International Journal of Business & Law Research 6(2):9-19, April-June, 2018

 www.seahipaj.org ISSN: 2360-8986

Corporate Branding and Marketing Success of Quick Service Restaurants

[1]Ateke, Brown Walter & [2]Nwulu, Chinyere Stella

[1]Department of Marketing, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Email: brown.ateke@ust.edu.ng

[2]Department of Marketing, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

ABSTRACT
Product differentiation is proving increasingly difficult while consumers have become overly enlightened. The achievement of sustainable marketing success has thus become more challenging for firms now than ever before. However, to achieve and maintain sustained competitiveness, firms must distinguish their offerings from those of competitors. Corporate branding is the strategy firms are increasingly adopting to achieve this goal. The purpose of the current study thus, was to investigate the nexus between corporate branding and marketing success of QSRs. The study treated corporate branding unidimensionally and assessed marketing success in terms of brand awareness, brand preference and new product success. Data collected from three hundred and thirty-five (335) respondents consisting of patrons of QSRs through questionnaire was utilized in the final analyses. The P(r) served as the test statistic, relying on SPSS version 20.0. The study found that corporate branding and marketing success have positive and statistically significant association; as all the measures of marketing success covered in the study were found to be influenced by corporate branding. The study therefore conclude that corporate branding and marketing success are strongly correlated and recommends that QSRs that seek improved brand awareness, brand preference and new product success should engage in corporate branding.
Keywords: Brand awareness, brand preference, corporate branding, marketing success, new product success

INTRODUCTION
The intensity of competition in the business-scape is on the increase. The customership is getting increasingly more knowledgeable and conveniently compares offerings of competing brands. As globalisation intensifies and international brands come into direct competition with national brands, the competition to stand out in the business-scape can only get fiercer. Firms thus rely on corporate branding to achieve marketing success. Corporate branding represent the activities and programmes undertaken by the firm to ensure a good position or reputation for its brand by building relationships with stakeholders through the establishment of effective internal and external communications (Mohammad, 2017). It is the "systematic process implemented by organizations to create favourable brand image and maintain brand reputation through interaction with internal and external stakeholders" (Chang, Chiang & Han, 2009) in the process of adding value to products provided by the company (Khan, Rasheed, Islam, Ahmed, & Rizwan, 2016).
Marketing scholars are increasingly giving attention to corporate branding as consumers become more knowledgeable about products and companies (Sallam, 2016); and product differentiation become increasingly difficult in the contemporary business-scape. Firms on their part are turning to their own identity as a way of building brand essence (Richard, 2010). Corporate brands symbolize corporate identity and deal with multiple stakeholders. They serve as compass to different stakeholders and for

different purposes, such as evaluating employers, investment and buying behaviour of consumers (Balmer & Greyser, 2003).

Marketing success in terms of brand awareness, securing long-term preferences of consumers, new product success, as well as generating cash flows, and maximizing returns for shareholders (Doyle, 2000) is the cardinal objective of every business organisation. However, these are not achieved as much as firms expect. Efforts at proffering solutions to business problems sometimes bring ephemeral success, and other times, plunge firms into further uncertainties. Several scholarly efforts have been expended over the decades, to link branding to various aspects of marketing success of firms. Ateke and Akani (2018) examined the link between brand positioning and marketing wellness while Ateke and Nwulu (2017) studied the nexus between brand value and marketing wellness. Hsu, Wang, and Chen (2013) investigated the impact of brand value on financial performance. Relatedly, Shahri (2011) investigated the effectiveness of corporate branding strategy in multi-business companies while Yeung and Ramasamy (2008) probed the nexus between brand value and company performance. However, these studies offer little succour to firms in this part of the world owing to disparities in economic conditions and other factors that may be peculiar to the operating environment. Also, most of the studies conducted on these variables were focused on industries other than the fastfood industry. The current study therefore seek to join the discourse on branding and marketing success by examining the nexus between corporate branding and marketing success of quick service restaurants (QSRs).

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

This study on corporate branding and marketing success is hinged on the theory of associative learning. The theory of associative learning was propounded by Jerzy Konorski (1903-1973) and made popular by B. F. Skinner (1904-1990). The theory postulates that individuals learn by transferring meaning from one stimulus to another, or by associating objects with stimuli. In its basic form, the associative learning theory holds that learning occurs when association is created between two stimuli or between a stimulus and behaviour.

Classical and operant conditioning are the two forms of associative learning commonly discussed in literature. Previously neutral stimulus is repeatedly presented together with a reflex eliciting stimuli until the neutral stimulus eventually elicits a response on its own in classical conditioning. While in operant conditioning, certain behaviour is either rewarded or punished, thus resulting in an altered probability that the behaviour will happen again. From the theory of associative learning, it can be deduced that firms through their marketing programmes introduce a tessellation of association between the consumers and the brand; each of which represent a point in a cognitive system, whose linkage can be modified according to experience (Till, Stanley, & Priluck, 2008). The relevance of the theory of associative learning to the current study is based on the idea that brands are built mostly in the minds of consumers, and consumers' perception of a brand is usually based on the benefits (rewards) they derive from using the brand. Thus, a brand is unique only in relation to how the consumers associate it to some unique beliefs they held.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Corporate Branding

Substantial curiosity attends branding; and scholars express divergent views on the subject. Branding holds an intangible, yet intuitive impact on individuals' personal experience with a product or organisation, including the personal memories and cultural links that are associated with it. A brand is a compendium of written and unwritten expressions that identify and distinguish one firm and its products from those of the competitors. It is an identifiable entity that makes specific promises of value; and is often the most valuable asset a firm can own (Aaker, 2000). Branding on the other hand is the expression of the essential truth or value of an organisation and its products that distinguish it from the competition (Aaker, 2000). It is communicated through features, values, attributes, etc. that clarifies what a particular brand is; and what it is not (Aaker, 2000). Corporate branding basically involves advancing the brand name of a corporate entity instead of advancing the specific products of the firm. The scope of corporate branding is thus broader than that of product branding. Though corporate branding and product branding can take place concurrently, the activities and thinking that is directed at corporate branding are different from those expended on product branding.

The pattern of interactions that take place between corporate and product brand of a given organisation is known as corporate brand architecture (Schultz, Hatch, & Larsen, 2000). Corporate branding affects multiple stakeholders and influences several dimensions of the firm, including the evaluation or assessment of its products (Fetscherin & Usunier, 2012). Corporate branding therefore, is not only about a specific symbol, logo or name of a firm, but also involves multiple touch-points, including quality of products (Schultz et al, 2000). All avenues through which customers come in contact with a firm and its value offerings are touch-points that usually impacts consumers' perception about the corporate brand. It is thus argued that successful corporate branding often is hinged on the compatibility between strategic vision, organizational culture, and company image (Hatch & Schultz, 2008). Corporate brand underperformance ensues from misalignment or nonalignment between these factors.

Corporate branding is a construct with multiple dimensions. Souiden, Kassim, and Hong (2006) identify corporate name, corporate image, corporate reputation and corporate loyalty as dimensions of corporate branding while Khan et al (2016) proffered corporate associations, corporate values, corporate activities, corporate personalities, and benefits as dimensions of corporate branding. Relatedly, Anisimova (2013) proposes corporate activities, associations, personalities, values as well as brand benefits as dimensions of corporate branding. So, Parsons, and Yap (2013) on their part identify corporate associations, corporate activities, corporate values, corporate personalities, functional benefits and symbolic benefits as dimensions of corporate branding. It is therefore cogent that corporate branding is a multidimensional construct. However, the current study treats corporate branding unidimensionally.

Marketing Success

Success is the desired-end-result of an activity. Marketing success is a measure of the extent to which a firm achieves its marketing objectives based on its marketing programmes and activities and the constraints of the operating environment. It is an assessment of the contributions of an organization's marketing functions to its corporate goals and objectives (Buzzel, Gale, & Sultan, 2005). Trends indicate that corporations rely more on the marketing function to drive business growth and sustainability. Marketing executives thus work under continued pressure to report on their activities. However, the assessment of marketing success remains a critical but ambiguous concept. Bonoma and Clark (1988) argue that assessment of marketing success is critical because universally agreed metrics of success would promote scholarly investigation, and clarify managerial decisions; and ambiguous because marketers have been challenged with pointing out concise and reliable metrics of performance by which marketing success could be determined.

Historical literature on marketing performance suggests that marketing success measures have moved in three different directions over the years: (i) from financial to non-financial output (ii) from output to input; and (iii) from one-dimensional to multidimensional (Clark, 1999). The multidimensional view of marketing success identifies financial dimensions, competitiveness dimensions, consumer behaviour dimensions, customer intermediate dimensions, direct customer dimensions and innovativeness dimensions (Ambler, 2000). Marketing success that translates to achieving business targets is determined by both quantifiable and unquantifiable performance metrics. Nevertheless, firm whose predominant view is the bottom-line focuses on financial metrics as the basic measurement of success. Hence, the determination of metrics of marketing success is still a challenging task for business researchers and managers (Ittner & Larcker 1998). Most studies on marketing success dwell on financial measures which are not necessarily the best forms of measurement, considering that marketing's role in the firm do not involve only short term goals, but long term goals as well. Therefore, the current study considers non-financial measures of marketing success which can indicate the health of any organization. The study focuses on brand awareness, brand preference and new product success as viable measures of marketing success.

Brand Awareness

Brand awareness is the relative strength of a brand's presence in the minds of consumers (Aaker, 2010). It is an outcome of brand-related exposures and experiences consumers accumulate. Every stimulus that calls the attention of consumers to a brand strengthens their awareness of the brand (Neumeier, 2006). Creating brand awareness is the beginning of the process of building strong brands (Gerber, Terblanche-Smit, & Crommelin, 2014); and is a major goal of marketing in lieu of its influence on consumers (Aaker, 2010; Macdonald & Sharp, 2000). Brand awareness is a basic level of brand knowledge involving at least, recognition of the brand name (Hoyer & Brown, 1990). It is thus concerned with accessibility of the brand in memory, and describes how well it is recognized by customers and potential customers. Brand awareness also involves correctly linking the recognized brand to a particular product within a product category (Aaker, 2010). Brand awareness is an essential first step in building a brand (Rossiter, Percy, & Donovan, 1991) and is associated with consumer's purchase decision making (Koniewski, 2012; Yaseen, Tahira, Gulzar, & Anwar, 2011; Romaniuk, Sharp, Paech, & Driesener, 2004).

Consumers patronize familiar brands because they are comfortable with them or based on the assumption that a familiar brand is probably reliable and of reasonable quality (Aaker, 2010). Brand awareness is also very essential for building brand equity (Aaker, 2010; Keller, 2003). The ability of consumers to recognize a brand, recall the brand in different situations (Aaker, 2010) and distinguish it from competing brands is the core of brand awareness. Whereas brand recognition is important for a new brand, brand recall and distinction are vital for established ones (Aaker, 2010). Brand awareness thus consists of brand recognition, recall and distinction (Ateke & Onwujiariri, 2016). Brand recognition represents consumers' ability to identify a brand when there is a brand cue; brand recall indicates consumers' ability to recall a brand name when they see it (Chi, Yeh, & Yang, 2009) while brand distinction represents consumers' ability to identify a brand and distinguish it from other brands.

Brand Preference

Consumer preference is a subjective taste of individuals, measured by utility of available options. Preferences enable consumers to rank alternatives according to the levels of utility they offer. They are independent of income and prices. Hence, ability to purchase products does not determine a consumer's preferences. Consumer preference is used to mean consumers' choice or inclination to choose an option that has the greatest anticipated value among alternative options, in order to satisfy needs, wants or desires. Preferences indicate choices among neutral or more valued options available. Consumer preference is deduced from the result of their behaviour expressed during the search, purchase and disposal of products. Marketers have always been interested in understanding and influencing consumer behaviour. The efforts of theorists in identifying the core drivers of consumer behaviour have thrown up several theories and models that attempt to describe factors that influence consumer behaviour, especially in purchase situations (Isik, & Yasar, 2015). The theory of consumer choice is one theory that has been advanced to explain buying behaviour of consumers. The underlying assumption of this theory is that consumers fully understand their own preferences, and that they compare between alternatives when confronted with a purchase decision making situation.

One of the fundamental goals of investigations into consumer behaviour is to discover patterns of consumers' attitudes in their decision to patronize or ignore a product or brand (Matsatsinis & Samaras, 2000). A combination of factors influence consumers' preference for a product or brand. These factors may be associated with the consumers themselves, the features of the product or brand or the consumers' environment (Isik, & Yasar, 2015; Venkatraman, Clithero, Fitzsimons, & Huettel, 2012; Spillan & Harcar, 2010). Often, consumers make choices in settings where not all available alternatives are known (Ge, Brigden, & Häubl, 2015). When making a choice from a set of alternatives, the manner in which each of the alternatives is discovered is irrelevant from a normative standpoint (Isik & Yasar, 2015); since consumer must sometimes decide between choosing among known alternatives and searching to discover additional alternatives before making a choice.

New Product Success

A new product is any innovative offering from a firm that seeks to satisfy consumers' identified or latent needs (Ateke & Iruka, 2015). A new product is successful if it satisfies a need, meets consumers' expectation, is accepted by the target market and can be sold profitably. Considerable attention has been accorded new product development (NPD) because it is a source of competitiveness (Brown & Eisenhardt, 1995). Scholars hold divergent views on the definition and measures of new product success. However, what is common to most definitions is the focus on both financial and non-financial performance associated with new products. This is in view of the fact that new products can be successful without enhancing the financial position of the firm (Chien, 2010; Baker & Sinkula, 2005). NPD is pivotal to economic growth, improved standard of living, profitability and businesses continuity (Bhuiyan, 2011).

NPD is closely linked to marketing success in the fast-paced technology-intensive business environment (Ateke & Iruka, 2015). Also, it is a route taken by firms to enter new markets by tweaking products for new customers, using variations on core products to stay ahead of competitors and create interim solutions for industry-wide problems (Kotler & Keller, 2009). In view of the contribution of successful new products to competitive superiority, company's ability to introduce new products has been accorded increased importance (Agarwal, Shankar, & Tiwari, 2007). New product introduction has become a very attractive pathway to competitiveness. It is a winning strategy; especially in businesses in which product life cycles are relatively short (Agarwal et al, 2007). New product success brings significant benefits, including greater market share and price premiums, which improves profitability (Jayaram, Vickery, & Droge, 1999). Conversely, delaying the introduction of new products can lead to negative outcomes, including lower market share, lower margins and loss of customers' goodwill (Agarwal et al, 2007).

Corporate Branding and Marketing Success

The idea of corporate branding evolved as brands shifted from being identifiers and distinguishers of products to being signifiers of company-customer relationships. Corporate brands therefore express and give credence to relationships built on trust and promises (Heaney & Heaney, 2008); and is most suited in settings where it is difficult to rely on specific tangible attributes, or make a priori judgments about the company or its offerings (Boyd, Leonard, & White, 1994). This is especially so because the emphasis of corporate branding is on the capabilities of the firm (McDonald, de Chernatony, & Harris, 2001). Corporate brands are also necessary in view of "the pressures of transparency, increased costs and firms' need for increased differentiation" (Hulberg, 2006).

Furthermore, projecting the whole firm under corporate branding is often more efficient in creating brand awareness and differentiation compared to product branding; as the firm could leverage on the its image, attributes and reputation to launch multiple products (Olins, 2000) in Richard (2010). In addition, Gylling and Lindberg-Repo (2006), Balmer and Grayser, (2003) and Keller and Aaker (1998) identify positive image, profitability and other favourable outcomes, sustainable competitive advantage based on the resource based theory, *insubstitutability*, corporate credibility and improved evaluations as other outcomes of corporate branding. "Corporate branding is in essence, a powerful tool for aligning the organisation's resources in the development of strategic competitive advantage" (Richard, 2010). Corporate branding provides managers with a systemic context for picturing and blending the different activities by which companies express who they are and what they stand for. Thus, corporate branding according to Schultz and de Charnatony (2002) assist in providing a strong platform for developing a comprehensive and engaging promise for all stake holders; it acts as a mechanism for aligning organisational culture and enables the firms to better balance issues of global recognition and local adaptation.

Schultz and de Charnatony (2002) assert that proactive firms implement corporate branding as an organization-wide activity, thus moving corporate branding from a marketing communication activity to a strategic business action, which gives the firm a clear sense of direction and provides the basis for competitive advantage. Taking advantage of corporate branding integrates ideas from marketing and other functional areas of business into a unified whole that promotes synergy. Firms therefore carefully consider the decision to pursue a corporate brand, being increasingly seen as a major identifier of a corporation and often used to support business communication (Shahri, 2011; Aaker, 2004). Also, consumers' perception of a brand is easily transferred to other products that are marketed with the corporate brand (Shahri, 2011). The corporate brand is thus a valuable asset to the firm because it integrates all significant aspects of the corporation. In view of the forgoing, the current study proposes that:

H_1: Corporate branding significantly associates with brand awareness.
H_2: Corporate branding significantly associates with brand preference.
H_3: Corporate branding significantly associates with new product success.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The focus of this study was to determine the nexus between corporate branding and marketing success of QSRs. The study adopted an explanatory research design and was conducted in a non-contrived setting. The population of the study consisted of QSR customers in Rivers State. The total number of customers of QSRs in Rivers State could not be ascertained due to nonexistence of such database. Therefore, the study adopted three hundred and eighty five (385) as its sample size. This is based on the assertion that the sample size for an unknown population at ninety-five per cent (96%) confidence interval and plus or minus five per cent (± 5%) precision is three hundred and eighty five (385) (Israel, 1992). The convenience sampling technique was employed to select the test units due to its merits in easing access to test units (Collis & Hussey, 2009).

The final analysis of the study however, was based on usable data collected from three hundred and thirty five (335) respondents through questionnaire. The study instrument required respondents to tick an option from alternatives responses on a scale where 1= very low extent; 2= low extent; 3= moderately; 4= high extent, and 5= very high extent. The validity of the instrument was confirmed through opinion of a jury of experts consisting of members of the academia and practitioners with adequate knowledge of the subject of the study; while the internal consistency of the measurement items was determined through a test of reliability using the Cronbach's alpha test with a threshold of 0.70 set by Nunally (1978). Table 1 below presents the summary of the results of test of reliability.

Table 1: Summary of Result of Reliability Analysis on Study Variables

S/N	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of items
1.	Corporate Branding	0.861	8
2.	Brand Awareness	0.714	8
3.	Brand Preference	0.744	5
4.	New Product Success	0.811	6

Source: Simulation from SPSS Output on Data Analysis on Corporate Branding and Marketing Success (2018).

Cronbach's alpha is a commonly used test to evaluate the internal reliability of study instruments (Bryman & Bell, 2007). The study used the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) as the test statistic and relied on the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 for all analyses. In addition to assessing the strength of relationships, researchers often evaluate the nature of relationship between the variables. The Pearson correlation is the technique commonly used to quantitatively measure this phenomenon (Bryman & Bell, 2007). The coefficient of correlation ranges from -1.00 to 1.00. -1.00 represent a perfect negative relationship, 1.00 represent a perfect positive relationship; while 0 denotes no relationship. A higher correlation coefficient indicates stronger relationship between variables (Shiu, Hair, Bush, & Ortinau, 2009).

RESULTS

Table 2: Correlation analysis of the nexus between corporate branding and measures of marketing success

			Corporate Branding	Brand Awareness	Brand Preference	New Product Success
Pearson Correlation	Corporate Branding	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.794**	.765**	.766**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.000	.000	.000
		N	335	335	335	335
	Brand Awareness	Correlation Coefficient	.794**	1.000	-	-
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	-	.000	.000
		N	335	335	335	335
	Brand Preference	Correlation Coefficient	.765**	-	1.000	-
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	-	.000
		N	335	335	335	335
	New Product Success	Correlation Coefficient	.766**	-	-	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	-
		N	335	335	335	335

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

Source: Simulation from SPSS Output on Data Analysis on Corporate Branding and Marketing Success (2018).

Table 2 displays the test results. As the Table indicates, a strong relationship exists between corporate branding and brand awareness. This in view of the P(r) coefficient of 0.794** generated by the test. The positive sign of the result indicates a positive relationship between the variables, just as the PV of .000 which is less than .05 indicates that the relationship between the variables is statistically significant. Hence the study accepts the alternate hypothesis.

Also, Table 2 displays a P(r) coefficient of .765** on the association between corporate branding and brand preference. This value implies a strong relationship between the variables. The positive sign of the result indicates a positive relationship between the variables, while the PV of .000 indicates that the relationship between the variables is statistically significant. The study therefore accepts the alternate hypothesis.

Furthermore, Table 2 indicates a positive relationship between corporate branding and new product success. The P(r) coefficient of .766** produced by test suggests that the relationship between the variables is strong. The PV of .000 generated by the test indicate that the relationship between the variables is statistically significant. Thus, the study accepts the alternate hypothesis.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The aim of the current study was to determine the nexus between corporate branding and marketing success of QSRs. The results of the analyses of data collected from respondents indicate that corporate branding and marketing success have a strong and statistically significant correlation. Particularly, the study found that corporate branding associates significantly with brand awareness, brand preference and new product success, with corporate branding and brand awareness posting the strongest relationship. The findings of the study represent reality in lieu of the fact that corporate branding is a prerequisite to successful marketing and building value for the firm and its products. The findings also conform to the assumption that consumers favour products from familiar brands.

The findings also support the assertion that consumers rely on brand names to reduce the risks associated with purchasing products about which they have little or no experience (O'Neill & Xiao, 2006). Strong corporate brands enhance the propensity of products to remain in the memory or customers. They also improve the prospects of a product occupying a top-of-choice position in consumers' minds. Furthermore, strong corporate brands enhance the success level of firms in their brand extension efforts.

Since corporate branding highlights the uniqueness of the brand that stands it out from the competition, it is expedient to posit that the findings of the current study are credible and conform to observable marketplace phenomena. The finding that a strong positive relationship exists between corporate branding and marketing success is a clear indication that corporate branding is not an exercise in futility, but one that yields results; effective corporate branding impacts positively on marketing success and builds value for the firm. Has the goal of branding not been to explore ways to add value to the basic product and create brand preference and loyalty?

Additionally, the findings support the position of Liang and Lai (2002) that corporate branding is very important in instances where consumers resort to information when deciding on a brand to patronize and when comparing value offers from different firms. This means that with effective corporate branding, the firm stands to gain awareness, secure consumer preference as well as increase its visibility, recognition and reputation (Hatch & Schultz, 2003). Consumers usually prefer brands they are familiar with; and corporate branding gives the firm ample opportunity to create brand awareness. The findings also corroborate the position that a strong corporate brand has significant impact in creating positive consumer perceptions of existing products and new product extensions (Hatch & Schultz, 2003).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Marketing success is the cardinal objective of progressive and long-term oriented firms. It is the only thing that keeps a firm in the competitive and dynamic business-scape. Achieving marketing success is thus the reason firms undertake marketing research. It is also the reason firms contrive and implement marketing strategies. This study focused on corporate branding and marketing success of QSRs. Based on the findings of the study and the discussions presented in the preceding sections, the study concludes that corporate branding influences marketing success, and that marketing success measured in brand awareness, brand preference and new product success depends on corporate branding. QSRs could improve their marketing success by engaging in corporate branding.

The study therefore recommends that QSRs in Port Harcourt whose objective is to achieve and sustain marketing success for business survival and prosperity should have a good grasp of corporate branding strategies that evoke marketing success. Importantly, QSRs should engage in corporate branding to engender improved brand awareness, brand preference and new product success which indicate marketing success.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A. (2010). *Building strong brands*. London: Free Press.

Aaker, D. A. (2004). Leveraging the corporate brand. *California Management Review*, *46*(3), 1-18.

Agarwal, A., Shankar, R., & Tiwari, M. K. (2007). Modeling agility of supply chain. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36, 443-457.

Ambler, T. (2000). Marketing metrics. *Business Strategy Review*, 11(2), 59-66.

Anisimova, T. (2013). Evaluating the impact of corporate brand on consumer satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 25(4), 561-589.

Ateke, B. W., & Nwulu, C. S. (2017). Brand value and marketing wellness of deposit money banks. *European Journal of Management and Marketing Studies*, 2(2), 87-102.

Ateke, B. W., & Akani, G. H. (2018). Brand positioning and marketing wellness of deposit money banks. *Forthcoming*.

Ateke, B. W., & Onwujiariri, J. C. (2016). Brand awareness: Does celebrity endorsement help? *University of Port Harcourt Journal of Accounting and Business*, 3(1), 246-258.

Ateke, B. W., & Iruka, C. H. (2015). Investigating the relationship between customer involvement management and marketing performance in the manufacturing industry. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 2(9), 22-34.

Baker, W. E., & Sinkula, J. M. (2005). Market orientation and the new product paradox. *Product Innovation Management,* 22(6), 483-502.

Balmer, J. M. T., & Grayser, S. (2003a). Corporate brands: What are they? What of them? *European Journal of Marketing,* 37 (7/8), 972-998.

Bhuiyan, N. (2011). A framework for successful new product development. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management,* 4(4), 746-770.

Bonoma, T. V., & Clark, B. H. (1988). *Marketing performance assessment*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Boyd, W. L., Leonard, M., & White, C. (1994). Customer preferences for financial services: An analysis. *International Journal of Bank Marketing,* 12, 9-15.

Brown, S. L., Eisenhardt, K. M. (1995). Product development: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 343-378.

Bryman A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research methods*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buzzell, R. D., Gale, B. T., & Sultan, R. G. M. (2005). Market share: A key to profitability. *Harvard Business Review*, 53, 97-106.

Chang, A., Chiang, H., & Han T. (2015). Investigating the dual-route effects of corporate branding on brand equity. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 20, 120-129.

Chi, H. K., Yeh, H. R., & Yang, Y. T. (2009). The impact of brand awareness on consumer purchase intention: The mediating effect of perceived quality and brand loyalty. *The Journal of International Management Studies*, 4(1), 135-144.

Chien, S. (2010). Market orientation and new product success: A Mediator model based on intellectual capital. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 15(3), 377-390.

Clark, B. H. (1999). Marketing performance measures: History and internationals. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15, 711-732.

Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2009). *Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Doyle, P. (2000). *Value-based marketing*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Fetscherin, M., & Usunier, J. (2012). Corporate branding: An interdisciplinary literature review. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(5), 733-753.

Ge, X., Brigden, N., & Häubl, G. (2015). The preference-signaling effect of search. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(2), 245-256.

Gerber, C., Terblanche-Smit, M., & Crommelin, T. (2014). Brand recognition in television advertising: The influence of brand presence and brand introduction. Acta Commercii 14(1). doi. org/10.4102/ac.v14i1.182. Retrieved December 2015 from http://www. actacommercii.co.za

Gylling, C. & Lindberg-Repo, K. (2006). Investigating the links between a corporate brand and a customer brand. *Brand Management*, 13 (4/5), 257-267.

Hatch, M. J., & Schutz, M. (2003). Bringing the corporation into corporate branding. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(7/8), 1041-1064

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2008). *Taking brand initiative: How companies can align their strategy, culture and identity through corporate branding*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Heaney, J., & Heaney, M. (2008). Services branding strategies: Using corporate branding to market educational institutions. *Being a proceeding at the Academy of World Business, Marketing and Management Development Conference*. Retrieved February 2018 from http://researchonline.nd.edu.au/bus_conference/

Hoyer, W. D., & Brown, S. P. (1990). Effects of brand awareness on choice for a common, repeat-purchase product. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17, 141-148.

Hsu, F. J., Wang, T. Y., & Chen, M. Y. (2013). The impact of brand value on financial performance. *Advances in Management & Applied Economics*, 3(6), 129-141.

Hulberg, J. (2006). Integrating corporate branding and sociological paradigms: A literature study. *Brand Management*, 14 (1/2), 60-71.

Isik, A., & Yasar, M. F. (2015). Effects of brand on consumer preferences: A study in Turkmenistan. *Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics*, 2015, 8(16), 139-150.

Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size*. Retrieved September 2017 from http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu.

Ittner, C. D., & Larcker, D. F. (1998). Innovations in performance measurement: Trends and research implication. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, 10, 205- 238.

Jayaram, J., Vickery, S. K., & Droge, C. (1999).An empirical study of time-based competition in the North American automotive supplier industry. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 19(10), 1010-1033.

Keller, K. L., & Aaker, D. A. (1998). Corporate level marketing: The impact of credibility on a company's brand extensions. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1, 356-378.

Keller, K. L. (2003). Understanding brands, branding and brand equity. *Interactive Marketing*, 5(1), 7-20.

Khan, M., Rasheed, S., Islam, F., Ahmed, H., & Rizwan, M. (2016). Corporate branding, emotional attachment and brand loyalty: The case of luxury fashion branding. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(5), 151-159.

Koniewski, M. (2012). Brand awareness and customer loyalty. Retrieved December 2017 from www.research-pmr.com.

Liang, T. P., & Lai, H. J. (2002). Effects of store design on consumer purchases: An empirical study of online bookstores. *Information and Management*, 36, 431-444.

McDonald, H. B., de Chernatony, L. & Harris, F. (2001). Corporate marketing and services brands, moving beyond the fast-moving consumer goods model. *European Journal of Marketing,* 35 (34), 335-352.

Macdonald, E. K., & Sharp, B. M. (2000). Brand awareness effects on consumer decision making for a common, repeat purchase product: A replication. *Journal of Business Research*, 48, 5-15.

Matsatsinis, N. F., & Samaras, A. P. (2000). Brand choice model selection based on consumers' multicriteria preferences and experts' knowledge. *Computers and Operations Research*, 27(7-8), 689-707.

Mohammad, A. A. S. (2017). The impact of brand experiences, brand equity and corporate branding on brand loyalty: Evidence from Jordan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 7(3), 58-69.

Neumeier, M. (2006). *The brand gap*. Berkeley, CA: New Riders.

Nunally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Neill, J. W., & Xiao, Q. (2006).The role of brand affiliation in hotel market value. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 1-14.

Romaniuk, J., Sharp, B., Paech, S., & Driesener, C. (2004). Brand and advertising awareness: A replication and extension of a known empirical generalisation. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 12(3), 70-80.

Richard, J. (2010). Corporate branding: The role of vision in implementing the corporate brand. *Innovative Marketing*, 6(1), 44-57.

Rossiter, J. R., Percy, L., & Donovan, R. J. (1991). A better advertising planning grid. *Journal of Advertising Research,* 31, 11-21.

Sallam, M. A. (2016). The impact of brand image and corporate branding on consumer's choice: The role of brand equity. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 8(1), 98-106.

Schultz, M., Hatch, M. J., & Larsen, M. H. (2000). *The expressive organization: Linking identity, reputation and the corporate brand*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shahri, M. H. (2011). The effectiveness of corporate branding strategy in multi-business companies. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(6), 51-59

Shiu, E., Hair, J., Bush, R., & Ortinau, D. (2009). *Marketing research*. European Edition. Berkshire: McGraw Hill Higher Education.

So, J., Parsons, A., & Yap, S. (2013). Corporate branding, emotional attachment and brand loyalty: the case of luxury fashion branding. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 17(4), 403-423.

Souiden, N., Kassim, N. and Hong, H. (2006). The effect of corporate branding dimensions on consumers' product evaluation: A cross-cultural analysis. European Journal of Marketing, 40 (7/8): 825-845.

Spillan, J. E. & Harcar, T. (2013). A comparative study of patriotism, protectionism, social economic conservatism between Indian and Vietnamese consumers: the effects of these constructs on buying inclinations. *Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics*, 6 (12), 1-26.

Till, B. D., Stanley, S. M., & Priluck, R. (2008). Classical conditioning and celebrity endorsers: An examination of belongingness and resistance to extinction. *Psychology and Marketing*, *25*(2), 179-196.

Venkatraman, V., Clithero, J. A., Fitzsimons, G. J., & Huettel, S. A. (2012). New scanner data for brand marketers: How Neuroscience can help better understand differences in brand preferences. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(1), 143-153.

Yaseen, N., Tahira, M., Gulzar, A., & Anwar, A. (2011). Impact of brand awareness, perceived quality and customer loyalty on brand profitability and purchase intention: A resellers' view. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(8), 833-839.

Yeung, M., & Ramasamy, B. (2008). Brand value and firm performance nexus: Further empirical evidence. *Journal of Brand Management*, 15, 322-335.