

**CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY EFFECTS  
ON CONSUMER RESPONSES  
A STUDY ON MOBILE PHONE BRAND**

**SHAZANA BINTI MOHAMED SHARIFF**

**UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA**

**CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY EFFECTS ON  
CONSUMER RESPONSES  
A STUDY ON MOBILE PHONE BRAND**

**SHAZANA BINTI MOHAMED SHARIFF**

**A thesis submitted to the Graduate School in partial  
fulfilment of the requirement for the degree  
Master of Science (Management)**

**GRADUATE SCHOOL  
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA**

**JULY 2002**



**Sekolah Siswazah  
(Graduate School)  
Universiti Utara Malaysia**

**PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PROJEK  
(Certification of Project Paper)**

Saya, yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa  
*(I, the undersigned, certify that)*

**SHAZANA BINTI MOHAMED SHARIFF**

calon untuk Ijazah  
*(candidate for the degree of)* Master in Science (Management)

telah mengemukakan kertas projek yang bertajuk  
*(has presented his/her project paper of the following title)*

**CUSTOMER – BASED BRAND EQUITY EFFECTS ON CONSUMER**

**RESPONSES : A STUDY ON MOBILE PHONE BRAND**

seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas projek  
*(as it appears on the title page and front cover of project paper)*


bahawa kertas projek tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan,  
dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.

*(that the project paper acceptable in form and content, and that a satisfactory  
knowledge of the field is covered by the project paper).*

Nama Penyelia

*(Name of Supervisor)* : Assoc. Prof. Abdul Aziz Ab. Latif

Tandatangan  
*(Signature)*

: 

Tarikh  
*(Date)*

: 30/07/02

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

“Alhamdulillah”, all praise to Allah the almighty for giving me the courage, motivation and guidance to successfully complete this thesis.

I wish to acknowledge my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my academic supervisor, Associate Professor Abdul Aziz Latif for his patience, support and constructive comments.

Furthermore, I would like to express my grateful thanks to my parents for giving me the encouragement and support that I needed. My deepest thanks go to my beloved husband, Khairul Azman for his support and opinion throughout the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to convey my appreciation to all my friends who also have contributed to this thesis.

**Shazana binti Mohamed Shariff**  
Graduate School  
Universiti Utara Malaysia

July 2002

## **Abstract**

Brand equity is very important to marketers of consumer goods and service. Brand equity facilitates in the effectiveness of brand extensions and brand introductions. This is because consumers who trust and display loyalty toward a brand are willing to accept possible brand extension and willing to recommend the brand to others. While there have been a lot of studies based on the financial value and management of brand equity, research in customer-based brand equity has been lacking. This paper studies the dimensions of customer-based brand equity focusing on the five dimensions that have been suggested by Lassar et al., (1995). Five dimensions are identified: performance, trustworthiness, social image, value/price, and attachment. 16 hypotheses have been constructed in which related to the objective of this study. The objective of this paper is to study the dimensions of customer-based brand equity effect on consumer responses. By way of hypothesis, 10 of the hypothesis have been proposed that these dimensions have no significant relationship on consumer willingness to recommend the brand to other and willingness to accept brand extension. While five of the hypothesis proposed that there have no significant difference on consumer responses based on selected demographic factors. The hypotheses have been tested in the mobile phone market in Ipoh, Perak. The data collected was analysed using descriptive statistic, t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson-Bivariate Correlation Analysis. The results obtained confirm the relationship between the dimensions of customer-based brand equity and consumer responses. However, there is no significant difference in consumer responses based on demographic factors.

## Abstrak

Ekuiti jenama adalah sangat penting dalam pemasaran barangan dan perkhidmatan. Ekuiti jenama membantu pengembrangan dan pengenalan jenama. Ini disebabkan pengguna yang percaya dan setia terhadap suatu jenama bersedia menerima kebarangkalian pengembangan jenama dan bersedia untuk mencadangkan jenama tersebut kepada individu yang lain. Walaupun terdapat banyak kajian telah dijalankan terhadap ekuiti jenama berasaskan kewangan dan pengurusan, namun kajian terhadap ekuiti jenama berasaskan pelanggan masih kurang diberi perhatian. Kajian ini mengkaji dimensi-dimensi ekuiti jenama berasaskan pelanggan menjurus kepada lima dimensi seperti yang dicadangkan oleh Lassar et al., (1995). Lima dimensi yang telah dikenalpasti tersebut ialah: prestasi, kepercayaan, imej sosial, nilai/harga dan kesetiaan. 16 hipotesis telah dibina berdasarkan kepada objektif kajian ini. Objektif kajian ini ialah untuk mengenalpasti dimensi-dimensi ekuiti jenama berasaskan pelanggan yang memberi kesan kepada reaksi pelanggan. Berdasarkan hypotesis yang dibina, 10 daripadanya mencadangkan bahawa kesemua dimensi itu tidak mempunyai hubungan yang ketara terhadap kesediaan pengguna untuk mencadangkan jenama kepada inividu lain dan kesediaan untuk menerima pengembangan jenama. Manakala 5 daripada hipotesis tersebut, mencadangkan bahawa tiada perbezaan yang ketara dalam reaksi pelanggan berdasarkan faktor demografi yang terpilih. Hipotesis-hipotesis ini telah diuji dalam pasaran telefon bimbit di Ipoh, Perak. Data-data yang telah dikumpul dianalisa menggunakan statistik deskriptif, ujian-t, ANOVA, dan Analisis Hubungan Pearson-Bivariate. Keputusan yang telah diperolehi mengesahkan terdapat hubungan yang signifikan diantara dimensi-dimensi ekuiti jenama dan reaksi pelanggan. Bagaimanapun, tidak terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan terhadap reaksi pengguna berdasarkan kepada faktor demografi.

<b>TABLE OF CONTENT</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>		
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	BACKGROUND	3
1.2	PROBLEM STATEMENT	5
1.3	OBJECTIVES	6
	<i>1.3.1 General Objective</i>	
	<i>1.3.2 Specific Objectives</i>	
1.4	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	6
1.5	SCOPE OF RESEARCH	
1.6	LIMITATION	7
1.7	OPERATIONAL DEFINITION	8
		8
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>		
2.0	INTRODUCTION	11
2.1	BRAND EQUITY	11
	<b>2.1.1 Brand Equity Definition</b>	
	<i>2.1.1.1 Aaker's Brand Equity Approach</i>	
	<i>2.1.1.2 The Keller Brand Equity Approach</i>	
	<i>2.1.1.3 Kapferer's Brand Equity Model</i>	
	<b>2.1.2 The Perspectives of Brand Equity</b>	
	<i>2.1.2.1 Brand Equity in the Context of Customer</i>	

*Perspective*

**2.1.3 Elements/Dimensions of Brand Equity**

**2.1.4 Brand Equity Measure**

**2.1.5 The Affect of Brand Equity Dimensions on Consumer  
Response**

**2.2 THE PROPOSED MODEL OF CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY 29**

**2.2.1 Dimensions of Customer-Based Brand Equity**

*2.2.1.1 Performance*

*2.2.1.2 Trustworthiness*

*2.2.1.3 Social Image*

*2.2.1.4 Value/Price*

*2.2.1.5 Attachment*

**CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**3.0 INTRODUCTION 35**

**3.1 MEASUREMENT OF CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY,  
WILLINGNESS TO RECOMMEND TO OTHERS AND ACCEPT  
BRAND EXTENSION 35**

**3.2 HYPOTHESIS 39**

**3.3 DATA SAMPLING 41**

**3.3.1 Population**

**3.3.2 Analysis Unit**



3.3.3	<i>Sample Size</i>	
3.3.4	<i>Respondents</i>	
3.4	INSTRUMENTATION	42
3.5	DATA COLLECTION	43
3.6	DATA ANALYSIS	43
3.6.1	<i>Frequency Distribution</i>	
3.6.2	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	
3.6.3	<i>T-test and ANOVA</i>	
3.7	RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY	46
<b>CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>		
4.0	INTRODUCTION	47
4.1	SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	47
4.1.1	<i>Gender of Respondents</i>	
4.1.2	<i>Age of Respondents</i>	
4.1.3	<i>Race</i>	
4.1.4	<i>Academic Qualifications</i>	
4.1.5	<i>Income Per Month</i>	
4.1.6	<i>Details of Respondents' Mobile Phones Brand</i>	
4.1.7	<i>Current Mobile Phone Purchase Price</i>	
4.1.8	<i>Respondents' Reasons for Choosing Brand's Mobile Phone</i>	
4.1.9	<i>Satisfaction with the Current Mobile Phone Features</i>	

4.2	RESULT OF CORRELATION ANALYSIS	68
4.2.1	<i>Hypothesis 1</i>	
4.2.2	<i>Hypothesis 2</i>	
4.2.3	<i>Hypothesis 3</i>	
4.2.4	<i>Hypothesis 4</i>	
4.2.5	<i>Hypothesis 5</i>	
4.2.6	<i>Hypothesis 6</i>	
4.2.7	<i>Hypothesis 7</i>	
4.2.8	<i>Hypothesis 8</i>	
4.2.9	<i>Hypothesis 9</i>	
4.2.10	<i>Hypothesis 10</i>	
4.2.11	<i>Hypothesis 11</i>	
4.2.12	<i>Hypothesis 12</i>	
4.2.13	<i>Hypothesis 13</i>	
4.2.14	<i>Hypothesis 14</i>	
4.2.15	<i>Hypothesis 15</i>	
4.2.16	<i>Hypothesis 16</i>	

4.3	CONCLUSIONS	83
-----	-------------	----

**CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.0	INTRODUCTION	86
5.1	SUMMARY OF INTRODUCTION, LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY	86
5.2	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	89
5.2.1	<i>Socio Demographic Characteristics</i>	
5.2.2	<i>The Relationship Between The Customer-Based Brand Equity Dimensions with Consumer Responsens</i>	

**5.2.3 The Differences Effects on Consumer Responses Based  
On Selected Demographic Factors**

5.3	CONCLUSION	92
5.4	RECOMMENDATIONS	93

*BIBLIOGRAPHY*

*APPENDICES*

*Appendix A: Questionnaire in English Version*

*Appendix B: Reliability Analysis*

*Appendix C: SPSS Output*

*Appendix D: Pearson-Bivariate Correlation*

*Appendix E: t-Test and ANOVA*

<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Figure 2.1a: Aaker's Model of Brand Equity	13
Figure 2.1b: Keller's Model of Brand Equity	16
Figure 2.1c: Feldwick Brand Equity Chain	19
Figure 2.1d: SDR's Brand Value Model	26
Figure 2.2: Customer-Based Brand Equity Model	29
Figure 4.1.1: Gender of Respondents	48
Figure 4.1.2: Age of Respondents	49
Figure 4.1.3: Race of Respondents	50
Figure 4.1.4: Academic Qualification	51
Figure 4.1.5: Income Per Month	53
Figure 4.1.6a: Respondents' Current Mobile Phone Brand	54
Figure 4.1.6b: Respondents' Favourite Purchase Mobile Phone Brand	55
Figure 4.1.6c: Respondents' Future Purchase Mobile Phone Brand	56
Figure 4.1.7: Current Mobile Phone Purchase Price	57
Figure 4.1.8a: Respondents' Current Puchase of Mobile Phone According age	59
Figure 4.1.8b: Respondents' Favourite Purchase of Mobile Phone According Age	60
Figure 4.1.8c: Respondents' Future Purchase of Mobile Phone	61

Accordinging Age

Figure 4.1.9a: Respondents' Current Purchase of Mobile Phone 62

Accordinging Income Per Month

Figure 4.1.9b: Respondents' Favourite Purchase of Mobile Phone 64

Accordinging Income Per Month

Figure 4.1.9c: Respondent's Future Purchase of Mobile Phone 65

Accordinging Income Per Month

<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Table 3.1: Measurement scale for Customer-Based Brand Equity, Willingness to Recommend to Others, Willingness to Accept Brand Extension	36
Table 3.6: Statistical Approaches Used To Analyze the Data	44
Table 3.7a: Reliability Coefficients for Customer-Based Brand Equity Dimensions	46
Table 3.7b: Reliability Coefficients for Willingness to Recommend To Others and Willingness to Accept Brand Extension	46
Table 4.1.1: Gender of Respondents	48
Table 4.1.2: Age of Respondents	49
Table 4.1.3: Race	50
Table 4.1.4: Academic Qualification	51
Table 4.1.5: Income Per Month	52
Table 4.1.7: Current Mobile Phone Purchase Price	57
Table 4.1.8: Respondent's Reasons for Choosing Brand's Mobile Phone	66
Table 4.1.9: Satisfaction with the Current Mobile Phone Features	67
Table 4.2a: Pearson Correlation Between The Five Underlying Dimensions (Performance, Trustworthiness, Social Image, Value/Price & Attachment) with Willingness to Recommend To Others	68
Table 4.2b: Pearson Correlation Between The Five Underlying	69

Dimensions (Performance, Trustworthiness, Social Image,  
Value/Price & Attachment) with Willingness to Accept Brand  
Extension

Table 4.3.11: One Way ANOVA Test and Mean Value on Willingness To Accept Brand Extension to Other Product Categories Based On Their Age	77
Table 4.3.12: One Way ANOVA Test and Mean Value on Willingness To Recommend Brand to Others Based On Their Age	78
Table 4.3.13: Mean Values and Value From Consumers' Willingness To Accept Possible Brand Extension to Other Product Categories based on their gender	79
Table 4.3.14: Mean Values and Value From Consumers' Willingness To Recommend Brand to Others Based on their gender	80
Table 4.3.15: One Way ANOVA Test and Mean Value on Willingness To Accept Brand Extension to Other Product Categories Based On Income	81
Table 4.3.16: One Way ANOVA Test and Mean Value on Willingness To Recommend Brand to Others Based On Their Income	82

# CHAPTER 1



## **CHAPTER 1**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Generally, brand is a trademark or label used by a marketer to identify their product than other competitors. It also can be defined as the name associated with one or more item in the product line that is used to identify the source or character of the items. According to the American Marketing Association brand can be defined as a name, term, sign, symbol, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors (Kotler, 1999; Kotler, Ang, Leong & Tan, 1999).

Brands have been a part of the marketing landscape for many years, but in the past few years the future of the brands have been questioned. In response to the brand contentions, researchers have focused their efforts on developing a more sophisticated understanding of how strong brands can be created and nurtured. Due to its importance, there are many practitioners explore the importance of brand equity in marketing. Although brand equity has been proposed as a financial instrument for capturing and measuring the value of brands, perhaps its most important contribution is a metric for discovering the differential consumer behavior effect of the firm's marketing mix activities.

The contents of  
the thesis is for  
internal user  
only

- Aaker, D.A. (1991). **Managing Brand Equity: Capitalising on the Value of a Brand Name**. NY: The Free Press.
- Aaker, D.A. (1993). "Are Brand Equity Investments Really Worthwhile?" Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, 150.
- Aaker, D.A. (1996). **Building Strong Brands**. NY: The Free Press.
- Agarwal, M.K. and Rao, V.R. (1996). "An Empirical Comparison of Consumer-Based Measures of Brand Equity". **Marketing Letters**, 7, (3), 237-247
- Ambler, T. (1997). "Do Brands Benefit Consumer?", **International Journal of Advertising**. 166-198.
- Ambler, T. and Vakratsas, D. (1988). "Why Not Let The Agency Decide The Advertising". **The Journal of Marketing Society**, NCT Publications.
- American Productivity and Quality Center. July 2001. Evaluating a Brand's Effectiveness Through Elements of Equity.  
<http://www.apqc.org/freearticles/dispatchArticle.cfm>.
- Belk, R.W. (1988). "Possessions and the Extended Self," **Journal of Consumer Research**, Sept, 139-168.
- Berry, L.L. (1995). "Relationship Marketing of Services- Growing Interest, Emerging Perspectives", **Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science**, Vol. 23, 236-245.
- Berry, L.L. (1999). "Discovering the Soul of Service Brand Equity: The Nine Drivers of Sustainable Business Success". NY. The Free Press.
- Berry, L.L. (2000). "Cultivating Service Brand Equity". **Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science**, Vol. 28. 128-137.
- Berry, L.L., Lefkowitz, E.F. and Clark, T. (1988). "In Service, What's in A Name?", **Harvard Business Review**, Vol. 66, Sept-Oct, 28-30.
- Biel, A.L. (1992). "How Brand Image Drives Brand Equity", ARF Workshop, NY.
- Boulding, W., Kaira, A., Staelin, R., and Zeithalm, V. (1993). "A Dynamic Process Model Of Service Quality: From Expectations to Behavioral Intentions", **Journal of Marketing Research**, Vol. 30, Feb. , 7-27.
- Brucks, M. and Zeithalm, V.A. (1991). "Price and Brand Name as Indicators of Quality Dimensions", Report Number 91-130, Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge, MA.

- Cobb-Walgren, C.J., Ruble, C.A., and Donthu, N. (1995). "Brand Equity, Brand Preference, and Purchase Intent", **Journal of Advertising**, Vol. 24, 25-40.
- Dacin, P.A. and Smith, D.C. (1994). "The Effect of Brand Portfolio Characteristics on Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions", **Journal of Marketing Research**, Vol. 31, May, 229-242.
- Farquhar, P.H. (1989). "Managing Brand Equity", **Marketing Research**, Vol 1, 24-33.
- Feldwick, P. (1996). "Do we Really Need "Brand Equity?", **The Journal of Brand Management**, 4 (1). 9-28.
- Graeff, T.R. (1996). "Using Promotional Message to Manage the Effects of Brand and Self-Image on Brand Evaluations", **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, Vol. 13, 4-18.
- Grapentine, T. (1996). "Demystifying Brand Equity", **Marketing Management**, 5(2), 25-29.
- Hogg, M.K., Cox, A.J. and Keeling, K. (2000). "The Impact of Self-Monitoring on Image Congruence and Product /Brand Evaluation", **European Journal of Marketing**, 34 (5/6), 641-666.
- Hutton, J.G. (1997). "A Study of Brand Equity in An Organizational-Buying Context", **Journal of Product and Brand Management**, 6(6), 428-439.
- Kamakura, W.A. and Russell, G.J. (1991). "Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Brand Quality with Scanner Data: Implications for Brand Equity", Report Number 91-122, Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge, MA.
- Kapferer, J.N. (1992). **Strategic Brand Management: New Approaches to Creating and Evaluating Brand Equity**. NY: The Free Press.
- Keller, K.L. (1991). "Conceptualizing, Measuring and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity", Report Number 91-123, Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge, MA.
- Keller, K.L. (1993). "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity", **Journal of Marketing**, Vol. 57, 1-22.
- Keller, K.L. and Aaker, D.A. (1992). "The Effects of Sequential Introduction on Brand Extensions", **Journal of Marketing Research**, Vol. 29, 35-50.
- Keller, K.L. (1998). "Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity, Upper Saddle River: NJ Prentice Hall.
- Keller, K.L. (2001). "Building Customer-Based Brand Equity". **Marketing Management**, 10 (2), 14-19.

- Kerin, K. and Sethuraman, R. (1998). "Exploring the Brand Value-Shareholder Value Nexus for Consumer Goods Companies", **Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science**, 26(4), 260-273.
- Kotler, P., Ang, S.H., Leong, S.M. and Tan, C.L. (1997). **Marketing Management: An Asian Perspective**. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Englewood Cliff: NJ Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, P. (1999). "Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning and Control". 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs: NJ Prentice Hall.
- Lassar, W., Mittal, B. and Sharma, A. (1995). "Measuring Customer-Based Brand Equity", **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, Vol. 12, 11-19.
- Leuthesser, L. (1988). "Defining, Measuring and Managing Brand Equity", A Conference Summary, Marketing Science Institute, Cambridge, MA.
- Leuthesser, L, Kohli, C., and Harich, K. (1995). "Brand Equity: The Halo Effect Measure". **Journal of Marketing**, Vol. 29, Nov, 59-66.
- Loken, B. and John, D.R. (1993). "Diluting Brand Belief: When Do Brand Extension Have A Negative Impact?", **Journal of Marketing**, Vol. 57, July, 71-84.
- Markus, H. and Kunda, Z. (1986). "Stability and Malleability in the Self-Concept". **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 51, 858-866.
- Martin, G.S. and Brown, T.J. (1990). "In Search of Brand Equity: The Conceptualizing and Measurement of the Brand Impression Construct", **Marketing Theory and Applications**, Vol 2, American Marketing Association, Chicago: IL. 431-438.
- Muhamed, M. (2001). "Equity is Nice to Have, but....", **FMCG: Marketing Buzz**.  
<http://www.indianfolone.com/fmcg/stma/st27.html>.
- Neal, W.D. and Crum, K. (t.t). "Modelling Brand Equity".  
[http://www.sdrnet.com/modelingbrandequity\\_detail.htm](http://www.sdrnet.com/modelingbrandequity_detail.htm).
- Nedungadi, P. and Hutchinson, J.W. (1985). "The Prototypicality of Brand: Relationships with Brand Awareness, Preference and Usage", **Advances in Consumer Research**, Vol 12, 498-503
- Onksivit, S. and Shaw, J.J. (1989). "Service Marketing: Image, Branding, and Competition", **Business Horizons**, Vol.32, Jan-Feb, 13-18.
- Pitta, D.A. and Katsanis, L.P. (1995). "Understanding Brand Equity for Successful Brand Extension", **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, 12(4). 51-64.

- Park, C.S. and Srinivasan, V. (1994). "A Survey-based Method for Measuring and Understanding Brand Equity and Its Extendibility", **Journal of Marketing Research**, Vol. 31, May, 271-288.
- Prentice, D.A. and Miller, D. (1992). "When Small Effects Are Impressive". **Psychological Bulletin**, 112(1): 160-164.
- Richins. (1994). "Special Possessions and the Expression of Material Value." **Journal of Consumer Research**, 21, 522-533.
- Rio, A.B., Vazquez, R., and Igelsias, V. (2001). "The Effects of Brand Associations on Consumer Response", **Journal of Consumer Marketing**, 8(5).
- Riskey, D.R. and Kerin, R.A. (2001) "Measurement and Tracking of Brand Equity in The Global Marketplace". *International Marketing Review*, 18(1), 91-96
- Simon, C.J. and Sullivan, M.W. (1993). "The Measurement and Determinants of Brand Equity: A Financial Approach," **Marketing Science**, 28-52.
- Snyder, M. and Gangestad, S. (1986). "On the Nature of Self-Monitoring: Matters of Assessment, Matters of Validity." **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 51, 125-139.
- Srivasta, R.K. and Shocker, A.D. (1991). "Brand Equity: A Perspective on Its Meaning and Measurement", Working Paper, Marketing Science Institute, Boston, MA, 91-124.
- Swait, J., Erdem, T., Louviere, J. and Dubelaar, C. (1993). "The Equalization Price: A Measure of Consumer-Perceived Brand Equity", **International Journal of Research in Marketing**, Vol 10, March,23-45.
- Tetlock, P.E. and Manstead, A. (1985). "Impression Management Versus Intapsychic Explanation in Social Psychology: A Useful Dichotomy?" **Psychological Review**, 92(1): 59-77.
- Tauber, E.M. (1988). "Brand Leverage: Strategy for Growth in a Cost-Control World". *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 28, 26-30.
- Ward, J. and Loken, B. (1986). "The Quintessential Snack Food: Measurement of Product Prototype". *Consumer Research*, Vol.13, 126-131.
- Winters, L. (1991). "Brand Equity Measures Some Recent Advances". *Marketing Research*, 3(3), 70-73.

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., and Lee, S. (2000). "An Examination of Selected Marketing Mix Elements and Brand Equity", **Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science**, Vol. 28, 195-211.

Young, L. and Wilkinson, I. (1989). "Characteristics of Good and Poor Interfirm Relations: Australian Experience", **European Journal of Marketing**, 23(2), 109-122.