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Abstract
The study was aimed to measure customer based brand equity of selected Television channels in Addis Ababa with respect to media service buyers’ perception by utilizing Aaker’s customer based brand equity model. A four dimension of brand equity model posited by David Aaker was used in order to conduct the investigation via quantitative research design, where descriptive and explanatory research approach was applied. A sample of 404 media service buyer respondents from Addis Ababa were selected by a convenience sampling method and data was collected through a structured questionnaire intending to identify their perception towards the television channel brand (EBC1, EBS and Kana). Out of 404 structured questionnaires distributed to respondents 363 were collected, which maintained 89.85% response rate. The results of correlation analysis showed that all the four determinants of Customer-Based Brand Equity had a positive significant relationship with the overall brand equity as well as within themselves. The results of multiple regression analysis also revealed that the three dimensions (brand loyalty, brand association and perceived quality) have a positive influence on the overall brand equity though their contribution magnitude is not the same however brand awareness contribute or predict the overall brand equity negatively but not significant. Among those dimensions, brand loyalty had the strongest positive significant influence on the studied television channels’ customer based brand equity followed by perceived quality. Thus, media managers should exert their efforts to increase brand loyalty first along with Perceived Quality of their customers so that the Overall brand equity would accordingly increase.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an insight to readers about the introduction parts of the study starting with the topics related to the background of the study, statements of the problem that initiated the researcher to conduct this study, research questions to be answered, objectives of the study, significance of the study and scope of the study. Eventually, the definitions of terms and organization of the study is presented at the end of this chapter.

1.1 Background of the Study

In the changing world economy, branding has occupied an important position by being a part of existence and embracing the activities of large corporations, small size enterprises, and not-for-profit organizations. According to Keller (2003), branding still plays a major role in the survival and the success of different types of companies and organizations. Initially, brands were used as the means for differentiating the products by craftsmen and claiming the ownership of animals by cattle owners (McDonald, 2003).

For decades the value of a company was measured in terms of its buildings, land and its tangible assets such as plant and equipment. It is understood only recently that the firm’s real value lies in the minds of potential customers. Nowadays, companies use brands not only with an aim to differentiate the company’s market offerings from the ones competitors, but also to reach the minds and hearts of their customers and create special emotional connections with them. It is the basis of competitive advantage and source of future earnings streams (Lassar, Mittal & Sharma, 1995; Aaker, 1991).

The Brand is more than a product because, it can have dimensions that differentiate it in some way from other products designed to satisfy the same need. These differences may be rational and tangible related to product performance of the brand or more symbols, emotions, and intangible (Keller, 2003; Kapferer, 2008).

Different researchers define brand equity in many ways. As per Farquhar, Han and Ijiri (1991), brand equity is the added value endowed with the brand name. According to Aaker (1991,p.15), “Brand equity is a set of assets and /or liabilities linked to a brand name and symbol that add to
or subtract from the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or that firm’s customers.”

Besides building long term customer loyalty, organizations with high brand equity can create a differential advantage. According to Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000), customer-based brand equity is considered as the driving force of increased market share and profitability of the brand, and is based on the marketers’ perceptions. Customer-based brand equity is mainly manifested by the customers’ response to marketing activities done by many brands and the differential effect of one brand from the others (Keller, 2003).

The determinants of customer-based brand equity is conceptualized as five elements, namely Brand Awareness, Perceived Quality, Brand Association, Brand Loyalty and other proprietary brand assets (Aaker, 1996). Costumer based brand equity model takes into account the perceptions of costumer. Acquiring the information regarding the perception of costumers towards a certain brand can be a sign of the performance of the brand.

One way of measuring to what extent customers identify with a specific brand is through brand equity. A brand is said to have high brand equity when it generates positive connotations in the consumers’ minds and therefore is likely to be the preferred purchase over other brands or non-branded products (Pappu, Quester & Cooksey, 2005; Yoo et al., 2000). Measuring brand equity is important due to its strategic value in guiding marketing strategy, providing a basis for assessing brand extendibility, evaluating the effectiveness of marketing decisions and tracking the brand’s health compared to its competitors over time (Ailawadi, Lehmann & Neslin, 2003).

Media have an intense impact on markets and societies through their ability to inform, educate and entertain. Through their contents and the advertisements they carry, they have also a persistent influence on global patterns of consumption. High brand equity of a media outlet leads to repeat media choice behavior, thereby increasing the stability and predictability of the audience reach of the vehicle (Wolff, 2006).

Wolff (2006,P.9) , argued that, “If the indirect measurement of the brand equity reveals strong, favorable, and unique associations with regard to a socio-psychological appeal such as a certain social status, this brand image can be used to transfer brand associations to the advertised products with a similar claim”.
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As a result, producers and distributors are becoming more committed to communicate persistent information about their products and services. Moreover, with the advent of so many advertising agencies and the arrival of billions of products, services and ideas, satisfying the needs of the clients has become the ultimate objective of advertisers (Robert, 2008).

From a media stance, the brand equity built between a medium and its audiences as well as the media service buyers have an effect on its perceived usefulness as an advertising medium (Ots, 2008).

Ots (2008, p. 13), also stated that, “Division of revenues between both the consumer market and the business-to-business market, i.e. selling audience’s attention and time to advertisers is the distinct characteristics of branding in the media industry”.

In today’s highly competitive and fragmented media markets, attracting media service buyers’ resources has become more important than ever to generate revenue. According to Robert (2008, p.1), “The need for strong brand equity has grown along with the number of media types and units of competing for the attention and loyalty of consumers and advertisers”.

The media buyers not only consider media research data in media planning, but also their buying habits are influenced by perception of the brands they wish to choose as the media outlet. So that, it is significant to understand the value perception of media service buyers in measuring costumer -based brand equity of the television channel.

According to the Ethiopian Broadcasting Authority (EBA) report in (2016), recently there are about 79 broadcasting media in Ethiopia; among 14 of them are private commercial, 21 of them are public owned and 44 of them are community broadcasters that have target audiences. These days, there are 9 public or government owned national and regional TV channels and 5 private commercial satellite TV channels (such as ‘EBS TV’ ‘kana TV’, ‘Nahoo TV’, ‘J TV’, and ‘ENN TV’) that have been entered into the Ethiopian television broadcasting media market and have target audiences.

In addition to these, the Ethiopian government currently also gave licensee for three additional domestic private TV broadcaster (such as Fana TV, Walta TV and Arki TV) which will be competing for existing large and medium businesses that actually buying media services (which include advertisements, promotions, sponsorships, announcements, etc) to advertise their
products, services or ideas in order to reach their target audiences (customers) (EBA, 2016). From this we can observe that the Ethiopian media market is facing a stiff competition.

However, though there are so many studies conducted on the customer-based brand equity of different kinds of products and services, as to the knowledge of the researcher there is no any published research that has been conducted regarding to CBBE of TV Channels in the Ethiopian context in the view point of media service buyer’s perception.

During the past two decades the brand equity concept was the area of interest among academicians and practitioners. Many research works were published regarding its conceptualization, measurement, its sources, benefits etc.(Aaker,1991; Keller,1993;Park & Srinivasan,1994; Lassar et al.,1995 ;Yoo et al.,2000; Yoo & Donthu,2001 ).

Despite such global interest in the brand equity concept from various perspectives, the topics seem under researched in the Ethiopian context, except for some endeavors in recent years among researchers in the business field. During the past two years, some studies have been undertaken on the issue of brand equity, focusing on its measurement from the customer’s perspective.

The studies were conducted by postgraduate students of Addis Ababa University, school of commerce. (E.g. Million, 2013; Bezawit, 2014; Beidemariam, 2014; Wasihun, 2014; Wengelawit, 2014; Ephrem, 2015, etc), targeting the Airline, brewery, carbonated soft drink, and bottled water industries. All the studies were employed Aaker’s (1991); four dimensional brand equity determinants namely brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty.

The current study focused on measuring customer-based brand equity of selected TV channels in view of media service buyer’s perception, i.e. in the Ethiopian media organizations; especially on selected TV channels in Addis Ababa. Like the previously conducted researches in the Ethiopian context, this research gave attention only to dimensions of brand equity, namely brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty but in different industry context. The last dimension of Aaker’s brand equity was not considered in this study, because, it
doesn’t show a fluctuation of customer perception and behavior to the brand that can be readily understood by customers rather it is on a firm’s side (Barwise, 1993; Yoo & Donthu, 2001). The researcher, therefore, attempted to measure customer-based brand equity of three selected TV channels which have audiences and media service buyers.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Increased competition, significant operational complexity and volatility of demand are among the key features of the current business environment. With the advent of so many advertising agencies and media channels as well as the arrival of billions of products, services and ideas, satisfying the needs of the customer is very essential to get and maintain a competitive advantage (Robert, 2008).

Building strong brand is essential in media organizations because technology has increased the number of content providers and made it possible for many more competitors to seek the attention and loyalty of audiences and advertisers (Ots, 2008). Media vehicles with high brand equity offer potential benefits to advertisers, which may lead to a competitive advantage in the media industry offering the media services (Wolff, 2006). Also, he highlight that, Brand equity building is frequently promoted and discussed on business-to-customer markets. Even though, the fact that media companies operate in a dual market, i.e. consumer markets (audiences) and B2B markets (media service buyers), very few studies addressed how brand equity is built in a B2B setting. In order that, it is significantly crucial to measure customer-based brand equity of selected TV channels in Addis Ababa with a specific attention on media service buyers’ perception.

Unlike the previous time, leave alone print media and radio stations, currently many television channels are entering the Ethiopian media market that competing for the attention of media service buyers in the country in addition to their own audiences. Marketing researchers have been repeatedly confirmed that when facing a competitive market situation, brand equity increases the effectiveness and efficiency of marketing activities (Hoeffler and Keller 2003).

Despite the above mentioned growth and opportunities of the media industry in Ethiopia, except for some recent years attempts to research brand equity regarding its measurement from customers’ perspectives (e.g. Million, 2013; Bezawit, 2014; Beidemariam, 2014; Wasihun, 2014; Wengelawit, 2014; Ephrem, 2015, etc) ,to the knowledge of the researcher, the topics related to
measuring customer based brand equity of TV channels in Addis Ababa with respect to media service buyers’ perception appear to be not researched. That means measuring customer based brand equity of TV channels has not been given any attention by the academic researchers and media business practitioners. Besides this, the current composition of TV channel brands in the industry has not been clear as which dimension of the brand equity strongly influences CBBE of TV channels in Addis Ababa in line to the media service buyers’ perception.

Generally, the low attention given by academic researchers and media business practitioners to the brand equity perception of media service buyers compared to that of their audience and lack of adequate theoretical evidence that can be used as an insight to understand factors contributing to make up customer based brand equity of TV channels in Addis Ababa with regard to media service buyers’ perspective is the major problem that motivated the researcher to conduct this study. Pertinent to this, the researcher attempts to measure the CBBE of television channels in Addis Ababa with a specific focus on the brand equity perception of media service buyers.

### 1.3 Research Questions
This study tried to address the following research questions:

1.3.1 **Main question**
- What are the key determinants of CBBE of the TV channels in Addis Ababa with regard to media service buyers?

1.3.2 **Sub questions**
- Is there a relationship between brand awareness and CBBE of the selected TV channel brands in Addis Ababa?
- Is there a relationship between brand association and CBBE of the selected TV channels in Addis Ababa?
- How does a brand loyalty associate to CBBE of the selected TV channels in Addis Ababa?
- Is there a relationship between perceived quality and CBBE of the selected TV channels in Addis Ababa?
1.4 Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 General Objective of the Study
The general objective of this study was to measure customer-based brand equity of the selected TV channel brand in Addis Ababa with regard to media service buyers’ perception.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives of the Study
The specific objectives of this study were:

- To examine the relationship between Brand awareness and CBBE of the selected TV channels brand in Addis Ababa.
- To assess the relationship between Brand association and CBBE of the selected TV channels brand in Addis Ababa.
- To examine the association of Brand loyalty and CBBE of the selected TV channels brand in Addis Ababa.
- To assess the way Perceived quality relates to CBBE of the selected TV channels brand in Addis Ababa.

1.5 Significance of the Study
Measuring customer-based brand equity of one’s products or services helps marketers to give attention on those dimensions that are most important in building strong brand equity. Therefore, the study of customer-based brand equity has great importance in order to build and maintain a strong brand and the concept is relevant to the media vehicles which is a highly competitive industry. Relevant to this, the study will provide helpful solutions for the TV channel’s brand managers or owners in rendering an insight about CBBE with regard to media service buyers’ perception. This significance is emanated from how vital and helpful for managers to understand the relationship between the factors determining CBBE of the selected TV channels and in turn building brand equity that will be worth contributing to the success of their business.

In addition to this, the study will also be helpful to the media owners under study in formulating their internal policies as they will be able to know from the study result the areas in which the perception of the media service buyers is not favorable to their brand. Then, they will be able to come up with response strategies to modify their brand and branding methods to remain in the competitive media market. Besides this, the result of the study will also be helpful to identify the
relationship that exists between brand equity dimensions and CBBE of the selected TV stations with regard to media service buyer’s perception.

Furthermore, academically this research will be supposed to enrich the knowledge of the reader on CBBE and its dimensions with a specific attention on measuring customer-based brand equity of TV channels in view of media service buyer’s perception; which will in turn give away for other researchers to conduct further researches on the problem. Thus, future researchers might use the finding of this thesis as a bench mark for their study on the area of CBBE.

Eventually, conducting this research also requires referring different relevant materials on the subject matter under study and needs ups and downs to come up with full and condensed final paper. As a result, this study benefits the researcher itself in equipping Skill, knowledge and experience of conducting such kind of research by going through all ups and downs for the study.

1.6 Scope/Delimitation of the Study
The scope of this study was limited conceptually, geographically and methodologically as follows. Conceptually, the scope of this study had been restricted only to measuring customer-based brand equity of the selected TV channels in Addis Ababa in view of media service buyer’s perception by utilizing Aaker’s brand equity model. Only the first four Aaker’s brand equity dimensions (brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty) were considered as independent variables in this study. The last Aaker’s brand equity asset ‘other proprietary assets’ were omitted. Because other proprietary assets do not measure brand equity from the customer’s perspective; instead it measures brand equity from company side (Barwise, 1993; Yoo and Donthu, 2001).

Although there are so many types of media vehicles (print media, radios and TV broadcasters) throughout the country, this study considered only one public owned TV( EBC1) and two private satellite TV (EBS TV and Kana TV) that are geographically found in Addis Ababa.

Methodologically, the scope of this study also limited to descriptive and causal research approach and utilize quantitative research design that enable the researcher the use of statistical tools to analysis the data and employ non probability -convenience sampling techniques to draw the representatives from the targeted population under study.
In addition, to come up with the stated research objectives, the researcher was employed primary data type to collect relevant firsthand information from the representatives of the population under inquiry for this study. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were applied in the analysis of the data. The findings of the study had been analyzed by using SPSS application and mean, frequency, percentage, standard deviations, and tabular presentations that enable the researcher to show data to be as accurate as possible was employed to present the collected data.

1.7 Definition of Terms
A clear understanding of major concepts in any study goes a long way in revealing the reader’s views by engendering better understanding. The major variables of this study were defined as:

**Brand Equity**: It is a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand name and symbol, which add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service (Aaker, 1991, p.15).

**Customer Based Brand Equity**: It is the differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to the marketing of that brand (Keller, 2013, p.69).

**Brand Awareness**: It is the customers’ ability to recall and recognize the brand as reflected by their ability to identify the brand under different conditions and to link the brand name, logo, symbol, and so forth to certain associations in memory (Keller, 2003, p.76).

**Brand Association**: It is about brand-related thoughts, feelings, perceptions, images, experiences, beliefs, attitudes and is anything linked in memory to a brand (Kotler & Keller, 2006, p.188).

**Brand Loyalty**: It is the attachment that a customer has with a brand (Aaker, 1991, p.39).

**Perceived Quality**: It is customer’s perception (subjective evaluation) of the overall excellence or superiority of the product (or service) with respect to its intended purpose, relative to alternatives (Zeithmal, 1988, p.97).
1.8 **Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters and each chapter has sub topics.

The first chapter provides a general introduction of the study, including background of the study, why the study is conducted (statements of the problem), the research questions, purpose of the research (objectives of the study), value of the study (significance of the study), its scope and limitation.

Chapter two of the paper encompasses review of related literatures which encompasses a theoretical aspect of the subject matter of the study area from different sources. Further, also it includes an empirical review, and conceptual framework of the current study.

The third chapter elaborates the type and design of the research methodology. This section describes issues such as the type of research approach utilized, the research design employed, participants of the study, sampling techniques, sample size and the method used to collect data, analyze and interpret the collected data.

Chapter four covers data analysis and interpretation. It discusses in detail the findings of the study based on the result of the collected data and analysis was made in this part using the statistical tools stated in the research methodology part.

The last chapter incorporates summaries of major findings, conclusions and recommendations, future research area and limitations of the study. At the end of the research, important materials that were used to conduct the study but did not added in the main part of this paper are also incorporated.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction
This chapter provides an insight to readers about the theoretical review of the topics under study. In line with the objectives of the study, the chapter covers topics related to brand, brand equity, brand equity model, customer based brand equity and dimensions of brand equity. In addition, empirical review of the study area and hypothesis of the study are presented at this chapter. Eventually, the conceptual framework of this study is presented at the end of this chapter.

2.1 Theoretical Review
2.1.1 Brand at a glance
Brand is not new to marketing. It has been used around for centuries as a means to distinguish the goods of one producer from those of another. The word “brand” is derived from the Old Norse word “brandr,” which means “to burn,” as brands were and still are the means by which owners of livestock mark their animals to identify them (Keller, 2013).

Historically, the concept of brand was first used by the ancient Egyptian brick-makers who drew symbols on bricks for identification (Farquhar, 1990). The uses of brands were also found in Greek and Roman times; at that time, due to illiteracy shopkeepers identified their shops using symbols. Moreover, in the Middle-Ages, craftsmen marked their goods with stamps as a trademark by which to differentiate their skills. The next milestone of brand evolved in North America with the growth of cattle farming as a kind of legal protection, proof of ownership and quality signals (Chernatony & McDonald, 2003).

However, in today modern world the concept of brand has come to include much more than just creating a way to identify a product or company. As Chernatony and McDonald (2003) clarification, brands have also been viewed to go beyond the physical components of what they stand for to encompass additional attributes, which are important considerations for consumers’ buying decisions. Different authors provide their own explanation towards the meaning of a brand.

According to the American Marketing Association cited in (Keller, 2013,p.31), “A brand is a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competition.” Technically speaking, whenever a marketer creates a new name, logo, or symbol for a new product or service, he or she has created a brand (Keller, 2013).
For Kapferer (2008), brands are intangible assets, assets that produce added benefits for the business. This definition tried to see brands as valuable to the firms mainly from financial perspective. Brands will result in higher returns to the business since premium price can be set and claimed by the business of a product with a brand than with a generic brand.

Keller (2004), on his part defines brand as a perceptual entity embedded in reality, but it is also more than that reflecting the perceptions and perhaps even the peculiarity of consumers. This definition states that, brand is what resides in the minds of consumers and the ultimate goal of all efforts in creating a perceived value of products and services in the minds of consumers. Kapferer (2008), support Keller's definition by explaining a brand as a set of mental associations, held by the customer, which add to the perceived value of a product or service. As to Ellwood (2003), brands acts as a kind of flag, waving to consumers, creating awareness of the product and differentiating it from other competitors.

Aaker (1991) defines brand in a perspective of identification and differentiation of product/service by the customer from the competitor. For him a brand is a portion of an intangible asset that offers a sustainable competitive advantage over the competitor. In addition, brands are built now for the purpose of earning a long-term benefit.

In connection with this, Kapferer (2008) presented the benefits of brands both for final and business consumer as one entity and the firm as another entity. To the final consumers brands offer the recognition, expediency, assurance, optimization, symbol, continuity, and hedonistic benefits. For distributors a brand is a promise of recognition signal, practicality of choice, optimization of choice, pleasure for different categories of brands. The firm (manufacturer) also obtains a number of benefits. To mention a few, brand avoids risk, increase the likelihood of setting high price stability of future sales.

The above explanations have something in common which explain what a brand is. Brand is an added value, which identify and differentiate a product from other brands/products. Moreover, brand will be meaningful when consumers able to create a mental association in their mind.

### 2.1.2 Concept of Brand Equity

The concept of brand equity has been popular and potentially important marketing concepts since 1980s (Keller, 2013). However, similar to brand, despite brand equity is an extremely important construct for marketing, yet it lacks theoretical consensus and clarity in its
conceptualization, mainly because the researchers defining it come from different philosophies and perspectives (Wood, 2000). For example, a consensus has not emerged on whether brand equity refers to the value of a brand name or the value of a brand which is denoted by a brand name. This lack of consensus is reflected in the numerous measures and theoretical perspectives (for example, customer-based, and financial marketplace-based) that underlie the brand equity construct. Due to the lack of conceptual agreement, the construct has been subject to varying terminology during the past two decades (Oliveira & Luce, 2012). The following are some of the definitions provided for the term brand equity.

Brand equity is defined as the marketing effects or outcomes that accrue to a product with its brand name compared with those that would add if the same product did not have the brand name (Aaker 1991; Keller 2003). The specific effects may be either consumer-level constructs, such as attitudes, awareness, image, and knowledge, or firm level outcomes, such as price, market share, revenue, and cash flow.

Brand equity is the added value endowed by the brand name (Farquhar, Han, & Ijiri, 1991). It is the difference in consumer choice between the focal branded product and unbranded product given the same level of product features (Yoo, Donthu, & Lee, 2000).

Based on the value of brand equity, Aaker (1991, p.15) defined “brand equity as a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or that a firm’s customer.” He stated that, assets and liabilities linked to a brand’s name or symbol can be grouped into five dimensions: brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, perceived brand quality and other proprietary assets. He suggested that we can generate brand equity by strengthening those dimensions.

Simon and Sullivan (1993), on their part explained brand equity in terms of Incremental cash flows that accrue to branded products over unbranded products. Likely, Biel (1992), views brand equity in terms of future additional cash flows achieved by associating a brand name with a product.

Leuthesser (1988) on the other hand, defined brand equity as the consumer’s perception of the overall superiority of product carrying that brand name when compared to other brands. As to him, the five perceptual dimensions of brand equity include performance, social image, value, trustworthiness, and attachment.
Feldwick (1996) simplifies the variety of approaches, by providing a classification of the different meanings of brand equity as:

- The total value of a brand as a separable asset-when it is sold, or included on a balance sheet;
- A measure of the strength of consumers’ attachment to a brand;
- Adscription of the associations and beliefs the consumer has about the brand.

Generally, the above definition singles out that when brand equity dimensions, whether name or symbol, are strong the brand equity can be considered as an asset of the firm. As an asset the brand can command higher price, the brand can be sold above the infrastructure of the firm, competitors would be forced to incur huge amount of money to compete. Furthermore, the consumers are less likely to shift the brand because it offers values to them like functional value, avoidance of perceived risk, information processing, confidence and symbol. Moreover, as one can observer from the above definitions, some define brand equity from the customer’s point of view while others addressed it for the financial perspective.

### 2.1.3 Perspective of Brand Equity

There is a lot of literature about brand equity all with their differences and similarities. According to Kapferer (2008), there are two principal and distinct perspectives that have been taken by academics from which brand equity can be viewed. The first perspective of brand equity is from a financial market’s point of view where the asset value of a brand is appraised (Farquhar et al., 1991; Simon & Sullivan, 1990); while the second perspective of brand equity is customer-based perspective which is evaluating the customer’s response to a brand name (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993; Shocker et al., 1994).

#### 2.1.3.1 The Financial Perspective (Financial-Based Brand Equity)

Supporters of the financial perspective defined brand equity as the total value of a brand which is a separable asset when it is sold or included in a balance sheet (Atilgan, Aksoy & Akinci, 2005). Simon and Sullivan (1993), on their part explain brand equity as the incremental cash flows which add to branded products over and above the cash flows which would result from the sale of unbranded products.
From a financial perspective, brand equity is seen as a monetary figure and is used to estimate the brand value for accounting purposes (in terms of asset valuation for the balance sheet) or for merger, acquisition, or divesture purposes (Keller, 1993). In this perspective brand equity is viewed as a financial asset that aims at producing measures in monetary values. As Simon and Sullivan (1993), cited by Buil, Martinez and Chernatony (2013), some firms from a financial perspective consider brand equity as the monetary value of a brand to the firm.

However, Christodoulides and Chernatony (2010) noted that, it is the consumer’s response to the brand name which determines the financial value of the brand equity. Estimating a financial value for the brand is certainly useful but it does not help marketers to understand the process of building brand equity. Supporting to this, Wood (2000), believes that marketing perspective of brand equity can help marketers to understand the brand in the minds of customers and to design effective marketing programs to build the brand. Therefore, the financial value of a brand is the final outcome of consumer responses to brands.

2.1.3.2 Customer Perspective (Customer-Based Brand Equity)

This perspectives focuses exclusively on the relationship customers have with the brand (from total indifference to attachment, loyalty, and willingness to buy and re-buy based on beliefs of superiority and evoked emotions (Kapferer, 2008). The customer-based brand equity (CBBE) approach is the dominant perspective and the one preferred by a majority of academics and practitioners in marketing research because if a brand has no meaning or value to the consumer it is ultimately meaningless to investors, manufacturers, or retailers (Cobb-Walgren, Beal & Donthu, 1995).

From a costumer-based perspective, brand equity is viewed from the individual costumer’s viewpoint and is used to help marketers develop effective strategy to understand, meet, and influence costumer behavior. In this way, marketers could measure the consumer reactions toward a brand name. Thus, the second perspective, customer- based perspective, is based on customers’ perception; such as associations and beliefs connected to the brand (Christodoulides & Chernatony, 2010). For Leone et al., (2006), those from a consumer perspective, are based on the ground that the power of brands lies in the minds of consumers.
Hence, the current study will focus only on the consumer-based brand equity perspective and will not discuss the financial based brand equity as it is outside the scope of this study. The financial value of brand equity is ultimately the outcome of consumer response to a brand name. As Keller (1993) stated it for a brand to have value it must be valued first by the customer, if the brand has no meaning to the customer, the other definitions are meaningless. Moreover, consumer based brand equity is the driving force of increased market share and profitability of the brand since it is based on the market’s perceptions (Lassar et al, 1995; Christodoulides & Chernatony, 2010).

2.1.4 Brand Equity Model

In the literature, there are many brand equity models depending on the purpose of the outcome and the approach employed. Among the different CBBE models in the literature, this study will describe Aaker’s (1991) and Keller’s(1993), brand equity model and finally give emphasis on the most influential conceptualizations of brand equity models developed by Aaker (1991).

2.1.4.1 Aaker’s Brand Equity Model

Aaker (1991) is one of the earliest scholars in the field of brand equity that developed conceptual frame work of brand equity. He provided the most comprehensive brand equity model which consists of five different assets that are the sources of the value creation. Aaker (1991, 1996), grouped dimension of brand equity into a set of five assets (or liabilities) which are determinants of brand equity namely perceived quality, brand loyalty, brand awareness, brand association, and other proprietary brand assets such as patents, trademarks, and channel relationships.

The purpose of the Aaker Model is to help in creating a brand strategy consisting of different brand elements or patterns, so as to clarify, enrich and differentiate a brand from its competitors. Aaker argues that brand equity should be measured from the perspective of the consumer. The stronger the brand awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality and brand association the higher the financial value will be. In other words the value of the brand equity dimensions (i.e. especially brand awareness, brand loyalty, brand association and perceived quality) are the base on which the financial value of the firm will depend.
Scholars argue that, except the last dimension all the first four represent a fluctuation of consumer perception and behavior to the brand that can be readily understood by consumers while the other proprietary brand assets are not pertinent to customer-based brand equity rather it is of a firm’s side (Barwise, 1993; Yoo & Donthu, 2001). Strengthen to this, the fifth dimension is not considered by other scholars to be associated directly with customer perceptions and reactions to the brand (Christodoulides & Chernatony, 2010).

Hence, only the first four dimensions should be regarded as customer based brand equity (Yoo & Donthu 2001) and they have been widely used to measure customer-based brand equity in previous studies.

**Figure 2.1. Aaker's Brand Equity Model**

*Source: Aaker, 1991.*

**Aaker (1991) Brand equity dimensions**

*Brand loyalty:* generates value by reducing marketing costs and leveraging trade. Retaining existing customers is much less costly than attracting new ones and even if there are low switching costs, there is a significant inertia among customers. It is also difficult for competitors
to communicate to satisfied brand users because they have little motivation to learn about alternatives.

**Brand awareness:** It can be an anchor to which other associations can be attached, familiarity or liking about the brand could be developed, and it may signal substance or commitment of the company/brand and help consumers to consider the brand in the purchase category.

**Perceived quality:** It provides a reason to buy. The quality associated with a brand can also be a strong factor of differentiation and positioning. Perceived quality may offer a number of benefits for the company. Because consumers took quality as a justification of their buying, a base to conquer consumer mind as the tip of brand awareness, enable the company to extend its brands since consumers faith on the quality of the earlier products/services will be projected and still enable both the manufacturer or service provider to command premium prices. Perceived quality can also attract channel member interest, allow extensions and support a higher price that provides resources to reinvest in the brand.

**Brand associations:** Associations can be critical factors in differentiating and positioning, creating a reason to buy to those potential customers who are looking for specific associated physical or emotional features. It creates positive attitude and feelings, and help consumers to acquire, and process huge data of information about hundreds and thousands of different brand communication messages.

**Other proprietary brand assets:** refer to patents, trademarks and channel relationships which can provide strong competitive advantage. A trademark will protect brand equity from competitors who might want to confuse customers by using a similar name, symbol or package. A patent can prevent direct competition if strong and relevant to the purchase decision process. Finally, a distribution channel can be indirectly controlled by a brand as customers expect the brand to be available
2.1.4.2 Keller’s Brand Equity Model

Keller (2003) introduces the concept of customer-based brand equity model (also called Brand resonance model) in order to make clearer how brand equity should be built and managed.

In contrast to Aaker (1991), Keller (1993), only highlights two dimensions of customer based brand equity; brand awareness and brand image. These are viewed as the two separate construct which together constitutes brand knowledge. Keller (2004) put brand awareness and brand image as a source of brand equity. He emphasize that CBBE occurs when the customer has a high level of awareness and familiarity with the brand and holds some strong, favorable, and unique brand association in memory. He also suggested that, as customers respond more favorably to a product whose brand is identified, the brand has positive customer based brand equity and it exists when the consumer has a high level of awareness and familiarity and strong, favorable and unique brand associations in their memory (Keller, 2003).

Figure 2.2 Keller’s Brand Resonance Model

As presented in Figure 2.2, Keller Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) model identifies four steps, for building a strong brand from bottom to top: (1) ensuring identification of the brand with customers and an association of the brand in customers' minds with a specific product class or customer need;(2) firmly establishing the totality of brand meaning in the minds of customers by strategically linking a host of tangible and intangible brand associations; (3) eliciting the

Source: Keller, 2013

As presented in Figure 2.2, Keller Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) model identifies four steps, for building a strong brand from bottom to top: (1) ensuring identification of the brand with customers and an association of the brand in customers' minds with a specific product class or customer need;(2) firmly establishing the totality of brand meaning in the minds of customers by strategically linking a host of tangible and intangible brand associations; (3) eliciting the
proper customer responses in terms of brand-related judgment and feelings; and (4) converting brand response to create an intense, active loyalty relationship between customers and the brand (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

In this branding ladder each step is dependent on successfully achieving the previous - from brand identity to brand meaning, brand responses and finally brand relationships. These steps consist of six brand building blocks, with a number of sub-dimensions (Keller, 1993). The six steps are: Salience which relates to the awareness of the brand, imagery that relates to the satisfaction of customer’s psychological needs, performance which relates to the satisfaction of the customer functional needs, feelings which are the customer’s emotional responses and reactions to the brand, judgments which focus on the customer’s opinions based on performance and imagery and finally resonance- the relationship and level of identification of the customer with a brand. The ultimate aim is to reach the pinnacle of the CBBE pyramid - resonance - where a completely harmonious relationship exists between customers and the brand. According to this model, brand building involves sequential series of steps, where each step is contingent upon successfully accomplishing previous step.

2.1.5 Measuring Customer-Based Brand Equity

The concept of customer based brand equity can be operational zed from two angles. One is from customer perception (cognitive approach while the other is from customer behavior (behavioral approach) (Silverman, Sprott, & Pascal, 1999). However, the conceptualizations of customer-based brand equity have mainly derived from cognitive psychology (Christodoulides & Chernatony, 2010).

Hence, in this study the researcher considers the measurements of customer-based brand equity of the subject matter under study from customer perception (cognitive approach) rather than customer behavior (behavioral approach).

On the other hand, the main concern of marketing managers, besides building strong brands, is the measurement and monitoring of the health of their brands, which is done through brand equity measurement. Some scholars have operational zed the measurement of CBBE but have used complicated statistical procedures which make it difficult to comprehend (Christodoulides & Chernatony,
How to measure brand equity is very important in assessing the value of brands. Scholars have used two different approaches for measuring CBBE namely direct and indirect approach.

### 2.1.5.1 Direct Approach

Direct approaches to brand equity measurement attempt to measure the phenomenon directly by focusing on consumers’ preferences or utilities (Park & Srinivasan 1994; Kamakura & Russell 1993). Under the direct approach the preferences of the customers are in focus and the phenomenon is measured directly which means that scholars are trying to make a clear distinction between the value of the product (services) and the value of the brand (Christodoulides & Chernatony, 2010).

According to Keller (1993, p.12), “the direct approach attempts to measure customer-based brand equity more directly by assessing the impact of brand knowledge on consumer response to different elements of marketing program”. The limitation of this approach is that it does not explain the source of the brand equity and normally includes complex statistical models; therefore, it might be argued that this kind of approach would be of limited value for practitioners (Christodoulides & Chernatony, 2010).

Further, Tong and Hawley (2009), suggest that, in the direct approach one is simply looking at the performance of the brand in the marketplace and does not take into account how the brand should be managed. Moreover, Studies fall under the direct approach neglect the theoretical dimensions of the construct that, if properly prepared, can provide actionable insights into the drivers of equity.

### 2.1.5.2 Indirect Approach

Under this approach, instead of measuring actual customer preferences, scholars try to identify the actual sources of CBBE (Keller, 1993), because it is the differential customer response that creates brand knowledge. Keller (1993) suggests that, the indirect approach is more useful in indentifying what aspects are actually responsible for creating CBBE. In simple words, what is actually measured is the consumers’ perception of overall brand equity in relation to their perceptions of the dimensions of brand equity (Tong & Hawley, 2009).
The indirect approaches to customer-based brand equity measurement adopt a more holistic view of the brand compared to direct approaches, and seek to measure brand equity either through its manifest dimensions or through an outcome variable such as a price premium (Christodoulides & Chernatony, 2010). Strengthen to this, (Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Pappu, Quester, & Cooksey, 2005) also states that, brand equity is measured through its demonstrable manifestations. Therefore, the indirect approach to measuring customer-based brand equity is considered for this research.

2.1.6 Importance of Measuring Brand Equity

Measuring brand equity remains an important factor to brand management and can be used in order to guide marketing strategy and tactical decisions, to assess the extendability of a brand, to evaluate the effectiveness of marketing decisions and to track the brand’s health compared to its competitors over time (Ailawadi, Lehmann & Neslin, 2003).

The importance of managing and monitoring brand equity has been argued, by several scholars, to be of high importance when building a strong brand (Aaker, 1991; Biel, 1992; Shocker et al., 1994; Pappu et al., 2005). Yoo et al. (2000) even go as far to say that, brand equity provides sustainable competitive advantages because it creates meaningful competitive barriers.

Thus, a thorough understanding of brand equity from the customer’s point of view is essential for successful brand management. As to Keller (1993, p.8) explanation, “positive customer-based brand equity can lead to greater revenue, lower cost, and higher profit; it has direct implications for the firm’s ability to command higher prices, a customer’s willingness to seek out new distribution channels, the effectiveness of marketing communications, and the success of brand extensions and licensing opportunities”.

The company may further strength the customer base to extend brands (Aaker, 1991, 1996, Kotler & Keller, 2012). On the contrary when the brand strength is decaying the company will lost its customers to other competitors, the image will be eroded and the value of the company will be below the sum of tangible and intangible balance sheet accounts.

To extend a brand in to similar of totally different new brand, measuring the key strength of the parent brand is vital before doing any extension. Incurring a huge expenditure related to
marketing communication, creating an effective channel, revising pricing techniques, and as well packaging will be a must in order to re-brand and revitalize its brand and gain competitive position again.

Similarly, Keller (2003) emphasizes the role of measuring customer based brand equity to the benefits of the firm in terms of both long term and short term basis. He added that, measuring CBBE is strategic in nature and help to improve marketing productivity. Hence, there seems to be a consensus in the scholarly community that the study of brand equity is of great importance in order to build and maintain a strong brand.

Therefore, it is relevant to measure CBBE of the subject matter of the current study area where it is important to firm’s managers and owners to identify the relationship between the factors determining CBBE of the selected TV stations under enquiry and be able to come up with response strategies to build strong brand equity as they will be able to know from the study areas in which the perception of the media service buyers is not favorable to their brand to compete with the competitors or with the various content providers.

2.1.7 Dimensions of Brand Equity

Understanding the dimensions of brand equity, then investing to grow this intangible asset raises competitive barriers and drives brand wealth (Yoo et al., 2000). Based on this, the researcher conceptualized brand equity in accordance with Aaker (1991) using a customer perspective (perceptions) for this study. Brand equity is, therefore, referred as customer-based brand equity and defined as the value customers connect with a brand, as reflected in the dimensions of brand awareness, brand image (associations), perceived quality and brand loyalty.

Thus, the dimensions of brand equity being discussed in this paper consist of brand association, brand awareness, perceived quality and, brand loyalty only.

2.1.7.1 Brand Awareness

Brand awareness is an important component of brand equity (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993). Aaker (1991, p. 61), defines brand awareness as “the ability of a potential buyer to recognize or recall that a brand is a member of a certain product category”, whereas, according to Keller (2003, p.76), brand awareness is “the customers’ ability to recall and recognize the brand as reflected by
their ability to identify the brand under different conditions and to link the brand name, logo, symbol, and so forth to certain associations in memory”.

As to (Aaker, 1991), the first step to build brand equity is to create brand awareness. “If a customer recognizes a certain brand name or can recall it, the brand will have a higher chance of being selected than unknown brand” (Tam, 2008, p.7). Keller (1993) also acknowledged that, there are two sub-dimensions within brand awareness: brand recognition and brand recall where brand recognition is the ability to merely be able to recognize a particular brand among several others while brand recall refers to customers' ability to retrieve the brand from memory, for example, when the product category or the needs fulfilled by a product category are mentioned.

Brand awareness plays an important role in customer decision-making by influencing which brands enter the consideration set of these brands are used as heuristic and the perception of quality (Macdonald & Sharp, 2000). During the decision making process the customer retrieves from long term memory, those products and brands of which they are aware of. The followings are some of the sub-dimensions included under the brand awareness (Keller, 1993; Aaker 1996):

- **Brand recognition**: Brand recognition is the extent to which a consumer can correctly identify a particular product or service just by viewing the product or service's logo, tag line, packaging or advertising campaign. In order to build brand recognition, an organization must repeatedly provide customers with a consistent visual or auditory learning experience.

- **Brand recall**: Brand Recall is the extent to which a brand name is recalled as a member of a brand, product or service class. It refers to the ability of study respondents to remember a name (i.e. of a brand, company or product”). It is a qualitative measure of how well a brand name is connected with a product type or class of products by consumers.

- **Top-of-mind**: Top-of-mind is the situation by which a brand or specific product coming first in customers' minds when thinking of a particular industry. Achieving top-of-mind requires consistent communication efforts by companies through various marketing channels.
Brand dominance: Brand dominance is the state that exists when the majority of consumers believe that one brand outperforms all competitors. Is your product or service is the first product that comes to customers' minds when they deliver into your market segment? Why not? To what extent a product, brand, or firm controls a product category is termed as brand dominance.

Brand knowledge: Keller (1993), defined brand knowledge as awareness of the brand name and belief about the brand image. Valuable beliefs are authentic beliefs – consistent and durable. In addition to belief, consumer experience is an important part of brand knowledge. Consumer experience includes emotions, sensations, and activity. It is a function of awareness, which relates to consumers’ ability to recognize or recall the brand, and image, which consists of consumers’ perceptions and of associations for the brand.

Generally, Brand awareness can be a sign of quality and commitment, letting consumers become familiar with a brand and helping them consider it at the point of purchase (Aaker, 1991). It can affect customers’ perceptions, which lead to different brand choice and even loyalty (Aaker, 1996). A brand with strong brand recall (unaided awareness) and top of mind can affect customers’ perceptions, which lead to different customer choice inside a product category (Aaker, 1996). According to (Aaker, 1996), for new or niche brands, recognition can be important. For well-known brands recall and top-of-mind are more sensitive and meaningful. Brand knowledge and brand opinion can be used in part to enhance the measurements of brand recall.

2.1.7.2 Brand Associations

These are another important component of brand equity (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993). It is the core asset for building strong brand equity (Chen, 2001). Aaker (1991, p. 109) defines brand associations as “anything linked in memory to a brand" and continues to explain that several associations put together creates a brand image which includes user imagery, product attributes, use situation, organizational associations, brand personality and symbols (Aaker,1996).

As to Kotler and Keller (2006, p. 188), “Brand associations consist of all brand-related thoughts, feelings, perceptions, images, experiences, beliefs, attitudes and is anything linked in memory to a brand.” Brand associations play a vital role in creating brand knowledge, and ultimately brand
equity, and are widely assumed to be the driving force of a brand’s strength (Biel 1992; Feldwick 1996). The more associations a customer have to a brand, the stronger the link between the customer and the brand (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993).

Brand associations create value for the firm and its customers by helping to process or retrieve information, differentiate the brand, create positive attitudes or feelings, provide a reason to buy, and provide a basis for extensions (Aaker, 1991). Marketers use brand associations to differentiate, position, and extend brands, to create positive attitudes and feelings toward brands, and to suggest attributes or benefits of purchasing or using a specific brand where as Consumers use brand associations to help process, organize, and retrieve information in memory and to aid them in making purchase decisions (Aaker, 1991).

Some of the types of brand associations are:

- **Social image**: Social image is defined as the consumer’s perception of the esteem in which the consumer’s social group holds the brand. It includes the attributions a consumer makes and a consumer thinks that others make to the typical user of the brand. According to Lassar, Mittal, and Sharma (1995) argument, social image which includes the attributions a consumer makes and a consumer thinks that others make to the typical user of the brand is more relevant in measuring customer-base brand equity.

- **Trustworthiness**: Lassar et al., (1995), define trustworthiness as the confidence a consumer places in the firm and the firm’s communications and as to whether the firm’s actions would be in the consumer’s interest. Consumers place high value in the brands that they trust.

- **Perceived value**: Lassar et al., (1995) explain perceived value as the perceived brand utility relative to its costs, assessed by the consumer and based on simultaneous considerations of what is received and what is given up to receive it. Consumer choice of a brand depends on a perceived balance between the price of a product and all its utilities (Lassar et al., 1995). A consumer is willing to pay premium prices due to the higher brand equity (Aaker, 1993).

- **Corporate Social responsibility**: can be defined in terms of legitimate ethics or from an instrumentalist perspective where corporate image is the prime concern (McAdam
It is influencing the development of brands (Blumenthal and Bergstrom, 2003) as the public is interested to know what, where, and how much brands are giving back to society.

### 2.1.7.3 Perceived Quality

Aaker (1991) describes perceived quality as a customer’s perception of a product or service superiority or overall quality. It is not the actual quality of the product but the customer’s perception (subjective evaluation) of the overall excellence or superiority of the product (or service) with respect to its intended purpose, relative to alternatives (Zeithaml, 1988). Since it is impossible for consumers to make complete and correct judgments of the objective quality, they use quality attributes that they associate with quality (Zeithaml, 1988). It is described as being intangible in nature and based on an overall feeling about the brand.

Zeithaml (1988) classify the concept of perceived quality in two groups of factors; that are intrinsic attributes and extrinsic attributes. The intrinsic attributes are related to the physical aspects of a product (e.g. color, flavor, form and appearance); on the other hand, extrinsic attributes are related to the product, but not in the physical part of this one (e.g. brand name, stamp of quality, price, store, packaging and production information.

High perceived quality can be useful for a brand in several ways. It can be, a platform for brand extensions, a reason for customer to pay a premium price, a mechanism to increase the interest of channel members for the product or service, a way to differentiate a product or service, and finally it can also provide the customer with a reason to buy the product or service (Aaker, 1991). Further, Kayaman and Arasli (2007) say that, if the perceived quality of a product or service is high then the customer is more likely to become loyal to that brand.

### 2.1.7.4 Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty is at the heart of brand equity. Aaker (1991, p. 39), defines brand loyalty as “the attachment that a customer has to a brand”. On his way ,Oliver (1997, p. 392), defined brand loyalty as “a deeply held commitment to re buy or re patronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future thereby causing repetitive same brand purchasing despite situational influences and marketing efforts having potential to cause switching behavior”.
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Thus, being a strategic asset for the brand, it can reduce marketing cost because retaining loyal customers do not require as much marketing activities as compared to attracting new customers. Brand loyalty can lead to attracting new customers because a loyal and satisfied customer can provide guarantee to non-existing customers and can reduce the hesitation of risk among potential new customers, hence, providing them with a feeling that the product or service is a safe choice (Aaker, 1991).

Brand loyalty can further provide the company with trade leverages in the sense that the intermediate supplier of the product or service can also become loyal due to the belief that the brand has loyal customers who will always buy the product or services (Aaker, 1991). Further, Bowen and Shoemaker (1998) argued that, loyal customers are likely to make more frequent purchases than the customers who are not loyal.

The major levels of brand loyalty are:

- **Cognitive loyalty**: Cognitive loyalty refers to the consumers’ intention to buy the brand as the first choice (Keller, 2013). It is tendency to be loyal to a focal brand as demonstrated by the intention to buy it as a primary choice (Oliver, 1997). It is a means that a brand comes up first in a consumers’ mind, when the need to make a purchase decision arises, that is the consumers’ first choice. The cognitive loyalty is closely linked to the highest level of awareness (top-of-mind), where the matter of interest also is the brand, in a given category, which the consumers recall first. Thus, a brand should be able to become the respondents’ first choices (cognitive loyalty) and is therefore purchased repeatedly (behavioral loyalty) (Keller, 2013).

- **Behavioral loyalty**: Behavioral loyalty can be indicated by a number of repeated purchases (Keller, 1998) or commitment to re-buy the brand as a primary choice (Oliver, 1997). It is defined as the degree to which a buying unit, such as a household, concentrates its purchases over time on a particular brand within a product category (Schoell & Guiltinan, 1990).

- **Price premium**: Price premium is defined as the amount a customer will pay for the brand in comparison with another brand offering similar benefits and it may be high or low and positive or negative depending on the two brands involved in the comparison. It is
the customer’s willingness to pay higher price for a brand in comparison with another brand offering similar benefits (Aaker 1996).

In general, brand loyalty adds considerable value to a brand and/or its firm because it provides a set of habitual buyers for a long period of time. Loyal customers are less likely to switch to a competitor solely because of price; they also make more frequent purchases than comparable non-loyal customers (Bowen & Shoemaker, 1998).

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 Studies Based on Aaker’s Brand Equity Model

Yoo and Donthu (2001), empirically tested Aaker’s four dimensions on Korean and American customers for three product categories (color television, athletic shoes and film for cameras). Their results show that the four dimensions are reliable and valid across both cultures and all the product categories that were tested.

Washburn and Plank (2002), similar to Yoo & Donthu (2001), also empirically tested the four dimensions: brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty in the context of co-branded products. Washburn and Plank (2002), also found support for all four dimensions; however, they concluded that further research is necessary for unconditional acceptance of the dimensions.

Pappu et al., (2005), also empirically tested the four dimensions conceptualized by Aaker on two product categories, cars and televisions, in Australia. The results of Pappu et al., (2005) also provide evidence for the validity of the four dimensions.

Abad (2012) studied CBBE in the Banking sector of Iran aiming to conceptualize the customer based brand equity in the financial service sector with respect to its effect on perception of brand. After employing Aaker's (1991) CBBE model, he found out that Perceived quality, brand loyalty, brand awareness and brand association are influential criteria of brand equity that enhances perception of brand in financial service sector. Among the four mentioned dimensions, brand association appears to have the most influence on brand equity.

Barwise (1993) and Yoo & Donthu (2001), asserted that among Aaker’s five brand equity dimensions, the first four represent customers’ evaluations and reactions to the brand that can be readily understood by consumers and hence they have been widely adopted to measure
customer-based brand equity in prior researches. A few research works were also conducted using Aaker (1991), brand equity model in the area of customer based brand equity measurement in the Ethiopian context.

Amongst, Wongelawit’s (2014), were applied Aaker’s (1991) brand equity model, in her study that focused on measuring consumer-based brand equity in the carbonated soft drink sector in the Ethiopian context. She employed Aaker’s four brand equity dimensions to measure customer based brand equity of coca cola and concluded that brand association and brand loyalty positively influenced brand equity while perceived quality and brand awareness negatively influenced it.

Beidemariam (2014) also attempted to measure CBBE in the Ethiopian beer industry based on Aaker’s established determinants of brand equity model. Like Wngelawit (2014), he used the first four dimensions of Aaker’s (1991) brand equity model but included brand preference as additional dimension of brand equity in determining the magnitude of brand equity in the Ethiopian beer industry. All dimensions were supported except for brand awareness according to the findings of Beidmariam (2014).

Similarly, Bezawit’s (2014) adopted Aaker’s brand equity model on the CBBE measurement of Ethiopian Airlines and she has came to a conclusion that all brand equity dimensions positively influenced brand equity.

Furthermore, Million (2013) and Wasihun (2014) were carried out a research to measure CBBE in the Ethiopian beer industry using Aaker’s (1991) brand equity model. Their findings concluded that all dimensions have got support in measuring brand equity.

In the literature review above, the four dimensions originally proposed by Aaker (1991) are the most widely used dimensions of brand equity. This goes in line with the findings of Christodoulides and Chernatony (2010) as well as Chieng and Goi (2011), who also found that Aaker’s brand equity dimensions are the mostly used dimensions among the scholars. In addition to this, the literature review above also shows that Aaker’s four brand equity dimensions have been empirically tested for several product categories and in most cases proven to be valid.
Given that, among several brand equity models in the literature, this study uses customer based brand equity model constructed by Aaker (1991), that base on customer perceptions. Because several studies in the literature shows that Aaker’s brand equity model is the most commonly cited and empirically tested in a number of previous studies (Yoo et al., 2000; Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Kim & Kim, 2004; & Atilgan et al., 2005). Furthermore, the researcher of this enquiry proposes that among the five dimensions conceptualized by Aaker, four of them (brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived quality and brand associations) will be considered in this study. Because, the last dimension of Aaker’s brand equity doesn’t show a fluctuation of customer perception and behavior to the brand that can be readily understood by customers rather it is of a firm’s side (Barwise, 1993; Yoo & Donthu, 2001).

2.2.2 The Relationship between Dimensions Brand Equity and Brand Equity

2.2.2.1 Brand Awareness and Brand Equity

Brand awareness is the first and fundamental attribute of customer-based brand equity (Aaker, 1991; Tong & Hawley, 2009). Brand awareness precedes the construction of brand equity in the consumer mind set (Huang & Sarigollu, 2011). Brand equity occurs when the consumer has a high level of awareness and familiarity with the brand and holds some strong, favorable, and unique brand association memory. According to Yoo and Donthu, (2001) suggestion, brand awareness had an equivalent positive effect on brand equity. Aaker (1996) argue that, in order to assess brand equity, brand awareness has to be taken into account. High brand awareness can be a sign of quality and commitment, letting consumers become familiar with a brand and helping them consider it at the point of purchase (Aaker, 1991; Tong & Hawley, 2009; Yoo et al., 2000). Esch et al., (2006), also argue that customer-based brand equity occurs when the consumer is aware and familiar with the brand and holds positive associations about the brand in memory. Keller (2004) extends this argument by stating that, customers attribute certain associations with a brand only when they have high level of brand awareness and familiarity with the brand.

In summary, brand awareness affects customer’s perception and attitudes, as well as it influences customer’s brand choice and brand loyalty (Aaker, 1996). Based on the aforementioned theoretical interrelationship between brand awareness and brand equity, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H1a: Brand awareness has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.
2.2.2.2 Brand Association and Brand Equity

Brand association is an element that helps a brand to be remembered (Aaker, 1991). Aaker (1991) believes that, brand association and brand equity are strongly interrelated to each other, because brand association which is the outcome of high brand awareness, is positively related to brand equity, since it is viewed as a sign of quality and commitment, leading customers to familiarize with a brand (Aaker, 1991; Tong & Hawley, 2009; Yoo et al., 2000). Aaker (1996) also states that brand equity is supported in great part by the associations that customers make with the brand.

Brand equity occurs when customers have a high level of awareness and hold some strong, favorable, and unique brand associations in their memories. Leone, et al. (2006) clearly illustrated that, brand association belongs to the part of brand equity, because strong, favorable and unique brand association are essential as sources of brand equity to drive customer behavior. Furthermore, research done by Atilgan et al., (2005) and Yoo et al., (2000) discovers that, if customers have more positive association toward a brand, they would be more loyalty toward a brand. Based on the above definition and the suggested relationship of brand associations and brand equity in the literature, the following hypothesis is formulated:

*H2a: Brand association has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.*

2.2.2.3 Brand loyalty and Brand Equity

According to Travis (2000), the ultimate objective and meaning of brand equity is to build brand loyalty. For Yoo et al., (2000), brand loyalty has the power to impact on customer decision to purchase the same product or brand and decline to shift to competitive brands.

According to Aaker (1991), brand loyalty adds considerable value to a brand and/or its firm because it provides a set of habitual buyers for a long period of time. Loyal customers are less likely to switch to a competitor solely because of price; they also make more frequent purchases than comparable non-loyal customers (Bowen & Shoemaker, 1998). Brand loyalty makes consumers buy a brand routinely and resist switching to other competing brand (Yoo et al.,
As a result, brand loyalty is a concept that firms emphasize, since it may create or sustain a customers' patronage over the long-term, thereby increase brand equity. Thus, brand loyalty is located at the heart of brand equity.

Atilgan et al. (2005), investigated the causal relationships between the dimensions of brand equity and brand equity itself, and specifically measured the way in which consumers’ perceptions of the dimensions of brand equity affected the overall brand equity evaluations. Their study found that brand loyalty is the most influential dimension of brand equity. Bezawit's (2014), also conducted study on the CBBE measurement of Ethiopian airline to investigate the relationships between dimensions of brand equity and overall brand equity and has came to a conclusion that all the brand equity dimensions positively influenced brand equity. However, strong support was found for brand loyalty. Based on this argument and the relationship between brand loyalty and brand equity, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3a: Brand loyalty has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.

2.2.2.4 Perceived Quality and Brand Equity

Perceived quality is considered as an important dimension of brand equity. The main reason is that, perceived quality is a primary dimension in brand equity models that has a strategic effect on brand equity, by reducing the perceived risk (Aaker 1991; Keller 1993). Perceived quality has been found to be significantly associated with brand equity in the tested model for hotels, among shopping mall consumers and students choice of USA products in India (Papu.et al., 2005; Aaker, 1991; Kayaman, & Arasli, 2007; and Keller, 2003).

Furthermore, Yoo et al., (2000) mentioned that, brand equity will be increased with the help of promoting positive perceived quality that leads consumers to select a particular brand rather than another competing brand.

Wasihun (2014), were attempt to measure CBBE in the Ethiopian beer industry using Aaker’s (1991) brand equity model and his study has found strong support for perceived quality.

Based on the aforementioned and suggested theoretical interrelationship between perceived quality and brand equity in the literature, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4a: Perceived quality has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.
2.3 Conceptual Framework of the study

Brand equity is a multidimensional concept and a complex phenomenon. Among several brand equity models in the literature, this study conceptualizes and uses customer based brand equity model constructed by Aaker (1991), that base on customer perceptions which is the most commonly cited and has been empirically tested in a number of previous studies (Yoo et al., 2000, Yoo & Donthu, 2001; Kim & Kim, 2004; Atilgan et al, 2005).

Hence, the researcher sets out the current study to measure customer-based brand equity of selected television stations brand in Addis Ababa in view of customer’s perceptions with employing Aaker’s (1991) brand equity model as a conceptual framework of study. However, as previously raised, the researcher breaking it down into sub-components and hypothesize that, among the five dimensions of Aaker’s (1991) brand equity model, only the first four brand equity dimensions -brand awareness, perceived quality, brand association, and brand loyalty are considered in this study.

For the purpose of this study, other proprietary brand assets are not found relevant by the researcher, because other proprietary assets do not measure brand equity from customer’s perspective; instead it measure brand equity from company side (Barwise, 1993; Yoo and Donthu, 2001). Accordingly, the researcher of this enquiry proposes the following conceptual model, to illustrate the interrelationships and determinants influencing customer based brand equity of the study area.

Figure 2.3: Conceptual framework of the study

Source: own Researcher
2.4 Summary
In the detailed part of the literature review, core points with regards to brand, brand equity, perspectives of brand equity, brand equity models, customer-based brand equity; brand equity dimension, and the underlying conceptual framework of the study were discussed.

The first part discussed about a brand consists of any name, term, design, style, words, symbols or any other feature that distinguishes the goods and services of one seller from another. This representation conveys attributes, values, purpose, strength and passion of a brand, which helps a consumer to recognize and distinctively identifies a brand from its competitors.

Secondly, Brand equity, which is one of the significant concepts in brand management, as well as in business practice and academic research, was highlighted in this part. Developing and properly managing brand equity has been emphasized as an important issue for most firms. The two main perspectives of brand equity i.e., customers-based perspective and financial based perspective were also addressed.

Proceeding, both Aaker and Keller brand equity models were described in this part and their views is customer oriented. Regarding the benefit of brand equity, the opinions of Aaker and Keller are very similar. However, Aaker is the one who classified customer’s and firm’s benefits of brand equity. Both Aaker and Keller give advices to build brand equity.

The dimensions of brand equity mainly of brand awareness, brand association, brand perceived quality and brand loyalty that base on Aaker’s Brand Equity Model (1991), are discussed and the researcher hypothesized that they have a positive relationships with brand equity.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

For Creswell (2009), research is a systematic inquiry aimed at providing information to solve problems. In order to solve the problem or answer the research questions, appropriate methodology should be designed to show how research questions are answered in the most rigorous method. Thus, methodology became very important section for obtaining the data used in chapter four and five of this study. Hence, this chapter highlights the research methodologies used in the study starting with topics related to, research approach, research design; data type and sources, target population, sampling procedures and sample size, data collection technique, method of data analysis and presentation, issues of reliability and validity and finally the ethical considerations in carrying out this research.

3.1 Research Approach

Burns and Grove (2003, p.195), define a research approach as “a blueprint for conducting a study with maximum control over factors that may interfere with the validity of the findings.” It specifies the details of the procedures necessary to obtain the information needed to structure or solve research problems (Malhotra & Birks, 2009). The various types of research that can be used by many researchers based on the study purpose are: exploratory, descriptive and causal or explanatory research (David, 1998).

Exploratory research is conducted into a research problem or issue when there are very few or no earlier studies, which refer to information regarding the issue or problem, are found. Parasuraman (1991), states exploratory research as intended to develop initial insight and to provide direction for any further research needs. According to Olsen and Pedersen (2008), the aim of this type of study is to look for patterns, ideas or hypotheses, rather than testing or confirming a hypothesis.

According to Burns and Grove (2003), descriptive research is designed and conducted to describe a picture of phenomena as it is naturally happening. It aims to depict the state of affairs as it exists and to describe characteristics of a population or phenomenon in terms of its characteristics to provide an accurate profile of a group verbally or numerically (Kothari, 2004).
Descriptive research goes further in examining a problem than exploratory research, as it is undertaken to determine and describe the characteristics of the relevant issues (Olsen & Pedersen, 2008).

Explanatory or causal research is an elaboration of descriptive research. The researcher goes beyond purely describing the characteristics, to analyze and explaining why or how the phenomenon being studied is happening. An explanatory investigation will try to illustrate cases, effects or intentions with the aim of explaining a certain phenomenon (Olsen & Pedersen, 2008).

Thus, according to the above theoretical argument, the researcher had used both descriptive and explanatory research approach. Because the researcher was attempting to describe demographic information of the respondents and tried to seek the correlation between determinants of brand equity and customer based brand equity (overall brand equity) of the subject matter under study. The goal was to test the research hypothesis need to be answered in relation to the research questions and explain what really exists in media service buyers’ mind in perceiving the brand equity of TV channels brands in the country.

Taking this into account, this research type was a descriptive (describing and summarizing the characteristics of respondents) and explanatory research type (testing the causal relationships that exist between dimensions of brand equity (brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty) and customer overall brand equity.

3.2 Research design
Based on the research purposes and data types, research design can be classified into quantitative, qualitative research design or a combination of them (Creswell, 2009). According to Malhotra and Birks (2009), qualitative research design is unstructured primary exploratory research design that depends on small samples, intended to provide insight and understand. It involves the collection, analyzing and interpreting of data that cannot be meaningfully quantified and summarized in the form of numbers (Parasuraman, 1991). In qualitative research samples tends to be smaller as compared with quantitative projects that include much larger samples.

On the other way, quantitative research is a study that makes use of statistical tools to obtain findings. Instance to Kothari (2004, p. 3), “Quantitative research is based on the measurement of quantity or amount and applicable to phenomena that can be expressed in terms of quantity”. It
places greater emphasis on the numerical data and statistical test to achieve conclusion that can be generalized (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Again, Veal (2006), claim that quantitative research, including statistical analysis that relies on numerical evidence to draw conclusions or to test hypotheses, often, it is essential to research relatively large numbers of people and utilize computers to analysis the data to be sure of the reliability of the results. Quantitative research is used to answer hypotheses or research questions using descriptive or explanatory techniques (Malhotra & Birks, 2009).

Therefore, given the concepts of the above parts since the aim of this research was to measure CBBE of selected television Channels in Addis Ababa, this research was a quantitative research design as it used data that are numeric in nature. In addition to this, since the researcher uses systematic collection and measurement of data as well as application of statistical tools to analyze and obtain the findings so as to address the raised research questions, objectives and to test the formulated hypotheses, it is a quantitative research design.

3.3 Data Sources and Type

Data is one of the most important and vital aspect of any research undertaking. According to Malhotra & Birks (2009), primary data are originated by the researcher for the specific purpose of addressing the problem at hand.

Accordingly, the researcher of this project had used primary data as a source of information for this study. Even if obtaining them can be expensive and time consuming, the primary data for this research were gathered by means of a structured questionnaire that was distributed to representatives of the targeted population under study (i.e. media service buyers) in Addis Ababa.

The major reasons for employing primary data source was to get firsthand information on customer based brand equity of television channels in Addis Ababa with respect to media service buyers’ perception, which became the basis for data analysis and findings in chapter four. Furthermore, other post graduated researchers those the researcher mentioned earlier like (Million, 2013; Bezawit, 2014; Beidemariam, 2014; Wasihun, 2014; Wengelawit, 2014; and Ephrem, 2015), were also utilized primary data for their studies.
3.4 Target Population of the study

Parahoo (1997) defines population as the total number of units from which data can be collected, such as individuals, artifacts, events or organizations. For Kothari (2004), population refers to the total of items about which information is desired. As stated earlier in the scope of the study, this research attempted to measure CBBE of selected TV channels in Addis Ababa due to limitations of location, time and financial resources in line with media service buyer’s perception.

Hence, the target population for this study comprised of all media service buyers (all ad agencies, large and medium private businesses, governmental and nongovernmental organizations) that were actually buying media services from one or more of the selected media’s vehicles under study. Because the researcher believes that those media service buyers have high levels of exposures and experiences about different media’s brand and more familiar with the television channel brand choice while they purchase media services to advertise, announce, sponsoring, etc to meet their own communication goals than other ordinary person. Furthermore, they are also considered as key informants as they are different from ordinary informants to the extent that they have more information to impart and are more visible. Hence, by considering the aforementioned merits, those media service buyers mentioned earlier were believed to be more worthy to be considered as the target population of this study.

3.5 Sample and Sampling Techniques

3.5.1 Sampling Method

According to Anol (2012), sampling is the statistical process of selecting a subset called a sample of a population of interest for purposes of making observations and statistical inferences about that population. There are two types of sampling techniques that may be divided as probability and non-probability.

Probability sample is a sampling procedure in which each element of the population has a fixed probabilistic chance of being selected for the sampling. This requires not only a precise definition of the target population, but, also a general specification of the sampling frame (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). It includes samples based on simple random sampling, systematic sampling, stratified sampling, cluster/area sampling (Kothari, 2004).
In contrast, non-probability does not use chance selection procedure, but rather rely on the personal judgment of the researcher. As to Kothari (2004, p.15), “non-probability samples are those based on convenience sampling, judgmental sampling and quota sampling techniques.” In this project, the researcher employed non-probability technique of convenience sampling for investigation, because the dominant aspect of non-probability sampling provides researcher greater freedom and flexibility in selecting the individual population units than probability sampling (Parasuraman, 1991). Convenience sampling refers to the sampling procedure of obtaining those people or units those are most conveniently available.

According to an EBA report (2016), currently there were nine public or government owned TV channels and five private commercial satellite TV channels which have target audiences in the country. Amongst, three TV channels brand (one public owned TV channel (EBC1) and two private commercial Satellite TV Channels (EBS TV and Kana TV), that have their own subsidiary branches in Addis Ababa were selected purposively for the study.

The major reason to include those TV channels in the study sample was that a transfer effect exists between the media vehicle image and the advertised product (Winick, 1962). This in turn is known among media service buyers (Blair, 1966), and that it would have implications for the execution of advertising campaigns depending on communication goals. Moreover, the favorability of media brand images and associations may lead to engagement and this would attract the media service buyers.

The researcher also contacts the respondents out of the total population of media service buyers through non probability - convenience sampling for this study. Convenience sampling, which also called accidental or opportunity sampling is a non-probability sampling technique in which a sample is drawn from the part of the total population that is close to hand, readily available, or convenient (Bhattacherjeend,2012; Anol, 2012). This approach also enables the researcher to obtain a large number of completed questionnaires quickly and economically (Zikmund, 2003).

Furthermore, since it is difficult for the researcher to get each representatives address in the random table list or computer generating lists and time consuming to prepare it, convenience sampling method is chosen to contact the respondents.
3.5.2 Sample Size
According to Wimmer & Dominick (2006, p: 87), sample is “a proportion of the population that is representative of the entire population”. A carefully selected sample can provide data representative of the population from which it is drawn. Determining sample size is very complex as it depends on other factors such as margins of errors, degree of certainty and statistical technique. Sample size is, therefore, directly proportional to the desired confidence level of the estimate and to the variability of the phenomenon being investigated, and it is inversely proportional to the error that the researcher is prepared to accept (Corbetta, 2003).

According to Israel (2013), there are different strategies to calculate sample size. These include using census for small population, using a sample size of similar study, using published sample size tables and using formula to calculate sample size. As per the on-line published table of sample size, the sample size taken from a population of more than 500,000 with a 95% confidence interval and a 5% margin of error is 384. According to Cochran (1963) a large population's sample size can be determined by using the formula

\[ n = \frac{Z^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{e^2} \]

Where \( n \) = required sample size

\( Z \) = Degree of confidence (i.e. 1.96)\(^2\)

\( P \) = Probability of positive response (0.5)

\( q \) = Probability of negative response (0.5)

\( e \) = Tolerable error (0.05)\(^2\)

Given that, the sample size for this study was determined by using the estimation formula developed by Cochran (1963, p.75).The reason for choosing this formula is that; it is mostly used by other researchers to measure CBBE and the total population number of this investigation is also very large and unknown. Furthermore, post graduated researchers like Million (2013); Beidemariam (2014) and Wasihun (2014) were used this estimation formula to determine sample size and attempted to measure CBBE in the Ethiopian beer industry using a sample size of 384.
each. Hence, with a maximum variation of $p=0.5$, confidence level of 95% and ±5% precision, the resulting sample size for this study will be:

\[ n = \frac{z^2pq}{e^2} \]

\[ (1.96)^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5 \]

\[ (0.05)^2 \]

\[ n = 3.8416 \times 0.25 \]

\[ 0.25 \]

\[ n = 384.16 \approx 384 \text{ Respondents} \]

However, many researchers commonly add some margin to the sample size to compensate for non-response (Israel, 2013, p.75). Taking this into consideration the researcher added 5% of the sample size and distributed 404 questionnaires in order to increase the response rate while gathered the required data from the representatives of the target population of the study.

### 3.6 Data Collection Instruments

According to Fisher (2007), if the researcher wants to quantify the research material, then it is best to use a survey approach. In general, due to the need for high response rate and low cost as a student researcher, the survey method is found to be economical and efficient one. Therefore, since the population of this research is large, the survey approach was applied to the study, because the survey approach enables the researcher to gather data at a particular point in time (cross-sectional) with the intention of describing the nature of existing conditions. Because, survey studies enable to ask large numbers of people questions about their behaviors, attitudes, and opinions to infer characteristics or relationships of population.

#### 3.6.1 Product Stimuli

In order to examine and measure the relationships between dimensions of brand equity on creating brand equity, this study focused on selected television channel brand as television broadcasting market in Addis Ababa. Based on the performance and popularity of television
broadcasting service in the Ethiopian media market, and considering to avoiding respondent fatigue, only three television channel brands was chosen as product (channel brand) stimuli (they are: EBC1, EBS TV and Kana TV). This three television channel brand was used in the current study because those television brands were found to be the preferred and famous among media service buyers in Ethiopia. From the three listed brands, respondents were first asked to choose the one they are interested in or most familiar with, and then asked to respond to all the statements in the questionnaire for that specific brand accordingly.

### 3.6.2 Measurement Instrument

Four brand equity dimensions (perceived quality, brand awareness, brand association and brand loyalty) were considered as Independent Variables to measure CBBE of the current study area. Constructs and scales were adopted and customized a little bit to fit with the current study area with reference to empirical studies of (Yoo & Donthu, 2001). The reason for referring to their scale development studies is that their scales are the most commonly accepted measure of CBBE (Washburn & Plank, 2002). Accordingly, five items for brand awareness, four items each for brand association, brand loyalty, and perceived quality were adopted. Similarly, four items for measuring customers based brand equity, which is considered as dependent Variables for this study were derived from the work of Yoo and Donthu (2001) to examine customers’ overall attitudes toward the focal brand and their intention to select the brand against its counterpart.

### 3.6.3 Survey Questionnaire

Collection of data through questionnaire is quite popular, particularly in case of big inquiries. According to Creswell (2009), types of questionnaires can be divided into three types as self-administered questionnaires (hand delivered questionnaires), telephone and personal interviews. Since both telephone and personal interviews are costly, time taking, requires trained interviewers and subject to interviewer bias, self-administered questionnaire is preferred as it is low cost and do not require the involvement of the researcher (Blumberg, Cooper, & Schindler, 2008). Based on that argument, a survey questionnaire was employed to gather data from the representatives of the target population in the current study.

The survey questionnaire for this study incorporated three parts. The first part was about the demographic profile of respondents’ like Gender, Education, organization type, and their
position in the organization. The second part concentrated on questions relating to their TV channel brand choice and their media service consumption habits. Finally, the third part incorporated questions on basic information which includes items that are important to measure CBBE of TV channels under study i.e. items intended to measure brand awareness, brand association, perceived brand quality, brand loyalty and the overall brand equity aspect.

Apart from the first and second parts, brand equity measuring items that intended to measure the factors that are considered to make up the respondents brand equity (brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality, brand loyalty) and overall brand equity aspect were developed on five point Likert scale anchored by 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Because it is a widely used rating scale that requires the respondents to indicate a degree of agreement or disagreement with each of a series of statements about the stimulus objects (Miller & Salkind, 2002). In general, Likert scale is used to measure respondent’s attitudes of the product or service, because it is easy to construct, administer and understand.

The resulting questionnaires adopted from the Yoo and Donthu (2001), were customized and originally drafted in English language was translated into Amharic language by one of legally operating translation offices since they have the experience and proficiency in translation. The Amharic version of the questionnaire was intended for those respondents who have low proficiency in the English language. After the translation was done, the researcher observed it if there is some gap in the translation and tried to modify it. It was also commented by the advisor on so as to refine the questions to be answerable by the respondent. Based on the feedbacks, necessary refine was made on the questionnaire before administering to the selected sample size.

It is recommended to keep the questionnaire as short as possible and give it a logical and sequential structure so that the respondent can easily see what the questionnaire is about and can follow its themes as they go through them (Fisher, 2007). Instance to this, the questionnaire was designed in a way that is clear, brief and easy to understand and straightforward as well as covers the relevant aspects of the model used.

The data were gathered face-to-face at each TV channels office under study. The administration took place when media service buyers came to buy the service from the stations. Based on their
arrival, voluntary respondents were asked with which version of the questionnaire they would be at ease to fill; the English or the Amharic version and then given the questionnaire accordingly. Since it was costly and difficult to get every media service buyers in their respective areas, this found to be the best way of administering the data collection. To increase the probability of inclusion of each media service buyer, the data were collected through sufficient period of time due to the variation of the arrival time of each media service buyer in the stations. Moreover, the researcher was also collected a few of the data by getting respective media service buyers in their office in Addis Ababa.

3.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The purpose of data analysis is to organize, provide structure to, and elicit meaning from research data. The data analysis consisted of examining the surveys for correctness and completeness, coding and entering data into a database and performing an analysis of responses according to frequency distribution and inferential statistics.

Following to the data collection, the researcher had been entered data to and analyze it by the use of statistical package for social science (SPSS version 20). The entered data was also counter-checked against the original version of the questionnaire in order to sort out invalid responses, to correct errors committed in the process of data entry and thereby to check the consistency of the data entered. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were applied in the analysis of the data. Because the nature of the data compiled, partly determines the appropriate method to analyzing them with the purpose of finding the research problem answer (Walliman, 2001).

Firstly descriptive statistical tools were used in the data analysis to summarize the demographic characteristic of respondents. Particularly, descriptive statistical tools such as frequencies, percentages, mean, standard deviations, and cross tabular presentation that helps the data to be as accurate as possible were employed in order to describe and interpret the demographic and other related information of the respondents.

Also, correlation analysis was applied for testing the proposed hypothesis. The objective was to find out the relationships that exist between variables of the study. So that, Pearson correlation analysis was made to see the direction and significance of the independent variable such as brand
awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality and brand association upon the overall brand equity (dependent variable).

In addition, multiple linear regression analysis of all the variables was studied to investigate the extent of influence that the independent variables have on the dependent variable. The independent (exogenous) variables for this study as mentioned above were the main four brand equity dimensions; Brand Awareness, Brand Association, perceived brand quality and Brand Loyalty, and the dependent (endogenous) variable were assumed to be customers overall brand equity of the TV channels in line with media service buyers’ perceptions.

3.8 Reliability and Validity Analysis

The researcher used Cronbach’s alpha to assess the internal consistency of variables in the research instrument. Cronbach’s alpha is a coefficient of reliability used to measure the internal consistency or homogeneity of the items that comprise each scale represented as a number between 0 and 1 (Ntoumanis, 2001). Scale with coefficient alpha between 0.6 and 0.7 indicate fair reliability (Zikmund, Babin and Griffin, 2010). However, Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of 0.7 or higher is considered acceptable and adequate to determine reliability in most social science research situations. Thus, for this study, Cronbach’s alpha score of 0.7 or higher has been considered adequate to determine reliability.

Instance to this the researcher carried out the pilot study to test the reliability of the construct whether the questionnaires can obtain the outcomes which the study required for meeting objectives and hypotheses of the inquiry. Accordingly 20 questionnaires were distributed and gathered up from media service buyers in Addis Ababa and the value of Cronbach’s alpha coefficients that were calculated for both the brand equity dimensions and the overall brand equity items were presented in the table below.
Table 3.1: Reliability test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand associations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall brand equity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall brand equity reliability</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own Survey SPSS result (2017)*

As shown in the table 3.1 above, all the constructs were fulfilled the recommended cutoff point of the alpha, i.e. 0.7, which Cronbach’s Alpha .744 for brand awareness, .860 for brand association, .710 for brand loyalty, .831 for perceived quality and .786 for the overall brand equity. The overall Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for all brand equity items is also .876. To sum up, all the constructs have confirmed as reliable variables that can be taken as an indication of acceptability of the scale for further analysis.

Validity is the extent to which differences found with a measuring instrument to reflect true differences among those being tested, (Kothari, 2004). In other words, Validity is the most critical criterion and indicates the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. In order to ensure the quality of the research design, content and construct validity of the research questionnaire was checked.

According to Kothari (2004), Content validity is the extent to which a measuring instrument provides adequate coverage of the topic under study. If the instrument contains a representative sample of the universe, the content validity is good. Its determination is primarily judgmental and intuitive. It can also be determined by using a panel of persons who shall judge how well the measuring instrument meets the standards, but there is no numerical way to express it.”

Based on this definition, the questionnaire was given both to the experts in the subject matter area of study for comments and to the thesis advisor to look into the appropriateness of the questions and the scales of measurement and accordingly the refinement was made before administering the questionnaire to the respondents in addition to the researcher full engagement and effort.
3.9 Ethical Considerations

To maintain the broadly agreed-upon norms of ethical research, the following issues were carefully considered:

The purpose of the research was clearly communicated to the participants and the TV stations on who is conducting the study, for what purpose and the Participants were asked their voluntary that they have the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without any unfavorable consequences. In addition respondents were promised that all data collected was used only for academic purpose and kept confidential. Furthermore, approval was obtained from the top management of the selected TV channel (stations) under study to gather the necessary primary data and the results of the study was presented without any biasness and the works of scholar cited in the study was properly acknowledged.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

This chapter covers the data analysis and finding part of the study. The data analysis was made with the help of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS v.20). It encompasses both descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of the collected data. The demographic profile of the study respondents, media service buyers’ television channel preference and their media service consumption frequency per a week have been analyzed and presented in this part using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, etc. The results of different inferential statistics like Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression analysis employed to test hypothesis and achieve the study objectives were also presented in this chapter. Eventually, the discussion of the findings is presented in this part.

4.1 Data preparation

To address this research objective, data were collected from media service buyers in Addis Ababa for three television channels (EBC1, EBS and Kana Television). Consequently, the researcher distributed 404 questionnaires and out of these 363 was collected which its response rate accounts for 89.85%. Subsequently, the data collected using the questionnaire were coded for each question, since coding of data is necessary for transferring and editing data in SPSS. In order to make all the collected data suitable for the analysis, all questionnaires were screened to be complete. During the data editing process the questionnaires were checked for errors and all returned incomplete questionnaires were therefore considered as errors. Accordingly, 17 incomplete questionnaires were discarded from the survey data and only 346 fully responded questionnaires were considered in the analysis.

4.2 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

This part tries to elaborate the characteristics of the respondents (media service buyers) in terms of gender, educational status, type of organization respondents working in, respondents’ status in their respective organization, television channel preference and their media service consumption
frequency in a week. Accordingly, the following variables about the respondents were summarized and described in the subsequent part.

Table 4.1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school complete</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first degree</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masters and above</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of organization respondents working in</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising agency</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government organization</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business organization</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non business organization (NGOS)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents level of position in their own organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Expert</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level manager</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top level manager</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owner of the organization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>346</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own survey SPSS Result (2017)*

Table 4.1 shows the information of 346 usable respondents of this research by dividing from gender. Accordingly, from the total respondents, male respondents constituted 61.0 % (211) whereas female respondents constituted the remaining 39.0% (135). That means in this investigation the number of male media service buyers who visited television channel station on behalf of their organization constituted the highest percentage than that of female media service buyers which implies that the majority of media service buyers in Addis Ababa are male.
Education plays an important role in influencing human action, the impulse and motives that sustain and regulate all mental activity and behavior of individual (Bytiqi, 2008). In terms of educational classification the above table 4.1 indicated that, almost all of the respondents’ educational level is above high school complete. Out of the 346 respondents, 56.1% (194) of them were first degree holders, 24.9 % (86) of the respondents were masters and above degree holders, 17.6% (61) of them were diploma holder and the remaining 1.4% (5) of respondents’ responded high school complete. This implies that, the majority of media service buyers who visited those television channel stations to buy media services on behalf of their organization had first degree.

Also, as depicted in table 4.1 above, out of 346 usable respondents, 35.0 % (121) of them were working in other business organization followed by Advertising agency for 28.0 % (97) and the rest of respondents were working in government and non-business organizations (NGOs) constituted 25.1 % (87) and 11.8 % (41) respectively which indicated that, the majority of media service buyers came to buy media services from the television channel station under study were working in other business organization (which may be producers, wholesalers, service providers, retailers, etc).

Furthermore, the table 4.1 above shows that 5.5 % (19) of respondents who visited television channel station to buy media services were responded that they are the owner of the organization, 9.2 % (32) replied top level manager in their respective organization, 27.7% (96) were responded middle level manager and the remaining but which account large percentage 57.5 % (199) were responded they are employee/expert in their concerned organization.
4.2.1 Brand preference of the respondents:

**Figure 4.1: Respondents Brand Preference**

![Bar chart showing brand preferences]

As Figure 4.1 above demonstrates the selection of most usually preferred television channel brand, which generally reflects the current positions in terms of market share in Ethiopia. From the total 346 media services buyer respondents responses indicate that, 52.0% (180) respondents responded that they were usually preferred to buy media services of Ethiopian broadcasting corporation channel one (EBC1) which ranks the first place, whereas EBS was occupied 26.9% (93) which take the second place and subsequently, 21.1% (73) of the participants were usually preferred to buy media services of Kana television which take the third position in this research paper.

*Source: Own survey SPSS Result (2017)*
4.2.2 Media service consumption

Figure 4.2: Media service consumption frequency of the respondents in a week

Regarding media service usage, respondents were asked how frequently they use media service of the television channel that most of the time preferred to buy in a week. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents which make up 28.61% use media services of that television channel under study occasionally followed by more than three days in a week which constituted 24.28%. Those who consume once or twice per week account for 21.10 % and every day in a week make up 17.63 % rank third and fourth position respectively. The remaining 8.38 % of the respondents replied that they used media services only on weekends.

Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)
4.3 Cross tabulation

4.3.1 Media Service Consumption Rate by television channels

The cross tabulation carried out consisting of figure 4.5 that summarizes, analyzes and interprets the media service consumption frequency habit of respondents per week VS their television channel brand preference’s for each television channel under study. Graphically, each television channel under study media service consumption frequency of the respondents was depicted as follows:

Figure 4.3: Media Service Consumption rate of Respondents

Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)
As we can see from figure 4.3 above, among media service buyers usually preferred to buy from EBC1; 17.63% (61) of them consume media services occasionally followed by those who use it once or twice per a week account for 11.27% (39). The remaining respondents who use EBC1 media services for every day in week constituted 9.54% (33), more than three days per a week account for 9.25% (32) and the minimal respondents 4.34% (5) responded that they use only on weekends. On the contrary when we see for EBS, out of media service buyers who usually preferred to buy from this channel, 8.67% (30) of them use more than three days in a week, 7.23% (25) and 5.78(20) of them use media services of EBS once/twice per a week and occasionally respectively. The rest, which account for 3.18% (11) and 2.02% (7) consume this television channel media service every day in a week and only weekend respectively. On the other hand, among media service buyer respondents most of the time preferred to buy media services from Kana television, 6.07% (21) use more than three days per a week, whereas of those who consume this television channel either every day in a week or occasionally together constituted 10.40% (36). The remaining 2.60% (9) and 2.02% (7) utilized Kana Television media services once or twice per a week and only weekend respectively.

4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Brand Equity Dimensions

In order to compare the respondents brand equity, descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation was used. The mean indicates to what extent the sample group averagely agrees or disagrees with the different statements of the constructs used in this study, where as the standard deviation describes how the responses are diverse from the mean for a given construct. The higher the mean, the more the respondents agree with the statement while the lower the mean the more the respondents disagree with the statement.

As a measurement of brand equity dimension, Table 4.2 to Table 4.6 presents the items from brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, perceived quality and overall brand equity. Subsequently the comparison of the four brand equity dimensions descriptive mean score and standard deviation is presented in table 4.7. All parts of the dimensions are processed, analyzed and interpreted in order to achieve the desired result as follows.
4.4.1 Brand Awareness
According to Keller (2003,p.76) brand awareness is “the customers’ ability to recall and recognize the brand as reflected by their ability to identify the brand under different conditions and to link the brand name, logo, symbol, and so forth to certain associations in memory.” Accordingly, the respondents were asked 5 questions related to brand awareness. The Table 4.2 below presents respondents result of brand awareness with mean and standard deviation values for each item.

Table 4.2: Brand Awareness Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items measuring brand awareness</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know the logo or symbol of the ‘x’ television channel.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognize the brand of ‘x’ television channel quickly, among other competing brands.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of the ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I think of television channels to buy media services, brand ‘X’ television channel comes first in to my mind.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the brand of ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand awareness</strong></td>
<td>346</td>
<td><strong>4.0821</strong></td>
<td>.61458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)*

As it can be seen from table 4.2 above, the mean value of brand awareness is 4.082 and the highest mean score is obtained for the item “I know the logo or symbol of the ‘x’ television channel” with a mean score of 4.45 which show that the majority of the respondents almost strongly agree that they know the logo or symbol of the television channel’s media services they buy While the item "I am familiar with the brand of ‘X’ television channel" scored the lowest with a mean score of 3.60.

4.4.2 Brand Associations
Brand association consists of “all brand related thoughts, feelings, perceptions, images, experiences, beliefs, attitudes and is anything linked in memory to a brand (Kotler and Keller 2006, p.188). Hence, 4 items related to brand association asked to the respondents. Table 4.3 shows the analysis about brand association mean and standard deviation.
Table 4.3: Brand Association Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items measuring brand associations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ‘X’ television channel has a very unique brand image compared to other competing television channels brand.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the company, which makes the brand of ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I associate and admire people who buy media service of ‘X’ television channel</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the ‘X’ television channel is contributing to the society</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.693</td>
<td>.61762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (list wise) 346

Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)

As shown in Table 4.3, the mean value of brand association is 3.69 that they have slightly agreed with the constructs and the respondents scored the highest mean value relatively for the item “I believe that the ‘X’ television channel is contributing to the society” with a mean score of 3.93 whereas the lowest obtained from the item which states “I trust the company, which makes the brand of ‘X’ television channel” with mean score of 3.53. This implies that although the respondents have a good level of association with their chosen television channel brand, their association doesn't go to the level of personal attachment.

4.4.3 Brand loyalty

Loyalty is a core dimension of brand equity. Aaker (1991, p.39) defines brand loyalty as “the attachment that a customer has with a brand.” Based on this definition 4 item related to brand loyalty was raised to the respondents to be answered. The subsequent table 4.4 shows the outcome to these questions with mean score and standard deviation.
Table 4.4: Brand Loyalty Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items measuring brand loyalty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be loyal to brand ‘x’ television channel.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still willing to buy media services of ‘X’ television Channel even if its price is a little higher than that of its competitor.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will keep on buying brand &quot;X&quot; television channel as long as its offering satisfies me.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to recommend the ‘x’ television channel media services to my friends.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand loyalty</strong></td>
<td>346</td>
<td><strong>3.5788</strong></td>
<td>.64080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)*

As depicted in Table 4.4 above, the mean value of brand loyalty is 3.578 and the item state that “I will keep on buying brand "X" television channel media services as long as its offering satisfies me” scored the highest among the list of items related to brand loyalty with a mean score of 4.08 while the respondents gave the least score of 3.18 to the item “I would like to recommend the ‘x’ television channel media services to my friends.” This clearly indicates that even though the respondents see themselves as relatively loyal customers, they are seldom to recommend those television channel media services to their friends.

### 4.4.4 Perceived Quality

Perceived quality is the customer’s judgment about a product’s overall excellence or superiority that is different from objective quality (Aaker, 1996). Since it’s impossible for consumers to make complete and correct judgments of the objective quality, they use quality attributes that they associate with quality (Zeithaml, 1988). With this idea, 4 items related to perceived quality were raised to the respondents and the results of the Mean score and the Standard deviation analysis is displayed in table 4.5 below.
Table 4.5: Perceived Quality analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items measuring perceived quality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I trust the quality of media services from brand ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media services from the ‘X’ television channel would be of very good quality.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think brand ‘x’ television Chanel has a reputation of high quality in delivering media services.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand ‘X’ television channel offers reliable media services.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>346</td>
<td><strong>3.5824</strong></td>
<td>.75929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)

As illustrated in Table 4.5, all of the items used to measure Perceived quality scored relatively well with an overall mean score of 3.58. The respondents also gave relatively the highest mean score to “I trust the quality of media services from brand ‘X’ television channel” with a mean score of 3.75 while they gave a low mean score of 3.43 to the item "I think brand ‘x’ television Chanel has a reputation of high quality." The results indicate that the respondents have good level of perceived quality towards their television channel media service brand choice.

4.4.5 Overall Brand Equity

In order to test the respondents overall brand equity, four items were asked to the respondents to answer. Table 4.6 shows the Mean score and Standard deviation analysis regarding the overall brand equity of the respondents.

Table 4.6: Overall Brand Equity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items measuring overall brand equity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If there is another brand as good as this brand, I would prefer to buy media services of the ‘X’ television channel brand</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if another brand has the same feature as this brand, I would prefer to buy media services of the ‘X’ television channel brand</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is another brand has same price as this brand, I prefer to buy media services from the ‘X’ television channel brand.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have to choose among brands of television channels, the ‘X’ television channel brand is definitely my choice.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall brand equity</td>
<td>346</td>
<td><strong>3.6395</strong></td>
<td>.76771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)
As can be seen from table 4.6, the mean value of overall brand equity is 3.64 and the respondents gave a low mean score of 3.52 to the item "Even if another brand has the same feature as this brand, I would prefer to buy media services of the ‘X’ television channel brand " implying that they have a limit to the emotional attachment that they have with their choice of television channel brand. The respondents also gave a relatively higher mean score to the item “If I have to choose among brands of television channels, the ‘X’ television channel brand is definitely my choice” with the mean score of 3.77 which means that even though they have a limit on the emotional attachment, they would not want to replace their chosen brand with others.

4.4.6 Comparison of Brand Equity Dimensions Descriptive Mean Score

In this section, each element of brand equity results from the respondents was compared to show brand equity for media service buyer’s perception of the selected television channel brand under study in Addis Ababa. In summary the mean and standard deviation of each brand equity dimension is presented (see table 4.7 below)

Table 4.7: summarizes the Mean score and Standard deviation results of the four determinants of brand equity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Equity dimensions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4.0821</td>
<td>.61458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.6973</td>
<td>.61762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.5788</td>
<td>.64080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3.5824</td>
<td>.75929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)

As described in table 4.7, the brand equity dimension with the highest mean score is brand awareness with a mean value of 4.082; followed by brand association 3.697, brand loyalty 3.578 and finally perceived quality 3.582 respectively, which indicate that the respondents show somehow an agreement to the questions raised during the survey and have positive perception of the television channel media services they consume. On the other hand, high standard deviation is scored for perceived quality followed by brand loyalty among the entire dimensions implying
that the data is slightly wide spread from the mean. That means the respondents have relatively diverse perception, whereas lower standard deviation is obtained relatively from brand awareness and brand association indicating that the respondents’ perception has matched in their responses.

### 4.5 Correlation Analysis

To meet this research objective, the researcher conducted correlation analysis because Correlation analysis helps the researcher to investigate the direction and strength of relationships between the dimensions of brand equity and customer-based brand equity (overall brand equity) of the television channel brands in Addis Ababa. Correlation coefficients take values between -1 and 1 ranging from being negatively correlated (-1) to not correlated (0) to positively correlated (+1). Hence, to determine the existence and level of association, Pearson correlation analysis was made to provide evidence of convergent validity. Pearson correlation coefficients reveal the magnitude and direction of relationships (either positive or negative) of the relationship (-1.0 to 1.0). It is also used to rank the variables that have the strongest influence on the overall customer-based brand equity with regard to media service buyers of the television channel brands under study because Correlations are perhaps the most basic and most useful measure of association between two or more variables (Marczyk, Dematteo & Festinger, 2005).

In order to interpret the strengths of relationships between variables, the guidelines suggested by Field (2005) were followed for simplicity. Field’s (2005) classification of the correlation coefficient(r) is as follows: correlation of 0.1-0.29 is considered weak; a correlation of 0.3-0.49 is considered moderate; and correlation of greater than 0.5 is considered as strong. Based on these assumptions, all basic constructs were included in the correlation analysis and a bivariate a two-tailed test of statistical significance at the level of 95% significance, p<0.05 correlation analysis was made. Table 4.8 below indicates the relationship between each brand equity dimension and the overall customer-based brand equity of the television channels under study in Addis Ababa.
### Table 4.8: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brand awareness</th>
<th>Brand association</th>
<th>Brand loyalty</th>
<th>Perceived quality</th>
<th>overall brand equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand awareness</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand association</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand loyalty</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived quality</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.267**</td>
<td>.585**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>overall brand equity</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.113*</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>.431**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

*Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)*

Table 4.8 above illustrates the correlation coefficients of the four factors considered to measuring customer based brand equity were positively related to the overall brand equity within the range of 0.113 to 0.527 and except brand awareness all of them were even significant at $p<0.01$ level. The result indicates that there is a weak positive significant correlation between Brand Awareness and overall brand equity ($r=0.113, p=0.036 <0.05$) while brand association and perceived quality show a moderate positive significant relationship with the overall brand equity ($r=0.423, p.000<0.01$ and $r=0.431, p.000< 0.01$) respectively. According to the above Pearson correlation coefficient result among the four dimensions of brand equity used in this paper, there is a strong positive significant relationship between Brand Loyalty and the overall brand equity ($r= 0.527, p.000<0.01$). In general, it is possible to deduce that the relationship between the brand equity dimensions and the overall brand equity is statistically significant.
Table 4.8 also showed the correlation of the independent variables within themselves. It can be noted that all variables are positively correlated with each other. Amongst the correlation between Brand association and Perceived quality (p= 0.585) is relatively the strongest one while the correlation is small between Brand Awareness and Brand Association, brand awareness and brand loyalty and brand awareness and perceived quality (p= 0.263,0.204 and 0.267) respectively, whereas the correlation is moderate between brand association and brand loyalty and brand loyalty and perceived quality (P=0.532 and 0.446) respectively. Thus, the relations that exist between the dimensions of brand equity might affect brand equity by influencing each other.

4.6 Model assumptions

4.6.1 Normality Test

Shukla (2009) stated that skewness and Kurtosis test, the low difference between mean and median is the basic ways to check the normality of the data. (Shukla, 2009) positive skewness values suggest clustering of data points on the low value (left hand side of the bell curve) and negative skewness values suggest clustering of data points on the high values (right hand side of the bell curve). The data in the study suggest the response is clustering of the high values (right hand side of the bell curve) .Positive kurtosis value suggests that the data points have peaked at (gathered in the center) with long thin tails. The data set is of a thin bell shape value. Kurtosis below zero (0) suggests that the distribution of data points is relatively flat (Shukla, 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Std. Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-1.019</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.576</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-.552</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall brand equity</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-.633</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Yi (1988) one of the first thing that should be taken care of before proceeding into the main part of the analysis, is to check whether the data are normally distributed or not. For this checking, Yi (1988) suggests that, the standardized skewness distribution result and Kurtosis result must be between the ranges of $\pm 2.58$. According to the above table, both the standardized skewness and kurtosis results fall in the given range. So this was a good signal to start with the subsequent analyses since the data are normally distributed (see the detail graphical presentation in Appendix).

### 4.6.2 Multi co linearity Assumption

Multi-co linearity refers to the situation in which the independent variables are highly correlated. When the independent variables are multi-co linearity, there is overlap or sharing of predictive power (Dillon, 1993). When the predictor variables are correlated among themselves, the unique contribution of each predictor variable is difficult to assess. This is because of the overlapped or shared variance between the predictor variables, i.e., they are multi-collinear.

Thus, the researcher of this paper believed that, it is important to check for the multi-co linearity in regression. One way of doing this is to check the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) and the Tolerance Values. This would help in identifying any possible problems with multi-co linearity even when the problem is not evident in the correlation matrix. According to Pallant (2005), the VIF values above 10 and tolerance value below 0.10 indicate multi-co linearity. Hence, both the “tolerance” values (greater than 0.10) and the “VIF” values (less than 10) are all quite acceptable.

Regarding this study the tolerance value ranges from 0.559 to 0.909 and the values of VIF for all the independent variables are below 2 showing no indications of multi-co linearity (see table 4.10 below).
Table 4.10: Multi-Co-linearity Statistics Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Co linearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: overall brand equity

4.7 Regression Analysis

Regressions fit a predictive model to data and use the model to foresee the value of the dependent variable from one or more independent variables (Andy, 2005). Hence, in order to see the contribution of factors that shape the customer based brand equity in the television channels brand with respect to media service buyers perception, multiple linear regression analysis was employed. Multiple Linear regression estimates the coefficient of the linear equation, involving one or more independent variables that best predict the value of the dependent variables. Overall brand equity was used as the dependent variable while the underlying four dimensions of brand equity (brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived quality) were used as the independent variables in this project. Thus, the regression analysis has been made to measure the variables that explain the variance in the overall brand equity and its results has been shown in the subsequent tables.
Table 4.11: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.63021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Perceived quality, Brand awareness, Brand loyalty, Brand association

Source: Own survey SPSS result (2017)

The regression model summary presents the correlation of brand equity dimensions (independent variables) with overall brand equity (dependent variables) is .578 and R² value .334 that indicated how much of the variance in the measure of brand equity of media service buyer customers is explained by the underlying four dimensions of the Customer Based Brand Equity.

Accordingly, 33.4% (R² = .334) of variance in respondents’ perception of the television channel brand in Addis Ababa was explained by the four independent variables (brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived quality) together whereas the remaining 66.6% variations is influenced by other variables not considered in this project. This shows that there are other variables which can influence the overall customer-based brand equity of television channels brands in Addis Ababa which are out of this model.

Table 4.12: Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Un standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>3.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand awareness</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand association</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand loyalty</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived quality</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: overall brand equity

Source: own survey SPSS result (2017)

The result of regression analysis on the three independent variables (brand associations, brand loyalty and perceived quality) with the dependent variable (overall brand equity) indicates the
existence of positive contribution to CBBE where as the outcome of brand awareness shows negative and statistically insignificant effect on dependent variable.

As stated earlier, this study aims to identify the most contributing, independent variable in the prediction of the dependent variable. Thus, the strength of each predictor (independent variable) influencing the criterion (dependent variable) can be investigated via standardized Beta coefficient. The regression coefficient explains the average amount of change in the dependent variable that is caused by a unit change in the independent variable. The independent variable that has the larger value of Beta coefficient brings more support to the independent variable as it is more important determinant in predicting the dependent variable.

Therefore, the result of the regression analysis showed that all the dimensions of brand equity not equally contribute to the customer based brand equity in the study area. The study result indicated that among the four brand equity dimensions, brand loyalty is the first with the a beta value of 0.386 followed by perceived quality with a beta value of 0.209, brand association with a beta value of 0.109 and brand awareness with a beta value of -0.50.

Brand loyalty and perceived quality are statistically significant and their respective standardized coefficient (beta value) that showed their contribution to the overall brand equity is positive. But the variable brand association is statistically insignificant irrespective of its beta value, whereas brand awareness contributed to customer based brand equity negatively but statistically insignificant.

In general, when we see the extent to which each independent variable influences the dependent variable, the result of the regression analysis showed the priority area of building the customer-based brand equity of the television channel brand with regard to the media service buyers’ perceptions. It also revealed that not all the brand equity dimensions contribute equally to the brand equity perception of media service buyers for the studied television channels brands.
According to figure above, the study indicated that among the four brand equity dimensions, brand loyalty is the first positively related and significantly contributing to customer based brand equity with the largest β value of .386 followed by perceived quality with the β value of .209 and brand associations with the β value of .109 and finally brand awareness with the β -.050. In this study the author found that brand awareness is not as a significant factor which place effect on CBBE. Frequently endorsing a well-known TV channels brand may create a negative influencing, due to the annoying from redundancy for audiences. That is, brand awareness is bringing a negative consequence up on the value of brand equity in the Addis Ababa based television broadcasting media market. Here, brand awareness has an inverse relationship with brand equity in the media market of Addis Ababa which has a consistent with the work of (Xiao Tong, 2009; Wasihun, 2014) in other industry, they come up with the same conclusion.

Therefore, superior performance on the most important dimension (brand loyalty) may be helpful in building strong customer-based brand equity followed by that of perceived quality and brand association in this study area. Hence, media marketing managers need to build their media brand equity by investing on brand loyalty first and perceived quality second than brand associations and brand awareness which contribute less to media service buyers over all brand equity.
4.8 Validating the proposed Hypothesis

Table 4.13: Hypothesis Testing Based on Multiple regressions Analysis Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1a:</strong> Brand awareness has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.</td>
<td><strong>Rejected</strong></td>
<td>$\beta = -0.050, p&gt;0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2a:</strong> Brand association has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.</td>
<td><strong>Rejected</strong></td>
<td>$\beta = 0.109, p&gt;0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3a:</strong> Brand loyalty has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong></td>
<td>$\beta = 0.386, p&lt;0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4a:</strong> Perceived quality has a positive relationship with customer based brand equity for television channels.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong></td>
<td>$\beta = 0.209, p&lt;0.05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: own survey result (2017)*

As hypothesized in literature review except brand awareness ($H1a$) and brand association ($H2a$), brand loyalty ($H3a$) and perceived quality ($H4a$) have significant positive effect on customer based brand equity. As it can be seen from table 4.12, brand loyalty (0,000) and perceived quality (0,000) were significant at p-value $<0.05$ whereas brand awareness (0.279) and brand association (0.067) were not significant at p-value $<0.05$. Hence, the first two hypotheses were rejected whereas the last two hypothesis were accepted.

The findings of the study gave support for brand loyalty and perceived quality dimensions to have a positive and significant influence on the overall brand equity of television channel brands while the influence of brand association and brand awareness was found to be insignificant.

The influence of brand loyalty was the stronger one among the brand equity dimensions in the determination of brand equity followed by perceived quality in the Addis Ababa based television broadcasting media market.

Moreover, according to regression coefficient (beta), brand loyalty is at the first place of importance for dimensions of brand equity on brand equity, perceived quality ranks the second
place, brand association and brand awareness are at third and the last place respectively. Within this finding, the researcher suggest that marketers or brand managers of TV channels should put their efforts on brand loyalty and perceived quality since both dimensions have positive and strong significance level in brand equity building.

4.9 Discussion of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to measure customer based brand equity of selected television channels in Addis Ababa using Aaker’s brand equity model.

The first question asked to media service buyer respondents was about their demographic profile. Based on the collected data analysis, 61.0% of the total respondents are male and the rest 39.0% are females. This showed that the male is the dominant media service buyers in the Addis Ababa based television channels studied in this project.

The second question asked to respondents showed that most of the media service buyers of the sample of this study had a first degree account for 56.07% and the majority of the respondents which account for 34.97% were working in business organization followed by Ad agency for 28.03%. Among the all respondents, 57.5% of them were employed/experts in the organization they working for.

The fifth parameter tried to assess the television media services that media services buyers usually preferred to buy, and according to the finding 52.0% of the respondents responded that they usually preferred to buy media services from EBC1 and with respect to media service consumption frequency habit per week, large percentages (28.6%) of them use media services occasionally.

From the descriptive mean result the highest mean value was scored by brand awareness with a mean value of 4.082, followed by brand association 3.697, brand loyalty 3.578 and finally perceived quality 3.582 respectively, which indicates that the respondents show somehow an agreement to the questions raised during the survey and they have a positive perception of the television channel media services they consume.

The finding from the correlation result reveals that, there is a positive and significant relationship between the brand equity dimensions and the overall brand equity that goes with the work of
Bezawit’s (2014) she came to a conclusion that all brand equity dimensions positively related to brand equity after conducted research on the CBBE measurement of Ethiopian Airlines. Amongst the results showed that brand loyalty is the superior factor considered in consumer setting preference which supports the idea proposed by Aaker (1991) brand loyalty is the core face across CBBE frame work.

Perceived quality is the next factor following to brand loyalty for media service buyers in choosing television channels. After quality of media services is accepted by media service buyers, brand association is considered subsequently. When customers satisfied with the service, they will tell others about which people associate their satisfaction of media services with those television channels.

Multiple regression analysis of this study identified that the three dimensions (brand loyalty, brand association and perceived quality) have a positive influence on the overall brand equity though their contribution magnitude is not the same. The contribution of brand loyalty was found to be great at predicting the overall brand equity followed by perceived quality, which goes to the work of Abad (2012) who found that brand loyalty and perceived quality have a positive and significant effect on the overall brand equity. He found out that Perceived quality, brand loyalty, brand awareness and brand association are influential criteria of brand equity that enhances the perception of a brand in the financial service sector. The finding also showed that brand awareness contribute or predict the overall brand equity negatively but insignificant which is related to the work of Beidmariam (2014) that all the dimensions were positively contributing to the overall brand equity except for brand awareness according to his findings obtained from studies conducted on measuring CBBE in the Ethiopian beer Industry.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCULUSION AND RECOMMENDATION
This chapter first presented summary of the findings, then conclusion and recommendations of the study and finally limitations and Suggestions for future research area.

5.1 Summary of Findings
The primary objective of this study was to measure customer-based brand equity of selected television channels in Addis Ababa by using Aaker’s Customer-based brand equity model with respect to media service buyers’ perception. The introduction of the new television channel in the Ethiopian media market makes it important to analyze Aaker’s customer based brand equity model to have large market share. On the basis of these objectives the study considered four determinants of brand equity to understand factors affecting the overall CBBE and investigate the perception of media service buyers toward the brand. This research also, examined the relationships that exist between the four dimensions of brand equity (brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived quality) with the overall brand equity of the study area.
In addition, this study also tried to answer the four research hypothesis formulated in chapter two of this study. To this end the researcher considered quantitative research design and convenience sampling technique to collect data from 404 sample size of media service buyers. Based on the theoretical frame work and objectives of the study 21 items were provided in a 5 point Likert scale to the respondents. The gathered data was analyzed by using both descriptive statistics (like mean, frequency, percentage) and inferential statistics (correlation and multiple linear regressions) via SPSS version 20.

The results of descriptive analysis showed, the mean value of all dimensions is above 3.57 manifesting the respondents have a positive attitude towards the studied television channel brand.

As to the finding of Pearson's Correlation analysis, the four independent variables considered in this study had a positive correlation with overall brand equity. The Pearson coefficients indicated that the variables have different magnitudes of correlation with the dependent variable. Accordingly, Brand Loyalty has a strong positive correlation ($r=0.527$, $p<0.01$) followed by Perceived Quality and brand association which had got moderate correlation ($r=0.341$, $p<0.01$).
and $r=0.423$, $p<0.01$) with the overall brand equity whereas Brand Awareness had a small magnitude of correlation($r=0.113$, $p<0.05$). The study also revealed the existence of a positive inter-correlation between the brand equity dimensions considered in this inquiry, which might affect the customer-based brand equity of those television channels by influencing one another.

At the beginning, it was hypothesized that all the four determinants of CBBE had a positive association with the overall brand equity of the customers. After the analysis was done using Pearson correlation, the findings revealed that all the dimensions of brand equity considered in this study were positively correlated with overall brand equity that the researcher was accepted the hypothesis drawn.

One of the objectives of this study was to find out which dimension was the most significant in determining the customer-based brand equity in the Addis Ababa based television channel media service market with respect to media service buyers’ perception and the results of multiple linear regression analysis revealed that Brand loyalty, Perceived Quality and Brand Association were identified as having positive influence on the overall brand Equity of the respondents except brand awareness that influence customer based brand equity negatively but in significant. The contribution of brand loyalty was found to be the most important in building brand equity followed by Perceived Quality.

5.2 Conclusion

Brand equity is one of the significant concepts in brand management, as well as in business practice and academic research. It can help brand markers and managers to create differentiation from their competitors in order to gain the competitive advantage in the market. Especially, in a high competitive media market in Ethiopia, brand equity plays an essential role that affects developing business for a brand company.

Based on the analysis made, the following conclusions were drawn: According to the correlation analysis result, the brand equity determinants (brand association, brand awareness, brand loyalty and perceived quality) considered in this study have a positive relationship with the CBBE, which implies that media service buyers have a positive attitude towards the television channels studied. The result also identified, there is also a positive inter-correlations among the four brand equity dimensions which implies strong and positive inter relationship between brand equity dimensions brings competitively attractive and distinct brand position which could create
a favorable feeling and behavior towards the brand and leads to strong television channel brand. Hence, all brand equity dimensions have to be considered in the brand equity building strategy in the study area.

The results of multiple regression analysis depicted, different brand equity dimensions considered in this study also contributes to the overall brand equity in different ways and that a priority must exist among the four dimensions because marketers or brand managers of those television channels often have limited resources (e.g. Money, time and manpower) to implement branding strategies. Thus, this finding can help them to prioritize and allocate resources across the dimensions accordingly.

Among the brand equity dimensions considered in this study, Brand loyalty demonstrates the strong contribution to the overall brand equity, indicating attention should be given primarily to this dimension while to build brand equity in the study area. In addition the results showed that, perceived quality is the next important brand equity dimension in building CBBE preceding to brand loyalty. From this we can deduce that, there should be a priority among the brand equity dimension considered in this study while needing to implement branding strategy for those television channels with respect to media service buyers’ perception.

### 5.3 Recommendations

Depending on the findings of the study and the conclusions made, the following possible recommendations were forwarded for the concerned body:

- To increase brand loyalty, those television channels should adopt customer loyalty programs that can be enhanced through meeting customers’ desired service level, dealing effectively with dissatisfied customers, taking customer complaints positively as an input for future improvements and recognizing loyal customers and providing them with very attractive rewards as for their loyalty.

- Furthermore, to increase customer loyalty and retention, as well as to manage their interaction with current and future media service buyers, those television channels should have to apply CRM system. Customer-oriented service centers should be organized to provide a one-to-one solution to customers’ requirements. Marketers or brand managers should use Calendar alerts, holiday best wishes and email notifications to promote a
friendly relationship with the media service buyers. Especially since ad agencies act as agents for so many other businesses and non-business organizations, these techniques will be crucial in strengthening their relationship with those media service buyers.

- The television channels brand managers and marketers should tell their media service buyers what makes their media service different from other television. They need to provide consistent, proactive and informative information about their brand services to the media service buyers as well as their audiences. They should provide valuable contents that are meaningful to their target audiences and media service buyers by using social media such as YouTube channels, Face Book Pages and Blogs in addition to the medium they have at hand. They have to empower their marketing staff members to spontaneously create and maintain relationships with their media service buyers.

- Since trustworthiness of the TV channel is crucial in building customer relationship and developing brand equity, the TV channels have to provide value to their audiences and media service buyers. They have to optimize their program contents by making them attractive, comprehensive and convincing to ensure credibility of their brand and to foster engagement of media service buyers.

- The studied television channels station should use affiliate marketing strategy to extend the association and the image of their brand keeping the linkage credible. They can benefit from opportunities like sponsoring of programs, sports teams, arts, cultural events, social advertisements and charitable activities that enhance the positive association of the brand to the society as well as media service buyers.

- Since the real power of a brand exists in the mind of customer, the television channels have to always capture and analyze the media service buyers’ feedback. This will make the media service buyers to perceive their opinions and feelings are acknowledged as being important. The formal customer feedback arrangement will help the media service buyers to realize that their TV channel brand is interested in improving and enhancing their business relationship and it will raise the customers’ top of mind and brand dominance.
The television channel brand managers or marketers have to develop attractive jingles, entry tunes and logos to make their brands more unique and promote it using techniques like self-promotion and posters.

5.4 Limitations and Suggestion for future research

The major limitation of the study was that of the sampling area. This study was planned to gather the required first-hand information from the representatives of the targeted population of the study only limited to Addis Ababa. Therefore, the results only represent the behavior, attitude and perception of media service buyers from Addis Ababa; it may not precisely indicate the Ethiopian media service buyers’ market in general. Because, Ethiopia is a big country, different cities and different region have many different behaviors, attitudes and culture. Hence, further research need to take more respondents from different cities in order to make the findings precisely indicate the Ethiopian media service buyers’ market.

Moreover, due to the limited scope of the study, this paper has focused on measuring customer-based brand equity of only the actual media service buyers on selected television channels in Addis Ababa. It would be useful to brand managers to know what potential media service buyers think about their brands so that they can formulate their marketing strategy accordingly. However, this study is still beneficial because it provides an insight for media owners and managers under study about media service buyers where their perception or reaction is not good with factors determining CBBE and in turn to take response strategies which will be worth contributing to the success of their business. Further research needs to be conducted by considering the potential media service buyers in addition to the actual media service buyers.

Eventually, since the study was only limited to selected TV channels, of other media channels like radios, print media, and internet brand equity; the generalization of the finding and recommendation generated may not be working for the whole media vehicles available in the country. Thus, other research should be done to examine brand equity across different media channels.
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Appendix
Dear respondents:

My name is Tesfaye Akuma, a graduate candidate at the Addis Ababa University School of Commerce and currently, I am conducting my thesis entitled “Measuring Customer Based Brand Equity of Selected Television Channels In Addis Ababa: The Media Service Buyer’s Perspectives” as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the completion of my Master’s Degree in Marketing Management.

This questionnaire is designed and given to you aiming to find out the sources of brand equity in the television broadcasting channels in Addis Ababa based media service buyers’ perception. The main reason you are chosen as a respondent for the study is that given your frequent media service consumption habit, your inputs are believed to be helpful in drawing valid conclusions on the source of customer based brand equity of Television channel.

Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time. If you choose to participate in this research, please take a few minutes of your time to answer this entire questionnaire honestly about your personal perception, feeling and attitude with regard to the selected television channels brands in Addis Ababa. I really appreciate your willingness and cooperation in giving genuine information for this questionnaire and I hereby declare and promise you that the information you provide will be kept confidential and only used for academic purpose. Thank you in advance for your utmost cooperation.

Instruction:

- No need of writing your or yours organization name.
- Please put tick mark (✓) in front of your choice box that express yourself for part one and two of the questionnaire.
- Please circle the number which reflects your agreement or disagreement among the five rating alternatives given for each sentences in part three of this survey questionnaire.
- Please give more attention and return the entirely completed questionnaires promptly.
Part I: Demographic and General information of Respondents

1. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Education background: High school complete ☐ Diploma ☐ First degree ☐
   Master and above ☐

3. Type of the organization you are working in:
   Advertising agency ☐ Government organization ☐ Non-business organization (NGOs) ☐
   Business organization (producers, wholesalers, service providers, retailers, etc) ☐

4. Your position (status) in the organization:
   Employee/expert ☐ Top level manager ☐
   Middle level manager ☐ Owner of the organization ☐

Part 2: Basic information with respect to television channel media services consumption

5. Which Television channel media services do you usually prefer buy?
   Ethiopian broadcasting corporation (EBC1) ☐ Ethiopian broadcasting services (EBS) ☐
   Kana Television ☐

6. How many times in a week do you use the media services of the television channel you have chosen in question No.5 above?
   Every Day in a week ☐ More than Three days in a week ☐
   Once or Twice per week ☐ only on weekends ☐
   Occasionally ☐

Part 3: Basic research questions on Brand equity and multi-dimensional brand equity scales

The statements below are designed so that they give information on which factors affect Customer-Based Brand Equity of those selected Television channels brand under study.

Note1: Please note that, the statements drawn (X) are referring to represent the television channel you have already chosen under question No.5 above.

Note2: Please circle the number which reflects your level of perception in the table for each of the sentences stated in the box below keeping in mind the Television channel brand you have selected that best describe your level of agreement or disagreement among the five alternatives
given where :1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree and 5= Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Measuring Brand equity dimensions</th>
<th>Rating scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Awareness (BAW)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAw1</strong> I know the logo or symbol of the ‘X’ Television channel.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAw2</strong> I can recognize the brand of ‘x’ television channel quickly among other competing brands.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAw3</strong> I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of the ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAw4</strong> When I think of television channels to buy media services, brand ‘X’ television channel comes first in my mind.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAw5</strong> I am familiar with the brand of ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Associations (BAS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAs1</strong> The ‘X’ television channel has a very unique brand image compared to other competing television channels brand.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAs2</strong> I trust the company, which makes the brand of ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAs3</strong> I associate and admire people who buy media service of ‘X’ television channel.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAs4</strong> I believe that the ‘X’ television channel is contributing to the society.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Loyalty (BL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BL1</strong> I consider myself to be loyal to the brand of ‘X’ television Channel.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BL2 | I am still willing to buy media services of ‘X’ television Channel even if its price is a little higher than that of its competitor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
---|---|---|---|---|---
BL3 | I will keep on buying brand "X" television channel as long as its offering satisfies me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
BL4 | I would like to recommend the ‘x’ television channel media services to my friends. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Perceived Quality (PQ)**

| PQ1 | I trust the quality of media services from brand ‘X’ television channel. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| PQ2 | Media services from the ‘X’ television channel would be of very good quality. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| PQ3 | I think brand ‘X’ television channel has a reputation of high quality in delivering media services. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| PQ4 | Brand ‘X’ television channel offers reliable media services. |

**Over all Brand Equity (OBE)**

| OBE1 | If there is another brand as good as this brand, I would prefer to buy media services of the ‘X’ television channel brand. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| OBE2 | Even if another brand has the same feature as this brand, I would prefer to buy media services of the ‘X’ television channel brand. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| OBE3 | If there is another brand has same price as this brand, I prefer to buy media services from the ‘X’ television channel brand. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| OBE4 | If I have to choose among brands of television channels, the ‘X’ television channel brand is definitely my choice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Thank You for Your Kind Response and Cooperation**
Collinearity assumption
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Dependent Variable: overall brand equity
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