

## How to Cite

ODELEYE, O. T. (2021). Brand equity and marketing performance: Perspectives from the brewing industry in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business, Economics & Management*, 4(1), 103-115. <https://doi.org/10.31295/ijbem.v4n1.1279>

# Brand Equity and Marketing Performance: Perspectives from the Brewing Industry in Nigeria

Olayinka Tope ODELEYE

*Business Administration and Marketing, Delta State University, Asaba Campus, Nigeria*

Email: [anthony.kifordu@yahoo.com](mailto:anthony.kifordu@yahoo.com)

**Abstract**---Branding and equity balancing in organizational performance have been a task in marketing that entails a holistic approach to getting it right. Thus the study examined the effect of brand equity on marketing performance in brewing firms. The specified objectives are to examine the influence brand loyalty has on marketing performance, and to ascertain the influence of brand associations on marketing performance. The population consists of employees of Guinness Nigeria Plc in Benin City, Edo State, Nigerian Breweries Plc and in fact Beverages in the South-East region. The sample size determination table was used to determine the sample size and survey research design method was used in the selection of respondents to represent the population. The statistical tools used include simple percentage and multiple regression. The findings of the study showed that all variables examined such as brand loyalty and brand associations, were positive and significant factors of marketing performance. The study concluded that brand loyalty has a positive influence on marketing performance. Brand loyalty can be seen to be formed through brand trust, commitment, satisfaction, perceived value, image, association and quality.

**Keywords**---brand equity, brand trust, brewing firms, industry, marketing performance.

## Introduction

The desire of firms to improve their performance in the market is the paramount push behind all marketing decisions and programmes because the market performance of the firm is cardinal to the corporate wellbeing of business undertakings and also determines the continued existence of the firm in the business landscape. Market performance has thus continued to enjoy very attractive investigations from practitioners and academics. Efforts have been made to determine how individual marketing programmes affect various aspects of market performance. Thus, to determine the core drivers of market performance, several studies have been conducted (eg., Ateke & Iruka, 2015; Adejoke & Adekemi, 2012; Asiegbu et al., 2011). Marketers have realized that it is no longer enough to just provide a value offering to the marketplace, and amass tangible assets; but they must also consider their brands as significant intangible assets (Liu et al., 2010).

The conceptualizations of consumer-based brand equity have mainly derived from cognitive psychology and information economics. The performance of a firm is intuitively expected to be improved as a result of a stronger brand and higher brand equity. However, brand equity is defined in many different ways and there is no generally accepted standard way of measuring it. In this study, a consumer-based perspective is adopted in examining the brand equity concept. Consumer-based brand equity approaches adopt a cognitive psychological point of view in assessing the brand and the value created by it. The dominant stream of research has been grounded in cognitive psychology, focusing on memory structure (Christodoulides & De Chernatony 2010). Aaker (1991) identified the conceptual dimensions of brand equity as brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality, brand loyalty, and other proprietary brand assets such as patents, trademarks and channel relationships. The former four dimensions of brand equity represent consumer perceptions and reactions to the brand, while proprietary brand assets are not pertinent to consumer-based brand equity. Keller (2013) defined consumer-based brand equity as 'the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand' and brand knowledge is a key antecedent of customer-based brand equity. It is in turn conceptualized as a brand node in memory to which a variety

of associations have been linked. Brand knowledge is then decomposed into two separate constructs: brand awareness and brand image (associations).

Consumer-based brand equity (CBBE) and its elements help customers in interpreting and processing information, create confidence in purchasing decisions and also enhance customers' satisfaction (Aaker, 2011; Davis, 2000; Ambler, 2003). The familiarity, high quality and reliability offered by brands decrease the uncertainty and risk involved in consumers' decision-making process. Moreover, a more subjective aspect of value is also obtained from brands by the consumers. These personal benefits can materialize as self-esteem, self-actualization, enjoyment, sense of accomplishment, reference group belonging or status demonstration. This subjective value is related to brand associations and also related to Keller (1993) brand equity component, the brand image. Consumer-based brand equity help companies increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of their marketing programs enjoys higher profit margins (Erdem et al., 2002; Bendixen et al., 2004), offers good trade leverage and helps in implementing brand extensions (Aaker, 2011). Additionally, brand equity can also be used as a performance indicator for marketing activities in a company. Accountability and justification of marketing activities is an important and contemporary area of interest both for practitioners and academics in marketing (Christodoulides & de Chernatony 2010; Sharma et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2011).

Prior researches on brand equity and market performance do not provide adequate knowledge for managers in the Nigerian context on how brand equity affects a firm's customer's acquisition. This is because most such studies are foreign and conducted using other measures of market performance. For instance, Marakarun & Panjakajornak (2017) used customers with trust and loyalty. Kilie et al. (2016), used service organization, Cetin et al. (2016) used market share, Park & Bai (2014) used financial performance measures, Huang & Sarigollu (2002) used performance measures as brand sales and market shares. From the perspective of cognitive psychology, customer-based brand equity occurs when consumers hold some favourable, strong, and unique brand associations in memory, which in turn leads to incremental utility or value-added. Thus, investing in brand equity is expected to lead to differential consumer response that may positively affect firm value (through greater consumer retention, price tolerance, or word-of-mouth recommendations, for example).

### *Statement of the Problem*

Due to the fast change in the global market and increase competition, the management of the brand has become of importance. Building strong brand equity is the topmost priority of many breweries firm, but attaining this objective is not always an easy task because the products and services of many breweries firm are similar and their means of distributions are alike. Price in the form of discount and brand equity is the only possible means by which customers can differentiate one brand from another. The failure to measure marketing performance is the main weakness that has been widely discussed because the brand is the first possession of a company. A brand can play the primary role in the success of an organization by creating a competitive advantage via the performance of non-product related means.

Understanding the differences of the products via their branding has given so much benefit to the companies including consistent volume and revenue over the years, resisting the attacks, getting higher fair share and specifically the cash flow and more earnings. The marketing performance can be taken in to account as a factor that corresponds to the evaluation of brand success in the markets and it can help the brands achieve their goals in the market place.

Despite the remarkable development of branding in the world and its role in increasing the performance of companies, a quick preview of previous researches indicates that there is a lack of researches related to the topic of this study. Thus, with the view of filling the knowledge gap that has been identified, the study is targeted at examining the link between brand equity and market performance in terms of brand loyalty, brand associations and brand awareness.

### *Research Objectives*

- 1) examine the influence brand loyalty has on marketing performance
- 2) ascertain the influence of brand associations on marketing performance

### *Research Hypotheses*

HO<sub>1</sub>: Brand loyalty has no significant influence on marketing performance

HO<sub>2</sub>: Brand associations has no significant influence on marketing performance

## **Review of Related Literature**

### *Conceptual Review*

#### *Concept of Brand Equity*

Since the development of brand equity in the 1980s, there have been rapid developments in the subject. This is because branding has been recognized as an important factor for the success of a firm, especially in a very competitive business environment. In the literature, different definitions of brand equity have been proposed. Brand equity is usually defined as the difference between the marketing effects that accumulate to a particular product given its brand name and the effects that would accumulate if the product does not have the same brand name (Keller, 2003; Zhou, 2009). According to Kotler & Keller (2009), brand equity is a set of brand assets and liabilities that add to or subtract from the value provided by the product or service to the Company and/or that the company's customers. Brand equity is the result of the understanding of the attitude of the brand to ensure the continuation of the positive brand attitude which will lead to strong brand equity (Zhu, 2009; Kim & Kim, 2005; Wang et al., 2015).

#### *Branding*

The company brand is an important factor of any organization, yet it is one of the least understood assets. Great companies transcend tangible and functional benefits by creating positive emotional ties that can easily outlast any individual product or service. The brand is the most valuable property a company acquires over time is its reputation, its goodwill, and its brand name (Wansink & Seed, 2001). Branding in the new millennium is used to create an emotional attachment to products and organizations. The stakes involved in launching, maintaining, and evolving a brand are much higher today in the global economy than they were in the past. A brand is a powerful strategic weapon. It distinguishes a company from its competitors. It defines to the stakeholders, which is the company, what the company believes in and what they may expect from the company. A great brand is a story that is never completely told each new product, promotion or advertisement is just another passage, one more chapter, and one more revealing insight into a complex yet familiar plot (Wansink & Rajeev, 2004; Seggie et al., 2006; Subawa et al., 2020).

The brand is a continuum that starts with the most generic form (the commodity) and ends with the most unique and specific things: a brand. Brand management underlines the fact that brands are not born as brands, but are born as commodities. For example, more than a century ago, John Pemberton set out to create a tonic, not a global brand named Coca-Cola. And in 1962, when Bill Bowerman and Phil Knight each chipped in dollars 550 to set up Nike, their goal was to make running shoes for athletes, not create a global leisure brand empire.

The concept of branding has always been prominent in marketing circles. Recently, it has attracted much broader management attention for several good reasons. For many industries, branding offers the best opportunity for creating growth. Branding applies to all categories and industries and even applies to commodities. That's because any product or service can be differentiated. And since any differentiated product or service can be given a proper name to signal its particular qualities, branding is possible in every case imaginable. The branding of products in what was thought to be commodity categories is so common that we no longer even notice it. Bananas, oranges, flour, aspirin, integrated circuits, paper, carpet fibres, water, and salt are all "commodity" categories possessing exceedingly profitable brand names.

#### *Brand Image*

Brand image, the major component, is regarded as "consumer perceptions of a brand as reflected by the brand associations held in consumers' memories (Keller, 2003). The theoretical base of the CBBE model can be delineated with a psychological theory, the associative network memory model, viewing semantic memory or knowledge as a set of nodes and links while nodes represent stored information connected by links that vary in strength (Chowdhury, 2002; Nneka et al., 2016). The link between nodes is activated by cues, such as ads, logos, and other brand elements or information. Unique brand personality in this study is used as a brand rejuvenation strategy to activate memory retrieval as soon as possible and has a significant impact on brand image and brand awareness. Thus, brand knowledge is also important in brand rejuvenation because it influences what comes to mind and, therefore, affects how ageing brands come back to consumers' minds, i.e., brand rejuvenation. While the

enhancement of brand awareness seems the easiest method to rejuvenate ageing brands, strong, favourable, and unique brand associations, i.e., improving a brand's image, can also be very helpful to create new sources of equity. As part of this repositioning or recommitment to an existing position requires positive associations that have faded must be bolstered, any negative associations must be neutralized, and additional positive associations should be created. In some cases, ageing brands need to increase differentiation from competing brands, and in other times, a brand must be repositioned to establish a point of parity on some key image dimensions to "break-even concerning other brands (Hofer, 2008). Also, Gopinath (1995) also indicates that retaining vulnerable or recapturing lost customers can enable a firm to identify neglected segments and attract new customers, which are very important tasks during brand repositioning. Brand awareness, one of two major components of brand knowledge, is referred to as "the strength of the brand node or trace in memory, as reflected by consumer's ability to recall or recognize the brand under different conditions.

### *Brand Associations*

Brand associations consist of all brand-related thoughts, feelings, perceptions, smells, colours, music, images, experiences, beliefs and attitudes (Kotler & Keller, 2006). Thus a brand association can be anything linked in memory to a brand (Aaker, 2011). Associations have been categorized in different ways by researchers but a dichotomous approach dividing them into product-based associations and organization based associations is widespread (Aaker, 2011; Chen, 2001). Product associations include functional attribute associations and non-functional associations (Chen, 2001). Organizational associations, the third dimension of associations named by Aaker (2011), are not related to any product but include corporate capability associations (related to a company's ability and know-how in delivering its intended outputs), and corporate social responsibility associations (Chen, 2001).

### *Brand Loyalty*

Brand loyalty is a core dimension of the brand equity model proposed by Aaker (2011) and is defined as the attachment that a customer has to a brand. Loyalty can be observed as behavioural or attitudinal loyalty (Kumar & Shah, 2006). Behavioural loyalty is linked to consumer behaviour in the marketplace that can be indicated by several repeated purchases or commitment to repeatedly buy the brand as a primary choice even if marketing efforts are promoting other brands (Kotler & Keller, 2006). Attitudinal loyalty on the other hand focuses on consumers' preference of a brand, and refers to consumers' psychological attachment level and also attitudinal advocacy towards the brand (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001).

### *Brand Loyalty and Marketing Performance*

Brand loyalty is used to infer favourable consumer behaviour towards a given brand that leads to continued use of the same brand over a long period. Skogland & Siguaw (2004), brand loyalty refers to the ability of the brand to attract, retain and grow its customer base over a long period. Chaudhuri & Holbrook (2001) proposed a brand loyalty model that outlines purchase loyalty leads to more market share while attitudinal loyalty leads to higher premiums on pricing. In today's ever-competitive environment, firms strive to attract, retain and grow loyal customers. It is no longer enough to satisfy customers since every competitor can achieve the same and therefore it is imperative to go a step further and create a customer base that is delighted and loyal to a firm's brands. This is important to brand equity since a firm can in future consider brand extensions based on strong brand loyalty. Marketing practitioners agree that exploiting strong brand loyalty help firms achieve high sales and reduce advertising investment when carrying out a brand extension.

Success in brand extension is determined by factors such as the quality of products. High-quality brands tend to succeed in brand extensions compared to brands whose quality is questionable. Brand extensions are more acceptable for products where the customer-based brand associations are salient and relevant. Success in brand extensions leads to success in marketing performance

Brand loyalty as a subject matter has been studied by various scholars. Based on these studies, two approaches to this concept have been developed and the first is the behavioural approach while the second is the cognitive (attitudinal) approach. Behavioural approach views brand loyalty as consistent purchase and use of one brand over a long period as a degree of brand loyalty. Critics of this approach have highlighted other factors that may be critical to consistent purchase and usage such as price, monopolistic tendencies and biased distribution channels amongst other

factors. If prices were to change and cheaper alternative brands were available in retail outlets, some consumers would be swayed to go for other brands and there it can be concluded that these factors may lead to repetitive purchase and not necessarily committed to the brand by the consumer. This thus leads to a cognitive approach to brand loyalty which underscores the importance of both behaviour and commitment to determining consumer brand loyalty. This commitment is reflected in consumer attitudes where they remain steadfast to a given brand irrespective of price changes recommending others to the brand through word of mouth. This also leads to improved marketing performance of an organization (Smith & Wright, 2004). There are different types or levels of brand loyalty and for purposes of this study, only one type will be highlighted due to its effect on brand equity and is the customer-based brand loyalty. This type of brand loyalty reflects the likelihood of a customer switching brands occasioned by a change in marketing mix elements such as price, product features, distribution etc. This type of brand loyalty affirms that as brand loyalty increases in a customer base, exposure to competitive activities reduces.

#### *Brand Association and Marketing Performance*

The brand association generally means anything that consumers think or relate to a given brand. This linkage is mental and many elements of the brand such as product attribute, product use lifestyle, product class, its competitors and country of origin of the brand. Brand association is any mental linkage to the brand and refers to how consumers' perceptions in respect to a brand are reflected and stored in their memory. This is how individual consumers give meaning and value to brands based on individual interactions and experiences with the brand and its elements in general resulting in visual pictures and images of the brand. Interaction and experiences arise when consumers are exposed to a brand's advertising, when they buy and use the brand and when they are told by others about the brand. In day to day brand management, the role of brand custodians is usually to try to influence the brand's position in the consumer's mind and the key objective is to achieve a favourable position for the brand that results in a positive brand association that is distinct and unique to the brand relative to competition thus enhancing the improved financial performance of the firm (Yoo & Donthu, 2001).

The brand association can be measured and levels of association determined in terms of strength. Brand association is important because favourable brand associations are useful to the firm because they lead to repeat sales and more brand referrals. Brand association influence the processing and recall of information by consumers, it enables a brand to be differentiated and gives the reason why it should be bought. The brand association can be identified through classes of association which are mainly brand attributes, brand benefits and brand attitudes. Attributes refer to product features that describe and distinguishes a product or service thus directly relating to a specific brand. Attributes can be distinguished according to how directly they relate to product or service performance. Further, attributes can be classified into product-related and non-product-related attributes (Keller 2003). Product-related attributes includes what makes up the product, while non-product attributes are attributes associated with its purchase or consumption. The second type of brand association is a brand benefit which refers to personal value and meaning that consumers assign to the product or service. This is further divided into functional benefits, experiential benefits, and symbolic benefits based on underlying motivation. The third type of brand association is brand attitudes which refers to how the overall evaluation of a brand by consumers and is more abstract compared to brand attributes and benefits.

### **Theoretical Review**

#### *Brand Equity Theory (Stakeholder Marketing Perspective)*

The study is anchored on the Prior marketing literature which suggests further research in the consumer and company co-operation domain. These views are in line with some contemporary approaches (Iglesias et al., 2013; Merz, 2009; Babin & James, 2010) that suggest embracing stakeholder co-operative perspectives in the creation of brand equity. Hult et al. (2011) argued that an important pillar of brand equity theory is stakeholder value perspectives that posit brand equity as a social and dynamic process of brand creation among stakeholders, rather than having narrow and limited perspectives from the consumer or company viewpoint. Most businesses make their financial plans and expected performance outputs. From a market dynamic perspective, a brand may have a high financial performance in the current period, but without continuous investments in marketing assets and stakeholder values that position will be jeopardized and in subsequent periods will be lost. As Hult et al. (2011) point out, the organization is a dependent part of social networks and a holistic stakeholder marketing perspective may provide achievement of performance goals through the value for all stakeholders.

*Empirical Review*

Aydin & Ulengin (2015) examined empirical evidence linking consumer-based brand equity (CBBE) with the financial performance of firms in Turkey. Aaker's CBBE approach is adopted and this equity is measured using a questionnaire developed from scales in the existing literature. Differing from the extant literature, this study relates to CBBE and firms' performance by taking a direct approach in measuring financial performance by utilizing independently audited financial statements. A face-to-face survey study encompassing 28 companies from a variety of consumer goods industries was carried out in Turkey arriving at 505 valid responses. Firms' financial performance was assessed using ten different performance indicators derived from financial statements submitted to the Istanbul Stock Exchange. Following an exploratory factor analysis to reveal CBBE dimensions, a multiple regression analysis was carried out to test the potential effects of CBBE factors on financial performance indicators. As an outcome of the analysis, it has been seen that the components of CBBE positively affect most of the financial performance indicators to varying extents. The perceived quality dimension appears to be the major driver of financial performance followed by the composite factor encompassing brand awareness and brand association components.

Huang & Sarigollu (2012) investigated how brand awareness relates to market outcome, brand equity and the marketing mix by combining survey data with real-market data to investigate the relationship between brand awareness and market outcome and the relationship between brand awareness and brand equity. These authors use brand sales and market share to measure brand market outcome and adopt measures of brand market performance, that is, revenue premium due to its ability to offer a more complete view than other brand market performance measures, such as market share or price premium and its consideration for both the price and the sales of a brand as well as competitors' performance, which is consistent with brand equity which symbolizes the strength of the brand in the marketplace relative to competitors. Using both regression and cross-prediction analyses to test whether brand awareness is an antecedent of the market outcome, the results of their study established that a positive correlation exists between brand awareness and brand market outcome. Specifically, there was a positive correlation between brand awareness and sales and between brand awareness and market share at  $p < .0001$ . In other related studies of the relationship between brand awareness and brand performance, the market performance outcome in the hotel industry establishes that brand awareness has a positive relationship with market performance and that significant differences in brand awareness are found between high and low market performance hotels.

Shadi et al. (2016) investigated the relationship between brand equity and consumer behaviour in Iran. In the model proposed in this study, the relationship between brand equity and the dimensions of consumer behaviour including the willingness to pay for an extra cost, brand preference and purchase intention is investigated. The research method is descriptive correlational. Structural equations and descriptive and inferential statistics and factor analysis were used to analyze the data. The statistical population of the study includes the owners of Grand Vitara, Sportage and Santafe from the companies of Iran Khodro, Kia and Hyundai. The population was unlimited including 384 people using the Cochran formula, and cluster sampling and endemic questionnaire tool were used. The study concluded that brand equity is associated with some aspects of consumer behaviour including willingness to pay extra costs, brand preference and purchase intention. The study recommended that companies with sufficient knowledge of the target market should focus more on these markets, identify loyal customers and give them special privileges and create a foundation for lasting in the minds of customers using good communication techniques.

**Method**

The cross-sectional survey research design method was employed because it is concerned with the collection and analysis of data to describe, evaluate or contrasting current prevailing practices, event or occurrences Olannye (2006). The population of this study consist of employees of Guinness Nigeria Plc in Benin City, Edo State, Nigerian Breweries Plc and Intafact Beverages in the South-East region. That came to 306.

Table 1

The total population would be 306 which consist of the employees from the sales and marketing department of selected breweries firms.

Companies	Population
Guinness Nigeria Plc	148
Nigerian Breweries Plc	114
Intact Beverages	44

Total	306
-------	-----

Source: Sales and Marketing Department

A sample size of three hundred and six (306) was used for the study and was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (as cited in Kenpro, 2012) sample size determination table. To make up this subset, the approximate number is one hundred and seventy-five (175).

Table 2  
Companies, Population and Sample Size

Companies	Population	Sample Size
Guinness Nigeria Plc	148	100
Nigerian Breweries Plc	114	52
Intafact Beverages	44	23
Total	306	175

Source: Sales and Marketing Department

### Sampling Techniques

The probability sampling method was employed in this study using the stratified random sampling technique. Structured questionnaires were used to obtain relevant data from the respondents. The researcher used the Likert five scale question model ranging from 1 undecided to 5 strongly agreed. Secondary data were gathered through journal articles, manual and material from the internet. Content validity was used to test if the content of the questionnaire has addressed what it is supposed to measure (Haynes et al., 2005). Cronbach's Alpha based test was used to test for the reliability coefficient. A reliability coefficient of 0.7 and above, is high and is acceptable while a reliability coefficient of 0.6 and below shows poor reliability (Sekaran, 2003). The hypotheses stated for this study were tested using linear regression analysis. This statistical tool was found appropriate because it establishes a relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The first level of statistical analysis involves the use of simple, descriptive statistic which uses the frequency, percentage mean, and standard deviation.

### Test of hypotheses

The hypotheses were tested below using the results obtained from the regression analysis (SPSS) for the primary and secondary data respectively). The hypothesis will be based on the decision rule as stated below:

*Decision Rule:* Reject null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) if the p-value is less than 0.05 (5%) and if not, do not reject the null hypothesis. This result is seen below:

#### Test of hypothesis one

H<sub>01</sub>: Brand loyalty has no significant influence on marketing performance.

Table 3  
Showing Brand loyalty correlation with marketing performance

		Brand loyalty	Marketing performance
Brand Loyalty	Pearson Correlation	1	.715**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	140	140
Marketing Performance	Pearson Correlation	.715**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	140	140

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Researchers' Field Survey (2020)

Table 3 shows the correlation of brand loyalty correlation with marketing performance shows a positive correlation coefficient with marketing performance at (0.715) which means that brand loyalty is a very good measure of marketing performance.

Table 4  
Regression Analysis Coefficients for brand loyalty correlation with marketing performance

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.53	2.604		1.250	.084
	brand loyalty	.303	.395	.691	1.21	.006

a. Dependent Variable: marketing performance  
Source: Researcher's Field Survey (2020)

Table 4 shows the regression analysis for brand loyalty correlation with marketing performance which indicates that brand loyalty exhibit a positive effect on marketing performance having a beta value ( $\beta= 0.691$ ).

Table 5 Contingency table  
Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)		2.604		1.250	0.084
brand loyalty	5.53	.395	.691	1.21	0.006
brand association	.303	.672	.737	2.453	0.019

a. Dependent Variable: marketing performance

Table 5 shows the regression analysis for brand loyalty and marketing performance which indicates that brand loyalty exhibit a positive effect on marketing performance having a beta value ( $\beta= 0.691$ ). From Table 5 the significance value is 0.006. This value is less than the set value of 0.05 used as the level of significance. Thus, the study rejects the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) which stated that there is no significant relationship between brand loyalty and marketing performance and accepts the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) which states that there is a significant relationship between brand loyalty and marketing performance in Nigeria. The significance value for brand loyalty is 0.006 from the coefficient table. The t statistics values on the other hand show 1.21. It implies that brand loyalty has a positive trend with marketing performance. One per cent (1%) movement in marketing performance is accounted for by the standardized coefficient of ( $\beta= 0.691$ ). The r-value is 0.612 while, the r squared value of 0.679 depicts near goodness of fit relationship between brand loyalty and marketing performance. The adjusted r square value on its part shows 0.631 (emphasizing non-spurious of variable) and this shows that movement in marketing performance is predicted by the variant in the model specification to the tune of 63.1% while other factors not included in the model specification has an effect of 36.9%. A Durbin Watson value of 2.713 shows that the model autofit. Therefore, in support of the study level of significance (0.05), brand loyalty is significantly related to marketing performance. Where brand loyalty is given priority in the firm, customers are assured of getting the best from the firm and this would in turn improve upon the overall marketing performance.

*Test of hypothesis two*

**HO<sub>2</sub>:** Brand associations has no significant influence on marketing performance

Table 6  
Showing Correlation of Brand associations and marketing performance

		Brand associations	marketing performance
Brand associations	Pearson Correlation	1	.610**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	140	140
marketing performance	Pearson Correlation	.610**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	140	140

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Field Survey (2020)

Table 6 shows the correlation between brand associations and marketing performance. Brand associations show a positive correlation coefficient with marketing performance at (0.610) which means that brand associations are a good measure of marketing performance.

Table 7  
Regression Analysis Coefficients for brand associations and marketing performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.53	2.604		1.250	.084
	brand associations	.145	.672	.737	2.453	.019

a. Dependent Variable: marketing performance

Table 7 shows the regression analysis for brand associations and marketing performance which indicates that brand associations have a positive effect on marketing performance having a beta value ( $\beta = 0.737$ ). From Table 7 the significant value is 0.019. This value is less than the set value of 0.05 used as the level of significance. Thus, the study rejects the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) which stated that there is no significant relationship between brand associations and marketing performance and accepts the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) which states that there is a significant relationship between brand associations and marketing performance. The significance value for brand associations is 0.019 from the coefficient table. The t statistics values on the other hand show 2.453. It implies that the enhancement of the brand associations has a positive trend with marketing performance. One per cent (1%) movement in marketing performance is accounted for by the standardized coefficient of ( $\beta = 0.737$ ). The r-value is 0.612 while, the r squared value of 0.679 depicts near goodness of fit relationship between brand associations and marketing performance. The adjusted r square value on its part shows 0.631 (emphasizing non-spurious of variable) and this shows that movement in marketing performance is predicted by the variant in the model specification to the tune of 63.1% while other factors not included in the model specification has an effect of 36.9%. A Durbin Watson value of 2.713 shows that the model autofit. Hence, in support of the study level of significance (0.05), a brand association is significantly positively related to marketing performance. Furthermore, where a constant brand association is guaranteed, patronage by customers would invariably increase and this, in turn, would aid the competitiveness of the firm.

## Discussion of Results

The findings of this study are hereby discussed and supported with relevant literature.

### *Brand Loyalty and Marketing Performance*

The significance value for brand loyalty is 0.006 from the coefficient table. The t statistics values on the other hand show 1.21. It implies that brand loyalty has a positive trend with marketing performance. One per cent (1%) movement in marketing performance is accounted for by the standardized coefficient of ( $\beta = 0.691$ ). The r-value is 0.612 while, the r squared value of 0.679 depicts near goodness of fit relationship between brand loyalty and marketing performance. The adjusted r square value on its part shows 0.631 (emphasizing non-spurious of variable) and this shows that movement in marketing performance is predicted by the variant in the model specification to the tune of 63.1% while other factors not included in the model specification has an effect of 36.9%. A Durbin Watson value of 2.713 shows that the model autofit. Therefore, there is a positive relationship between brand loyalty and marketing performance. The finding of the study is in line with [Chaudhuri & Holbrook \(2001\)](#) proposed a brand loyalty model that outlines purchase loyalty leads to more market share while attitudinal loyalty leads to higher premiums on pricing. It is no longer enough to satisfy customers since every competitor can achieve the same and therefore it is imperative to go a step further and create a customer base that is delighted and loyal to a firm's brands.

### *Brand Association and Marketing Performance*

The significance value for the brand association is 0.019 from the coefficient table. The t statistics values on the other hand show 2.453. It implies that the enhancement of the brand association has a positive trend with marketing performance. One per cent (1%) movement in marketing performance is accounted for by the standardized coefficient of ( $\beta = 0.737$ ). The r-value is 0.612 while, the r squared value of 0.679 depicts a near goodness of fit relationship between the brand association and marketing performance. The adjusted r square value on its part shows 0.631 (emphasizing non-spurious of variable) and this shows that movement in marketing performance is predicted by the variant in the model specification to the tune of 63.1% while other factors not included in the model specification has an effect of 36.9%. A Durbin Watson value of 2.713 shows that the model autofit. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the brand association and marketing performance. The finding of the study is in line with [Yoo & Donthu, \(2001\)](#) stated role of brand custodians is usually to try to influence the brand's position in the consumer's mind and the key objective is to achieve a favourable position for the brand that results in a positive brand association that is distinct and unique to the brand relative to competition thus enhancing the improved financial performance of the firm.

### **Conclusion**

It is concluded that brand loyalty has a positive influence on marketing performance. Brand loyalty can be seen to be formed through brand trust, commitment, satisfaction, perceived value, image, association and quality. Therefore, when a firm succeeds in establishing loyalty amongst its customers it adds value to the brand and creates strong brand affiliation, reduces marketing expenditure and influences other potential customers through positive word-of-mouth. Furthermore, customers, particularly those who tend to be loyal towards a brand are those with high experience and involvement levels with that particular brewery brand, as brand loyalty cannot exist without prior purchase and use experience. It is concluded that brand associations have a positive influence on marketing performance, for breweries firms, brand associations can be represented by the functional and experiential attributes offered by the specific brand.

### *Recommendations*

- 1) Breweries firm need to ensure that they not only sustain brand recognition and brand recall levels of brand awareness but also strive to ultimately achieve top of mind awareness in the minds of their consumers.
- 2) Breweries firm need to ensure that they consistently maintain an identity that their consumers can, at any given point, link to positive cues such as credibility for instance.

### **References**

- Aaker, D & Joachimsthaler (2000), "*Brand Leadership*", Free Press, New York.  
 Aaker, D. A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity*, The Free Press: New York, NY.  
 Aaker, D. A. (2006), *Measuring Brand Equity across Products and Markets*, California.  
 Aaker, D. A. (2011), *Managing Brand Equity*. New York: Free Press.

- Adejoke, K. B., & Adekemi, A. O. (2012), Relationship marketing and bank performance: an applied study of commercial banks in southwestern Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(10), 102-110.
- Ailawadi, K., Lehmann, D. and Neslin, S. (2003), "Revenue Premium as an outcome measure of Brand Equity", *Journal of Marketing*, 67(4), 1-17.
- Ambler, T. (2003), *Marketing and the Bottom Line: Creating the Measures of Success*. Financial Times/Prentice Hall, London, UK.
- Ambler, T., Bhattacharya, C.B., Edell, J, Keller, K.L., Lemon, K.N. and Mittal, V.(2002)," Relating Brand and Customer Perspectives on Marketing Management", *Jurnal of Service Research*, 5(1), 13-25.
- Asiegbu, I. F., Awa, H. O, Akpotu, C. & Ogbonna, U.B (2011), Salesforce competence development and marketing performance of industrial and domestic products firms in Nigeria. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 2(3), 43-59.
- Ateke, B. W. & Iruka, H. C. (2015), investigating the relationship between customer involvement management and marketing performance in the manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 2(9), 22-34.
- Aydin G & Ulengin B, (2015), Effect of Brand Equity on Firms' Financial Performance in Consumer Goods Industries. *Journal of Business, Economics & Finance* 4(3), 331 – 350.
- Babin, B. J. & James, K. (2010), "A brief retrospective and introspective on value", *European Business Review*, 22(5), 471-478.
- Balduaf, A., Karun, C. & Gudrum, B. (2013), Performance consequences of brand equity management from the organization in the value chain. *Journal of Products and Brand Management*.12(4), 220- 236.
- Balmer, J.M.T., (2001), "The three virtues and seven deadly sins of corporate brand management", *Journal of General Management*, 25(7), 1-17.
- Bendixen, M., Bukasa, K.A & Abratt R. (2004), "Brand equity in the business to business market" *Industrial Marketing Management* 33(5), 371– 380.
- Broniarczyk, S.M. and Gershoff, A.D. (2003), "The Reciprocal Effects of Brand Equity and Trivial Attributes", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40(2), 161-175.
- Cetin, D., Kuscu, A., Oziam, D. S. & Erdem, Y. C. (2016), Brand Image, Satisfaction, and Brand Loyalty-How effective are they in the Automotive Industry Market share. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 8 (7), 31-38.
- Chaudhuri, A. & Holbrook, M. B. (2011), The Chain of Effects from Brand Trust on Brand Performance: The Role of Brand Loyalty, *Journal of Marketing*, 6(2), 81-93.
- Chen, A. C. (2001), "Using free association to examine the relationship between the characteristics of brand associations and brand equity", *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 10(7), 439-451.
- Chowdhury, S.D., (2002), Brand rejuvenation: A stage theory perspective. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*. 19(3), 249.
- Christodoulides, G. & Leslie, D. (2010), Consumer-based brand equity conceptualization and measurement. *International Journal of Market Research*. 5(2), 43–66.*the definitive guide to measuring marketing performance*, Pearson, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Daly, A. and Moloney, D. (2004) "Managing Corporate Rebranding", *Irish Marketing Review*, 17(1/2), 30-36
- Davcik, N.S. (2013), "An empirical investigation of brand equity: Drivers and their consequences", *British Food Journal*, 115(9), 1342-1360.
- Erdem, T., Katz, M.L. and Sun, B. (2010), "A simple test for distinguishing between internal reference price theories", *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, 8 (3), 303-332.
- Erdem, T., Swait, J. & Louviere, J. (2002), "The impact of brand credibility on consumer price sensitivity", *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 19(1), 1–19.
- Gopinath, C. (1995), External influence on firms: An exploratory model of bank strategies. *Journal of Business Research*, 34, 133-143.
- Gotsi M, and Andriopoulos C. (2007) Understanding the pitfalls in the corporate rebranding process. *Corp Commun: An Int J*;12(4):341–55.
- Harcourt, H. & Ikegwuru, M. (2018), Brand Equity and Market Performance: An Empirical Study of Food and Beverage Firms in Rivers State. *IIARD International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 4(4), 1-14
- Hofer, C.W. (2008), Brand rejuvenation strategies, *Journal of Business Strategy*. 1, 19.
- Huang, R. & Sarigöllü, E., (2012), 'How brand awareness relates to market outcome, brand equity, and the marketing mix', *Journal of Business Research* 6(5), 92–99.

- Hult, T., Mena, J. A., Ferrell, O. C. and Ferrell, L. (2011), "Stakeholder marketing: a definition and conceptual framework", *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 1(1), 44-65.
- Iglesias, O., Ind, N. & Alfaro, M. (2013), "The organic view of the brand: A brand value co-creation model", *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(8), 670-688.
- Jones, T., Shirley, F. T & Harvir S. B. (2008), Commitment to a Friend, a Service Provider, or a Service Company- Are They Distinctions Worth Making? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 36(4), 473-487.
- Keller, K. L., Lehman, D. R. (2013), How Do Brands Create Value, *Marketing Management*, 12 (3), 26-31.
- Kilei, P., Iravo, M. & Omwenga, J. (2016), The impact of Brand awareness on market brand performance of service brands: contextual consideration of Kenya's banking industry. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 8(10), 92-103.
- Kim, H. B., & Kim, W. G. (2005). The relationship between brand equity and firms' performance in luxury hotels and chain restaurants. *Tourism management*, 26(4), 549-560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.03.010>
- Kim, J. H., & Hyun, Y. J. (2011). A model to investigate the influence of marketing-mix efforts and corporate image on brand equity in the IT software sector. *Industrial marketing management*, 40(3), 424-438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.06.024>
- Kotler, P. (2013). Principles of Marketing. 14th ed. Boston: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, J. L. (2006), *Marketing management* (12th ed.), New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall
- Kracklauer, A.H., Quinn Mills, D., Seifert, D. (2004), Collaborative Customer Relationship Management – Taking CRM to the Next Level, *Springer- Verlag, Germany Marketing*, 11(3), 18-32.
- Liu, X. Hu, M.Y & Grimme, P.E (2010), Affect transfer in brand extensions: The role of expectancy and relevancy. *Journal of Product Brand Management*, 1(9), 317-326.
- Macdonald, E. K., & Sharp, B. M. (2011), Brand awareness effects on consumer decision making for a common, repeat purchase product: A replication. *Journal of Business Research*, 48(1), 5-15.
- Maloney, J. C. (2003). "The History and Significance of Military Packaging". Defence Packaging Policy Group. Defence Logistics Agency. Retrieved 7 June 2018.
- Marakarun, L. & Panjakajornsak, V. (2017), Perceived quality perceived risk and customer trust affecting customer loyalty of environmentally friendly electronics. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*. 38 (17), 24-30.
- Merz, M.A., He, Y. & Vargo, S.L. (2009), "The evolving brand logic: a service-dominant logic perspective", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37(3), 328-344.
- Mowen, J.C. & Minor, M.S., (2011), *Consumer behaviour: A framework*, Prentice Hall,
- Muzellec, L. (2005), "What is in a name change? Re-Joycing corporate names to create corporate brands." *Corporate Reputation Review*, 8(4).
- name changes", Presentation at 2008 Annual Meeting of the Financial Management Association.
- Nneka, M., Anthony, K. A., & Ann, O. (2016). Effective management of intellectual capital and organizational performance on selected manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 3(11), 22-32.
- Robinson, D. and Wu, Y. (2008), "What's in a name? Causes and Consequences of corporate
- Samantaray, A. (2015), The effect of brand equity on consumer behaviour: with special reference to durables products. *Journal of Business Management and Economics Research*, 6(3), 6-13.
- Schendel, D., Patton, G.R. and Riggs, J. (2007), Corporate brand rejuvenation strategies: a study of profit, decline and recovery. *Journal of General Management*. 33, 3.
- Seggie, S. H., Kim, D., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2006). Do supply chain IT alignment and supply chain interfirm system integration impact upon brand equity and firm performance?. *Journal of business research*, 59(8), 887-895. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.03.005>
- Sharma, P., Davcik, N. S., & Pillai, K. G. (2016). Product innovation as a mediator in the impact of R&D expenditure and brand equity on marketing performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5662-5669. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.074>
- Smith, R.E., & Wright, W.F. (2004), Determination of Customer Loyalty and Financial Performance. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, 16, 183-205.
- Srinivasan, V., Park, C. and Chang, D. (2005), "An Approach to the Measurement, Analysis, and Prediction of Brand Equity and Its Sources", *Management Science*, 51(9), 1433-1448.
- Staisch, I. (2007). A Brand Audit on the L'Oreal Brand. Thesis, University of Stellenbosch, Business Administration.

- Subawa, N. S., Widhiasthini, N. W., & Suastika, N. P. M. W. S. (2020). The effect of experiential marketing, social media marketing, and brand trust on repurchase intention in Ovo applications. *International Research Journal Of Management, IT And Social Sciences*, 7(3), 11-21.
- Sundus Z, Naintara S. R. (2014). Effect of Rebranding and Repositioning On Brand Equity Considering Brand Loyalty as a Mediating Variable. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(1): 58-63
- Tong, X. & Hawley, J. M. (2009), Measuring customer-based brand equity: empirical evidence from the sportswear market in China, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 18(4), 262-271.
- Underwood, R. L. (2003), The Communicative Power of Product Packaging: Creating Brand Identity via Lived and Mediated Experience,” *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 9(Winter): 62-76.
- Van Osselaer, S. M. J., & Alba, J. W. (2011), Consumer learning and brand equity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(1), 1–16.
- Wang, D. H. M., Chen, P. H., Yu, T. H. K., & Hsiao, C. Y. (2015). The effects of corporate social responsibility on brand equity and firm performance. *Journal of business research*, 68(11), 2232-2236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.06.003>
- Wansink, B. and Seed, S. (2001) Making Brand Loyalty Programs Succeed, *Journal of Brand Management*, 8:3 (February), 211-222.
- Yoo, B., & Donthu.N. (2001), Developing and developing a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 52, 1-14.
- Zhu, J. (2009), *Three Essays on Brand Equity*, PhD Thesis, University of Iowa, Iowa, USA.