

INPLASY2023100062

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2023.10.0062

Received: 19 October 2023

Published: 19 October 2023

Corresponding author:

Maria Margarita Gutierrez Gutierrez

margarita.gutierrez@asturias.edu.co

Author Affiliation:

Corporación Universitaria Asturias.

Gutierrez, F¹; Gutierrez, M²; Perona, J³; Ruiz, C⁴.**ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION****Support** - University Research.**Review Stage at time of this submission** - Data analysis.**Conflicts of interest** - None declared.**INPLASY registration number:** INPLASY2023100062**Amendments** - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 19 October 2023 and was last updated on 19 October 2023.**INTRODUCTION**

Review question / Objective We decided to address a systematic review of the state of the art of models to measure the BE, which have been applied in all types of industries and are recognized for having the seal of their creator.

Background Although a latent need to evaluate brands in an objective way has been known since the beginning of Branding, the question of how brands should be financed, evaluated, and presented to the market has become relevant (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Chernatony and Dall'Olmo, 1998; Healey, 2008). Thus, since the 1980s, the concept of the Brand Equity (BE), understood by Aaker (1991) as intangible values including loyalty, quality, associations, and brand perception has been developed approached from a sphere of the value associated by the consumer when exposure to promotional actions or any activity that requires reference to it (Guzmán, 2005). For Keller (1993) it is the contextual information that the consumer has about the brand at the time of acquisition,

which summarizes as the differentiator. Now, from these two points of view, it may be debatable which of the two is more accurate, however, although they look at different variables, both respond to market needs and make tangible what is intangible, since concepts such as purchase trends, rebuying (loyalty), preference or perception are abstract and the industry has had to develop ways of understanding the consumer's behaviour around a brand in order to get answers and move in a world of tangibles, which large corporations seek to afford and introduce into the stock market since a brand is due to its consumers and its potential is 100% based on the response and feelings they have about it (Ahna et al., 2018). Consequently, it has gained great importance, evolving its concept, becoming for the consumer an experience that exceeds functionality, representing a lifestyle and even a dream or aspiration, and acquiring emotional relevance and satisfaction in the acquisition of a product (Christodoulides and De Chernatony, 2004; Tinto, 2008; Barnes and Pressey, 2012; Davcik et al., 2015). It is valid that the first historical references

to symbolic consumption appear at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, with the works of James (1890), Simmel (1903) and Flügel (1930) to later arriving at Maslow (1943) who established a hierarchy with five needs and factors motivating people. These authors claim that consumers reinforce their identity through the products they purchase.

Rationale Knowing the state of the art of models used to measure Brand Equity to offer a solution to measuring brand value in an efficient, coherent, forceful way through models of quantitative and qualitative character, is every time a need (Dick and Kunal, 1997; Dominici, 2009; Dedeoglu et al., 2019; Barrio-Fraile and Enrique-Jiménez, 2021; De Regt et al., 2021). Since the 1980s different brand measurement techniques have been developed with theoretical and pragmatic approaches, from the purely stock market to the qualitative for determining rankings of recall, emotionality, and even valuation by purchase possibility (González, 1986; Ger and Belk. 1996; Edson and Bettman. 2005; Einstein, 2011).

METHODS

Strategy of data synthesis This systematic review was carried out through the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines. As a first step, we proceeded to search for scientific papers about the "Brand Equity" and "Measurement models". The authors consulted the databases of Science Direct, SCOPUS, SCIELO, ISI Web of Knowledge, web of science, DIALNET, EBSCO, REDALYC, and Google Scholar. Search terms were the following: "Brand" and "models" (221,476 sources), "Brand Awareness" and "Models" (3,131 sources), "Brand Association" and "models" (1,348 sources), "Brand Equity" and "Measurement models" (791 sources), "Brand Association" AND "Measurement models" (337 sources).

Eligibility criteria Inclusion Criteria: The inclusion criteria were (i) publication date until april 2022; (ii) being an empirical study, project report, or case studies; (iii) written in English or Spanish languages, which are the languages known by the authors; (iv) published in a scholarly peer-reviewed journal; (v) mention a proposal model to measure brand equity; (vi) propose out variables that allow measuring brand equity. In this systematic review, all the studies selected measured brand equity, or proposed a model for this measure.

Source of evidence screening and selection Inclusion Criteria The inclusion criteria were (i)

publication date until april 2022; (ii) being an empirical study, project report, or case studies; (iii) written in English or Spanish languages, which are the languages known by the authors; (iv) published in a scholarly peer-reviewed journal; (v) mention a proposal model to measure brand equity; (vi) propose out variables that allow measuring brand equity. In this systematic review, all the studies selected measured brand equity, or proposed a model for this measure.

Pre-exclusion Criteria: Final records identified through database searching were 5,607. Among these, 5,056 records were excluded due to the fact that they were theory books, conceptual book chapters, letters, editorials, or comments.

Exclusion Criteria: Among these 551 works, 528 were excluded based on the following exclusion criteria: (i) the research did not propose a specific model to measure brand equity; (ii) documents do not proposed specific variables to measure brand equity; (iii) works written in languages other than English or Spanish; (iv) works that resulted as in progress in april 2022 (thus were not concluded).

Data management 1. Purpose: Separating the sources that advanced in brand building and measurement, those that focused on brand construction, and those that developed a brand measurement.

2. The sources were classified by their brand measurement orientation as follows:

Market: It is measured by estimating the valuation of the company's intangible assets based on the market prices of other comparable companies in recent acquisitions or mergers.

Consumer: Brand elements that provide added value to the consumer are valued, motivating them to pay an additional price for a product and generating brand loyalty.

Accountant: Either by measuring the historical cost incurred in creating the brand or the replacement cost to reactivate a brand.

Financial: The brand is valued as a company asset to reflect it in the financial statements and determine the impact on profitability.

Intangible Assessment: If variables that measure intangible aspects of the brand were included in the proposed model.

3. This review proposed a brand valuation classification as follows:

Simple implicit valuation: The source used secondary information with a single process to obtain results.

Complex implicit valuation: The source used secondary information with two or more processes to obtain results.

Simple explicit valuation: The source used primary information with a single process to obtain results.

Complex explicit valuation: The source used primary information two or more processes to obtain results.

4. The sources were classified according to the type of method used: quantitative, qualitative, or mixed.

5. The selected sources were classified according to the number of variables implemented in their models: One-dimensional (One variable), two-dimensional (two variables), and multidimensional (more than two variables to measure brand equity).

6. The sources were differentiated into two levels: theoretical work (with a model proposal) and pragmatic work (normally applied to a specific case study).

Reporting results / Analysis of the evidence The analysis presented has a qualitative focus, with the purpose to identify the different types of brand equity models applied to different industries with a global perspective.

Presentation of the results This review allows us to conclude that the valuation included in the models is stable, and most of them require two or more complex processes to extract the previously exposed variables. This response to the different categories that each model intends to analyze, all pursuing the analysis of brand equity from different perspectives and deployed from the perspective of various concepts that compose it, is reinforced by the fact that seven models are one-dimensional, eight two-dimensional, and 16 multidimensional. In other words, 24 models consider that brand equity is composed of multiple variables, while the one-dimensional ones analyze financial or costing processes, which do not involve the consumer in their approaches, except for the proposed model of “analysis between sets that makes price analysis”, considering the opinion and point of view of the consumer.

In general, the models focus on the consumer and the search and analysis of secondary information, they become relevant, and the process becomes more complicated since they involve a wide methodologies' variety for data collection and processing. Most of the methods used in interviews (focus groups), whether structured, semi-structured, or mixed, are limited to the qualitative, while for the quantitative, purchasing processes with recognition are implemented through loyalty, surveys, and sampling. In terms of categorization, although the models name each variable differently, they can be generalized, which allows us to see the relationship between the various models and the variables, which are the most representative, and how the concepts are intertwined.

The model's review allowed us to understand and recognize their variables, strengths, and weaknesses. Its variability is wide, but none has been properly validated to BV robustly measure. The measurement does not generate a consensus between the pragmatic and the theoretical, which is evidenced by the little combination of variables between the models. They all try to value the intangible but ignore the "branding" communication, which makes it possible to identify a flaw since this is the tool that directs the consumer and collects all communicative action, and therefore can invalidate the interpretations. It is clear, based on our results, that a comprehensive proposal must be achieved with a model that allows for the incorporation of tangible and intangible variables of BE, hopefully incorporating multiple variables that capture these dimensions.

Language restriction Only includes Spanish and English sources.

Country(ies) involved Colombia: Caribbean developing country; Spain: European and develop country with large amount of papers in communication and brand value.

Other relevant information This paper is one of a kind in the field, makes evidence of a gap in literature around brand equity and trends, tries to explain the huge impact that CSR can give to brand and how have been completely forgotten and unstudied in the field.

Keywords Brand Equity; Brand; Brand Awareness; Brand Association; Models; Measurement models.

Dissemination plans Indexed journal: Heliyon.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Francisco de Paula Gutierrez Bonilla - Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing.

Email: francisco.gutierrez@utadeo.edu.co

Author 2 - Maria Margarita Gutierrez Gutierrez - Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing.

Email: margaritaggutierrez@gmail.com

Author 3 - Juan José Perona Paéz - Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing.

Email: juanjose.perona@uab.cat

Author 4 - Cesar Augusto Ruíz Agudelo - Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing.

Email: cesara.ruiza@utadeo.edu.co