidence in a brand.

If the company that created the brand is unknown, the brand can be institutionalized and consumers can form an image of the company that can influence their attitudes and behaviour towards the brand (Barijan et al., 2021). If larger entities are trusted, then smaller entities under their control are also trusted because they are components of the larger entity. For a company and its brand, the company is the larger unit and the brand is the smaller unit as a whole. Customers who trust a company are more likely to trust their brand. A company is a larger unit compared to its brand, and a brand is a smaller unit as a whole. Customers who believe in the company are more likely to believe in their brand.

Corporate reputation remains an important issue. It's about how people perceive the company behind the brand to be fair and impartial so that consumers can get and use the company's brand more comfortably. This increases confidence in the brand (Rahmani, Halim, Gayatri & Furinto, 2021). Some regular traders and vendors have built a reputation for integrity through self-sacrifice and compassion for other channel members. When channel members believe that the reputation of retailers and suppliers is credible, they are more likely to trust them (Rahmani et al., 2021).

Gunawan (2015) found that the perceived goals of a trading partner influence trust in that partner, and that direction is a means of building trust in the buyer-seller relationship. Intentionality is associated with both an assessment of one and an assessment of the other's motivation. If a party is considered nice, you can trust it. Similarly, Den, Shippers, and Koopman (2002) argue that leader trust depends on how much the leader's behaviour is related to the needs of the followers. Therefore, the quality of motivation is a necessary part of the relationship. Customers trust the brand when the business behind the brand is friendly and acts in the best interests of the consumer.

Consumers recognize that the company behind brand integrity follows certain established standards such as: Compliance with ethical and fair promises (Ritch, Elaine & McColl, 2020). The company checks the brand based on the consistency of previous actions, credible communication by third parties, the recognition of a strong sense of justice by the company, and the consistency of company actions and statements. If the company behind the brand has a good reputation, consumers are more likely to trust the brand (Ritch et al., 2020).

2.5 Consumer-Brand Characteristics and Brand Trust

Relationships are not one-sided. Both sides influence the relationship. As a result, consumer brand attributes can affect customer confidence in the brand. These qualities include consumer self-image similarity and brand image similarity, brand empathy, brand experience, brand satisfaction, and colleague support and influence. The whole of an individual's thoughts and feelings about himself as an object is called a self-concept (Jamal & Goode, 2001).

What the marketing literature has in common is that brands, like people, have individuality. As a result, companies can develop their own image and personality. A brand image is a collection of brand-related associations that a customer remembers. The image of a brand influences its perceived personality. A brand's personality can be described as a collection of human characteristics associated with a particular brand (Aaker, 1997). This includes not only demographic traits (gender, age, financial background, etc.), but also normal human personality traits (warmth, empathy, emotions, etc.). Human personalities such as brand identity have been found to be clearly permanent (Aaker, 1996). Consumers often remember the brand as an individual, especially when associated with very attractive objects such as clothing and vehicles (Aaker, 1996).

Studies on human interactions suggest that similarities in two traits can lead to a tendency towards trust. Trust creates trust, so similarities are good, and you can start a cycle of strengthening contacts. In purchasing interactions, the perceived similarity of personality between the buyer and the seller influences the buyer's trust in the seller, allowing the supplier to earn the customer's trust in line with the customer's beliefs, values and customs. increase. When a brand's physical characteristics and personality match the customer's self-image, consumers are more likely to trust it.

The love of the brand shows that one party prefers the other because one party finds the other to be wonderfully comfortable. According to Pires and Suetrong (2021), one must be loved by the other in order to have a relationship. In order for customers to build relationships with brands, consumers must first be satisfied. When a customer enjoys a brand, he or she definitely learns more about it and lays the foundation for trust. In addition, a positive personality has been found to emphasize honesty, credibility, openness, thoughts, and concerns, all of which are related to trust (Pires et al., 2021).

A brand experience is a previous interaction between a customer and a brand, especially with respect to consumption. According to Amin and Nika (2019), reciprocity is essential to building process-based trust. A mutually diffused system of social norms emerges, which leads to mutual responsibility and expectations of equal treatment. Based on their experience, both sides have a better understanding of each other. As a result, experience can increase confidence in relationships. The more consumers interact with a brand, the better they understand and trust it (Amin et al., 2019).

Brand satisfaction is a psychological evaluation of whether or not the alternative brand you select fulfils or surpasses your expectation. This makes a comparison of consumer expectations with actual performance that has a significant impact on the definition of satisfaction (Cuong, 2020). Satisfaction with previous results shows that they are honest with sharing in an ongoing relationship. If the customer is happy after using the brand, the scenario is similar to keeping a promise. The company keeps its promises, and consumers tend to trust them (Cuong, 2020).

Ursoiu (2021) discovered that the influence of others was the main impetus for his actions. As a result, social impact appears to be an important predictor of consumer behaviour. This is reflected in consumer choice models that use social norms and interpersonal concerns to predict behavioural intent. Consumers are worried about what others think of themselves, or because they are influenced by other people's product choices and usage, so they want to join an item to join a peer group.

2.6 Empirical Review

Liao (2015) trusts in brand loyalty and brand equity by assessing cognitive and experience-related variables, their direct impact on brand loyalty and brand equity, and the indirect impact of trust. We conducted a survey to investigate the impact. Liao (2015) conducted a printed and online survey of 292 cosmetic consumers in Taiwan. The results show that all three characteristics so far have had a significant impact on brand loyalty and brand fairness. Brand trust served as a bridge between the impact these pioneers had on brand loyalty and brand fairness.

As a result, brand trust is considered a prerequisite for brand loyalty and value. In addition, cognitive precursors such as brand awareness, brand association, recognized brand quality, brand image, and brand reputation contribute significantly to the development of brand loyalty and brand value. These two historical features were equally important in building brand trust, loyalty and fairness. According to this, marketers need to emphasize not only cognition but also the empirical aspects of marketing activities (Liao, 2015). Therefore, it is important for marketers to establish brand equity by focusing not only on cognitive and sensory factors, but also on intermediate products such as brand trust and brand loyalty.

Han, Nguyen, and Lee (2015) used the consumer-based restaurant brand equity chain (CBCRBE) to investigate the impact of brand reputation on the relationship between CBCRBE and brand trust. With the help of Comparative Structural Model Analysis (SEM), this study found that CBCRBE's food and service quality, brand impact, brand awareness, and brand relevance have a positive impact on brand reputation. I showed that. In addition, the results show that brand reputation has a positive impact on brand credibility, and brand reputation partially reflects the impact of food and service quality, brand impact, and brand awareness on brand credibility. It shows that it is. Brand reputation has been shown to be positively impacted by food and service quality, brand impact, brand awareness, and brand relevance, while brand credibility is negatively impacted by brand reputation. (Han et al., 2015). The results also showed that selfconformity did not affect the brand's reputation, but it did adversely affect the brand's credibility. The results emphasize that brand associations affect brand trust primarily through brand reputation, and positive brand reputation enhances customer confidence in the brand.

Nabukenya (2018) uses Kamwokya's Uganda Breweries Limited case study to examine the impact of promotions on customer brand loyalty to the sale of brewery products, and the relationship between free samples and consumer buying behaviour. The subjects included both male and female users of Uganda Breweries Limited in Kamwokya, Kampala, conducted using a quasi-experimental quantitative approach. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) shows that there is a strong link between sales, coupons, and free samples, suggesting that sales have had a significant impact on customer behaviour.

Angasa Kinoti (2013) uses a descriptive study design to focus on consumer perceptions of laundry detergents, as well as factors that influence the perceptions of Kenya's fast-moving consumers and laundry in Kenya. the authors investigated the factors that influence the perception of detergent consumers, sampling in Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. Based on descriptive statistical analysis, according to the report, multiple laundry detergents are used in five countries, including Omo, Sunlight, Ariel, Persil and Toss, with Omo being the most popular and Sunlight second.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodological strategy used in the data collection and assessment procedure. This includes the study's design, population, sampling method and test measures, research tools, data collection, and analysis.

3.2 Research Design

According to Kothari (2004), research design is a strategy, structure, and research method for finding answers, asking questions, and addressing contradictions. Nevertheless, it is a way for researchers to ask his research questions and provides the basis for reflection. A descriptive cross-sectional survey was used in this survey. Descriptive studies seek to collect data that represent current events by providing information about results, emotions, decisions, or traits (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Descriptive research is considered to be the best strategy for achieving research goals. This survey was a cross section because the data was collected only at specific times.

3.3 Population of the Study

Table 1. Population distribution.

Phase	Household Units Per Phase
I	941
II	977
III	887
IV	857
V	1053
Total	4710

Each item considered in each question field consists of a population and a target population (Kothari, 2004). It is the total number of people or things that a study seeks to generalize to the results of a study. The population, Table 1 shows the houses in Buru Buru Estate distribution.

3.4 Sample of the Study

A sample size is allocated to a smaller group or subset drawn from the available population, according to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003). Buru Buru is organized into 5 phases and each phase has courts. The researcher selected 2 courts within each phase making the court the basis of clustering. This gave rise to 10 courts selected and within each selected court five households were randomly selected. The total number of respondent households was therefore be 50. This number formed the sample.

3.5 Data Collection

The most important data was collected through questionnaires. We used a structured questionnaire to get the most important data from the survey. The device consisted of three components. Part A collected demographic information of respondents, Part B collected trust information, and Part C collected CBBE indicators. We used a standardized 5-point Likert scale to ensure consistency and make it easier for respondents to complete the survey. Respondents were residents of selected homes in the Buru Buru Estate. The enumerator identified the right person before asking for a short interview.

3.6 Data analysis

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) characterized information analysis and methods as a collection of data to represent beliefs, perceived composition, in order to unravel and test hypotheses. Studies have used quantitative methods to analyse the data. Quantitative data from the study was encoded and run into statistical software to generate descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations and variances. A basic regression analysis was performed to determine the statistical significance of the correlation between the variables. The following was an analytical model:

$Y = a + BX + e$

Where:

Y= Consumer Based Brand Equity

B= Co-efficient of Trust

X = Trust

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains a survey of background information on response rates, age, gender, and level of education, as well as descriptive statistics and regression results. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the analysis results.

4.2 Response Rate

Within each phase, the study chose two courts as the basis for clustering. This resulted in the selection of ten courts, with five homes chosen at random from each court. The overall number of respondent houses was thus 50, although only 48 of them provided complete data. This resulted in a 96 percent response rate, which was considered representative.

4.3 Background Information

4.3.1 Age

Table 4.1. Age of Respondents

Age Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
24 and below	4	9
25-34	21	44
35-44	17	35
45-54	4	8
Above 55	2	4
Total	**48**	**100**

The age categories included 24 and below, 24-34, 35-44, 45-54 and above 55. Majority of the respondents were found to be in 25 to 34 age categories, while the least were in the 24 and below category. The most significant finding was that 79% of the respondents age is between 25 and 44 inclusive.

Table 4.2. Gender of respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent (%)
MALE	51	68
FEMALE	24	32
Total	**48**	**100**

Table 4.2 displays the proportion of responders who were either male or female. Out of the 48 respondents that submitted valid data, 68 percent were male and 32 percent were female. This reveals the most of the responders were male.

4.3.3 Level of Education

Table 4.3. Level of Education

Category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Certificate	3	4.0	4.0

Diploma	27	36.0	36.0
Degree	27	36.0	36.0
Masters	12	16.0	16.0
PhD	6	8.0	8.0
Total	**48**	**100.0**	**100.0**

Table 4.3 shows the categories of educational levels that were examined through the questionnaire. The educational background of the respondents included certificate (4%), diploma (36%), degree (36%), masters (16%) and PhD (8%) respectively. Percentage of the participants have, equally, a certificate and degree type of qualification. Thus, the participants had an excellent educational background, as up to 96 percent of the respondents possessed a diploma or higher degree of education.

4.4 Descriptive Statistics

The following section shows the descriptive statistics (the mean and standard deviation) of the brand characteristics, company characteristic, consumer brand characteristics and brand equity respectively. The responses were weighted on a five Likert scale from agree to strongly disagree. the instrument results include the mean and standard deviation as indicated in the following tables.

4.4.1 Brand Characteristics

Table 4.4. Brand Characteristics

Statement	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
Reputation of Brands		
This brand has a reputation for being excellent	3.69	.885
Other folks have informed me that this brand is not good	3.83	.906
Other individuals have informed me that this brand is trustworthy	4.01	.937

Other people have told me that this brand is trustworthy	4.05	.943
This brand has a reputation for functioning well	3.72	.966
I have heard terrible remarks about this brand	4.21	.827
Average score	**3.92**	**0.911**
Brand Predictability		
When I purchase this brand, I know precisely what to expect	3.80	.986
I can always properly predict how this brand will function	3.69	.885
This brand's quality is not very consistent	3.69	.885
The performance of this brand is consistent	4.01	.937
The performance of this brand tends to be rather varied	4.05	.943
I can't always be sure how it will operate next time I purchase it	3.73	.977
I know how this brand will function	3.85	.865
This brand can always be depended on to work as I wish	3.64	.910
Average score	**3.81**	**0.934**
Brand Competence		
This brand is the best for this product category	3.00	.986
Most other brands are better than this	4.09	.947
This brand works better than other brands	3.07	.991
This brand is more effective than other brands.	3.11	.967
This brand suits my requirements better than other brands	3.08	.926
This brand accomplishes its function better than other brands	2.92	.955
Average score	3.21	0.962
Composite score	**3.49**	**0.887**

Table 4.4 shows the results of brand characteristics instruments, which included brand reputation, brand predictability and brand competence. The brand reputation was measured using 6 factors that returned an average mean and standard deviation scores of 3.92 and 0.911. Brand predictability had 8 factors and returned a mean and standard deviation of 3.81 and 0.934, while brand competence had 6 factors and returned a mean and standard deviation of 3.21 and 0.962

respectively. Based on the average scores' computation, the mean and standard deviation composite score for brand characteristics is 3.49 and 0.887 respectively.

4.4.2 Company Characteristics

Table 4.5. Company Characteristics

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perceived Motives of Company		
This company is all about it	2.19	.711
This company only cares about its own well-being	2.89	1.047
I see how this organization influences its decisions and actions on consumers so you can trust it	2.61	.884
Average score	2.56	0.881
Perceived Motives of Company		
This company is all about it	2.67	1.031
This company only cares about its own well-being	2.23	1.146
I see how this organization influences its decisions and actions on consumers so you can trust it	2.88	1.065
Average score	2.59	1.081
corporate integrity		
Company behaviour is consistent with its rhetoric	2.16	.871
Company promises are not maintained	2.96	1.246
Company is honest with consumers	2.39	1.012
Company is ethical	2.32	.841
Average score	2.46	0.992
Trust in the Company		
I don't trust this company	3.01	.966
I don't believe this company will try to fool me.	2.36	.939
I feel absolutely trustworthy in this organization	2.72	.980
I know that the company will not disappoint me, so I can comfortably use the items in this business.	2.67	1.044

I feel confident that this company will provide working items properly	2.73	1.004
Average score	**2.70**	**0.987**
Composite Score	**2.59**	**0.986**

Table 4.5 shows the results of company characteristics instruments, which included company reputation (3 factors with average mean and standard deviation of 2.56 and 0.881), perceived motives of the company (3 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.59 and 1.081), company integrity (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.46 and 0.992) and trust in the company (5 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.70 and 0.987). Based on the average scores' computation, the mean and standard deviation composite score for company characteristics is 2.59 and 0.986 respectively.

4.4.3 Consumer Brand Characteristics

Table 4.6. Company Brand Characteristics

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Brand Liking		
I like this brand	2.36	.747
I like alternatives to this brand	2.40	.986
This is my favourite brand	2.21	1.069
Average Score	**2.32**	**0.934**
Peer support		
My friend told me to buy this brand	2.21	.722
my friend does not support my decision to buy this brand	1.69	.870
my friend would want to know that I bought this brand	2.95	1.077
This brand has not worked as well as I thought	2.59	.887
Average Score	**2.36**	**0.889**
Satisfaction with the brand		
This brand works as expected	2.64	1.022
Satisfied with the decision to buy this brand	2.20	1.127
I really loved this brand	2.89	1.060
I feel bad about my decision to buy this brand	2.08	.801

Not satisfied I bought this brand	3.03	1.219
Using this brand, it was a fun experience	2.31	.958
Similarities between consumer self-concept and brand image		
The image of this brand is similar to my point of view	2.31	.885
If this brand were a person, it is completely different from me	3.11	.909
The image of this brand is different from me	2.40	1.000
Average Score	**2.55**	**0.998**
Trust in the brand		
I trust in this brand	2.69	.915
I do not trust in this brand to do the job	2.69	1.065
I feel this brand is absolutely trustworthy	2.72	1.008
I can't trust this brand	2.32	.756
I was relieved to know that I would never be disappointed in this brand	2.41	.974
Average Score	**2.566**	**0.944**
Composite Score	**2.49**	**0.955**

Table 4.6 shows the results of consumer brand characteristics instruments, which included liking for the brand (3 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.32 and 0.934), peer support (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.36 and 0.889), satisfaction with the brand (9 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.55 and 0.998) and trust in the brand (5 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.57 and 0.944). Based on the average scores' computation, the mean and standard deviation composite score for consumer brand characteristics is 2.49 and 0.955 respectively.

4.4.4 Brand Equity

Table 4.7. Brand Equity

Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation
Brand Awareness		
I'm making a special effort to meet a detergent maker	2.29	1.148
My brand's detergent type is fixed to my mind	2.67	1.358
I can distinguish one brand of detergent from another	2.06	.598

Advertisement of detergent the amount of brand differentiates customers	1.75	.934
Average Score	2.193	1.010
Brand Loyalty		
the performance of the detergent brand I use convinces me	2.80	1.078
On the quality of the detergent brand, I use I'm satisfied	2.88	1.102
The detergent I use provides better service to me	2.67	1.044
I believe that the quality of the product determines the detergent I use	2.35	1.180
Average Score	2.675	1.101
Patented Brand Assets		
I think class has a role in how I chose the brand of laundry detergent	2.96	1.156
I buy a particular brand of laundry detergent due to brand associations	2.17	.760
The variety of brand line extensions and options from the same manufacturer allows me to be loyal to one brand.	2.39	.914
I believe that a highly visible trademark can influence the choice of my product	2.16	.839
Average Score	2.42	0.917
Industry context		
Lack of appropriate options influences detergent brand selection	3.16	1.053
Grocery shopping behavior May limit the purchase of your favorite detergents	2.93	1.178
Distribution network and availability of detergent types allow customers to choose their favorite brand, as seen in most places.	3.24	1.172
Store type or brand gives you confidence in your choice of detergent on the shelves	2.84	1.326
Average Score	3.043	1.182
The Consumer's Choice		
Seeing your favorite detergent advertised, you want to buy	2.57	1.164
You choose a brand because you are an avid customer of the brands	1.88	1.230
Trust yourself If you buy products based on the popularity of each brand	3.09	1.210
I think the quality will help me choose my favorite laundry detergent brand	3.19	1.363
Average Score	2.683	1.242
Composite Score	**2.58**	**1.053**

Table 4.7 shows the results of brand equity instruments, which included brand awareness (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.19 and 1.01), brand loyalty (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.68 and 1.10), patented brand assets (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.42 and 0.917) industry context (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 3.04 and 1.182) and consumer choice (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.683 and 1. 053). (4 factors, average mean and standard deviation of 2.683 and 1. 053). Based on the average scores' calculation, the mean and standard deviation composite score for brand equity is 2.58 and 1.053 respectively.

4.5 Findings of the Regression Analysis

Table 4.8. Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.290[a]	.084	.022	.392	.084	1.345	3	44	.272

a. Predictors: (Constant), Consumer Brand Characteristics, Brand Characteristics, Company Characteristics

b. Dependent Variable: Brand Equity

Table 4.8 shows the model summary of the regression analysis, which indicates that 29% of the variation in brand equity is explained by consumer brand characteristics, brand characteristics and company characteristics. However, it is also informative that 61% of the variation in brand equity is explained by others.

Table 4.9. ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.619	3	.206	1.345	.272[b]
	Residual	6.751	44	.153		
	Total	7.370	47			

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Equity
b. Predictors: (Constant), Consumer Brand Characteristics, Brand Characteristics, Company Characteristics

Table 4.9 shows the ANOVA of the regression analysis. The findings indicate that consumer brand characteristics, brand characteristics and company characteristics are not significant predictors of brand equity given that the p value is greater than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis that brand equity is predicted by consumer brand characteristics, brand characteristics and company characteristics is in this case not a tenable proposition.

Table 4.10. COEFFICIENTS

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	3.285	.627		5.238	.000
Brand Characteristics	-.129	.124	-.151	1.048	.301
Company Characteristics	.126	.118	.156	1.062	.294
Consumer Brand Characteristics	-.238	.155	-.225	1.533	.132

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Equity

Table 4.10 shows the regression analysis results. The findings indicate that the influence of brand characteristics on brand equity is not statistically significant, p is greater than 0.05, and as brand characteristics increases, brand equity decreases. Similarly, the influence of consumer brand characteristics on brand equity is not statistically significant, $p > 0.05$, which suggests inverse proportionality. The influence of company characteristics also is not statistically significant, $p > 0.05$, however, an increase in company characteristics leads to an increase in brand equity an indication of direct proportionality. Thus, based the analytical framework and the regression coefficients, the follow model is presented.

$Y= 3.912 - 0.129X_1 + 0.126X_2 – 0.238X_3$

Where, Y represents Brand Equity, X_1 represents Brand Characteristics, X_2 represents Company Characteristics and X_3 represents Consumer Brand Characteristics.

4.6 Discussion of the Findings

The data suggest that the survey was highly responsive and that respondents came from a well-educated segment of the population, represented by educational background, who are relatively familiar with the topic. Descriptive statistics included a survey of the mean and standard deviation of the independent variables. Brand attributes, consumer brand characteristics, corporate characteristics, brand value. The data show that respondents agree to some extent that brand attributes influence the determination of the brand value of detergents. In this case, it has been observed that the standard deviation of the distribution is low. However, respondents agree that company characteristics influence their view on brand equity, based on the mean and low dispersion of the data set analysed. At the same time, respondents also agree that consumer brand characteristics influence their view on brand equity, which is also supported by the low dispersion as reflected by the standard deviation.

The regression analysis of the survey data included independent factors such as brand attributes, business characteristics, and consumer brand characteristics, and the dependent variable was brand value. The data show that 29% of brand value fluctuations are explained by brand attributes, brand characteristics, and consumer business characteristics, but 71% of brand value fluctuations are explained by other variables. It's interesting. Further, the ANOVA test indicate that respondent's conception of brand equity of laundry detergents in relation to brand characteristics, company brand characteristics and consumer brand characteristics is insignificant compared to other consideration factors. This is consistent with Fitzerpatrik et al. (2011) and Howard-Sheath's' (1968) proposition on customer behaviour.

Fitzerpatrik et al. (2011) and Howard-Sheath's' (1968) consumers choice theory suggests that the outcomes of brand equity are the effects of the perceptual and learning factors and how buyers respond to these factors; Consideration, brand appreciation, behaviour and intention. And that there are numerous exogenous factors such as purchase size, customer brand characteristics, religion, time constraints, brand characteristics, company characteristics, among others, which influence customers choice. Tajfel (1982) proposed the social identity theory of branding, suggesting that psychology and social identity factors influence customers perception and decision in brand selection. Fitzerpatrik et al. (2011) and Howard-Sheath's' (1968) and Tajfel (1982) propositions are reflected in the survey responses and findings on analysis of the data.

The study indicates that the influence of brand characteristics on brand equity is not statistically significant, this is because as brand characteristics increases, brand equity decreases, and a similarly position obtains for the consumer brand characteristics. However, the influence of company characteristics on brand equity reflects statistically insignificant direct proportionality. This may be attributed to trust factors that were not under consideration in this study, as revealed in studies by Han, Nguyen, and Lee (2015) and Nabukenya (2018). Thus, the findings show that the relationship between consumer trust and consumer-based brand equity of laundry detergents is not significant as far as consumers in Buru Buru Estate are concerned.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the research and conclusions and concludes with the contribution of the research to brand equity, especially with regard to consumer trust. In addition, the study provides recommendations in key areas that further exploration is needed with regard to consumer trust and brand equity.

5.2 Summary

The study's goal was to evaluate the link between customer trust and brand equity of laundry detergents in Nairobi County's Buru Buru Estate. This was done using a cross-sectional descriptive survey of consumers in the study area. Quantitative data collected from the survey was coded and subjected to statistical software to generate descriptive statistics, which included the mean and standard deviation. In this case, the independent variables included brand characteristics, company characteristics and consumer brand characteristics, while the dependent variable was brand equity. To evaluate the statistical significance of the relationship between the variables, simple regression analysis was employed.

The findings indicated that the survey was highly responsive, and the respondents were from an adequately informed segment of the population that was reasonably knowledgeable of the subject matter, as indicated by their educational background. Descriptive statistics included a survey of the mean and standard deviation of the independent variables. Brand attributes, consumer brand characteristics, corporate characteristics, brand value. The data showed that the majority of consumers agreed that brand attributes influence the assessment of the brand value of laundry detergents. A majority of the consumers agreed that company characteristics and consumer brand characteristics influenced their perception of brand equity.

We performed another regression analysis of the data to better understand the relationship between independent factors (brand attributes, business characteristics, and consumer brand characteristics) and dependent variables (brand equity). The data showed that the association between the independent factor and the dependent variable was not statistically significant. However, it was observed that brand characteristics and consumer brand characteristics had a negative relationship with brand equity, as far as laundry detergents are concerned, but company characteristics had a positive relationship with brand equity. The implications of these findings are that an increase in brand characteristics and consumer brand characteristics would lead to decreased brand equity for the laundry detergents, while an increase in company characteristics would have a proportional effect on brand equity. Thus, brand equity is, according to the findings of this study, is significantly influenced by other factors apart from brand characteristics, company characteristics and consumer brand characteristics.

5.3 Conclusion

This study contributes to knowledge in the field of consumer trust and brand equity in several ways. First, the relationship between brand attributes and brand value is not statistically significant, and an increase in brand attributes leads to a decline in brand value. Secondly, that the relationship between company characteristics and brand equity is also not statistically significant, however, increasing company characteristic will lead to an increase in brand equity. Third, the relationship between consumer brand characteristics and brand equity is not statistically significant, but as consumer brand characteristics increase, brand value declines. These findings are specific to consumers in Buru Buru Estate, and more particular in so far as laundry detergents are concerned.

5.4 Recommendation

5.4.1 Recommendation for practice and policy

This study is important for laundry detergent distributors at Buru Buru Estate on how to address consumer trust issues related to brand characteristics, business characteristics, consumer brand characteristics, and brand fairness. However, the results of this study are unique to Buru Buru Estate laundry detergent distributors and consumers and may not necessarily be generalized to other population groups unless a comprehensive empirical study is conducted to get a profound awareness of the relation among consumer trust and brand equity. Nonetheless, for marketers, as this study shows, consumer confidence in laundry detergent brand equity really depends on brand characteristics, business characteristics, and consumer brand characteristics. There is a possibility. Therefore, from a political point of view, it is important for detergent retailers to adopt a broader marketing approach.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

It is important to carry out additional studies to improve the validation of current study by using the same approach or different approaches with respect to sample size, study design, and brand and domain of scope. This will ensure that marketers' knowledge and practice of consumer trust and brand equity is expanded.

REFERENCES

Alhaddad, A. (2014). The effect of brand image and brand loyalty on brand equity. International *Journal of Business and Management Invention*. 3. 28-32.

Angasa, P. & Kinoti, M. (2013). Factors affecting consumer perception of Kenyan manufactured fast moving consumer goods in the East African Community. A case of laundry detergents products. *DBA Africa Management Review*, Vol 3, No. 2 pp 108-123.

Amin, F. & Nika, F. (2019). Brand Experience and Brand Equity. Vision: *The Journal of Business Perspective*. 23

Barijan, D., Ariningsih, E., & Rahmawati, F. (2021). The Influence of Brand Trust, Brand

Familiarity, and Brand Experience on Brand Attachments. *Journal of Digital Marketing and Halal Industry*. 3. 73-84. 10.21580/jdmhi.2021.3.1.7440.

Bhattacharya C.B, Sen S, (2003). Consumer-business identification: a framework for understanding consumer-business relationships. *Marketing magazine*. 67 (2): 76–88

Chieng, F & Lee, C.G.. (2011). Customer-based brand equity: a literature review. *Int. Refereed Res*. J.. 2. 33-42.

Chiu, C., Hsu, M., Lai, H., & Chang, C. (2012). Re-examining the influence of trust on online repeat purchase intention: The moderating role of habit and its antecedents. *Decision Support Systems*. 53. 835–845. 10.1016/j.dss.2012.05.021.

Cuong, D. (2020). The influence of brand satisfaction, brand trust, brand preference on brand loyalty to laptop brands. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*. 11. 95-101.

Den, H.D., Shippers, M., & Koopman, P. (2002). The impact of leader behaviour on trust in management and co-workers. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*. 28.

Deutsch M. Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 1958;2(4):265-279.

Fitzerpatrik, Q., Ibrahim, A. and Rehman, H. (2011). *The art of identity: creating and managing a successful corporate identity*. Gower.

Francioni, Barbara & Curina, Ilaria & Hegner, Sabrina & Cioppi, Marco. (2020). Brand addiction: brand characteristics and psychological outcomes. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. ahead-of-print. 10.1108/JCM-02-2020-3678.

Gunawan, S. (2015). The impact of motivation, perception and attitude toward consumer purchasing decision. *iBuss Management*, Vol. 3, NO. 2, PP. 154-163.

Han, S., Nguyen, B., & Lee, T. (2015). Consumer-based chain restaurant brand equity, brand reputation, and brand trust. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. Vol. 50, 84-93.

Hasan, A., Khan, M., Rehman, K., Ali, I., & Sobia, W. (2009). Consumer's Trust in the Brand: Can it be built through Brand Reputation, Brand Competence and Brand Predictability. *International Business Research*. 3.

Herrero-Crespo, A., Gutierrez, H. S. and García-Salmones, M. d. (2016). Influence of the country's image on the value of the country brand: application to higher education services. *International Marketing Magazine*, 33 (5), 691-714.

Jamal, A., & Goode, M. (2001). Consumers and brands: A study of the impact of self-image congruence on brand preference and satisfaction. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*. 19. 482-492.

Kocak, A., & Kabadayi, E. (2012). Brand trust and brand affect: their strategic importance on brand loyalty. *Journal of Global Strategic Management.* 1. 80-80.

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: methods and techniques.* New Age International, New Delhi.

Komunda, M., & Osarenkhoe, A. (2012). Remedy or cure for service failure? Effects of service recovery on customer satisfaction and loyalty. *Business Process Management Journal*. 18. 82-103.

Liao, Y. (2015). The role of trust on brand loyalty. Technology, Innovation and Industrial Management, *Joint International Conference*, Bari, Italy.

Howard-Sheth, J.N (1968). *Theory of buyer behaviour*. J. Wiley & Sons, New York, NY

Lewis, J. D. and Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a Social Reality. *Social Forces,* 63, 967-985.

Madura, B., Stecko, J., & Mentel, G. (2016). *Brand image vs consumer trust*. Actual Problems of Economics. 8. 237-245.

Movafegh, R. & Fotoohi, H. (2015). Brand Reputation and Costumer Trust. Kuwait Chapter of *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. 5. 48-52.

Mugenda, O. and Mugenda, A. (2003). *Research methods: quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi. Nairobi Press.

Nabukenya, M. (2018*). Impact of sales promotion on customer brand loyalty for brewery products: a case study from Uganda Breweries Limited, Kamwokya*. (Doctoral thesis, Makerere University).

Nassiuma, H. (2000). *Business research methods,* East African Publishers.

Pires, G., & Suetrong, P. (2021). Brand Liking and Consumer Gratitude effects on Consumer-Brand Love Relationships and Repurchase Intention. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*. 1. 1. 10.1504/IJEBR.2021.10032246.

Rahmani, S., Halim, R., Gayatri, G., & Furinto, A. (2021). *The role of company reputation in mitigating negative word of mouth. Business: Theory and Practice.* 22. 109-120. 10.3846/btp.2021.12983.

Ritch, Elaine & McColl, Julie. (2020). Are You Being Served? Exploring Consumer Perspectives of Retail Brand Integrity: An Abstract. 10.1007/978-3-030-42545-6_219.

Shapiro, D., Sheppard, B. H. and Cheraskin, L. (1992). Business in a handshake. *Negotiation Journal,* vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 365–377.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review Psychology*, 33, 1-39.

Ursoiu, A. (2021). The Convergence of Endogenous and Exogenous Influences on Consumer Behavior. IARJSET. 8 (2).

Wang, H., & Liu, Di. (2020). The differentiated impact of perceived brand competence type on brand extension evaluation. *Journal of Business Research.* 117. 400-410.

Rehman, M., Wong, H., & Hossain, M. (2016). The progression of brand orientation literature in twenty years: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Brand Management*, 23.10.1057/s41262-016-0008-2.

APPENDIX I

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A: Background Information

1. **Gender**

   Male ☐

   Female ☐

2. **Age**

30 and below ☐

31-40 ☐

41-50 ☐

51 and above ☐

3. **Level of Education**

☐ O-level

☐

Undergraduate

☐

Postgraduate

☐

Other (Specify**)**

PART B: Consumer Trust and Brand Equity

Please check the appropriate box to indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements: 1 = Not at all, 2 = little scope, 3 = moderate degree, 4 = great scope, 5 = great scope (check appropriately)

1. **Brand Characteristics**

Statement	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Reputation of Brands					
This brand has a reputation for being excellent					
Other folks have informed me that this brand is not good					
Other individuals have informed me that this brand is trustworthy					
Other people have told me that this brand is trustworthy					

This brand has a reputation for functioning well					
I have heard terrible remarks about this brand					
Brand Predictability					
When I purchase this brand, I know precisely what to expect					
I can always properly predict how this brand will function					
This brand's quality is not very consistent					
The performance of this brand is consistent					
The performance of this brand tends to be rather varied					
I can't always be sure how it will operate next time I purchase it					
I know how this brand will function					
This brand can always be depended on to work as I wish					
Brand Competence					
This brand is the best for this product category					
Most other brands are better than this					
This brand works better than other brands					
This brand is more effective than other brands.					
This brand suits my requirements better than other brands					
This brand accomplishes its function better than other brands					

2. Company Characteristics

Statement	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Company Reputation					
This company has a reputation for fairness with its customers					
Some consumers think this company only takes care of themselves					
Hearing terrible remarks about this company					
Perceived Motives of Company					
This company is all about it					
This company only cares about its own well-being					
I see how this organization influences its decisions and actions on consumers so you can trust it					
corporate integrity					
Company behaviour is consistent with its rhetoric					
Company promises are not maintained					
Company is honest with consumers					
Company is ethical					
Trust in the Company					
I don't trust this company					
I don't believe this company will try to fool me.					
I feel absolutely trustworthy in this organization					
I know that the company will not disappoint me, so I can comfortably use the items in this business.					
I feel confident that this company will provide working items properly					

3. **Consumer Brand Characteristics**

Statement	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Brand Liking					
I like this brand					
I like alternatives to this brand					
This is my favourite brand					
Peer support					
My friend told me to buy this brand					
my friend does not support my decision to buy this brand					
my friend would want to know that I bought this brand					
brand satisfaction					
this brand works as expected Did not					
Satisfied with the decision to buy this brand					
I really loved this brand					
I feel bad about my decision to buy this brand					
Not satisfied I bought this brand					
Using this brand, it was a fun experience					
I'm sure it's right to get this brand					

Similarities between consumer self-concept and brand image					
The image of this brand is similar to my point of view					
If this brand were a person, it is completely different from me					
The image of this brand is different from me					
Trust in the brand					
I trust in this brand					
I do not trust in this brand to do the job					
I feel this brand is absolutely trustworthy					
I can't trust this brand					
I was relieved to know that I would never be disappointed in this brand					

4. **Brand Equity**

Statement	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Brand Awareness					
the performance of the detergent brand I use convinces me					
On the quality of the detergent brand, I use I'm satisfied					
The detergent I use provides better service to me					
I believe that the quality of the product determines the detergent I use					
Brand Loyalty					
The performance of the brand of laundry detergent I use satisfies me					
I am satisfied with the quality of the brand of detergent I use.					
The laundry detergent I use gives me a better service					

I think the quality of the product influences the choice of laundry detergent I use					
Patented Brand Assets					
I think class has a role in how I chose the brand of laundry detergent					
I buy a particular brand of laundry detergent due to brand associations					
The variety of brand line extensions and options from the same manufacturer allows me to be loyal to one brand.					
I believe that a highly visible trademark can influence the choice of my product					
Industry context					
Lack of appropriate options influences detergent brand selection					
Grocery shopping behavior May limit the purchase of your favorite detergents					
Distribution network and availability of detergent types allow customers to choose their favorite brand, as seen in most places.					
Store type or brand gives you confidence in your choice of detergent on the shelves					
The Consumer's Choice					
Seeing your favorite detergent advertised, you want to buy					
You choose a brand because you are an avid customer of the brands					
Trust yourself If you buy products based on the popularity of each brand					

I think the quality will help me choose my favorite laundry detergent brand					