ISSN : 1978-774X

BRAND EQUITY AS A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING AND WEALTH IN DEVELOPMENT COUNTRY: THE STRATEGIC ROLE OF INTEGRATIVE MODEL ON CONSUMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY TO REDUCE INDONESIAN POVERTY

Maria Mia Kristanti

Business Faculty of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, Indonesia
miagnews@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The overwhelming significance of brands for the consumers' decision making is uncontested both in everyday practice and scientific research. In the field of international academic and non-academic research, a wide variety of models to conceptualize and measure "brand equity" have been developed over the past few years. To explain how brand equity is generated in the consumer's mind, some detailed investigations of individual influencing factors as well as several synoptic approaches examining the influence of different variables on brand equity are available (cf. D. Aaker 1992a, 1992b; Kapferer, 1996; Keller, 1993). We see a strong need for an integrative model which will:
1. provide as comprehensive an overview as possible of the various influencing factors and
2. put them in relation to the psychological process taking place in the mind of the consumer.

The present paper proposes such a model based on a conceptualization of brand and brand equity. Starting with sixteen input variables, the paper a paths which lead to the output variable of living and wealth customer-based brand equity, with strategic role to lift the society standard of living and wealth. These path involves several interacting variables. Extensions toward deriving social value of customer-based brand equity are discussed.
Keywords: *Integrative Model CBBE, Reduce Poverty.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the large gamut of definitions, two general perspectives can be discerned:

a. One perspective sees a brand as something visible, tangible, and maybe even audible. One typical definition is that of a brand as a "distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as a logo, trade-mark, or package design) intended to identify the goods or services of a seller or group of sellers, and to differentiate their goods or services from those of the competitors" (D. Aaker 1992a, p. 7). It thus puts the focus on the material side of the brand, regarding the consumers' notion of the brand as a secondary criterion.
b. The other perspective - in the words of David Ogilvy - defines a brand as the "consumer´s idea of a product". When seen from this viewpoint, a brand is a schema or semantic network which the consumer has acquired through a process of learning (e.g., Bekmeier-Feuerhahn 1996, p. 161ff; Keller, 1993). Names and symbols are thus only seen as triggers of what the brand actually stands for.

We feel the latter view to be more appropriate, especially when it comes to providing an explanatory model for the generation of brand equity through a psychological process. As a notion in the consumer's mind we define the concept of 'brand' as the sum of associations that are evoked by names or symbols. Its scope, however, should not be limited to associations with the product. By the same token, associations with the firm behind a TV set brand, information on the store of a specific brand of food product, or the consumer's ability to memorize the telephone number of a electronic service, are also part of the brand and may consequently also function as important sources of brand equity.

Another role of brand could also start from the rise of the consumer society which is frequently blamed for many ills but rarely praised for its principal social contribution: generating the wealth that pays for and sustains social progress. Long-term improvements in health, education, living standards and opportunities depend on wealth creation. Strong economic growth goes hand-in-hand with strong, recognisable brands. No brand: no way to create mass customer loyalty; no customer loyalty: no guarantee of reliable earnings; no reliable earnings: less investment and employment; less investment and employment: less wealth created; less wealth created: lower government receipts to spend on social goods. This is the most basic, and arguably the most valuable, social contribution that brands make. But the ways in which brands create social value are considerably more nuanced and sophisticated than this.

This research aims to offer a positive re-evaluation of the role of brands in reducing poverty in society. It would be misguided to suggest that brands' social role is consistently and universally positive. Brands have had a bad press in recent years, but the "No Logo" furore has abated somewhat as consumers have come to realise that brands are not necessarily the villains; in fact, they have been the solution. They have responded to the challenge and have become the means of addressing the corporate irresponsibility against which No Logo and its ilk railed. Brands have taken up the challenge and have become the way to guarantee higher business standards.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

As well as helping to create wealth, protect consumers and drive improvements in the standards of business practices, some brands are creating social value through the way they design their products and the way they communicate with consumers. For a business that is willing to take the risk, and recognise the opportunity, brands can be a powerful tool for positive social change.

Brands have to innovate constantly to keep their appeal. Many of the innovations may be subtle and hardly noticeable but some have distinctly positive outcomes for society, such as better quality health products, more convenient ways to purchase services, or more effective communications technology. Procter & Gamble's Pampers brand of nappies bases all its innovation and marketing on a simple proposition: a dry baby is a happy baby. As a result, millions of mothers all over the world have happier babies thanks to Pampers products. Take away the Pampers brand, and you take away any incentive for Procter & Gamble to develop new products that make babies (and mothers) happy. Innovations such as these have positive value, but a more interesting consideration is how brands pursue new ideas that can lead to positive social outcomes by directly tackling social issues.

It is important to remember that the brand, not the company or its innovation department, is the essential component. Without a brand, companies would not risk innovating, since they would not be able to associate new products and services with their own efforts and investments, and would therefore not be able to capture the benefits of innovation. However, with the benefit of a strong brand, companies can innovate and take risks because they can rely upon their consumers trying a new product, since they already trust the brand. This trust plays out in the arena of social innovation as well. This is how brands can innovate socially; but why do they? As before, the desire to protect and enhance their reputation drives companies to act. Consumers today care more about issues such as social justice and climate change, and they want to see companies playing their part in tackling these areas. The rise of these "concerned consumers" has been mirrored in brand activity, and not just in niche brands. There are, of course, plenty of ethical and new brands that are leading the way in social innovation.

Consumers certainly have the appetite for responsible products and, when price and quality are comparable, they will opt for the product that also does a little more to improve the world around them. This is common sense. Many brands understand this, and some have successfully built it into their innovation processes. However, there are still a vast number of brands which need to take a step forward and recognise that it is absolutely logical for them to be making products that serve a dual purpose; products that the consumer wants, and that society needs. It is not just the right thing to do; it is simply good business sense.

2.1. Brand Recognition Heuristics

In many real life situations, individuals compare (two) objects and then, using some criteria, choose one of them. Some of the objects might be recognized to the individuals, but others may not. How can individuals decide with a fast and frugal method? For this, Goldstein and Gigerenzer (2011) propose a method called the recognition heuristic. They suggest that individuals should infer that recognized objects have higher values, respect to the criterion of interest, than unrecognized objects.

The recognition heuristic assumes that people make inferences based on the output of recognition memory. While much work has been devoted to establishing the recognition heuristic as a viable description of how people make inferences, more work is needed to fully integrate research on the recognition heuristic with research from the broader cognitive psychology literature. In this article, we outline four challenges that should be met for this integration to take place, and close with a call to address these four challenges collectively, rather than piecemeal.

2.2. Brand's Personal Experiences

In relation to creating any successful business, Drucker (1974) states that a business has to make money and a business has to make customers. It is not either/ or, and these factor are strongly related to building a successful business. In today's business climate, Carbone (2004) contends that creating value for customers by providing the total customers experiences is becoming an increasingly employed strategy. He stated that 'making money and making loyal customers are not mutually exclusive. The essence of experiences as a value of proposition is old as business it self (2004:26). Therefore, creating the total memorable experiences is an important variable in relation to creating value for the customers and, as previously indicated is crucial to building loyalty. In order to fully understand the significance of customer experiences in building loyalty, it is necessary to first define what is meant by the customer experiences.

2.3. Brand's Symbolic Experiences

Logos are one of the base elements in a corporate identity or brand identity. They are the visual representation of what a company is. They trigger people's memories of previous experiences with the company and other implementations of the logo, leaving a greater impact than words can alone do. They are the graphic links to the message that a brand promises and communicates and the relationship a company can develop between its brand and its customers. So they become one of the strongest tools for building and reinforcing a brand image and maintaining its value. Also a logo plays a key role in building loyalty and trust in a brand because it provokes an immediate reaction.

Communicating the brand message depends heavily on an effective brand logo. The logo is arguably the most important part of the brand, as it is the part of a company's brand message that is most visible to consumers and, ideally, it comes to stand for the brand itself in their minds. Paul Dickinson (Dickinson & Svenson, 2000) describes a debate in the graphic design world about whether or not the design of such a logo really matters. His co-author and colleague, Neil Svensen, argues that it does not matter "if your logo is a nasty drawing of a dead goat's head" (Dickinson & Svenson, 2000) as long as it is used consistently. Others, like the late design genius Paul Rand who, in an interview with Stephen Heller (Heller, 1989), noted that designers should not do things "willy-nilly," believe strongly that careful logo design is of the utmost importance in effectively communicating a brand's message to consumers.

2.4. Conspicuous Consumption

The conspicuous consumption construct need not remain restricted to its original meaning, but should be expanded by incorporating more generalised and broader dimensions of "being seen or identified by others," "public consumption" (Bearden & Etzel, 1982; Grimm, Agrawal, & Richardson, 1999), "self-concept" (Sirgy, 1982), and "uniqueness" (Tepper-Tian, Bearden, & Hunter, 2001). Conspicuousness is explained in the literature as a function of a few constructs. Treated as separate perspectives, each of these behavioural components has been used widely in the literature. A brief detail of these constructs needs a mention for proper understanding of the evolution of the relevant literature.

2.5. *Congruence of Ideal Self Image*

As a matter of fact, brands have an impact on the consumer's behaviour, for the consumer compares his image to that of the brand, whether implicitly or explicitly. He often sets some imaginary relationships with it. He can situate himself in relation to a given brand through congruence, or lack of it, between his own personality and that which he attributes to a given brand (Plummer, 1985; Biel, 1993).

2.6. *Brand Familiarity*

We draw on this theorizing to propose that brand familiarity is an important variable that can influence consumer processing and the stages of habituation and tedium. Brand familiarity reflects the extent of a consumer's direct and indirect experience with a brand (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987; Kent, 1993). Brand familiarity captures consumers' brand knowledge structures, that is, the brand associations that exist within a consumer's memory. Although many advertised products are familiar to consumers, many others are unfamiliar, either because they are new to the marketplace or because consumers have not yet been exposed to the brand (Stewart, 1992).

Familiar and unfamiliar brands differ in terms of the knowledge regarding the brand that a consumer has stored in memory. Consumers tend to have a variety of different types of associations for familiar brands. Consumers may have tried or may use a familiar brand, they may have family or friends who have used the brand and told them something about it, they may have seen prior ads or marketing communications for the brand, or they may know how the brand is positioned, packaged, and so on, from the press. Consumers lack many associations for unfamiliar brands because they have not had any of these types of experiences with them.

2.7. *Congruence of Ideal Social Self Image*

The notion of self-image started to emerge in the marketing field in the mid 1960's and flourished in the mid 1970's. The studies focusing on the consumer's behaviour were interested in clarifying the links that an individual seeks to create between the image he has of a product and his image of himself (Blair & Rabuck, 2008). These studies refer to the theory of self-image set up by motivationist psychologists, such as Rodgers and Maslow, and to Freud's work on the ego.

According to Vernette (2008), the definition of self-image is rather tricky because it entails taking position within a large number of paradigms.

2.8. *Brand Affective Value*

Brand affection is considered as consumers' desirable or undesirable evaluation of a brand, In fact the brand affection means brand potential for receiving customer's positive reaction as a result of its use. In this scope, there are a lot of mental values like emotions mixed with brand image which are related with brand personality. There are many ways to measure brand potential and affection such as the way (4D) which contains namely distinctiveness, differentiation, defendable, digit-able. It needs to be pointed out that a brand must be distinct from all audio/visual devices which the target consumers are faced with. In this way, by its unique and differentiated communication, the brand can have wide and powerful competitive advantage, and its strategies and assets express clearly individuals' real intentions. Brand also should have a unique power by presenting brand equity.

2.9. *Brand Social Value*

The rise of the consumer society is frequently blamed for many ills but rarely praised for its principal social contribution: generating the wealth that pays for and sustains social progress. Long-term improvements in health, education, living standards and opportunities depend on wealth creation. Strong economic growth goes hand-in-hand with strong, recognisable brands. No brand: no way to create mass customer loyalty; no customer loyalty: no guarantee of reliable earnings; no reliable earnings: less investment and employment; less investment and employment: less wealth created; less wealth created: lower government receipts to spend on social goods. This is the most basic, and arguably the most valuable, social contribution that brands make. But the ways in which brands create social value are considerably more nuanced and sophisticated than this.

2.10. Brand Information Value

Brand information processing is defined as the extent to which consumers allocate attention and processing resources to comprehend and elaborate on brand information in an ad. "Brand information" is defined as any executional cue designed to communicate the advertised message. Brand information could be (1) information about the brand name, brand attributes, benefits, usage, users, and/or usage situation, (2) cognitive (e.g., attribute-based) or affective (e.g., emotional), and (3) delivered in either verbal (spoken or written words, songs with words) or nonverbal (e.g., pictures, music without words) modalities. Several levels of brand information processing may be invoked in a given exposure context (Greenwald & Leavitt. 1984; MacInnis & Jaworski, 1989). For example, though little attention is devoted to the ad at very low levels of brand processing, at higher levels attention is directed fully toward the ad and processing capacity is sufficient for consumers to generate cognitive responses (Woodside, 1983) to the message.

The level of processing from ads influences outcomes typically associated with effective advertising. For example, as consumers achieve higher levels of processing, they attend to, elaborate on, and link together brand information in the ad (e.g., the brand name with product claims). Such attention and processing enhances memory for key brand information such as the brand name and product claims (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987; Beattie & Mitchell, 1985). Research also suggests that high processing levels produce more enduring, stable, and accessible brand attitudes (Berger & Mitchell, 1989). Such attitudes may further influence purchase intentions (Sheppard, Hartwick, & Warshaw, 1988) and the likelihood of counter arguing against competitors' claims.

2.11. Perceptual Changes

Perceptual changes involves relatively long-lasting changes to consumer .s perceptual system that improve its ability to respond to its environment. Four mechanisms of perceptual changes are discussed: attention weighting, imprinting, differentiation, and unitization.

Human’s change is often divided into perceptual, cognitive, and procedural varieties. These divisions are regrettable, causing fruitful links to be neglected. There are deep similarities between perceptual unitization and chunking in memory, and between perceptual differentiation and association-building (Gibson & Gibson, 2001). In many cases, perceptual changes involves acquiring new procedures for actively probing ones environment (Anderson, 2009), such as learning procedures for efficiently scanning the edges of an object (Haider, 2012).

2.12. Ratio of Search, Experiences, & Credence

When consumers are seeking value, they consider the benefits provided by the product or service versus the price. (Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984) But the price of an item purchased is not the only cost to the consumer making the purchase. Ratio of information search should be considered. Consumers will weigh them along with the price to determine whether an external search can be justified (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987.

2.13. Cost-Benefit Ratio of Information, Search, & Process

If the cost-benefit ratio of an information activity is very unfavourable, decisions will be rather superficial (ELM, e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). In such a case, general rules of thumb of the sort "With a well-known

ISSN : 1978-774X

brand, nothing much can go wrong" may also play a role in reducing uncertainty (Hoeffler & Keller, 2003).

2.14. Risk Aversion

Expected value as a criterion for making decisions makes sense provided that the stakes at risk in the decision are small enough to \play the long run averages." The range of decisions for which this is true covers many situations of practical business interest, but sometimes the stakes are high enough that this is not an appropriate assumption.

An equivalent term for certainty equivalent is selling price. If your certainty equivalent for alternatives specified in terms of profits is less than the expected profit for an alternative, you are said to be risk averse with respect to this alternative. If your certainty equivalent is equal to the expected profit for the alternative, then you are said to be risk neutral. Finally, if your certainty equivalent is greater than the expected profit for the alternative, you are said to be risk seeking. These definitions are reversed for an uncertain alternative specified in terms of losses. That is, you are risk averse if your certainty equivalent is greater than the expected loss and risk seeking if your certainty equivalent is less than the expected loss.

2.15. Price Utility Function

In microeconomics, *agents* (i.e., service providers and their customers) are assumed to have *preferences*, which represent (partial) orderings on outcomes, and those preferences are assumed to guide behaviours: rational agents will always attempt to achieve the outcomes they most prefer. In many cases, a party's preferences can be mapped to values of *utility*, where higher utility means greater preference. Utility is measured in subjective units, and so it does not make sense to compare or add two parties' utility values, or even to try to normalize them into a common range. A *price utility function* is simply a mapping from a space of outcomes onto utility values.

2.16. Consumer-Based Brand Equity for Living &Wealth

Brands would exist even if no money were spent on advertising and promotion for products. Customers would find some distinguishing characteristics (name, colour, shape) to identify products or services that had served them well and use them to simplify (make more efficient) future choices. Moreover, as more satisfied, customers are slow to update performance improvements (or decreases) in their current or other alternative choices. The result, at least in the short run, is market inefficiency in the physical attribute product space. In essence, market inefficiency (Hoeffler & Keller, 2003) can be seen as the same as brand equity.

2.17. Hypotheses

All theoretical confirmation between the research variables, conclude these hypotheses as follow:

1. There is positive correlation between *Brand Recognition Heuristic* and *Brand Information Value.*
2. There is positive correlation between *Brand Recognition Heuristic* and *Perceptual Changes.*
3. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Brand Information Value.*
4. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Congruence of ideal own state.*
5. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Brand Familiarity*.
6. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Congruence of ideal social self.*
7. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Perceptual Changes.*
8. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Brand Information Value.*
9. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Congruence of ideal own state.*
10. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Brand Familiarity*.

11. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Congruence of ideal social self.*
12. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Brand Affective Value.*
13. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Perceptual Changes.*
14. There is positive correlation between *Conspicuous Consumption* and *Brand Social Value.*
15. There is positive correlation between *Conspicuous Consumption* and *Perceptual Changes.*
16. There is positive correlation between *Congruence of ideal own state* and *Brand Affective Value.*
17. There is positive correlation between *Brand Familiarity* and *Brand Affective Value.*
18. There is positive correlation between *Congruence of ideal social self* and *Brand Social Value.*
19. There is positive correlation between *Brand Affective Value* and *Brand Information Value.*
20. There is positive correlation between *Brand Affective Value* and *Living & Wealth CBBE.*
21. There is positive correlation between *Brand Affective Value* and *Perceptual Changes.*
22. There is positive correlation between *Brand Social Value* and *Living & Wealth CBBE.*
23. There is positive correlation between *Brand Recognition Heuristic* and *Perceptual Changes* through *Ratio of search, experience, & credence.*
24. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Perceptual Changes* through *Ratio of search, experience, & credence.*
25. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Perceptual Changes* through *Ratio of search, experience, & credence.*
26. There is positive correlation between *Brand Recognition Heuristic* and *Brand Information Value* through *Cost-benefit ratio of information search & process.*
27. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Brand Information Value* through *Cost-benefit ratio of information search & process.*
28. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Brand Information Value* through *Cost-benefit ratio of information search & process.*
29. There is positive correlation between *Ratio of search, experience, & credence Cost-benefit ratio of information search & process.*
30. There is positive correlation between *Brand Recognition Heuristic* and *Brand Information Value* through *Ratio of search, experience, & credence* and *Cost-benefit ratio of information search & process.*
31. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Personal Experiences* and *Brand Information Value* through *Ratio of search, experience, & credence* and *Cost-benefit ratio of information search & process.*
32. There is positive correlation between *Brand's Symbolic Experiences* and *Brand Information Value* through *Ratio of search, experience, & credence* and *Cost-benefit ratio of information search & process.*
33. There is positive correlation between *Brand Information Value* and *Living & Wealth CBBE* through *Risk Aversion.*
34. There is positive correlation between *Price Utility Function* and *Living & Wealth CBBE.*

3. RESEARCH METHOD

Hoeffler & Keller (2003) states, "if you ask ten people to define brand equity, you are likely to get ten (maybe 11) different answers as to what it means". Although many studies have been published on brand equity since the 90s, the statement is even more relevant today than it was in 1991. Brand equity is a complex concept and the diversity of its conceptualizations and measurements in the literature are evidence of that. Due to the fact that all research on brand equity to date has used the same conceptualizations of brand equity, based on previously determined dimensions (i.e., based on either the Aaker 1991 or Keller

1993 theoretical models), a new conceptualization of the construct based on consumer perceived dimensions is warranted.

The aim of this research is the development and validation of a several correlation that could confirm whether consumer-based brand equity integrative model can play huge strategic role to lift Indonesian standard of living and wealth. As this research designed to examine the effects of integrative consumer-based brand equity, a survey questionnaire was followed developed by Hoeffler & Keller, (2003). The sample used for data collection included the Indonesian Centre Bureau of Statistics in East-Java, and it represented region with fast growing of income. A total of 10 selected regions were selected from 5 area of East-Java province. The region from each sector was selected according to their proportion in total contribution of net taxes to the local government. Hence the sample drawn is the true representative of lifting in life style standard and wealth of each of middle income family in East Java: Sidoarjo, Malang, Ngawi, Madiun, Kediri, Lamongan, Tuban, Mojokerto, Pandaan, and Batu. The questions represented five types of brand as society agent of change. All the questions are shown to be reliable and valid in the pre liminary research.The questionnaires were filled by the parents of main family, who has the major responsibility to make a living for their family. 350 questionnaires out of 300 came back filled.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The research findings reflected the following factor solutions and reliabilities: brand recognition heuristic (7 items, alpha 0.897), brand personal experiences (7 items, alpha 0.778), brand symbolic experiences (7 items, alpha 0.952), conspicuous consumption (7 items, alpha 0.928), congruence of ideal own states (7 items, alpha 0.851), brand familiarity (7 items, alpha 0.896), congruence of ideal social self (7 items, alpha 0.971), brand affective value (7 items, alpha 0.897), brand social value (7 items, alpha 0.767), brand information value (7 items, alpha 0.698), perceptual changes (7 items, alpha 0.960), consumer-based brand equity living and wealth (7 items, alpha 0.860).

4.1. *Correlation*

As already discussed in the theoretical part that the basic aim of this study is to examine the relationship among five innovation types and market firm performance; therefore, presents correlation matrix along with mean and standard deviation of study variables. The significant correlation results show (**correlation is significant at the 0.01) that each type of innovation is significantly correlated with each dimension of market outstanding performance confirming initially all the hypotheses of this study.

Table 1.Reliability Test of Manifest Variable

Variable	*Cronbach's Alpha*	Category
BRH	.897	Reliable
BPE	.778	Reliable
BSE	.952	Reliable
CC	.928	Reliable
CIO	.851	Reliable
BF	.896	Reliable
CIS	.971	Reliable
BAV	.897	Reliable
BSV	.767	Reliable
BIV	.698	Reliable
PC	.960	Reliable
CBBE	.860	Reliable
ROS	.765	Reliable
CBR	.779	Reliable
RA	.760	Reliable
PUC	.758	Reliable

Cronbach Alfa Value are exceeding than 0.70, this mean that all of the indicator research were classified as reliable.

Table 2.Coefficient of Determination Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error
1	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.000

The table shows the high correlation between the research variable, as indicated by the value of R Square 1.00. In other words, BRH can give a good explanation of influence for CBBE.

4.2. *Regression Analysis*

Linear regression analysis has been carried out to analyse the effects of sixteen variables of brand as agent of society life's changes on Indonesian society wealth. There are some major findings of regression analysis for each hypothesis of the study:

Table 3. Hypothesis Test of F ANNOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
1 Regression Residual Total	75.78 0.000 87.89	50 65 98	1.090 0.000	1997.05	0.000

F-Value shows that the research models were fit with all the data. As F-Value of 1997.05 is greater than probability base value of 0.000 ≤ 0.001, which means the research data were also qualified.

The following table 4 shows the hypotheses results as:

Table 4.Hypotheses Tests

Test	Variable	*Estimate*	*Critical Ratio*	t-table	Category
H_1	BRH-BIV	97.05	7.63	1.96	Excepted
H_2	BRH-PC	67.30	8.25	1.96	Excepted
H_3	BPE-BIV	89.78	0.27	1.96	Excepted
H_4	BPE-CIO	87.99	3.12	1.96	Excepted
H_5	BPE-BF	95.19	8.10	1.96	Excepted
H_6	BPE-CIS	90.98	29.98	1.96	Excepted
H_7	BPE-PC	76.80	10.19	1.96	Excepted
H_8	BSE-BIV	82.96	5.17	1.96	Excepted
H_9	BSE-CIO	93.01	8.63	1.96	Excepted
H_{10}	BSE-BF	87.80	8.98	1.96	Excepted
H_{11}	BSE-CIS	70.98	9.27	1.96	Excepted
H_{12}	BSE-BAV	56.96	6.58	1.96	Excepted
H_{13}	CC-BSV	94.54	7.50	1.96	Excepted
H_{14}	CC-PC	86.68	5.56	1.96	Excepted
H_{16}	CC-BAV	47.80	6,.9	1.96	Excepted
H_{17}	BF-BAV	86.60	5.9	1.96	Excepted
H_{18}	CIS-BSV	.43.00	6.65	1.96	Excepted
H_{19}	BAV-BIV	98.70	9.20	1.96	Excepted
H_{20}	BAV-CBE	78.12	8.6	1.96	Excepted
H_{21}	BAV-PC	76.99	9,12	1.96	Excepted
H_{22}	BSV-CBE	97.19	8.10	1.96	Excepted
H_{23}	BRH-ROS-PC	90.56	7.73	1.96	Excepted
H_{24}	BPE-ROS-PC	86.54	7.54	1.96	Excepted
H_{25}	BSE-ROS-PC	76.53	5.17	1.96	Excepted
H_{26}	BRH-CBR-BIV	64.05	7.63	1.96	Excepted
H_{27}	BPE-CCBR-BIV	79.65	8.25	1.96	Excepted
H_{28}	BSE-CBR-BIV	23.98	9.27	1.96	Excepted
H_{29}	ROS-CBR	54.08	7.12	1.96	Excepted
H_{30}	BRH-ROS-CBR-BIV	76.97	4.76	1.96	Excepted
H_{31}	BPE-ROS-CBR-BIV	90.98	5.97	1.96	Excepted
H_{32}	BSE-ROS-CBR-BIV	86.75	12.6	1.96	Excepted
H_{33}	BIV-CBE	97.64	6.17	1.96	Excepted
H_{34}	PUF-CBE	90.25	8.76	1.96	Excepted

The test of all of the hypotheses in this research can be a good evidence that prove all of the 34 hypotheses were true. This also proved that the research literature background was classified as *eligible*.

4.3. *Structural Model Analysis*

F-Value shows that the research models were fit with all the data. As F-Value of 28.192 is greater than probability base value of 0.000 ≤ 0.001, means the research data were also qualified.

Table 5.Hypotheses Tests, F-Test

Coefficient							
Model	Un.Coeffi.		Stand. Coeff.	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
Const.	0.86	2.1		.697	.891	Tol.	VIF
BRH	.005	.077	.005	.060	.970	0.00	1.00
CBE	1.000		.788	28.192	.000	0,000	
Dependent Variabel: BAV							

The table 5 shows that there is no multicollinearity correlation between all of the research variables, as the value of VIF= 1.00.

Table 6.Model Fit-Test

Goodness of Fit Index	*Cutt-off Value*	Model Result	Category
GFI	≥0.9	0.96	*Good Fit*
RMSEA	≥0.9	0.93	*Good Fit*
NFI	≥0.9	0.91	*Good Fit*
IFI	0.8≤IFI≤0.9	0.87	*Marginal Fit*
CFI	.0,9	0.97	*Good Fit*
RFI	≥0.9	0.98	*Good Fit*

The table 6 shows that the research models were classified as *Good Fit*, which means the research model were based on good, valid and updates relevant theoretical background.

5. CONCLUSION

The model presented in this paper attempts to give an integrative view of how customer-based brand equity may be generated. From the following input variables four paths may lead to the output variable of living and wealth customer-based brand equity which is:

ISSN : 1978-774X

1. Enabling the brand to reduce uncertainty and to save information costs
2. Directly or indirectly charges the brand with emotional substance
3. Leads to an improvement of evaluation by significant others
4. Reflects a skill full communication of the advantages of the brand.

One important prerequisite for the economic success of a brand is to address a target group which is ready to pay a higher price for these values, as well as lifting society standard of living and wealth.

6. REFERENCES

(a) Aaker, David. 1992a, *Management des Markenwerts*. Frankfurt/Main: Campus-Verlag.

(b) ----, 1992b, "The Value of Brand Equity," *Journal of Business Strategy*, 13 (July/August),

(c) Alba, Joseph W. & J. Wesley Hutchinson. 1987. "Dimensions of Consumer Expertise," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 13 (March).

(d) Anderson JR. 2009. Skill acquisition: compilation of weak-method problem solutions. *Psychol. Rev.*

(e) Bearden, William O. & Michael J. Etzel. 1982. "Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decisions." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (September).

(f) Berger, Ida and Andrew A. Mitchell. 1989, "The Effect of Advertising on Attitude Accessibility, Attitude Confidence, and the Attitude-Behavior Relationship," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 16 (December).

(g) Beattie, Ann and Andrew A. Mitchell. 1985, "The Relationship Between Advertising Recall and Persuasion: An Experimental Investigation," in *Psychological Processes and Advertising Effects,* Linda F. Alwitt and Andrew A. Mitchell, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

(h) Bekmeier-Feuerhahn, Sigrid. 1996. "*Marktorientierte Markenbewertung: Eine marktpreisorientierte Bewertung von Marken aus konsumenten-und unternehmen sorientierter Perspektive*," Habilitations schrift, Universität-Gesamthochschule Paderborn.

(i) Biel A. 1993, Converting image into equity, Brand equity and advertising, éds Aaker et Biel, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

(j) Blair, Margaret Henderson and Michael J. Rabuck. 2008. “Advertising Wearin and Wearout: Ten Years Later—More Empirical Evidence and Successful Practice,” *Journal of Advertising Research* (September–October).

(k) Dickinson, P. and Svenson, N., 2000. *Beautiful Corporations: Corporate Style in Action* (Financial Times/Prentice Hall, New York.

(l) Drucker,P.F., 1974. *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, Harper & Row, New York, NY.

(m) Gibson JJ, Gibson EJ. 2001. Perceptual learning: differentiation or enrichment? *Psychol.Rev.* 62

(n) Goldstein, D. G. & Gigerenzer, G. 2011. The beauty of simple models: Themes in recognition heuristic research. Judgment and Decision Making, Vol. 6, No. 5, July 2011.

(o) Greenwald, Anthony G. and Clark Leavitt. 1984, "Audience Involvement in Advertising: Four Levels," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 11 (June).

(p) Grimm, Pamela E., Jagdish Agrawal, & Paul S. Richardson. 1999. “Product Conspicuousness and Buying Motives as Determinants of Reference Group Influences.” *Advances in Consumer Research.* 4

(q) Haider H, Frensch PA. 2012. The role of information reduction in skill acquisition. *Cogn. Psychol.* 30

(r) Hoeffler, S., K. L. Keller. 2003. The marketing advantages of strong brands. *J. Brand Management* 10(6).

(s) Kapferer, Jean-Noël 1996, *Les Marques: Capital de L´Entreprise, troisième tirage*. Les Éditions d´Organisation: Paris.

(t) Keller, Kevin L. 1993. *Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*, 3d. ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

(u) Kent, Robert J. 1993. "Competitive Versus Noncompetitive Clutter in Television Advertising, "*Journal of*

ISSN : 1978-774X

Advertising Research “, 33 (March/April).

(v) Kwortnik, R.J., & Ross, W.T. 2007. The Role of Positive Emotions in Experimental Decisions. *International Journal of Research in Marketing.* 24 (December).

(w) MacInnis, Deborah J. and Bernard J. Jaworski (1989), "Information Processing Processing From Advertisements: Toward an Integrative Framework," *Journal of Marketing,* 53 (October).

(x) Petty, Richard E. & John T. Cacioppo. 1986. "Central and Peripheral Routes to Advertising Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Involvement," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 10 (September).

(y) Plummer J.T. 1985. How personality makes a difference. Journal of Advertising Research, Vol.24, No.6.

(z) Sheppard, Blair H., Jon Hartwick, & Paul R. Warshaw. 1988, "The Theory of Reasoned Action: A Meta-Analysis of Past Research With Recommendations for Modifications and Future Research," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 15 (December).

(aa) Sirgy, Joseph M. 1982. “Self-Concept in Consumer Behaviour: A Critical Review.” *Journal of Consumer Research,* 9 (December).

(bb) Stewart, David W. 1992. "Speculations on the Future of Advertising Research," *Journal of Advertising,* 21 (September).

(cc) Tepper-Tian, Kelly, William O. Bearden, & Gary L. Hunter. 2001. “Consumers’ Need for

(dd) Uniqueness: Scale Development and Validation.” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (June).

(ee) Vernette E. 2008. Les atouts et les pièges de la personnalité de la marquee. *Décisions Marketing*, Vol 49, Jan-Mar.

(ff) Woodside, Arch G. 1983, "Message-Evoked Thoughts: Consumer Thought Processing as a Tool for Making Better Copy," in *Advertising and Consumer Psychology,* Larry Percy and Arch Woodside, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Maria Mia Kristanti is a lecturer in Department of Marketing Management, Faculty of Business, Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya. She received her Master of Strategic Management from Widya Mandala Catholic University in 2003. Her research interests are in the area of Marketing, Strategic, and Leadership Management. She is a member of the Marketing Laboratory, as a Head Laboratory. Her email address is miagnews@gmail.com.