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Abstract

The customer-based brand equity (CBBE) model was developed to guide brand building in a consumer product or individual brand context, but the model is proposed to be applicable to any context, including business-to-business (B2B) and service contexts. However, consumer branding strategies are not directly transferable to B2B markets and there are documented differences between the B2B and business-to-consumer (B2C) contexts. There is also doubt regarding the validity of the claim that the CBBE model is applicable, as is, to the B2B sector. In addition, research is needed to develop a tailored branding model for B2B services.

Using a qualitative interpretivist approach with a non-probability sampling design, the researcher tried to understand and make sense of the demand side clients’ (research participants’) world regarding the construction of B2B short-term insurance brands in their minds. The present research aimed to identify the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model that are confirmed, those that are not confirmed and to establish what other brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions may be relevant to a short-term business insurance context. Data were gathered by means of semi-structured interviews with participants from selected accommodation providers of demand side short-term business insurance. This allowed for sensible investigation of the drivers of brand equity in a specific B2B services context. Atlas.ti was used to assist with coding and analysing the transcribed interview data.

Based on interpretation of the data, an amended brand equity framework for short-term business insurance was developed, which is called the client-based brand equity (CL-BBE) framework. The present research contributed to the body of academic knowledge by expanding the limited existing B2B services branding theory through the proposed CL-BBE framework. This enhances and extends classical brand management. The insight that has been gained from the present research, regarding the sources of brand equity, should assist marketing practitioners and brand decision makers (brand managers and consultants) to improve the effectiveness of brand building and strategic brand management strategies for B2B services.

The present empirical research contributes to three areas of brand equity research, namely 1) the offering type – by investigating service offerings rather than product offerings; 2) the brand level – by investigating organisation-level brands rather than product-level brands; and 3) context – by investigating a B2B context rather than a B2C context. The proposed CL-BBE framework should improve the effectiveness of brand building strategies for selected B2B
services (short-term business insurance) by only enhancing dimensions that have been confirmed and the dimensions that have been added.
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Clarification of key terms and concepts

This section includes the most important terms and concepts used in the present study. A more comprehensive list of terms and concepts are attached as Appendix 5.

Brand
A brand resides in a consumer’s mind. It is a consumer’s perception (brand image) and attitude, which comprise the tangible and intangible (attributes, benefits and psychological/emotional) associations that are used to identify and differentiate an offering (adapted, Keller, 2013: 30-33). For a consumer a brand contains a promise of performance and value, which allow consumers to project their self-image (Keller, 2013: 34; Chiaravalle & Schenck, 2007: 34-35).

Branding
The strategic process and creative practice of developing a brand (Interbrand, 2007: 20). The process of endowing offerings with the power of brand equity. The aim of the branding process is to create brand equity (Keller, 2013: 57).

Brand association
An attribute (feature or characteristic) and/or benefit (value) (Keller, 2013: 77-79) or, more broadly, anything linked in memory to a brand, which includes; offering attributes, intangibles, benefits, relative price, use/application, consumer, celebrity/person, lifestyle/personality, offering category, competition, and geographical area (Aaker, 1991: 115). The “positive and negative feelings, beliefs, or knowledge that consumers have about a brand” (Interbrand, 2007: 9).

Brand awareness
Also called brand familiarity (Keller, 2013: 73).

Refers to the degree of consumer knowledge of a brand (Interbrand, 2007: 14).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Brand equity</strong></th>
<th>Brand equity refers to brand equity from the organisation’s point of view, as opposed to customer-based brand equity, which refers to brand equity from the consumer’s point of view.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>also called reputational capital (Interbrand, 2007: 15), goodwill (Ambler, 1995: 389; McDonald, de Chernatony &amp; Harris, 2001: 337) or brand power (Berry, 2000: 128)</td>
<td>“Is a marketing derived asset that has financial value in terms of future profit and cash flow” (Ambler, 1995: 388) and “a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand’s 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” (Aaker, 1996: 216). “The sum of a brand’s distinguishing qualities” (Interbrand, 2007: 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand loyalty</strong></td>
<td>When a consumer truly owns the brand, he/ she is brand loyal, and may well repeat a purchase. Loyalty is earned by delivering unique and meaningful benefits to consumers (Interbrand, 2007: 75).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand management</strong></td>
<td>The process of managing an organisation as a brand and an organisation’s brand(s) in order to preserve and enhance brand equity (Interbrand, 2007: 17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand value</strong></td>
<td>The financial worth of the brand as an intangible asset (Interbrand, 2007: 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business-to-business (B2B) branding</strong></td>
<td>It is concerned with branding in the business market. Business-to-business (B2B) branding refers to branding on an inter-business (between businesses) level rather than B2C. B2B purchases are made for further processing, for added value or for incorporation into the final offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also called industrial branding (Kuhn, Alpert &amp; Pope, 2008: 41), commercial, trade, organisational or institutional (Collins Dictionary of Marketing, 2005: 204)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business-to-consumer (B2C) branding
also called consumer branding (Kuhn et al., 2008: 41)

Business-to-consumer (B2C) branding is branding in the consumer market. It is concerned with branding on an organisation to consumer level.

Customer-based brand equity

Customer-based brand equity refers to brand equity from a consumer’s point of view, as opposed to brand equity, which refers to brand equity from an organisation’s point of view. “The differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to marketing of that brand” (Keller, 2013: 69).
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION, RESEARCH PROBLEM AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

If a product is not a brand, it is a commodity. This is where brand equity demonstrates its value by translating into revenue – through increased sales driven by branding, as well as the willingness of consumers to pay a premium

– Michael Lieberman, founder and president, Multivariate Solutions

1.1 INTRODUCTION
This study contributes to the literature discussion regarding whether or not the customer-based brand equity (CBBE) model is applicable to all contexts by applying the CBBE model to a selected business-to-business (B2B) services context. This involves ascertaining which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are confirmed for this context and which are not, and to identify additional blocks and sub-dimensions that may be applicable. As a consequence, this continues the amendment of a prominent brand equity model into a client-based brand equity (CL-BBE) framework for short-term business insurance.

This chapter introduces the key elements of the study and offers structure for the dissertation. First, a background is provided, followed by the research problem, research question and objectives. The study is delineated, assumptions are clarified and a list of the most important terms is provided. A brief literature review is presented, which leads to the conceptual framework. The importance of the study is advanced, followed by an overview of the research design and methods, while sampling and participant selection follow. The chapter concludes with an outline of each chapter, which is presented in the dissertation.

1.2 BACKGROUND
Strong brands, in general, can reduce risk, indicate quality, differentiate, generate profit, create competitive advantage (Keller, 2013: 34), and provide advantages that may result from brand extensions (Martínez and de Chernatony, 2013: 68). A brand is an increasingly important instrument to mitigate risk, especially in B2B contexts where risks may be considerable (Aaker, 1991: 7, 8; Keller, 2013: 37-38). B2B brands, specifically, can provide re-assurance to consumers (Baumgarth, 2010: 666), allow premium pricing, shield against competition (Ryan & Silvanto, 2013: 47, 49), and create a link between producers and sellers (Gupta, 2010: 397).

The extant brand management knowledge has been derived from research predominantly in business-to-consumer (B2C) markets, and more specifically fast moving consumer goods. The “academic inquiry on the subject [of B2B branding] is limited, dispersed and inconclusive” and while in the B2C context branding has been accepted as multi-dimensional, in the B2B context
branding is still constrained to a narrow and myopic view of the brand (Leek & Christodoulides, 2011: 230). Geigenmuller and Bettis-Outland (2012: 432) reiterate the point that most branding research is conducted within consumer markets, and that B2B services branding research is still in its early stages. O’Cass and Grace (2004: 267) support this and suggest that more consumer research is needed for services branding. This is the case in spite of major brands such as Caterpillar being B2B brands and, more specifically, B2B service brands such as Yahoo and Google (Kalafatis, Remizova, Riley & Singh, 2012: 623).

Various models have been developed to guide the brand management process of which the most prominent models are by Aaker (1991: 270; 1996: 318–338) and Keller (1993 (conceptualised), 2001: 7; 2003: 76–77; 2008: 60–61; 2013: 108). The literature shows that Aaker and Keller’s models are referred to more than any other model. Kuhn, Alpert and Pope (2008: 41) recognise Keller’s customer-based brand equity model (CBBE) model as the most comprehensive model for guiding the brand management process.

The applicability of the CBBE model to a B2B context has not been comprehensively assessed (Kuhn et al., 2008: 41) and even though Kotler and Keller (2012: 205–207) mention differences between consumer (customer) and business markets, Keller maintains that the CBBE model is applicable to a B2B context (cited in Kuhn et al., 2008: 41; O’Cass & Grace, 2004: 257). Christodoulides, Cadogan and Veloutsou (2015: 320) are concerned with the indiscriminate application of the CBBE model in different contexts. equally, Christodoulides and de Chernatony (2010: 60) are convinced that brand equity measures are market sector specific. Keller (2001: 25) mentions that the CBBE model should be refined, edited and embellished to suit the needs of its users. The claimed (unadapted) applicability the CBBE model to both B2C and B2B contexts was brought into questioned by the finding of research conducted by Kuhn et al. (2008: 40-58).

In summary, even though some of the most valuable brands are B2B brands, for example, IBM, Cisco and SAP (Interbrand, 2011; Glynn, 2012: 666), the majority of branding research is located within B2C markets with limited B2B research. The CBBE model is one of the most prominent branding models available in the literature, and the intention is for the CBBE model to be applicable to any and all contexts (Keller, 2001: 3; cited in Kuhn et al., 2008: 41; O’Cass & Grace, 2004: 257), but its appropriateness and applicability are questioned (Christodoulides et al., 2015: 320). There is thus a gap (disagreement) in the literature regarding whether the CBBE model is applicable to B2B. Leek and Christodoulides (2011: 8) suggest unresolved B2B research directions that need attention. These include:

- What are the components of industrial brand equity?
- Are existing measures of brand equity applicable to B2B markets?
- How can industrial brand equity be measured?
Applying the CBBE model to a B2B context can contribute towards resolving doubt about the applicability of the CBBE model and towards advancing the research direction stated above. For purposes of the present study, the CBBE model is applied to a selected B2B service context, namely short-term business insurance in Cape Town, South Africa.

1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT
The research problem is that there is no comprehensive, accepted and adapted brand equity model for B2B services specifically (McDonald et al., 2001: 350). As mentioned, the CBBE model is suggested to be applicable to a B2B context (O’Cass & Grace, 2004: 257), but when tested the applicability of the CBBE model to a B2B setting a number of issues were raised including that (Kuhn et al. 2008: 40-58):

- the brand equity of the organisation brand seemed more important than that of the individual brand, which is the focus of the CBBE model;
- the CBBE model's brand-building block “imagery” should be replaced with “corporate reputation”;
- the CBBE model's brand-building block “feelings” should be replaced with “sales force relationship”;
- The CBBE model's brand-building block “resonance” should be replaced with “partnership solutions”.

The unadapted use of the CBBE model for B2B services (for the present study: short-term business insurance industry in South Africa) may lead to ineffective or suboptimum brand building strategies. Sub-dimensions (or sources of brand equity) may be enhanced that are not applicable and/or sub-dimensions that may be important may not be enhanced at all. The phenomenon investigated was brand equity, specifically for B2B services. The present study assessed the applicability of the existing CBBE model to B2B services. This process identified the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions that are confirmed, those that are not confirmed and additional brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions that may be relevant. From this an adapted framework was suggested, which is called the client-based brand equity (CL-BBE) framework for short-term business insurance.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTION
Research questions were formulated instead of hypotheses. The primary research question that was formulated to address the problem statement was: what would constitute a brand equity framework, as strategic brand management instrument, for short-term business insurance?
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
To answer the research question, primary and secondary research objectives were developed.

1.5.1 Primary research objective
The primary research objective was to develop a brand equity framework that guides the strategic brand management process for short-term business insurance.

1.5.2 Secondary research objectives
The secondary research objectives were:
- To identify the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model that are confirmed for short-term business insurance;
- To identify the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model that are not confirmed for short-term business insurance; and
- To establish what other brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions may be relevant to short-term business insurance.

1.6 DELINEATION, ASSUMPTIONS AND DEFINITION OF TERMS
1.6.1 Delineation
The present research focused on:
- Short-term business insurance services offerings;
- Hotels - B2B service demand-side client organisations of short-term insurance service providers, which were located in Cape Town, South Africa

Due to time and financial resource limitations, the study was limited to the Cape Town metropole within the Western Cape, which is where the researcher is based.

The reasons for selecting short-term insurance service offerings included:
- Short-term insurance represents a service offering;
- There is well established competition in the short-term insurance industry so branding is important as a means of differentiation;
- The short-term insurance industry is a focused, well-defined sector within the broader financial services sector;
- Within general short-term insurance, B2B or commercial short-term insurance offerings are well defined and major insurance houses have separate divisions that deal with B2B insurance offerings specifically;
- B2B short-term insurance is a sizeable industry – R101 million turnover for the first three months of 2009, which increasing from 74 million in the first three months of 2008 (Financial Services Board, 2009); and
Brands in the short-term insurance sector tend to be prominent, well known and actively managed (Financial Services Board, 2009).

One of Cape Town’s comparative advantages is its “scenic beauty and natural sights”, which attract international visitors. The tourism industry can thus contribute to Cape Town’s economic growth (City of Cape Town, 2013). The largest portion of tourist spend at a destination is spent on accommodation. Therefore, accommodation demand is a useful indicator of the performance of the tourism industry as a whole. With regard to paid accommodation during 2013, most visitors stayed at hotels (35.37%) (City of Cape Town, 2014b: 31). The sector’s wholesale and retail trade, catering and accommodation is among the top three economic sectors in the City of Cape Town (Wesgro, 2012a: 1-11; Wesgro, 2012b: 1-12). It was, therefore, decided to focus on hotels as the B2B service demand-side client organisations of short-term insurance service providers.

1.6.2 Assumptions
The trustworthiness of the results is dependent on the following assumptions:

- That there are no major differences between hotels included in the present study and
- That the participants gave honest and reliable feedback.

The present study was limited to a specific sector of accommodation providers (hotels), which should reduce the negative influence of the first assumption. The B2B short-term insurance needs of hotels should be more similar than for different accommodation providers like hotels, guesthouses and B&B’s. Similarly, to try to negate the possible negative impact of the second assumption, interviews were conducted with people who had some influence on which insurance brand was selected for the hotels.

1.6.3 Definition of terms
The most important terms are clarified in Chapter 2 to aid clarity and consistency throughout the dissertation. A secondary contribution of the present study is the clarification of basic terms and concepts attached as Appendix 5. A list of acronyms and abbreviations are included in the preliminary page of the dissertation. Next a brief literature review is presented.

1.7 LITERATURE REVIEW
“A product is something that is made in a factory; a brand is something that is bought by a customer. A product can be copied by a competitor; a brand is unique. A product can be quickly outdated; a successful brand is timeless” (Stephen King, as cited in Aaker, 1991: 1).

The present research resides within the general field of study or academic discipline of business management and, more specifically, marketing and the subject of branding.
According to Aaker (1991: x), there are several reasons for the importance of managing brand equity. These include premiums that are paid for strong brand names, the commoditisation of products, and the possible advantage of unlocking value through brand extensions. Aaker further states that organisations allocate substantial resources to brand-building activities in order to create a sustainable competitive advantage. Aaker continues by mentioning certain potential problems with these brand-building activities, which include the difficulty inherent in calculating brand equity worth, while there are often limited benefits as far as sales growth is concerned in the short-term (in contrast to sales promotions (Aaker, 1991: 10)) and that over-extending a brand through brand extension can devalue brand equity.

For these reasons, brands should be managed effectively and the main function of brand management is to create a brand image, which comprises positive perceptions in the minds of consumers. With regard to the present marketplace Keller (2013: 35, 52-56) states that “brand management may be more difficult than ever”. Some of the reasons for this difficulty include changes in consumer attitudes and behaviour, competitive forces, marketing efficiency and effectiveness, and internal company dynamics, which complicate brand management decisions. A brand is an increasingly important “risk-handling device”, particularly in B2B contexts where risks may be substantial.

1.7.1 Branding models
The two most prominent models are by Aaker (1991: 270; 1996: 318–338) and Keller (1993 (conceptualised); 2001: 7; 2003: 76–77; 2008: 60–61; 2013: 108), who have both developed comprehensive models to guide the brand management process. Kuhn et al. (2008: 41), nevertheless, consider Keller’s CBBE model to be the most comprehensive model for guiding the brand management process. The literature showed that Aaker’s and Keller’s models are referred to more than any other model. The two models are introduced next, which form the theoretical foundation for this study. A detailed analysis can be found in Chapter 3.

Aaker (1996: 13, 15-16) states that brand equity comprises the assets or liabilities that are associated with the brand, which will either add to or subtract from the utility (usefulness) to the consumer. “Brand equity has the potential to add value to the firm by generating marginal cash flow”. From this perspective there is a difference between an asset and a skill: an asset is something that an organisation owns, such as a brand or a factory, which is better than that of its competitors. Conversely, a skill is something that an organisation does better than its competitors such as research and development and marketing. An organisation should build its sustainable competitive advantage on its key assets and skills. The author states that:

- a brand is a distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as a logo, trademark or package design) intended to identify the goods or services of either one seller or group of sellers, and to differentiate those goods or services from those of competitors. A brand thus signals
Aaker (1991: 16) developed a model (Figure 3.7) comprising a framework for creating, maintaining and protecting brand equity. The author mentions that brand equity can provide value to both the organisation and the consumer. Aaker's model groups brand equity into five “asset dimensions”, namely “(1) brand loyalty; (2) brand name awareness; (3) perceived quality; (4) brand associations in addition to perceived quality; and (5) other proprietary brand assets – patents, trademarks and channel relationships”. According to the author these “five categories of assets underlie brand equity”, and these assets are linked to the name and/or symbol of the brand. The model illustrates ways in which value may be created by each asset dimension. The value that is created by the asset dimensions is then distilled into the two groups, namely value to customers and value to the firm. Furthermore, Aaker (1991: xi) posits that his treatment of brand equity applies equally to both consumer and industrial markets.

Supporting his view that brand differentiation is a distinguishing characteristic of modern marketing (Aaker, 1991: 7), Aaker in a later book (1996: 318-338) expands on the model in Figure 3.7 and calls the expanded model the “brand identity planning model”. This model comprises the “brand identity system” and the “brand identity implementation system”. The basic premise of this model is to help the brand strategist to consider different perspectives that differentiate the brand identity. These elements include the “brand as a product”, “brand as organization”, “brand as person”, and “brand as symbol”. These perspectives are fundamental to Aaker’s brand-equity model. In addition to the brand equity model and the brand identity system, Aaker (1996: 318–338) proposes the brand equity ten. The brand equity ten was compiled by drawing on insight from Young and Rubicam (Y&R), Total Research, Interbrand, and others, and proposes, as the name suggests, ten measures of brand equity. These measures are: “(1) price premium; (2) satisfaction/loyalty; (3) perceived quality; (4) leadership/popularity; (5) perceived value; (6) brand personality; (7) organizational associations; (8) brand awareness; (9) market share; and (10) market price and distribution coverage.”

Keller (2013: 69) defines customer-based brand equity, but as “the differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to marketing of that brand”. Keller explains that this response can either be positive or negative. If positive, the consumer may be less price sensitive and accepting of extensions; however, if negative, the brand is regarded as a commodity. The author further states that customer-based brand equity is a result of strong brand awareness and associations, and mentions that the power of a brand and its value ultimately resides with the customer and in the customer’s mind. It is evident from the literature that Keller uses the term
“customer” to include those who purchase and/or consume products and services, since Keller states that the CBBE model was developed to be “versatile and applicable to all possible kinds of brands and industry settings”, “can apply to any product or service category” and should have “far-ranging relevance”.

Keller’s CBBE model is arguably the most comprehensive, accepted and used model, which builds, measures and manages brand equity. Keller’s model (Figures 3.3 and 3.4) comprises of the following four sequential steps: (1) brand identity; (2) brand meaning; (3) brand response; and (4) brand relationship. Each step is dependent on the successful completion of the previous step. The sequential steps are also referred to as the “branding ladder”. These steps correlate with six brand-building blocks (brand salience, brand performance, brand imagery, brand judgments, brand feelings and brand resonance), which are also collectively called the brand equity pyramid. Each of the blocks has sub-dimensions and corresponding brand objectives. Brand equity is created by reaching the pinnacle of the brand equity pyramid by establishing different brand-building blocks. Accordingly, the pinnacle relates to reaching the top of the branding ladder. The strongest brands excel in all six brand-building blocks, therefore implementing all four steps of the branding ladder. The most valuable brand-building block is brand resonance, which only occurs once all other brand-building blocks have been established. Brand resonance is present when consumers express a high degree of brand loyalty, which should allow organisations greater price premiums and more effective and efficient marketing programmes (Keller, 2001: 5, 7, 17).

The purpose of Keller’s CBBE model is to act as a benchmark for brand building by providing strategic direction for brand-building processes and decisions – namely to be applied in planning, implementing, and interpreting brand strategies. In addition, the model serves as a guide for marketing research. The author relates the CBBE model to three other well-known industry models of brand equity. These models are Young and Rubicam’s BrandAsset Valuator model, Millward Brown’s BrandDynamics model and Research International’s Equity Engine. The CBBE model includes concepts of all three of these models (Keller, 2001: iv, 25; Keller, 2013: 351-358).

Pappu et al. (2005: 144-145) confirm the four dimensions of customer-based brand equity, namely brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty. Martinez and de Chernatony (2013: 69) found a causal order in the creation of brand equity, namely that brand awareness improves perceived quality and builds positive brand associations, while brand associations also influence brand loyalty. The brand equity dimensions are supported by other authors: Hakala, Svensson and Vincze (2012: 447); Im, Kim, Elliot and Han (2012: 399); Sasmita and Suki (2015: 286); and Christodoulides et al. (2015: 320).
Satisfaction and competitive pricing affect loyalty for B2B services, while loyalty, satisfaction and service quality are interrelated for B2B services. For insurance service, the reliability of the offering, the physical evidence, and how people deliver the service (knowledgeable and caring), affect service satisfaction (Lakshmi and Santhi, 2015: 79). Ha, Janda and Muthaly (2010: 923-924) found that brand associations, perceived quality, satisfaction and loyalty impact on B2B service brand equity. The authors extend the brand equity theory with what they term the “perceived quality → satisfaction → brand equity” chain for services brand equity. They also suggest that improved efficiency will elevate client satisfaction, which will enhance service brand equity.

1.7.2 Brand equity in consumer and business markets
The B2B sector (or market) is often referred to as the industrial or business sector (or market). Aaker (1991: ix) mentions that “the power of brand names is not restricted to consumer markets”. Aaker continues that “in fact, brand equity may be more important in industrial goods markets than in consumer marketing.” Aaker also states that the greater importance is because “brand-name awareness” is fundamental for an industrial buyer to consider a brand and that “what a brand means to a buyer” can be a deciding factor in purchasing one brand over another.

From the literature it is evident that Aaker and Keller’s models have been developed primarily for B2C markets. Keller’s CBBE model is a summative model of best practice for branding in consumer markets, however, according to the literature, the applicability of the CBBE model to a B2B context has not been comprehensively assessed (Kuhn et al., 2008: 41). Kotler and Keller (2012: 205–207) also mention differences between consumer and business markets; however, Kuhn et al. (2008: 40–58) note that Keller maintains that the CBBE model is applicable to a B2B context. In one of a few studies that apply the CBBE model to a B2B (government) context, Kuhn et al. (2008: 40-58) confirmed two of the CBBE model’s building blocks, namely performance and judgment, but found that emphasis on some of the other building blocks differed. Kuhn et al.’s empirical research was conducted in a single B2B setting; therefore the results should be verified in an alternative setting. Christodoulides et al. (2015: 31) report that across countries, consumers of goods view brand equity more similar than consumers of services. As is evident from the literature, limited brand equity research has been undertaken in the South African market. There is a bias in the literature towards brand equity dimensions that were developed and validated in the United States (Christodoulides & de Chernatony, 2010: 60), and brand equity may be culture specific (Christodoulides et al., 2015: 320). This study analysed the applicability of the CBBE model to a short-term business insurance context in Cape Town, South Africa. Application of the dimensions in a different context assesses the conceptual equivalence of the CBBE dimensions across cultures.
In summary, Keller introduced a “conceptual model of brand equity from the perspective of the individual consumer”, which was later developed into “a comprehensive new approach, the customer-based brand equity (CBBE) model”. The CBBE model was developed from theory (based on advances in research), industry models and own insight into managerial practices. The author also provides “candidate measures of brand-building blocks” (Keller, 2001: 27-30; Keller, 2013: 123-124). These candidate measures, among others, were used in the present study to test the generic CBBE model by means of its empirical application to short-term business insurance, which highlighted issues with the unmodified application. The present study also addressed these limitations and an amended CL-BBE framework was presented. Client-based brand equity is brand equity specifically from the client’s perspective (a consumer of service-dominant offerings, like insurance) and not from the perspective of the customer (a consumer of product-dominant offerings, like a can of cool drink) or from the inclusive perspective of the consumer (including consumers of service and product offerings).

1.8 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

As depicted in Figure 1.1, the differences between a product and a service and the product-service spectrum, are at the centre of the present study. A pure product, pure service or product-service combination, together with information and experience, constitute the offering, which is supplied by a supplier and demanded by a consumer. Perceptions about a brand are influenced by a consumer’s experience (engagement) with the brand, which interprets the brand’s identity and forms the consumer’s brand image (Hanna & Rowley, 2013: 1791). Client experience influences brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality, and brand loyalty (Biedenbach & Marell, 2012: 455). The offering contains a value proposition, which provides a benefit or value to the consumer that satisfies a need. The brand enhances the offering with meaning that differentiates it from other brands. Represented to the left-hand side of the conceptual framework, the CBBE model originated from an individual B2C product brand equity perspective; from the supplier-customer perspective - predominantly a person who purchases a product offering. The study’s contribution is depicted to the right-hand side of the conceptual framework. The present study had, as primary research objective, the development of a B2B service brand equity model. This was achieved by testing the applicability of the existing CBBE model in a selected B2B services context (short-term business insurance). The present study, therefore, contributes to three areas, namely 1) the offering type – by investigating service rather than product; 2) brand architecture – organisation-level brand architecture rather than product-level architecture; and 3) context – B2B context rather than a B2C context. The components of the CBBE model that are confirmed, those that are not confirmed and those other components that may be relevant were identified and combined to develop the B2B service CL-BBE framework. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 show the theoretical positioning of the present study.
Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework
1.9 IMPORTANCE/ SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
From the literature review it is evident that B2B brand equity research is limited and in an early stage of development (Baumgarth, 2010: 665; Geigenmuller, 2012: 432). As mentioned previously, the literature proposes the CBBE model as a brand management instrument to guide the creation of brand equity across many industries (Keller, 2001: 3, O’Cass & Grace, 2004: 257), but the applicability of the CBBE model to a B2B context has been questioned and there is currently no comprehensive and accepted brand equity model available specifically for B2B services (Kuhn et al., 2004; 2008: 40–58).

The development of a framework or adaptation of a model to the B2B industry is a substantial undertaking. The present research contributed to the body of academic knowledge by expanding the limited existing B2B services branding theory through the proposed CL-BBE framework. This enhances and extends classical brand management. The insight gained from the present research, as to the sources of brand equity, should assist marketing practitioners and brand decision makers (brand managers and consultants) to improve the effectiveness of brand building and strategic brand
management strategies for B2B services. If the sources of B2B service brand equity are strategically developed and managed the long-term success should improve (O'Cass & Grace, 2004: 265). The present empirical research contributes to three areas of brand equity research, namely 1) the offering type – by investigating service offerings rather than product offerings; 2) the brand level – by investigating organisation-level brands rather than product-level brands; and 3) context – by investigating a B2B context rather than a B2C context.

The proposed B2B CL-BBE framework should improve the effectiveness of brand building strategies for the selected B2B services (short-term business insurance) by only enhancing the confirmed and added dimensions of the CL-BBE framework.

1.10 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

1.10.1 Research design
The research problem dictates which type of research design is required. The research design is guided by the type of evidence that is necessary to adequately address the primary research question (Mouton, 2001: 57). An exploratory empirical research design was required to address the research problem.

As far as the philosophy of science is concerned, the study of branding resides in marketing, which resides in the business and management sciences. The research paradigm was interpretivism, the research discourse included induction and deduction and the research design comprised exploratory (qualitative) research. This approach is supported by O'Cass and Grace (2004: 267) who motivate the use of qualitative research to investigate services branding.

1.10.2 Research methods

1.10.2.1 Selection
The insurance market is segmented into B2B and B2C. The B2C market is the personal insurance market, whereas the B2B market includes commercial and/ or corporate insurance. The commercial offering is mostly targeted at entrepreneurs and businesses (like guesthouses and dentists), whereas the corporate offering specifically addresses the needs of larger corporate organisations. The research population, from which the sample was selected, comprised of hotels in Cape Town, South Africa registered with Cape Town Tourism and/ or www.booking.com. For the study non-probability judgemental selection was done. The selection frame used was the accommodation providers, arranged alphabetically by name of organisation.
The participant (sample element) was the person in the demand-side client organisation who has some influence on the B2B short-term insurance purchase decision. Therefore the sample element was a senior member of management.

1.10.2.2 Interview guide design
An interview guide was developed from the literature. The questions were open-ended. Section A of the interview guide included qualifying questions and Section B comprised of classification questions. Section C included questions to test the applicability of the existing CBBE model to a selected B2B service context and measured the sub-dimensions of the sequential brand-building blocks to assess the brand-building of short-term insurance brands. This was done to identify which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are confirmed for short-term business insurance, which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are not confirmed for short-term business insurance and which additional brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions may be relevant to short-term business insurance. The questions either confirmed or did not confirm the sub-dimensions as well as what other additional sub-dimensions may be relevant. Section D of the interview guide elicited participants’ feedback as to the content of the interview guide and its appropriateness.

1.10.2.3 Data collection
Semi-structured individual face-to-face interviews were conducted with participants.

1.10.2.4 Data analysis and interpretation
Content analysis was done with the aid of the software programme Atlas.ti7. The results were interpreted and used to adapt the CBBE model to the CL-BBE framework and to draw conclusions and suggest guidelines for improved strategic brand management for short-term business insurance.

1.11 CHAPTER OUTLINE
The current chapter deals with the problem statement, research question, research objectives and literature as it relates to brand equity. The importance of the study and research design and methods are also discussed. The remainder of the dissertation is divided into the following chapters:

Chapter 2: Brands, branding and brand management
This chapter explores the concepts and importance of brands, branding and brand management.
Chapter 3: Brand equity and branding models

In this chapter the emphasis is on brand equity and a distinction is made between brand equity and brand value. The most prominent models that guide the strategic brand building process are discussed and compared. The chapter concludes by presenting the present study’s conceptual framework.

Chapter 4: Brand equity in business-to-business and services markets

The differences between product and service and the B2B and B2C sectors are investigated and related to the present study’s conceptual framework.

Chapter 5: Research design and methods

This chapter begins by contextualising the researcher’s ontological and epistemological position. This is followed by an explanation of the methodology and the steps in the research process followed. This includes stating the research problem and research objectives as they relate to the research question, research design, selection planning, data collection, data analysis, data reporting and interpretation.

Next the initial and amended interview guides design is discussed. A statement regarding the code of conduct concludes the chapter.

Chapter 6: Presentation of findings

The findings of the present empirical research are presented and analysed in this chapter. The major findings of the study are summarised, conclusions drawn, the CL-BBE framework presented and recommendations made for future research.

1.12 CONCLUSION

The contemporary market environment is increasingly competitive and differentiation is important to organisational success. To this extent brand management aids differentiation through the creation of brand equity. However, too little is known about branding in a B2B context. Although research have been conducted focusing on brand equity practices in the consumer market, research that applies these practices to B2B services remains limited. The rest of the study focuses on addressing the research problem, which is that there is no comprehensive and accepted brand equity model for B2B services. This is achieved by developing an adapted CBBE model, the B2B client-based brand equity (CL-BBE) framework, to guide strategic brand management for short-term business insurance.

Next, in Chapter 2, the foundation is laid for the literature review by considering the importance of brands, branding and brand management.
CHAPTER 2
BRAND AND BRAND MANAGEMENT

2.1 INTRODUCTION
Chapters 2, 3 and 4 form the literature review. These chapters contextualise the study and identify where a contribution can be made. This chapter clarifies additional basic terms that are used interchangeably in the literature for the sake of consistency, clarity and context, as these terms are used in this study. Brands and brand management have emerged as important research areas within the academic marketing literature (de Chernatony, 2009: 101-105), therefore, the concepts of brand and brand management, and its importance, are also explored.

2.2 CONCEPT CLARIFICATION
Brand, branding, brand management and some of the terms that are important to the conceptual framework (Figure 1.1) are discussed in this section. A more comprehensive list of terms and concepts is attached as Appendix 5.

2.2.1 Brand

*If this business were to be split up, I would be glad to take the brands, trademarks and goodwill and you could have all the bricks and mortar – and I would fare better than you.*

- John Stuart

The term brand is prevalent in academic literature, but its meaning is not agreed upon (de Chernatony, 2009: 101-105). A recent attempt at defining what a brand is, based on an analysis of various explanations of the term, is: “an identifiable kind of good and/or service commodity comprised of differentiated characteristics” (Pike, 2013: 334). A similar definition is that a brand is a “name, sign, symbol or design which identifies the goods and services of one seller and differentiates them from those of competitors” (Kotler & Armstrong, 2010: 255). For a consumer a brand contains a promise of performance and value which allow consumers to project their self-image (Chiaravalle & Schenck, 2007: 34-35). Kapferer (2008: 12) speaks of “brands as living systems made up of three poles: products or services, name and concept. The author contests that a brand cannot exist without an offering. This offering is identified through a name and proprietary signs and differentiated based on a set of tangible and intangible associations, which constitutes the value proposition of the brand. It is the intangible aspect that gives brands value, without which a brand is worthless (Taylor, Celuch & Goodwin, 2004: 227). De Chernatony (2009: 104) considered the evolution of the definition of the term brand, and concluded that at a basic level a brand could be defined as “a cluster of values that
enables a promise to be made about a unique and welcomed experience”. These values are initially functionally oriented, but are enhanced with emotionally oriented values, adding to the promise that adds value to all stakeholders.

Based on these definitions, the researcher understands brand to mean: a consumer’s perception (brand image) and attitude, which comprise the tangible and intangible (attributes, benefits and psychological/emotional) associations that are used to identify and differentiate an offering (adapted, Keller, 1993: 2-5).

2.2.2 Branding
The strategic process and creative practice of developing a brand (Interbrand, 2007: 20). The process of endowing offerings with the power of brand equity. The aim of the branding process is to create brand equity (Keller, 2013: 57).

2.2.3 Brand management
The process of managing an organisation as a brand and an organisation’s brand(s) in order to preserve and enhance brand equity (Interbrand, 2007: 17).

2.2.4 Customer, client and consumer
A customer is the purchaser (buyer) of a product or service and can be a person or organisation (American Marketing Association, 2015; Pride & Ferrell, 2010: G-3). A client is the purchaser of a service offering, but conventionally also referred to as a customer. It is a person or organisation using the services of an individual or company (Oxford Dictionaries, 2015). A consumer is the end user of a product or service, but may also refer to the buyer who may or may not be the end user (American Marketing Association, 2015).

The terms customer, client and consumer are used interchangeably in the literature, therefore, the following classification and adopted use of the terms are clarified. To differentiate a purchaser of a product from a purchaser of a service, for the purpose of this research, the term ‘customer’ will have a narrower meaning to refer to a purchaser or consumer of a primarily product offering and the term ‘client’ will refer to a purchaser or consumer of a primarily service offering only. Furthermore, a customer and client can be any entity including a person and an organisation. The researcher adopts the view that the concept ‘consumer’ is used to include the terms “customer” (a purchaser of a product offering) and “client” (a purchaser of a service offering). The term consumer is used to refer inclusively to any entity (a person and an organisation) that consumes offerings. In most instances the term consumer is used because most offerings include a combination of products and services together
with information and experience (depicted in Figure 1.1). When the term customer is used it will denote the purchaser or consumer of a pure product offering, and when the term client is used it will denote the purchaser or consumer of a primarily service offering. If the terms customer, client and/or consumer is used as it is presented in the literature, the link will be made to consumer, if necessary, to indicate this study’s conceptual framework. Mindful of the explained use of the word consumer, the term consumer is used to refer inclusively to any entity (a person and an organisation, for example, a franchise, museum, tourism bureau or cinema) that consumes offerings. These concepts, as mentioned, are included in the ‘conceptual framework’ (Figure 1.1).

Because most branding discussions are conducted within a consumer product (customer) context (Interbrand, 2011), and because the CBBE model (explained in detail in Chapter 3) was developed mostly from an individual (fast-moving) consumer product (customer) perspective (Kuhn et al., 2008:41; Kimpakorn & Tocquer 2010: 378) the present study focuses on an organisational client perspective (as the consumer of a service offering). The organisational client perspective represents the opposite extreme of the customer product context, as depicted in Figure 2.1. It is proposed that the CBBE model should be applicable to any context (Keller, 2001: 3).

2.2.5 Organisation and entity

Branding is not limited to any one type of entity; however in the literature the terms business, firm and organisation are used interchangeably (Mani & Barua, 2015: 9-38). To deal with this issue some authors mostly use the term ‘organisation' (Bruton, Peng, Ahlstrom, Stan & Xu: 2015: 95-114; Pride & Ferrell, 2010: G-3). Hence, to aid consistency, and to show the scope of branding application the term organisation is used in the present study to refer to, in its broadest interpretation, an organisation of people or ideas that share a common goal. An organisation, therefore, includes a commercial business organisation (listed or private, large or small), a non-profit organisation, a public enterprise, the government, an institution, a geographical area, a political party or a sports club. A person is an individual consumer, as opposed to an organisation, and an entity refers to both person and organisation that supplies or demands an offering. This view of organisation and entity is included in the ‘conceptual framework’ (Figure 1.1).

2.2.6 Product, service and offering

Because the terms product, good, service, and offering are also used interchangeably in the literature, a distinction is made and the adopted use of these terms for this study is clarified. A product is an organisational offering that potentially satisfies consumer needs and wants (Davcik, da Silva and Hair 2014: 3).
A service is an intangible act or performance by one party towards another without resulting transfer of ownership of the offering. Services are intangible, while delivery and production are inseparable. Services include health care services, insurance, legal services, consulting, hospitality services, information communication technology (du Plessis, Strydom & Jooste, 2012: 196; Kotler, 2000: 428). The distinction between product offering and service offering is shared by Aspara and Tikkanen (2008: 46) and Hutt and Speh (2013: 225). This shows that the relationship (or distance) between a producer and end consumer is more intimate (or closer) for a service than for a product. For a service the relationship is of paramount importance. Lorette (2012) shares this view and adds that “a service is more about selling a relationship and the value of the relationship between the buyer and seller of the service”. Hellen and Gummerus (2013) use the term offering to refer to products and services.

An offering can include both product and service and most offerings are part product and part service with the combination varying, as depicted in Figure 2.1. But an organisation does not merely offer a product or service or a combination of the two; rather, an organisation offers a value proposition, which contains a benefit that is aimed at satisfying a consumer need. Therefore, an offering is first and foremost the value proposition, which is manifested through the product-service combination with accompanying information and experiences. A brand will then be an offering that can be identified and differentiated by its brand elements and linked to the manufacturer, together with all its strong, favourable and unique associations (Kotler & Keller, 2012: 32). This view forms the centre of the ‘conceptual framework’, which is depicted in Figure 1.1.

Cognisant of the explanations of what a product, service and an offering is; the term offering is used throughout to include both product and service (to varying degrees, as depicted in Figure 2.1). For the present study, when the term product is used, it is used specifically to refer to a primarily tangible product offering or context, and when the term service is used it refers to a primarily intangible service or context. If the terms product, service and good is used as it is presented in the literature, the link will be made to the offering concept, if necessary, to indicate this study’s conceptual framework. The differences between product and service are elaborated on in Chapter 4.

2.2 OFFERING ELABORATED

As shown in the conceptual framework (Figure 1.1 and the discussion thereof) and the concept clarification section, the offering is central to brand and brand management. Therefore, offerings, as product-service combinations, will be classified into different categories and types. Services, as part of the B2B service focus of the current study, will be further classified into various categories and because it constitutes the extended marketing mix or services marketing mix, this will be discussed.
This section concludes by introducing the B2B part of the study, which is applied to the current study in the next section.

### 2.3.1 Categories of offerings

Five categories of offerings are notable, which are outlined below (du Plessis et al., 2012: 197-198).

1. **Pure product** – the offering consists of only a tangible product such as most fast-moving consumer goods, for example, a can of cola.
2. **Mainly product with some services** – the offering consists of mainly a tangible product with some services attached to the product, for example, an entry level motor vehicle.
3. **Hybrid** – the offering consists of equal parts product and services, for example, a restaurant, which offers food and service performance.
4. **Mainly service with some product** – the offering consists of mainly an intangible service with some tangible products attached to the service, for example, airlines that offer mostly a service with some products limited to the ticket itself, meals and drinks.
5. **Pure service** – the offering consists of only intangible services such as a visit to a psychologist and insurance.

The product and service spectrum is illustrated in Figure 2.1. The present study lies at one extreme of the spectrum, at the pure service extreme, and considers brand equity of services. The short-term insurance offering was chosen for this study because short-term insurance is an example of an offering approaching a pure service, much like other financial services (Ulaga and Reinartz, 2011: 5). This is in contrast to the CBBE model, which focuses on the other extreme; the pure product side of the spectrum (Kuhn et al., 2008: 41).

![Figure 2.1: Product-service spectrum](source: developed from du Plessis et al. (2012: 197-198), Lovelock and Wirtz (2011: 37-38))
2.3.2 Types of offerings

Offerings are classified as “convenience, shopping, speciality and unsought”. Convenience offerings include staples, impulse offerings and emergency offerings. Staples are purchased regularly, for example, rice. Location (place) is of paramount importance for convenience offerings. Impulse offerings are unplanned purchases, for example, ice cream. The position of impulse offerings within an outlet is critical. Emergency offerings, which are purchased owing to an urgent need, for example, a light bulb, should be available when the consumer needs it; namely at outlets that are open for extended hours. Shopping offerings are compared before purchase, for example, kitchen appliances. Salespersons play a vital role in advising consumers who compare offerings. Speciality offerings are often sought after brands for which consumers are willing to make a special effort, for example, luxury passenger cars. Consumers do not compare speciality offerings; they are clear about the specific brand that they seek. The convenient location of the outlet (place) is less important for speciality offerings than for convenience offerings. In addition, unsought offerings are offerings that consumers do not regularly think of purchasing, for example, insurance. Unsought offerings should be supported by advertising and personal selling to make consumers aware that they need the offerings (du Plessis et al., 2012: 201-204).

2.3.3 Categories of services

Services can be further categorised as (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2011: 40-43):

- People processing: the physical presence of the person that the service is rendered to is required. For example, health care and transportation;
- Possession processing: the service is directed at a physical possession. For example, treating a house for insects;
- Mental stimulus processing: a service that is directed at peoples’ minds. For example, education; and
- Information processing: services that are delivered by employing technology.

The marketing programmes for the various categories of services will generally differ. Also, services are experienced by the client, therefore there may be greater risk attached to buying a service as opposed to buying a product. Brands reduce risk; hence there may be even greater relevance for services. Because services cannot be sensed before a purchase, as is the case with products, the client’s perception of quality is influenced by what is referred to as the extended marketing mix. The extended marketing mix includes the elements of people, physical evidence and processes (Bhasin, 2011; Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011: 47-48).
2.3.4 Services marketing mix

When developing marketing strategies for products, the 4 Ps of the marketing mix is normally addressed. The 4 Ps are product, price, place and promotion. As mentioned, for services these four elements should be extended to include people, process and physical evidence. Services involve contact between service personnel and the client, and this interaction has a direct influence on quality perceptions. Therefore, recruitment, training and motivation of employees are important. Poorly designed processes lead to ineffective service delivery and a disappointing brand experience. Processes support the people element in the delivery of services. Because services are intangible, the physical evidence cues provide tangible evidence of the organisation’s service quality. The quality element is labelled as an eighth ‘P’, as it aids differentiation and influences client satisfaction and loyalty (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2007: 22-25), which is the pinnacle of the CBBE model. He and Li (2011: 92-93) found that personal interaction factors and overall service quality are important for service brand equity. Sales people are core to B2B service brands and enhance partnership relationships as long as the service satisfies a client need (Pop, Mihoc, Fotea & Lazar, 2011: 100-101). This is supported by Sichtmann, Selasinsky and Diamantopoulos (2011: 16), as well as Geigenmuller and Bettis-Outland (2012: 432) who found that capable, motivated and trained human resources and standardised work processes support service quality. Kim and Hyun (2011: 434) found that perceived service quality is pivotal for the creation of brand equity, and that the marketing programme activities enhance brand image, which affects perceived quality. Geigenmuller and Bettis-Outland’s (2012: 432) study confirm the importance of the physical evidence component of the extended marketing mix. The authors found that it is beneficial to provide a pleasant and appropriate physical environment for B2B services, which refers to location and functionality or infrastructure.

The element ‘people’ is included in the performance building block of the CBBE model (Figure 3.4) under the sub-dimensions ‘service effectiveness’, ‘efficiency’ and ‘empathy’. The element ‘processes’ supports the sub-dimensions of ‘effectiveness’ and ‘efficiency’. The interpersonal relationship between client and all organisation representatives, including salespersons and call centre operators is not made explicit in the CBBE model. The element of physical evidence is also not explicit in the CBBE model, but may be alluded to under the sub-dimension ‘purchase situation’. Purchase situation more directly relates to the concept of ‘place’ in the 4 Ps.

2.3.5 Industrial offerings

There are industrial (business) products and industrial (business) services. Industrial products are classified as materials and parts, capital items and supplies. Materials and parts are further subdivided into raw materials and manufactured materials and parts. Raw materials can be farm products (livestock and fruit), which are seasonal and often commodities, or natural products (timber and
Manufactured materials and parts can be component materials (yarn and cement), which are normally manufactured further or component parts (windshields). Capital items can be classified or subdivided as installations or equipment. Capital items include buildings and fixed machinery, and require significant capital investment, and hence personal selling has a more important role than advertising. Equipment is portable equipment (hand tools and office equipment) (Kotler & Keller, 2012: 349-350).

Industrial services are classified as financial, logistical, medical, educational, maintenance and repairs, management consulting, marketing, technical, data processing and information management, as well as other services. Services are demanded as pure services or as part of a product-service combination (Webster & Keller, 2004: 392) (as illustrated in Figure 2.1 and the core of Figure 1.1). The majority of brand management knowledge has been derived from research in business-to-consumer markets. Research into B2B branding is limited (Leek & Christodoulides, n.d.: 1, 7; Kimpakorn & Tocquer 2010: 378) and the importance of brands for B2B products and services have been ignored (Sarin, 2014: 91). To contribute to addressing this, the present study resides within the business (or B2B) services.

2.4 APPLICATION TO CURRENT STUDY

The research problem resides within the B2B services context. The source of the data was demand-side client organisations of short-term business insurance in Cape Town, South Africa. Insurers should offer a value proposition that contains benefits and value to satisfy business (organisation’s) needs. Short-term insurance approaches a pure service and is an unsought offering, while the service is people-based.

The client’s presence is needed at the time of purchase, when additional information is needed as well as when there is a claim. But the client’s presence is limited between purchase and claim. Information and client experience is important owing to the intangibility of the service offering. The extended marketing mix (people, physical evidence and processes) influences the client’s relative perceived service quality impression if the client, for example, purchases the insurance by visiting a broker. A person’s image influences how he/ she is treated and interpreted (Keller, 2008: 9). If so, then the effectiveness and professionalism of the people (receptionist, support staff and broker); cleanliness and ambience of the office; and efficiency of the support systems are important quality cues. The quality cues may even extend to the broker’s dress code, vehicle, quality of documentation when, for example, the broker visits the client. Brands are important for services owing to the intangibility and associated perceived increased risk to the client.
2.5 BRAND ELABORATED

The marketing battle will be a battle of brands, a competition for brand dominance. Businesses and investors will recognize brands as the company’s most important assets. This is a critical concept. It is a vision about how to develop, strengthen, defend, and manage a business …. It will be more important to own markets than to own factories. The only way to own markets is to own market-dominant brands - Light

The American Marketing Association (AMA) (2015) defines a brand as a “name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or 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”. A brand is more than an offering. Undifferentiated and unbranded offerings that satisfy the same need are called commodities. A brand, however, can differentiate a commodity. Also, “a brand … resides in the minds of consumers” (Keller, 2013: 31, 36). Landa (2006: 4) calls a commodity a “parity good or service – products that are equivalent in value”, and states that without a brand name all offerings are basically commodities. Differentiation may be based on an offering’s attributes or intangible feelings about, and attitude towards the brand. The brand can, therefore, create competitive advantage through differentiation by innovating and/or by creating a favourable image, which creates brand loyalty. Brand loyalty could lead to financial gain and it is this ability of brands that makes them some of the most valuable assets of an organisation. Furthermore, a brand is the primary asset of an organisation and can be more important that “the bricks and mortar - or even people” (Aaker, 1991: 221). Muylle, Dawar and Rangarajan (2012: 71) view brands as “long-term assets that accumulate meaning for customers over time”.

The Collins Dictionary of Marketing (2005: 38) defines a brand as:

a combination of attributes that gives a company, organisation product, service concept, or even a person, a distinctive identity and value relative to its competitors, its advocates, its stakeholders and its customers. The attributes that make a brand are both tangible and intangible: a name, a visual logo or trademark, products, services, people, a personality, reputation, brand loyalty, mental associations, culture and inherent values which, together, create a memorable, reassuring and relevant brand image in the eye and mind of the beholder.

The Collins Dictionary of Marketing continues that the consumer-brand relationship is often emotional rather that rational. A strong brand elevates the position of a brand in the customer’s mind to become part of the evoked set (top of mind list of products), which facilitates brand loyalty (Keller, 2013: 74). This builds brand awareness. Landa (2006: 4) conceptualises a brand as the sum total of all functional and emotional aspects, the identity and consumer perceptions of and about an offering or organisation.
Branding refers to the strategic process and creative practice of developing a brand (Interbrand, 2007: 20). Similarly, branding has to do with creating meaning from the articulation and communication of the brand (Pike, 2013: 334). Branding is a strategy to achieve marketing objectives and influences consumer preference. Branding techniques include “crafting a memorable and compelling brand name, attractive package design, and recognisable logo and symbol to evoke positive consumer responses (Anabila, 2015: 62, 72). Early on Fournier (1998: 260) contemplated that it may also be that in a post-modern society brands fill a void in people (the ‘empty selves’) which is created by the diminishing sense of community with others and loss of traditions. A brand then signals to others who the person is and what the person believes in. This gives the person access to a brand community and provides some stability in an ever changing world.

2.6 BRAND HISTORY
The term ‘brand’ is derived from the Old Norse word ‘brandr’, which means ‘to burn’, which was the way livestock was marked (ownership identification) (Interbrand, 1992: 8). Branding is brand marketing and has been practised for many centuries. Figure 2.2 depicts a branding timeline. As far back as 5000BC the inhabitants of the Lascaux Caves in Southern France painted images of bison on the walls to indicate ownership. Egyptian tombstones of 3000BC show branded domestic animals (Affinity Advertising, 2011: 7). Later craftsmen marked their products so that customers could identify the origin. Marks have been found on ancient Chinese porcelain, on Roman pottery and on products from India dating back as far as 1300 BC. Later, during medieval times, marks of ownership were added to bread, gold and silverware (with a personal identity, as well as with a sign indicating the quality of the metal used) and products of various craft guilds. The reasoning was twofold: on the one hand to increase demand by customers to be able to identify the origin of quality products, and on the other hand to identify products of inferior quality.

The Europeans took the practice of branding with them when they moved to North America. The pioneers of branding in America were the producers of medicine and tobacco products. These products furthered the use of individual packaging with distinctive labels, and the tobacco products steered towards the development of creative names to differentiate products (Low and Fullerton, 1994: 176). A summary of Low and Fullerton’s (1994: 175-186) article follows to provide a concise historical overview of the development of branding which will provide a context for the field of study.
2.6.1 The establishment of manufacturer brands in America: 1870 to 1914

The key events listed below created a fertile environment for branded products to establish distinct brand identities, leading to producers taking responsibility for their products for the first time.

- Regional and national distribution was made easier by developments in transportation (railroad system) and communication (telegraph and telephone).
- Production process improvements made inexpensive, yet quality mass manufacturing is possible.
- Improvements in packaging have made individually packaged and branded goods (as opposed to mass) viable.
- Developments in US trademark law from 1870 to early 1900 made trademark protection possible, which enhanced brand awareness.
- Advertising became more broadly acceptable and was used on a wider scale.
- Magazines (owing to the realization of increasing revenue) became a vehicle for brand messages.
- The increased prevalence of retail stores and the establishment of new types of organisations (mail order) established a consumer culture.
- An increase in standards of living for Americans, which was brought about by industrialisation, facilitated consumerism.
- Poor quality unbranded goods and their proliferation created initial demand for branded goods, which promised more consistent quality.

These factors enabled the spread of more affordable and better quality products over larger geographic areas, while packaging and trademark protection advanced decomoditisation. Expanded and improved communication better informed an expanding pool of potential customers of the differences between products. The increased availability of products and financially able customers set the scene for mass marketed brands.
Branding historical timeline

**Figure 2.2: Branding timeline**

Source: Developed from Interbrand, 1992: 8; Low and Fullerton, 1994: 176; Affinity Advertising, 2011: 7
Branded products, however, were not without its detractors. Wholesalers, retailers and consumers, owing to the influence of the distribution system, initially resisted branded products. In time, however, most of the resistance in the distribution system was overcome through collaboration, authority and push and pull marketing strategies.

### 2.6.2 Leadership of mass marketed brands: 1915 to 1929

A classical research study, which was conducted by Hotchkiss and Franken (1923: 107-121, cited in Low and Fullerton, 1994: 178), showed the value of brands. The research measured the unaided brand recall (hence, brand familiarity or awareness) across 100 different categories. Some of the brands listed (including Ford, Colgate, Kellogg’s Corn Flakes and Goodyear) are still well known today. The researchers remarked that the goodwill of some of the brand names were worth millions of dollars and were the most important assets of the companies. They also stated that customers do differentiate between brands as part of the decision-making process, and that brands were trusted for quality and service. It is interesting to note that some companies adopted the strong product brand names as company names. Perhaps this was an early tendency towards what is presently called family or even corporate branding. Furthermore, the functional management system, where more than one functional manager was responsible for brand decisions, became problematic. This was exacerbated by brand proliferation. Hotchkiss and Franken’s (1923: 107-121, cited in Low and Fullerton, 1994: 178) research is summarised below.

### 2.6.3 Challenges of mass marketed brands: 1930 to 1945

This period included the Great Depression and World War II. The onset of the Great Depression in 1929 brought with it renewed challenges to mass marketed brands. Power in the distribution system moved to retailers and wholesalers who responded to the consumer spending crunch by introducing cheaper house brands, and by reducing the range of brands that were carried. Customer suspicion regarding advertising added to the challenges of mass manufactured brands. Around 1930 Proctor and Gamble began to develop a system of assigning one brand manager to a single product and even developed different personalities for their competing brands (brand cannibalisation may be a factor to consider with this type of strategy), for example, Camay and Ivory soap. Competitors were slow to introduce this system and sustained their presence owing to a lack of competition. Interestingly the brand manager system was mostly confined to the B2B, as opposed to the consumer-goods market.

### 2.6.4 The dominance of the brand management system: 1946 to 1985

As the war ended, there were two schools of thought; the one proposed that manufacturer branded goods will struggle to return to their former dominance as consumers are no longer in the habit of purchasing branded products, whereas the other foresaw a surge in demand for branded products owing to the inherent fundamental tenants of branding, which are consistent quality and
manufacturer responsibility. During the baby boom era, demand for branded products did indeed increase rapidly owing to an increase in discretionary income, an extended variety of products, and the effect of television advertising.

As a result, by 1967 brand managers became the norm at major American consumer goods manufacturers. Other factors, which contributed to the adoption of the brand management system were brand proliferation and complex organisational structures. This made it near impossibility for a marketing head to understand and manage all the different products within such a complicated structure. The brand management system and brand manager concept fed into the marketing concept.

On the contrary, PepsiCo discontinued the brand manager concept while some modified their brand manager system. Some of the scenarios that were presented included companies that could do without brand managers if the company had a limited number of brands and a history of focused family branding. One of the major reasons for the problems experienced with the brand management system was because of the misalignment of authority and responsibility of the brand manager; hence interpersonal skills were found to be vital for success.

The future of the brand manager has been brought into question. The current organisational structure differs substantially from that of post-World War II, in which brand managers were the norm owing to innovations such as downsizing, outsourcing and corporate reengineering. Other reasons for opposing the brand manager concept include a disproportionate internal focus by brand managers, short job tenures, a short-term approach and de-proliferation.

It is interesting to note that most of the leading brands in 1923 are still leaders today, hence the brand manager function should be retained, but with certain adaptations, which include the following:

- Longer job tenures;
- More experienced brand managers;
- Responsibility for a portfolio of brands;
- Greater external communication and contact;
- Customised brand manager role to better align with organisational needs; and
- Realised entrepreneurial potential of the brand manager – flexibility, creativity, and relationship building skills.

To summarise the above; an entrepreneurial brand manager system is envisaged that will, even to a greater extent, exemplify the marketing concept (Low & Fullerton, 1994: 181).
2.7 BENEFITS OF BRANDS

A product is something that is made in a factory; a brand is something that is bought by a customer. A product can be copied by a competitor; a brand is unique. A product can be quickly outdated; a successful brand is timeless (Stephen King, as cited by Bizcommunity.com, n.d.).

For consumers a brand contains a promise of performance and values, which allow consumers to project their self-image (Keller, 2008: 8). Organisations are willing to pay a premium to acquire brands to capitalise on the intrinsic brand equity and, in addition, competing on price commoditise an offering whereas building a brand differentiates an offering, which may form the basis of non-price based competitive advantage (Aaker, 1991: x).

Brands provide benefits. Some of the benefits for consumers include that brands identify the source or manufacturer of the product; assign responsibility to the manufacturer; reduce the risk involved in a transaction; reduce the search cost; entail a promise by the manufacturer; are symbolic; and are an indication of quality (Keller, 2008: 17-18). Some of the benefits of brands for intermediaries or resellers include: connecting manufacturer to intermediary and building trust between the parties (Muyelle, Dawar & Rangarajan, 2012: 58); less vulnerability to competitive marketing actions or marketing crises (Geigenmuller & Bettis Outland, 2012: 432); enhanced consumer interest; and greater profits through price premiums (Snežana & Bruno, 2014: 194). For organisations a brand can be a key success factor because it can increase recognition and patronage (Aureli, Forlani & Pencarelli, 2015: 19). B2B brands create competitive advantage (Geigenmuller & Bettis Outland, 2012: 432) and prominent B2B brands can command a price premium and improve relationships (Glynn, 2012: 673-674).

2.8 BRAND MANAGEMENT

In South Africa, for example, at FirstRand the organisational structure was amended to introduce a brand director as the guardian of FirstRand’s FNB, RMB, WesBank and Momentum brands (Marketingweb, 2008), which demonstrates the importance of brands to FirstRand. The term “guardian” is preferred here because the term “brand custodian” is reserved for the most senior position in any organisation. The brand custodian may, for example, be the chief executive officer (CEO) or the managing director (MD).

Even though strategy is at the core of the brand, any brand is susceptible to poor brand management, regardless of a brand’s strength. In addition, contemporary brand management may be more challenging than ever. Knowledgeable consumers, brand proliferation, media fragmentation, increased competition, increased costs and greater accountability contribute to the difficulty. Effective brand management is a long-term imperative, which is under pressure from the short tenures of chief marketing officers (CMO) – found to be 23 months in the United States (US).
These short tenures may lead to a short-term profit maximisation focus, which may compromise long-term imperatives (McGovern & Quelch, 2004: 47).

2.8.1 Brand architecture
Brand architecture refers to the strategic structure of an organisation’s brands and how they relate to each other. It refers to the inter-relationships between brands (Muylle, et al., 2012: 71; Muyelle, Dawar & Rangarajan, 2012: 59) and to “the process of designing and managing portfolios of the brands” (Hanna & Rowley, 2013: 1789). Brand architecture provides a framework for future brand decisions (line and range extension, acquisitions, unbundling, divestment and mergers and acquisitions). To align terminology the researcher’s adapted terms for the different types of brand architecture are included in brackets next. As part of the architecture, a brand can be parent-dominant (an organisation-controlled brand), parent-endorsed (an organisation-endorsed brand) or parent-silent (organisation-silent or a stand-alone individual brand) (adapted, Chiaravalle & Schenck, 2007: 30-32 and McDonald, de Chernatony & Harris, 2001: 337-338; Aureli et al., 2015; Muyelle, Dawar & Rangarajan, 2012: 59-60). These architectures are briefly explained below.

- Organisation-controlled brand architecture (also called parent-dominant or umbrella brand): the organisation itself and the offering carry the same brand name. This brand architecture is economical, as only one brand should be established, but if the organisation brand’s equity is compromised, it may affect all offerings.
- Organisation-endorsed brand architecture (also called parent-endorsed): the organisation and the offering are brands in their own right, but the organisation endorses the offering. The offering as a brand will be primary, and the organisation brand secondary.
- Organisation-silent brand architecture (also called parent-silent): the independent, stand-alone brand has no reference to the organisation brand. This type of architecture provides an opportunity to establish different brands to better connect to different market segments with different values.

The brand architecture houses different types of brands, namely an organisation brand, an organisation-endorsed brand and an individual brand. The organisation controlled brand architecture and the organisation brand has as its main advantages the brand equity of the organisation brand that has been built over time by investment in the marketing programme and consistent offering performance. This reduces consumer risk and should reduce the consumer’s reluctance to trial purchase the offering. It is recommended that financial institutions should use organisation brands because the deciding factor for clients is the organisation’s historic performance (adapted McDonald, et al., 2001: 337).
Brand architecture is neglected by B2B organisations (Muyelle, Dawar & Rangarajan, 2012: 59). In B2B markets the organisation-controlled brand architecture is most prominent with organisation-endorsed brand architecture that is also used. Organisation-silent brand architecture is seldom used. This supports relationship marketing as an important construct in B2B marketing where the relationship is between supplier organisation and buyer organisation, and not between buyer organisation and individual offering brand/ sub brand. Hence, the brand becomes the relationship between the seller and buyer. This is because the quality of the offering is a hygiene factor (quality is considered a given that it will be of sufficient/ comparable quality). Differentiation is thus achieved by the supplier brand; the credibility of the supplier brand behind the offering and not the individual offering brand, as is the case in B2C markets (Webster & Keller, 2004: 397; Muyelle, Dawar & Rangarajan, 2012: 59). For services brand architecture, the organisation name is often adopted as the service brand or the service is treated in a traditional product branding fashion, which fails to take the distinct differences between products and services into account (O'Cass & Grace, 2004: 266-267). However, the use of an individual brand is not entirely uncommon in the services sector. This type of brand is used as part of the brand architecture where the new service is distinctly different to what the organisation offers, or when a new and distinctly different market is targeted. This limits the potential damage to the organisation brand if the new brand’s offering fails. This strategy will result in higher marketing costs and possibly lower profitability (McDonald et al., 2001: 338). This is, for example, true for the South African short-term insurance brand, Santam, which also owns the stand-alone individual MiWay brand. Santam’s distribution strategy primarily relies on brokers and MiWay deals directly with clients. A Santam direct brand (as opposed to MiWay) would contradict the Santam-through-broker strategy. This strategy makes sense as the new offering is distinctly different to the core structure of the Santam offering (Fin24, 2010). For the context of this study it is important to note that MiWay does not offer business insurance, which is the focus of the present study. The researcher’s observation suggests that in a B2B market the end-user is mostly a brand-receiver and in the B2C market, the end-user is a brand-decider, which means that in a B2B situation the employee uses brands that the organisation decided on through its buyers and based on organisation-specific requirements (for example, Dell computers), whereas in a B2C situation, the end-user decides which brands he/she prefers to use (or has a much greater influence at least, for example, an Apple iPad). Hence, reliability may be more important than status, in this example, for the B2B transaction. Therefore, the brand-receiver does not own the brand that is used (consumed) in a B2B setting, but in a B2C setting the brand-decider owns the brand that is used (consumed). Therefore, the brand’s value proposition should be relevant to all the role players in the decision-making process (for B2B marketing), and not to one person (as is often the case for B2C marketing).
In addition to brand architecture, Muylle, et al. (2012: 60-63) propose a brand architecture model for the B2B context, specifically. The authors’ model highlights the different phases of consumer-seller relationship building, and shows the customer risks in each phase. The authors suggest that B2B brand architecture can be designed to reduce consumers' risk at each phase of the consumer-seller relationship. The five phases are 1) the contact relationship phase; 2) the transaction relationship phase; 3) the expansion relationship phase; 4) the consultative relationship phase; and 5) the enterprise relationship phase. During the contact relationship phase the consumer realises that he/ she has a need and short lists potential suppliers. The suppliers indicate that they have an ability to satisfy consumers’ needs. To reduce the customer’s risk perception of doing business with the seller, the umbrella brand architecture, where the organisation brand and the offering brands have the same name, is regarded as most appropriate. This equates to the organisation-controlled brand architecture. The transaction relationship phase is when the seller tries to convince the consumer of its offer, and this is when the consumer places a trial order. The umbrella brand architecture is most appropriate during this phase also, and reduces consumer risk. If the consumer’s need were met during the transaction phase, the consumer will begin to trust the seller and place more orders. This is the start of the expansion relationship phase. Still the umbrella brand architecture is most appropriate, but the line brand architecture (similar to organisation-silent brand architecture) starts to become important. During the consultative relationship phase, the trust that was built during the previous two phases leads to the preparedness of the consumer to work with the supplier to solve other of the consumer’s needs outside of the initial order. The consumer's risk is reduced through a combination of an umbrella, line and modifier brand (an offering brand within the offering line) architectures. The enterprise relationship phase is dependent on success in the consultative phase, and leads to increased commitment from the consumer to work with the seller on strategic initiatives. Both umbrella and line brand architectures reduce consumer risk during this phase. Co-branding (for example Sony-Ericsson), ingredient branding (for example, Intel inside) or dual branding (for example, IBM and Linux) can also be considered during this phase. The suggested dominance of the umbrella or organisation-dominant brand architecture for service brands is supported by Berry (2000: 130) and for B2B services, by Davis, Golicic and Marquardt (2008: 225).

2.8.2 Strategic brand management

Porter’s generic strategy model in Figure 2.3 gives a graphic representation of the four categories of products based on two variables, namely ‘competitive scope’ and ‘competitive advantage’. Competitive scope refers to the scope of the market (narrow or broad) or product mix width (narrow or broad); whereas competitive advantage refers to the two sources of competitive advantage, namely low cost and differentiation. The relationship of the two sources of competitive advantage with the competitive scope gives four generic strategies, namely cost leadership, product differentiation, cost focus and differentiation focus. Cost leadership entails a competitive advantage
based on an organisation’s low-cost position in a broad market or across a broad product portfolio. This strategy is enabled by, among others, economies of scale to offer the lowest per unit price in the industry to a broad (large) market and price is the main consideration in the buying decision. Competitive advantage can also be achieved based on differentiation when a product (or broad portfolio of products) is regarded as being unique in a broad market. Both the cost leadership and differentiation strategies can be concentrated on a narrow segment of the market. A narrow market focused differentiation achieves competitive advantage by satisfying a specific target market or niche as opposed to a broad market. A cost focused strategy refers to an organisation that offers a narrow or niche market at lower prices than the opposition, or offers a narrow product portfolio at the lowest prices.

![Figure 2.3: Porter’s generic strategy model](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)

Modern marketing aims to create differentiated brands. Branding de-commoditises offerings by focussing on bases for differentiation and not price competition. However, owing to the cost of advertising and competitive pressures, a brand is often consigned to a niche market. Relating this to Porter’s generic strategies, displayed in Figure 2.3, it is clear that a pure cost leadership strategy is not the focus of branding. However, if cost leadership is interpreted as a value strategy, then it becomes a viable branding strategy. Almost all successful branded consumer products derive their competitive advantage based on differentiation, which focuses on brand image and commands a
price premium. Top-end luxury brands employ focused differentiation strategy, and usually enjoy a high level of consumer loyalty. Therefore, focussed differentiation strategy is one of the strategies that can be used by an organisation to achieve resonance, and to enhance the loyalty sub-dimension in the CBBE model, specifically. Taylor et al. (2004: 217) supports this, since favourable attitudinal loyalty increases relative price (Jooste, Strydom, Berndt & du Plessis, 2009: 63-64; Keegan & Green, 2008: 508-512).

Keller’s (2013: 58-60) strategic brand management process, as depicted in Figure 2.4, consists of four steps, which are outlined below:

1. “Identify and establish brand positioning and values”;
2. “Plan and implement brand marketing programs”;
3. “Measure and interpret brand performance”; and
4. “Grow and sustain brand equity”.

The four steps are discussed in greater detail next:

Step 1: “Identify and establish brand positioning and values” entails the development of brand positioning and distilling the brand values, which include the following key concepts:

- “Mental maps”, which are graphic representations of various mental associations of a consumer with a brand;
- “Competitive frame of reference” is brand positioning in terms of competitors. Brand positioning entails establishing a unique and meaningful position for brands in the consumer’s mind. Positioning aims to differentiate brands and to create a competitive advantage. Positioning is often linked to the brand’s most valued attributes and benefits;
- “Points of parity and points of difference” indicate how brands differ from competitors’ brands (the advantages), and easing consumer concerns about possible disadvantages;
- “Core brand associations” are core attributes, benefits and symbolic associations; and
- “Brand mantra”, also called brand promise or brand essence, expresses the most important aspects of the brand (positioning and core associations) single mindedly, and in only a few words.
Step 2: “Plan and implement brand marketing programs” outlines how the brand’s positioning will be communicated to create brand awareness and meaning, and includes the following key concepts:

- “Mixing and matching of brand elements”. Brand element choice forms part of this process and can enhance brand awareness, as well as brand associations, which build brand equity.
- “Integrating brand marketing activities” is the use of marketing activities to “create strong, favorable and unique brand associations”.
- “Leveraging secondary associations” includes identification of origin or ownership and channel strategy and co-branding are considered.

Step 3: “Measure and interpret brand performance” entails a brand audit and includes the following key concepts:

- “Brand value chain” to “trace the value creation process for brands” and to comprehend the financial implication of spending on brand marketing.
- “Brand audits”. A brand audit analyses, in detail, the brand equity of a brand, which offers recommendations to improve brand equity. This includes a market and competitive environment analyses.
“Brand tracking” follows brand performance and informs the brand equity management system.

“Brand equity management system” is a research based system, which provides brand managers with information to make timely decisions.

Step 4: “Grow and sustain brand equity” deals with the organisation’s branding strategy and considers the following key concepts:

- “Brand-product matrix”, which is a visual representation of all offerings and brands that are sold by the entity.
- “Brand portfolios and hierarchies” visually represent common and distinctive brand components, which clarifies the organisation’s branding strategy.
- “Brand expansion strategies” consider leveraging existing brand equity to introduce a line or range extension to the product and brand portfolios.
- “Brand reinforcement and revitalization” deal with strengthening and updating the brand.

It is not known to what extent the strategic brand management process, which is detailed above, is applicable to B2B services. Some of the research directions called for by Leek and Christodoulides (2011: 8) support this view (summarised in Table 4.2). For example, additional research is called for regarding the meaning of B2B brands and the importance of functional and emotional associations, which constitutes mental maps as a sub-dimension step 1. The present research contributes to the steps and key concepts indicated in bold in Figure 2.4.

2.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter clarified the basic terms and concepts, which are used in the present study and which are fundamental to the conceptual framework (Figure 1.1). The differences between product, service and offering; between customer, client and consumer; and between B2B and B2C were discussed. It became evident that these terms are used interchangeably in the literature. For the present study it can be concluded that there is no agreement around the definitions of some of the key branding concepts. The discussion, as well as definitions in this chapter and in Appendix 5 can be seen as an additional contribution of the present study, albeit a minor contribution. The chapter provided a brief overview of the history of brand and branding and introduced brand management, which links to Chapter 3, where the most prominent brand management models are discussed and compared.


3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 explored and detailed the concepts that constitute the conceptual framework. The issue that there is no agreement around the definition of these concepts, and the fact that most branding research was conducted for B2C products, were highlighted. The conclusion was that more needs should be done to define these concepts, and that research is needed for B2B services.

In this chapter the focus is on brand equity and a distinction is made between brand equity and brand value. The most prominent models that guide the strategic brand building process are discussed and compared. Another contribution to theory is presented by relating the sub-dimensions of CBBE model to the extended marketing mix.

3.2 DEFINING BRAND EQUITY

Even though brand equity is a fundamental issue within contemporary brand management (Uggla, 2014: 29), the researcher shares the sentiment of Juntunen, Juntunen and Juga (2011: 302-303) who state that there seems to be ambiguity as far as the term brand equity is concerned. Even though the term brand equity is used most often, in some instances brand equity and brand value are used synonymously. There are two perspectives when studying brand equity, namely financially based and strategy based. The financially based perspective has, as its aim, estimation of the economic market value of the brand for accounting purposes, which is asset valuation for the balance sheet, and also known as goodwill. Various approaches exist to calculate the financial value of brand equity, including the price premium generated by the brand; impact of the brand on customer preference; replacement value of the brand; stock price movements; and future earnings.

The strategy based perspective aims to build the importance of brands in respect of consumers’ perceptions. This view uses nonfinancial measures of brand equity such as brand awareness and attitude. Therefore, the financial based perspective deals with the value of a brand from the organisation’s point of view (the value of the asset), whereas the strategy based perspective deals with the value of a brand from the consumer’s point of view (building the asset itself). There is also another view that reasons that market share is an adequate measure of brand strength, which renders brand equity obsolete. There are, however, issues with this approach even though market share is one of the most important measures of brand equity. Also, brand valuation is so variable, with differing valuations depending on the method used, that some reason that brand equity has no validity (Aaker, 1991: 22-30; Ambler, 1995: 386-387, 392, 394; Keller: 1993:1-2). The strategy or consumer based perspective aims to improve the return on marketing investment (Pappu, Quester & Cooksey, 2005: 153).
Ambler’s distinction between brand value (quantified financial worth of brand) and brand equity (strength of brand as asset) is adopted for this study. The distinction between brand value and brand equity is clearer from Keller’s (2001:17) CBBE model than from Aaker’s (1991: 270) brand equity model. The strategic aspects of brand equity are the focus of this study, and not financial brand value.

The brand equity concept has different definitions with no generally accepted view about how to conceptualise and measure it. The Oxford Dictionary (2010) defines brand equity as “the commercial value that derives from consumer perception of the brand name of a particular product or service, rather than from the product or service itself”.

Ambler (1995: 388- 389) defines brand equity (the author also calls it goodwill) as “the sum of brand relationships with those in the market, weighted by their importance that will enhance future profits and cash flow” and brand equity “is a marketing derived asset that has financial value in terms of future profit and cash flow”. Also, brand equity is not only consumer driven; rather, “influence agents” outside the distribution channels such as journalists and professional advisors may influence brand equity. Farquhar’s (1989: 24) work on brand equity is considered as seminal, and the author defined brand equity as the “added value” that a brand endows a product with, while brand equity leads to increased attitude strength on the part of the consumer. Aaker and Keller pioneered best practices for brand equity (Bolton, 2011: 125, 129). Aaker (1996: 15-16) states that brand equity comprises the assets and liabilities that are associated with the brand, which will either add to or subtract from the utility to the consumer. According to Aaker, brand equity has five components (or asset and liability groupings), namely (1) brand loyalty; (2) brand name awareness; (3) perceived quality; (4) brand associations in addition to perceived quality; and (5) other proprietary brand assets such as patents, trademarks and channel relationships. Brand equity is, therefore, represented by a brand name and is a base for competitive advantage and future earnings.

Brand equity and the relational concept are linked and focus on long-term value creation rather than a short-term transaction orientation or profit maximisation. The relational concept treats the brand as “a partner of the consumer with compatible values and personalities” and the brand and consumer have a relationship, which is not dissimilar to that between people (Ambler, 1995: 386, 394). The brand equity concept emphasises the strategic importance of the brand in marketing activities and presents a means of addressing contemporary brand management challenges. The CBBE model incorporates “theoretical advances and managerial practices” to provide a framework for building, measuring and managing a strong brand. CBBE approaches brand equity from the consumer’s point of view. The basic argument of the CBBE model is that a brand’s power resides in the consumer’s mind. That is, that the power of a brand is built through all experiences with a
brand. It is, therefore, crucial for all experiences to add to a positive consumer image and attitude (Keller, 2008: 37-38, 48). The importance of consumer image is supported by Mackay, Romaniuk and Sharp (1997: 1153):

[The] marketing approach (often referred to as consumer based brand equity) refers to added value of the brand to the consumer. Subscribers to this approach tend to focus on the value created by marketing activities as perceived by customers.

Keller (2013: 69) defines customer-based brand equity as “the differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to marketing of that brand”. The author explains that this response can either be positive or negative. The brand has positive customer-based brand equity if the consumer reacts more favourably to an offering and the marketing message because the brand is known, than if the brand is not known and may, therefore, be less price sensitive and more accepting of extensions. The brand has negative customer-based brand equity if the consumer responds less favourably to the offering when the brand is known, than to an unknown brand. If negative, the brand is regarded as a commodity. Berry (2000: 130) agrees that brand equity can be positive or negative. Positive brand equity is the “degree of marketing advantage a brand would hold over an unnamed or fictitiously name competitor”, and negative brand equity is the “degree of marketing disadvantage linked to a specific brand”.

The ambiguity of the terms brand equity and brand value is furthered by the definition of the term equity in the Oxford Dictionary (2010), which treats value as an explanation for equity by stating that the term equity can refer to:

- “the value of the shares issued by a company: he owns 62% of the group’s equity; or
- the value of a mortgaged property after deduction of charges against it: people who have built up a significant amount of equity in their homes.”

For the present study the researcher adopts Keller’s view of customer-based brand equity.

3.3 THE MOST PROMINENT BRAND EQUITY MODELS

The short-term results of promotional activities (sales turnover and market share) are easy to measure compared to long-term brand-building returns. For this reason research into building brand equity is important to show how brand-building activities are linked to future brand performance; to justify spending on brand-building activities (Aaker, 1991: 15). Branding models try to explain and simplify the roles of the various components and their inter-relatedness. Branding models bring together academic research and industry best practice. Both perspectives are historical, but aim to elevate branding practice from opinion to objective discussion (Aaker: 1991: xii).
There are different branding models; from the simplified models of Bailey and Schechter (1994) and Grossman (1994), which refer to the tangible aspects of the brand only to the model of Kapferer (1992), which focuses mostly on the emotive aspects of the brand. However, the two most prominent models are Keller’s (1993: 1-22; 2001: 15-19; 2008: 60-61; 2013: 108) customer-based brand equity model and Aaker’s (1991: 270) brand equity model (O’cass & Grace, 2004: 257). These two models are discussed and compared next. Because the two models are so prominent and are referred to most often in the literature, the discussion will focus on the contributions of the two developers of the models. Literature that confirms the dimensions of these models is added, following the discussion of the two models.

Note: after the literature review was completed the customer-based brand equity model was renamed to the brand resonance model (Keller, 2013: 107).

3.3 Keller’s conceptualisation of customer-based brand equity

3.3.1 Brand knowledge

Keller (1993: 2) states that brand knowledge is maybe an organisation’s most valuable asset and is a result of previous investment in brand marketing. Key to Keller’s CBBE model is the concept of brand knowledge. Brand knowledge creates the differences (differential effect) that result in brand equity. Keller uses a psychological concept called the ‘associative network memory model’ to explain brand knowledge. According to this concept, information is stored in nodes and the links between nodes. The strength of the associations determines how rich the knowledge will be or how many nodes or associations will be activated. Therefore, brand knowledge can be represented by one brand node with several associations linked to it.

Keller further asserts that brand knowledge consists of brand awareness (or brand familiarity) and brand image (brand associations or the consumer’s perception of the brand) (Figure 3.2). Brand awareness relates to the strength of the brand node in the consumer’s mind and brand image refers to other associated nodes in the consumer’s memory. Therefore, “customer-based brand equity occurs when the consumer has a high level of awareness and familiarity with the brand and holds some strong, favourable, and unique brand associations in memory” (Keller, 2013: 70-73).
3.3.1.2 Brand awareness

As depicted in Figure 3.2, brand awareness consists of brand recognition and brand recall. Brand recognition is a consumer’s ability to recognise a brand based on a brand cue, while brand recall is a consumer’s ability to recall a brand from memory if given the need that the offering category satisfies, or the offering category itself as a cue. Brand awareness is created with the various brand elements. Brand elements are derived from brand identity and the meaning conveyed through, for example, a visual picture. Brand elements include names, logos, symbols, characters, slogans, jingles, packaging and signage (Weszka, 2011: 175). Similarly, Phillips, McQuarrie and Griffin (2014: 318) found that art directors see brand elements as visual brand identity, and “as the holistic look and feel of a brand, manifest as consistency among the brand, its strategy, and all its
individual visual elements, ongoing over time”. Brand awareness may suffice to create brand equity for low involvement decisions, but in most instances both brand awareness and brand image is needed to create brand equity. An organisation-proprietary brand (store brand, private label, generic brand, own brand, retailer brand) may, therefore, be seen as an unbranded offering or a commodity if it merely represents the offering category and satisfies the basic category need. In such a case price will become the deciding decision-making factor. For high involvement purchases both brand awareness and brand image are important.

There are at least three benefits for creating brand awareness. These are (Keller, 2013: 74):

1. “Learning advantages”, which involve indexing the brand in the consumer’s mind, which is the first step towards building brand equity. The combination of brand elements that is used is important for indexing.

2. “Consideration advantages” is the probability that the brand will be included in the consideration set. A consideration set is the list of brands that comes to mind and is seriously considered to satisfy an unmet need.


The focus of the present study is on B2B services. As explained in Chapter 2 (section 2.3.1), short-term insurance is per definition a service and approaches a pure service as depicted in Figure 2.1. The purchase does not happen at the point of sale as with many fast moving consumer goods. The purchase often happens away from the service provider’s premises or offices or even online. In this situation brand recall is most important. The client should be able to recall the brand from memory and initiate the transaction. If the transaction is facilitated by a broker, for instance, brand recall may facilitate brand awareness. A high level of brand awareness is thus important for a short-term insurance brand.

Brand awareness is created by raising brand recognition and by improving brand recall. Repeated exposure of the consumer to a combination of brand elements (for example, the South African short-term insurer Santam uses the yellow umbrella symbol in addition to their name and colour) through the marketing mix is more effective in creating brand recognition than brand recall. Improving brand recall involves establishing linkages in the consumer’s memory between the brand and the category and relevant purchase and consumption cues. Santam's current slogan “insurance good and proper”, for example, includes offering category and brand positioning, which build a positive brand image. The aim of brand awareness is to get consumers to think of the brand when they think of the offering category, so the strength of this association is important (Keller, 2013: 75-76, 79).
3.3.1.3 **Brand image**

A positive brand image, as shown in Figure 3.2, is created through the establishment of strong brand associations in the mind of the consumer. These associations should be “strong, favourable and unique”. Relevant and consistent information strengthens brand associations so that the brand has various retrieval cues. There are three types of brand associations, namely attributes, benefits, and attitudes. Brand associations should be derived and aligned to brand positioning that is important to consumers and differentiates the brand in consumers’ minds. This is at the heart of differentiation and creating a sustainable competitive advantage or unique selling proposition. There normally are general attributes and benefits that consumers expect all brands in a category to display. In this instance a brand should develop differentiation through additional attributes and benefits or at least exemplify the general attributes and benefits as best in the category. Category associations may also be linked to a brand. For example, if people do not trust the short-term insurance industry, in general, then all short-term insurance providers will be distrusted as a point of departure (Keller, 2013: 76-79).

To summarise, brand equity is built by creating a familiar brand identity (through the choice of brand elements) and a positive brand image (strong, favourable, and unique brand associations), which is integrated into the marketing mix (Keller, 1993: 17).

3.3.1.4 **Keller's customer-based brand equity model**

The CBBE model (Keller, 2008: 59-78; 2001: 15-19; Keller, 2013: 108) provides a framework to guide the brand building process, to ascertain brand building progress (for example brand tracking) and to guide marketing research. The model is based on what consumers have “learned, felt, seen and heard about the brand over time” therefore, marketers’ continuous challenge is to ensure proper experiences (through touch points) with the product or service offering, and to use marketing programmes to create appropriate “thoughts, feelings, image, perceptions, and attitudes” as associations that are linked to the brand. The CBBE model represents brand building as a sequence of four stages, with each stage being reliant on achieving the objectives of the previous stage. Each stage entails a question, which consumers ask of brands. These stages (or steps) and related questions, as depicted in Figure 3.3, are shown below.

1. Establishing the proper “brand identity = Who are you?”
   Ensuring that consumers are able to identify the brand and associate the brand with a specific need or offering category in consumers’ minds.

2. Creating the appropriate “brand meaning = What are you?”
   Establish brand meaning as the sum total of tangible and intangible associations in the minds of consumers.

3. Eliciting the right “brand response = What about you? (What do I think or feel about you?)”
Eliciting the appropriate consumer response to stages 1 and 2, that is ‘brand identity’ and ‘brand meaning’.

4. Forging appropriate “brand relationships = What about you and me? (What kind of association and how much of a connection would I like to have with you?)”. This deals with converting brand response into a loyal relationship between consumer and brand.

Figure 3.2: Customer-based brand equity (brand resonance model) pyramid

Source: Keller, 2008: 60; Keller, 2013: 108
The four stages are also referred to as the “branding ladder”. Each stage on the branding ladder corresponds to a brand-building block (or blocks) and its various sub-dimensions (Figure 3.4), which are shown as contained in the brand equity pyramid in Figures 3.3 and 3.4. There are a total of six brand-building blocks in the brand equity pyramid with duality in the brand building process, which are indicated by the building blocks up the left side of the brand equity pyramid, representing a “rational route” to brand building and the building blocks up the right side of the brand equity pyramid, representing an “emotional route” to brand building. Most strong brands follow a branding strategy that includes both sides of the brand equity pyramid. The six brand-building blocks (as indicated in Figures 3.3) are ‘brand salience’, ‘brand performance’, ‘brand imagery’, (consumer) ‘brand judgments’, (consumer) ‘brand feelings’ and (consumer-) ‘brand resonance’ (Hutt & Speh, 2013: 165). Christodoulides and de Chernatony (2010: 61) concur that functional (performance) and emotional (affinity) dimensions are important for brand equity and add “experiential facets”. Salience means important or prominent (Oxford Dictionary, 2010) and brand salience refers to how easily or often a consumer thinks of the brand, especially at the right place at the right time. Salience is created during stage 1 on the branding ladder. Brand salience is brand awareness,
which entails brand recognition and brand recall. This brand-building block establishes associations in the consumer's mind in terms of needs satisfied, the offering category, brand elements and the portfolio of offerings. Brand salience includes the sub-dimensions, namely ‘category identification’ and ‘needs satisfied’. The objective of stage 1 is “deep, broad brand awareness”. Deep brand awareness refers to how easy it is for consumers to recall brand elements, whereas broad brand awareness indicates the range of purchase and use situations in which the brand elements can be recalled.

Stage 2 on the branding ladder corresponds to ‘brand performance’ and ‘brand imagery’ in the brand equity pyramid. These two brand-building blocks refer to the image construct of the components of brand knowledge (Figure 3.2). During this stage a consumer begins to understand the brand's points of parity and points of difference. Brand performance concerns the fact that an offering should satisfy a consumer’s need or want at a functional or attribute level. Sensory aspects may also play a role. The sub-dimensions of brand performance include ‘primary characteristics and secondary features’, ‘offering reliability, durability and serviceability’, ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy’, ‘style and design’ and ‘price’. For service offerings clients have associations of service effectiveness, service efficiency and service empathy. “The service related attributes may refer to the process of the core service”. For a dry cleaning service, cleaning detergent, cleaning equipment and employee expertise of the cleaning process would be internal to the process, while the premises and price would be external (O’Cass & Grace, 2004: 258).

Primary characteristics and secondary features emphasize that some offering attributes are essential for the offering to function properly, while other attributes allow for customisation and versatility. Offering reliability, durability and serviceability refers to the consumer’s view on the offering’s performance where reliability measures consistency of performance, durability relates to the expected economic life of the offering, and serviceability to the ease of repairing the offering. Delivery and installation (speed, accuracy, and general care), customer service (promptness, courtesy, and helpfulness), and the standard of repair services (including the time involved) will influence perceptions of the offering’s performance. Service effectiveness relates to the degree of satisfaction with the service, service efficiency in respect of the speed and responsiveness of the service, and service empathy is the client’s perception of whether the service provider is trusting, caring and focused on the client. Style and design includes size, shape, materials used and colour. Price determines the consumer’s perception of how expensive or inexpensive the offering is. Discount (frequency and by how much) is also considered as part of price. Price is extrinsic to the process and, therefore, a non-product related attribute probably belongs within the imagery building block (Keller, 2013: 111-113).
Where brand performance deals more with the intrinsic attributes of the offering (tangible associations), brand imagery deals with the extrinsic aspects (intangible associations) of the offering. This includes psychological and social needs. The sub-dimensions of brand imagery are ‘user profiles’, ‘purchase and usage situations’, ‘personality and values’ and ‘history, heritage, and experiences’. User profiles (or self-congruence) refer to associations of the type of consumers or idealised consumers that consume the offering. This may include descriptive demographic (gender, age, race and income) or abstract psychographic (attitude towards life, careers, possessions, social issues and political views – controversial or conservative) factors Keller, 2013: 113-114). The purchase situation refers to the marketing mix element place or distribution channels, and the ease of purchase and rewards. Usage situation relates to the time of day, week, month or year to use the offering, indoors or outdoors (location) and informal or formal. A brand can embody personality traits such as lively or exotic or modern or old-fashioned, which can be divided into the following five categories (with their associated subcategories in brackets) (Keller, 2013: 113; Aaker, 1997: 352):

- “Sincerity (down-to-earth, honest, wholesome, and cheerful);
- Excitement (daring, spirited, imaginative, and up-to-date);
- Competence (reliable, intelligent, successful);
- Sophistication (upper class and charming); and
- Ruggedness (outdoorsy and tough).”

A brand’s personality could be informed by user profiles, purchase and usage situations and is formed through personification and brand characters. Brands may also have values such as integrity and innovation. Colour, look and feel of the packaging, manufacturer, country of origin, place and brand ambassador can indicate history, heritage, and experiences. User imagery in a B2B situation relates to the size and type of organisation (as being aggressive or caring). The objective of stage 2 is to create “points of parity and difference”. This means that a brand should create, sequentially, strong, favourable and unique brand associations.

Stage 3 on the branding ladder corresponds to ‘brand judgments’ and ‘brand feelings’ in the brand equity pyramid. During this stage consumers judge the brand with their heads and hearts. Brand judgments are formed through all the associations of brand performance and brand imagery. The sub-dimensions of brand judgment are ‘quality’, ‘credibility’, ‘consideration’ and ‘superiority’. Perceived quality is one of the most important influencers of consumer attitude, as is value and satisfaction. Credibility is a consumer’s perception of the entity that owns the brand. Credibility includes perceived expertise (competent, innovative, market brand leader), brand trustworthiness (dependable), and brand likability (fun, interesting). Consideration is whether the consumer will purchase the brand or not and superiority relates to whether the brand is perceived as unique and different in comparison to other brands (Keller, 2013: 117-118).
Brand feelings deal with how the brand makes consumers feel about themselves and their relationship with others. The sub-dimensions of brand feeling include the following:

- Warmth – these are soothing feelings, including sentimental, warmhearted and affectionate feelings;
- Fun – are upbeat feelings, including lighthearted and playful feelings;
- Excitement – are energized feeling, feelings of being cool, being alive and sexy;
- Security – provide feelings of safety, including self-assurance and less worry;
- Social approval – others approve of a consumer’s brand choice (appearance); and
- Self-respect – brand enhances a consumer’s self-perception (feels proud or fulfilled).

The feelings of warmth, fun and excitement are experiential and short-term, whereas the feelings of security, social approval and self-respect are inward/private or enduring long-term feelings. The objective of stage 3 is to create “positive, accessible reactions”. This means that a brand should create, sequentially, strong, favourable and unique brand associations (Keller, 2001: 24).

Brand resonance is created during the final stage, stage 4, on the branding ladder. The strength of the psychological bond between consumer and brand exemplifies brand resonance. This dimension has the following sub-dimensions:

- Loyalty, which means repeat purchase and category share of brand;
- Attachment, which exceeds positive attitude; it is love for the brand;
- Community as a feeling of kinship with other brand users; and
- Engagement through social groupings around brand interest such as supporters’ clubs, and becoming brand ambassadors.

The objective of stage 4 is to create “intense, active loyalty”, which is a fully harmonious relationship between consumer and brand. Resonance can begin before the judgment and feeling building blocks have been fully established, but these building blocks should be established over time for lasting relationships with the brand to develop, and to turn consumers into brand ambassadors. Also, resonance can be achieved through the building blocks up the left-hand side or right-hand side of the brand equity pyramid, but strong brands combine the two routes to brand building. The left-hand side represents the “head” (rational/cognitive) or “more product-related performance associations and resulting judgments” that “satisfy utilitarian needs”, whereas the right-hand side represents the “heart” (emotional/affective) or “more nonproduct-related imagery associations and resulting feelings” that satisfy psychological or emotional needs (Keller, 2001:21).

Anselmsson, Bondesson and Johansson’s (2014: 96) findings corroborate the importance of rational and emotional aspects. Feelings towards a brand can lead to brand loyalty (Allaway, Huddleston, Whipple and Ellinger (2011: 201). It is important that the judgments and feelings building blocks should be complementary. This should result in a brand that has breadth (in terms of duality – both sides of the pyramid/rational and affective) and depth (in terms of richness – performance and imagery associations). Conversely, if a brand’s performance and imagery
advantages are lost, the judgments and feelings associations from the consumer towards the brand will be diminished. This will lead to less consumer resonance and a decrease in market share (Keller, 2001:22).

Condensed elaborations of the meanings of the sub-dimensions have been added to the CBBE model in Figure 3.5.

Brand resonance should be considered as the goal of brand building activities and gives focus to brand marketing decision-making. The key questions to ask is: “to what extent is marketing activity, which affects the key dimensions of brand resonance – consumer loyalty, attachment, community, or engagement with the brand? Do marketing activities create brand performance and imagery associations and consumer judgments and feelings that will support these brand resonance dimensions?” A strong brand is built by properly planning and executing the linked steps of the CBBE model with the consumer. The time that is required to build a strong brand is directly proportionate to the time, which is necessary to create sufficient awareness and understanding among customers to form strong beliefs and attitudes about the brand, which builds brand equity. The sub-dimensions have an order or cascading effect. For example, the sub-dimensions of resonance have a specific order in which they should be established; behavioural loyalty should first be established, followed by attitudinal attachment and a sense of community for active engagement to occur (Keller, 2001: 20, 23-24).

Davcik et al. (2014: 18) suggest that research into how the marketing mix contributes to the creation of brand equity. If brand equity is the dependent variable and the marketing mix elements are the independent variables, then the dimensions and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model and the new CL-BBE framework are intermediate variables. Allaway et al. (2011: 202) agree that implementation of the marketing programme leads to brand equity. As indicated in Figure 3.6, the ‘Performance’ building block of the CBBE model relates to the product element; the ‘price’ sub-dimension of the ‘Performance’ building block to the price element; and the ‘purchase situation’ sub-dimension of the ‘Imagery’ building block to the place element of the marketing mix. As for the extended marketing mix or services marketing mix, the element people is eluded to and the element processes is included with the CBBE model sub-dimensions of ‘serviceability, service effectiveness and service empathy’. The element physical evidence is not included in the CBBE model (it will be an over interpretation to see it included as part of the sub-dimension ‘purchase situation’).
Figure 3.4: Sub-dimensions of CBBE elaborated

Figure 3.5: Sub-dimensions of CBBE elaborated and related to extended marketing mix

Keller (2013: 123-124) provides candidate measures for the six brand-building blocks. The questions included in the measuring instrument are based on these candidate measures, as well as questions included in Kuhn et al.’s (2008: 54-58) application of the CBBE model, and insight that was gained from the literature.

Keller (2001: 25) incorporates aspects of Young and Rubicam’s BrandAsset Valuator model, Millward Brown’s BrandDynamics model, Research International Equity Engine and others (Keller, 2013: 351-358). The four pillars of the BrandAsset Valuator model, with corresponding CBBE model aspects given in parentheses, are: “(1) Differentiation (Superiority); (2) Relevance (Consideration); (3) Esteem (Credibility); and (4) Knowledge (Resonance)”. Similarly, the five stages of the BrandDynamics model, namely Presence, Relevance, Performance, Advantage, and Bonding can be related to the four steps of the branding ladder (Identity, Meaning, Response, and Relationships) and the concepts of salience, consideration, performance or quality, superiority, and resonance of the brand equity pyramid of the CBBE model. The Equity Engine has two key factors, which are also incorporated into the CBBE model, namely Affinity and Performance. Affinity has three dimensions, and each comprises three more dimensions: “(1) Authority (Heritage, Trust, and Innovativeness); (2) Identification (Bonding, Caring, and Nostalgia); and (3) Approval (Prestige, acceptability, and Endorsement)”.

Interestingly, Aaker (1991: xii) notes that Keller was involved with the first two branding research efforts that he undertook. Aaker (1991: xii; 1996: ix) also acknowledges Keller for his input and vibrant discussions. Keller, in turn, supervised Jennifer Aaker’s (Aaker’s daughter) Ph.D. in Marketing (Haas, 2006) and acknowledges her (Keller, 2008: xx). Jennifer Aaker’s Ph.D. developed personality dimensions that are incorporated into the CBBE model as a sub-dimension of the imagery building block. Aaker and his daughter facilitate branding lectures, which are entitled “An afternoon with the Aaker’s” (Haas, 2008). Hence, there is a sharing of ideas and challenging of views between Aaker and Keller. It is, therefore, not surprising that there are remarkable similarities between the two brand equity models (Figures 3.3 and 3.5).

Rust, Zeithmal and Lemon (2004: 116) state that “our attitude should be that brands come and go – but customers … must remain”, which emphasises a consumer equity perspective as being more important than a brand equity perspective. Keller (2008: 86) restates this as “through the years customers may come and go, but strong brands will endure” with brand equity as the central focus. The CBBE model combines both views and considers both consumers and brands as important.
3.3.2 Aaker’s brand equity model

Aaker’s brand equity model was developed to show how value is created (or lost) through advertising activities that have enhanced (or damaged) brand equity. And Aaker’s brand equity model was developed for organizations, large and small, with product or service offerings and in B2C or B2B markets (Aaker, 1991: xi).

According to Aaker’s brand equity model (Figure 3.7), brand equity consists of five interrelated brand equity dimensions (assets), with their potential value to either the demand-side consumer or supply-side firm. The dimensions are ‘brand loyalty’, ‘brand awareness’, ‘perceived quality’, ‘brand associations’ and ‘other proprietary brand assets’.

![Figure 3.6: Aaker’s brand equity model](source: Aaker, 1991: 270)
Brand loyalty (of consumer base) is in effect the likelihood of consumers to switch to a competing brand. Brand loyalty translates into sales and is, therefore, linked to future profit. The levels of brand loyalty are presented in the loyalty pyramid. The loyalty pyramid consists of the following five levels of consumer loyalty:

- ‘Nonloyal consumer’ – is completely indifferent to the brand, which means that the consumer perceives brands in the category as commodities. The brand will, therefore, play a minor role and price a key role in the purchase decision;
- ‘Satisfied (not dissatisfied) consumer’ – also termed a habitual purchaser who is content with the brand and does not actively seek an alternative. For this consumer there is an effort barrier to switching – it may be less effort staying with the current brand than switching to another brand. Competing brands may be able to overcome the consumer’s resistance to change by clearly demonstrating the benefits of switching;
- ‘Satisfied consumer with switching costs’ – the switching costs include time, money, and performance risk. These consumers are also called switching-cost loyals. Competing brands should offer incentives (or substantial benefit) to overcome switching costs;
- ‘Consumers who truly like the brand’ – the consumer’s preference is based on brand associations, for example, the brand elements, brand awareness (for example, use experiences), or perceived quality. Brand liking can be described as the German word ‘gestalt’, which means that liking is not a result of anything specific, but rather the whole is more than the sum of the individual parts. At this level there is an emotional attachment to the brand; and
- ‘Committed consumer’ – is proud of their association with the brand and the brand has significant importance to them, hence transforming the consumer into a brand ambassador.

Levels of the brand equity pyramid are not absolute, and a consumer may display characteristics of more than one level (Aaker, 1991: 39-41).

According to Aaker (1991: 41-42), past use experience is a prerequisite to building brand loyalty and brand loyalty can be influenced by brand awareness, perceived quality and brand associations dimensions. Aaker maintains that these asset dimensions do not always explain brand loyalty since brand loyalty can occur independently from these dimensions. Furthermore, loyalty refers to the brand because if loyalty referred to the product or service, and not to the brand, then brand equity would not exist.

Brand loyalty has the potential value to reduce marketing costs because it is less expensive to resell to a loyal consumer than to acquire a new consumer. Brand loyalty provides trade leverage because an organisation that has high consumer loyalty has a certain amount of distribution leverage to secure shelf space owing to the pull effect (consumer demand). Trade leverage is of particular importance when introducing brand extensions and variations. Brand loyalty also attracts
new customers owing to the fact that intermediaries and existing consumers will create links to the use context and user profile for potential new consumers, increasing brand recall, while existing consumers may reassure potential new consumers and thus reduce their risk. Lastly, brand loyalty may afford organisations time to strategise a response to a competitive threat.

Brand loyalty is created and maintained by treating the consumer right. Consumers should be treated with respect by being polite, respectful, caring and responsive. This is achieved through rigorous training and by establishing an enabling organisational culture. In addition, consumer interaction at all levels of the organisation is paramount to creating brand loyalty. Regular surveys linked to the compensation system should be instituted to measure and manage customer satisfaction, while switching costs should be created by solving consumer problems innovatively and through loyalty programmes. Providing extras, above and beyond what consumers expect, can also create and maintain brand loyalty (Aaker, 1991: 39, 46-49, 50-52).

Brand awareness, also called brand familiarity, is a consumer perception. Consumers often purchase brands that are familiar and translate familiarity into reliability and quality based on past use-experiences. Also, consumers mostly purchase brands that form part of their consideration set and brand awareness increases the likelihood of inclusion in the consumer’s consideration set. Brand awareness entails a link between the brand and the category, and refers to the awareness pyramid, which is a hierarchy that ranges from unaware of the brand, brand recognition, and brand recall to top-of-mind awareness. Brand recognition is assessed with an aided recall test and brand recall with an unaided brand recall test. The brand that is mentioned first during a brand recall test achieves top-of-mind awareness. Aaker (1991: 50-52) adds another level to the top of the awareness pyramid, namely dominant brand, which is a brand that is the only brand recalled in a category. A dominant brand provides a concrete competitive advantage. In addition, brand awareness provides value by being an anchor to which other associations can be attached. The first task of the communication process is to establish brand recognition in the minds of the consumer. Also, there is a link between familiarity and liking. Repeated exposure to brand elements increases liking of the brand. Brand awareness can be linked to attributes such as substance and commitment, and for a brand to be considered for purchase, it should form part of the consumer’s consideration set and preferably be top-of-mind. It is suggested that brand awareness should perhaps be linked with a “reason-to-buy” to translate into sales. As mentioned, brand awareness is created by registering the brand identity and linking it to the category. Furthermore, brand awareness is achieved, maintained and improved by being different and memorable, which means that it is necessary to be effective among other competing brands. A slogan should link to the brand name and the offering category and may be effective in raising the level of recall. In addition, a symbol that is closely related to the brand can enhance awareness. Publicity can assist brand awareness if the brand is newsworthy, whereas event sponsorship
exposes a number of viewers to the brand elements. Brand extensions allow the brand to appear on more brands, and brand cues include various brand elements (name, symbol and packaging) or brand ambassador. Hence, constant exposure aids recall (Aaker, 1991: 61-76).

The next dimension, perceived quality can be defined as a consumer’s perception of an offering’s quality, as it relates to its intended purpose and alternatives. It often relates to offering performance, but is different to objective quality. Perceived quality directly influences brand loyalty, especially in low involvement purchases. Perceived quality generates value in the following ways:

- **Reason-to-buy** – perceived quality influences which brand form part of the consideration set and, which is ultimately selected, which affects market share;
- **Differentiate/position** – perceived quality is a key positioning dimension and is categorised as super premium, premium, value or economy;
- **Price premium** – is possible owing to perceived quality advantage, which is relative to other brands in the category and a higher price conversely serves as a quality cue;
- **Channel member interest** – brands with high perceived quality is beneficial to channel members through the quality association and consumer pull; and
- **Extensions** – perceived quality can enable brand extensions.

Perceived quality is achieved through commitment to quality, a quality culture, consumer input, measurements/goals/standards, which allows for employee initiative and meet consumer expectations. Intrinsic cues (product attributes), as well as extrinsic cues (brand name and associations) can signal quality (Aaker, 1991: 85-96). Brand associations are based on consumer perceptions and attitude and feelings that are linked in the consumer’s memory to a brand. Brand associations are links to character, symbol, consumer segment, offering category, feelings, offering attributes and user profiles of varying strength depending on past-use experience and the extent of exposure or awareness. Brand image is a set of associations. Brand associations may support brand positioning strategy. Brand position is based on relevant or desired and distinct association or image attributes in relation to competitors. Positioning can be perceived from the consumer (how it is) or organisation’s (how the organisation would prefer it to be) point of view. Brand equity is often based on brand associations, which gives meaning to consumers and is represented in brand loyalty.

Some of the ways in which brand associations provide value are:

- **Helping to process/retrieve information** – brand associations can help the consumer summarise/distill volumes of information, even if only in relation to competition;
- **Differentiate/position** – a brand association can provide a basis for differentiation and provide a competitive advantage, which can be a strong barrier to entry for competitors;
• Reason-to-buy – brand associations include attributes that may inform the purchase decision;
• Create positive attitudes/ feelings – based on brand associations, a consumer can like a brand and have favourable feelings towards the brand; and
• Basis for extensions – brand association can create a sense of fit for a brand extension.

From the organisation’s perspective, brand associations should be strong; shared by many consumers (segment); be relevant; affect buying behavior; and be available (not linked to a competitor). There are different types of associations, which include (Aaker, 1991: 109-129):

• Offering attributes - (or features/ characteristics) are intrinsic cues that are directly linked to the offering, which provide an explicit reason to buy. Too many attributes dilute positioning. Offering attributes may, however, be matched by competitors;
• Intangible attributes – are general attributes (such as perceived quality, innovation, technology, health, nutrition) that result from other more specific attributes. Therefore, intangible attributes are normally less likely to be matched by competitors than direct offering attributes;
• Consumer benefits – offering attributes normally provide consumer benefits, which is crucial to forming associations. There are rational and psychological benefits. Rational benefits relate to offering attributes, whereas psychological benefits relate to brand feelings;
• Relative price – is an offering attribute with different levels including budget, economy, luxury and premium. Positioning a brand should fall clearly within one category, but can be differentiated by higher perceived quality than other brands within the same price level. For a brand to be positioned at the premium price level, it should offer superior quality and provide status to the consumer;
• Use/ application – refers to time of day and outdoor or indoor use. A positioning based on use is normally not the primary association strategy, but is used to expand the brand’s market;
• User/ consumer – is a positioning strategy that links the brand to a type of user and overlays segmentation;
• Celebrity/ person – linking a celebrity (celebrity endorsement) or ordinary character/ person to a brand usually transfers the strong associations attached to the celebrity/ character or person to the brand. The celebrity/ character or person’s credibility is, however, key;
• Lifestyle/ personality – a brand, like a human, can have a personality and a specific lifestyle;
• Product class – entails association with the desired offering category;
• Competitors – a competitor’s established image can be used as reference to relate relative
differences of a brand’s associations. This can be done through comparative advertising that
compares attributes; and
• Country/ geographic area – a brand can be linked to associations that are attached to a
country or region.

Other proprietary brand assets include patents, trademarks and channel relationships. These
brand assets are most valuable in creating barriers to entry for competitors, and in preserving
brand loyalty. The brand assets must underlie (be linked to) a specific brand. Channel relationship
is a result of brand performance and should be based on the individual brand and not the
organisation as a brand. Also, the assets in this category only contribute to brand equity if the
brand cannot easily be replaced by another brand.

As indicated in Figure 3.7, these five asset dimensions ultimately provide value to the consumer
and organisation. The value provided to the consumer includes enhancing interpretation/
processing and storing of information about the offering and brand; confidence in the purchase
decision based on brand awareness (familiarity), past-use experience and attributes; and use
satisfaction as a result of perceived quality and brand associations. The value that is provided by
the asset dimensions to the organisation includes enhancing efficiency and effectiveness of
marketing programmes to attract new consumers and to reactivate past consumers; brand loyalty
that may contest competing brands at the purchase situation; prices/ margins owing to premiums
pricing and less reliance on price promotions; brand extensions which, if managed strategically,
can enhance profitability; trade leverage as a result of established brand recognition and
associations; and competitive advantage because a brand may offer a barrier to entry for
competitors based on its key associations, including product attributes, perceived quality and brand

Table 3.1 is a comparative summary of Aaker and Keller’s models and Figure 3.8 indicates the
parity between Aaker and Keller’s models using colour.
### Table 3.1: A comparison of Aaker and Keller’s brand equity models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aaker’s brand equity model</th>
<th>Parity of Aaker and Keller’s brand equity models</th>
<th>Keller’s customer-based brand equity model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models brand equity from the consumer’s perspective, but includes benefits to organisation.</td>
<td>Most dimensions with sub-dimensions correspond.</td>
<td>Models brand equity from the consumer’s perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand equity and brand value are used synonymously.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly distinguishes between brand equity (the brand as asset) and brand value (financial worth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the benefits of brand equity dimensions to the organisation and consumer.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes different stages (with consumer questions), corresponding objectives and sub-dimensions supporting each brand-building block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays various brand dimensions and indicates causal interrelatedness between them. Brand dimensions seem to be on the same plane, allowing various points of entry to building brand equity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sequences the particular order in which the brand-building blocks relate. Has four distinct stages of brand development with corresponding branding objectives, and it is made clear that lower order building blocks are a prerequisite to higher order building blocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More explicit means to create, maintain and improve asset dimensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offers two routes to brand building, namely going up the left side of the brand equity pyramid (called the ‘rational route’), and going up the right-side of the brand equity pyramid (called the ‘emotional route’). The strongest brands are, however, built by going up both sides of the brand equity pyramid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loyalty</strong></td>
<td><strong>Loyalty/ Resonance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resonance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaker’s brand loyalty asset dimension (including the loyalty pyramid) corresponds to Keller’s brand resonance brand-building block.</td>
<td>Aaker refers to the loyalty pyramid with a hierarchy of loyalty levels and Keller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The aim of the CBBE model is to created brand knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion

Discussion starts with brand loyalty.

Brand loyalty can be influenced by brand awareness, perceived quality and brand association dimensions, but these asset dimensions do not always explain brand loyalty, since brand loyalty can occur independently from these dimensions.

Brand loyalty can be considered both a dimension of brand equity and an outcome of brand equity.

---

### Awareness

A hierarchy (brand awareness pyramid) with increasing importance from unawareness of the brand, brand recognition, brand recall to top of mind awareness, and adds another level to the top of the hierarchy, which is named dominant brand, which is the only brand recalled in a category.

### Awareness/ Salience

Aaker's brand awareness asset dimension (including the awareness pyramid) corresponds to Keller’s brand salience brand-building block.

### Salience

Includes explicitly that a brand should satisfy consumer needs.

---

### Perceived quality

The benefits of perceived quality to channel members are addressed.

### Perceived quality/ Performance and Judgments

Aaker's single perceived quality asset dimension corresponds to two of Keller's brand-building blocks, namely brand performance and judgments.

### Performance and Judgments

Judgements are based on imagery and performance.

---

Discussion ends with brand resonance, of which brand loyalty is a sub-dimension.

Brand resonance is the result of all the other brand-building blocks.

Brand loyalty and brand equity are distinct constructs and loyalty is a sub-dimension of the CBBE pyramid, which builds brand knowledge that feeds into brand equity. Loyalty is a characteristic of strong brand equity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand associations</th>
<th>Brand associations/Imagery and Feelings:</th>
<th>Imagery and Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides eleven types of associations.</td>
<td>Aaker’s single brand associations asset dimension corresponds to two of Keller’s brand-building blocks, namely brand imagery and brand feelings. Brand associations are explained to support positioning strategy.</td>
<td>Provides five personality types and six types of feelings. Makes values explicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other proprietary brand assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included because the CBBE model models brand equity from the consumer’s perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes patents, trademarks and channel relationships, which are important from the organisation’s perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.7: Parity between Aaker and Keller’s models
The preceding comparison indicates that Keller’s six brand-building blocks (brand salience, brand performance, brand imagery, brand judgments, brand feelings and brand resonance) include virtually all of the concepts that are covered by Aaker’s four brand asset dimensions (brand loyalty, name awareness, perceived quality, and brand associations). Aaker’s brand equity model, however, has one brand asset dimension called “other proprietary brand assets”, which refers to “patents, trademarks and channel relationships”, which is not included in Keller’s brand equity pyramid. This is probably because these assets provide value to the organisation, but not to the consumer directly, therefore, they do not form part of the consumer based view of brand equity. Aaker (1991: 270) and Keller (2008: 60-61) both define brand equity from the consumer’s perspective (Pappu et al., 2005: 144).

Pappu et al.’s (2005: 145, 150-151) empirical research supports the relationship between the four constructs of brand equity, namely brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty. These four constructs are included in both Aaker and Keller’s conceptualisation and is depicted in Figure 3.9.

![Figure 3.8: Four-dimension consumer-based brand equity model](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)

**Figure 3.8: Four-dimension consumer-based brand equity model**

Source: Developed from Pappu, et al., 2005: 144, 150-151

According to Pappu et al. (2005: 144-145), the more brand loyal a consumer is, the higher his/ her perception of quality and vice versa, and the more favourable a consumer’s brand associations are, the more loyal he/ she will be and vice versa. Favourable brand associations lead to higher perceived quality and vice versa. A consumer’s level of brand awareness will be high if he/ she perceives that brand to be of a high quality and when he/
she has strong associations with the brand and vice versa. The authors found that the brand associations dimension is multi-dimensional and includes sub-dimensions such as personality and organisational associations.

Pappu et al.’s (2005: 144-145) confirmation of the four dimensions of customer-based brand equity are reiterated and extended by Martinez and de Chernatony (2013: 69). The authors found that perceived quality, brand associations (specifically personality and value) and brand loyalty influence brand equity, and that there is a causal order in the creation of brand equity. First, brand awareness or familiarity (including recall) improves perceived quality and builds positive brand associations. Second, brand associations influence brand loyalty. Supporting the view that brand awareness is linked to other dimensions that influence brand equity, Hakala et al. (2012: 447) acknowledge that brand awareness is important, but not sufficient to create brand equity. Similarly, it was found that brand awareness, brand associations and brand loyalty influence brand equity (Im et al., 2012: 399; Sasmita & Suki, 2015: 286). Brand awareness is a precondition for brand associations (Christodoulides et al., 2015: 320).

He and Li (2011: 81) believe that, even though important, limited research has been conducted to link service quality to service brand equity. Product and service quality, and customer loyalty were used to build brand equity within the supermarket industry (Allaway et al., 2011: 202). Brand associations affect perceived quality, which affects brand loyalty. For B2B services, loyalty is conditional upon satisfaction and a competitive price. Also, loyalty, satisfaction and service quality are linked for B2B services. For insurance services, the reliability of the offering, the physical evidence and how people deliver the service (knowledgeable and caring) affect service satisfaction (Lakshmi and Santhi, 2015: 79). Perceived better service quality and efficiency may entice a loyal and satisfied client to switch to a competing brand (Biedenbach & Marell, 2010: 455). Ha et al. (2010: 923-924) also support the notion that brand associations, perceived quality, satisfaction and loyalty are important aspects of B2B service brand equity. The authors extend the brand equity theory by proving that perceived quality affects brand loyalty through satisfaction, which they term as the "perceived quality → satisfaction → brand equity chain for services brand equity. The authors suggest that improved efficiency will enhance client satisfaction, which will enhance service brand equity.

Relationship appeal positively affects loyalty (Theron, Terblanche & Boshoff, 2013: 41), but perceived better relationships may lead to the switching of brand loyalty (Naumann, Haverila, Khan & Williams, 2010: 892-894). Theron and Terblanche (2010: 396) list
relationship marketing dimensions that strengthen relationships from theory and their empirical research for financial services. This list includes trust, satisfaction, commitment, communication, competence, relationship benefits, bonding, customisation, attractiveness of alternatives and shared values.

### 3.3.3 Brand identity prism

Kapferer’s (2008: 183) brand identity prism (brand model) (Figure 3.10) portrays brand identity as having six dimensions, namely physique, personality, culture, self-image, relationship and reflection.
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**Figure 3.9: Brand identity prism**

Source: Kapferer, 2008: 183

Next, the brand identity prism’s dimensions (Kapferer, 2008: 182-187) are related to the CBBE models building blocks and sub-dimensions (Figures 3.3 and 3.4). The “Physique” dimension deals with the offering’s physical attributes, which relates to the CBBE model’s “Performance” building block, whereas the ‘personality’ dimension is included in the CBBE model as a sub-dimension of the “Imagery” building block. “Culture” is the brands values, which is also a sub-dimension of the CBBE model’s “Imagery” building block. The “relationship” dimension is what the CBBE model’s “Resonance” building block deals with. “Reflection” and “self-image” dimensions are included as the sub-dimension ‘user profiles’ of
the CBBE model's “Imagery” building block. The dimensions of the brand identity prism can be used to assess the brand’s strengths and weaknesses.

In addition to the fact that the CBBE model includes a majority of the concepts of Aaker’s brand equity model, it also incorporates concepts of three industry brand equity models. The CBBE model was developed later than Aaker’s model and builds on Aaker’s model. In the final analysis, brand equity may provide competitive advantage only if the consumer’s image of a brand is favourable. Hence, it is imperative to have consumer-based brand equity instruments (Pappu et al., 2005: 143). In support of this view, there “is value to the investor, the manufacturer and the retailer only if there is value for the consumer” (Cobb-Walgren, Beal & Donthu, 1995: 26). Keller’s CBBE model has a marketing perspective, is a consumer-based brand equity model, and seems to currently be the most comprehensive and referenced brand equity model. Therefore, the CBBE model is deemed as the most comprehensive and accepted brand equity model to date.

3.4 APPLICATION OF THE CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY MODEL

Based on samples of waste management tracking device users in Australia (five local government authorities for study 1 and 26 for study 2), Kuhn and Alpert (2004); and Kuhn et al. (2008: 40-58) tested the applicability of the CBBE model to a B2B setting or, more accurately, a business-to-government setting. The conclusions include the following:

- With regards to the CBBE model’s brand-building block “salience”, the brand equity of the organisation brand seemed more important than that of the individual brand;
- The CBBE model’s brand-building block “performance” was confirmed;
- It is suggested that the CBBE model’s brand-building block “imagery” should be replaced with “corporate reputation”;
- The CBBE model’s brand-building block “Judgment” was confirmed;
- The CBBE model’s brand-building block “feelings” should be replaced with “sales force relationship”, therefore, the importance of company representatives (the human element) should to be included in an amended CBBE model; and
- The CBBE model’s brand-building block “resonance” should be replaced with “partnership solutions”.

These conclusions highlight the issues that were experienced when the CBBE model was applied to a B2B setting. This leads to questioning the claim that the CBBE model is applicable to a B2B context (cited in Kuhn et al., 2008: 41; O’Cass & Grace, 2004: 257). The present research’s findings are compared to these findings throughout Chapter 6.
In support of Kuhn et al.’s (2008: 40-58) findings regarding the importance of the organisation brand and sales people, Aspara and Tikkanen (2008: 43) also suggest that organisation brands are important in the B2B context, and not in individual brands because business consumers:

assess, value and make purchase decisions based on company specific images/ perceptions, such as about the company’s … servicing capabilities and performance; consultative expertise/ capabilities, processes, and performances; strategic network position; intentions to reciprocally partner and cooperate with customers; and customer-facing (sales) personnel and their behaviour.

As Kuhn et al. (2008: 51) mention in their article; their study was the first to begin “the assessment and adaptation of a major brand equity model for the B2B context, but it is by no means the end”. This is echoed by the corresponding author. In addition, research is needed to develop a tailored services branding model (McDonald et al., 2001: 350). The present research combines the aforementioned and focuses on B2B services branding.

3.5 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, brand equity was defined and Ambler’s distinction between brand equity and brand value was adopted. Various brand equity models, frameworks and components of brand equity were synthesised or overlaid and the two most prominent models, namely those of Aaker and Keller, were discussed and compared. This contributed to the body of knowledge because it is not currently and explicitly known where these models are similar and where it differ. Based on this it is accepted that Keller’s CBBE model represents the most comprehensive brand equity management model from the consumer’s perspective.

In the next chapter brand equity in B2B and services markets is discussed. This is done to provide a context for the present study, which is to develop a B2B service brand equity framework by testing the applicability of the CBBE model in a short-term business insurance context. This contributes to the limited B2B service branding research.
CHAPTER 4
BRAND EQUITY IN BUSINESS-TO-BUSINESS AND SERVICES MARKETS

4.1 INTRODUCTION
In Chapter 3 the most prominent brand equity models were analysed, compared and related to current research. This was done to provide and understand the building blocks of brand equity, and concluded that the CBBE model is the most comprehensive brand equity model, which is available in the literature. This model was applied to a selected B2B service context for the present study.

Because most branding research has been conducted within a consumer product context, the present study focussed on a B2B service context. Therefore this chapter discusses the differences between product and service offerings and the branding thereof, as well as the differences between B2C and B2B branding. This completes the conceptual framework of the present study (Figure 1.1), which positions B2B services branding.

4.2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRODUCT AND SERVICE OFFERINGS
The present study makes a contribution by studying a service and not a product, as depicted in Figures 1.2 and 1.1. Marketing theory was largely developed around the concept of a product (good) and, more specifically, a commodity. A product is tangible and the output of a manufacturing process, which can be distributed and exchanged. Hence marketing dealt with the functions involved in facilitating commodity exchange and focused on the product and the organisation, and not on the customer. The functional view of marketing evolved into marketing management, which deals with managing the marketing functions (activities that are performed in the exchange) and has a customer focus. Marketing thus became a management function, which was aimed at satisfying customer needs, profitably, through the marketing strategy and marketing programme. This became the central reasoning of marketing. But with the emergence of concepts such as market orientation, relationship marketing and services marketing, product marketing reasoning was challenged and was found inadequate to deal with services marketing, as service is pervasive and part of most offerings (Vargo & Lusch, 2004: 14-15,1-2; Zeithaml, Parasuraman & Berry, 1985: 33-34).

Traditionally, offerings were divided into product and service offerings with marketing management focusing on the differences between the two types of offerings or, more specifically, how existing product marketing theory can be adapted for service offerings (Vargo & Lusch, 2004: 14-15,1-2). One of the earlier studies to differentiate between
products and services is a study by Zeithaml, *et al.* (1985: 33-34), which was based on a literature review of 46 articles. The authors report that products and services differ in terms of their characteristics and, as a result, are separated. The primary difference is that products are tangible (du Plessis *et al*., 2012: 196), with a separation of production and consumption, therefore it can be premanufactured, stored and standardised, and are, therefore, homogeneous. Conversely, services are intangible and production and consumption are simultaneous/ inseparable. The relationship between seller and buyer is more intimate and interactive with services, while the distribution channel is mostly direct (or more direct) because the producer and seller of services is the same entity (the performer), and the client is mostly present during the performance of services. Because services are performed when needed and more difficult to standardise than products (services are heterogeneous), the quality of services is more variable than product quality. The authors also note that there are authors that dispute the need to separate products and services as far as marketing is concerned (Geigenmuller & Bettis-Outland, 2012: 432, Kimpakorn & Tocquer, 2010: 378). Roberts and Micken (2015: 97) consider Zeithaml *et al.*’s (1985: 35) intangibility, heterogeneity, inseparability, and perishability (IHIP) framework as an appropriate and contemporary explanatory framework, which previous authors also considered to “constitute[s] today’s received wisdom” regarding the differences between products and services, while it is still the prevailing foundation for services marketing (Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004: 22, 25). The expanded IHIP framework (Zeithaml, *et al*., 1985: 35) is shown below:

- **Intangibility**
  - services cannot be stored;
  - services are difficult to protect with patents;
  - services are difficult to display/communicate about; and
  - services are difficult to price.

- **Heterogeneity**
  - standardization and quality control of services; and provision is difficult.

- **Inseparability**
  - the consumer is involved in service production;
  - other consumers are often involved in production; and
  - centralised mass production is difficult.

- **Perishability**
  - services cannot be inventoried.
Roberts and Micken's (2015: 98-101) paper “suggests ways faculty can effectively use the existing services marketing IHIP framework”. The authors summarise suggested deviations, which are necessitated by digital offerings (Roberts & Micken's, 2015: 98). These amendments to the IHIP framework include:

- Intangibility – “intangible but can be easily measured, stored, transferred, communicated, and priced”;
- Heterogeneity – “because people are not involved in delivering the core offering, digital offerings can theoretically be designed to be perfectly homogeneous”;
- Inseparability – “inseparable from delivery systems, such as hardware, software, and peripherals”; and
- Perishability – “because they are kept and delivered via storage media, they are not perishable (though file maintenance can be an issue)”. These amendments do not apply to the current study because all the participants worked directly via a broker and none dealt directly and digitally with the insurance house.

In terms of expanding the product versus services or the separation debate, Gummesson (1995: 250-251) argues that consumers do not consume pure products or products for products’ sake, but consume offerings (a bundle of product and service) that create value, which is created through intangibles, exchange processes and relationships. This is not merely a shift away from product marketing to services marketing, but rather a paradigm shift from a product and organisation (manufacturer) focus to a consumer focus – a service-centred view, which is a consumer oriented view. This view purports that all economies are service economies with knowledge as the source of competitive advantage; the core units of exchange are skills and knowledge; products are the distribution mechanisms of services; consumers are coproducers; and the organisation only offers value propositions. The service-centred view is a philosophy that is not concerned with differences between products and services. Rather, products are seen as subordinate to services and as containers/distributing mechanisms (appliances or platforms) of services. This philosophy only perceives services, and is applicable to the marketing of all offerings. Any offering is a service or “the application of competences for the benefit of the consumer” and all employees are service providers. The service-centred view is summarised as follows:

1. “Identify or develop core competences, the fundamental knowledge and skills of an economic entity that represent potential competitive advantage.
2. Identify other entities (potential customers) that could benefit from these competences.
3. Cultivate relationships that involve the customer in developing customized, competitively compelling value propositions to meet specific needs.
4. Gauge marketplace feedback by analyzing financial performance from exchange to learn how to improve the firm’s offering for customers and to improve firm performance” (Vargo & Lusch, 2004: 2-3, 5, 14).

An entity should identify its core competencies (intangible knowledge and skills) and the (mostly intangible) benefits desired by potential consumers; and then offer a service, (which may include a tangible product as container for a service) to meet a demand for a service (often for a higher order need). This is illustrated by the following simplified examples. If fish is exchanged for wheat, then fishing services (knowledge and skills) are traded for farming services (knowledge and skills) rather than fish for wheat products to obtain the benefit of the services (knowledge and skills). This suggests that, for example, Toyota primarily offers an intangible service (core competencies/ knowledge and skills to satisfy consumer desires and vehicle manufacturing) that is delivered through a Lexus to satisfy an intangible consumer desire, which may be status. In other words, if consumers want products, they want it for the services that it delivers. Air conditioning equipment is the container of a service (the application of knowledge), which is sought by consumers, namely comfort. Through a service-centred view, marketing becomes a core competence itself (Vargo & Lusch, 2004: 6-9, 13).

According to the service-centred view, marketing is thus a strategic function, which is concerned with identifying and building core competences that are formulated as the value proposition, and is formalised in the vision statement. Branding, as a marketing function, is responsible for building intangible assets. Following the service-centred view, branding will, in the more sophisticated contemporary era, be concerned with the building of knowledge about the service offered (intangible core competences/ specialised knowledge and skills), and the higher order need (to establish brand identity and image), for example, offering comfort (constant ambient temperature) as a service, which may involve the glazing of windows, insulation of roofs, doors and windows and air conditioning units rather than an air conditioner only. The service-centred view appeals for an adaptation of key marketing and branding constructs and their relationship rather than a complete reinvention.

The researcher takes cognisance of the service-centred view, but also recognises the traditional product versus service differentiation view. Hellen and Gummerus (2013: 140) found that, after reviewing relevant literature, the tangibility versus intangibility distinction remains relevant. The consumer-centred view, the core competencies concept, the importance of higher order consumer needs and the importance and prevalence of services are all supported. To accommodate the fact that there are few pure services and pure
products, for purposes of the present study, the term offering was adopted to refer to the bundling of both product and service.

4.3 BUSINESS-TO-CONSUMER AND BUSINESS-TO-BUSINESS MARKETS
The present study makes a contribution by studying branding within a B2B context and not a B2C context, as depicted in Figures 1.2 and 1.1. Most branding discussions are from a consumer context even though B2B transactions are the major driver of economic activity (Rozin, 2004: 344), and reasons for this include the visibility of and expenditure for B2C brands; even though some of the most valuable brands are B2B brands, including Caterpillar and Hewlett Packard, or even more specifically B2B service brands such as IBM, Cisco, Oracle, eBay, Accenture, Yahoo, Google, Intel, DuPont, GE and SAP (Kalafatis et al., 2012: 623; Muyelle, Dawar & Rangarajan, 2012: 58). Glynn’s (2012: 666) consideration of the Interbrand list of Best Global Brands of 2010 revealed that B2B brands are well represented in the financial services sectors. On the 2014 Interbrand top 10 global brands list, B2C brands were been replaced by B2B brands such as Apple, Google, IBM, Microsoft GE, Samsung, Toyota and Mercedes Benz (Sarin, 2014: 91).

For many B2B organisations, the organisation’s name is the brand, but the brand must be much more than the organisation’s name. This indicates that brand building activities are limited in terms of the creation of salience, while establishment and enhancement of the brand with brand associations, are lacking (Rozin, 2004: 344).

4.3.1 Comparison between business-to-consumer and business-to-business markets
There are similarities and differences between B2C and B2B branding. Individuals are often unaware of the influence of B2B brands, but are aware of B2C brands owing to their experiences with mostly B2C brands (Rozin, 2004: 344). Both B2B and B2C branding should be informed by strategy basics, namely the marketing concept (identifying and satisfying a consumer need) and the marketing strategy (segmentation, targeting and positioning). The strategy should be embedded in the value proposition and brand promise. As depicted in Figure 4.1, marketing basics remain unchallenged. The brand is the “major tool of strategic marketing management” (Webster & Keller, 2004: 388 – 391, 398 -399; Interbrand, 2011).

B2B brands can, as with B2C brands, be commoditised. Raw material, processed materials, component parts and subassembly parts are especially prone to this. In these situations B2B branding, which is based on organisational reliability, credibility and technical expertise as points of differentiation, is paramount. To differentiate capital equipment, the focus could be
The notion that emotions do not influence B2B consumers (Kuhn et al., 2008: 50-51) has resulted in limited research on branding in B2B markets. In fact, B2B branding research can be seen as still being in the nascent stage. In an article that provides guidelines for B2B branding, and which can be seen as the conceptualiser of the CBBE model’s attempt to show the applicability of the CBBE model to the B2B market, Webster and Keller (2004: 388-402) highlight the importance of B2B branding, and in fact consider the B2B industry to be larger and of greater importance than the B2C industry. According to the authors, an organisation should start with identifying its distinct competence, its target market and consumers, its value chain position and strategy in order to deliver superior value to consumers. Branding, therefore, should be central to the B2B organisation’s business model.

Table 4.1 provides a detailed comparison between B2C and B2B markets and branding. Some of the more important issues are mentioned next, and related to the sub-dimensions of the CBBE model. In industrial markets purchase decisions are often made by a buying centre or decision-making unit and the unit has more formalised decision-making criteria,
specialised knowledge and complex needs (Muyelle, Dawar & Rangarajan, 2012: 58-59). Industrial buyers have different needs (the needs of the organisation and its consumers), so the brand promise must be relevant to all who are involved in the buying process. This means that the supplier organisation and its offerings should support the buying organisation’s business strategy, as well as the buyer’s personal goals. The buyer-seller long-term relationship is important (as opposed to one off transactions), while the organisation brand of the owner of the individual brand (if applicable), is paramount. This importance is contained in the sub-dimension ‘credibility’ (reliability and trust of the owner of the brand), as part of the ‘Judgments’ brand-building block of the CBBE model. Kuhn et al. (2008: 46) found credibility to be even more important than it appears to be in the CBBE model. To this extent, the values of expertise, trustworthiness, ease of doing business and likeability should be maximised to build the organisational brand’s intangible brand associations of credibility, reputation and distinctiveness. These concepts should play out through specific organisational attributes, activities and experiences and be supported by the organisation’s performance management system.

B2B buying and marketing is regarded as long-term relationship management and cooperation between buyer and seller. In a strategic B2B buyer-seller relationship, the strongest brand of the seller owns the relationship with the consumer (Webster & Keller, 2004: 393-396; Rackham & DeVincentis, 1992: 112). Hence even though the end user may purchase short-term business insurance through a broker, the relationship with the end-user will be owned by the insurance house. In this transaction relationships should be built between supplier (insurance house) and broker (intermediary), broker and end-user (client) and supplier and end-user. This is supported by McDonald et al. (2001: 341) who report on difficulties that are experienced by the insurance industry to establish organisation service brands. To this end the traditional FMCG approach was followed to create brand name awareness rather than points of difference of the insurance brands, and brokers were targeted instead of the consumer. The intermediary has greater and direct interaction with the consumer; more so than the supplier organisation. The supplier organisation should empower the reseller so that the reseller can be knowledgeable enough to properly advise the consumer (Gupta et al., 2010: 400). Intermediaries can act as a “multiplier of market performance (Glynn, 2012: 673).

Taylor, et al. (2004: 217) report that it is suggested that “customer brand loyalty is generally considered as the ultimate desirable marketing-based outcome from strategic marketing activities”. This is supported by Keller’s (2013:108) CBBE model, as the highest ranking sub-dimension of the capstone brand-building block (resonance) is also loyalty (or behavioural
loyalty, meaning repeat purchase) or “what I do” (Taylor et al., 2004: 218), with the second sub-dimension of the CBBE being attachment (or attitudinal attachment/attitudinal loyalty/affective loyalty) or “what I feel” (Taylor et al. 2004: 218). Aaker (1991: 270) treats ‘loyalty’ as a standalone asset dimension. Taylor et al. found in a nation-wide study of industrial customers of heavy equipment that brand equity and trust are the most important antecedents of loyalty (both behavioural and attitudinal loyalty), which suggests that marketers of B2B product may consider transcending satisfaction as the focus of relationship marketing to, in addition, build brand equity and trust (Parry, Rowley, Jones & Kupiec-Teahan, 2012: 896). Affect (emotions) was also found to be an antecedent of both types of loyalty, albeit to a lesser extent, than trust and brand equity. Favourable behavioural loyalty is said to increase market share, whereas favourable attitudinal loyalty increases relative price. In addition, Michell et al. (2001: 424) found that brand loyalty in B2B markets is built by quality, reliability and performance associations. The differences between B2C and B2B markets and branding are listed in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: A comparison between B2C and B2B markets and branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B2C</th>
<th>B2B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both B2C and B2B branding can create a competitive advantage, but both can also be commoditised.</td>
<td>The strategy basics apply to both B2C and B2B branding, namely the marketing concept and marketing strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSUMER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person: the consumer of the brand is a person.</td>
<td>Organisation: the consumer of the brand is another organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal decision-making: the transaction is concluded by a person for him/herself or for another person – for personal goals.</td>
<td>Personal and organisational decision-making: the transaction is concluded by a person on behalf of an organisation – to primarily achieve organisational goals. It is difficult to isolate the decision maker so the decision-making unit should be targeted through a communication strategy, which builds the organisation’s brand image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making is informal.</td>
<td>Decision-making is formalised with a concentration of buying power in a buying centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct demand for personal consumption.</td>
<td>Derived demand, which means that a B2B organisation’s demand is dependent on the demand for its own offerings from its consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large number of consumers.</td>
<td>Fewer consumer organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand is fairly stable.</td>
<td>Demand is volatile and volatility is influenced by the volatility of B2C demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand is spread over a broad geographical area.</td>
<td>Demand is often geographically concentrated in an industrial cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk is relatively limited to a few people and products.</td>
<td>Risk is higher owing to the impact on more people and larger volume transactions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRAND**

| Focus is on individual brands and builds the image and reputation of individual brand. | Focus is on the organisation as a brand and builds the image and reputation of organisation brand. |
| Branding must be understood from consumers’ point of view. | Branding must be understood from an organisational brand perspective. |
| Brand is more of a risk-handling device, but to a lesser extent than for B2B. | Brand is an even more essential risk-handling device for B2B. |

**TRANSACTION**

<p>| Non-career buyer. | Often involves expert (knowledgeable), professional and trained career-buyers. |
| Buying decision is made by a person or a few people. | Buying decision is made by a committee or group of people (buying centre), therefore, the brand’s value proposition should be relevant to all involved in the decision-making process. |
| Purchase is made for final consumption. | Purchase is made for further processing; for added value; or for incorporation into the final product. |
| The transaction has limited impact on an individual consumer or a limited number of consumers, with limited consequences. | The transaction has a broader impact on the organisation as a whole, with possibly more serious consequences. |
| The transaction is less complex with limited/few role players who are involved in the decision-making process. | The transaction is more complex with more role players involved in the decision-making process. |
| The purchase process is shorter with fewer stages in the consumer decision-making process, which consists of the following stages: - Need identification; - Search for information; - Evaluation of alternatives; - Purchase; and - Post-purchase behaviour. | The purchase process takes place over a longer period of time with various stages in the B2B decision-making process, namely: - Problem recognition; - Development of specifications; - Identification and evaluation of potential suppliers and offerings; - Selecting one or more supplier; |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Negotiating of buying terms;</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Evaluation of performance; and</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Management of relationship.</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transaction is of a lower volume/ quantity, size and value.</td>
<td>Transaction is usually of a larger volume/ quantity, size and value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RELATIONSHIP</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship is between the individual brand and the consumer.</td>
<td>The relationship is primarily between the organisation brand and consumer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship is more personal, as the purchase is for the person him/ herself.</td>
<td>The relationship is less personal, as the purchase is on behalf of an organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust: the purchaser should trust the individual brand only.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trust: the purchaser should trust both the individual and organisation brands.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MARKETING</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General segmentation, channel and pricing strategies apply.</td>
<td>Segmentation, channel and pricing strategies should be adapted for B2B markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General marketing programme applies.</td>
<td>General marketing programme should be adapted for B2B markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger advertising budget.</td>
<td>A smaller advertising budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media is readily available to communicate with target audiences.</td>
<td>Mass media availability is limited; instead, specialised media such as industry trade shows and professional journals are employed to communicate with target audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal selling and sales people can be less sophisticated because a person or a few people make the buying decision.</td>
<td>Personal selling and sales people should be more sophisticated to engage and negotiate with buyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited negotiation, as the price is usually set.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extensive negotiation such as discounting is often part of negotiations.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship marketing is important, but not to the extent as with B2B, as the impact of a lost sale/ repeat purchase is limited.</td>
<td>Relationship marketing is paramount owing to the magnitude and complexity of a transaction, and the large impact of a lost sale/ repeat purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenders are not used.</td>
<td>Tenders are the norm, therefore, demand a skilled support team for sales people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Business-to-business branding

Hutt and Speh (2013: 164-168) use the CBBE model to guide brand building for B2B brands. Mudambi, Doyle, and Wong (1997: 438-440) conceptualise the value of industrial brands for consumers as a pinwheel, which consists of “four performance components: product, distribution (ordering and delivery) services, support services, and company” with each performance component containing both tangible and intangible aspects. Tangible attributes are those that can be seen, measured or experienced, whereas intangible aspects are understood through the cognitive process, and often includes an emotional component. The tangible part of the product performance component of the pinwheel corresponds to the CBBE model’s performance building block, which includes aspects such as product reliability and durability. The intangible part of product performance of the pinwheel corresponds to the CBBE models’ perceived quality sub-dimension, which is a judgement and involves a cognitive process. The distribution component of the pinwheel’s tangible aspect can be compared to the CBBE model’s service effectiveness and refers to on-time deliveries. However, the intangible aspect of distribution, which refers to the ability to respond to an emergency, is not as clear as in the CBBE model. The support services component of the pinwheel is not as explicit in the CBBE model and includes technical support, training and financial support services. The company’s performance component of the pinwheel includes aspects of the organisation, as a whole, and not the individual offering. The tangible aspects include financial stability (profitability and market share) and the intangible aspects include company reputation, quality image and country of origin. The CBBE model includes one sub-dimension, which refers to the organisation behind the brand, namely credibility, which is not as elaborate as the company’s performance component of the pinwheel. The pinwheel study also found that price is important, as did the CBBE model, where it is included under the performance building block. Results from a study by Bendixen, Kalala and Abratt (2003: 376-378) confirm the importance of price and delivery in a B2B setting, as well as perceived quality, reliability and performance. The authors report that B2B buyers are willing to pay a price premium (owing to a sentimental relationship to the product); recommend their preferred brand to their peers; and extend the brand equity of their preferred brand to the brand extensions. People (technical consultants and sales representatives) were found to be the best means to create brand awareness among potential consumers of medium-voltage electric equipment.

Mudambi et al. (1997: 440), in addition, refer to the “basic, augmented, [and] potential model of branding”. Product performance is important for the basic brand, while support services, distribution and company performance is relatively inarticulate. Distribution and support services gain importance for the augmented brand, whereas the potential brand features all
four of the performance components. The pinwheel highlights the intangibility aspects (and even psychological aspects) of the brand even at the core physical product level. Also, the (spinning) pinwheel captures the dynamic nature of consumer brand decision-making, which is also captured in the double vortex brand model of de Chernatony and Dall’Olmo Riley (1998: 1085). This dynamic nature of branding complicates understanding of the interrelatedness of various components that contribute to brand equity, and is probably why the spinning pinwheel should be stopped, why a snapshot should be taken of one moment in time of the double vortex and why the CBBE model is depicted as sequential building blocks.

Sarin (2014: 99) presents a simplified B2B branding model, which is entitled the Functional and Emotional Equity Model. The author posits that the B2B brand experience consists of two pillars, namely performance (functional dimensions) and behaviour (emotional dimensions). The performance dimensions include quality, delivery, price and service, whereas the behavioural dimensions include attitude, relationship, integrity, abiding by promises and responsiveness. The CBBE model (Figure 5.3) includes both functional and emotional dimensions.

Brand knowledge is important to B2B brands (Gupta et al., 2010: 400). Biong and Sikoset’s (2014: 171) findings of a review of the current B2B brand management research indicate that brands are important to buyers; the most prominent strategy is to create corporate brand awareness; and the drivers of B2B brand equity are perceived quality, name awareness, brand associations and brand loyalty. Kim and Hyun (2011: 435) confirm that B2B brand equity is affected by brand awareness and brand associations, and that perceived quality affects brand loyalty. Similarly, brand awareness, brand associations and brand loyalty were found to be important for services brand equity by Im et al. (2012: 399).

B2B brand equity is also affected by loyalty, relationships and partnerships (Hallmann, Jarvis & Bitner, 2015: 272, 274). Ryan and Silvanto (2013: 48-49) confirm the importance of long-term relationships for B2B brand equity and include price, performance, quality, trust and service performance as additional dimensions.

Gupta et al. (2010: 399-400) report on the importance of brand representatives to create B2B brand equity. They use the term brand, which is personified to refer to the people aspect of B2B brand equity. Brand representatives act as a channel through which brand knowledge is transferred to the satisfaction of the resellers. Brand representatives has a direct influence on the purchase intension of resellers. In this interaction it is beneficial for
representatives to understand the consumer's situation and concerns (Ryan and Silvanto, 2013: 48).


It is evident that systematic brand management is critically important to success in the B2B sector, and has a definite positive effect on market performance (Baumgarth, 2010: 666). B2B brands may:

- Provide more profitable customer relationships and more opportunities for sales;
- Provide re-assurance to consumers;
- Aid premium pricing (Ryan & Silvanto, 2013: 49; Biong & Silkoset, 2014: 171; Sarin, 2014: 92);
- Attract talent and business partners (Rozin, 2004: 345; Sarin, 2014: 92);
- Provide more confidence in the purchase decision;
- Enhance corporate reputation;
- Raise barriers to entry (Michell et al., 2001: 415, 425);
- Protect an organisation against competition (Ryan & Silvant, 2013: 47, 49); and
- Create a direct association between producer and reseller (Gupta, 2010: 397).

As indicated above, B2B brands can provide benefits. The application of the CBBE model to the B2B sector can provide valuable insight to improve B2B brand management.
4.3.3 Business to business research directions

Suggested research directions for B2B branding are listed in Table 4.2. The present study contributes, to a lesser or greater extent, to the issues in bold, and significantly to the issue in red. This makes the significance of the present study clear.

### Table 4.2: B2B branding: future research directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Further research directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The B2B brand concept</td>
<td>• What does “brand” mean for B2B marketers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the concept of a brand a cluster of functional and emotional benefits applicable to a B2B context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are emotional benefits important to members of the decision-making unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is their relative importance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To brand or not to brand?</td>
<td>• Is branding suitable for all B2B brands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When should a B2B brand? When should it not brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the barriers to branding in B2B organisations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand architecture</td>
<td>• Is organisation branding more suitable for B2B brands than product/ product line branding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When should B2B organisations adopt product vs. product line vs. organisation branding strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative criteria and importance of brand</td>
<td>• What is the importance of brand equity/ reputation in the selection of a B2B brand in a buying situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Under what circumstances is the brand more/ less important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the importance of the brand different for different types of purchases?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand relationships</td>
<td>• Do buyers in a B2B context value their relationships with B2B organisations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are relationships with firm employees preferred over relationships with the B2B brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Under what circumstances should B2B organisations promote their brands as relationship builders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand equity</td>
<td>• What are the components of industrial brand equity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are existing measures of brand equity applicable to B2B markets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can industrial brand equity be measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are its antecedents and consequences?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leek & Christodoulides, 2011: 8
The context of the present study, namely short-term business insurance, involved B2B and services issues. B2B issues have been discussed in earlier sections, and services issue is discussed next. This concludes the literature review, and the last aspect of the theoretical framework (Figure 1.1).

### 4.4 SERVICE BRANDS

For FMCG the product is the primary brand, but for services the organisation is the primary brand. Because services are difficult to evaluate before purchase, service brands are even more valuable as a risk handling device (monetary, social and safety risk), than is the case with tangible goods. Service brands offer a promise of future service experience satisfaction and are based on clients’ perceptions. As for brand elements, services cannot benefit from packaging, labelling and displaying to the extent that tangible products can. Strong service brands increase clients’ trust and aids understanding and visualisation of the intangible offering. The FMCG purchase process is silent and impersonal, with no inter-personal contact, which renders people a service brand’s competitive advantage. Building long-term relationships based on these interactions are important for B2B services, where intimate client interaction and trust are required (Natti & Palo, 2012: 1837).

An emotional connection with clients is important, but discounting negates the opportunity to create an emotional connection (Berry, 2000: 128-130, 136). The author further states that “great brands always make an emotional connection with the intended audience”, surpasses attributes and benefits, and touches on feelings of closeness, affection and trust. “Brands that connect with customers’ emotions are those that reflect customers’ core values” and “brands that connect emotionally, are authentic summations of a company with a soul.” The author's findings regarding the importance of an emotional connection in building service brand equity raised an important issue that was investigated in the present study, as Kuhn et al. (2008: 50-51) found that feelings do not play a role in building B2B brand equity. The present study investigated, among others, whether feelings or an emotional connection play a role in creating B2B service brand equity. In addition, Berry (2000: 135) mentions that a great service brand should be caring, while fostering a connection between supporters. These aspects are included in the CBBE model (Keller, 2013: 108), as the sub-dimensions service empathy (part of the imagery building block) and community (part of the resonance building block). McDonald et al. (2001: 338-339, 350) support the importance of the interaction with the organisation brand’s personnel and add that internal marketing to recruit, induct and train personnel is more important for service brands than for product brands. Personnel recruitment, in this instance, becomes a marketing imperative. Personnel should be recruited, trained and incentivised to deliver services of high quality. The realisation of the
importance of the interrelationship between brand and people is illustrated by Santam, which has an ‘executive head: people and brand services’ (Santam, 2012). The marketing function should know the consumer well and should inform the entire organisation about how to deliver superior value to consumers (Webster, 1992: 14). Berry (2000: 129-130) conceptualises a service-branding model, which is depicted in Figure 4.2. The bold black text is the author’s original descriptions; the text in blue has been added by the researcher from the author’s article; and the text in red has been added by the researcher from Keller (1993: 3-4). The aspects that are underlined correspond to O’Cass and Grace’s (2004: 257) findings, which are discussed later, and are depicted in Figure 4.3.

In the model (Figure 4.2) the term ‘presented brand’ refers to how an organisation’s brand identity is enhanced through advertising, service facilities and the appearance of the service providers (physical evidence). This includes organisation brand elements. The model shows that even though a ‘company’s perceived brand’ has a primary impact on ‘brand awareness’, ‘brand awareness’ only has a secondary impact on ‘brand equity’. A ‘company’s presented brand’ has a secondary impact on ‘brand meaning’. ‘External brand communications’ refer to uncontrolled communication about the organisation brand, including word-of-mouth and publicity, and has a secondary impact on both ‘brand awareness’ and ‘brand meaning’. ‘Customer experience with company’ has a primary impact on ‘brand meaning’, which in turn has a primary impact on brand equity. The ‘brand awareness’ and ‘brand meaning’ dimensions is the same as Keller’s (1993: 3-4) ‘brand awareness’ and ‘brand image’ (consumer perception) dimensions and is combined with what Keller (1993: 2, 2008: 48) refers to as brand knowledge, which creates brand equity. The fundamental difference between Keller’s (2013: 108) CBBE model and Berry’s (2000: 130) service-branding model is that for services, the client’s focus is on the organisation as a whole (the service organisation becomes the brand), while the client’s service experiences is the cornerstone of service brand equity, and human performance rather than machine performance is critical to brand building. B2B clients’ experiences affect all dimensions of brand equity (Biedenbach & Marell, 2012: 455). This conceptualisation is useful, but is an estimation of the relationship between clients and brand because the research is based on an analysis of 14 mature high-performance service brands and not upon actual responses from clients.
Investigation into the branding of goods has been extensive, but service branding research has been limited. Nevertheless, because services are commercially important, research into services branding is becoming more important. Branding has become particularly important in financial services owing to the proliferation of services, which is offered and provides a competitive advantage for services. Service branding needs a different approach to that of product branding because an aspect such as, for example, price is equally relevant for service and product branding, but there are other aspects that differ.

Brand knowledge is formed through brand awareness (salience building block of CBBE), and brand image (imagery and performance building blocks of CBBE), and as far as these aspects are concerned for service branding, facilities, past experience, word-of-mouth communication and the input of service employees (and their physical appearance), are important (Biedenbach & Marell, 2012: 455; Lakshmi & Santhi, 2015: 79). Employees, and specifically personal selling, are important for B2B brand equity (Glynn, 2012: 670). Lakshmi and Santhi (2015: 79) found that staff’s physical appearance contributes to perceived service
quality for B2B brands. Service quality, professionalism and understanding are important attributes of B2B service brand equity (Parry et al., 2012: 896), while and service employee training improves service quality perceptions for B2B services (Sichtmann et al., 2011: 17). Some of these aspects are included in Berry's (2000: 130) service-branding model and are underlined in Figure 4.2. The fundamental difference between product branding and service branding is the importance of people in the branding process. People refer to both employees and clients because clients are involved in the delivery and creation of the service. Moreover, service brand equity is mainly created by employees. Hence, service branding should, first and foremost, be people-centred (Berry, 2000: 128 & Grace, 2004: 257, 264, 266-268). In addition to the importance of people in the services context, Baumgarth and Binckebanck (2011: 487-498) were the first to confirm that, in contrast to the business-to-consumer context, sales people are an important building block of B2B brand equity. The authors also clarify that a salesperson's behaviour is more important than a salesperson’s personality, which is more important than product quality and non-personal communication. As depicted in Figure 4.3, all four of these dimensions have a positive influence on B2B brand equity; hence the sales force should be included in a proposed B2B brand equity model.
O’Cass and Grace (2004: 257) validate the CBBE model's non-product related attribute of the image of other users (self-image congruence/ user profile), as well as the sub-dimension usage situation, but calls for additional research into other types of services to confirm the dimensions that they found to be important. Figure 4.4 combines insight from Keller (2013: 68-69) (in red) and O’Cass and Grace (2004: 257) (in black).
O’Cass and Grace (2004: 257) report that core-service, experience with brand, self-image congruency, feelings, servicescape and interpersonal service, publicity, advertising, price and brand are important dimensions for clients. Aggregated, the authors found that service brand associations has an influence on attitude towards the service brand and that service brand associations and attitude towards the service brand influences intention to use the service brand. Country of origin (is included under history, heritage and experiences as part of the CBBE model’s imagery building block), and word-of-mouth was not important dimensions for clients. Brand experiences affect all dimensions of B2B service brand equity (Biedenbach & Marell, 2012: 455). The CBBE model does not include servicescape (facilities’ visual appeal, employees’ appearance and other material appeals) (O’Cass & Grace, 2004: 262; Lakshmi & Santhi, 2015: 79), while controlled or uncontrolled communication, were found to be relevant for service brands by Berry (2000: 130) and O’Cass and Grace (2004: 257). Matear, Gray and Garrett (2004: 295) highlight the importance of brand investment as a source of advantage for service organisations and found that a superior brand position is the best marketing position for a service organisation.

Parry et al. (2012: 899) report that price was a critical issue for B2B services because decision makers have budgetary constraints. The issue is more nuanced than mere price; it has to do with the price being a competitive price, relative to alternatives. Price is traded off against other sub-dimensions such as service and trust. Price is also an indicator of unobservable quality (Biong & Silkoiset, 2014: 178).
B2B services brands can differentiate competitors and raise competitive barriers (Geigenmuller & Bettis-Outland, 2012: 432).

4.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter summarised the differences between product and service offerings and compared B2B and B2C markets and branding. In addition, B2B and service brands were elaborated on and conceptual models were presented for service branding, as well as sales force impact on B2B brands and client experience with a service brand. These models and the list of B2B research direction concluded the conceptual framework of the present study, as depicted in Figure 1.1.

There is a considerable amount of branding research for consumer goods, less so for business and service branding, and little concerning B2B services branding, even though brands can differentiate B2B services (Davis et al., 2008: 219), the literature review isolated the lacuna in the body of knowledge, which is that there is no comprehensive, accepted and adapted brand equity model for B2B services specifically. This was captured in the primary research objective, which is to develop a brand equity framework that guides the strategic brand management process for B2B services. The next chapter details research design conceptualisation, data collection, sampling, operationalisation and analysis of collected data of the present study to achieve the primary and secondary research objectives.

The empirical research that follows, therefore, contributes to three areas of brand equity, namely 1) the offering type – by investigating service offerings rather than product offerings; 2) brand level – by investigating organisation-level brands rather than product-level brands; and 3) context – by investigating a B2B context rather than a B2C context. Based on this, a business-to-business client-based brand equity (B2B CL-BBE) framework is proposed.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH STRATEGY AND METHODS

5.1 INTRODUCTION
The previous literature review chapters dealt with concepts, which concern the research context, including brands, branding, brand management, brand equity, as well as brand equity in B2Bs and services markets. The most prominent brand equity models were discussed in depth, since the focus of the present study was to apply the CBBE model to a selected B2B service context.

This chapter focuses on the research strategy and methods that were used for the present research. This includes making the researcher’s ontological and epistemological position clear and applying Zikmund and Babin’s (2010: 57) marketing research process to the present study step-by-step. This process includes the research objectives, research design, sample size and sample frame, collection of data, analysis of the data and reporting of the data. Each of the questions included in the interview guide was discussed to make the conceptual purpose clear. The link between the interview guide questions (Appendix 2) and the dimensions of the CBBE model is presented in Figure 5.4, while consideration of the code of conduct and ethics, conclude the chapter.

5.2 SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH POSITION
Even though the methodology that was followed for the present study should be made clear, the present study is a study about brand equity and not a study about methodology. This study does not aim to contribute to the methodological debate in terms of a new methodology or amended methodology. Even though from a pure methodological debate perspective it is not ideal to use a set typology for this intricate discussion, Table 5.1 conceptualises research designs, and shows the research philosophy, strategy and methods that were adopted and applied in the present study. This also shows the dominant methodological terminology, which was adopted for the present study. This framework was compiled by Haydam, Slabbert and Uken (2011: 231) from 10 sources.

5.2.1 Ontology and epistemology
Ontology is concerned with the nature of reality, which can be discovered through research (epistemology) (Maxwell, 2013: 42). A distinction is made between the paradigms: positivist, anti-positivist (called interpretivist in Table 5.1) and realist. Positivists believe that there are sufficient similarities between all the sciences, hence a similar epistemology and methodology can be followed. In contrast, the anti-positivists (interpretivists) believe that the
differences between the sciences are so fundamental that the same epistemology and methodology cannot be used for natural and social sciences. Realists accept that there are differences between the sciences, but that there are also similarities, which justify the use of the same epistemology and methodology (Mouton, 2009: 46-47). Henning et al. (2004: 16-25) differentiate between three types of epistemological positions, namely positivist/ post-positivist, interpretivist/ constructivist and critical. This corresponds to the typology of research philosophies in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1: Conceptualising research designs/ strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Research philosophy [paradigm/ epistemological position/approach]</th>
<th>Researcher’s sociological departure point and life orientation. (a) [non-empirical] Theoretical/historical/philosophical—basic research (b) Empirical (applied) research: (i) interpretivist (qualitative), (ii) positivistic (quantitative), (iii) realistic and (iv) the critical approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Research discourse [type of reasoning]</td>
<td>(a) Exposition; (b) Argument/reasoning: (i) inductive (theory building), (ii) deductive (theory testing/testing causal relationships) (iii) abductive reasoning (symptomatic hypothesis formulation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Research strategy [design]</td>
<td>EXPLORATORY RESEARCH DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time horizon</td>
<td>Longitudinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1a Sample design</td>
<td>Non-probability sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1b Sample techniques</td>
<td>Convenience, quota, experience, <strong>judgmental</strong> and snowball sampling [selection]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Measurement</td>
<td>Open-ended and conversational questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Data manipulation [data analysis method]</td>
<td>Category construction; <strong>deductively based</strong> (pattern matching, explanation building) and <strong>inductively based</strong> (content analysis, analytical induction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A positivistic approach applies guidelines from natural science research to social science. Concerns mainly objective facts and holds that observation and measurement is the aim of scientific study. The researcher’s own emotions (feelings) and thoughts do not enter into the study. This paradigm focuses on uncovering the truth and proving it empirically. Propositions are proven quantitatively and claims are made about validity and accuracy. Bailey (2007: 51-53) and Denscombe (2013: 324) explains that within the positivist paradigm the researcher stays objective/removed from that being studied. The research begins with a theory and uses deductive reasoning to develop testable hypotheses from the theory. Data are then collected and analysed to test whether there is empirical support for the hypotheses. Reliability, validity and generalisability are central to the methodological concerns of this paradigm. A post-positivist paradigm allows for both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, but if a qualitative methodology is followed, it only captures data at a descriptive level. This philosophy disregards how people form meaning. Critical realism is one of the most common post-positivist philosophies. In contrast to the positivist who believes that the goal of science is to “uncover the truth, the post-positivist critical realist believes that the goal of science is to hold steadfastly to the goal of getting it right about reality, even though we can never achieve that goal”. The interpretive framework holds that all observation is fallible, that theory is revisable and that research should approximate reality. This framework incorporates participants’ beliefs, judgements, perceptions, attitudes and reasons (deep understanding), and the research is scrutinised and/or endorsed by other researchers (Henning et al., 2004: 16-25). The interpretive framework holds that there “is no objective social reality but instead multiple realities” and that the researcher is interrelated with what is learned from the research. The meanings that participants attach to concepts are important in this paradigm.

If, for the present study, the researcher’s social ontology and epistemology had to be made explicit, it would be that the brand are constructed in the minds of humans and that the researcher and the studied reality cannot be separated. An interpretivist approach was used to investigate the knowledge claim that the CBBE model should be applicable to guide branding practice in any context. For the present study it is accepted that reality is influenced by the frame of reference. Even though important, the researcher does not believe that science is the only way in which truth can be uncovered. Logic, philosophy and theology can contribute to knowledge. The researcher supports Kepler’s (1601) historical view that “the chief aim of all investigation of the external world should be to discover the rational order, which has been imposed on it by God and, which he revealed to us in the language of mathematics” or in a broader context, natural laws. However, the researcher is cognisant that branding is part science and part art. This is the reason why an amended brand equity
framework is suggested and not a branding process. A framework is understood to present a
guide, which can be amended and interpreted based on the context in which it is applied.
The present study aimed to understand the dimensions that are used in short-term business
insurance brand building. This inevitably involved subjectivity when responses were
interpreted (with the use of codes and categories) in order to construct an adapted B2B
services brand equity framework. It was an exercise, which sought to make sense of how
people constructed brand meaning in their minds.

In the final analysis, the present study was concerned with adding to the existing knowledge
about B2B services branding, which will hopefully lead to more effective branding practice.
The present study thus resides in the social sciences, and is applied (applying CBBE model
to B2B services context) and empirical (through observation and measures of reality). The
present study conducted research to identify the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the
CBBE model that are confirmed and the building blocks and sub-dimensions that are not
confirmed and identify additional building blocks and sub-dimensions that may be applicable
to a short-term business insurance context.

5.2.2 Methodology
While epistemology deals with the science of how we come to know, methodology is
cermed with methods that are used to acquire this knowledge (Babbie, 2010: 4). A
distinction is made between quantitative and qualitative research methodologies (Table 5.1).
The purpose of the present research was to understand the importance of the sub-
dimensions of B2B services brand equity, which cannot be done through the use of
predetermined scaled responses only. The aim of the data collection was depth of
understanding (Richards & Morse, 2013: 25) and not merely quantity. The present research
sought to build (or adapt) a complex and holistic B2B services framework through a
discursive basic qualitative research approach. A qualitative study was used by Kuhn et al.
(2008: 40–58) in a similar study. Qualitative research “addresses marketing objectives
through techniques that allow the researcher to provide elaborate interpretations of market
phenomena without depending on numerical measurement”. Its focus is on “discovering true
inner meanings and new insights” (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 131). For areas of brand
research that are being researched, interpretive and qualitative methodologies are
recommended (Mitchell, Hutchinson & Quinn, 2013: 1385).
17 in-depth interviews were conducted with participants from short-term business insurance client demand side organisations, over a period of five months. The interviews were time consuming with most taking more than 40 minutes to complete. Gift vouchers from either Exclusive Books, Cavendish Shopping Centre or Woolworths were offered to participants as an incentive.

5.2.3 Types of reasoning
There are inductive, deductive and abductive reasoning (Table 5.1). Inductive reasoning differs from deductive reasoning, since inductive reasoning infers that the occurrence or reoccurrence of an event may lead to generalisation, whereas deductive reasoning holds that a conclusion can be validly inferred if the premises on which it is based are true (Remler & van Ryzin, 2015: 15). The present research forms part of the early stages of the adaptation of a major branding model for a short-term business insurance context. A generally accepted and adapted model can only be developed from a collection of similar studies. The present study worked with a known conceptual model and tested the applicability thereof in a B2B services context, which is deductive reasoning (theory testing), and identified additional dimensions to amend the conceptual model, which is inductive reasoning (theory building). The present study elaborates on the existing theory by applying and extending the CBBE model to a short-term business insurance context, therefore, a mixed research discourse was used.

5.3 MARKETING RESEARCH
The American Marketing Association (2012) defines marketing research as:
the systematic gathering, recording, and analysis of data about issues relating to marketing products and services.

Marketing research is the “application of the scientific method in searching for the truth about marketing phenomena” (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 5). The scientific method is based on systematic observation, logical explanation, prediction, openness and scepticism (Remler & van Ryzin, 2015: 13). “Marketing research involves all phases of the information-management process, including the specification of what information is needed, the collection and analysis of the information; and the interpretation of the information” (Churchill & Brown, 2007: 6).
5.3.1 Marketing research process

Marketing research often involves the following stages (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 57):

1. Defining the research objectives;
2. Planning a research design;
3. Planning a sample;
4. Collecting the data;
5. Analysing the data; and
6. Formulating the conclusions and preparing the report.

5.3.1.1 Step 1 - defining the research objectives

The conceptual question of the present research was: what does research literature tell us about brand equity, branding models and B2B services branding? As a result of preliminary research, two prominent generic branding models were identified, namely Aaker’s (1991: 270) brand equity model and the CBBE model (Keller, 2013: 108). After comparing the two models (Chapter 3), the researcher accepted the CBBE model as the most current and comprehensive brand equity model. As mentioned before, even though the CBBE model was developed for B2C individual product brands, it is claimed that the CBBE model should be applicable to any context, therefore, the B2B services context as well. But, there are also doubts about this claim (Kuhn et al., 2008: 40–58; Christodoulides et al., 2015: 320-321; Christodoulides & de Chernatony, 2010: 60-61). Preliminary research indicates that the research problem is feasible and that the present research will make a contribution to branding theory in three areas, namely: 1) the offering type – by investigating service offerings rather than product offerings; 2) brand level – by investigating organisation-level brands rather than product-level brands; and 3) context – by investigating a B2B context rather than a B2C context.

Based on preliminary research, the problem statement and research objectives were finalised. The research objectives are goals that should be achieved, or the deliverables of the research (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 58). The present research is empirical, therefore, the research problem had to be stated, which is that there is no comprehensive, accepted or adapted brand equity model for B2B services, specifically. If the generic B2C branding models are used to brand B2B services, it may lead to suboptimum brand building strategies. The phenomenon that was investigated was brand equity, specifically for B2B services. The primary research objective was to develop a brand equity model, as a strategic brand management instrument, to guide the branding process for B2B services. This was achieved by verification; by investigating the applicability of the CBBE model and its
assumption in a real world B2B services context (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010: 137), and by adapting the existing CBBE model for B2B services.

Short-term business insurance, as an offering, was the focus of the present study because, as explained in Chapter 2, a short-term insurance offering is, per definition, a service and approaches a pure service, as depicted in Figure 2.1 in the product-service spectrum.

Primary research was paramount because limited research had been undertaken in this regard. The primary research objective was translated into a primary research question, which was: what would constitute a brand equity model, as a strategic brand management instrument, for B2B services? The secondary research objectives, which translated into secondary research questions that supported the primary research question, were:

- Which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are confirmed for short-term business insurance?
- Which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are not confirmed for short-term business insurance?
- Which other brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions may be relevant to short-term business insurance?

Appendix 3 indicates linkages between questions that were included in the initial interview guide and the objectives of the study.

5.3.1.2 Step 2 – planning a research design

Once the research problem and objectives have been defined, the research design must be developed. The research design is a master plan that details methods and procedures to collect and analyse the required information. The research design includes sources of information, techniques and sampling (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 64). As indicated in Table 5.1, there are different types of research designs/ strategies, including exploratory, descriptive and causal. As mentioned before, the research objectives necessitated an exploratory research strategy to clarify an ambiguous situation. A qualitative research approach was appropriate because the brand equity phenomenon is complex and multifaceted with many dimensions. There are various qualitative research approaches, which include case study, ethnography, phenomenological study, grounded theory and content analysis. The study was a cross-sectional study and the questions were refined as the study progressed (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 61). Open-ended questions were used to elicit participants’ perceptions of the CBBE model’s current and potential sub-dimensions.
The study attempted “to understand people’s perceptions, perspectives, and understandings of a particular situation” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010: 135, 137-145), which necessitated lengthy interviews. The interview data was analysed through content analysis.

The present study’s research philosophy, strategy and methods are summarised in Table 5.3.

**5.3.1.3 Step 3 – planning a sample**

Sampling “involves any procedure that draws conclusions based on measurements of a portion of the population” (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 65). The two major types of sampling are probability sampling and purposeful (nonprobability) selection. As included in Table 5.1, probability sampling includes simple random, systematic and stratified sampling. These samples are drawn so that the sample is representative of the population from which it is drawn, hence the results can be generalised to the population. A large sample is required for probability sampling. This type of sampling is mostly used for quantitative research, whereas purposeful selection (called non-probability sampling in Table 5.1) is the norm for qualitative research. For purposeful selection the number of cases selected is limited. The focus is on selecting cases to study that are information-rich, rather than a large sample (Bailey, 2007: 63-64). The types of non-probability sampling include convenience, quota and judgemental (Table 5.1). Judgemental selection was used for the present study.

**a) Sample size**

Bailey (2007: 64) highlights the dilemma of determining a sample size for non-probability sampling and suggests a sample size of 20. Seidman (2006: 55) reports on a suggested maximum sample size of 25, based on the notion that exceeding this number would not lead to new or additional information; the so called saturation point. Leedy and Ormrod (2010: 141) suggest a typical sample size of 5 to 25. Kuhn et al. (2008: 40-58) obtained 26 useable interviews in a similar study. As mentioned earlier, for the present study, selection of participants was based on non-probability judgemental selection. A total of 17 Interviews were conducted for the study, of which 14 were useable. The selection process is illustrated in Figure 5.2. Research, which was commissioned by the City of Cape Town and conducted by Grant Thornton, realised a response rate from hotels of 12 during 2013 and 13 during 2014 (City of Cape Town, 2014b: 15).

Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted on the fixed premises of the demand-side client organisations of short-term business insurance within Cape Town, South Africa. Judgemental selection was used based on inclusion on the Cape Town Tourism and
www.booking.com databases and location (Cape Town). Considering the high nonresponse rate it was decided to sample the two databases to exhaustion with the main criterion being conducting interviews with the right participants – those who had some influence on the decision regarding which insurance brand to select for the hotel that they were involved with. Based on the selection frame it was noted that there was one hotel in Cape Town with a 1 star grading, while there were no 2 star hotels. An interview was conducted with a participant from the 1 star hotel, but the data was not useable. Even though 17 interviews were conducted, the study represented more than 17 hotels. For example, the interview that was conducted with participant P1 solicited information about one insurance house and broker, but covered four hotels in the same group that were all insured with the same insurance house and through the same broker. Likewise, the brand equity section of the interview with participant Q1 covered three hotels and interview O1 covered two hotels as was the case for participant C1. The 14 interviews covered about 30 of the 89 hotels on the selection frame.

b) Selection frame
The selection frame for the present study included hotels in the Cape Town metropolitan area that had business insurance. How the selection frame was decided on is discussed next and indicated in Figures 5.1 and 5.2.

Since the researcher was based in Cape Town and time and financial resources were limited, the study was limited to the Cape Town metropole of the Western Cape. The gross domestic product’s (GDP) annual average growth for the Western Cape has consistently outperformed the national economy between 2003 and 2010, averaging 4.25% against the national average of 3.6%, but was 3.1% in 2010. The Western Cape accounted for 13.61% of South Africa’s gross domestic product in the fourth quarter of 2014. Since 2006, the Western Cape’s economy shifted from being natural resources and commodities based to being services dominant, which is in line with international trends for developed countries. The Western Cape has six district municipalities, namely the City of Cape Town, West Coast, Cape Winelands, Overberg, Central Karoo and Eden, and has 5.2 million inhabitants (for 2010). Cape Town is the capital of the Western Cape. The City of Cape Town with its 3.5 million inhabitants, which represents 66% of the population of the Western Cape, is divided into eight districts, namely Cape Town CBD, Northern, Blaauwberg, Cape Flats, Table Bay, Southern, Khayelitsha/Mitchell’s Plain, Helderberg and Tygerberg. The City of Cape Town contributes 74% of the region’s gross domestic profit (GDP), while the city’s GDP grew by 2.5% from R174.6bn in 2009 to R179.0bn in 2010. The City of Cape Town had the second highest gross geographic contribution of all towns in South Africa for 2014 at 11.3%. (Wesgro, 2012a: 1-11; Wesgro, 2012b: 1-12; City of Cape Town, 2014a: 10).
The sector wholesale and retail trade, catering and accommodation is among the top three economic sectors in the City of Cape Town and contributed R26.6bn or 14.8% to the city’s GDP. Hotels and tourism accounted for 10% of foreign direct investment (FDI) into Cape Town from 2003 to 2011, while the catering and accommodation sector accounted for 42,019 formal employment opportunities in 2010. One direct employment opportunity is created for every 29 leisure visitors and one indirect job is created for every 20 leisure visitors. Of the tourists that visited the City of Cape Town during 2011, 81.6% made use of accommodation services (stayed over). A total of 73.8% of the visitors were from abroad and most hailed from the United Kingdom (12.2%), Germany (12.31%), the United States (6.75%) and the Netherlands (2.84%). The top non-European markets were the United States, Australia and Brazil. Cape Town’s share of domestic tourists grew from 10% in 2008 to 16.7% in 2011, and these tourists were from Gauteng (46.61%), the Western Cape (27.97%) and KwaZulu-Natal (7.63%). Most people visited Cape Town for holiday and leisure (83.62% share) purposes, business (6.47%) and conventions (4.96%). Other reasons included visiting friends and relatives, events and honeymoons (Wesgro, 2012a: 1-11; Wesgro, 2012b: 1-12).

The tourism industry was selected for the present study owing to its importance to the Cape Town economy. One of Cape Town’s comparative advantages is its “scenic beauty and natural sights that attract international visitors and make Cape Town globally recognisable”, which includes one of the new seven wonders of nature. The tourism industry can thus contribute to Cape Town’s economic growth. In the fourth quarter of 2014, Cape Town’s six major attractions received 8,272,729 visits (City of Cape Town, 2014a: 6, 10-12, 54, 58). Tourism spend in Cape Town has grown by 5.6% per year between 2009 and 2012. Cape Town’s tourism industry contributed R12.4 billion in 2009, R16 billion (FIFA World Cup), and R14.6 billion in 2012 to the local economy. Research found that an increase in tourist numbers equates to an increase in jobs, and that most of the jobs that have been created in the tourism industry in Cape Town were in the unskilled and semi-skilled categories. Cape Town’s tourism industry employs 34,500 permanent and 15,000 temporary workers (City of Cape Town, 2013).

The largest portion of tourist spend at a destination is spent on accommodation. Therefore, accommodation demand is a useful indicator of the performance of the tourism industry as a whole. This spend has the largest effect on employment in the tourism industry. Occupancy rates at Cape Town accommodation providers remained stable from the fourth quarter of 2013 to the fourth quarter of 2014, at just over 72%. The average rate per room for the fourth quarter increased from R1 313 (2013) to R1 384, and the average revenue per room increased from R952 to R1 001. This indicates the overall health of the tourism industry in
Cape Town. Compared to the rest of South Africa, accommodation is a comparative advantage for Cape Town, which means that accommodation contributes more to the city’s economic output than they do to South Africa’s output, in general. In addition, the hospitality sector was one of the fastest growing sectors of the Cape Town economy, with accommodation being the most labour intensive. This highlights the importance of accommodation if seen in light of South Africa’s unemployment rate of 34.6%, and Cape Town’s unemployment rate of 26% for the fourth quarter of 2014 (City of Cape Town, 2014a: 6-7, 11-12, 24, 54-55).

Foreign arrivals to the Western Cape increased by 15.8% between 2012 and 2013, and from 1.3 million in 2012 to 1.5 million in 2013. They spent 19 million bednights in the Western Cape (2013), which was up by 17.3% in 2012. This made the Western Cape the second most visited province following Gauteng. Revenue that was generated by foreign visitors in the Western Cape was R17 billion in 2013 (City of Cape Town, 2014b: 44-45). During 2012 the Western Cape received 40.3% international visitors, 57.4% domestic visitors, and 48.4% overnight visitors (Wesgro, 2012c: 6).

Of paid for accommodation during 2013, most visitors stayed at hotels (35.37%), with the rest staying at guesthouses (18.02%), self-catering accommodation (14.82%) and camping and caravanning (0.91%) (City of Cape Town, 2014b: 31).

Cape Town Tourism is considered to be a credible and official accommodation providers’ database and had more than 1000 accredited establishments listed. The number reduced to 376 accommodation providers for the Cape Town area, of which 54 were listed as hotels. The breakdown is shown in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2: Accommodation providers registered with Cape Town Tourism

Source: Cape Town Tourism (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation type</th>
<th>Number in Cape Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backpacker and hostelling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpackers</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush lodge</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan and camping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave/rest/trail hut</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country house</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game lodge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest house</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home stay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostelling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel and inns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-catering</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail hut</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the following types of accommodation were removed from the list of hotels (Cape Town, 2013):

- “self-contained, self-catering holiday home”;
- most boutique hotels;
- “guesthouse”;
- “holiday apartments”;
- “farm lodge”;
- “self –catering hotel and apartments”; and
- hotel group entries.

This further reduced the number of hotels to 44. Hotels (highlighted in Table 5.2) were included in the present study as selection frame one. In addition to the reasons provided in section 5.3.1.3b, it was thought that smaller establishments such as backpackers and B&B’s would conform to B2C considerations and actions. Hotels are more structured and decisions will more likely be made in the interest of the organisation and not the individual purchaser, hence would more closely represent a B2B situation. Of the first 15 hotels contacted (and
followed-up) three interviews were secured. This gave an early indication of a possible high non-response rate. In light of the high non-response rate the Cape Town Tourism database was supplemented with a database of hotels registered with www.booking.com. www.bookings.com was the top advertised accommodation provider listed when a search was done for “accommodation providers Cape Town” and “hotels Cape Town”. This site listed 375 properties, but when those that were already included in selection frame 1, apartments and self-catering were removed, the second selection frame added 40 additional hotels that could be approached for interviews, which rendered a total of 84 hotels that represented the bulk of all hotels in Cape Town.

As mentioned earlier, all hotels in the selection frame were contacted (with numerous follow-ups, to exhaustion) and 17 face-to-face interviews were secured and conducted (a 20 % response rate), of which 14 were useable. Because the unit of analysis, the actual sample and participants were homogeneous, this allowed for sensible investigation of the drivers of brand equity in a specific B2B services context.

Figure 5.1: Unit of analysis, participants and actual sample size of the study
Selection frame 1:
Accommodation providers listed with Cape Town Tourism 
N > 1000

Inclusions:
Accommodation providers for Cape Town area 
N = 376

Exclusions:
Accommodation providers outside of Cape Town area 
N > 624

Accommodation providers listed as “hotels” 
N = 54

“True” hotels 
N = 44

Other accommodation providers incorrectly listed as “hotels” 
N = 10

Selection frame 2:
Accommodation providers listed with www.booking.com 
N = 375

Exclusions:
Accommodation providers listed with Cape Town Tourism (duplicates) and incorrectly labelled as “hotels” 
N = 335

Inclusions:
“True” hotels not listed with Cape Town Tourism 
N = 40

Total selection: “True” hotels 
N = 84

Interviews secured: N = 17 of which useable: N = 14

Figure 5.2: Summary of selection process
5.3.1.4 Step 4 – collecting the data

There are two types of data, namely primary and secondary data. Primary data are data that are collected for the first time (new data), which has not been analysed and interpreted by anyone. Secondary data refers to data that were collected, interpreted and analysed previously (old data), but is relevant to the current investigation (Remler & van Ryzin, 2015: 8; Babbie, 2010: 288). The present study used primary textual data (from transcribed interviews) and secondary sources of information for the literature review. The specific primary data, which were required, were informed by the problem statement and the literature sources that were consulted.

Hofstee (2006: 110-111) provides ten criteria to test the appropriateness of the selected research method. The preferred method was evaluated against the criteria before it was implemented. The criteria are:

- How completely does your method cover your thesis statement (completeness)?
  The thesis statement of the present study is that the CBBE model is not applicable, as is/ unadapted, to B2B services and, therefore, an amended model is needed. Semi-structured face-to-face interviews can elicit all the primary data that is needed to adequately consider and reach conclusions about all aspects of the thesis statement.

- How well does your method test your thesis statement (applicability and reliability)?
  Face-to-face interviews can lead to reliable conclusions about the applicability of the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model. This lead to addressing the problem statement and to achieving the research objectives by proposing an amended framework to guide the strategic brand management process for short-term business insurance.

- How familiar are you with the research design?
  The researcher is comfortable with the interview method concerned.

- How reliable will your data be?
  Interviews are preferred because it can produce the quality of data that is required, directly from the source. In this regard interviews are considered more appropriate than self-completion questionnaires.

- How difficult will it be for you to analyse the data?
  Qualitative data analysis can be difficult and time consuming. In preparation for the data analysis the researcher attended Atlas.ti7 workshops and studied books on the software programme. The researcher also arranged for consultations with experts of the software programme.
- How difficult will it be for you to obtain your data if you go about it using the method that you are considering?
  Securing interviews with people who are involved with making short-term insurance decisions for hotels can be a challenge. Cognisant of this interviews were scheduled during the off-peak season for hotels (April 2013 to August 2013). Still, securing and conducting interviews were challenging.
- How much effort will it take to comply with ethical guidelines?
  The method that was chosen made it easy to comply with all ethical requirements of the University of Stellenbosch Business School.
- Can you afford to do it this way (expense)?
  The researcher was able to afford the expenses.
- Will the method allow you to keep to your time frame?
  Face-to-face interviews are time consuming, as was developing the interview guide and mastering the Atlas.ti software.
- How easily will you be able to structure the body of your dissertation?
  This chapter on strategy and method provides structure to the body chapters of the dissertation.

a) Interview guide
Some findings from previous research were included in the interview guide. These include the candidate measures of the brand-building blocks of the CBBE model (Keller, 2013: 123-124), as well as key findings and questions from Kuhn et al. (2004; 2008: 40–58). A marketing methodology academic colleague acted as an expert reader of the initial interview guide and contributed to the appropriateness and structure of the questions. The interview guide design is explained in Section 5.4.

b) Interviews
Interviews can be unstructured, structured and semistructured. Unstructured or informal interviews are conversational, but focused on what the researcher wants to achieve. For these interviews flexibility is key and there is no structure to this form of interview technique. Different questions and a number of questions may be used with different participants. This makes it difficult to estimate the time that it will take to conduct these interviews. During a structured interview questions are asked in a specific order and responses are controlled to align closely to the predetermined questions. Flexibility is not a key feature of this type of interview so to determine the time that will be needed to conduct these types of interviews is achievable and more realistic than for unstructured interviews. This interview technique is
useful when the researcher wants to compare responses from different participants. In contrast to unstructured interviews, the data that is obtained from structured interviews may be analysed statistically by transforming the data into quantitative data. Semistructured interviews adopt features of unstructured and structured interviews. These interviews have some structure to the type and sequence of questions, but also allow for some flexibility regarding how interviews are conducted. The sequence of the questions may differ from interview to interview and the researcher may engage in dialogue with the participant rather than simply ask questions. The time needed for these interviews can normally be estimated in advance (Bailey, 2007: 5, 96-100; Denscombe, 2013: 175, 174-175, 111, 175, 195; Marshall & Rossman, 2011: 144-145). The present study used a semistructured interview format with open-ended questions. Even though the sequence of the questions was kept constant, the participants were probed to understand certain responses. This supported the interpretive paradigm that framed the research.

Leedy and Ormrod (2010: 149-152) offer guidelines to conduct a productive interview. These guidelines are the following:

- Prepare questions in advance to guide the conversation;
- Keep participants’ cultural differences in mind;
- Ensure that participants are representative of the population;
- Conduct the interviews in a suitable location to limit interruptions;
- Obtain informed consent;
- Establish and maintain rapport;
- Focus on the actual rather than the hypothetical during the interview;
- Do not put words in the participants’ mouths;
- Record responses verbatim;
- Do not show surprise, agreement or disapproval of respondents’ feedback; and
- Remember that responses may be perceptions and not facts.

The interviews for the present study were obtrusive, as the subjects had to be disturbed for the data to be collected (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 66). Possible sites were selected from the selection frame and potential participants were contacted via phone to set up meetings. Contact was not initiated via e-mail owing to perceived scepticism about receiving unsolicited e-mail invitations to meetings. During initial contact the objectives of the research were stated broadly as well as what would be expected of the participant. Securing interviews almost always involved follow-up contact. Individual interviews were conducted with participants who were responsible for their hotel's short-term insurance purchase,
renewal or amendment. The participants were asked to sign a (informed) consent form (Appendix 6).

Face-to-face interviews as a method was considered the ideal way to solicit the required information to answer the research questions. However, interviews take time, are expensive and involve making contact with strangers, while dealing with issues about access (Seidman, 2006: 12, 14).

Interviews were secured via telephonic contact, with follow up calls in most cases, as well as email contact. The interviews were conducted on the hotels' premises in Cape Town, South Africa. The respondents were people responsible for purchasing, renewing and/or amending the hotels' short-term business insurance. The participants were people with some influence over which short-term insurance brand the hotels were insured with. This is the reason why three of the interviews were deemed unusable. These participants' influence over which insurance brand the hotels were insured with were considered too limited. As mentioned, incentives were offered to participants in the form of gift vouchers from either Woolworths, Exclusive Books or Cavendish Square. After each interview the questions were reconsidered according to the quality of the data that was obtained. A consent form was signed by each participant (Appendix 6). The interviews lasted about 40 minutes and were recorded digitally.

The initial interview guide is attached as Appendix 1 and each of the questions discussed in Section 5.5. Changes that were made to the initial interview guide are discussed next.

**5.3.1.5 Step 5 – analysing the data**

Creswell (in Leedy & Ormrod, 2010: 153) describes a data analysis spiral that begins with raw data and progresses through the following process, as it relates to the present study, to produce the final report:

- Organisation – creating a computer database;
- Perusal – of the data set as a whole to get a sense of the bigger picture;
- Classification – coding the data and creating categories or themes; and
- Synthesis – integrate and summarise the findings into a model.

Following the interviews the audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed and analysed, hence the data gathering and analysis happened consecutively. The transcriptions totalled more than 400 pages of text. Each interview transcription was compared to the actual audio recording by following the typed text while listening to the recording. Minor
changes were made to the transcriptions with regard to typographic errors. Feedback from participants was not changed at all. The questions were highlighted in bold and the hotel and participants’ names were replaced by alphanumerical numbering to ensure confidentiality. For example, transcription A1 refers to hotel A and participant 1 at that hotel. Care was taken to remove any and all references to the participants and hotels. In the summative table (for Q.1 to Q.4 and QQ.B) in the amended interview guide duplicate insurance brands that were mentioned were deleted, which means that the brands mentioned for Q1.a to Q.1f (unaided recall) were deleted if mentioned again for Q.2 (aided recall/ recognition), because Q.2 was designed to record the ‘other’ brands that were not mentioned in Q.1a to Q.1f.

Data manipulation was done by transcribing the interviews and coding (labelling data that are important to the research) and categorising the codes into themes (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010: 142) with the aid of the computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) programme, Atlas.ti7. Atlas.ti merely supports systematic data analysis, which enhances credibility and transparency of the analytical process. It provides a “verifiable technique of text interpretation” and improves the validity of results and transparency, but cannot analyse data (Friese, 2012: 1, 3, 11). The analysis was still done by the researcher. Coding concerns identifying useful portions of text for analysis, which is then coded and grouped to form categories. The coding began with initial coding or open coding of the principal study, which entailed disaggregating large amounts of text data into manageable sections that could be grouped. This was done by repetitive reading of the data text and listening to the audio recordings of the interviews. Not all of the text was coded and a certain amount of subject knowledge was required to accurately code text. The initial coding process lead to focussed or axial coding. During this stage some of the initial codes were combined into larger categories that subsumed multiple codes. This elevated the process from literal coding to more strategic coding and was influenced by concerns within the discipline and theoretical concepts (Bailey, 2007: 6, 128-129). The researcher analysed the data through a theoretical lens that was constructed, over time, by studying and lecturing the subject of branding. The present study’s research questions, objectives and theoretical framework informed the coding system. Part of the coding was inductive, which means that the codes emerged from the data. However the objectives included confirming the applicability of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the generic CBBE model, which suggested codes (deductive). Merging the two sources of codes, which were obtained inductively and deductively, did not proof difficult. For example, one of the questions tested whether brand personality was as relevant in a B2B services context as it is suggested to be in a B2C context. The resulting categories were named inductively and deductively, because
knowledge of the prominent branding theory inevitably influenced the naming in the same way that it did the naming of the codes.

There are other forms of qualitative analysis, which include typologies, taxonomies, visual representations, themes, storytelling, critical events and analytical induction (Bailey, 2007: 133, 143, 161). Figure 5.3 shows an example of the initial coding process. Appendix 8 is an example of a coded primary document.

Figure 5.3: Coded textual data

5.3.1.6 Step 6 – formulating the conclusions and preparing the report

This step includes interpreting and communicating the research results, describing the implications and drawing conclusions (Zikmund & Babin, 2010: 66-67). According to Henning et al. (2004: 106) the questions that should be asked during this stage of the process are:

- “What are the relationships in meaning between all these categories?"
- What do they say together?
- What do they say about each other?
- What is missing?
- How do they address the research question(s)?
- How do these categories (together) link with what I already know about the topic?
• What has been foreground in the analysis?
• What has moved to the background?
• What additional data gathering and/or analysis have to be completed?”

Each category was used as the core of an argument, which was substantiated with data from the interviews. These arguments were aligned to the research question and objectives. New knowledge was presented by merging interview data with theoretical data, or the empirical with the theoretical, and by presenting a recontextualised client-based brand equity framework (Henning et al., 2004: 108).

Where Table 5.1 provides a broad conceptualisation of research designs, Table 5.3 is an application of this to the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3: Research strategy and methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretivist approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 TRUSTWORTHINESS OF DATA

Issues of validity, reliability and generalisability needed to be addressed. For qualitative research the terms trustworthiness and credibility often replace validity and reliability. Trustworthiness is the degree to which qualitative results can be trusted and believed, which does not necessarily mean that the reader agrees with the result. Credibility deals with whether the research results can be believed and whether the results are plausible. The researcher addressed trustworthiness and credibility by making the process of arriving at the conclusions clear. As for generalisability, the term naturalistic generalisability is more appropriate for qualitative research than the more familiar statistical generalisability. Naturalistic generalisability depends on the reader’s opinion, which is based on the reader’s experience, awareness and knowledge (Bailey, 2007: 180-183; Seidman, 2006: 23). The present research makes no claims as to the generalisability of the findings to a broader
population; rather, the findings may be extended to similar contexts. Additional comparative research in different contexts can support extendibility. The location of the present study within a specific theoretical framework increases the possibility of analytic (theoretical) generalisations.

A total of 17 participants were interviewed. This raised the issue of external validity; of whether the 17 participants that were interviewed were representative of the larger population. For large samples that will be analysed statistically (quantitative studies) the number of interviews to conduct can be calculated statistically and a sample can be drawn randomly or stratified. True randomness would be prohibitive for qualitative studies because the sample would simply be too large to cope with. For the present study the concepts of representativeness and generalisability were subordinate to the value of exploratory research to identify the building blocks and sub-dimensions of brand building in the selected context. The researcher aimed to find similarities between the responses from different participants to identify patterns in the research (Seidman, 2006: 51-52).

5.5 INTERVIEW GUIDE DESIGN
The initial interview guide (Appendix 1) was divided into four sections, which are presented below.

- Section A: Qualifying questions;
- Section B: Classification questions;
- Section C: Questions to test the applicability and appropriateness of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE for a B2B services context. This section follows the sequence of the CBBE model and the specific conceptual purpose of each of these questions is indicated on the initial interview guide, below each question. This links each question to the building block or sub-dimension being investigated; and
- Section D: This section solicited insights about the appropriateness of the interview guide to investigate brand equity of short-term business insurance.

Each of the questions included in the exploratory study (at the beginning of the study) is discussed below in order to clarify reasons for their inclusion. The interview guide begins with instructions for the interviewer and is grouped into sections A, B, C and D.
5.5.1 Section A
Section A begins with an introduction script for the interviewer. The first of the qualifying questions (question QQ.a) was included to locate the sample element within the unit of analysis (the participant in the target organisation/ hotel). The interview with the participant began from Question QQ.b. This question was, therefore, preceded by a script to guide the interviewee to introduce himself/ herself and to state the purpose and duration of the intended interview. Question QQ.b limited data collection to those who have an interest in the offering under investigation, namely short-term business insurance. The next qualifying question (question QQ.c) limited the study to organisations that were members of Cape Town Tourism. This gave some credibility to the data sources. Question QQ.d recorded the participants’ position in the hotel.

5.5.2 Section B
The questions in Section B of the interview guide are classification questions. The questions sought to establish the legal entities that are used to operate the organisations (question B.1); the type of accommodation offered (question B.2); the number of rooms (question B.3); the number of full-time employees (question B.4); and the number of years in operation (question B.5).

5.5.3 Section C
The questions in this section tested the applicability and appropriateness of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model for the short-term business insurance context, and aimed to identify new or additional building blocks and/ or sub-dimensions. This section of the interview guide mostly followed the sequence of the CBBE model’s six building blocks from Salience through Performance, Imagery, Judgments, and Feelings to Resonance. Each building block has sub-dimensions that were linked to specific questions. The links were made explicit through the inclusion of the conceptual purpose below each question in the initial interview guide (Appendix 1). Figure 5.4 links the sub-dimensions of the CBBE model with the various questions of the amended interview guide. The questions were derived from:

- a list of possible candidate measures (Keller, 2013: 123-124);
- two related articles that applied the CBBE model to a B2B government context (Kuhn & Alpert, 2004; Kuhn et al., 2008: 40-58);
- a tested questionnaire based on the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model (Kuhn et al., 2008: 54-58). Written permission was obtained from the
corresponding author to make use of the questionnaire for the purposes of the present study; and

- the literature review.
Figure 5.4: Interview guide questions linked to sub-dimensions
Question 1 was preceded by instructions to the interviewer, which provide details about how to correctly record the responses to questions 1 to 4 and 5. All 25 short-term business insurers in South Africa that are registered with the South African Insurance Association (SAIA, 2012) were listed as options in the table that was included in the initial (Appendix 1) and amended interview (Appendix 2) guide interview guides. An option was provided to add insurers to the list.

**Questions 1a to 1f** tested and recorded brand awareness, brand recall and category identification. Question 1a recorded the short-term business insurance brand that was first mentioned, which was regarded as the brand that has achieved top-of-mind awareness. Questions 1b to 1e recorded the brands mentioned second to fifth and were deemed as brands that have a higher likelihood of being purchased. Question 1f recorded all other brands that were mentioned or recalled outside of the top five. All brands that were mentioned in questions 1a to 1f formed part of the consumer’s evoked set.

**Question 2** recorded the brands that did not achieve brand awareness as indicated by spontaneous recall, but had achieved recognition as indicated through aided recognition. Any brands that were recorded in response to questions 1a to 1f that were mentioned again in response to question 2 were not considered during data analysis. This was because question 2 needed to elicit brands that were recognised, but not recalled. The short-term business insurance provider that the organisation was insured with was recorded in **question 3** and tested salience, awareness and recall of a brand element.

Responses to **question 4** provided insight into whether the participants were aware of which insurance provider their competitors were insured with. This tested the user profiles sub-dimension of the Imagery building block of the CBBE model.

**Questions 5a to 5e** recorded associations that the participants linked to the brands that were recalled from memory. This tested the ‘Salience’ and ‘Imagery’ building block of the CBBE model and tested the strength of the associations.

**Question 6a and 6b** tested whether a link had been established between the brand and slogan. This tested the ‘Salience’ building block and recognition of a brand element. The question was included to probe whether slogans are important tools in B2B branding because of Kuhn et al.’s (2008: 48) findings that B2B buyers care about the product offering and not the slogan.
The purchase process was probed in questions 7 to 9 and tested the sub-dimension purchase situation of the Imagery building block of the CBBE model. These questions were included to investigate the existence and structure of the organisation’s buying centre and the role of the organisation’s representatives. This is supported by Kuhn and Alpert’s (2004) finding that company representatives contribute to building brand equity in a B2B context, and that the human element, which is not included in the CBBE model, should be recognised. The finding that the B2B brands that were studied did not possess any personality traits, values or associations related to history, heritage and experience (Kuhn & Alpert, 2004; Kuhn et al., 2008:47, 49) necessitated the inclusion of questions 10 and 11. Question 10 is based on research by Aaker (1997), which identified brand personality scale measures.

Questions 12 to 17 are concerned with the building block ‘Performance’ and the sub-dimensions service effectiveness, efficiency, and empathy of the CBBE model. The present study was concerned with a service offering, therefore, the sub-dimensions durability and serviceability were not investigated.

The practice in the market under investigation of returning a portion of insurance premiums that the client had paid over a period of time back to the client was probed by the inclusion of question 18. This tested the building block ‘Performance’ and the sub-dimension price. Question 19 further investigated the price sub-dimension.

Question 20 verified the building block ‘Judgments’ and the sub-dimension quality. It is more difficult to judge the quality of a service offering than a product offering (Lorette, 2012).

The building block ‘Feelings’ of the CBBE model, was investigated by the inclusion of question 21. This was done because Anselmsson et al. (2014: 96) found that rational and emotional aspects were important for brand equity, and that feelings towards a brand can lead to brand loyalty (Allaway et al., 2011: 201), but Kuhn and Alpert (2004) found that brand feelings were not important in industrial markets, and that the purchase process was more rational than emotive.

The capstone building block of the CBBE model, ‘Resonance’, was verified by questions 22 to 25. The reason for including these questions is because the ultimate aim of brand building is to
achieve ‘Resonance’ (Keller, 2001: 20). Kuhn and Alpert (2004) did not find any evidence of resonance nor could their study confirm any of the sub-dimensions of ‘Resonance’.


Behaviour loyalty (purchase intention/ likelihood to recommend) was considered in **questions 29 and 30**. The human element in brand building was probed with question 31.

5.5.4 **Section D**

Section D comprised of **questions 32 and 33**, which solicited feedback regarding questions that were included in the interview guide, the structure of the interview guide and any other comments from participants.

5.5.5 **Amendments to the interview guide**

Amendments were made to the initial interview guide as the interviews progressed. These amendments resulted in the renumbering of the initial interview guide. The question numbers referred to here are the numbers of the questions of the amended interview guide, unless otherwise indicated (highlighted in yellow in Appendix 2). The question number changes are detailed in Table 5.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test question numbers</th>
<th>Principal study question numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.3</td>
<td>QQ.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a to 1.f</td>
<td>1.a to 1.f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.2</td>
<td>Q.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.4</td>
<td>Q.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.5a to Q.5e</td>
<td>Q.4a to Q.4 e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.a to Q.6b</td>
<td>Q.5a to Q.5.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.8</td>
<td>Q.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.7</td>
<td>Q.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.9</td>
<td>Q.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.9a Additional Q</td>
<td>Q.9b Additional Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.10</td>
<td>Q.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.11</td>
<td>Q.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.12</td>
<td>Q.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.13</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.14</td>
<td>Q.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.15</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.16</td>
<td>Q.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.17</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.18</td>
<td>Q.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.19</td>
<td>Q.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.20</td>
<td>Q.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.21</td>
<td>Q.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.22</td>
<td>Q.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.23</td>
<td>Q.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.24</td>
<td>Q.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.25</td>
<td>Q.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.26</td>
<td>Q.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.27</td>
<td>Q.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.28</td>
<td>Q.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.29</td>
<td>Q.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.30</td>
<td>Q.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.31</td>
<td>Q.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.32</td>
<td>Q.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.33</td>
<td>Q.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each question on the initial interview guide included the conceptual purpose of the question, for example, Q.1’s conceptual purpose was to test ‘salience–awareness-recall-category identification’. The purpose of the questions was omitted from the amended interview guide as it served no role during the interviews.

- The terms ‘renewed/ renewal/ renewing’ and ‘amended/ amendment/ amending’ have been added to Q.7, Q.8, introduction to Section A and QQ.A, because participants are more likely to be involved with the renewal or amendment process of their insurance schedule than with the initial purchase.
• Q.3 of the initial interview guide was reclassified to be a qualifying question (QQ.B) for the amended interview guide and thus forms part of Section A, because if the participant was not familiar with the hotel's insurer, then the correct sample element has not been identified, and the interview cannot proceed.

• Question QQ.C was added as a qualifying question to ensure that interviews were conducted with the appropriate people who actually had some influence over the decision of which insurance brand to purchase. This inclusion was necessitated after two interviews were found to be unusable (D1 and G1). The question that was added was: To what extent can you influence the decision as to which insurance house your hotel insures or reinsures with?

• The abbreviations Pty (LTD) and Pty were added to the options for B1-4 and B1-5, respectively, to assist with classifying whether the hotel is registered as a private or public company.

• Space was provided with Q.1a to Q.1f for practical reasons so that answers could be recorded next to the questions and then be transferred to the summative table because the participants provided the answers so quickly that there was not enough time to locate the options directly into the summative table.

• Q.4 was updated to also include a reference to the brand mentioned in QQ.B in order to record the associations linked to the top five brands mentioned, as well as the insurance house the hotel is insured with.

• Q.6 used to follow Q.7, but was moved to precede it. It was more appropriate to first establish who the hotel dealt with to purchase, renew or amend their insurance, because if the hotel worked via a broker it would be preferable to know this before Q.7, Q.8 and Q.9 were asked, as these dealt with the purchase process. Space was also provided (Q6-6) to record the broker's name as part of Q.6.

• Q.9a and b were added because it was apparent from the first few interviews that the broker had significant influence over which insurance brand was selected for the hotel, which made this an important aspect to investigate.
• Q.12, Q.13 and Q.14 were changed from closed-ended to open-ended questions to be aligned with the qualitative nature of the study.

• Q.12, Q.14 and Q.16 from the initial interview guide were omitted because the responses were incorporated into Q.12, Q.13 and Q.14 of the amended interview guide.

• Q.15’s wording was changed from ‘for purchasing’ to ‘for being insured’.

• Q.19 was simplified.

• Q.26’s wording was changed from ‘a friend or colleague’ to ‘another business’ in order to reflect the B2B focus of the study.

5.6 CODE OF CONDUCT AND ETHICS
The research did not have any major ethical issues. The research did not include vulnerable members of the community. In addition to the requirements of the USB (Appendix 7) the researcher abided by the code of marketing and social research of the Southern African Research Association (SAMRA). The code is available from www.samra.co.za and includes explicit issues about informed consent, and confidentiality. Regarding informed consent (Appendix 6) the research participants were told the following before the research commenced:

• that they were participating in research;
• what the purpose of the research was;
• the procedures that were used during the research;
• that participation was voluntary;
• that they may withdraw from the research at any stage; and
• about the degree of data confidentiality, which would be maintained by means of non-identification of any participants.

5.7 CONCLUSION
This chapter covered the research design and methods, which underpin the present study. The marketing research process that was followed was discussed and each question that was included in the interview guide was discussed to make its conceptual purpose clear. Chapter 5, together with the literature review, framed the inquiry into B2B services brand equity and clarified the assumption on which the present research was based. Chapter 6 which follows,
presents the empirical findings together with direct quotations from the participants to justify the subconclusions that have been drawn.
CHAPTER 6
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

As stated in previous chapters, the phenomenon that was investigated was B2B services brand equity. The primary research objective was to develop a brand equity framework, as a strategic brand management instrument, to guide the branding process for short-term business insurance. This chapter provides the findings from the analysis of the interview data. The data were used to achieve the primary research objective through verification or by testing the applicability of the CBBE model and its building blocks and sub-dimensions in a real world (empirical) B2B services context (being short-term business insurance). Chapter 6 concludes the study by adapting the existing CBBE model for the short-term business insurance context. This chapter provides the findings to address the secondary research objectives, which were translated into the following secondary research questions:

- Which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are confirmed for short-term business insurance?
- Which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are not confirmed for short-term business insurance?
- Which other brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions may be relevant to short-term business insurance?

As mentioned throughout the dissertation, the CBBE model consists of six brand-building blocks, namely ‘Salience’, ‘Performance’, ‘Imagery’, ‘Judgments’, ‘Feelings’ and ‘Resonance’; each with various sub-dimensions. Because each of the more than 30 questions included in the interview guide contributed to more than one of the research objectives (as indicated in Appendix 3), the findings are reported per interview guide question and not per research objective. Sub-conclusions, based on analysis of the answers that were provided by participants for the questions, are summarised regularly and indicated on the CBBE model (a replica of Figure 6.1) throughout this chapter. Towards the end of the chapter consolidated figures (Figures 6.38 and 3.39) are included to indicate how the three research objectives were achieved. The CBBE model is included, from Chapter 3 (section 3.3.1.4), as Figure 6.1 to serve as a visual framework for the reporting of the findings. The interview guide question numbers have been added to the building blocks and sub-dimensions in Figure 6.1.
Quotations from coded text are referenced as follows: if the quote is: “7:77 happy to use them. Don’t get that feeling of dread when you have to contact them to ask for something.(599:599)”, then the in-text reference will be (7:599), which means that the quotation can be found in primary document 7 and paragraph 599 within the primary document. An example of a coded primary document is attached as Appendix 8.
Figure 6.1: Building blocks and sub-dimensions of CBBE model linked to interview guide questions
6.2 SECTION A OF THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section A of the amended interview guide (Appendix 2) consisted of four qualifying questions, namely:

- Question QQ.A - helped to locate the correct participant; the person responsible for purchasing, renewing or amending the hotel's short-term business insurance. Interviews were only conducted once the correct participant was isolated and permission was granted by this participant;
- Question QQ.B - was included to ascertain with which short-term business insurance house the hotel was insured. Tables 6.1a and 6.1b include these responses, which are explained in Section 6.2.1;
- Question QQ.C - recorded the extent to which the participant could influence the decision regarding which insurance house the hotel was insured with. This is elaborated on in Section 6.2.2; and
- Question QQ.D - was included to record the participant’s position within the hotel. The responses to this question are contained in Table 6.2 and were recorded in Section 6.2.3.

6.2.1 Insurance house insured with

Question QQ.B (Appendix 2), about the insurance house insured with, tested the relevance of the 'Salience' brand-building block (Figure 6.1), specifically brand awareness and unaided brand recall (Figure 3.2), as well as the depth of awareness or ease of recall with the brand element (name) as cue.

Tables 6.1a and 6.1b provide information about the insurance houses that the hotels were insured with. Four hotels were insured with HIC (one of the four participants actually mentioned HIU (C1, P19:091) as the provider, but HIU’s name has changed to HIC (HIC, 2013) before the interview); two with Santam (even though the broker was initially mentioned as the insurer) and one each with Etana Insurance, Mutual & Federal, Chartis South Africa, BnB Sure and Lion of Africa. It could not be ascertained with which insurer three of the hotels were insured. In these instances (K1, P7:011; N1, P15:021; O1, P16:037) the brokers were mentioned as the insurers. The most prevalent insurer, HIC, was established as specialist Hospitality Industries Underwriting Consultants (HIU) in 1998 and even though its scope was broadened to include general commercial and industrial insurance, the hospitality focus was never lost. Its current name, Hospitality Industrial Commercial Underwriting Managers (HIC) still includes the
hospitality industry specifically in its name. Since more of the hotels that participated in the present research study insured with HIC than any other, it would appear that specialisation can be used as a differentiator. This view is supported by comments from the participants:

Oh, HIC they understand hospitality. Sorry they understand hospitality risk. They specialise in this industry. So they understand the risks (P17:267, 395); and hospitality industry … specific. HIU because it's specifically industry driven, it slots in so perfectly to the requirements of the hotel industry (P19:109 – 111, 239).

BnB Sure, which was mentioned once, is also a specialist insurer, but as is evident from its slogan “the only insurance policy created by B&B and guesthouse owners for B&B and guesthouses” (bnbsure) specialises in B&B and guesthouses and not hotels.

The darker-shaded participant columns in tables 6.1a and 6.1b indicate that four participants mentioned brokers and not the insurance houses when asked which insurance provider their hotel is insured with. The brokers were B1 (F1, P3:007), B2 (K1, P7:011) and B3 (mentioned by N1, P15:021 and Q1, P20:013). The participant that mentioned B2 as their insurer later during the interview said the following:

I do know that the different policies are underwritten by – I know the one is Lloyds and one or two of the other ones that you mentioned there. So ja I mean B2 – I don’t know how they work – if they’re just sort of umbrella in the different – because we’ve obviously got different types of insurance (P7:219).

This indicates confusion regarding whether B2 is the insurer that offers the insurance, as the participant mentions that B2 may be underwritten by Lloyds. This indicates a lack of clarity, from the client’s perspective/ mind set, of the insurance house’s brand. This may be because the broker’s brand is what is paramount to the participant/ client.

In addition, three other participants initially mentioned their brokers, but corrected this by stating the insurance houses with which they are insured with. An example of this is when participant L1 mentioned “A” (P12:009), which is a broker, and later corrected this to “… insurance is actually with Santam Insurance” (P12:019). The confusion among the participants who tendered their broker as the insurance house insured with probably stems from the fact that the broker is in direct contact with the participant. From the participants’ view, based on their experience (as included in the conceptual framework of Figure 1.1), the broker renders the insurance service and is the participants’ direct contact for insurance related issues. The insurance house is a level removed from the short-term business insurance client and is represented by the broker.
who is in direct contact with the client. The broker’s brand may well impact on the insurance house’s brand and *vice versa*.

The broker undoubtedly supplies much of the ‘information’, influences the brand ‘experience’ and contributes to the ‘needs satisfied’ of the almost pure service offering, as depicted at the core of the conceptual framework (Figure 1.1). This indicates the fundamental importance of the broker who is part of the broader interpersonal relationships, which importance should be highlighted as a dimension in the amended brand equity framework. To build positive brand equity it would therefore be important for the insurance house to be associated with the correct brokers in order to support the brokers through training and information about the offerings, processes and brand identity that the insurance house wants to communicate.

Short-term business insurance client loyalty is to the broker and not to the insurance house. The broker often holds the deciding vote as to which insurance house will be used. This is supported by the direct quotes from the interview data, which is included in the later part of Section 6.4.1. Aaker’s (1991: 39, 46-49, 50-52) contention of how consumers should be treated posits that loyalty is influenced by how both the broker and the insurance house treat the client through seamless interaction between the insurer (behind the broker) and the broker. The broker delivers the service directly so it is not surprising that the relationship and, therefore, loyalty is built between the client and the broker and the insurer and the broker. From the insurer’s perspective, there needs to be two brand-building strategies; one with the aim of creating awareness that the insurer offers business insurance among those that need business insurance and another towards the brokers who influence which short-term business insurance offerings their clients purchase. Kuhn and Alpert (2004) and Kuhn *et al.* (2008: 40-58) suggest that (the importance of) company representatives (the human element) should be included in an amended CBBE framework. The present study supports this and suggests that the broker’s brand equity is all important to an amended framework.

Two of the 10 insurance houses that were mentioned, namely HIC and BnB Sure, were not registered with the South African Insurance Association, which was the database that was used when a list of insurance houses was compiled to include in the interview guide (Appendix 2, question 4).
### Table 6.1a: Insurance house insured with Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etana</td>
<td>HIU</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Chartis [South Africa]</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>HIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- now called HIC (HIC, 2013)</td>
<td>- is a broker insured with Santam Insurance</td>
<td>- initially mentioned B2, which is a broker, and much later clarified confusion</td>
<td>- not registered with the South African Insurance Association</td>
<td>- not registered with the South African Insurance Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1b: Insurance house insured with Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Santam Insurance</td>
<td>BnB Sure</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Lion of Africa</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- is a broker</td>
<td>- first mentioned the broker, then corrected to insurance house</td>
<td>- not registered with the South African Insurance Association</td>
<td>- is a broker</td>
<td>- not registered with the South African Insurance Association</td>
<td>- is a broker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 Participants' influence over the purchase process

Question QQ.C (Appendix 2) assessed the extent to which the participant could influence the decision regarding which insurance house the hotel was insured with. From the transcriptions it is evident that all the participants who were included in the analysis either had:

- full discretion to decide on the insurance house to insure with:
  
  *at the end the decision lies by me to sign or not ... I'm free to decide which insurance company I want to choose* (P5:233, 23);
  
  *I have the final say* (P12:35; P13:321);
  
  *have sole discretion* (P15:29); and
  
  *I make the decision* (P17:51).

- or could decide in conjunction with their partners:
  
  *my two co-directors where I just run through it with them and if there's anything they want to consider or change, otherwise I renew it totally* (P16:63); and
  
  *Well I consult with the other directors but I'm the person who would make the recommendation* (P17:55).

- or, at the very least, could influence the decision:
  
  *I can go to the MD and I could say to him listen this and this is – these are the three options* (P19:475).

As mentioned in the previous chapter, 17 interviews were secured and conducted, but only 14 were deemed useable for analysis. The reason why the analysed interview data of three interviews were not included in the analysis was because the participants’ influence over the purchase process was not substantial enough to influence the decision of which insurance house was ultimately selected. This was crucial because the present study aimed to distil how actual clients of B2B services construct brands in their minds. The aim was not to generalise to a bigger population.

6.2.3 Participants' position in the hotel

Table 6.2 indicates the positions that the participants occupied in the hotels. These were the responses to question QQ.D (Appendix 2). Six of the participants were owners and eight were employees. Of the eight employees, six held financial positions and two were general managers. This indicates that the correct participants were targeted; they had the knowledge and experience to participate meaningfully in the study. The focus was on selecting cases for the study that are information-rich rather than a large sample.
Table 6.2: Position occupied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>J1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in hotel</strong></td>
<td>Employee: General Manager</td>
<td>Employee: General Manager</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Employee: Director of Finance</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Employee: Financial Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.4 Subconclusions

The fact that participants could recall the brand names of either their insurer or broker when the need (short-term business insurance) was used as cue, supports the theory regarding the ‘associative network memory model’ (Keller, 1993: 2). The theory tells us that the brands that were mentioned have been registered in the participants’ minds and knowledge about the brands has been stored in nodes in the participants’ minds. This confirms the building block ‘Salience’ and sub-dimension ‘needs satisfied’. In some instances the broker brand node was laid down better in participants’ minds than the insurer brand node. Whether associations have been linked to these nodes will be assessed later.

In addition to what is already included in the CBBE model, the feedback from participants indicates the fundamental importance of the broker (human element) who is part of the broader interpersonal relationships and the importance of this should be highlighted as a dimension in the amended brand equity framework. The broker forms part of the extended marketing mix element ‘people’, which affects the sub-dimensions ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy’ (Figure 6.1) and adds to ‘physical evidence’/ servicescape (affecting the sub-dimension ‘purchase situation’, Figure 6.1), which can be enhanced to include ‘physical evidence’ or ‘servicescape’ and ‘processes’ (affecting the sub-dimension ‘service effectiveness and efficiency, Figure 6.1) (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011: 48). The broker directly influences the perceived service quality dimension (included in the ‘Judgments’ building block, Figure 6.1) of the intangible service offering, which impacts on short-term business insurance client satisfaction and loyalty (which is part of the ‘Resonance’ building block, Figure 6.1), as mentioned by Bhasin (2011) and Lovelock and Wirtz (2007: 22-25). The importance of the broker and the human element should be included in an amended framework. Short-term business insurance client loyalty is to the broker and not to the insurance house. ‘People’ is of core importance in a services context and of much greater importance than recognised in the
CBBE model, where people affect the sub-dimensions ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy (Figure 6.1)’. Kuhn et al. (2008: 50) recognise this and suggested the inclusion of a building block for ‘Sales Force Relationships’. The current study suggests the elevation of the ‘People’ factor to a core building block. This building block should include aspects and characteristics of the broker’s representatives, sales people (brokers) and administration/support services. This building block will be affected (enhanced) through the controllable aspects of relationship marketing. Coleman, de Chernatony and Christodoulides (2011: 1068-1069) proved the importance of the people dimensions (“employee and client focus” and “human resource activities”) empirically in a B2B services context. These dimensions are two of the five dimensions that form part of what the authors call a “B2B services brand identity scale” or network.

A key finding is that, even though the present study was structured to test the applicability of the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model for the insurance house’s’ brand, the participants’ responses mostly concerned the brokers. There seems to be two interrelated brand equity frameworks that are involved with brand building for short-term B2B insurance. From the client’s perspective there is a framework that guides brand building between the broker and client (primary framework building the brokers’ brand equity in the client’s mind) and ‘behind’ the broker there is brand building between the broker and the insurance house (secondary framework). This differs from the current view of the CBBE model and the revision by Kuhn et al. (2008: 50). Both of these recognise one model only and not two interrelated frameworks or two brands that need to be built. Insurance brands should recognise that their task is to build brand equity in the minds of brokers primarily and then in the minds of end users/clients. Insurers should invest resources to associate with and build strong and lasting relationships with the most appropriate brokers. If the insurers brand is not part of the brokers’ evoked set or better still top of mind, the insurer’s offerings will not be sold. Brokers should appreciate that their task is to build their own brand’s equity in the minds of their end users/clients and that trusting relationships between the broker and insurer is critically important to deliver on their promises to their clients.

Specialisation can improve recall and enhance brand awareness of the insurers’ brands.
From the analysis of the interview data from Section A of the interviews, the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model for the brokers that have been confirmed are indicated in Figure 6.2.

![Figure 6.2: Sub-dimensions of broker brand equity confirmed by Section A of interviews](image)

6.3 SECTION B OF INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section B of the amended interview guide (Appendix 2) consisted of five classification questions. The responses to these questions are displayed in Table 6.3. The hotels were either registered as private companies (10) or close corporations (4). None of the hotels were registered as a sole proprietor, partnership or public company.

It so transpired that data collection was spread across four 5-star, six 4-star and four 3-star hotels. There was one 1-star hotel and no 2-star hotels in the selection frames. An interview was conducted with a participant from the 1-star hotel, but the data were not usable.
The number of rooms that the hotels had ranged from seven to 207 rooms. Based on the number of rooms, an arbitrary categorisation can be made, namely:

- Small hotels with less than 20 rooms, = 3;
- Medium-sized hotels with between 20 and 80 rooms, = 7; and
- Large hotels with more than 80 rooms, = 4.

The hotels employed between six and 330 employees with a ration of between 0.37 employees per room to 1.9 employees per room. The 3-star hotels tended to have a lower employee to room ratio when compared to most 4-star and 5-star hotels. This makes logical sense because the luxurious end of the hotel accommodation market demands a higher level of services. The present study included some of the oldest hotels in Cape Town, with three that have been in operation for more than 100 years, and a hotel that had only been operational for two years. The information provided in this section indicates that an array of hotels were included in the study with different star gradings, number of rooms, number of employees, and years in operation. This resulted in rich data that were obtained from participants from these hotels.
Table 6.3: Hotel classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal entity:</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sole proprietor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close corporation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star grading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of full time employees</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees : room</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in operation</td>
<td>&gt;113</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 SECTION C OF THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section C of the interview guide tested the applicability of the CBBE model’s sub-dimensions for short-term business insurance. Data were mostly gathered according to the inherent hierarchy of the CBBE model. The findings are reported according to the sequence of the interview guide. As mentioned elsewhere, the specific building block and sub-dimension that each question dealt with (the conceptual purpose) is indicated below each question in Appendix 1 and Appendix 3.

6.4.1 Insurance houses recalled – Q.1a to Q.1f of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

(including: Broker influence over purchase process – Q.9a and Q.9b of amended interview guide (Appendix 2))

This question investigated the applicability of the ‘Salience’ brand-building block and short-term business insurance ‘category identification’ sub-dimension (Figure 6.1), which deals with brand awareness and brand recall (Figure 3.2). The maximum number of insurance brands that were mentioned was five (Q1a to 1.e), so Q.1f did not provide any data for analysis.

The insurance houses that were mentioned 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th by the participants are summarised in Table 6.4. This indicates unaided recall, which is depicted in Figure 3.2. In Table 6.4 the primary documents are linked to the participants. For example, A1 (P18) means that participant A1’s interview transcription is primary document P18 in Atlas.ti. Open cells mean that the participants could not recall insurance houses. For example, participant K1 (P7) could only recall one insurance house. Participants were not asked to exclude the insurance house that their hotel was insured with. Only one participant (E1, indicated in bold in Table 6.4) mentioned the insurance house that their hotel was insured with. This is concluded by comparing tables 6.1a and 6.1b (insurance houses insured with) to Table 6.4 (insurance houses mentioned).
Table 6.4: Insurance houses mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>IH 1st mentioned</th>
<th>IH 2nd mentioned</th>
<th>IH 3rd mentioned</th>
<th>IH 4th mentioned</th>
<th>IH 5th mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 (P18)</td>
<td>Outsurance</td>
<td>First for Women</td>
<td>Woolworths</td>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[- Does not offer short-term business insurance; does offer short-term consumer insurance]</td>
<td>[- Does not offer short-term business insurance; does offer short-term consumer insurance]</td>
<td>[- is a broker]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 (P19)</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal</td>
<td>Outsurance</td>
<td>Sanlam or Santam</td>
<td>AIG</td>
<td>Auto &amp; General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;either one of those&quot;] (P19:91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 (P2)</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal</td>
<td>Outsurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 (P3)</td>
<td>Santam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 (P4)</td>
<td>Alexander Forbes</td>
<td>AIG</td>
<td>Auto &amp; General</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal</td>
<td>Santam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1 (P5)</td>
<td>Old Mutual</td>
<td>Sanlam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[- does not offer short-term insurance; its affiliate Mutual &amp; Federal does offer short-term insurance]</td>
<td>[- does not offer short-term insurance; its affiliate Santam does offer short-term insurance]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 (P6)</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal</td>
<td>Outsurance</td>
<td>First for Women</td>
<td>AIG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 (P7)</td>
<td>Outinsurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>[- referring to Outsurance]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 (P12)</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[- is a broker]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 (P13)</td>
<td>Sanlam</td>
<td>Ascent</td>
<td>H &amp; L</td>
<td>First for Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[- does not offer short-term insurance; its affiliate Santam does offer short-term]</td>
<td>[- is an underwriter on behalf of Infinity Insurance]</td>
<td>[- Hospitality &amp; Leisure’ also known as H&amp;L. - Underwriting on behalf of Santam Limited]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The shaded cells within the table indicate feedback that cannot be considered as being B2B insurance houses. This includes two brokers (B5 and B4), two underwriters (Ascent and H&L), two consumer (personal) only insurers (Woolworths and Jet) and Silver Rand, which could not be found, so it is uncertain whether it is a broker or underwriter. It is not absolutely certain whether any of the insurer brand awareness is specific to business insurance. It is not evident whether the participants were aware of whether the insurers that were mentioned offered business insurance specifically, or whether the awareness was based on spill-over from personal insurance awareness; even though the term ‘business’ insurance was included in the question. One participant referred to this:

_But I'm not sure if this kind of insurance [short-term business insurance] would also apply [to the business insurance]_ (P2: 049).

Another participant who had no idea who his competitors were insured with (business insurance) later referred to the insurance house that his friend was insured with (personal/consumer insurance):

_I haven't made any experience myself with Outurance, but I have friends who have insurance with them_ (P2: 189).

Also, in Table 6.4, I1 and M1 mentioned Sanlam and Old Mutual. Participant I1’s comment was:

_Actually, Sanlam and Old Mutual more than long term insurance than in short terms actually_ (P5:193).
This indicates that the participant could not recall Mutual & Federal (which is a short-term insurer and belongs to Old Mutual) and Santam (which is a short-term insurer and belongs to Sanlam), but could differentiate between short- and long-term insurers. Discounting these entries, nine different insurance houses (brands) were mentioned, namely Outsurance (9), Mutual & Federal (6), Santam (4), AIG (3), First for Women (3), Auto & General (2), Etana (1), Lion (1) and Alexander Forbes (1). The total number of mentions is indicated in brackets. Two of the nine participants that mentioned Outsurance actually referred to the insurer as Outinsurance, indicating that the Outsurance name recall awareness is problematic for some. Outsurance offers insurance, but the name Outsurance aims to highlight the insurer’s key differentiator, which is its outbonus attribute (Outsurance, 2014).

Mutual & Federal (5) were most often mentioned first followed by Outsurance (3), Santam (2) and Alexander Forbes (1), which indicates that three of the nine insurance brands that were mentioned achieved top of mind awareness. Top of mind awareness is achieved, as explained in Table 3.1, when a brand is mentioned first in a category. When a brand is the only one mentioned in a category it has achieved dominance. Therefore, as shown in Table 6.4, Santam achieved brand dominance in the mind of participant F1 and Outsurance in the mind of participant F1. Outsurance attracted the most second mentions (5), followed by First for Women (1), AIG (1) and Etana (1). Regarding the third mentioned insurance brands, Santam, Auto & General, Outsurance, First for Women and Lion were each mentioned once. The fourth mentioned insurance houses were AIG (2), Mutual & Federal (1) and First for Women (1). The insurance houses mentioned fifth were Auto & General (1) and Santam (1).

The insurers that were mentioned during recall formed each participant’s evoked set or consideration set. This means that these brands would be seriously considered to satisfy their hotel’s need for insurance (Keller, 2013: 73-75). This is why it is important for a brand to reach a level of awareness where the brand is included in the consumer’s evoked set; so that it is at least part of the list of brands that the client will consider. Better still would be for a brand to be top of mind or to be a dominant brand. But in the context of the present study, being part of the consumer’s evoked set was not important. Even more powerful it seems is for the brand to be part of the broker’s evoked set. This is concluded based on the following comments by participants when asked how much influence the broker had over the decision of which short-term business insurer to insure with (question 9a of the amended interview guide of Appendix 2):
I would say it was basically 100% influence … of the broker. No he gave me a selection (P2:237, 245);

… basically all the talks and the negotiation happens between the broker and the insurance and I do get a proposal and normally get advice to sign or not to sign. That’s basically the broker it’s 100%. No he just came up and said look that’s – we made a deal with – or ja we made a deal with HIC and that’s in their opinion the best solution and they recommended to sign with them (P5:217, 221, 245);

… I would say 100% [the broker] (P12: 307); and

He gave me a selection and why he selected different ones (P15: 295).

The above statements indicate that the brokers provided participants with an evoked set from which to choose. This supports the discussion in Section 6.2.1.

Some participants were not even aware of some of the insurance brands that they are insured with before their brokers recommended it:

… he presented Assent to me in the first place where I didn’t know about (P13: 317).

So your broker made you aware of Lion? Yes (P16: 509, 511).

Listen there’s a new guy on the block, they’re specially tailoring for the hotels and this is their product (P19: 419).

The following comments indicate that the broker supplied the evoked set, but that the participant had some influence as to which insurer was eventually chosen.

I will say it’s 50/50. There was a few quotes and what he presented me to but at the end I made the decision for Santam (P3: 209, 233);

… they did give us a selection of – I think they must have approached about twelve different insurers … So we both sort of mutually agreed that it was the best option to… (P6: 349);

So they come with their proposals and I’ll go through it. He presented everything with the rates and all that and then I just interrogated it and he took it from there. It’s a mutual agreed discussion and we come to the same, an arrangement (P16: 043, 357, 389); and

He knows that we will only deal with any big five of the top insurers and - but he starts off with Mutual and Federal. We don’t get much further than that (P20: 476).
Even though the following participant believed that his broker had no influence over which insurance brand was selected, he reports that the broker compiled the evoked set:

[the broker] Doesn’t have any influence. Ja because what we did two years ago was we got him to guide the market and get us some competitive pricing … (P17: 391).

The comments below indicate that not only did the broker control which brands were part of the evoked set, but the broker had an evoked set and also decided which brand to go with on the short-term business insurance client’s behalf:

As a matter of fact I think they’re dealing with Chartis and that’s what they sort of like went with you know. I know that they said to me the last time that I spoke to them that they were actually sitting with a few different companies looking at prices, but they didn’t actually tell me which companies. … he just said to me that’s like – oh that they were sitting with all of the insurance companies and went through all of the quotes and that Chartis was still the cheapest okay. And that was it, you know. So we’re still with Chartis. So he didn’t actually come back and say okay fine these are all of the different quotes from the different companies. It was just okay Chartis is the cheapest therefore we’ll go with Chartis (P4:455, 459, 467, 471);

So they recommended just one company on your behalf? Ja. So if he has got out of ten clients, eight wouldn’t be happy with HIC, most probably he would then suggest the next renewal we’re going to change the insurance house, obviously. That’s basically the core – basically there’s insurance broker (P5:247, 409); and

I think probably very highly because we – I didn’t actually pick Santam because I mean we just went with Hamilton Solutions and they suggested Santam and obviously you know if you go with the broker I guess they suggest the best policy for you, based on what you’ve got available to insure (P12: 303).

Even when the participant had a cheaper insurer in mind the broker’s recommendation outweighed that of the client:

And we did look at other insurance companies last year and to be totally honest we did actually get a quote that was slightly cheaper but we decided to continue with [broker’s] one [insurance brand], because of that relationship that we have with them and in terms of settling claims etc, etc we just didn’t feel for the small reduction that there was in premium, it wasn’t actually worth you know breaking that relationship and going with somebody else. … have been dealing with – oh you can just imagine, it’s for I think
about 14/15 years. So there is quite a bit of history with the company and therefore a good relationship has you know been built up over the last couple of years (P6:051, 047).

The last comment also stresses the importance of relationships between the short-term business insurance client and the broker, as well as the relationship between broker and insurer, which is more important than price alone. This is in contrast to the CBBE model, which recognises only the brand equity of the offering as a brand/ individual brand. Relationships were also found to be important by Kuhn et al. (2008).

Some brokers recommended a switch of insurers, which was accepted by the participants:

They [the broker] recommended that we change one of the policies, over … he said that he recommends we change over to a – you know to a new policy for the – I think it was as I said the contents – I didn’t really question. I mean he went through the policy, it covered everything [primary characteristics]. It saved us money [price] and you know but it’s not like I went out and did my own investigation (P7: 367, 375).

The complexity of insurance is one of the reasons why participants allowed and even wanted the brokers to provide an evoked set and to greatly influence which brand was chosen. The participant then justifies the recommendation that was made by the broker. This is distilled from the comment below:

Well at the end the decision lies by me to sign or not because I’m basically signing off the policy but there’s a lack of basically evaluating details and judgement, I’m going to leave that stuff in hands of my broker because he, I trust him. Or his institute and it’s also because HIC is also a very specialised insurance house for hospitality industry (P5:233, 237); and

… I think that’s one of the things that maybe I liked about B2 was the fact that we could have just renewed all three, you know contracts again. There wouldn’t have really been – and because I’m not doing any research into it but the fact that they came forward and said listen we recommend maybe you go for this you can save money (P7: 551).

Short-term business insurance clients trust their brokers, even blindly (without doing research themselves):

… and because I’m not doing any research into it but the fact that they came forward and said listen we recommend maybe you go for this you can save money (P7: 551);
or ja we made a deal with HIC and that’s in their opinion the best solution and they recommended to sign with them (P5:217, 221, 245);

As a matter of fact I think they’re dealing with Chartis and that’s what they sort of like went with you know (P4:455);

… I didn’t actually pick Santam because I mean we just went with Hamilton Solutions and they suggested Santam … (P12: 303);

… he said that he recommends we change over to a – you know to a new policy for the – I think it was as I said the contents – I didn’t really question (P7: 375);

… there’s a lack of basically evaluating details and judgement, I’m going to leave that stuff in hands of my broker because he, I trust him. Or his institute … (P5:233, 237);

He [the broker] knows best (P15: 291); and
But I’ve relied on my broker to provide that input in terms of whether they’re going to be reliable to sort out claims, how strong they are, what their rating is … (P16: 595).

It seems that as long as the brokers’ service levels were acceptable to the client, the broker would continue to dictate which brands are included in the evoked set:

I would say he has the majority. I think maybe the situation would be different if I hadn’t been happy with their services up until now but essentially you know when he said that he recommends we change over to a – you know to a new policy for the – I think it was as I said the contents – I didn’t really question. I mean he went through the policy, it covered everything. It saved us money and you know but it’s not like I went out and did my own investigation (P7: 375).

In the final analysis, it seems that insurance is almost seen as a commodity by the short-term business insurance clients and that the broker is influential.

… if they offer the same deal, then I’m not so fussed about the insurance company, was as good (P13: 625).

The best strategy for insurance houses is to build brand equity with brokers, because the insurance house that they recommend is the insurer that will get the business. Business clients tend to stay with the same broker as long as the service is acceptable and renew with the same insurer as long as the price and cover (primary characteristics) are acceptable:

Every year we just go with the same guy [loyalty] (P17: 399).
From the discussion above it is evident, for this sample of participants, that the relationship is between the broker and hotel representative(s), and not between hotel representative(s) and the individual offering brand/ sub brand. Hence, the broker’s brand becomes the relationship between the broker and the hotel. This is because the quality of the offering (business insurance) is probably seen as a hygiene factor (quality is considered a given that it will be of sufficient/ comparable quality). Differentiation is thus achieved by the broker brand; the credibility of the broker brand behind the offering (business insurance) and not the individual offering brand, contrary to what is the case in B2C markets. In consumer markets the relationship is directly between the individual brand and the end consumer (Webster & Keller, 2004: 397). Intermediaries are not included in the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). The sub-dimension ‘credibility’, which is part of the ‘Judgments’ building block of the CBBE model is explained to relate to the credibility of the owner of the brand and the owner’s reliability and trust - the consumer’s (hotel’s) perception of the entity that owns the brand. Credibility includes perceived expertise (competent, innovative, market brand leader), brand trustworthiness (dependable), and brand likability (fun, interesting) (Keller, 2001: 24). This explanation makes sense and applies between the owner of the brand and the intermediary (broker), but does not seem to apply between the owner of the brand and the buyer (hotel), in the context of the present study. The present study points to an additional credibility sub-dimension between the intermediary (broker) and the buyer (hotel). It is not clear whether Homburg, Wilczek and Hahn’s (2014: 70) suggestion that it may be a viable option for B2B suppliers (insurance houses for the present study) to provide downstream support to both reseller (brokers) and their consumers (the insurance house’s indirect clients). The current study found no evidence that clients’ knowledge of the insurers influenced, which brand they chose as an insurer. Whether greater awareness of the insurers among their indirect clients would be able to create a pull-demand through the system, is unclear. Homburg et al.’s (2014: 73) caution that this type of indirect marketing campaign may annoy B2B intermediaries should also be kept in mind.

In addition, it seems that clients (buyers/ hotels) do not pull (or request) specific brands through the system; rather, brokers push brands through the system. ‘Resonance’ may exist between supplier and intermediary (broker) and again between intermediary (broker) and buyer (hotel/ client). Credibility is important, but also exists in the two different dimensions.
Services brand architecture, as explained by Webster and Keller (2004: 397) and Berry (2000: 130), is relevant between supplier and intermediary (broker), but less so or even irrelevant between intermediary (broker) and buyer (hotel) because of the brand push effect. This suggests that adopting the organisation brand as the service brand (the brand name of the actual insurance offering) is a valuable strategy. Davis et al.’s (2008: 225) finding supports the view that, in a B2B services context, the organisation’s name is the brand, and hence the reason why the organisation’s name should be distinct from that of its competitors.

6.4.1.1 Subconclusions

The fact that participants could recall various insurance brands when the category within which they operate was used as cue is in line with the theory regarding the ‘associative network memory model’ (Keller, 1993: 2; Figure 3.2). Relating the theory to the present study leads to the explanation that the brands that were mentioned have been registered in the participants’ minds and knowledge about the brands has been stored in nodes in the participants’ minds. It is assessed later whether associations have been linked to these nodes.

The number of insurance houses that were mentioned/recalled when the category (business short-term insurance) was used as cue confirms the sub-dimension ‘category identification’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1) for the insurance brand. Even though it is not entirely sure whether the participants linked the insurance brands that were mentioned to the business short-term category or consumer short-term category, the insurance brands were spontaneously linked to short-term insurance, or insurance at the very least. But, even though this was the case, it did not matter as the broker’s evoked set was important. This supports the conclusion in Section 6.2.4 that there are two brand equity frameworks involved, namely one between the insurance brand and the broker and one between the broker and the client (hotel). So it follows that being able to link the broker to the short-term business insurance category is more important than being able to link the insurance brand to the short-term business insurance category. Also, it is important for the insurance brands to form part of the broker’s evoked set or, put differently, that the broker can link the insurance brand to the short-term business insurance category. Either way, ‘category identification’ is confirmed for both brand equity frameworks, as highlighted in red in Figures 6.3 and 6.39 (for broker brand equity) and 6.36 (for insurer brand equity).
High brand awareness, being part of the evoked set or even achieving top of mind awareness in the purchaser’s mind does not guarantee selection for B2B short-term insurance brands. In the present study Outsurance had the highest overall brand awareness from the clients' perspective with a total of 9 mentions, the second most first mentions and the most second mentions. Yet none of the hotels in the present study insured with Outsurance. Some clients insured with brands that they were completely unaware of. It is not even necessary that the client can link the insurer to the category, which means whether it provides business insurance or not. It is only important that the client can link the broker to the short-term B2B insurance category. It is important that the insurance brands form part of the broker’s evoked set and that the broker links the insurer to the category. This supports the finding of Section 6.2.4 that there seems to be two interrelated brand equity frameworks involved with brand building for short-term B2B insurance.

The other sub-dimensions that were confirmed were ‘price’, ‘service effectiveness’, ‘primary characteristics’ and ‘loyalty’. Even though credibility was considered to be important, it refers to the credibility of the broker and not to the owner of the brand (Keller, 2013: 117), as incorporated into the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

Additional dimensions that should be considered are the credibility of the broker, people, relationships and trust. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).

From the analysis of the interview data from Section C: Q.1 of the interviews, the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model for the brokers that that have been confirmed are indicated in Figure 6.3. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).
The sub-dimension ‘service effectiveness’ that is confirmed in Figure 6.3 is enabled by the ‘People’ dimension, which is mentioned in Section 6.2.4. The primary characteristics (of the insurance cover; what is included and excluded) is mostly under the insurer’s control, but the insurer is in the background/ behind the broker/ a level removed from the client. The insurer, logically, also influences ‘service effectiveness’, ‘price’ and ‘loyalty’ sub-dimensions.

For insurer brand equity, ‘category identification’ was confirmed, but reasoned to be between the insurer and the broker. The broker may also be loyal to certain insurers. It seemed more important for the broker to be able to link the insurance brands to the short-term business insurance category than for the client (hotel) to be able to link the insurers to the category because, for the present study, the brokers decided, which insurer the hotel would ultimately choose as its insurer. The client’s awareness of the different insurers, or lack thereof, made no difference to the brand that the hotel chose as its insurer.
As depicted in Figure 3.9 (developed from Pappu, et al., 2005: 144, 150-151), recall, based on category membership, can affect perceived quality, which can affect brand loyalty.

6.4.2 Aided recognition – Q.2 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
Where question 1 dealt with unaided recall, question 2 dealt with aided recognition. This question probed the relevance of the ‘Salience’ brand-building block (Figure 6.1), brand awareness and brand recognition (Figure 3.2) with the name brand elements as cue.

Table 6.5 shows the insurance brands that the participants recognised (those ticked) when the names were called out. The table includes all 25 short-term business insurers in South Africa that are registered with the South African Insurance Association (SAIA, 2012) and were listed as options in the initial (Appendix 1) and amended interview guides (Appendix 2).

The mentioned aided recognition responses were overlaid with the following data in the same table (Table 6.5):
- The insurance houses that the hotels were insured with (from tables 6.1a and 6.1b) are indicated in bold underlined ticks and
- The insurance brands mentioned (unaided recall) (from Table 6.4) with the colours in the table having the following meanings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Insurance brand 1st mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Insurance brand 2nd mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Insurance brand 3rd mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Insurance brand 4th mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Insurance brand 5th mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an example, Table 6.5 is interpreted as follows; for row 16, ‘Mutual & Federal Insurance’:
- The ticks (√) – indicate that 13 of the 14 participants recognised the Mutual & Federal brand when the name was called out (aided recognition);
- The underlined tick (✓) – indicates that participant E1 was actually insured with Mutual & Federal;
The boxes in **orange** – indicate that Mutual & Federal was mentioned first (unaided recall) by participants C1, E1, J1, P1 and Q1 and

The box in **green** – indicates that Mutual & Federal was mentioned forth (unaided recall) by participant H1.

**Table 6.5: Insurance houses: aided recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insurance houses registered with SAIA</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1st for Woman</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ABSA Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Auto &amp; General Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Budget Insurance Brokers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chartis South Africa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dial Direct Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Etana Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HDI Gerling Insurance of South Africa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hollard Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indequity Specialised Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Insurance driven by AA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lion of Africa Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lloyd’s</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lombard Insurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurers not registered with SAIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Forbes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnB Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brokers mentioned as being insurers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Participant was familiar with these brands, but was not aware that these insurers operated within the South African market.
A ‘total’ column was added to Table 6.5, which indicates that none of the participants were aware of HDI Gerling Insurance of South Africa or Renasa Insurance. All participants were aware of Lloyd’s and OUTsurance. Few participants were aware of Indequity Specialised Insurance (1), Unity Insurance (1), SAFIRE Insurance (2) and Etana Insurance (3). Some were aware of Chartis South Africa (6), Lombard Insurance (6), ABSA Insurance (7), Lion of Africa Insurance (7) and Regent Insurance (7). Most participants were aware of Budget Insurance Brokers (8), Nedgroup Insurance (8), Standard (bank) Insurance (9), 1st For Women (10), Insurance driven by AA (10), Zurich Insurance (10), Auto & General Insurance (11), Dial Direct Insurance (11), Hollard Insurance (11), Santam (12), Momentum Short-Term Insurance (13) and Mutual & Federal Insurance (13).

6.4.2.1 Subconclusions

The fact that participants could recognise various insurance brands when the names were called out as cue supports the theory regarding the ‘associative network memory model’ (Keller, 1993: 2; Figure 3.2). Interpreting the theory means that the brands that were recognised, even though weaker than those that were recalled unaided, have been registered in the participants' minds and the knowledge about the brands has been stored in nodes in the participants' minds. It is later assessed whether associations have been linked to these nodes.

Figure 6.4 indicates that the ‘Salience’ building block of the CBBE model has been confirmed by the data from Section C: Q.2.
6.4.3 Insurance house competitors insured with – Q.3 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Question 3 of Section C of the interview guide gathered information about the insurance brands that the hotels’ competitors were insured with. This tested the applicability of the sub-dimension ‘user profile’ of the ‘Imagery’ building block of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). A classification of selected responses is included in Table 6.6.
Table 6.6: Insurance houses competitors are insured with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Selected Responses</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 (P2:173)</td>
<td>I have no idea</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 (P3:153)</td>
<td>I have no idea</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 (P4:161, 165)</td>
<td>And they're insured with Alexander Forbes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1 (P5:185)</td>
<td>I've got no idea</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 (P 6:215)</td>
<td>I actually wouldn't know</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 (P7:215)</td>
<td>No I should imagine a lot of them are with B2</td>
<td>Guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 (P12:231)</td>
<td>I actually have no idea</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 (P13:229, 233)</td>
<td>Nedbank ... Standard ... BnB Sure ... Zurich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1 (P15:187)</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 (P16:219, 223)</td>
<td>Got no clue</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 (P17:259:259)</td>
<td>No idea ... Not really concerned about it as long as I get the best deal</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (P18:120)</td>
<td>I’m not even sure if we have competitors</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 (P19:231, 235)</td>
<td>as far as I know, because and this is purely because of – I’ve worked with other companies, in other companies. Mutual and Federal is one of the companies that was been used and Santam was another one that was being used.</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal Santam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 (P20:276, 280)</td>
<td>Wouldn’t have the foggiest clue but I think most of them – I would say S-A-T-I-N</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.3.1 Subconclusions

Being aware of the user profiles of competitors is regarded as important and is included under the CBBE model building block ‘Imagery’ and the sub-dimension ‘user profile’ (Keller, 2013: 113-114). The theory is that consumers prefer or are influenced by the brand choices of their peers (called idealised consumers). Keller (2013: 114) relates this to the B2B context where ‘user imagery’ might refer to the type of organisation and the size of the organisation. As indicated in Table 6.5 only three participants were aware of the insurance brands that their competitors were insured with. Participant H1 was aware of which insurer one other hotel were
insured with, participant M1 served on a hotel industry board and knew, in general, which insurers hotels were insured with and participant C1 knew the insurers of the his/her former employers. Based on this, it cannot be confirmed that the sub-dimension ‘user profiles’ is important to the target audience of the present study.

6.4.4 Word associations: insurance houses recalled – Q.4a to Q.4e of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This section tested the applicability of the ‘Imagery’ brand-building block (Figure 6.1); specifically brand associations (Figure 3.2) attached to the short-term insurance brand, but the responses were not limited to the ‘Imagery’ building block.

The word associations attached to the insurance brands, which were recalled, are listed in Table 6.7. In order to use these comments as confirmation of some of the dimensions of the CBBE model, the word associations, per insurance brand, are elevated to its conceptual purpose of the CBBE model. For example, from Table 6.7, the word association “more traditional long standing insurance company”, which is attributed to the insurer Mutual & Federal, relates to the ‘Imagery’ building block and the history sub-dimension (the conceptual purpose). The colour convention that was introduced for Figure 3.8 and which was used for Figure 3.9, is applied to the Table 6.7. This means that light orange refers to ‘Salience’, pink to ‘Performance’ (dark pink) and ‘Judgments’ (light pink) and blue to ‘Imagery’ (dark blue) and ‘Feelings’ (light blue) and tan to ‘Resonance’ building blocks of the CBBE model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insurance house recalled</th>
<th>Word associations</th>
<th>Building block-sub-dimension (conceptual purpose)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.4.4.a Mutual & Federal [E1 (P2), I1 (P5), J1 (P6), P1 (P17), C1 (P19) & Q1 (P20)] | “more traditional long standing insurance company  
It’s conservative, not very innovative” (P2:177)  
“trying to limit pay outs as much as possible” (P2:193)  
“big brands, big names, dominant in advertising” (P5:189)  
“They’ve been in the business for a long time” (P6:223)  
“I think they’re pretty good at settling claims” (P6:227)  
“They’re just out there in the market” (P6:235)  
“The green logo” (P17:279)  
“very professional” (P19:267)  
“Probably a little bit more expensive, However, it’s a no quibble kind of situation. It’s not – there’s no fine print that they’re going to come back and go no, we’re not paying you because of” (P19:267)  
“I’m probably paying too much but never mind” (P19:271)  
“I’ve never had a problem with them” (P19:275)  
“They contribute to Old Mutual’s profit” (P20:37) | ‘Imagery’-history  
‘Imagery’-personality & values  
Product reliability  
‘Salience’-awareness  
‘Imagery’-history  
Product reliability  
‘Salience’-awareness  
‘Salience’-brand element (logo)  
‘Imagery’-personality & values  
Performance-price  
‘Judgments’-quality  
Performance-price  
‘Judgments’-quality  
‘Judgments’-credibility |
### 6.4.4.b Santam [F1 (P3), M1 (P13) & O1 (P16)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Just a yellow umbrella&quot; (P3:157)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They just seem to push their brand&quot; (P16:273)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They're always in your face in terms of advertising.&quot; (P16:277)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4.4.c Alexander Forbes [H1 (P4)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Efficient&quot; (P4:221)</td>
<td>Performance-efficiency &amp; empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;fast, efficient ... very helpful&quot; (p4:231)</td>
<td>Performance-efficiency &amp; empathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4.4.d Outsurance [E1 (P2), K1 (P7), N1 (P15) & A1 (P18)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Green&quot; (P7:255)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They're everywhere&quot; (P7:259)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a lot of advertising&quot; (P7:263)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;multi-media&quot; (P7:267)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Less hassles&quot; (P15:203)</td>
<td>‘Judgments’-quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They pay out when you’ve got a claim&quot; (P15:211)</td>
<td>Performance-product reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;very popular in the market&quot; (P18:36)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;they’re very big&quot; (P18:140)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;they grew from literally nothing – came out of nowhere and they’re just consuming the market&quot; (P18:144)</td>
<td>‘Salience’-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modern, more innovative company&quot; (P2:185)</td>
<td>‘Imagery’-personality &amp; values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;very quick in responding to claims&quot; (P2:189)</td>
<td>Performance-efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think they are very quick in responding to claims and they are not trying to limit the payouts, contrary to what – what I think insurance companies are trying all the time. They’d rather pay quickly and higher amount to create customer satisfaction&quot; (P2:189)</td>
<td>Performance-efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;very much out there&quot; (P6:247)</td>
<td>‘Judgments’-quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I actually haven’t been happy with&quot;</td>
<td>Performance-service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the way our claims have been settled. So we’ve actually moved away from Outinsurance” (P6:255)

“I actually find it quite a joke because they have this ad going at the moment R400 and they can better the claim blah, blah, blah but you know when you actually sign up with them I don’t feel that they actually value their customer” (P6:263)

“not impressed” (P6:267)

“They’re always in your face in terms of advertising” (P16:277)

“I just think Outinsurance sounds more like a gimmick the way they push their things and the things that they offer. It doesn’t give me any confidence in them” (P16:281)

“I’ve tested their rates so … they didn’t match ours” (P16:285, 289)

“The guys who give you your money back” (P17:143)

“The Discovery guys” (P17:139)

“They’re everywhere” (P17:139)

“I had Outsurance because I was with First National Bank” (P19:279)

“They treat you very well as an in the spoken word but the actions don’t follow through” (P19:279)

6.4.4.e AIG [H1 (P4)]

“good service” (P4:243)

6.4.4.f First for Women [A1 (P18)]

“It’s up and coming … I think they’re quite established at this point.” (P18:136)

“They’ve actually got a very good name out there amongst men and
6.4.4.g Etana [Q1 (P20)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>women” (P18:140)</th>
<th>“They do only thing and that is fidelity, ja that’s the only thing they do …some professional indemnity. So we only do one thing with them.” (P20:376, 384)</th>
<th>Performance-primary characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s nothing extraordinary” (P20:388)</td>
<td>‘Judgments’-quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6.7 it can be seen that colour was associated with insurers, even though participants were not asked about the brands’ colours directly:

- **Mutual & Federal** - The green logo (P17:279);
- **Santam** - … a yellow umbrella (P3:157); and
- **Outsurance** - Green (P7:255).

Colour is one of the brand elements that is used to create brand awareness (Keller, 2008: 53-55), which builds ‘Salience’.

Participants had a good sense of older and newer brands:

- **Mutual & Federal** - more traditional long standing insurance company. It’s conservative, not very innovative (P2:177); and they’ve been in the business for a long time (P6:223).
- **Outsurance** - they grew from literally nothing – came out of nowhere and they’re just consuming the market (P18:144).
- **First for Women** - it’s up and coming … I think they’re quite established at this point (P18:136).

This did not apply to Santam, which is the oldest insurer among the list of insurers in South Africa. These associations can best be associated with ‘history and heritage’, but Keller (2013: 116) is more specific as far as ‘history, heritage and experiences’ are concerned, because it should be more personal and less generic.
The participants even had a sense of which organisations the insurers are linked to:

- **Mutual & Federal** - they contribute to Old Mutual’s profit (P20:37).
- **Outsurance** - The Discovery guys (P17:139); and
  
  *I had Outsurance because I was with First National Bank (P19:279).*

These associations may hint to the ‘credibility’ sub-dimension of the CBBE as it relates to the owner of the brand (Keller, 2013: 117).

As mentioned, Table 6.7 was used to translate the associations that are attributed to the insurance brands that were recalled by the participants to the conceptual purpose or brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). This is displayed visually, one insurer at a time, by the figures below. First the brand-building blocks that were confirmed by the associations are displayed (employing the same colour scheme as was introduced for Figure 3.8 and used in Table 6.7) and then the specific sub-dimensions are indicated in red text.
6.4.4.a Mutual & Federal

‘Salience’, ‘Performance’, ‘Imagery’ and ‘Judgments’ dimensions were mentioned, but no ‘Feelings’ or ‘Resonance’ dimensions were mentioned for Mutual & Federal as displayed in Figures 6.5 and 6.6.
6.4.4.b Santam

Santam only attracted 'Salience' dimensions, as displayed in Figures 6.7 and 6.8.

**Figure 6.7: Brand-building blocks for Santam**

**Figure 6.8: Sub-dimensions for Santam**
6.4.4.c Alexander Forbes

Only ‘Performance’ dimensions were confirmed for Alexander Forbes, as displayed in Figures 6.9 and 6.10.

---

**Figure 6.9: Brand-building blocks for Alexander Forbes**

**Figure 6.10: Sub-dimensions for Alexander Forbes**
6.4.4.d Outsurance

For Outsurance, participants attached the most associations. They confirmed ‘Salience’, ‘Performance’, ‘Judgment’ and one ‘Imagery’ sub-dimension, as displayed in Figures 6.11 and 6.12.
6.4.4.e AIG

A ‘Performance’ related sub-dimension was mentioned for AIG, as displayed in Figures 6.13 and 6.14.

![Diagram showing Brand-building blocks for AIG]

![Diagram showing Sub-dimensions for AIG]

Figure 6.13: Brand-building blocks for AIG

Figure 6.14: Sub-dimensions for AIG
6.4.4.1 First for Women

First for Women attracted ‘Salience’ dimensions, as displayed in Figures 6.15 and 6.16.

Figure 6.15: Brand-building blocks for First for Women

Figure 6.16: Sub-dimensions for First for Women
6.4.4.g Etana

‘Performance’ and ‘Judgments’ dimensions were mentioned for Etana, as displayed in Figures 6.17 and 6.18.
6.4.4.1 Subconclusions

From the analysis of the interview data from Section C: Q.4 of the interviews the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model for the insurance brands that were confirmed are indicated in Figures 6.19 and 6.20.
Participants mentioned ‘Salience’, ‘Performance’, ‘Imagery’ and ‘Judgments’ dimensions. ‘Salience’ and ‘Performance’ associations were well established and important. ‘Imagery’ was limited to ‘personality and values’ and ‘history’ associations. Some ‘Judgments’ were formed based on the ‘Performance’ associations, but no ‘Feelings’ or ‘Resonance’ sub-dimensions were mentioned. This supports Kuhn et al.’s (2008: 50-51) notion that emotions do not influence B2B consumers. For the present study’s business short-term insurance brands the ‘rational route’ to building brand equity is supported, but not the ‘emotional route’.

However, the importance of loyalty, as concurred by Aaker (1991: 39, 46-49, 50-52), cannot be ignored. The applicability of the ‘Resonance’ sub-dimensions was tested based on the strict CBBE model interpretation – loyalty between insurance house and client (hotel). Loyalty may well be important, but not in the CBBE model sense. It seems, as mentioned throughout this chapter, that loyalty should rather be built on two fronts; between insurance house and intermediary and between intermediary and buyer/ end consumer/ client. In the final analysis (as elaborated on in Section 6.4.1.1), even though participants could recall and recognise insurance brands and attach associations to the brands, this does not matter in the context of the present study. The insurance brands are a level removed from the participants and their evoked set of insurance brands is supplied by the broker. Insurance brand equity should be built between the insurance house and the broker and the insurance house should support the broker so that the broker can deliver an acceptable service to the client. This supports McDonald et al.’s (2001: 341) recommendation that brokers should be targeted instead of the consumer.

6.4.5 Word associations attached to insurance houses insured with – Q.4 as it relates to QQ.B of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question tested the applicability of the ‘Imagery’ brand-building block (Figure 6.1); specifically brand associations (Figure 3.2) that are attached to the short-term insurance brand insured with.

The word associations attached to the insurance houses insured with are listed in Table 6.8. As shown in Table 6.7, the word associations, per insurer, are elevated to its conceptual purpose of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). For example, Table 6.8 shows that participant C1 mentioned the word association “hospitality industry” (P19:109)”, which is attributed to the insurer HIU and links to the ‘Salience’ building block and the category identification sub-dimension. Once again, the colour convention that was introduced in Figure 3.8 and used in Figure 3.9 is applied to Table
6.8. This means that light orange refers to ‘Salience’, pink to ‘Performance’ (dark pink) and ‘Judgments’ (light pink) and blue to ‘Imagery’ (dark blue) and ‘Feelings’ (light blue) and tan to ‘Resonance’.

Table 6.8: Word associations: insurance houses insured with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insurance house insured with</th>
<th>Word associations</th>
<th>Building block-sub-dimension (conceptual purpose)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etana (A1)</td>
<td>Question was not asked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIU (C1)</td>
<td>“hospitality industry” <em>(P19:109)</em></td>
<td>‘Salience’-category identification ‘Judgments’-superiority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“it’s specifically industry driven, it slots in so perfectly to the requirements of the hotel industry” <em>(P19:239)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal (E1)</td>
<td>“more traditional long standing insurance company. It’s conservative, not very innovative.” <em>(P2:177)</em></td>
<td>‘Imagery’-history ‘Imagery’-personality &amp; values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (F1)</td>
<td>Question was not asked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartis (H1)</td>
<td>“I don’t want to be rude but they really are useless” <em>(P4:185)</em></td>
<td>‘Judgments’- quality Performance-efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we put certain claims and stuff in that literally took them about six, seven months to come back to us, just to say that no, they’re not going to pay it.” <em>(P4:189)</em></td>
<td>Performance-product reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They lost some of our paper work” <em>(P4:193)</em></td>
<td>Performance-service effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“we had to go back to them about three or four times … they basically didn’t want to take our word for the fact that it was a burst pipe okay.”</td>
<td>Performance-service effectiveness Performance-empathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.4.5.1 Subconclusions

The interpretation of the findings concerning associations that were attached to the insurer brands makes sense if interpreted within the theoretical framework. Associations are key to the concept of brand equity. Srivastava and Shocker (cited in Ambler, 1995: 388) define brand equity as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insurer</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Judgments</th>
<th>Imagery</th>
<th>Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIC</strong></td>
<td>“they understand hospitality risk.”</td>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“they’re honest”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They specialize in this industry. So they understand the risks.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
<td>Question was not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3</strong></td>
<td>Question was not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santam Insurance</strong></td>
<td>“they’re very easy to use”</td>
<td>Performance-service effectiveness</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Reassuring”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“very trustworthy company”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BnB Sure</strong></td>
<td>“Hotel industry, guesthouse industry”</td>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialised in that area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lion of Africa</strong></td>
<td>“I just picture a lion”</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Strong”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a set of associations and behaviours on the part of a brand’s customers, channel members and parent corporation that permits the brand to earn greater volume or greater margins than it could without the brand name and that gives a strong, sustainable and differential advantage.

‘Brand associations’ is one of the five components of Aaker’s brand equity model (1996: 15-16) and is a key component of brand knowledge (Keller, 1993: 3-4) (Figure 3.2). The theory further tells us that associations are linked to the brand nodes that have been registered in the consumer’s mind; the so called ‘associative network memory model’ (Keller, 1993: 2). The strength of the associations determines how rich the knowledge will be or how many nodes or associations will be activated. Brand knowledge can be represented by one brand node with several associations linked to it.

The associations attached to the insurance brands are what create the brand image in the consumer’s mind. Figures 6.21 and 6.22 are a combination of all the associations (from Table 6.8) of all the business insurance brands that the participants were insured with as it relates to the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model.

Figure 6.21: Combined: all brand-building blocks of insurer brand equity confirmed by Section C: Q4f of interviews
Broadly, the same brand-building blocks are confirmed based on the associations of all the insurance brands that were recalled by the participants (Figure 6.19) and all the business insurance brands that the participants were insured with (Figure 6.21). In both instances the ‘Feelings’ and ‘Resonance’ building blocks were not confirmed.

However, there are a few differences in the confirmed sub-dimensions based on brands that were recalled versus brands they are insured with, as is evident from Figures 6.20 and 6.22. The differences are circled in blue in Figures 6.23 and 6.24. Price played a role during the recall of insurance brands in general, but not in relation to the brands that were actually insured with. The following comments by participants illustrate this:

*Probably a little bit more expensive (P19:267); and *
*I’ve tested their rates so … they didn’t match ours (P16:285, 289).*
Superiority was only confirmed for insurance houses actually insured with, while differentiation is important, as indicated in the following comments by participants:

*Specialised in that area (P13:177)*;

*They understand hospitality risk. They specialise in this industry. So they understand the risks." (P17:267, 395)*;

*It’s specifically industry driven, it slots in so perfectly to the requirements of the hotel industry” (P19:239); and

*Hotel industry, guesthouse industry” (P13:173).*

---

**Figure 6.23: Combined sub-dimensions based on recall**
The findings above are important as it correlate with Keller’s (1993: 17) explanation that brand equity is built by creating a familiar brand identity (through the choice of brand elements) and a positive brand image (strong, favourable, and unique brand associations), which should be integrated into the marketing mix.
6.4.6 Slogan of insurance house – Q.5a and Q.5b of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question aimed to test for Salience and awareness based on recognition of the slogan as a brand element. But as can be seen from Figure 6.25, none of the participants knew what the slogan was of the insurance house that their hotel was insured with and by extension the participants’ perceptions of the meanings of the slogans could not be tested. This indicates that the importance of slogans was not verified in the context of this study.

![Figure 6.25: Insurance houses’ slogans](image-url)
6.4.7 Point of contact – Q.6 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
This question tested the applicability of the ‘Imagery’ brand-building block and specifically the sub-dimension ‘purchase situation’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

All participants reported that they worked via a broker. None of the participants dealt directly with the insurer. Ten different brokers were used and no more than two hotels operated via the same broker. As mentioned, the concept of an intermediary is not included in the CBBE model (Keller, 2013: 108) or the revised customer-based brand equity pyramid for B2B by Kuhn et al. (2008: 50). Kuhn et al. (2008: 50-51) suggest the inclusion of a ‘Sales force’ building block, which speaks to the importance of the human element. The present study’s findings differ, since the broker dimension cannot simply be included in an amended model because there are two branding models involved – one to build insurance brand equity and one to build broker brand equity. The broker is not a dimension that should be added to the existing CBBE model; rather, the broker has a brand equity model of its own. The human element involved from the broker’s side is a dimension that should be included in the broker brand equity framework.

6.4.8 Purchase process involvement – Q.7 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
This question also tested the applicability of the ‘Imagery’ brand-building block and specifically the sub-dimension ‘purchase situation’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

In six instances the participants were the only people involved in the insurance purchase process and in five instances one other person was involved with the participants. Only in two instances were three or more people involved in the purchase process. These people, the participants, were the people whose brand perceptions were studied. The present study sought to understand how a services brand was constructed in the participants’ minds. In other words, whether the CBBE model’s conceptual representation of how brands are constructed in consumers’ minds and which dimensions should be used to measure brand equity (the various sub-dimensions) is accurate and which of these sub-dimensions can be confirmed for a short-term business insurance context.

6.4.9 Purchase process experience – Q.8 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
Question 8 also tested the applicability of the ‘Imagery’ brand-building block and specifically the sub-dimension ‘purchase situation’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

Some participants spoke about the broker’s attitude and/or approach:

- I think it was done in a very professional way by the broker (P2:233);
- … they’ve also been very – …professional (P7:419); and
- He was very patient (P7:351).
This can be equated to what is referred to under the sub-dimension ‘empathy’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). Empathy refers to whether the client perceives the service provider to be “trusting, caring and focused on the client” (Keller, 2008: 59-78; 2001: 15-19).

Some participants referred to the amount of time that the purchase, renewal or amendment process took:

… it took a good couple of hours (P7:359).

This does not refer to the sub-dimension ‘efficiency’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). It actually means the opposite. ‘Efficiency’ refers to how speedily a service is rendered with the emphasis that quicker is always more efficient/ better. Some participants of the present study referred to brokers spending much time examining the policy content with them and of brokers being patient. A participant offered the amount of time that it takes to examine the insurance cover with their broker as a reason to stay with the same broker, merely so that they do not have to experience this again:

There’s quite a lot of [noise] process you don't want to go through many times with different insurance companies because it takes a long time. You know so it’s a good three, four, five hours of a day just to actually make sure everything is in place (P12: 323, 327).

Other participants elaborated on the people that were involved with the process:

… she’s a very nice lady (P12:287) … she actually wanted to be able to help us rather than you know, sell us something (P12:291).

This also refers to being focused on the client, which is ‘empathy’. Whereas the comment:

I've dealt with them for quite a while so I've actually got to know the individuals (P19:47)

indicates the importance of relationships, as does

… very good - got a good experience with them. The communication from the beginning till the end of a claim (P3:201, 205).

Experience is also included in the conceptual framework of the present study (Figure 1.1), where experience, together with information, is core to the offering brand.

The sub-dimensions ‘service effectiveness and efficiency were confirmed, but for the broker and not for the insurer:

I deal with probably two office consultants … they’ve also been very – they get back to me timorously (P7:415, 419);

And we got a new evaluation and then they adjusted the policy for us. So and that was pretty quick and painless as well (P7:583); and

… she ja she always called me back. She always, you know ran to help me to do things. She just made it very easy to deal with (P12:287).
‘Price’ was confirmed as an important sub-dimension by these participants:

*We had a review of the insurance about three years ago or two years ago and the amount was reduced quite considerably (P2:233);*

… *the main reason was cost saving (P7:367);*

*I sent an email cancelling that and then came back – they were you know why don’t – I said well it’s on cost basis. I can save at least R2000 over R2000 a month (P13:281).*

It’s quite detailed and so I’m able to compare. They’ll say for instance that this one will cover you at this rate but the excess is X. Whereas with this person [indistinct 13:04], that y, etcetera, etcetera. So we can make the decisions around that P19:367 and … *what we do do is we get other quotes, sort of behind the scenes. Just to compare that we’re still on the same page and we normally are. And I’ve never found them wanting, my brokers (P20:452, 456, 460).*

*And … was sort of like so confident in the fact that we will not move our business that they didn’t really go out of their way to really you know like come and do a proper presentation…(P4:403).*

The comment above concerns ‘empathy’, but introduces the importance of information sharing between broker and client. This is aligned to the conceptual framework in Figure 1.1 where information is a core part of the offering or value proposition and contributes to need satisfaction.

The selected comments below provided insight into what services the clients expected from their brokers. These include that:

- the broker should deal with the insurance houses on the client’s behalf;

*Our requirements and basically all the talks and the negotiation happens between the broker and the insurance and I do get a proposal and normally get advice to sign or not to sign (P5:217).*

- work through the policy with the client to explain what is covered and what is not covered;

*we basically had a meeting – we went through the insurance almost line by line (P6:309).*

- allow the client to tailor what the insurance covered; and

*Discussed various things that we wanted changed or amended (P6:313).*

- advise the client;

*they recommended that we change one of the policies (P7:367). and she also posed a lot of questions, you know do we need this? Do we have a vehicle? Do we – you know – are there any other areas that we need to be covered in? (P12:287).*

*No it was great. They came in when we insured this building. They came in, took photographs, had a short discussion, came back with a report. What they’ve done is, they’ve identified areas, which might complicate a claim in the future. Which I rectified, set everything in place. They re-inspected and the insurance was done (P15:271, 275).*
These comments confirm the importance of the sub-dimensions ‘primary characteristics and secondary features’ of brokers’ services and offered details concerning what these should entail specifically. This is a typical example of information that emerged from the discussion even though these were not tested directly by any of the questions.

6.4.9.1 Subconclusions

From the analysis of the interview data from Section C: Q.8 of the interview guide, the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model for the brokers that were confirmed, are indicated in Figure 6.26. These were ‘primary characteristics and secondary features’, ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy’ and ‘price’.

Participants revealed additional aspects of how they constructed brands, including that those that the people involved should be professional, patient and knowledgeable and that relationships and experiences are important. These additional aspects will be incorporated into the amended brand equity framework. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).
No dimensions that related directly to the insurance brands' brand equity were mentioned.

6.4.10 Broker influence over purchase process – Q.9a and Q.9b of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Questions 9a and 9b aimed to establish the extent to which the broker could influence which insurance brand was selected. These were considered as additional questions, since intermediaries are not included in the CBBE model, hence the questions did not test any of the dimensions of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1) directly/ specifically.

The results from these two additional questions were included and discussed in Section 6.4.1. The feedback also forms part of the subconclusions of Section 6.4.1.1.

6.4.11 Brand personality – Q.10 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Question 10 tested the applicability of the 'Imagery' brand-building block (Figure 6.1) and specifically the sub-dimension ‘personality’ of the CBBE model.

The responses can be divided into those that:

- could associate human traits to insurer immediately;
  - A rather old person. Conservative, lower middle class (P2:261, 265);
  - Friendly, convenient, sufficient. It’s just easy (P3:241, 245); and
  - … engaging and they would be active (P13:337).

- spoke about actual people representing insurer;
  - … we had one of their assessors here and I would say very - I don’t want to use the word unapproachable but it was just the case that they’re very sort of like this is what it is and you know – there’s no like negotiation or anything like that … it’s not like they’re warm and fuzzy (P4:483).

This shows the impact that the conduct of those who represent the organisation can have. The organisation’s people bring the brand’s personality to life.

- could not assign personality traits initially and attached personality traits only after probing and consideration;
  - … not a prominent – not a publicly well-known insurance house. I think their strengths are basically of offering specific proper policies for each – for the demands of the hospitality. So it’s – I guess why I see it as a specialised insurance for hospitality – in the hospitality sector … rather conservative (P5:50, 51).
This reference could be classified under the sub-dimension ‘primary characteristics and secondary features’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1) and indicates differentiation.

I can’t tell you much about their brand. I haven’t really done much research to be totally honest – I am dealing with the broker and that is where my real relationship is (P6:44, 45);

I don’t know really. I mean I find that … is obviously a very well established company. I don’t really deal with them directly; it’s very difficult to say. I can only tell you what I perceive them to be and I just perceive them to be a very you know, strong company that has been around – I don’t know – I actually know nothing about them. But you know they’ve been around for a long time and they’re a well-established company and you know they’re reliable. So I don’t – as in terms of their personality I don’t know – I’ll say I don’t know. I mean I just see them as being, you know, I guess if you could target market them, you know middle aged, middle aged men and women you know who’re all wearing suits and you know they’re quite friendly people. But it’s like it’s a serious business. … rather than the fun friendly kind of joyful (P12:343, 347, 359, 363); and

Well then they themselves I have no dealings with at all (P19:393).

These comments highlighted the distance between the client and the insurer and showed that the client’s contact is indeed with the broker and not the insurer. The participant even referred to ‘history’, but eventually managed to associate personality traits with the insurer.

- reported no personality traits

I know nothing about it. I have no personal connection or it has no personality to me at all. It’s a company (P7:395, 403).

### 6.4.11.1 Subconclusions

The sub-dimension ‘personality’ of the CBBE model for the insurance house/brand was confirmed by the present study. This confirmation was not spontaneous or from top of mind awareness and non-personality related issues were also mentioned. This indicates that it is unlikely that brand personality will have any influence on which insurer is selected. Part of the reason for this may be because brand personality can be influenced by the sub-dimension ‘user profiles’, which has not been confirmed by the present study (Section 6.4.3). Herbst and Merz (2011), as well as Veloutsou and Taylor (2012) extended Aaker’s (1997) brand personality research to B2B brands.

Throughout the analysis of the interview data, the importance of the human element has become evident. Baumgarth and Bincke banck (2011: 487-498) mention the salesperson’s personality as opposed to the brand’s personality, but also consider a salesperson’s behaviour to be more important than a salesperson’s personality, which is more important than product quality and non-
personal communication. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).

6.4.12 History – Q.11 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question tested the applicability of the ‘Imagery’ brand-building block and specifically the sub-dimension ‘history, heritage and experiences’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). Participants referred to both the history of their insurer and broker.

One participant knew, more or less, how long their broker has been in operation

The original … those two guys started that business must have been 40 years ago
(P20:524).

And some have been with the same broker for a considerable amount of time

we switched to … probably 1992 or something. 20 years’ experience with the same guys
(P20:368, 532).

A participant was insured with the same insurer for an extended period:

It’s probably about maybe ten, twelve years or so that I was first – that I first came across HIU, through Marsh (P19:415).

Yet other participants have not had a long history or much experience with their current insurer:

only know Etana from actually working … since working here (P18:258, 260)
I think about two years (P5:281).

or could not elaborate much on the history, heritage and experiences

It’s a good history (P17:467); and
No. I can’t comment on that (P16:437, 441).

The participants’ experiences with their insurers and brokers were generally positive and the participants’ related their experience to ‘service efficiency’, ‘effectiveness (or satisfaction)’, ‘price’, ‘product reliability) as well as to the people involved; their attitude and knowledge and the relationship, in general:

… where we have claimed it was always handled very efficiently by B1, but also well by BnB Sure when they sent out an assessor, the things that he looked at they were always informed and polite and seemed to know their business and gave good tips. We had one claim for a roof and they were actually, it’s more actually wear and tear, so it’s you know, it’s not really storm damage, but we will pay for the problems that’s occurred through the water coming in. So the ceiling would be covered, but the roof not (P13:369);
in my experience in the last six months that I’ve been here any claims that we’ve submitted they’ve actually honoured the claims and there was even one claim where they even made
an ex-gratia payment of an additional R15 300 [indistinct] because the relationship is good and I think they’re pretty fair in the way that they you know, transact and deal with it (P6:381); and

... this experience definitely has been a good one. Whenever we’ve had a problem you know, the, I mean obviously Hamilton has a big part to do with it. But in terms of the insurance company, they’ve never queried anything that we’ve done. They’ve just asked for you know, the evidence of, you know the geyser’s burst in a room, you know for example and you know they want photographs, they want quotations from us. You know they’ve paid out within two, three weeks without us actually making a claim. Which is incredible. So I’m not sure if that’s Hamilton pushing Santam to actually get the claim through. And I don’t really care at the end of the day and especially when you run a hotel that your – the most important thing is you’ve got to get it done and sorted and quickly, you can’t be hanging around. But I have certainly found that Santam have never you know, they’ve always been very reliable and very you know promptly with all their payments and things like that. And it’s not like we claim a lot, but you know when you’re paying such big you know fees, when you’re paying five, six thousand rands per month you know for insurance, you expect a good level of service. (P12:395, 399, 403).

The importance of the interaction between broker and insurer is also indicated above, as well as the fact that the client does not really care how these interactions or responsibilities are structured. There is even some confusion or lack of clarity about the responsibilities of the different parties:

I think the only dealing I’ve actually had with Lloyds is probably through their – but those aren’t – those are contractors anyway. So the guys who come in to do the assessments come from the actual – they’re recommended from – I think from the insurance holders rather than the brokers. But again they’re not from Lloyds. Lloyds is a faceless name like entity to me (P7:435, 439).

Only one participant reported dissatisfaction:

... my experience with them is like what I have now and that’s obviously not very good (P4:559).

Another participant referred to the process (extended marketing mix):

I think one claim in short term insurance and that get handles quite easily. So if the documentation is right and the process is followed, then the claim has been handled easily and painless (P5:289).
One participant linked their insurer to their childhood and another did not regard the insurance brand as important in his life:

I know them because my parents used them (P3:269); and
I didn’t really grow up with it and I didn’t – it’s just my insurance (P2:277).

6.4.12.1 Subconclusions

Whether the client knew the insurance brand from their childhood/ for an extended period of time did not add much to the brand equity of the insurance brand. However, it can be seen that if the insurer was the reason for non-payment or slow payment of a claim (lack of ‘product reliability’ and ‘efficiency) then the insurance brand’s equity would suffer.

Clients also expect a certain level of ‘service effectiveness’ (satisfaction) for the perceived high premium (‘price’) and understand that processes influence ‘service effectiveness’.

In addition, the people involved (their attitude and knowledge) and the relationships are also important. There should be seamless interaction and support between the broker and the insurer. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).

From the analysis of the interview data from Section C: Q.11 of the interviews, the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model for the brokers that were confirmed are indicated in Figure 6.27.
6.4.13 Service satisfaction - Q.12 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question tested the applicability of the ‘Performance’ brand-building block (Figure 6.1) and specifically the sub-dimension ‘service effectiveness’ (also called satisfaction) of the CBBE model.

Responses to the question about service satisfaction can be divided into three categories, namely participants who were not satisfied, those who were satisfied and those who were very satisfied. [The sub-dimensions of the CBBE model that the comments relate to have been inserted in square brackets] Some examples of these are:

Not satisfied:

As I said, you know the question of payouts ['product reliability'] and of being quick ['service efficiency'] and I’m not very happy with that (P 2:293); and

I know for a fact that he actually gets so annoyed with them because you know like he has to go back and back and back and like I said there’s always something else that they want. So if they tell you right from you know, from the get go, to say this is what we exactly want from you so we can process this claim it’s all good and well but so they’ll send you the forms, you’ll complete the forms and then like a week later they come back and say okay now they want this and now they want that and for me that is like very unprofessional
“service efficiency)” “that’s the other problem we had – was the fact that like the electronic equipment and stuff wasn’t properly detailed on the actual – you know on your – the insurance papers [‘primary characteristics’] (P 4: 447; 511).

Satisfied

Because you know like we’ve now put quite a few claims and stuff in, in the last year that I know of and like I said to you, some of them they are – like the – I would say the normal straightforward ones, they will sort out okay? [‘product reliability’] Although, I must actually also say that they – because the assessor came and he did an assessment on the building itself and they gave us a list of all of the risk areas [‘secondary features’], if I can put it like that and they gave us – you know at least they gave us a few months’ time to actually rectify all of these risk areas [‘empathy’]. You know ultimately from their point of view as well because it makes the – like fire risk and stuff more you know – so from that point – you know that point of view it was fine [‘primary characteristics’] (P 4: 439; 483);

… they do have competitive fair premiums [‘price’] (P 5:297); and

Sorry it’s not only settling the claims quickly [service efficiency] it’s pricing as well [‘price’] (P17:487).

Very satisfied:

… if you do a claim it’s so quickly, there’s no waiting. If there’s an assessor that needs to come out, it’s out the next day, it’s not phoning when can we see the assessor and when is he coming out. They’re always on time what they promise basically. [‘service efficiency’]" (P 3: 277);

Marsh, are brilliant and I’ve had different Account Managers through the years but ja, I’ve really not had anything to worry about [‘service effectiveness’]" (P19:431); and

If I pick up the phone I get such speedy service [‘service efficiency’] – the service is shocking [inaudible 25:00]. It’s like whoever I’ve spoken to have gone and studied our file [inaudible 25:02]. And it is actually so delightful and pleasant to deal with people like that [‘service effectiveness’] (P18:504).

6.4.13.1 Subconclusions

It is evident that some of the comments relate to the insurers, while others relate to the brokers. Together both parties contribute to or take away from how satisfied the participants were. The comments regarding service effectiveness showed that ‘product reliability’, ‘service efficiency’, ‘empathy’, ‘price’ and processes can affect service satisfaction. Both insurer and broker affect all these sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions and building blocks of the CBBE model that were confirmed based on the analysis of the interview data from Section C: Q.12 for the brokers and/ or insurers that were confirmed, are indicated in Figure 6.28.
What is evident is that the degree of satisfaction is ‘Performance’ dominated. This is important because as Lovelock and Wirtz (2007: 22-25) point out the ‘quality’ sub-dimension, which is a ‘Judgment’, is based on the ‘Performance’ sub-dimensions and ‘quality’ has an impact on ‘loyalty’. This is echoed by Keller (2013: 117) who states that perceived ‘quality’ is one of the most important influencers of consumer attitude, as is value and satisfaction. In addition, Michell et al. (2001: 424) found that brand loyalty in B2B markets is built by, among others, reliability and performance associations. In a B2B services context satisfaction is influenced by availability, responsiveness, reliability, completeness, and professionalism (Pop, Mihoc, Fotea & Lazar, 2011: 99), as well as client needs satisfaction (Geigenmuller & Bettis-Outland, 2012: 432). Also, for services, the service performance or delivery/ rendering is people dependant. Therefore, the human element needs an even greater emphasis than is the case in the current CBBE model. Client dissatisfaction is a major reason for brand switching and should be managed by linking customer satisfaction to employee incentive schemes and by providing loyalty programmes (Aaker, 1991: 39, 46-49, 50-52).

![Figure 6.28: Sub-dimensions of broker and insurer interaction](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)
6.4.14 Service efficiency - Q.13 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question tested the applicability of the ‘Performance’ brand-building block (Figure 6.1) and specifically the sub-dimension ‘service efficiency’ of the CBBE model.

In terms of speed and responsiveness, the responses from the participants can be grouped into being positive, negative and those that provide insight into the process.

Some participants were happy with the service efficiency:

… they deliver on time (P3:291);
… in terms of speed I mean they're very, you know, I've actually been quite surprised at how quickly they are (P12:427);
I don't know whether it's because you know, the claims have been quite small, you know ten to twenty thousand rands possibly for a burst geyser or something like that is you know quite a small claim. I'm sure they have huge corporate clients that you know put in much bigger claims for buildings and things like that. So as far as you know speedy wise I mean they're incredible. I mean I don't know how they manage to do it somehow… (P12:431).
It was ten days (P16:489); and
… literally within a matter of an hour I will get that response (P19: C1:439).

Some participants were not happy with the service efficiency:

… there was stuff sitting on there that was like nearly two years old. So it was just oh the paper work went missing and we had to submit the same stuff about three or four times before… (P4:547, 543) [processes]; and
… if they don't know your business and the product that you sell then it creates problems because then you sit with things like – like conference rooms that's basically standing empty for months because they don't want to you know there's no effort, real effort from their side to actually resolve the issue (P4:767) [product knowledge, people].

And some of the participants provided insight concerning why service satisfaction may be affected:

… pretty efficient as long as you’ve got the correct forms. It’s just two forms, quotes. You need to get quotes and then I just send it off to one of the consultants (P7:479) [processes]; I mean things can always be done quicker. It does mean that obviously, because they're a broker they obviously need to get hold of the company then the assessor is someone else entirely as well [people]. So then they need to wait for – but it does also depend on our side how quickly we get the quotes together and you know that sort of thing (P7:491);
So there’s always a lot of steps involved and quite a few different people and companies. But I think with the information that we’ve given them for the claims that we’ve done – ja – the response time has been good. I think there’s only one time that they took rather a long time. But I think that was – they were trying to clarify certain issues. It was a theft case
and it was just trying to figure out whether we were actually covered or not [primary characteristics] (P7:495); and
Depending on how big the claim is and depending on whether an assessor [people] needs to come out or not. I would say anywhere from two to six weeks (P7:499).

6.4.14.1 Subconclusions

‘Efficiency’ as a sub-dimension of the ‘Performance’ building block of the CBBE model was confirmed extensively. Participants referred mainly to their brokers, but realised that both the broker and insurer affect ‘efficiency’. Participants also recognised the two dimensions present, namely being the relationship between the broker and the client and the relationship between the broker and the insurer.

In addition, from the broker’s side, processes, people and product knowledge contribute to ‘service efficiency’. The additional dimensions were incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).

6.4.15 Trusting, caring and focused - Q.14 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question solicited responses regarding the sub-dimension ‘empathy’ of the building block ‘Performance’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). Empathy relates to whether the organisation treats their consumers in a trusting, caring and client-centred way. It refers to whether the consumer gets the impression that the organisation trusts them and cares about them. Some participants interpreted the question to mean whether they trust the organisation/insurance brand even though the question was: ‘How trusting, caring and focused on you the client is the service that you received from …’. Some responded by stating:

Difficult to say. I think I can trust them, yes (P 2:353);
They’re like a father. They’re like a father. It’s like I trust them with my building (P 3: 297);
and
Trustworthy 100% (P20:556).

These responses could not be used to interpret ‘empathy’, but speak to the importance of the insurer being trustworthy, which is core to brand equity.

One participant indicated that the insurer did not trust them:

You know because they basically didn’t want to take our word for the fact that it was a burst pipe okay … they’re not focused, customer focused (P 4: 197, 609).
Another participant saw care as being provided with information or guidance and being allowed to make an informed decision:

... tell me look your excess is going to be R2.5 thousand so you can decide if you want to claim or if you want to rather do it out of your pocket (P18: 384).

Another participant reported their positive experience as:

They really treat us like we are their only client (P18:604).

And yet another commented that ‘empathy’ is not that important, as long as ‘service effectiveness’ and ‘product reliability’ is satisfactory:

they obviously care because they obviously pay out and they you know, they respect the customers and they you know they do what they say they’re going to do And I don’t expect an insurance company to be a caring, kind, you know over the top, you know. I don’t want that. If it’s insurance it’s insurance you know. We have this item and you have to be insured for this amount and if it breaks or it gets damaged, it’s going to be replaced for this cost to me. That’s it. I mean it’s quite straightforward (P12: 451, 459, 463).

6.4.15.1 Subconclusions

‘Empathy’ as a sub-dimension of the ‘Performance’ building block of the CBBE model was confirmed. Participants also recognised the dual relationships between the broker and the client and the relationship between the broker and the insurer.

Information and experience, as included in the conceptual framework (Figure 1.1), were deemed important.

In addition, trustworthiness, information and experiences contribute to ‘service empathy’. The additional dimensions were incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).

6.4.16a Price: awards - Q.15 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Participants were probed about whether they received rewards or incentives for being insured with a specific insurance house. This tested the applicability of the sub-dimension ‘price’ of the building block ‘Performance’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). None of the participants received any rewards or incentives:

No incentives (P2:379);
I don’t have a financial incentive as such (P5:337);
I don’t think anything ( P6:409);
I’m not aware of any (P7:539); and
I just don’t think … there are any rewards (P12: 479).

One participant considered the actual premium as the incentive:

The only incentive I’ve got is the premium payment process, … which has eased my life. Other than that, the rates. (P16:519, 523).

Another participant did not want an incentive:

I [do not] want an incentive. I just want the best possible price (P17:563).

6.4.16b Price: importance - Q.16 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Regarding 'price', a sub-dimension of the 'Performance' building block of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1), almost all participants replied that price was important, to some extent, when deciding on which insurance house to insure with. This is evident from some of the responses:

It all depends on the price at the end (P3:209);
Pricing is always important (P7:543);
from our point of view, it is important, okay because you know you always like try to pay … to get the best service, but pay the least for it okay as little as possible … what we actually try to do here is like still make sure that we have like sufficient cover [primary characteristics] for all of our areas and just get the best price for it (P4:623);
Look price is definitely a factor – I wouldn’t say it is the only factor that’s considered” (P6:413);
Yes, price is definitely important (P13:473);
Because in terms of costs and overheads, everything, you’ve got to take that into account in terms of premiums (P16:539); and
I think that there is an importance to it because everything is driven financially these days (P19:459).

Two participants summarised the reason why price is important as follows:

The price is important because we all really have to watch costs to be in the hospitality business. We’ve got fewer travellers, we’ve got more hotels. There’s much more pressure on room prices. We’re not able to increase prices at the same rate that our costs are increasing for electricity, for rates and for wages and if insurance increases at 10% per annum that is – first of all it’s above inflation and secondly we can’t recoup that in our prices to our guests. That’s why it’s important (P13:477); and
At the moment, really price is one of the main things that we look for, just in terms of the economy and the market and things like that (P7:547).
Some participants were not aware whether their insurance was expensive or did not have the time to investigate this:

I’ve learnt they’re expensive. I wasn’t as aware that they were so expensive until this year, I have to say (P13:493); and

I think pricing is very important. I think it becomes very difficult when you have such a big portfolio to insure because it’s very difficult and time consuming to go through every single item and actually say can we get this for R50 cheaper and can we get this for you know R100 cheaper, because it’s just too time consuming. And I don’t know if anyone actually really has the time to go through it. I mean there’s possibly other products out there, that they could even have other insurances within Santam that we could possibly be using that I don’t know about. But you know as a General Manager, I don’t have time to go and I’m trying to deal with the everyday running of the hotel and the guests and the, you know, the more important wise, that are classed as important things than you know, trying to save R10 on a new insurance for a TV for a room (P12:495).

At least one participant did compare insurance quotes to ensure that they are not paying too much:

... just every now and again gone out and looked for another quote, just to see, make sure that the – they’re on the same page, but ... haven’t done that for about three years now” (P20:532, 540).

Some participants cited price as the reason for selecting an insurer to insure with:

I sent an email cancelling ...I said well it’s on cost basis. I can save at least R2000, over R2000 a month (P13:281);

I was changing because of the price of the offer that was on the table (P13:293);

they [the broker] recommended that we change one of the policies, over and the main reason was cost saving (P7:367);

... they came forward and said listen, we recommend maybe you go for this you can save money (P 7:551); and

And based on the rates and based on how they tailored their insurance, it made sense to go with them ... they were considerably cheaper at the time as well, by about I think it was about – almost like – a 12 to 15% difference between Mutual and Federal and HIU (P19:423, 427).

While other participants made a link between price and service or payouts of claims:

Of course, the price is important and I try to keep costs to a minimum that includes of course the insurance as well. It is – the relationship between price and the service [service effectiveness'] that makes the whole package (P 2:389);
Because it also goes in terms of claims. Look there’s no point in us having an insurance house that gives us a reduced premium, but then we want to claim and then they just keep saying no, no it doesn’t qualify etcetera [‘product reliability’] (P6:417);

... the service and the cover is probably the most important, but I would say cost comes in very close second (P7:547) and

I would say price is probably 90% of the decision and 10% is integrity of the insurer [‘credibility’]... Integrity comes down to the portion that you get back, which is when you pay a claim and you’re going to get it back or not (P17:571, 575).

A few participants stated that they are prepared to pay a premium for good service:

I will rather go with Santam even if Santam is R200 more than another insurance company
I will rather go with Santam because I know what type of service I get from them (P3:317).

In contrast, some participants were not willing to pay a premium for undifferentiated offerings:

Why pay R500 more with Outsurance if Santam come down with R500. It’s just cash flow (P3:313);

Why pay 20% more if you’re going to get the same service and the response time as somebody else (P16:543); and

Well why would I want to pay more for the same product (P17:575).

Yet, three participants believed that price should not be a deciding factor, but that proper cover [‘primary characteristics’] should:

I think the price as such of a premium is – should be in the business point of view – quite irrelevant. It’s for me more substantial is to have the right cover, to have the right – have I chosen the right product because at the end it determines then if I’m going to lose out or if I’m going to win basically, only in a claims situation [‘product reliability’] (P5:349);

if it’s cheap insurance, don’t go there (P15:243); and

Well I believe you get what you pay for. That is just the hard facts of life. If you’re going to go with some fly by night insurance company that’s going to give you a rate of next-to-nothing, which is going to suit your pocket, but at the end of the day if the paw-paw hits the fan, then you’re not going to get out what you thought you would get out ... So to me if you need to pay, if the thing is of value to you and if you want quality of service, then you must pay for it. That is just what it comes down to (P18:432, 436).

Price can be secondary to business insurance clients’ requirements:

... if you deal with Americans or overseas clients ... those clients they require that your business is basically – is adequately insured in terms of third party liability. If somebody
falls down the stairs you’re going to be liable so that’s – there you need to be covered (P5:357, 361) [‘secondary features’].

Some insurers used price to delight their clients:

... you know a lot of insurance companies they charge you that 1% admin fee if you divide it over 12 months instead of paying once off annual premium and they were very accommodating. They’ve done it without the 1% admin and they’re happy to accept one monthly (P16:477);

... that’s one of the things that maybe I liked about B2 was the fact that we could have just renewed all three, you know contracts again. … because I’m not doing any research into it, but the fact that they came forward and said listen, we recommend maybe you go for this you can save money (P7:551);

... they haven’t for the last years, they haven’t pushed up their rates (P17:407); and

... their rates were very competitive (P16:645).

One participant was dissatisfied with the portion of the premium that went to the broker and the premium that was paid when compared to the amount that was claimed:

We pay close to a million rand a year in premiums, which the broker gets R200 000, which is quite ridiculous and over a four year period I think I might have claimed R400 000 (P17:423).

Another participant held the conviction that:

As long as you don’t claim, any insurance is basically a waste of money (P5:349).

6.4.16.1 Subconclusions

The responses to questions 15 and 16 of the interview guide confirmed the importance of the sub-dimensions ‘primary characteristics and secondary features’, ‘product reliability’, ‘service effectiveness’ and ‘price’ of the building block ‘Performance’. ‘Price’ influenced the participants’ ‘Judgments’ of ‘quality’ and ‘credibility’ of the insurer. These dimensions are highlighted in red text in Figure 6.29.

Even though ‘Salience’ in Figure 6.29 refers and was confirmed by the participants to be solely that of the broker, the ‘Performance’ sub-dimensions that were confirmed were all influenced by both the broker and the insurer. The insurer and broker both have an influence on ‘primary and secondary features because the insurer offers the actual insurance and the broker should ensure that everything that should be covered is in fact covered by and listed in the policy on the hotel’s behalf. Similarly, from the participant’s point of view their broker is responsible for ‘product reliability’ and to ensure pay-out if there is a claim, which is also the insurer’s responsibility. Both broker and insurer affect ‘service effectiveness’. All these sub-dimensions mentioned here
influence the participant’s ‘Judgments’ of ‘quality,’ ‘credibility’ and ‘satisfaction.’ Also, value, as opposed to price, in isolation, is a combination of ensuring that everything that should be covered is covered and included in the policy (‘primary characteristics and people’) so that when there is a claim, they will receive compensation/ pay-out (‘product reliability’) and the level of satisfaction (‘service effectiveness’).

Figure 6.29: Sub-dimensions of broker and insurer brand equity confirmed by Section C: Q.15 and Q.16 of interviews

6.4.17 Overall opinion and quality - Q.17 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
The importance of the sub-dimension ‘quality’ of the building block ‘Judgments’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1) was tested with this question.

Responses ranged from a simple ‘no problems’ response to providing useful insight into the sources of perceived ‘quality’ and even the consequences of quality.

I’ve actually had no, no problems at all (P19:487);
So far so good p16:559);
Just great (P15:359);
… my overall opinion of them is that they are very professional [a ‘Judgment’ based on other sub-dimensions]. They are very efficient. I haven’t had any hiccups with them
It’s just been smooth sailing with them. I just wish they could automate the claims process. Look we hardly claim but ja. They’re actually very forthcoming because I know normally with insurance companies they will try and find something. They just – and even if they don’t try and find something their whole demeanour, their whole attitude – the way that they like cross question you. It’s just not on, whereas you don’t get it from these people (P18:440, 444);

It’s very good quality. In terms of their speed when we renew the policy, they issue everything very quickly. They don’t try unethical things. I’ve never experienced anything unethical (P17:587, 591);

it definitely is a quality company [credibility] and yes it’s a premium product [superiority] in the industry (P13:481, 485); and

Santam is just it’s a very well established [history], professional company and it’s [product] reliable (P12:499).

A participant relayed an incident that could have had negative consequences for the hotel’s brand, but because they had quality insurance, they could distance them/ their brand from the incident.

We have had a very, very serious case here it’s a public liability case – I won’t go into details etcetera, and it became a legal matter because a crime was committed;

And we basically stood back and went hang on, we did everything in our power, from the hotel perspective, security wise, etcetera, etcetera that we can do and we’ve stepped back and we handed it all over to the insurance and we removed ourselves from it. Okay, it’s gone on for years and it involves an overseas guest and everything else. But literally it’s at arm’s reach from us. So you know it keeps our name out of the newspapers; and

It’s now completely an insurance case (P19:491, 495, 499) [product reliability].

The comment:

I’m impressed with them. … here’s no reason for me to look at another insurance company at the moment (P6:425)

indicates that quality influences loyalty.

### 6.4.17.1 Subconclusions

The sources and a result of ‘quality’ are indicated in Figure 6.30. This is based on the responses to question 17 of the interview guide. The importance of the sub-dimension ‘quality’ of the building block ‘Judgments’ was confirmed. ‘Credibility’, superiority’, ‘product reliability’, ‘service effectiveness and efficiency’, as well as ‘history’ sub-dimensions, were also confirmed.
Some of the responses indicate that the participant did not separate which part the broker and which part the insurer played in the process and levels of satisfaction. It is evident that both parties influence ‘service effectiveness and efficiency’, as well as the additional dimensions of processes, professionalism, demeanour and even ethics.

‘Quality’ is particularly interesting in the context of the present study because services, in contrast to products, cannot be experienced (Figure 1.1) and sensed to the same extent before purchase. This leads to a perceived increase in risk for the client. Therefore, the client’s ‘judgment’ of quality is greatly influenced by the extended marketing mix (Bhasin, 2011). Lovelock and Wirtz (2011: 48) suggest that recruitment, training and motivation of the people who deliver the service, together with well-designed processes, affect ‘service effectiveness’ and the brand experience. Also, owing to services’ intangibility, the physical evidence dimension provides tangible evidence of service quality. Physical evidence extends to the professionalism of the people who are involved. The authors even label service quality as an eighth ‘P’ to indicate its importance. Service quality aids differentiation, satisfaction and loyalty.
The extended marketing mix is overlaid onto the CBBE model in Figure 3.6. Once again, this highlights the importance of the people, processes and physical evidence dimensions to an amended services brand equity framework.

Marks of ownership (early form of branding) were used to identify origin or ownership and to indicate quality (Affinity Advertising, 2011: 7). Quality is thus one of the core dimensions of brand equity and a brand may be seen as a promise of quality, which leads to trust (Hotchkiss and Franken, 1923: 107-121, cited in Low and Fullerton, Keller, 2008: 17-18).

6.4.18 Feelings - Q.18 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
Question 18 solicited responses regarding the building block ‘Feelings’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). This building block includes the sub-dimensions ‘warmth’, ‘fun’, ‘excitement’, ‘security’, ‘social approval’ and ‘self-respect’.

Participants mentioned other sub-dimensions, including primary characteristics, service effectiveness, superiority, trust and price:

… well it’s professional, I think it’s very tailored [superiority] towards the particular market that we have. Like I say, they’re professional, we haven’t really had a problem with it [service effectiveness]. There’s been certainly no quibbles, no sort of like well you know if you had – you know everything is out there. In terms of the insurance cover [primary characteristics], the renewal, the takeover, I’ve had no hiccups (P16:565, 569);
I feel that they can look at certain things. Like automating the claims process. So if insurance companies can actually just look at what it is that they are doing differently [superiority] to the other competitors in their field, they will actually get very far (P18:464, 472);
Respect [trust]. Just you know it’s a busy relationship. They understand – they see the bigger picture. If - if – my one claim I had if – they saw the bigger picture. They’re going to keep me for the next 20/30 years, why sour the relationship for what was the value? I think it was something like R10 000 (P15:367);
The cover is sufficient [primary characteristics] that I’m not paying too much [price] that I don’t have a cover, which I’m never going to use, let’s say ten million rand - contents insured for ten million when I only have got five, five million rand so that is for me important and that it works. For me it’s important that if I have put a claim that I know a procedure [process] that I can phone these people or I can use this form and pass it for her and it’s handled [service efficiency, product reliability] (P5:385); and
I like my broker and the staff there, they are very friendly, very efficient and very caring … (P2:405).
Other participants felt that insurance is not personal, with no emotional attachments associated to it. Of importance is the cover, which is external to the participant without any emotional ['Feelings'] attachment:

... the type of questioning is very personal. It’s like how do you personally view this – how do you personally feel about that? People – I don’t think insurance is such a personal thing for people. It’s like if I pay x amount a month and whatever happens when I need to claim that’s my piece of mind monthly. If I get into a car crash or whatever, the insurance is going to cover it. I don’t think people view the insurance as such a personal thing, especially not in the market that we are today with Hippo, you can get a quote cheaper, month on month. So I think maybe move away from you know, the feelings and there’s a lot of questions around how you feel and what do you take personally. How you personally view this and I mean it’s not like my doctor. Do you know what I mean? It’s just insurance and they can be changed. Do you know what I mean? (P18:644);

I don’t get a nice warmly feeling from Santam ... But I just get that they are a professional company, which is you know, in my business you need to have professional people (P12:455);

I have no feelings (P7:443);

I do have feelings but not for my insurance company. Well for me it’s not relevant for me it’s – as I say – insurance is – it’s an important part of a business but it’s not something which bothers me on a daily basis (P5:373, 377); and

I didn’t – it’s just my insurance (P2:277).

6.4.18.1 Subconclusions

Feelings can be a differentiator, according to Landa (2006: 4), but based on the responses to question 18 of the interview guide, the building block ‘Feelings’ and none of the sub-dimensions of ‘warmth’, ‘fun’, ‘excitement’, ‘security’, ‘social approval and ‘self-respect’ were confirmed. This finding supports Kuhn et al.’s (2008: 40-58) finding that feelings do not play a role in B2B branding. They proposed that the brand-building block ‘Feelings’ should be replaced. This is in contrast to Anselmsson et al. (2014: 96) who found that rational and emotional aspects were important for brand equity. It is also contrary to Berry (2000: 128-130, 136), supported by O’Cass and Grace (2004: 257), who assert that a service brand should make an emotional connection with the intended audience and build connections between supporters. It was indicated earlier (Section 6.4.3) that for the present study, ‘user profiles’ or the importance of relating to typical users of the brand was, not confirmed.

However, other sub-dimensions were confirmed, as highlighted in red in Figure 6.31, including ‘superiority’, ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy’, ‘primary characteristics’, and ‘price’. These sub-dimensions are all from the rational side of the CBBE model.
Additional dimensions that were mentioned are people and their professionalism and processes. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).

Figure 6.31: Sub-dimensions of insurer brand equity confirmed by Section C: Q.18 of interviews

6.4.19 Engagement - Q.19 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
This question solicited responses regarding the sub-dimension ‘engagement’ of the building block ‘Resonance’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

Some participants would be willing to recommend the insurance house via word of mouth:

As much as I’m talking to you, I certainly would go, you know, promote them whether I’d go out and stand on a soap box, you know that’s not going to happen. within the industry if somebody came back to me and asked me about them, yes I’d promote them. Without a doubt (P19:511, 515, 519); and

I would definitely recommend Santam as an insurance company even though I know nothing about them, which is very strange (P12:379).
Some participants were not willing to invest any time:

- *I don't want to know them better (P17:623);*
- *As little time as possible. Not at all (P5:389, 397); and*
- *No it’s not that important to me and I’m not that curious (P2:409).*

One participant thought that it was not the client’s prerogative:

- *Me, as the client, I don’t need to go out and canvass to their business, you know or for them to get my business okay. I honestly feel that they should be coming to us and say this is the service we can offer and this is what, you know what we can do for you as the company and this includes all of these, it’s like the services, the caring, the etcetera you know (P4:663).*

And other participants felt that it was a broker’s function:

- *… I've relied on my broker to provide that input in terms of whether they’re going to be reliable to sort out claims, how strong they are, what their rating is, whether it’s a triple A or a double A (P16:595); and*
- *that’s why brokers are there because they make it easier and they make it – but at the same time you do wonder, even though I’ve had a very positive experience with them – you do wonder is this the best option for us. I wish I had time to be able to research it myself and I wish I had the knowledge to be able to necessarily, you know understand what else is out there and that sort of thing. I just – I don’t (P7:615).*

### 6.4.19.1 Subconclusions

Based on the responses to question 19 of the interview guide, the sub-dimension ‘engagement’ was not confirmed. In general, the participants were not eager to engage in any activities to get to know their insurer better. Most left it up to the broker to know the different insurance options available and most cited that they do not have the time to investigate their insurers as reason for this. This confirms the primary importance of the broker.

### 6.4.20 Attachment - Q.20 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question solicited responses regarding the sub-dimension (attitudinal) ‘attachment’ of the building block ‘Resonance’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

Responses can be grouped into those:

- that do not think that the insurance brand is part of who they are and the brand would not be missed if not insured with them:
  - *Not at all (P2:413, P5:397, P19, 523);*
  - *… they’re not a part of me … (P6:495)*;
I felt comfortable being insured with them. I don't feel less insecure not being insured with them (P13:525); In other words if they fell of the planet tomorrow would I feel hard done by or in any way? No (P17:643); and
… because like I say it's an entity that I don’t know (P19:531).

- that consider the insurer a business partner that can mitigate business related risks, but that the insurance brand has a behind-the-scenes presence: I see them as a business partner (P15:387, P17:651);
Health and safety of our guests affects our reputation. So regardless of what our legal requirements are – our reputation would suffer tremendously if something happened. So we need to make sure that what we have is correct ['primary characteristics'] (P7:635); and
… it’s behind the company, just supporting company, just in case you know. So like it’s just in case something goes wrong they’re there to kind of back us up (P12:603, P19:527).

Other respondents referred to values, trust and loyalty:

Well, in terms of values, I mean as long as they’re people orientated and it’s not all about money (P16:599, 603); and
Etana has always been the house that we’ve used. Crawford Dougall they’ve always been the insurance brokers. So they are sort of part of our make up. There is a level of trust. There is an understanding (P18:504).

6.4.20.1 Subconclusions

Based on the responses to question 20 of the interview guide, the sub-dimension 'attachment' was confirmed by one participant who had been with the same broker and insurer for an extended period, but was not confirmed by most participants. Other sub-dimensions that were confirmed are values, trust and loyalty, which are indicated in Figure 6.32.
6.4.21 Community - Q.21 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

This question solicited responses regarding the sub-dimension ‘community’ of the building block ‘Resonance’ of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

The responses show that none of the respondents knew any other businesses that were also insured with the same insurance brand, so they could not comment on their relationship with those businesses, which translates to not having a relationship with other hotels based on a shared insurance brand. This is supported by the following comments:

- I don’t know any other business (P2:421);
- … don’t know of other businesses (P6:501);
- … don’t know of other businesses that are insured with Lion of Africa Insurance (P16:615); and
- I’m not familiar with anybody else that’s insured with them (P18:516).
6.4.21.1 Subconclusions
Based on the responses to question 21 of the interview guide, the sub-dimension 'community' was not confirmed. No additional sub-dimensions were confirmed by the responses to this question.

6.4.22 Relationship with brokers/representatives - Q.22 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
This was an additional question, which was included to gain insight into the importance of the brokers and other representatives (Figure 6.1).
A participant mentioned the self-congruence of the sub-dimension 'user profiles' and a few referred to other sub-dimensions, including 'efficiency' and 'service effectiveness'. The importance of 'people' was also highlighted again:

Well the brokers are Swiss as well as myself. So there is – from that point of view there is the same cultural background and then they are very quick, efficient and very supportive and very – they have a very personalized service – so I know, I know everybody there you know they came here to introduce themselves and well with the owner of the company on my playing golf as well sort of once in a while. So it’s a very – it’s on a very personal level.

Yeah look this kind of personal side is not really necessary than my broker needs to be efficient, friendly, trustworthy, responsible. I don’t need to play golf with my broker. That is – I’d say it’s a bonus (P2:459, 461).

Participants referred to their relationship with the broker and not the insurance house, even though they are aware of the insurance house:

I can phone Sean at 12 at night and he will do whatever he needs to do to assist with my problem. He’s just 24/7 on my phone. Just saves me some time not dealing directly and giving him all the work to do, what I’m paying them for (P3:56, 421); and … they’re like an important link between you and the insurers (P4:763).

The broker can harm the relationship:

… really literally the broker that’s making the whole thing sour … it’s not a good relationship (P4:591, 691).

The broker needs to be knowledgeable:

I would say like I said knowledge, the knowledge of your business you know. If they don’t know they should know what is and this is ja – it’s like your broker (P4:759).

The relationship needs to be long-term or continuous:

… from a relationship point of view I would say they just need to be there you know, sort of like, for you when you – when you need them. I don’t say like you must phone me every
week or something like that, but even if they come around to you and just say you know like how’s everything? Is there any issues and stuff that you can think that we need to deal with or etcetera. I would say even if it’s every three months or six months. Just come and do a courtesy visit and actually see (P4:779, 783).

Another participant did not talk about the relationship, but rather about being able to trust the broker ['product reliability'] and the importance of having peace of mind ['feeling' of 'security']:

... taking the burden away of me worrying about the insurance because it’s not my business. It’s not my main business to be worried about insurance. I should be insured, that’s it and the broker shall take care about all the other stuff and give me the feeling and the confidence that I’m rightly insured. ... they’ve always been very professional (P5:493, 503).

Yet another talked about the broker’s professionalism and ‘efficiency’:

... they’ve always been very professional ... and prompt (P6:503, 511).

In general, the relationship between the client and the broker is open, proficient and direct:

Very, very open and available and I could call him on the weekends if I needed to (P7:643).

A respondent was happy with the assessor who is directly linked to the insurer:

... the assessors who come? I mean they are from a completely different firm he was fine, ... he was actually very helpful (P7:695, 707).

Clients value broker availability or accessibility (P12:723), promptness (P12:727), product knowledge (P13:609, P20:6840), knowledge about the client’s business (P18:540), reliability (P16:621), integrity (P16:621), trust ['empathy'] (P18:636), respect and understanding (P18:640), partnership (P19:547) and attention to detail (P12:731). A participant mentioned that he/ she would consider going back to a previous broker that was more ‘personable’ (P13:621). Respondents also referred to pricing (P16:635), length of their relationship with their broker (P16:617) and loyalty towards their broker:

We’ve got a certain amount of loyalty and that’s part of our values as well. We don’t just chop and change relationships for the sake of it ... (P16:641);

there is mutual respect that there’s an understanding, a mutual understanding that we’re not going to be unreasonable with them you know I mean it’s a two way street and ja that is what I would say the aspects are for me (P18:640);

No, very good. I think that that I could say there’s a partnership involved. They have an interest in our – I feel that they have an interest in our business and yes, you know, I’ve
never had any issues there. They’ve been marvellous. As I say, we’ve built up a relationship where you know, it’s first name terms and that type of thing (P19:547); and … you want to know that when you phone him up he can say to you sorry, you’re not insured, yes we can get that under this cover. We’ve had a problem the building has gone into the sea with the tsunami you need to be able to speak to someone who will say yes you are covered and here’s your claim form. Let’s get moving and they do that (P20:692).

6.4.22.1 Subconclusions

The sub-dimensions that were confirmed are ‘price’, ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy’ and ‘loyalty’, which are indicated in Figure 6.33. This indicates that, for the present study, the relationship was based purely on ‘Performance’ related aspects.

Figure 6.33: Sub-dimensions of broker brand equity confirmed by Section C: Q.22 of interviews

Other important dimensions that emerged from the responses were people and relationships. The people should be friendly (personable), trustworthy, responsible, knowledgeable (product knowledge and client business knowledge), professional, available, accessible, prompt, have integrity, be reliable, show respect and understanding. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).
The relationship with the broker is regarded as a partnership. This speaks to one of the differences between products and services, which is that the distance (of the relationship) between producer and end consumer is shorter for a service (or more intimate/ closer) (Aspara and Tikkanen, 2008: 46). The findings of the present study bear testimony to this and correlate with Lorette’s (2012) view that “a service is more about selling a relationship and the value of the relationship between the buyer and seller of the service”. The importance of interpersonal relationships and partnerships should be explicit. The fourth stage of Keller’s (2013: 108) CBBE model deals with relationships. Kuhn et al. (2008: 40-58) suggest that this should be replaced with partnership solutions.

Webster and Keller’s (2004: 397) view that the organisation-controlled brand architecture is most prominent was found to be true for the present study. The actual insurance offering (the policy) mostly carried the name of the insurer. But the reason that the authors offer this is not supported. The authors conclude that the organisation-controlled brand architecture is most appropriate because, for a B2B, the brand becomes the relationship between the seller and buyer. For the context of the present study, it was found that the insurance brand was secondary and the relationship was between the broker and the participants. From the end user’s point of view it was not found that differentiation was based on the supplier brand (the insurance brand) or the credibility of the supplier brand. These aspects were a level removed from the end consumer and behind or supporting the broker whose brand equity was primary. Also, to indicate the importance of the relationship aspect, Ambler (1995: 389) included the term in his definition of brand equity as “the sum of brand relationships with those in the market …”. Channel relationships is included as a dimension of Aaker’s (1996: 15-16) brand equity model under ‘other propriety propriety brand assets’.

6.4.23 Most favourable aspects of insurance house - Q.23 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

The importance of all/ any of the building blocks (‘Performance, Imagery, Judgments, Feelings, Resonance-strength, favourability) and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1), were tested with this question.

Participant A1 (P18) reported that:

*I don’t have to sit with a claim that I have to follow up every other day. I get results fast P18:556)*.

This issue confirms the sub-dimension ‘service effectiveness and efficiency. All the sub-dimensions that are confirmed are highlighted in red text in Figure 6.34.

Some participants (E1 and I1) regarded the best aspect of their insurance house to simply be that their hotel is covered:
That they cover my business with an insurance (P2:429);
I’m covered (P2:433); and
... they insured my business (P5:421).

This confirms the sub-dimension ‘primary characteristics’.

Another participant (M1) mentioned a feeling of security in the insurance house:

... gives me that ... feeling of security that it’s a strong company and I would imagine unlikely to fold you know in this day and age (P13:573); and
... that it’s been in business such a long time (P13:569).

This confirms the importance of the sub-dimensions ‘credibility’ and ‘history’, which are part of the ‘Judgments’ and ‘Imagery’ building blocks. The feeling of security refers to the owner of the insurance offering (the insurance house as an organisation) and not to ‘feelings’ as part of ‘personality’, which relates to the specific offering’s brand.

Participant J1 (P6) considered the fact that:

they’ve honoured our claims and a reasonable speed (P6:523)
as the most favourable aspect of the insurance house. These comments confirm the sub-dimensions ‘product reliability’ and ‘efficiency’, whereas product knowledge was considered the best aspect of the broker by (P20:648):

They know their subject. The guy in charge has been in the game a long time, know his subject so and I think that’s what you need. I can pick and ask him any question I like and he will give me an answer straight away.

Other participants (H1 and L1) responded by stating “I honestly don’t know” (P4:703) and “I don’t think there is one” (P12:655) in reference to the most favourable aspect of the insurance house with which their hotel is insured with.

6.4.23.1 Subconclusions

Based on the responses to question 23 of the interview guide, the sub-dimensions ‘primary characteristics’, ‘product reliability’, ‘service effectiveness and efficiency’, ‘history’ and ‘credibility’ were confirmed by the responses, which are indicated in Figure 6.34.

Product knowledge was also considered as being important by a participant.
6.4.24 Least favourable aspects of insurance house - Q.24 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Responses to this question also provided insight into the appropriateness of all/any of the building blocks (‘Performance’, ‘Imagery’, ‘Judgments’, ‘Feelings’ and ‘Resonance’) and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

Some participants (O1, J1 and P1) had no least favourable aspects to report on. Participant A1 (P18) did not appreciate the “Paperwork” (P18:560) [this refers to ‘process’] and suggested that: “they [insurer] can make their things web-based” (P18:564); because

Then it would be even easier and you get a reference number so that will like be your number every time you need to follow up then you can use that number. I think … Least favourable I would say is the fact that they can actually jack up their technology a bit. (P18:572).

Mutual & Federal was considered as being “slow and stingy” (P2:449), while Chartis … just expect you on the annual basis just to go with them and renew and there’s no presence throughout the year (P4:709).
The participant wanted the insurer to:

… be revising the business … because your business changed (P4:711); and
… they haven’t even come back and looked at any of those figures and stuff again (P4:715).

The participant felt that:

… you need to be re-assessed on a yearly basis to ensure that you know like your business interruption is – because that’s like the most important thing that all of those things are covered” (P4:719); and

What they had on there for business interruption was like so wishy-washy that if this hotel actually burnt down? You have to look at the fact that it will take you about six years to get this place back up and running, okay. They only covered this hotel for I think one year. So how can you do that? One year? (P4:723).

The participant questioned:

how well do they know our product because if they then couldn’t advise us properly on that how much do they actually advise on – on other things because that’s only one thing that we’ve picked up (P4:727).

These issues refer to ‘efficiency’, and ‘primary characteristics. In addition, some participants wanted the brokers to review their business’ insurance needs and to know their business.

Participant L1 (P12) felt that they “don’t know much about” Santam. That “they don’t come to you … I mean I’ve never had any documentation from Santam whatsoever” (P12:659).

This issue deals with the sub-dimension ‘credibility’ of the owner of the brand (the insurance house), which is part of ‘Judgments’. This sub-dimension will encourage spill-over effects of the insurance house’s brand to add to credibility and not just the influence of the intermediary’s brand.

BnB Sure was considered to be “expensive” (P13:577) by participant M1. This obviously relates to the sub-dimension ‘price’.

6.4.24.1 Subconclusions

The issues that were raised in this section by the participants are important, as they are issues that participants suggest the insurers can improve upon. These issues either confirm some the sub-dimensions of the CBBE model, or raise additional sub-dimensions that may be relevant. The responses to question 24 of the interview guide confirmed ‘Performance’ related sub-dimensions only, which are indicated in Figure 6.35.
The additional dimensions that were mentioned relate to processes and knowledge of the participant’s business. The additional dimensions have been incorporated into the amended client-based brand equity framework (Figure 6.39).

6.4.25 Unique - Q.25 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Responses to this question could provide justification for any of the sub-dimensions of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1).

Some participants did not think that their insurer was unique or lacked insurer brand knowledge:

- I don’t think there is something really unique, I don’t know them well enough to say – to find something unique (P2: 453); and
- No unique, nothing (P4: 737).

Some considered ‘product reliability’, ‘price’ and ‘service efficiency’ to define the insurers’ uniqueness:

- They pay (P15: 431);
- It’s always the 1% admin fee or I arrange finance to pay it over ten months and save myself the difference between the bit of interest and the 1% (P16:677); and
... the fact that they turn around the claims very, very quickly, that I just don’t know how they do it. I don’t know how other companies work, but I would say that’s quite a unique feature of the company to be able to turn around a claim for such a big company in such a short time (P12: 691).

Yet, others formed ‘Judgments’ of ‘quality’ based on ‘service effectiveness’ and ‘empathy’:

I think the quality of the service that they give us. They really treat us like we are their only client. Ja they treat us like time stands still if we contact them and they’ll move heaven and earth to get our thing done. Whatever it is needs – that needs to be done. So I think that is what I find unique, what stands out for me about them. Because you’d seldom get that in the insurance industry. You’re just another number. Another number in the queue (P18: 604, 608).

However, the most significant differentiator was specialization, which can relate to the ‘superiority’ sub-dimension:

... they’re specialized in the hospitality and the catering segment or industry (P 5:449); Unique is that they focus on the hospitality industry (P13: 589); So I think that focus would suggest to me that they know about what needs to be insured within this industry (P13: 593); They focus only on the hospitality industry (P17: 679); and HIU I think it’s because it’s an industry thing (P19: 595).

6.4.25.1 Subconclusions

The responses to question 25 of the interview guide confirmed ‘Performance’ and ‘Judgments’ related sub-dimensions for their insurer, which are indicated in Figure 6.35.
6.4.26a  Loyalty - Q.26 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Responses to this question provided insight into the relevance of the sub-dimension (behavioural) ‘loyalty’ of the ‘Resonance’ building block of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). Responses were categorised and are reported in Table 6.9:

Table 6.9: Likelihood to recommend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most definitely</td>
<td>P3, P5, P15, P17, P19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>P6, P7, P12, P13, P16, P20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most definitely not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though the question concerned the insurer, four participants responded by regarding the broker (indicated in bold in Table 6.9). One participant clarified the reason as being that they dealt with the broker and not the insurance house:

\[ \ldots \text{but obviously I wouldn't recommend HIC; I would recommend the broker. It's insignificant if it's HIC for me. It's for me is – the broker is for me more important (P5:457, 465).} \]

Most participants would either recommend the insurer or the broker to other businesses (11 to 12, depending on interpretation, of 13 participants). Only one participant would definitely not recommend the broker.

P18’s response was not included in the Table 6.9, because the participant would not recommend the insurance brand, in general, but would recommend it to a specific market segment:

\[ \text{I would probably not recommend Etana because they are quite pricey. If you're looking at, you know, more high profile clients you know with properties like we have, then I would definitely recommend (P18:616, 624).} \]

6.4.26b Loyalty - Q.27 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Question 27 provided additional insight into the importance of the ‘loyalty’ sub-dimension of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1). This question was only relevant to one participant who answered ‘definitely not’ to question 26.

The participant apportioned blame to the broker and not the insurance brand and was not satisfied with the broker’s service:

\[ \ldots \text{because in my mind it's actually more the actual broker that's not doing their job or actually fulfilling their role in a proper way … they're sort of like always like very vague in the reasons as to why certain things are not being done (P4:575, 583).} \]

6.4.26.1 Subconclusions

The (behavioural) ‘loyalty’ sub-dimension of the CBBE model was confirmed by almost all participants. Loyalty is considered important to Aaker (1996: 15-16), hence he assigns one of the five dimensions of his brand equity model to it. Keller (Figure 6.1) includes it as a sub-dimension of the 'Resonance' brand-building block and as the objective of stage 4 of his CBBE model. The present study supports the view that loyalty is a consequence of brand equity rather than an antecedent thereof. Brand loyalty is the likelihood of repeat purchase, which correlates with sales and future profit (Aaker, 1991: 39-41). The ultimate aim of the present study can be seen as providing a framework to enhance brand equity in order to improve brand loyalty. The ‘experience’ component of the conceptual framework (Figure 1.1) of the present study is inextricably linked to
brand loyalty (Aaker, 1991: 41-42). Furthermore, the ‘loyalty’ dimension is supported by the people component (Aaker, 1991: 39).

The ‘price’ and ‘service effectiveness’ sub-dimensions were also confirmed.

6.4.27 Engagement - Q.28 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)
Responses to this question provided insight into the ‘people’ dimension. This was an additional question, as indicated in Figure 6.1.

The responses indicated that participants valued insurance subject knowledge. They spoke of a relationship and partnership with their broker and that their broker knew them (their business) and trusted them and that there should be interpersonal relationships:

Knowledge of the subject, integrity. Well those items are very important because you want to know that when you phone him up he can say to you sorry, you’re not insured, yes we can get that under this cover. … you need to be able to speak to someone who will say yes you are covered and here’s your claim form (P20:684, 692);

I think that that I could say there’s a partnership involved. They have an interest in our – I feel that they have an interest in our business … we’ve built up a relationship … (P19:547);

… they know us like the palm of their hand (P18:540);

The aspects I would say is that there’s trust (P18:636);

… interpersonal … I can identify the face you know. It’s a phone call and it’s not a case of if you phone there’s some call centre for instance (P19:623, 629, 633); and it’s probably actually really knowing the person in control of your assets and it’s a trusting relationship. They know if I’m going to claim – it’s not bullshit (P15:443).

Availability, reliability, integrity, professionalism and promptness of the broker were also important:

I suppose he’s available 24 hours a day. I pick up my phone and phone … he answers the phone, no matter what he’s doing (P17:699);

… his reliability, his integrity. I suppose he, ja I think those are the two key issues because party to that is the way the claims are being processed and all that, but the integrity and the reliability covers all those aspects of what he does for us (P16:725); and

Well I mean they act professionally and they’re very prompt with their responses, which is obviously important (P6:555).

One of the functions of the broker in terms of dealing with the insurance houses, was also valued:

Just saves me some time not dealing directly and giving him all the work to do, what I’m paying them for (P3:421).
From the comments above, it is evident that the people dimension was very relevant and important to the participants.

6.4.28a  Suggested changes to interview guide and/ or survey - Q.29 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Respondents were, in general, happy with the questions from the interview guide:

- I think the questions were appropriate. Were sharp, were clearly formulated (P2:465, 469) completely clear (P19:645); and
- … there’s no ambiguity. I think that it is pretty straightforward. I’m very interested to know where it’s going. And yes I actually thought it was going to take quite a bit longer (P19:649).

Two participants felt that the questions were repetitive:

- Don’t repeat the same questions (P3:429); and
- … one question that was – that I felt was a bit like repetitive (P4:795).

Other participants felt that the questions were difficult, long and too many:

- It’s difficult questions. It’s a lot – I don’t know it’s almost like you try to establish a personal relationship instead of a professional relationship and it’s not and in Afrikaans [Lang]. It’s in-depth questions. I had to think (P15:459).

Another participant mentioned the distance between the client and the insurance house:

- … a lot of questions about HIC, the insurance house, I actually couldn’t answer or properly answer it because I don’t know about them (P5:501).

One participant explained that he/ she felt that the questions were too personal and that this was not appropriate; that insurance was not personal and that feelings did not play a part:

- … the type of questioning is very personal. It’s like how do you personally view this – how do you personally feel about that? People – I don’t think insurance is such a personal thing for people. It’s like if I pay x amount a month and whatever happens when I need to claim that’s my piece of mind monthly. If I get into a car crash or whatever the insurance is going to cover it. I don’t think people view the insurance as such a personal thing, especially not in the market that we are today with Hippo, you can get a quote cheaper, month on month. So, I think maybe move away from you know, the feelings and there’s a lot of questions around how you feel and what do you take personally. How you personally view this and I mean it’s not like my doctor … It’s just insurance and they can be changed … (P18:644).
In order to assess all the CBBE model’s dimensions, it necessitated a lengthy interview guide with many questions. The questions were also in-depth as means to obtain relevant information. Participants were also encouraged to understand whether they had a personal relationship with and feelings for their business insurance brands, because these are deemed to be important for branding. This made the interviews mentally taxing for the participants, but they coped and their responses proved valuable.

6.4.28b Any other comments - Q.30 of amended interview guide (Appendix 2)

Most participants had no additional comments and others repeated comments from the previous question:

They’re some difficult questions (P12:247); and
… it’s almost like the questions are repeating (P15:395).

6.5 CONCLUSION

There seems to be two interrelated brand equity frameworks, which are involved with brand building for short-term B2B insurance, namely an insurance brand equity framework (between insurer and broker) and a broker brand equity framework (between broker and end user client). Figure 6.37 indicates all confirmed sub-dimensions (in red text) of insurer brand equity, as summarised in the subconclusions sections throughout this chapter. Even though the ‘Salience’ brand building block and the sub-dimensions ‘category identification’ and ‘needs satisfied’ were confirmed for insurer brand equity, as mentioned in the analysis elsewhere in the chapter, it did not matter whether the client was aware of the insurer brand. What mattered was whether the broker was aware of the insurer brand and whether the participant was aware of the broker brand. Therefore, as far as the ‘Salience’ aspect of the insurer brand is concerned, the insurance houses need to ensure that the brokers are aware of their brand, that the insurer is an option within the short-term business insurance sector and that the brokers know what the insurers’ offerings entail.

The insurer ‘Performance’ sub-dimensions that were confirmed all support the broker brand equity. The insurer has an influence over the ‘primary characteristics and secondary features’, or what is covered by the insurance policy. The insurer provides the cover, but the client specifies their requirements to the broker. Similarly, the insurer influences the ‘product reliability’ sub-dimension or whether a claim against the insurance policy will be paid or repudiated. But the client will submit the claim to the broker and follow up with the broker. The insurer also affects ‘service effectiveness and efficiency’ if the insurer is slow or ineffective when responding to the broker. ‘Price’ is a combination of the insurer’s cost plus the broker’s fee, but is probably mostly under the insurer’s control. However, the broker presents the quote to the client for the items included in the policy. The only sub-dimension under the ‘Performance’ building block where the insurer has a direct connection or impact on the client, is when the insurer’s assessor visits the client. In this instance,
the assessor can directly affect the client’s perception of the ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy’ sub-dimension.

According to the present study, the insurer’s ‘Imagery’ sub-dimensions do not matter to the client. The insurance is bought through a broker (which refers to the ‘purchase situation’ sub-dimension) and the client has almost no direct interaction with the insurer. As mentioned, the broker has full control as to which insurance brand is purchased, so even though some of the participants could mention some of the insurers’ ‘personality and values’ and ‘history’ sub-dimensions, this does not impact the situation. The present study found that, as far as the insurance brand to client link is concerned, the insurance brand does not have to build brand awareness or attach image associations to their brand in the client’s mind. The insurance brand should be registered and associations attached in the broker’s mind.

Furthermore, even though the participants could judge the ‘quality’, ‘credibility’ and ‘superiority’ of the insurance brand, it did not have a direct link to the client. The participant judged the ‘quality’ and ‘credibility’ of the broker, as they deal exclusively with the broker. The insurers have an impact on these judgments.

All the sub-dimensions of insurer brand equity that were confirmed, as indicated in Figure 6.37, can have an impact on how well the broker’s brand is perceived by the client. But, these are all a layer removed from the client. The client’s interaction, level of satisfaction, relationship and ultimate loyalty, is with the broker.
6.5.1 **How research objectives have been met**

The primary research objective of the present study was to develop a brand equity framework that guides the strategic brand management process for short-term business insurance. To achieve the primary objective, three secondary research objectives were developed. The first secondary objective was to identify the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model that are confirmed for short-term business insurance. As mentioned earlier, the present study found that there are two brand equity frameworks involved, namely between the insurer and broker (insurer brand equity) and between the broker and client (broker brand equity). In this context the first secondary objective was achieved by the present study and Figure 6.37 indicates the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions that were confirmed for insurer brand equity, while Figure 6.38 indicates all brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of broker brand equity that were confirmed (in red text). These figures are a combination or overlay of all the sub-dimensions, which were confirmed in the subconclusions of the chapter.
The second secondary research objective for the present study was to identify the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model that are not confirmed for short-term business insurance. Similar to the first secondary objective, the secondary objective was met by referring to both insurer and broker brand equity and these sub-dimensions and building blocks are indicated as faded grey text in Figures 6.37 and 6.38.

Because the relationship between the client and broker was deemed to be the primary relationship for the present study, an attempt will be made to explain why some dimensions were not confirmed for broker brand equity. Figure 6.38 indicates all the building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model (Figure 3.3) that were confirmed for broker brand equity (in red) and those that were not confirmed (in faded grey). Direct quotations from participants and academic sources have been used throughout Chapter 6 to justify the confirmation of the dimensions. Possible reasons for the nonconfirmation of some of the broker brand equity dimensions are considered next, per building block:
‘Performance’:

‘Durability’ – refers to the economic lifespan of a product. Short-term business insurance does not have an economic lifespan like a car, for example. ‘Durability’ was not applicable to broker brand equity;

‘Serviceability’ – a product can be repaired when it breaks. This does not apply to short-term business insurance or to broker brand equity;

‘Style & design’ – refer to size, shape, colour and material used. These do not apply to short-term business insurance or to broker brand equity;

‘Imagery’:

‘User profile’ – participants indicated that they are mostly not aware of who their competitors chose as insurers. The researcher suspects that self-image congruence is not an issue in the context of the present study (brokers offering B2B service); unlike in B2C, where consumers are more aware of the brands with which their reference group associate;

‘Usage situation’ – refers to where and when the product is consumed; the time of day, indoor or outdoor, and formal or informal. Short-term business insurance is not, for example, seasonal; it is not purchased more often at certain times of the year. ‘Usage situation’ was not applicable to broker brand equity;

‘Personality’ & ‘values’ – these subdimensions were not confirmed for broker brand equity. Part of the reason for this may be because brand personality can be influenced by the sub-dimensions ‘user profiles’ and ‘usage situation’, which have not been confirmed by the present study. However, personality traits and values were mentioned when describing the brokers’ representatives. Therefore, the ‘personality’ subdimension was retained, but included as a subdimension of the ‘People’ building block;
• ‘History, heritage & experiences’ – the researcher suspects that the reason why these subdimensions were not found to be important is because broker brand building was lacking;

• ‘Judgments’:
  ‘Consideration’ – no explanation is evident and this should be explored;
  ‘Superiority’ – a possible reason may be because brokers are seen as undifferentiated. This may be owing to a lack of broker brand building;

• ‘Feelings’:
  participants did not have emotional connections with their brokers and regarded brokers as being separate from them;

• ‘Resonance’:
  ‘Attachment’ – the researcher suspects that the reason why attitudinal ‘attachment’ was not confirmed for brokers is because ‘feelings’ were not confirmed. ‘Attachment’ is deeper than ‘loyalty’; it has to do with loving the brand, which involves feelings;
  ‘Community’ – participants were mostly unaware of who their competitors’ insurers were (‘user profile’ subdimension lacking), so they could not have a sense of kinship with other users and
  ‘Engagement’ – the researcher suspects that because ‘feelings’, ‘attachment’ and ‘community’ subdimensions were lacking, ‘engagement’ did not happen.

The dimensions above have not been confirmed by the present study and, if omitted from the CBBE model, it results in Figure 6.39.
The third secondary research objective of the present study was to establish what other brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions may be relevant to B2B services. Because participants only mentioned additional dimensions for broker brand equity and no additional dimensions for insurer brand equity, the third secondary objective was met for broker brand equity only. When the additional sub-dimensions that were uncovered by the present study (that are summarised in the subconclusions throughout the chapter) are added to the content of Figure 6.39, it results in the amended CBBE framework for the short-term business insurance. This framework is depicted in Figure 7.1 and is called the client-base brand equity (CL-BBE) framework for short-term business insurance.
CHAPTER 7
THE CLIENT-BASED BRAND EQUITY FRAMEWORK: DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

7.1 INTRODUCTION
Chapter 6 presented and interpreted the empirical interview data. This process provided answers to the three secondary research questions, namely:

- Which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are confirmed for short-term business insurance? (indicated in red text in Figures 6.37 – for insurer brand equity and 6.38 – for broker brand equity);
- Which of the brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are not confirmed for short-term business insurance? (indicated in faded grey text in Figures 6.37 – for insurer brand equity and 6.38 – for broker brand equity); and
- Which other brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions may be relevant to short-term business insurance? (indicated in red text in Figure 7.1, which is based on the finding contained in the subconclusions throughout Chapter 6).

The result of answering the above mentioned three secondary research questions achieved the primary research objective, which was to develop a brand equity framework that guides the strategic brand management process for selected B2B services (short-term business insurance in this instance). As the outcome of the present study, it was realised that there seems to be two interrelated brand equity frameworks that are involved with brand building for short-term business insurance.

From the client’s perspective, there is a framework that guides brand building between the broker and the client (primary framework building the broker’s brand equity in the client’s mind, Figure 7.1), while ‘behind’ the broker there is brand building between the broker and the insurance house (secondary framework, Figure 6.37). For the secondary framework only the first two secondary research questions could be answered, namely, which sub-dimensions of the CBBE model are confirmed and, which are not confirmed. No additional brand-building blocks or sub-dimensions were identified. The secondary framework concludes with these findings, as shown in Figure 6.37. It was evident from the research that, from a client of short-term business insurance’s point of view, the relationship between the broker and client was most important and relevant. The main conceptual contribution of the present study was, therefore, the proposal of the primary framework, which is called the CL-BBE framework, to guide strategic brand building between broker and client, and which is depicted as Figure 7.1. The CL-BBE framework is discussed next, followed by
recommendations to guide broker organisations towards more effective brand equity management. Finally, limitations of the study are mentioned.

7.2 CONCEPTUAL CONTRIBUTION: THE CLIENT-BASED BRAND EQUITY FRAMEWORK FOR SHORT-TERM BUSINESS INSURANCE

As stated in Chapter 1 (section 1.2), even though some of the most valuable brands are B2B brands (Interbrand, 2011; Glynn, 2012: 666), the majority of branding research is located within B2C markets, with limited B2B research. The CBBE model is one of the most prominent branding models that is available in the literature, and the intention is for the CBBE model to be applicable to any and all contexts (Keller, 2001: 3; cited in Kuhn et al., 2008: 41; O'Cass & Grace, 2004: 257), but the appropriateness and applicability of this remain in question (Christodoulides et al., 2015: 320). There is thus a gap (disagreement) in the literature regarding whether the CBBE model is applicable to B2B (Leek and Christodoulides, 2011: 8). The framework presented as Figure 7.1, namely the client-based brand equity (CL-BBE) framework for short-term business insurance between broker and hotel client, is the outcome of the present study’s primary research question, which was: what would constitute a brand equity model, as a strategic brand management instrument, for B2B services? This contributes to the amendment of a major brand equity model by applying the CBBE model to a selected B2B services context.
Different coloured text was used in Figure 7.1. The brand-building blocks and sub-dimensions in black text are those that were confirmed and retained from the CBBE model (Figure 6.1), while those in red text are additional building blocks and sub-dimensions that have been added by the present study and the sub-dimension in green text is merely a name change from that, which was used in the CBBE model. The CL-BBE framework consists of five brand-building blocks, namely ‘Salience’, ‘Service Performance’, ‘People’, ‘Judgments’ and ‘Relationships’.

7.2.1 Salience
The ‘Salience’ brand-building block of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1) was confirmed and retained in its entirety in the CL-BBE framework, including both sub-dimensions; ‘category identification’ and ‘needs satisfied’. Biong and Sikoset (2014: 171) confirm the creation of B2B brand awareness as the most common brand management strategy with brand awareness and brand associations as important drivers. Brand awareness and brand associations are confirmed by Kim and Hyun (2011: 435). However, as an amendment to the CBBE model and Kuhn et al.’s. (2008: 40-58) findings, the brand equity of the broker brand (present study/ CL-BBE framework) is more important that the individual brand (CBBE model) or the brand of the insurer/ organisation brand (Kuhn et al., 2008: 40-58). ‘Salience’ in Figure 7.1 refers to the prominence of the broker brand. ‘Salience’ has to do with the brand achieving prominence in the client’s mind. This is achieved by establishing brand awareness; both brand recognition and brand recall. It associates the needs that the brand satisfies and the category that the brand operates in to the brand node in the consumer’s mind. This is achieved through the use of various brand elements, which were explained in detail in Chapter 3 and summarised in Figure 3.5. For the present study, the offering provides peace of mind that a potential financial loss is covered and the offering resides in the short-term business insurance category.

The hierarchical effect, that ‘Salience’ is the foundation building block, followed by associations and other dimensions, is supported by Martinez and de Chernatony (2013: 69), as well as Christodoulides et al. (2015: 320).

7.2.2 Service Performance
The ‘Performance’ brand-building block of the CBBE model (Figure 6.1) was renamed ‘Service Performance’ in the CL-BBE framework (Figure 7.1) because the short-term B2B insurance offering approaches a pure service. It deals with the actual service that is rendered. Ryan and Silvanto (2013: 48, 49) also use the term service performance and regard it as a dimension of B2B brand equity. Most of the sub-dimensions of the CBBE model’s ‘Performance’ brand-building block were confirmed in the present study, as was the case with the study by Kuhn et al. (2008: 40-58). The sub-dimensions that were retained in the CL-BBE framework are: ‘primary characteristics and...
secondary features’, ‘product reliability’, ‘service effectiveness, efficiency and empathy’ and ‘price. In the CBBE model the sub-dimension ‘service effectiveness and efficiency’ and ‘product reliability’ includes the processes dimension. For the CL-BBE framework, ‘processes’ was spun off as a separate sub-dimension to give proper relevance to the importance of the processes that support the service related sub-dimensions. The CBBE model’s ‘usage situation’ sub-dimension was incorporated into this building block and renamed ‘distribution’. ‘Servicescape’ was added as an additional sub-dimension. All the sub-dimensions that were confirmed were explained in detail in Chapter 3 and summarised in Figure 3.5. Here the sub-dimensions will be related to the present study’s B2B service context; being a broker-hotel short-term insurance context:

- Primary characteristics: refer to the specific items that are covered under the business short-term insurance policy. For example, hotel furniture and vehicles;
- Secondary features: are the additional, non-standard/ customised items that are covered under the business short-term insurance policy. For example, public liability insurance;

The 2007 to 2009 financial crisis reduced the importance of customisation (‘secondary features’), which resulted in clients only using financial services providers for the fundamental financial services offerings. ‘Primary characteristics’ was thus found to be of fundamental importance (Theron *et al.*, 2013: 41).

- Product reliability: deals with whether the business insurance policy will be honoured when there is a claim against the policy. This is similar to Sarin’s (2014: 99) models delivery dimensions;
- Service effectiveness: according to the CBBE model, service effectiveness means degree of satisfaction. For the CL-BBE framework, service effectiveness and satisfaction are treated as two sub-dimensions. Service effectiveness refers to whether the service which is rendered has produced the desired result. For example, if a client sends an email to the insurance broker requesting that his or her policy be amended and the amendment is successfully and correctly made then the service was effective. The judgment that the client makes based on the effectiveness of the service or the pleasure that the client derives from this is accounted for under the sub-dimension ‘satisfaction’, which is part of the ‘Judgments’ brand-building block;
- Service efficiency: the promptness with which the service is rendered. For example, the time that lapses from submitting a claim to the time that the claim is settled. This supports Ha *et al.*’s (2010: 923-924) suggestion that improved efficiency will enhance client satisfaction, which will enhance service brand equity;
- Service empathy: has to do with how the service is delivered; whether the service provider cares about the client;
- Processes: is part of the extended marketing mix and includes all processes that support the service that is rendered. This includes the documentation involved with the claim submission process;

- Price: the policy premium and related aspects. Ryan and Silvanto (2013: 48, 49) include price as a dimension of B2B brand equity. This aligns with Parry et al.’s (2012: 899) finding that price was a critical issue for B2B services. The price should be competitive, relative to that of competitors and is traded off against other sub-dimensions such as service and trust. Price is also an indicator of unobservable quality (Biong & Silkoset, 2014: 178). ‘Service’, ‘trust’ and ‘quality’ dimensions of B2B service brand equity are included as sub-dimensions of the ‘Judgments’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework (Figure 7.1). Sarin’s (2014: 99) model also includes a price dimension;

- Distribution: is called purchase situation in the CBBE model, but is more commonly known as place, as part of the marketing mix. It refers to the channel of distribution, be it the broker’s office, online or a call centre; and

- Servicescape: the ambience and other aspects of the physical environment in which the service is delivered. Geigenmuller and Bettis-Outland’s (2012: 432) study confirm the importance of providing a pleasant and appropriate physical environment for B2B services. This refers to location and functionality, or infrastructure.

### 7.2.3 People

Based on the findings of the present study, a ‘People’ brand-building block was added to the CL-BBE framework in Figure 7.1, together with the following sub-dimensions:

- Attitude: the service providers’ internalised way of thinking and feeling, which informs their behaviour towards the client. For example, a conscious decision and commitment to deliver professional service and to be approachable;

- Demeanour: is the outward behaviour of the service providers towards the client. For example, a friendly demeanour;

- Personality: the characteristics and qualities of the service providers’ character. For example, having an engaging personality;

- Values: the service providers’ principles or standards of behavior. This refers to a way of doing business; of what is acceptable and what is not;

- Personableness: having a pleasant personal appearance and manner;

- Product knowledge: having an understanding of the insurance policy that includes what should be covered, exclusions and special precautions/requirements; and

- Client knowledge: being familiar with the client as an individual and their business needs.
Salespersons (included as part of the ‘People’ brand-building block of the adapted CL-BBE framework in Figure 7.1) is central to B2B service brands and enhance partnership relationships (which is included as part of the ‘Relationships’ brand-building block of the adapted CL-BBE framework in Figure 7.1), as long as the service satisfies a client need (included as part of the ‘Salience’ brand-building block of the adapted CL-BBE framework in Figure 7.1). This enhances the experience dimension, as depicted at the centre of the conceptual framework of Figure 1.1 (Pop et al., 2011: 100-101). B2B service client experience influences all brand equity dimensions (Biedenbach & Marell, 2012: 455). The ‘People’ brand-building block and the processes sub-dimension (of the ‘Service performance’ building block) of the new CL-BBE framework (Figure 7.1) are supported by Sichtmann et al. (2011: 16), as well as Geigenmüller and Bettis-Outland’s (2012: 432) findings that capable, motivated and trained human resources and standardised work processes support service quality (a sub-dimension of the ‘Judgments’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework in Figure 7.1).

The present study supports Lakshmi and Santhi’s (2015: 79) finding that staff’s physical appearance contributes to perceived service quality for B2B brands. These findings are included in the sub-dimension personableness of the ‘People’ building block, and service quality of the ‘Judgments’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework in Figure 7.1.

Parry et al.’s (2012: 896) finding that service quality, professionalism and understanding are important attributes of B2B service brand equity is supported by the present study and included as the sub-dimension service quality of the ‘Judgment’ building block and the sub-dimensions ‘attitude’ and ‘client knowledge’ of the ‘People’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework (Figure 7.1). The importance of the B2B ‘People’ building block is supported by what Gupta et al. (2010: 399-400) found and called brand personified. Ryan and Silvanto’s (2013: 48) findings support the ‘client knowledge’ sub-dimension as far as representatives needing to understand the consumer’s situation and concerns.

The inclusion of the ‘Performance’ and ‘People’ building blocks justify He and Li’s (2011: 92) finding that functional, as well as human aspects contribute towards service brand equity.

7.2.4 Judgments

The client forms opinions, which are based on the previous three brand-building blocks and all associations attached to the brand, as explained in Chapter 3. The ‘Judgments’ sub-dimensions include:

- Service quality: the client assesses the service, which is delivered against their expectations and forms an opinion of the degree of quality. Sarin’s (2014) model also includes service and quality dimensions;
- Credibility and trust: the degree to which the client believes in and trusts the broker; and
- Satisfaction: the level of satisfaction is based on service quality/ how well the service was performed.

As with the CBBE model, there is a cascading effect or sequence to the sub-dimensions of the ‘Judgments’ building block, which means that service quality affects credibility and trust, which affects satisfaction.

The findings that culminated in the new CL-BBE framework (Figure 7.1) is aligned to the findings of Kim and Hyun (2011: 434-435), Ha et al. (2010: 925) and He and Li (2011: 93) who found that perceived service quality (a sub-dimension of the ‘Judgments’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework) is pivotal to the creation of service brand equity, and that the marketing programme activities enhance brand image (included as ‘Service performance’ in the CL-BBE framework), which affects, perceived quality. The present study contributes to He and Li’s (2001: 81) concern that little research has been conducted to link service quality to service brand equity. Sichtmann et al. (2011: 17) also suggest that service employee training enhances service quality for B2B services.

Ryan and Silvanto (2013: 48, 49) include quality and trust as dimensions of B2B brand equity. Biong and Sikoset (2014: 171) found perceived quality to be one of the B2B brand equity drivers. Ha et al. (2010: 924) found an explicit link between perceived quality and brand loyalty through satisfaction in a services context. The current study supports these findings as quality, trust and satisfaction are included as sub-dimensions of the ‘Judgments’ building block, and in a hierarchical order of: ‘service quality’; ‘credibility and trust’; and ‘satisfaction’.

The current study’s findings are also supported by Lakshmi and Santhi (2015: 79) who found that, for insurance services, the reliability of the offering (which is ‘product reliability’ of the ‘Service performance’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework), the physical evidence (‘servicescape’ of the ‘Service performance’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework), and how people deliver the service (included as part of the ‘People’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework), affect service satisfaction.

As found by Geigenmuller and Bettis-Outland (2012: 432), the CL-BBE framework includes the sub-dimension ‘needs satisfied’ as part of the ‘Salience’ brand-building block, which influences the ‘Judgments’ building block’s sub-dimension ‘satisfaction’. Geigenmuller and Bettis-Outland (2012: 432) also reported that service ‘processes’, ‘efficiency’ and ‘effectiveness’ are important and lead to ‘satisfaction’. Supporting the importance of these dimensions, Pop et al. (2011: 99) found that availability, responsiveness, reliability, completeness and professionalism impacted satisfaction. These dimensions are included in the new CL-BBE framework as ‘distribution’, ‘service
effectiveness and efficiency’, ‘product reliability’ (all sub-dimensions of the ‘Service performance’ building block), and ‘attitude and demeanour’ (sub-dimensions of the ‘People’ building block).

7.2.5 Relationships

An additional brand-building block was added to the CL-BBE framework called ‘Relationships’. This is supported by Kuhn et al. (2008: 40-58) who found that sales force relationships was an important dimension that should be included in an amended brand equity framework. The CL-BBE framework extends this finding to include relationships with all representatives of the organisation who are involved with rendering the service. The two sub-dimensions of the ‘Relationships’ building block are:

- Interpersonal: the personal relationship between the client and the broker’s representatives based on business interaction; and
- Partnerships: broker and client working together towards achieving a common goal.

Because interaction with clients is intimate and trust is required for B2B services, while meaningful and beneficial interpersonal relationships can enable the formation of longer-term partnerships (Natti & Palo, 2012: 1837; Glynn, 2012: 666). Biedenbach and Marell (2010: 455) confirm the importance of direct interaction between B2B service providers and clients and the impact on service brand equity. Sarin’s (2014: 99) B2B equity model includes relationships as a dimension.

The pinnacle of the CBBE model is the ‘Resonance’ brand-building block (Figure 6.1). Of the four sub-dimensions, only ‘Loyalty’ towards the broker was confirmed by the present study. The present study supports Aaker’s (Table 3.1) view that brand loyalty can be considered both as a dimension of brand equity and an outcome of brand equity, hence the decision to omit the ‘Resonance’ building block from the new CL-BBE framework. The outcome or result of the CL-BBE framework can be brand loyalty. Taylor et al. (2004: 218) also found brand equity and trust to be antecedents of ‘loyalty’. Biedenbach and Marell (2010: 455) found a hierarchy of effects from brand associations to perceived quality to brand loyalty. The new CL-BBE framework conceptually supports these findings, as brand associations (represented by the ‘Service performance’ and ‘People’ brand-building blocks) lead to service quality and trust ‘Judgments’, which lead to brand loyalty. For B2B services, loyalty seems to be conditional upon a number of sub-dimensions. Satisfaction at a competitive price is important to achieve loyalty because at some point cost saving will dislodge satisfied clients that are loyal. Loyalty, satisfaction and service quality are linked for B2B services. Loyal, satisfied clients may switch to a competing brand owing to perceived better service quality. Similarly, satisfied B2B services clients may become disloyal owing to perceived improved efficiency of a competitor. Relationship appeal positively affects loyalty (Theron et al., 2013: 41), but perceived better relationships may lead to the switching of brand loyalty (Naumann et al., 2010: 892-894) for B2B services. The new CL-BBE framework accounts for these hierarchies; between price and satisfaction, between perceived service quality and satisfaction, and between efficiency.
and satisfaction, as indicated in Figure 7.1, which can then lead to loyalty. The new CL-BBE framework also aligns to Ha et al.’s (2010: 923) position that brand associations (included as ‘service performance’ in the CL-BBE framework), perceived quality, satisfaction and loyalty are important aspects of B2B service brand equity. B2B brand equity is affected by relationships and partnerships (Hallmann et al., 2015: 272, 274). Ryan and Silvanto (2013: 48, 49) confirm the importance of long-term relationships for B2B brands. Also, relationships are underpinned by trust and understanding clients for B2B services (Parry et al., 2012: 896). A ‘Relationships’ building block, ‘trust’ (as a sub-dimension of the ‘Judgments’ building block) and ‘client knowledge’ (as a sub-dimension of the ‘People’ building block, which includes understanding of the client), are included in the new CL-BBE framework, which is depicted as Figure 7.1.

Theron et al. (2013: 41) recognise the importance of trust and satisfaction in terms of relationships. ‘Trust’ and ‘satisfaction’ were found to be sub-dimensions of the ‘Judgments’ building block, which affects the higher-order ‘Partnerships’ building block of the new CL-BBE framework.

Relationship appeal positively affects loyalty (Theron et al., 2013: 41), but perceived better relationships may lead to the switching of brand loyalty for B2B services (Naumann et al., 2010: 892-894). Therefore, the relationship dimensions that Theron and Terblanche (2010: 396) found in the literature and through their empirical study within the financial services industry should be considered to foster long-term relationships. The following is a list of some of these dimensions, with corresponding dimensions confirmed by the current study and included in the new CL-BBE framework:

- Trust – a sub-dimension of the ‘judgments’ building block;
- Satisfaction - a sub-dimension of the ‘judgments’ building block;
- Competence – ‘product knowledge’ as a sub-dimension of the ‘People’ building block indicates competence to the client;
- Relationship benefits – indicate working together for a common goal, as encapsulated by the sub-dimension ‘partnerships’ of the ‘Relationship’ building block;
- Bonding – extends to the psychological aspects of the ‘interpersonal’ sub-dimensions of the ‘Relationships’ building block;
- Customisation – is the ‘secondary features’ sub-dimension of the ‘Service performance’ building block;
- Attractiveness of alternatives – is included as ‘satisfaction’ of the ‘Judgments’ building block; and
- Shared values – is a sub-dimension of the ‘people’ building block.

All the CL-BBE building blocks and sub-dimensions add to client brand knowledge, which is important to B2B brands. Brand representatives act as a channel through which brand knowledge
can be conveyed (Gupta et al., 2010: 400). Brand knowledge leads to brand equity, which can lead to brand loyalty (Biong & Sikoset, 2014: 171; Jarvis & Bitner, 2014: 272; Kim & Hyun, 2011: 435).

7.3 MANAGERIAL CONTRIBUTION
As mentioned, as a result of the present study, it was realised that there seems to be two interrelated brand equity frameworks that are involved with brand building for short-term business insurance. From the client's perspective there is a framework that guides brand building between the broker and client (primary framework building the brokers’ brand equity in the client’s mind, Figure 7.1) and ‘behind’ the broker there is brand building between the broker and the insurance house (secondary framework, Figure 6.37). The primary contribution of the study is the CL-BBE framework (Figure 7.1), which is an amendment of the CBBE model. By applying the CL-BBE framework, brokers will be able to strategically manage the building of brand equity within their organisations from a client perspective. The CL-BBE model includes dimensions that clients of short-term business insurance take into consideration when deciding on a broker. In addition, Figure 6.37 indicates the important aspects between insurance house and broker, which influence the ability of the broker to develop brand equity between the broker and the client hotel.

7.3.1 Recommendations
7.3.1.1 Recommendations to management of broker organisations
This study proposed that an amended brand equity model is required to guide brand building for short-term business insurance between a broker and a hotel client. The use of an unamended CBBE model to guide brand building for the selected B2B services may lead to investment in dimensions that have not been confirmed, or in dimensions that were neglected to be included in the CBBE model. One of the most significant outcomes of the study is knowledge of which dimensions to focus on to enhance brand equity from a broker’s perspective. This can enable appropriate allocation of resources.

As indicated in Figure 7.1, the management of brokerages can continue to build most the dimensions that are included in the ‘Salience’ and ‘Performance’ brand building blocks of the CBBE model. The sub-dimensions of these two building blocks that have not been confirmed are ‘durability’, ‘serviceability’ and ‘style and design’. In addition, brokerage managers should include within these two building blocks ‘processes’ and ‘servicescape’ sub-dimensions. In addition to the mentioned two building blocks, brokerage managers should recognise the importance of a ‘People’ brand-building block for their service. People personify the brand, while their attitude and demeanour, personality and values, personableness, product knowledge and client knowledge are important sub-dimensions. Managers should be aware that, in addition to the bottom three brand building blocks, short-term business insurance clients will form ‘Judgments’ about the quality of service received, credibility and whether they trust the provider’s brand, which will influence their
perception of satisfaction. ‘Relationships’ (‘interpersonal’ and ‘partnerships’) are of utmost importance for short-term business insurance.

To summarise, the ultimate aim of brand building for brokerages should be to develop partnerships with their hotel clients through long-term relationships between their employees and the hotels’ representatives. Brokerage brand building should begin with management creating awareness about their brokerage brand among decision makers within hotels who need short-term business insurance. This should be done by linking the needs that the brokerage brand satisfies and the category in which the brand operates to its brand in the minds of their clients or potential clients. This could be achieved by visiting clients and explaining what services the broker renders. The insurance cover should be appropriate and should be honoured when there is a claim against the policy. The offering should be supported by excellent service, which means that the service that is rendered should deliver the desired results promptly. The service should be rendered in a caring manner and should be supported by proper processes. All of this should be provided at a competitive price and through channels that the clients deem as most appropriate (physical office, Internet or telephone). The preferred channel is the broker’s office, which should have a pleasant ambience (the servicescape). Because a major part of the service is delivered by people, investment should be made in selecting and developing the appropriate skills and demeanor of the service employees. Clients prefer dealing with brokerage representatives that are professional, approachable, friendly, have engaging personalities and appropriate values, pleasant in appearance and manner, have thorough product knowledge, and who can relate to the needs of the hotel.

In addition, brokerage managers should to be aware that the sub-dimensions of the three brand-building blocks, interpreted in the paragraph above, are under their control and, therefore, specific strategies to enhance or improve each, are advisable. The ‘Judgments’ and ‘Relationships’ building blocks, however, are not under the brokerage’s direct control and are a result of the sub-dimensions that precede them. Therefore, if any of the sub-dimensions of the ‘Judgments’ and ‘Relationships’ building blocks are less than desired, then amendments can be made to the sub-dimensions that inform them.

7.3.1.2 Recommendations for further research

As mentioned previously, the present study found that there are two brand equity models that are involved in short-term business insurance. It is suggested that the brand equity model between insurance house and broker should be further developed, and that the suggested CL-BBE framework between the broker and the hotel client should be repeated. It would add value if the sub-dimensions of the suggested CL-BBE framework are investigated in other countries other than South Africa. No claims are made about the generalisability of the CL-BBE framework, therefore,
further research in different B2B service settings, other than short-term business insurance, would be valuable. The study followed a qualitative approach, which should be supported by quantitative studies. This will address some of the additional limitations, which are mentioned in section 7.4.

7.4 LIMITATIONS OF PRESENT STUDY

Any type of research will have limitations. Most of the limitations of this study are inherent to the qualitative research paradigm. One such issue is researcher subjectivity. The researcher is a brands and branding scholar and lecturer, but the (mostly) deductive discourse provided structure from the theory (from the CBBE model). This structure (building blocks and sub-dimensions) ensured a spread of issues to investigate or test for applicability in a different context. The study was not inductive from the beginning, which would have involved much more subjectivity. Deductive reasoning is the reason why reference is made to “the researcher” instead of “I”.

Due to time and financial resources limitations the study was limited to the Cape Town metropole of the Western Cape, which is where the researcher was based.

In addition, potential bias during data analysis was reduced by first removing any references to participants before coding. This ensured that the textual data could not be associated with any of the respondents. A further limitation of the study was the high non-response rate, which resulted in a limited sample.

The present study continued the quest to adapt a major branding model for B2B services and only considered B2B short-term insurance for hotels, so the results may be sector-specific and may not be representative of all B2B services markets. As a result of the delineation the results may also be area-specific. Therefore no claims are made as to the generalisability of the findings. At best the findings may be extendible to branding in a similar or comparable context.

The research sample was small, comprising interview data from only fourteen interviews within a selected sector and location. This may be an issue to consider, since brand equity may be culture specific (Christodoulides et al., 2015: 320). Also, owing to the nature of qualitative research, the findings are subjective and another researcher may, therefore reach different conclusions. An additional limitation of the present study is the fact that the researcher is a novice qualitative researcher and had a lot to learn.

The present study continued the process of assessing and adapting a major brand equity model for a short-term business insurance (a selected B2B service) context, but it is by no means the end.
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Appendix 1: Initial interview guide
Good day/ morning/ evening. My name is................ We are conducting a survey as part of a PhD study, at the University of Stellenbosch Business School.

Locate sample element/ person in hotel responsible for short-term business insurance purchase decisions – buyer, general manager, finance manager, MD, CEO, and so on.

QQ.a Who is responsible for obtaining/ purchasing short-term insurance for the hotel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Mr/ Mrs/ Ms/ Miss</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Surname:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position of participant in hotel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of hotel:</th>
<th>Physical address of hotel:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*For controlling purposes only.*

Telephone numbers of participant: Office: Cell:

*Ask to speak to the person identified above and once located continue with the interview.*

*** The interview starts here ***

Good day/ morning/ evening. My name is................ We are conducting a survey as part of a PhD study, at the University of Stellenbosch Business School, on business-to-business brand building and would like to ask you a few questions. The interview will last approximately 30 to 40 minutes.
QQ.b  Does the hotel have any form of short-term business insurance?

Yes  b-1  No  b-2  Don’t know  b-3

If ‘No’ or ‘Don’t know’; thank participant for his/her time and terminate ➔ REPLACE

QQ.c  How would you classify your position in this hotel?

Owner/ partner/ shareholder  d-1  Employee  d-2

SECTION B: Classification questions

B.1 Is the hotel operated as a:

Sole proprietor  B1-1  Partnership  B1-2  Close corporation  B1-3  Private company  B1-4  Public company  B1-5  Don’t know  B1-6

B.2 What is the official star-grading of the hotel?

1 Star  2 Star  3 Star  4 Star  5 Star

B.3 How many rooms does the hotel have?


B.4 How many full-time employees does the hotel have?


B.5 How many years has the hotel been in operation?


SECTION C: Applicability of the CBBE model’s sub-dimensions

- Circle responses to Q.1 to Q.4 and record answers to Q.5 in the table below.
- Q.1a to Q.1f is unaided and relates to short-term business insurance brands only, with Q.1a (1st mention) to Q.1e (5th mention) and then Q.1f all other mentioned brands (if more than 5 mentioned). Hence, Q.1f could have multiple answers.
- If brands are mentioned that are not part of the list, then add it to the bottom of the list, next to other, in the table.
- Q.2 is aided. Interviewee to call out options. If participant is unaware of brand, leave blank/uncircled.

Q.1a to Q.1f  When you think of short-term business insurance, which brands can you recall/are you aware of? Any other?

Q.2  Which of the following OTHER short-term business insurance brands do you recognise/are you aware of? (*) Participant to confirm options.

Q.3  With which short-term business insurance house is your hotel insured? (*) ➔ IF MORE THAN ONE SHORT TERM INSURER, CIRCLE THE MOST IMPORTANT ONE.

Q.4  Who are your competitors insured with? (*)

Q.5a-Q.5e  What associations come to mind when you hear ………… [brand 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th MENTIONED] (from Q.1a to Q.1e). ➔ DO NOT THINK OR SCREEN YOUR ANSWER, SIMPLY MENTION THE ASSOCIATIONS THAT COME TO MIND. [Prompt for further responses – any other associations?]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.1 to Q.5</th>
<th>1st mention</th>
<th>2nd mention</th>
<th>3rd mention</th>
<th>4th mention</th>
<th>5th mention</th>
<th>all other mentions(*)</th>
<th>Recognition (faded)</th>
<th>Insured with Competitor insurers(*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1st for Woman</td>
<td>1a-1</td>
<td>1b-1</td>
<td>1c-1</td>
<td>1d-1</td>
<td>1e-1</td>
<td>1f-1</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ABSA Insurance</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Auto &amp; General Insurance</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Budget Insurance Brokers</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chartis South Africa</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dial Direct Insurance</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Etana Insurance</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.5a – Q.5e
Word association (only for insurers mentioned in Q.1a to Q.1f 1st five brands mentioned (max) or less)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.1 to Q.5</th>
<th>1st mention</th>
<th>2nd mention</th>
<th>3rd mention</th>
<th>4th mention</th>
<th>5th mention</th>
<th>all other mentions(*)</th>
<th>Recognition (aided)</th>
<th>Insured with</th>
<th>Competitor insurers(*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHORT-TERM BUSINESS INSURANCE BRANDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HDI Gerling Insurance of South Africa</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hollard Insurance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indequity Specialised Insurance</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lion of Africa Insurance</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lombard Insurance</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mutual &amp; Federal Insurance</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Nedgroup Insurance</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Renasa Insurance</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. SAFIRE Insurance</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.6a and Q.6b  What is the slogan of …… (שירhort term insurer mentioned as per Q.3)? What does the slogan mean to you?

If participant does not know or is unsure then leave blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.6a SLOGAN</th>
<th>Q.6b MEANING OF SLOGAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you please tell me about your experiences with YOUR insurance purchase process:

Q.7  Who was involved, from your hotel’s side, when you purchased your business insurance?

[Imagery-purchase situation]
Q.8 Did you deal?(* call out the options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTLY WITH THE INSURANCE HOUSE</td>
<td>8-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THROUGH A BROKER</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THROUGH A 'WALK-IN' CENTRE</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONICALLY</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA WEBSITE</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.9 How did you experience the insurance purchase process; any other details that you would like to mention regarding your experience?

Q.10 How would you describe ..........’s (ộ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) brand personality? If ........ (ộ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) were to come alive as a person, what would it be like – down-to-earth, honest, daring, up-to-date, reliable, successful, upper class, charming, outdoorsy?

Q.11 To what extent do you feel you grew up with ........ (ộ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)? What is your opinion regarding the history, heritage and (years of) experience of .......... (ộ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?
Q.12 How satisfied are you with the service that you receive(d) from ………… (SMART TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?

[Performance-service effectiveness]

CALL OUT THE OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>12-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFIED</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SATISFIED, NOR DISSATISFED</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISSATISFED</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFED</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain / cannot tell</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.13 If participant answered ‘dissatisfied’ or ‘very dissatisfied’ in Q.12, then ask: Why were you ‘dissatisfied’/ ‘very dissatisfied’ with the service that you received?

[Performance-service effectiveness]

Q.14 How efficient is ………… (SMART TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) in terms of speed, responsiveness, and so forth?

[Performance-service efficiency]

CALL OUT THE OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY EFFICIENT</td>
<td>14-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENT</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT EFFICIENT, NOR INEFFICIENT</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEFFICIENT</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY INEFFICIENT</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain / cannot tell</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.15 If participant answered ‘inefficient’ or ‘very inefficient’ in Q.14, then ask: Can you please elaborate why you answered ‘inefficient’/ ‘very inefficient’?

[Performance-service efficiency]

Q.16 How courteous (trusting and caring) and helpful (focused on the client) is the service that you received from .......... (SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?

[Performance-service empathy]

CALL OUT THE OPTIONS

| VERY COURTEOUS AND HELPFUL | 16-1 | GO TO Q.18 |
| COURTEOUS AND HELPFUL      | -2   | GO TO Q.18 |
| AVERAGE                    | -3   | GO TO Q.18 |
| SOMEWHAT RUDE AND UNHELPFUL| -4   |            |
| VERY RUDE AND UNHELPFUL    | -5   |            |
| Uncertain / cannot tell    | -6   | GO TO Q.18 |

Q.17 If participant answered ‘somewhat rude and unhelpful’ or ‘very rude and unhelpful’ in Q.16, then ask: Can you please elaborate why you answered ‘somewhat rude and unhelpful’/ ‘very rude and unhelpful’?

[Performance-service empathy]
Q.18  What rewards/ incentives (if any) did, do or will you get for purchasing ………..’s (SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) business insurance?

[Performance-price]

No rewards/ incentives □

Q.19  Do you think that price is important when deciding which brand of business insurance to purchase? Why? Why not?

[Performance-price]

Q.20  What is your overall opinion of ……….. (SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) and its quality?

[Judgment-quality]

(If ‘no opinion’, probe. Why?)

Q.21  What are your feelings towards ……….. (SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?

[Feelings-warmth, fun, excitement, security, social approval, self-respect]
Q.22  To what extent would you be willing to invest time, energy, money or other resources to get to know .......... (➔ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) better? For example, by investing time to learn more about ..........(➔ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3), visiting ..........(➔ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)’s web site and talking to others about ..........(➔ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resonance-engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q.23  To what extent is .......... (➔ short term insurer mentioned as per q.3) part of you and who you are?

| Resonance-attitudinal attachment |

Q.24  How would you describe your relationship with other businesses that are also insured with ..........(➔short term insurer mentioned as per Q.3)?

| Resonance-community |

Q.25  How would you describe your relationship with ..........’s (➔ short term insurer mentioned as per Q.3) brokers/ representatives?

| Resonance-community |
Q.26 What is most favourable about/ the best aspects of .......... (➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?
[Performance, Imagery, Judgments, Feelings, Resonance-strength, favourability]

Uncertain/ cannot tell

Q.27 What is least favourable about/ the worst aspects of .......... (➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?
[Performance, Imagery, Judgments, Feelings, Resonance-strength, unfavourability]

Uncertain/ cannot tell

Q.28 What is unique about .......... (➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?
[Performance (relative to competition), Imagery, Judgments, Feelings, Resonance-uniqueness]

Uncertain/ cannot tell

Q.29 How likely are you to recommend .......... (➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) to a friend or colleague?
[Resonance-(behavioural) loyalty]

CALL OUT THE OPTIONS

| MOST DEFINITELY | 29-1 ➔ GO TO Q.31 |
| DEFINITELY | -2 ➔ GO TO Q.31 |
| MAYBE | -3 ➔ GO TO Q.31 |
| DEFINITELY NOT | -4 |
| MOST DEFINITELY NOT | -5 |
| Uncertain/ cannot tell | -6 ➔ GO TO Q.31 |
Q.30 If participant answered ‘definitely not’ or ‘most definitely not’ in Q.29, then ask: Why not?

[Resonance-(behavioural) loyalty]

Q.31 Which aspects of your relationship with brokers/ sales people or other of the insurance provider’s representatives are important? Why are they important?

[EXTRA: Relationship with brokers]

SECTION D:
Q.32 How did you experience this questionnaire? What changes would you make to this survey? (Please explain)

Q.33 Are there any other comments that you would like to make as we conclude?

"This concludes the survey. Thank you for your participation.
If I have any further questions, or if I require further advice, may I please contact you again in future?  

Thank you. I appreciate your time. (WAIT) Have a good day. Good bye”. END
Appendix 2: Amended interview guide
Good day/ morning/ evening. My name is............... We are conducting a survey as part of a PhD study, at the University of Stellenbosch Business School.

Locate unit of analysis/ person in hotel responsible for short-term business insurance purchase, renewal or amendment decisions – buyer, general manager, finance manager, MD, CEO, and so on.

QQ.A Who is responsible for purchasing, renewing or amending short-term insurance for your hotel?

Title: Mr/ Mrs/ Ms/ Miss
Name:
Surname:

POSITION OF PARTICIPANT IN HOTEL:

NAME OF HOTEL:

PHYSICAL ADDRESS OF HOTEL:

TELEPHONE NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANT:
OFFICE:
CELL:

For controlling purposes only.

Ask to speak to the person identified above and once located continue with the interview.

*** The interview starts here ***

Good day/ morning/ evening. My name is................. We are conducting a survey as part of a PhD study, at the University of Stellenbosch Business School, on business-to-business brand building and would like to ask you a few questions. The interview will last approximately 30 to 45 minutes.
QQ.B  With which short-term BUSINESS insurance house is your hotel insured? (*) ➔ IF MORE THAN ONE SHORT TERM INSURER, CIRCLE THE MOST IMPORTANT ONE.

Don't know | QQB: 2

If ‘Don’t know’; the correct unit of analysis has not been identified. Locate appropriate person in hotel or REPLACE with next hotel.

QQ.C  To what extent can you influence the decision as to which insurance house your hotel insures or reinsures with?

If participant cannot influence the purchase or renewal process at all (if in an administrative capacity only/ only handles claims), then locate person in hotel that can influence the purchase process to some extent. If not possible REPLACE with next hotel.

QQ.D  How would you classify your position in this hotel?

Owner/ partner/ shareholder | QOD-1

Employee | QOD-2

SECTION B: Classification questions

B.1 Is the hotel operated as a:

Sole proprietor | B1-1

Partnership | B1-2

Close corporation | B1-3

Private company Pty (LTD) | B1-4

Public company Pty | B1-5

Don’t know | B1-6

B.2 What is the official star-grading of the hotel?

1 Star | 2 Star | 3 Star | 4 Star | 5 Star
B.3 How many rooms does the hotel have?

B.4 How many full-time employees does the hotel have?

B.5 How many years has the hotel been in operation?

SECTION C: Applicability of the CBBE model’s sub-dimensions

Circle responses to Q.Q.B, Q.1, Q.2 and Q.3 and record answers to Q.4 in the table below.

Q.1a to Q.1f is unaided and relates to short-term business insurance brands only, with Q.1a (1st mention) to Q.1e (5th mention) and then Q.1f all other mentioned brands

(if more than 5 mentioned). Hence, Q.1f could have multiple answers.

Q.2 is aided. Interviewer to call out options. If participant is unaware of brand, leave blank/uncircled.

Q.1a to Q.1f When you think of short-term BUSINESS insurance, which brands can you recall/are you aware of? Any other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.1a</th>
<th>Q.1b</th>
<th>Q.1c</th>
<th>Q.1d</th>
<th>Q.1e</th>
<th>Q.1f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TRANSFER ANSWERS TO SUMMATIVE TABLE BELOW

Q.2 Which of the following OTHER short-term BUSINESS insurance brands do you recognise/are you aware of?(*) Participant to confirm options.

Q.3 Who are your competitors insured with? (*)

…………………………………………………………………………………………
Q.4a-Q.4e What associations come to mind when you hear .......... [brands mentioned in QQ.B, Q.1a Q.1b Q.1c Q.1d Q.1e]. ➔DO NOT THINK OR SCREEN YOUR ANSWER, SIMPLY MENTION THE ASSOCIATIONS THAT COME TO MIND. [Prompt for further responses – any other associations?]

Q.1 to Q.4 and QQ.B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT-TERM BUSINESS INSURANCE BRANDS</th>
<th>Q.1a: 1st mention</th>
<th>Q.1b: 2nd mention</th>
<th>Q.1c: 3rd mention</th>
<th>Q.1d: 4th mention</th>
<th>Q.1e: 5th mention</th>
<th>Q.1f: all other mentions(*)</th>
<th>Q.2: Recognition</th>
<th>Q.3: Insured with</th>
<th>Q.4a – Q.4e (Word association only for insurers mentioned in QQ.B and Q.1a to Q.1e - 1st five brands mentioned (max) or less)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1st for Woman</td>
<td>1a-1</td>
<td>1b-1</td>
<td>1c-1</td>
<td>1d-1</td>
<td>1e-1</td>
<td>1f-1</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>QQB-1</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ABSA Insurance</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Auto &amp; General Insurance</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Budget Insurance Brokers</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chartis South Africa</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dial Direct Insurance</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Etana Insurance</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>HDI Gerling Insurance of South Africa</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hollard Insurance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Indequity Specialised Insurance</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Lion of Africa Insurance</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lombard Insurance</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Mutual &amp; Federal Insurance</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Nedgroup Insurance</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Renasa Insurance</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. SAFIRE Insurance</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 26.</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.5a and Q.5b  What is the slogan of …… (➡️SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)? What does the slogan mean to you?
IF PARTICIPANT DOES NOT KNOW OR IS UNSURE THEN LEAVE BLANK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.5a SLOGAN</th>
<th>Q.5b MEANING OF SLOGAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you please tell me about your experiences with your hotel’s insurance purchase process:

Q.6  Did you deal?
(*) call out the options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTLY WITH THE INSURANCE HOUSE</td>
<td>6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THROUGH A BROKER</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THROUGH A ‘WALK-IN’ CENTRE</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONICALLY</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of brokerage: [Name of brokerage]
Q.7 Who was involved, from your hotel’s side, when you purchased, renewed or amended your hotel’s insurance?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Q.8 How did you experience the insurance purchase, renewal or amendment process; any other details that you would like to mention regarding your experience?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Q.9a How much influence does your broker have over which insurance brand you are insured with and how much influence do you have?

Q.9b Did your broker suggest an insurer or a selection of insurers for you to choose from?

Q.9a ......................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Q.9b ......................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Q.10 How would you describe …………’.s (§SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.8) brand personality? If ………. (§SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.8) were to come alive as a person, what would the person’s personality be like?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Q.11 To what extent do you feel you grew up with ........ (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)? What is your opinion regarding the history, heritage and (years of) experience of ........... (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)?

..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Q.12 How satisfied are you with the service that you receive(d) from ...........(➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)? Please explain.

..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Q.13 How efficient is ........... (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B) in terms of speed, responsiveness, and so forth? Please explain.

..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Q.14 How trusting, caring and focused on you the client is the service that you received from ........... (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)? Please explain.

..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
Q.15  What rewards/ incentives (if any) did, do or will you get for being insured with ..........’s (⇒SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B) business insurance?

No rewards/ incentives □

Q.16  Do you think that price is important when deciding which brand of business insurance to purchase? Why? Why not?

Q.17  What is your overall opinion of .......... (⇒SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B) and its quality?
(If ‘no opinion’, probe. Why?

Q.18  What are your feelings towards .......... (⇒SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)?
Q.19 To what extent would you be willing to invest time, energy, money or other resources to get to know .......... (⇒ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B) better? For example, by investing time to learn more about the brand, visiting their web site and talking to others about them.

Q.20 TO WHAT EXTENT IS .......... (⇒ short term insurer mentioned as per QQ.b) PART OF YOU AND WHO YOU ARE?

Q.21 HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER BUSINESSES THAT ARE ALSO INSURED WITH .......... (⇒ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)?

Q.22 HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH ..........’s (⇒ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B) BROKERS/REPRESENTATIVES?
Q.23 What is most favourable about/ the best aspects of ..........(➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)?

Uncertain/ cannot tell □

Q.24 What is least favourable about/ the worst aspects of ..........(➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)?

Uncertain/ cannot tell □

Q.25 What is unique about ..........(➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B)?

Uncertain/ cannot tell □

Q.26 How likely are you to recommend .......... (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER QQ.B) to another business?

➔CALL OUT THE OPTIONS

<p>| MOST DEFINITELY | 26-1 | ➔GO TO QQ.28 |
| DEFINITELY      | -2   | ➔GO TO QQ.28 |
| MAYBE           | -3   | ➔GO TO QQ.28 |
| DEFINITELY NOT  | -4   |              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST DEFINITELY NOT</th>
<th>-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain/ cannot tell</td>
<td>-6 ➔ GO TO QQ.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.27** **IF PARTICIPANT ANSWERED ‘DEFINITELY NOT’ OR ‘MOST DEFINITELY NOT’ IN Q.26, THEN ASK: WHY NOT?**

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

**Q.28** **WHICH ASPECTS OF YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH BROKERS/ SALES PEOPLE OR OTHER OF THE INSURANCE PROVIDER’S REPRESENTATIVES ARE IMPORTANT? WHY ARE THEY IMPORTANT?**

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

**SECTION D:**

**Q.29** **HOW DID YOU EXPERIENCE THIS INTERVIEW GUIDE? WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU MAKE TO THIS SURVEY? (PLEASE EXPLAIN)**

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

**Q.30** **ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE AS WE CONCLUDE?**

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

➤”This concludes the survey. Thank you for your participation. If I have any further questions, or if I require further advice, may I please contact you again in future? Y ☐ N ☐

Thank you. I appreciate your time. *(WAIT)* Have a good day. Good bye”. *END*
Appendix 3: Questions-objectives matrix
## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q #</th>
<th>INTERVIEW GUIDE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q.1a to Q.1f | When you think of short-term business insurance, which brands can you recall/ are you aware of? Any other?  
[Salience-awareness-recall-category identification] | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      |
| Q.2  | Which of the following OTHER short-term business insurance brands do you recognise/ are you aware of?  
[Salience-awareness-recognition-brand elements]          | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      |
| Q.3  | With which short-term business insurance house is your organisation insured?  
[Salience-awareness-recall-brand element-depth]            | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      |
| Q.4  | Who are your competitors insured with?  
[Imagery-user profiles]                                           | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      |
| Q.5a-Q.5e | What associations come to mind when you hear ............ [brand 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> MENTIONED] (from Q.1a to Q.1e).  
[Prompt for further responses – any other associations?]  
[Imagery-brand associations-offering]  | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      |
| Q.6a and Q.6b | What is the slogan of …… (➡️SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)? What does the slogan mean to you?  
[Salience-awareness-recognition-brand element]              | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      | ✅                                                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.7</th>
<th>Who was involved, from your organisation’s side, when you purchased your business insurance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.8</td>
<td>Did you deal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• directly with the insurance house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• through a broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• through a ‘walk-in’ centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• telephonically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• via website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.9</td>
<td>How did you experience the insurance purchase process; any other details that you would like to mention regarding your experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.10</td>
<td>How would you describe …………’s (short term insurer mentioned as per Q.3) brand personality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.11</td>
<td>What is your opinion regarding the history, heritage and experience of ………… (short term insurer mentioned as per Q.3)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.12</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the service that you receive(d) from ………… (short term insurer mentioned as per Q.3)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• not satisfied, nor dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• uncertain / cannot tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.13</td>
<td>If participant answered ‘dissatisfied’ or ‘very dissatisfied’ in Q.12, then ask: Why were you ‘dissatisfied’/ ‘very dissatisfied’ with the service that you received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.14</td>
<td>How efficient is ………… (short term insurer mentioned as per Q.3) in terms of speed, responsiveness, and so forth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• very efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• not efficient, nor inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• very inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• uncertain / cannot tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.15</td>
<td>If participant answered 'inefficient' or 'very inefficient' in Q.14, then ask: Can you please elaborate why you answered 'inefficient'/'very inefficient'?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Performance-service efficiency]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.16</td>
<td>How courteous (trusting and caring) and helpful (focused on the client) is the service that you received from ............. (➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      |  1. very courteous and helpful  
      |  2. courteous and helpful  
      |  3. average  
      |  4. somewhat rude and unhelpful  
      |  5. very rude and unhelpful  
<pre><code>  |  6. uncertain / cannot tell |
</code></pre>
<p>|      | [Performance-service empathy]                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Q.17 | If participant answered 'somewhat rude and unhelpful' or 'very rude and unhelpful' in Q.16, then ask: Can you please elaborate why you answered 'somewhat rude and unhelpful'/'very rude and unhelpful'? |
|      | [Performance-service empathy]                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Q.18 | What rewards/ incentives (if any) did, do or will you get for purchasing .............'s (➡ short term insurer mentioned as per q.3) business insurance? |
|      | [Performance-price]                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Q.19 | Do you think that price is important when deciding which brand of business insurance to purchase? Why? Why not? |
|      | [Performance-price]                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Q.20 | What is your overall opinion of ............. (➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.4) and its quality? |
|      | [Judgment-quality]                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Q.21 | What are your feelings towards ............. (➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)? |
|      | [Feelings-warmth, fun, excitement, security, social approval, self-respect]                                                                                                                                 |
| Q.22 | To what extent would you be willing to invest time, energy, money or other resources to get to know ............. .............(➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) better? For example, by investing time to learn more about ............. .............(➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3), visiting .............'s .............(➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) web site and talking to others about .............(➡ SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) |
|      | [Resonance-engagement]                                                                                                                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.23</th>
<th>How would you describe your relationship with …………. (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Resonance-(attitudinal) attachment]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.24</th>
<th>How would you describe your relationship with other businesses that are also insured with …………. (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Resonance-community]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.25</th>
<th>How would you describe your relationship with …………. and its representatives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Resonance-community]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.26</th>
<th>What is most favourable about / the best aspects of …………. (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Performance, Imagery, Judgments, Feelings, Resonance-strength, favourability]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.27</th>
<th>What is least favourable/ the worst aspects of …………. (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Performance, Imagery, Judgments, Feelings, Resonance-strength, unfavourability]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.28</th>
<th>What is unique about …………. (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Performance (relative to competition), Imagery, Judgments, Feelings, Resonance-uniqueness]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.29</th>
<th>How likely are you to continue to insure your organisation with …………. (➔SHORT TERM INSURER MENTIONED AS PER Q.3) in the future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Resonance-(behavioural) loyalty]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.30</th>
<th>If participant answered ‘definitely not’ or ‘most definitely not’ in Q.29, then ask: Why not?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Resonance-(behavioural) loyalty]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.31</th>
<th>Which aspects of your relationship with brokers/ sales people or other organisational representatives are important? Why are they important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[EXTRA: Relationship with brokers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix 4: Code book
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Info</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: brand personality and values</td>
<td>The personality (human personality traits) of the broker brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: efficiency</td>
<td>The speed of the service received from the broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: empathy</td>
<td>How caring and trusting the broker is towards the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Feeling</td>
<td>The participant's feelings/emotions towards their broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: feelings</td>
<td>The participant's feelings/emotions towards their broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: heritage</td>
<td>The heritage (aspects inherited over time) of the broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: history</td>
<td>Length of relationship with broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: influence over IH insured with</td>
<td>How much influence the broker has over which insurance brand the hotel is insured with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Likelihood to recommend</td>
<td>The likelyhood of the participant recommending the services of their broker to other businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: most favourable</td>
<td>Most favourable aspects of the broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: name</td>
<td>The name of the insurance broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: people</td>
<td>The importance of the people element as the service is delivered from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: personality and values</td>
<td>The broker's brand personality and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Unique</td>
<td>Any aspects that are unique to/ makes the broker unique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: WA</td>
<td>Associations attached to the broker (brand) that was mentioned by the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: other</td>
<td>Any other comments by the participant regarding any aspect of the interview. The very last question of the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: suggested changes to questionnaire</td>
<td>Changes suggested specifically relating to the questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitor: IH</td>
<td>The insurance houses that the hotel's competitors are insured with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact: with B not IH</td>
<td>Participants indicating that they deal with the broker directly and not the insurance house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: 1st mentioned</td>
<td>Insurance house/insurer (brand) that was mentioned first by the participant. This brand has achieved unaided recall and top of mind awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: 1st mentioned WA</td>
<td>Associations attached to the insurance house/insurer (brand) that was mentioned first by the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: 2nd mentioned</td>
<td>Insurance house/insurer (brand) that was mentioned second by the participant. This brand has achieved unaided recall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IH: 2nd mentioned WA                         | Associations attached to the
<p>| IH: 3rd mentioned | Insurance house/ insurer (brand) that was mentioned third by the participant. This brand has achieved unaided recall. |
| IH: 3rd mentioned WA | Associations attached to the insurance house/ insurer (brand) that was mentioned third by the participant. |
| IH: 4th mentioned | Insurance house/ insurer (brand) that was mentioned forth by the participant. This brand has achieved unaided recall. |
| IH: 4th mentioned WA | Associations attached to the insurance house/ insurer (brand) that was mentioned forth by the participant. |
| IH: 5th mentioned | Insurance house/ insurer (brand) that was mentioned fith by the participant. This brand has achieved unaided recall. |
| IH: 5th mentioned WA | Associations attached to the insurance house/ insurer (brand) that was mentioned fith by the participant. |
| IH: 6th mentioned | Insurance house/ insurer (brand) that was mentioned sixth by the participant. This brand has achieved unaided recall. |
| IH: aided recognition | These are the insurance brands that the participants recognised after the brand names were used as cues. These brands were not recall freely/ from memory/ unaided. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IH: brand personality</th>
<th>■ The personality (human personality traits) of the insurance brand.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IH: Feelings</td>
<td>■ The participant's feelings/emotions towards their insurer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: History, heritage &amp; experience</td>
<td>■ Length of relationship with and heritage (aspects inherited over time) of the insurer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: INSURED WITH</td>
<td>■ Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: INSURED WITH WA</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: BnB Sure</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (BnB Sure brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: Chartis</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Chartis brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: B1 Insurance</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (B1 brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: insured with WA: Etana</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Etana brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: HIC</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (HIC brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: HIU</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (HIU brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: Lion of Africa</td>
<td>■ Associations attached to the insurance house insured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: Lloyd's</td>
<td>Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Lloyd's brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: Mutual &amp; Federal</td>
<td>Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Mutual &amp; Federal brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: B3</td>
<td>Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (B3 brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: Santam</td>
<td>Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Santam brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with WA: B2</td>
<td>Associations attached to the insurance house insured with/ the insurer (B2 brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: BnB Sure</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (BnB Sure brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: Chartis</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Chartis South Africa brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: B1</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (B1 brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: Etana</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Etana Insurance brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: HIC</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (HIC brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: HIU</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (HIU brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: Lion of Africa</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Lion of Africa brand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: Lloyds</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Lloyd's brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: Mutual &amp; Federal</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Mutual &amp; Federal brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: B3</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (B3 brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: Santam</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (Santam brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Insured with: B2</td>
<td>Insurance house insured with/ the insurer (B2 brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Least favourable</td>
<td>Least favourable aspects of the insurance house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: legal entity</td>
<td>The legal entity that the hotel is registered as: close corporation, company and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Likelyhood to recommend</td>
<td>The likelihood of the participant recommending the services of their insurer to other businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: most favourable</td>
<td>Most favourable aspects of the insurance house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: number of FT employees</td>
<td>The number of full time employees employed by the hotel to deliver the services offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: number of rooms</td>
<td>The number of rooms available for paid accommodation to guests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: overall opinion &amp; quality</td>
<td>The perceived quality of the insurance house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: part of P</td>
<td>The extent to which the insurance brand is a part of the participant/ client's life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Service efficiency</td>
<td>■ Refers to the speed of the service received. The service is delivered by a person and supported by processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Service satisfaction</td>
<td>■ How satisfied the participant was with the service received from the insurance house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: slogan</td>
<td>■ The slogan of the insurance house including the actual words/ text and the meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: star grading</td>
<td>■ The official star grading or perception of grading if not officially graded, ranging from 1-star to 5-star.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Trusting, caring &amp; focused</td>
<td>■ This deals with empathy - from the insurer towards the client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: Unique</td>
<td>■ Any aspects that are unique to/ makes the insurance house unique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH: willing to invest time</td>
<td>■ The amount of time, energy, money and other resources that the client is prepared to invest into getting to know the insurance brand better indicate Engagement, which is the highest sub-dimension of the CBBE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: Occupation</td>
<td>■ Participant's occupation: owner, director, employee and so on. *** Merged Comment from: P: Position in hotel (2014-03-01T11:19:32) *** Participant's position in hotel: owner vs. employee and general manager, financial manager and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC: B</td>
<td>The participant’s point of contact to the insurance house was through a broker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP: experience</td>
<td>The participant’s experiences during the purchase process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP: influence of P</td>
<td>Records the extent of the participant’s involvement in the purchase process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP: who involved</td>
<td>This confirms that the participant was part of the purchase, amendment or renewal process and identified other role players in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Any comments related to the price/premium of the insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship: important aspects</td>
<td>Relationship aspects with the brokers or sales people or other of the insurance providers’ representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship: with IH brokers/ reps</td>
<td>Relationship with the broker and/or other representatives of the insurer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship: with other businesses insured with IH /</td>
<td>Relationship with other businesses that are insured with the same insurance house/brand. Links to the code Competitor IH (the insurance house that the participant's competitors are insured with).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of insurance: B2C vs. B2B</td>
<td>These quotes provide an indications of whether participants could differentiate between business and personal insurance brand awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in operation</td>
<td>The number of years that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the hotel has been in operation as reported by the respondent. This could be factual or based on a guess. This variable is not very important, therefore an estimate is sufficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Clarification of key terms and concepts
Clarification of key terms and concepts
As with other disciplines, branding has its own lexicon. In the course of the study, the researcher encountered several definitions and explanations for key branding concepts. Various sources were consulted over a period of time, and explanations of terms were compared with their meanings in *The brand glossary* (Interbrand, 2007). Most of the terms have meanings assigned to them that have been adopted by *The brand glossary*, which the researcher considers to be a definitive brand glossary. This publication is produced by one of the leading brand strategy and design consultancies, namely Interbrand. Interbrand’s glossary is developed by experts in the brand consulting field from an extensive and authoritative list of sources, as is evident from the glossary’s list of references. Where an appropriate definition could not be found, the researcher developed and refined a definition. For the purpose of the study, the following terms are used in the context of the meanings that are attached to them, and are used consistently throughout.

The researcher agrees with Interbrand’s (2007: ii) statement that once a common set of definitions has been agreed upon, energy can be better applied to deepen understanding of brands and branding, that is, to develop greater insight into value creation through the enhancement of brand equity.

**Attitude**
A consumer’s perception of the brand in totality, which consists of attributes and benefits (Wilkie, 1986, cited in Keller, 1993: 4). It includes three elements, namely a cognitive element (beliefs), an affirmative element (like/dislike), and a behavioural element (to purchase or not) (Engel, Blackwell, Roger & Miniard, 1986: 115-116), and is influenced by communication messages and a consumer’s experience (Interbrand, 2007: 9).

**Attribute**
Product-related attributes are those that are needed to perform the offering’s function – product’s physical composition and service requirements (Myers & Shocker, 1981, cited in Keller, 1993: 4); also called functional attributes by Aaker (1991: 220).
Non-product-related attributes are external aspects of an offering, including price, packaging/appearance, user imagery (type of consumer – demographic or psychographic factors, and brand personality), and usage imagery (type of situation offering is used-time of day or year, formal or informal); also called intangible attributes by Aaker (1991: 220).
Benefit

What an offering can do for the consumer or value derived by a consumer from an offering.

Functional benefits are intrinsic to the offering and relate to product-related attributes.

Experiential benefits include the sensory aspects of a brand and also relate to product-related attributes.

Symbolic benefits are extrinsic to an offering and relate to Maslow’s higher order needs and non-product-related attributes (Keller, 1993: 4).

Brand

A brand is a psychological phenomenon and the power of a brand resides in the consumer’s mind (Webster & Keller, 2004: 389). It is a consumer’s perception (brand image) and attitude, which comprise the tangible and intangible (attributes, benefits and psychological/emotional) associations that are used to identify and differentiate an offering (adapted, Keller, 1993: 2-5). For a consumer a brand contains a promise of performance and value, which allow consumers to project their self-image (Keller, 2008: 8; Chiaravalle & Schenck, 2007: 34-35).

Branding

The strategic process and creative practice of developing a brand (Interbrand, 2007: 20). The process of endowing offerings with the power of brand equity. The aim of the branding process is to create brand equity (Keller, 2008: 37).

Brand ambassador

also called brand evangelist or brand missionary (Keller, 2008: 87)

An external consumer who, as a result of a positive experience, promotes a brand (Chiaravalle & Schenck, 2007: 241), and an internal employee who is not directly associated with the marketing communication function, but who promotes the values of the brand throughout the organisation even though they may work in finance or logistics (Interbrand, 2007: 7).

Brand architecture

also called brand strategy (Keller, 2008: 433)

Brand architecture refers to the strategic structure of an organisation’s brands and how they relate to each other. It provides a framework for future brand decisions (line and range extension, acquisitions, unbundling, divestment and mergers and acquisitions).

As part of the architecture a brand can be an organisation-controlled brand, an organisation-endorsed brand or a stand-alone individual
brand. These architectures are briefly explained below:

- **Organisation-controlled brand architecture** (also called parent-dominant)
  - The organisation itself and the offering carry the same brand name.

- **Organisation-endorsed brand architecture** (also called parent-endorsed)
  - The organisation and the offering are brands in their own right, but the organisation endorses the offering. The offering as a brand will be primary and the organisation brand secondary.

- **Organisation-silent brand architecture** (also called parent-silent)
  - The offering is an independent, stand-alone brand that has no reference to the organisation brand (adapted, Chiaravalle & Schenck, 2007: 30-32).

**Brand association**

An attribute (feature or characteristic) and/ or benefit (value) (Keller, 2008: 120) or, more broadly, anything linked in memory to a brand, which includes; offering attributes, intangibles, benefits, relative price, use/application, consumer, celebrity/person, life style/personality, offering category, competition, and geographical area (Aaker, 1991: 115). The “positive and negative feelings, beliefs, or knowledge that consumers have about a brand” (Interbrand, 2007: 9).

**Brand awareness**

Also called brand familiarity (Keller, 2008: 49-53). Refers to the degree of consumer knowledge of a brand (Interbrand, 2007: 14).

**Brand elements**

also called brand identities (Keller, 2008: 140). Trademarkable components of a brand that identify and differentiate a brand and include the brand name, logo, symbol, characters, spokespersons, slogan (strapline, positioning statement), jingles, packaging, signage and URL (Keller, 2008: 140).
| **Brand equity** | Brand equity refers to brand equity from the organisation’s point of view, as opposed to customer-based brand equity, which refers to brand equity from the consumer’s point of view. “Is a marketing derived asset that has financial value in terms of future profit and cash flow” (Ambler, 1995: 388) and “a set of brand assets and liabilities linked to a brand’s 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” (Aaker, 1996: 216). “The sum of a brand’s distinguishing qualities” (Interbrand, 2007: 15). Keller (2008: 48) defines customer-based brand equity as: “the differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to marketing of that brand”. Keller explains that this response can either be positive or negative. The brand has positive customer-based brand equity if the consumer reacts more favourably to an offering and the marketing message because the brand is known, than if the brand is not known and may, therefore, be less price sensitive and more accepting of extensions. The brand has negative customer-based brand equity if the consumer responds less favourably to the offering when the brand is known, than to an unknown brand. If negative, the brand is regarded as a commodity. |
| **Brand essence** | This refers to the brand’s promise, which is distilled, simplified and condensed into as few words as possible. To be powerful it should be grounded in a fundamental consumer need (Interbrand, 2007: 15). |
| **Brand extension** | Brand extension refers to extending the brand to another category on the basis of the strength of an existing brand (Aaker, 1991: 208). Keller (2008: 142) differentiates between line extension and category extension. Line extension refers to extending the brand within the same category (vertical extension), whereas range extension refers to extending it into a different category (horizontal extension). |
| **Brand guardian** | A senior brand-equity manager who is responsible for promotional activities that will not negatively affect brand equity over the long |
manager (Aaker, 1991: 176) and the chief marketing officer (CMO) (Interbrand, 2007: 17) or brand director (Marketingweb, 2008)

term (Aaker, 1991: 176). A brand guardian is different to a brand manager.

**Brand identity**

This refers to how the organisation wants the brand to be perceived in terms of associations and in relation to competitors (Nandan, 2005: 264).

**Brand image**

This is how the brand is actually perceived by the consumer (Keller, 2008: 56-59).

**Brand loyalty**

When a consumer truly owns the brand, he/ she is brand loyal, and may well repeat a purchase. Loyalty is earned by delivering unique and meaningful benefits to consumers (Interbrand, 2007: 75).

**Brand management**

The process of managing an organisation as a brand and an organisation’s brand(s) in order to preserve and enhance brand equity (Interbrand, 2007: 17).

**Brand manager**

The person who manages the brand, however the term ‘brand manager’ is a misnomer as it actually more accurately refers to an offering’s marketing manager. A marketing manager often has a short-term focus of, for example, maximising sales through sales promotions as opposed to a brand guardian, who regards the brand’s long-term brand equity as a priority (Aaker, 1991: 9; Business Week, 1991: 67). The brand manager reports to the brand guardian (Interbrand, 2007: 17).

**Brand promise**

A brand contains a promise. A brand promise is a short statement about the essence or “positive difference” of the brand and the unique benefits or associations that it delivers. It is what a brand’s reputation is built upon. It guides branding practice and is communicated via a slogan, motto or tagline (Chiaravalle & Schenck, 2007: 92, 328; Keller, 2008: 39).
**Brand value**

The financial worth of the brand as an intangible asset (Interbrand, 2007: 9).

**Broker**

Licensed agent or middleman who earns a commission (Oxford Dictionary, 2010) from selling short-term insurance on behalf of an insurance house to clients.

**Business-to-business (B2B) branding**

also called industrial branding (Kuhn, Alpert & Pope, 2008: 41), commercial, trade, organisational or institutional (Collins Dictionary of Marketing, 2005: 204)

It is concerned with branding in the business market. Business-to-business (B2B) branding refers to branding on an inter-business (between businesses) level rather than B2C. B2B purchases are made for further processing, for added value or for incorporation into the final offering.

**Business-to-consumer (B2C) branding**

also called consumer branding (Kuhn, Alpert & Pope, 2008: 41)

Business-to-consumer (B2C) branding is branding in the consumer market. It is concerned with branding on an organisation to consumer level.

**Client**

The purchaser of a service offering, but conventionally also referred to as a customer (Oxford Dictionary, 2010). It is a person or organisation using the services of an individual or company (Oxford Dictionaries, 2015). Therefore, a client is an individual or organisational purchaser and/ or consumer of a service offering.

To differentiate a purchaser of a product from a purchaser of a service, for the purpose of this research, the term ‘client’ will have a narrower meaning and refer to a purchaser or consumer of a primarily service offering only. Furthermore, a client can be any entity that purchases a primarily service offering, including a person and organisation.
| **Client-based brand equity (CL-BBE)** | The researcher proposes that ‘client-based brand equity’ (CL-BBE) refers to brand equity, specifically from a client’s perspective (a consumer (user) of primarily services), and not from the perspective of a customer (consumer of primarily products) or from the inclusive perspective of a consumer (consumer of products and services). See “brand equity”, “client”, “customer” and “consumer”. |
| **Commodity** | A commodity is “a product [offering] that is so basic that it cannot be physically differentiated in the minds of consumers”. Undifferentiated offerings satisfy the same need (Keller, 2008: 5, 11). |
| **Competitive advantage** | A competitive advantage is the result of those factors that enable an organisation to compete successfully with its competitors. These may include superior skills and resources, distribution networks, research capacity, production economies of scale, financial resources, customer services and strong brand equity (Collins Dictionary of Marketing, 2005: 82). |
| **Conceptual framework** also called theoretical framework (Henning, Gravett & van Rensburg, 2004: 25-27) | A theoretical framework positions research in a specific discipline or subject and allows the researcher to theorise about the research; it makes the researcher’s entry point known and explicitly states what the researcher is doing. It makes explicit assumptions about the interconnectedness of constructs; is an “alignment of the key concepts of the study”; and it “anchors your research in the literature”. A conceptual framework includes a literature review, research contribution and research design (Henning, Gravett & van Rensburg, 2004: 25-27). |
| **Consumer** | A consumer is the end user of a product or service and may or may not be the buyer (Collins Dictionary of Marketing, 2005: 97; American Marketing Association, 2015). In addition the researcher adopts the view that the concept ‘consumer’ is used to include the terms “customer” (a purchaser of a product offering) and “client” (a purchaser of a service offering). The term consumer is used to refer inclusively to any entity (a person and an organisation) that consumes offerings. |
Customer

Conventionally, the purchaser (buyer) of a product or service and may or may not be the consumer and can be a person or organisation (Collins Dictionary of Marketing, 2005: 110; American Marketing Association, 2015). Therefore, a customer is an individual or organisational purchaser and/or consumer of a product and service offering.

To differentiate a purchaser of a product from a purchaser of a service, for the purpose of this research the term ‘customer’ will have a narrower meaning to refer to a purchaser or consumer of a primarily product offering only. Furthermore, a customer can be any entity that purchases a primarily product offering, including a person and an organisation.

Customer-based brand equity

Customer-based brand equity refers to brand equity from a consumer’s point of view, as opposed to brand equity, which refers to brand equity from an organisation’s point of view. “The differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to marketing of that brand” (Keller, 2008: 48).

Descriptive research

Descriptive research involves describing a group or entity, and usually the characteristics of a market (Malhotra & Birks, 2002: 65).

Empirical research

Research, which is based on observations or experiments, and not on theory (Oxford Dictionary, 2015).

Entity

The researcher suggests that an entity refers to any entity that supplies and/or demands a product and/or service offering. This includes a person and an organisation.

Exploratory research

The objective of exploratory research is to discover new ideas and insight. This type of research provides a better understanding of a situation (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009: 139).

Extended marketing mix

also called service marketing mix (Bhasin, Lovelock & Wirtz, 2007: 22-25).

When the marketing mix, which includes the elements product, price, place and promotion is extended to, in addition, include the elements people, process and physical evidence (Bhasin, 2011; Lovelock & Wirtz, 2007: 22-25).
Feature
Description that characterises an offering (Keller, 2008: 120).

Hypothesis
A hypothesis is “a testable proposition about the relationship between two or more concepts or variables” (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009: 124).

Individual brand
also called line brand
(McDonald, 2001: 338)
A stand alone individual brand with no obvious links to the corporate brand.

Logo
A graphic element, which is used to identify a brand. A distinctive mark, sign, symbol or graphic that can be trademarked (Interbrand, 2007: 25). Logos can identify the origin and ownership or association of a brand (Keller, 2008: 155).

Market
This is the sum of all actual and potential consumers who are ready, willing, and able to purchase an offering (Keller, 2008: 99).

Marketing
Marketing is a societal process that enables consumers to obtain their needs and requirements by creating, offering and freely exchanging products and services at acceptable prices, in acceptable quantities and in acceptable places (Kotler, 2000: 8).

Marketing concept
A business orientation or philosophy that holds that organisational success is dependent upon identifying and satisfying consumer needs (Collins Dictionary of Marketing, 2005: 181).

Marketing mix
also called the four Ps
(Lamb, Hair & McDaniel, 2002: 46), the marketing elements (Lamb, Hair, McDaniel, Boshoff & Terblanché, 2000: 20) and the marketing programme (Collins
A marketing mix refers to a unique combination of product, price, place (or distribution) and promotion strategies, which are designed to produce mutually satisfying exchanges with a target market for the consumer and the organisation (Lamb, Hair & McDaniel, 2002: 46). It has to do with the coordination and integration of various marketing programmes (Collins Dictionary of Marketing, 2005: 182-183).
Marketing strategy
The marketing strategy consists of an objective; a description of the target market; the competitive advantage; the positioning strategy; and the marketing mix (Lamb, Hair, McDaniel, Boshoff & Terblanché, 2000: 20).

Market segmentation
“Divides the market into distinct groups of homogeneous consumers who have similar needs and consumer behavior, and who thus require similar marketing mixes” (Keller, 2008: 99).

Nonprobability sampling
In a nonprobability sample each member of the target population does not have a known chance of being included in the sample (Churchill & Brown, 2007: 356).

Offering
An offering includes a product(s) and/ or a service(s), and most offerings are part product and part service to a varying degree (McDonald, de Chernatony & Harris, 2001: 339). An organisation does not offer products or services or a mix of the two; rather, an organisation can only offer a value proposition, which contains a benefit that is aimed at satisfying a consumer need. Therefore it is argued that the offering is first and foremost the value proposition that is manifested through the product-service mix with accompanying information and experiences (Kotler & Keller, 2012: 32). The information includes the terms and conditions of sale, including “price, quantity, delivery date, shipping costs, guarantee” (Interbrand, 2007: 90).

Organisation
The researcher uses the term ‘organisation’ to refer to an organisation of people or ideas that shares a common goal. An organisation, therefore, includes a commercial business (listed or private, large or small company), a non-profit organisation, a public enterprise, government, institution, geographical area, a political party, a sports club/franchise, museum, tourism bureau, cinema and social cause.

Organisation brand
Also referred to as corporate brand, industrial brand or manufacturer
brand (Aspara & Tikkanen, 2008: 43).

**Phenomenon**

“Thing the cause of which is in question” (Oxford Dictionary, 2010). For this study the phenomenon is brand equity and its building blocks in B2B services.

**Portfolio**

A portfolio includes all offerings that an organisation sells (Lamb, Hair & McDaniel, 2002: 299).

**Portfolio of brands**

A portfolio of brands includes all the brands of an organisation (Interbrand, 2007: 20).

**Probability sampling**

“In a probability sample each member of the target population has a known, nonzero chance of being included in the sample” (Churchill & Brown, 2007: 356).

**Product**

This is a tangible outcome of production (Vargo & Lusch, 2004: 15, 1). Delivery and production can be separated so that a product can be pre-manufactured and stored for later use when there is a demand and are objects that can be sensed (seen, felt, tasted and touched) (Zeithaml, Parasuraman & Berry, 1985: 33). Products include vehicles and fast-moving consumer goods. When a product is sold, ownership transfers from a seller to a buyer.

**Qualitative research**

Qualitative research employs subjective data, which is not easily represented by numbers. This method is used to gather information about consumer preferences, beliefs and emotions. “It investigates perceptions, opinions, brand images, brand personality, and testing of advertisements, and it seeks insights into marketing situations that do not require statistical accuracy” (Interbrand, 2007: 102).

**Quantitative research**

Quantitative research employs objective data that can be statistically analysed, and can be represented by numbers. Data are collected from a sufficiently large sample in order to produce statistically reliable information, which is often used to predict outcomes of the total population. “It is used to determine performance ratings, the importance of different customer needs, current product and customer [consumer] satisfaction levels, probability of repurchase,
and product preference” (Interbrand, 2007: 102).

**Research design**

A research design is a framework or plan, which is used as a guide for collecting and analysing data for a study. There are three research design types, namely exploratory, descriptive and causal (Churchill & Brown, 2007: 79).

**Service**

A service is an act or performance by one party towards another without resulting transfer of ownership of an offering. Services are intangible, while delivery and production are inseparable. Services include health care services, insurance houses, legal firms, consulting firms, hospitality industries, information communication technology firms (Kotler, 2000: 428), government and education (Vargo & Lusch, 2004: 2) – therefore, services that are offered by sports clubs or sports franchises, museums, cinemas, political parties and the Cancer Association of South Africa (a cause). A service is “the application of specialized competencies (knowledge and skills) through deeds, processes, and performances for the benefit of another entity or the entity itself” (Vargo and Lusch, 2004: 2). “A service is more about selling a relationship and the value of the relationship between the buyer and seller of the service” Lorette (2012).

**Service organisation**

组织 that predominantly offers services.

(McDonald *et al.*, 2001: 335)

**Slogan**

This is a short phrase, which single mindedly summarises, the brand promise. It can enhance awareness, especially if the brand name is not too descriptive and can link a brand to its category. It reinforces the brand positioning, point of difference, increases awareness and builds awareness (Keller, 2008: 150 - 161). It is similar to tag lines, but is more enduring. See ‘tag line’.

**Symbol**

This is that part of the logo that cannot be pronounced (Keller, 2008: 156), for example, the Nike swoosh.

**Values**

This refers to internalised enduring motivation (Keller, 2008: 120).
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Consent Form

Towards a client-based brand equity model for selected business-to-business services

Introduction
I extend an invitation to you to participation in a research study by Pieter Steenkamp, a doctoral candidate at the University of Stellenbosch Business School. You were approached because you have insight into aspects relating to short-term business insurance branding. Participation is entirely voluntary and if you volunteer to participate you may refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer and withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. There are no risks or discomfort involved in participating. You need to sign this form to indicating your willingness to participate.

Purpose of study
To develop a model to guide business-to-business services branding.

Research method
A comprehensive face-to-face interview will be conducted to gather data for the study.

Statement of Ethics
The researcher and interviewer abide by the code of marketing and social research of the Southern African Research Association (SAMRA). The code is available from www.samra.co.za. Confidentiality will be maintained by means of non-identification of any participants.

Contact Information
Researcher: Mr Pieter Steenkamp, steenkamppi@cput.ac.za, 072 566 8319
Supervisor: Prof. Frikkie Herbst, Frikkie.Herbst@usb.ac.za, 021 918 4227

Consent
I hereby consent voluntarily to participate in this study and am aware that the interview will be manually and digitally recorded.

Signature of participant ___________________________ Date ____________

Signature of interviewer ___________________________ Date ____________

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
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Appendix 8: Coded primary document
INTERVIEW H1

FIELDWORKER: [Small chat] Okay. Alright. Good afternoon PARTICIPANT H1. Thank you so much for so much for the time that you are spending with me. I'm with PARTICIPANT H1 from the HOTEL H1. A beautiful hotel and so thank you for your time PARTICIPANT H1. Now PARTICIPANT H1 we spoke on the telephone a good few weeks ago and obviously, just the consent form before we go any further to say that we are going to record this interview, just for data accuracy.

PARTICIPANT H1: Okay.

FIELDWORKER: Thank you. Thank you. Now you said that you are with ..... and you guys are moving over to Old Mutual.

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: So where are you right now, with which insurance business house is your hotel insured with?

PARTICIPANT H1: Still with ..... at the moment.

FIELDWORKER: Ja, okay. Alright lovely. Now how would you classify your position in this hotel? Owner, partner, shareholder or an employee?

PARTICIPANT H1: Employee.
FIELDWORKER: Is the hotel operated as a sole proprietor, partnership, a closed corporation, a private company PTY Ltd or a public company Limited?

PARTICIPANT H1: PTY Limited.

FIELDWORKER: PTY Ltd. What is the official star grading of the hotel, one, two, three, four or five star?

PARTICIPANT H1: Five star.

FIELDWORKER: Five star. How many rooms does the hotel have?

PARTICIPANT H1: 79.

FIELDWORKER: Yes, quite a big hotel hey? And how many full time employees does the hotel have?

PARTICIPANT H1: About I would say like a 100 plus minus.

FIELDWORKER: Alright. How many years has the hotel been in operation?

PARTICIPANT H1: Five years now.

FIELDWORKER: Five years. Now when you think of short term business insurance which brands can you
recall or are you aware of?

PARTICIPANT H1: Okay. There is - short-term?

FIELDWORKER: Short term yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: So we’re talking about - I know that Alexander Forbes, AIG, Auto and General, Mutual and Federal.

FIELDWORKER: Okay [inaudible 02:46] yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And Santam.

FIELDWORKER: [Inaudible 02:50]

PARTICIPANT H1: Dial Direct, Out…

FIELDWORKER: Dial Direct okay. **Which of the following other short terms business insurance brands do you recognise or are you aware of? Are you aware of First for Women?**

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: Yes. **Absa Insurance?**

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: **Auto and General Insurance?**
PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: Budget Insurance Brokers?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: ..... South Africa?

PARTICIPANT H1: .....?

FIELDWORKER: ..... 

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: Okay. Dial Direct Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Etana Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: No. HDI-Gerling Insurance of South Africa?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Hollard Insurance?
PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: Indequity Specialised Insurance.

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Insurance driven by AA?

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes, actually as a matter of fact.

FIELDWORKER: Lion of Africa Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: No, Lloyds?

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: Lombard Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Momentum Short Term Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: Mutual and Federal Insurance?
FIELDWORKER: Nedgroup Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Alright. Outsurance Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Regent Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: Renasa Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: SA Fire or Safire Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Santam Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Standard Bank Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: Yip.

FIELDWORKER: Unity Insurance?
PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Zurich Insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Oh right. Now who are your competitors insured with?

PARTICIPANT H1: Well the one that I definitely do know is Table Bay.

FIELDWORKER: Table Bay, yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And they're insured with Alexander Forbes.

FIELDWORKER: Okay that's Alexander Forbes, okay right. Now you spoke about initially - about you know when you think of short term business insurance, which brands can you recall you said Alexander Forbes, AIG. Now when you talk about let’s first - you also mentioned your own ….., what association or word comes to mind when you think about you know, your own?

PARTICIPANT H1: About my own insurance?

FIELDWORKER: Yes, …..

PARTICIPANT H1: And when I think about them?
FIELDWORKER: Ja.

PARTICIPANT H1: The sort of like, your feelings about them or?

FIELDWORKER: Feelings, yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: When I think about them, the first?

FIELDWORKER: Ja, ja.

PARTICIPANT H1: I don't want to be rude but they really are useless okay.

FIELDWORKER: When you say useless, please elaborate.

PARTICIPANT H1: Because for instance, we put certain claims and stuff in that literally took them about six, seven months to come back to us, just to say that no, they're not going to pay it.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: They lost some of our paperwork.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And then certain other things, we you know like we had to go back to them about three or four times because it's this - like how can I say - one of our
boardrooms flooded because of the air-con that a pipe burst or something. So, the floor and everything was damaged and we had to go and get so many like outside - sort of like advice as to exactly what happened. You know because they basically didn't want to take our word for the fact that it was a burst pipe okay.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: So they didn't - and also the other thing is they don't send their own assessors, we have to get assessors.

FIELDWORKER: You do?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja for those, we had to basically do that and you know so ja that's why I'm saying.

FIELDWORKER: You're saying [inaudible 06:14].

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: So useless is one word that comes to mind, maybe any other expletives that you want to add onto the word useless?

PARTICIPANT H1: It's really - that's like I said it's the word that actually really comes up.

FIELDWORKER: That sums up quite a lot hey, PARTICIPANT H1?
PARTICIPANT H1: Absolutely ja.

FIELDWORKER: PARTICIPANT H1 you also mentioned Alexander Forbes. What - when you mentioned Alexander Forbes what word comes to mind?

PARTICIPANT H1: Efficient, you know.

FIELDWORKER: Efficient, yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Because I'm like thinking of my previous company Sun International I worked for and obviously it's their insurers and you put a claim in - they're like fast.

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: And you know immediately what they actually, you know what they are going to do, what they're not going to do. I for instance, put a claim in when I was at the Kalahari Sands Hotel for the, what do you call it? A UPS box that was like struck by lightning and the same day you know I phoned them - the same day they actually had one of the brokers, our broker actually came out and he then filled in all of the paper work and stuff. The assessor was there, shortly after, he actually flew all the way from South Africa to come and have a look and they
gave us the best advice as to exactly what we need to do and within a month basically I would say two months, the whole thing was sorted out. We had the new UPS. That's why I'm saying like fast, efficient and you know like and very helpful.

FIELDWORKER: Helpful, oh lovely, helpful okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Okay alright. Now you talk about AIG. What comes to mind when you think about the word AIG, or the insurance AIG?

PARTICIPANT H1: Sort of like you know I would also say the reason why I'm thinking of them from a service point of view.

FIELDWORKER: Good service, bad service?

PARTICIPANT H1: You know good service, ja.

FIELDWORKER: Okay right, alright. Auto and General? What words comes to mind or association?

PARTICIPANT H1: My association with them?

FIELDWORKER: Ja.

PARTICIPANT H1: Is ..... [Laughing]. Their
managing, as well - I think he was their Managing
Director and it's just my dealings that I had with him while I was working as a student.

FIELDWORKER: Yes, yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: So very bombastic and…

FIELDWORKER: Bombastic.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Okay bombastic. Mutual and Federal? **Words and association that comes to mind when you think of the words Mutual and Federal?**

PARTICIPANT H1: Mutual and Federal - if I think about them - I think it's expensive.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: Okay because they are very expensive. If you compare them to other you know companies and what else. Ja that's sort of like if I think about them.

FIELDWORKER: Alright, Santam?

PARTICIPANT H1: Santam…

FIELDWORKER: Was it Santam or Sanlam that you mentioned?
PARTICIPANT H1: Santam.

FIELDWORKER: Was it Santam okay yes?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: What do you think about Santam?

PARTICIPANT H1: What do I think about it?

FIELDWORKER: Ja, ja.

PARTICIPANT H1: When I think of that it's like ultimately it's my insurer.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And so they've also been helpful you know like ja and then also the other thing is if I think about them, I see this actor and the whole Nando's ad [indistinct 09:25]. You know for me that was, it was just the fact little thing with their - you know with their ad where they say the little things that you miss?

FIELDWORKER: Yes, yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And it actually sort of like started making sense on the fact there is so many little things in your contract that you are - sort of like you just skim through it and you actually miss a lot of things and you
know, so from that point of view, how can I say, it's sort of like an - they opened my eyes to a lot of things okay.

FIELDWORKER: Through advertising?

PARTICIPANT H1: Through advertising.

FIELDWORKER: Alright.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja so yes, I think their ad, because their ads are really very - ja very punchy and sort of like in your face you know?

FIELDWORKER: But do they come across like that?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Santam, in your face? Okay in your face…

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja and you know what's also nice about what they do if you really think about it is the alignment with other well known brands.

FIELDWORKER: When you talk alignment PARTICIPANT H1, what do you mean alignment?

PARTICIPANT H1: Look at - look at the fact of how they, they actually align them with like with Nando's you know with this whole - I don't know - did you see that whole thing with Nando's because they had the waiter where the
waiter would actually - or the barman, that would put the different drinks and stuff and then they - they say at the end, did you notice how many times he has actually changed his clothes?

FIELDWORKER: Oh that ad, I think it’s a brilliant ad. Absolutely.

PARTICIPANT H1: Exactly and then Nando’s went and they did actually - they how can I say it - they did a Nando’s ad with the different chickens and stuff, portions and they also said like have you noticed how many times?

FIELDWORKER: Oh I know about that ad. That’s - that’s a very good ad hey?

PARTICIPANT H1: And then what they actually did was they went out - they - the guy from Santam - the actor - that actually did the ad, he went onto - it was on u-Tube - they went onto the TV and they know that a certain brand has actually like - been you know - playing the monkey with them etcetera, etcetera.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And that they actually then said that - they challenged Nando’s to actually go - give x amount of food - he had a whole list of foods and burgers and stuff that they had to go and donate to a charity of their choice.

FIELDWORKER: Oh my word. So you don’t take on the
big boys...

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Because you're going to pay at the end of the day.

PARTICIPANT H1: But that's - you see so for me that was like - I will never forget this whole thing because of this whole alignment and - and how they - this whole Nando's and then sort of like - I don't know to put it - it was like so amicable. It was the fact that yes, so now you are like playing a joke with us, but this is what we - so we retaliate and we tell you to go and donate something you know.

FIELDWORKER: Yes, yes, yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: So it was - maybe you can put there also like just from a response point of view...

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: It was like so quickly and really - I don't know.

FIELDWORKER: So the response as well.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja and...

FIELDWORKER: Okay that's good. Now
PARTICIPANT H1 - okay we've now covered the association and thank you for that. That was very in depth and I thank you that, four - we've covered that.

PARTICIPANT H1: I talk a lot, yes I know.

FIELDWORKER: Oh that's perfect, perfect that is what we want. We want lots of information. Alright let's get back here to the Question 5. Now the slogan of ... or ..... do you know what their slogan means?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Do you know the slogan?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: No, that's - okay - perfect. Can you please tell me about your experience with your hotel's insurance purchase process? Did you deal directly with the insurance house, through a broker, a walk in centre, telephonically or via a website?

PARTICIPANT H1: No the broker.

FIELDWORKER: Do you know the name of that broker, PARTICIPANT H1?

PARTICIPANT H1:.......
FIELDWORKER: And the name of that company?

PARTICIPANT H1: Okay you see the thing is because I think - if I'm not mistaken ..... is the actual broker and the insurance itself is ......

FIELDWORKER: Okay, right so you are with ..... hey?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: ..... Insurance, okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja, see, I always forget.

FIELDWORKER: No, no that's fine. Now PARTICIPANT H1 who was involved from your hotel side when you purchased, renewed or amended your hotel's insurance?

PARTICIPANT H1: Myself and our property manager.

FIELDWORKER: Okay, property manager.

PARTICIPANT H1: And then obviously we had to present all of that to the Managing Director and the owner. They've got the last say.

FIELDWORKER: Okay alright fine, lovely, thank you.

PARTICIPANT H1: And how did you experience your
purchasing, the insurance purchase, renewal or amendment process?

FIELDWORKER: Is there any other detail that you would like to mention regarding your experience?

With ..... 

PARTICIPANT H1: With ..... okay.

FIELDWORKER: Or the insurance house, which?

PARTICIPANT H1: Well the one thing that I sort of like can really say because ultimately you know like I said we want to move over to Old Mutual okay?

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And ..... was sort of like so confident in the fact that we will not move our business that they didn't really go out of their way to really you know like come and do a proper presentation...

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And this is the - like additional services we can offer etcetera and we did tell them actually as a matter of fact, that we are looking at changing insurance company okay? So for me that was like really a just another sign of like really how interested they are in keeping our business because you know if they're like really interested they would fight for it.
FIELDWORKER: So they did nothing out of the ordinary to hold onto it - or to retain the business?

PARTICIPANT H1: Exactly.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: They sort of like just expect you know or accepted that we are going to renew again.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: So while this guy from Old Mutual actually came and we sat down like one whole morning and we went through each and every aspect of the - with the insurance because we've got four companies insurance that we had to look at and we sat and worked through each and every aspect of all of that insurance. That was quite in depth.

FIELDWORKER: That was in depth hey.

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes.

FIELDWORKER: And ..... does nothing out of the experience~
ary, just you know obviously renew claims and amend
and then they are but furthermore nothing else?

PARTICIPANT H1: No, nothing else?
FIELDWORKER: Alright. So **now when you renewed** and when you purchased or when you put in your **claim** tell me about your experience.

PARTICIPANT H1: When we renew okay.

FIELDWORKER: Renew you know put in a claim or even just you know.

PARTICIPANT H1: I can tell you from a claim point of view okay.

FIELDWORKER: From a claim point of view, perfect.

PARTICIPANT H1: Because you know like we've now put quite a few claims and stuff in, in the last year that I know of and like I said to you, some of them they are - like the - I would say the normal straightforward ones, they will sort out okay?

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: It's the ones that actually where there is a bit more involvement and a bit more - you know like I could say work that has to go in there and those are the ones that we then really struggled to get you know, some any, kind of feedback from them. Our property manager - actually - I wanted him to be here as well but he's only coming in later.

FIELDWORKER: Yes, yes.
PARTICIPANT H1: I know for a fact that he actually gets so annoyed with them because you know like he has to go back and back and back and like I said there's always something else that they want. So if they tell you right from you know, from the get go, to say this is what we exactly want from you so we can process this claim it's all good and well but so they'll send you the forms, you'll complete the forms and then like a week later they come back and say okay now they want this and now they want that and for me that is like very unprofessional. It's like, it's like…

FIELDWORKER: Alright so you're saying they're asking too little information at the initial stages. You know that is obviously - to maybe to probably delay it or?

PARTICIPANT H1: I don't know if it's to delay it but it's just a case of you know - it's just - maybe they don't - they actually themselves don't know exactly what is needed you know and that's actually quite scary because if they've been in busy how long, then they should actually know what is required to put in a proper claim.

FIELDWORKER: Okay lovely. **Now how much influence does your broker have over which insurance brand you are insured with and how much influence do you have?**

PARTICIPANT H1: As a matter of fact I think they're dealing with ..... and that's what they sort of like went
PARTICIPANT H1: So - I know that they said to me the last time that I spoke to them that they were actually sitting with a few different companies looking at prices, but they didn't actually tell me which companies.

FIELDWORKER: Okay but they do give you a choice? I mean you know at the end of the day you know once, you know obviously once the renewal - you know obviously you know, [inaudible 18:44] they do give you a choice of...

PARTICIPANT H1: Exactly.

FIELDWORKER: Brand. Okay alright so does your broker have a lot of influence over the brand that you choose from and how influenced are you?

PARTICIPANT H1: Well we basically to tell you the truth because like I said we're with Chartirs - the last time we went - we actually went through all of the stuff we - he just said to me that's like - oh that they were sitting with all of the insurance companies and went through all of the quotes and that ..... was still the cheapest okay. And that was it, you know. So we're still with ......

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: So he didn't actually come back and
influence over IH insured with~
say okay fine these are all of the different quotes from the different companies. It was just okay ..... is the cheapest therefore we'll go with .....  

FIELDWORKER:ű Okay, okay alright, that's lovely and **how would you describe - well ..... brand personality?** If they were to come to - alive as a person - like if you can - if you look at the word Coca-Cola.  

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.  

FIELDWORKER: How would you describe them - fun - in the sun - summer - how would you describe your insurance company for your business?  

PARTICIPANT H1: For the business?  

FIELDWORKER: For the business, all about the business HOTEL H1.  

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja I'll tell you now because we actually had - we had one of their assessors here and I would say very - I don't want to use the word unapproachable but it was just the case that they're very sort of like this is what it is and you know - there's no like negotiation or anything like that. Although, I must actually also say that they - because the assessor came and he did an assessment on the building itself and they gave us a list of all of the risk areas, if I can put it like that and they gave us - you know at least they gave us a few months'
IH: brand personality~

IH: Service satisfaction~
ultimately from their point of view as well because it makes the - like fire risk and stuff more you know - so from that point - you know that point of view it was fine. But it was still a case of it's not like they're warm and fuzzy and…

FIELDWORKER: Okay alright, so they're a cold, it's all of that?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: So I shouldn't really be putting words into your mouth but I'm trying to you know, trying to feel what you are saying.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja that's why I'm saying they're not - it's not like this warm and fuzzy feeling that you would get okay but they were just sort of like very down to this is what it is and you know, so move on.

FIELDWORKER: Okay, cut and dry.

PARTICIPANT H1: Cut and dry, ja.

FIELDWORKER: Okay alright that's fine. **To what extent do you feel you grew up with your short term insurer and what is your opinion regarding the history, the heritage and the years of experience?**

PARTICIPANT H1: To what extent you feel you grew up with, kind of thing?
FIELDWORKER: Ja to what extent you feel you grew up with .....? Let's mention both, ..... and ..... and what is your opinion regarding the history and heritage and the years of experience with both these people, with both these companies?

PARTICIPANT H1: You know the thing is like, like I said, there was - I mean when I arrived here there was a lot of old stuff that was still pending, that hadn't been dealt with and unfortunately, how can I say it? There was just like new stuff lumped in there because of silly, you know things like laptops that they steal etcetera.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And the way that all of these things were - because that's the other problem we had - was the fact that like the electronic equipment and stuff wasn't properly detailed on the actual - you know on your - the insurance papers.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And so then they turned around and say well they're not going to pay for these things. But my point is like you're the one that actually has to make sure that all of these items are listed under the electronic section of the claim. So we had - we had really a lot of problems with them trying to sort out the laptops that were stolen.
FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: So they stole a few laptops.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: And so from that point of view if I can put it like that it was like really like pulling teeth to get those things sorted out.

FIELDWORKER: That claim sorted out.

PARTICIPANT H1: And that literally I'm not going to lie to you it took us most probably a year and a half.

FIELDWORKER: Wow.

PARTICIPANT H1: To get those things sorted out and eventually they decided to - they only paid out one laptop.

FIELDWORKER: One laptop?

PARTICIPANT H1: One laptop ja and out of four that were stolen and it was like stolen in, not all of them at the same time. So it's not a case like okay fine if you pay me the one was - I had reported it was stolen. The one was stolen out of the car and like you know with that whole thing in Durban they have where if you put it in the boot, so you think it's safe in there, with the hatchback, that they then opened the car and they go in to - through the back seat into the...
FIELDWORKER: Into the hatch…

PARTICIPANT H1: Into the hatch and steal. So we had one of those okay. Then we had two break-ins to our office where they also stole like the laptops out of the office and you know so and that's why I'm saying. So it was different cases and we sent them through the dockets from the police station. They lost the dockets from the police station.

FIELDWORKER: Is this your insurance company has lost the dockets or your brokers have lost the dockets?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja no it was most probably the brokers.

FIELDWORKER: The brokers that lost the…

PARTICIPANT H1: So obviously they're not going to say who it was. So it was just oh the paper work went missing and we had to submit the same stuff about three or four times before…

FIELDWORKER: Through your brokers?

PARTICIPANT H1: Through our brokers ja. And you see that was sort of like for us the cherry on top because already we've been struggling to get the information and stuff out of them or basically then [inaudible 24:53]. There was some really, there was stuff sitting on there that was
like nearly two years old.

FIELDWORKER: So the claim was not processed and it's two years later.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: And it's still not processed?

PARTICIPANT H1: Exactly.

FIELDWORKER: Now, now - to what - okay fine you know - talk to me about you know the history of - of ..... - talk to me about the heritage and the years experience that you've had in your, you know, you being with them?

PARTICIPANT H1: To tell you the truth my experience with them is like what I have now and that's obviously not very good.

FIELDWORKER: Not a good experience?

PARTICIPANT H1: No..

FIELDWORKER: Okay. Alright. Okay that's lovely. Now PARTICIPANT H1 how satisfied are you - okay we've covered a lot of the service. You've said you know bad service, they don't follow up. Claims take up to two years to process.
PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Is there anything else you know in a nutshell that you’d like to add about the service that you’ve received from you know from the insurance house?

PARTICIPANT H1: Anything else?

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: No my thing is this that I’m not one, I can’t say with 100% surety okay or certainty but the whole issue is just with ..... or if it’s with our broker. You know because like I said to you they don’t - they’re sort of like always like very vague in the reasons as to why certain things are not being done.

FIELDWORKER: Right.

PARTICIPANT H1: You know so I don’t want to go and say ..... is not doing their job properly or anything like that.

FIELDWORKER: Yes, yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: Because in my mind it’s actually more the actual broker that’s not doing their job or actually fulfilling their role in a proper way.

FIELDWORKER: Okay right.
PARTICIPANT H1: You know so from a ..... point of view I think most probably when and if they eventually found like the claim stuff I filed, they most probably are doing what they have to do you know. So therefore, that's why I'm saying it is a bit difficult to go to [inaudible 26:54] point and say that ..... did this and that. But because I don't have any prior history with ..... - I can't tell you if they are efficient or what they are you know.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: Because really literally the broker that's making the whole thing sour.

FIELDWORKER: Alright you spoke about the efficiency, regarding in terms of speed, responsiveness and so on and so forth. You're saying you know they are not all that you know they drag their feet etcetera, etcetera.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Okay. How trusting caring and focused on you the client is the service that you receive from .....?

PARTICIPANT H1: How trusting?

FIELDWORKER: How trusting caring and focused on you the client? I'll give you a minute to think about that,
I'm just going to…

PARTICIPANT H1: Okay. That's a good question. Why do they have questions like that? How trusting, caring and focused on you or the service that you receive from them. I don't know. Ah di da, di da…

FIELDWORKER: Do they focus on you as a client? I mean if the claims are taking two years to settle, do you think they're focused on you as the client…

PARTICIPANT H1: Oh no, no.

FIELDWORKER: So they're not focused, customer focused?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Okay, alright. So there's now…

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja that's okay thank you. I was like just stuck there.

FIELDWORKER: Okay what rewards, incentives if any do you receive from being insured with…..?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: No, okay. Do you think that price is important when deciding which brand of business insurance to purchase and why do you say so?
PARTICIPANT H1: Well obviously from our point of view, it is important, okay because you know you always like try to pay, well, you like to get the best service but pay the least for it okay as little as possible. My point is just that what we actually try to do here is like still make sure that we have like sufficient cover for all of our areas and just get the best price for it.

FIELDWORKER: Okay alright. So do you mind paying, you know obviously for good service do you mind paying the extra dollar or so?

PARTICIPANT H1: Well if it is good service then you will, okay. But then you definitely need to get that, well service as well.

FIELDWORKER: Okay alright. What is your overall opinion of ..... and it's quality?

PARTICIPANT H1: Oh did we not already cover that question?

FIELDWORKER: Alright that's fine.

PARTICIPANT H1: No I'm just like thinking because I'm going to say exactly the same thing.

FIELDWORKER: Okay so did we repeat that? Okay fine. Just tell me that okay?
PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: What are your feelings toward .....? Give it to me in a nutshell [inaudible 30:44].

PARTICIPANT H1: Well my feelings towards ..... - run like hell.

FIELDWORKER: Are you going to tell other people to run like hell or?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja most probably if they say the word to me.

FIELDWORKER: Okay. To what extent would you be willing to invest the time, money or other resources to get to know ..... better?

PARTICIPANT H1: To what extent?

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: You know what I'm sort of like so over ..... it's like no.

FIELDWORKER: You will not? Okay so you won't invest any time?

PARTICIPANT H1: Because my opinion about that is, there are so many insurance companies out there okay.
FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: Me as the client I don't need to go out and canvass to their business, you know or for them to get my business okay. I honestly feel that they should be coming to us and say this is the service we can offer and this is what, you know what we can do for you as the company and this includes all of these, it's like the services, the caring, the etcetera you know?

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And focusing on us as the client and honestly I haven't - we haven't had that from them.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: And ja so therefore...

FIELDWORKER: Okay. Oh that's great. To what extent is ..... a part of you and who you are?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: No, you're not a part at all?

PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: Okay right. How would you describe your relationship with other business that also insure
PARTICIPANT H1: I actually don't know because I'm trying to think because obviously they always give you this, like a list of all of the companies that are - they're dealing with, the brokers. So and I know that there is some of the other hotels on there as well and the only way I can tell you, our relationship with all of the other hotels are competition.

FIELDWORKER: Competition, competitive? Okay. Now how would you describe your relationship with ......, the brokers and the owner representatives?

PARTICIPANT H1: Our relationship?

FIELDWORKER: Ja. Because that should cover a little bit of you know - because that should cover everything that will be great, PARTICIPANT H1.

PARTICIPANT H1: The thing is ja - it's not a really - it's not a good relationship.

FIELDWORKER: Okay. When you say not good, we've obviously ascertained, it's quite cut and dry, quite business like and off they go, there's no time invested in you as the client.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja it's sort of like I said to you, there's no - you know like being here ensuring that they can keep our business. It's basically like we got the
business and now you can carry on your own.

FIELDWORKER: Okay, alright. So there's okay how do we put this now in plain layman's terms? Alright, no that's fine I will be able to do that. **So what's the most favourable aspect or the best aspect about .....?**

PARTICIPANT H1: What is the best aspect?

FIELDWORKER: Yes. If you don't know - that's also fine.

PARTICIPANT H1: No, I honestly don't know.

FIELDWORKER: Okay, perfect. Now **your least favourable or your worst aspect?** You said they do nothing to retain your business?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: They just expect you on the annual basis just to go with them and renew and there's no presence throughout the year, what else?

PARTICIPANT H1: The other thing also is the fact that they should be revising the business. You know because your business changed.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.
PARTICIPANT H1: They've only done it with me once. IH: Least favourable~
They haven't done it, they haven't even come back and looked at any of those figures and stuff again.

FIELDWORKER:  Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: You know so I just feel you need to be re-assessed on a yearly basis to ensure that you know like your business interruption is - because that's like the most important thing that all of those things are covered.

FIELDWORKER:  Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: What they had on there for business interruption was like so wishy-washy that if this hotel actually burnt down? You have to look at the fact that it will take you about six years to get this place back up and running, okay. They only covered this hotel for I think one year. So how can you do that? One year?

FIELDWORKER:  [Inaudible35:21].

PARTICIPANT H1: But it's those kind of things and then so my point is then also from a knowledge point of view, product knowledge, our product knowledge point of view, how well do they know our product because if they then couldn't advise us properly on that how much do they actually advise on - on other things because that's only one thing that we've picked up.

FIELDWORKER:  Yes, fine.
PARTICIPANT H1: You know so then you actually have to start questioning the rest of the things as well.

FIELDWORKER: Alright any unique points about .....?

PARTICIPANT H1: I don't know.

FIELDWORKER: No unique, nothing okay. How likely are you to recommend them? Most definitely, definitely, maybe, definitely not, most definitely not?

PARTICIPANT H1: I would just go with definitely not.

FIELDWORKER: Definitely not, okay, perfect.

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: In a nutshell again. I know we've covered this but just give it to me again, why not?

PARTICIPANT H1: Why not?

FIELDWORKER: Whynot?

PARTICIPANT H1: I think it's because of their, their really lack of good, lack of service.

FIELDWORKER: Okay. Alright, which aspect of your relationship with the brokers, the sales people or other
of the insurance provider’s representatives are important?

PARTICIPANT H1: Which aspect of your relationship?

FIELDWORKER: Yes. The brokers, the sales people or other of the insurance providers representatives, the etcetera, etcetera are important and why are they important?

PARTICIPANT H1: I would say like I said knowledge, the knowledge of your business you know. If they don't know they should know what is and this is ja - it's like your broker.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: Because I think they are the most - they're like an important link between you and the insurers, okay.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: And if they don't know your business and the product that you sell then it creates problems because then you sit with things like - like conference rooms that's basically standing empty for months because they don't want to you know there's no effort, real effort from their side to actually resolve the issue.

FIELDWORKER: Okay so - so you say from the
broker’s point - the broker must know your business?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Alright, alright.

PARTICIPANT H1: Or the type of business. I don’t say they must know exactly thing that goes into but they need to know the hospitality industry.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: You know so if you don’t know then don’t - you know don’t try and get the insurance for hotels and those kind of things. The other thing also is really like from a relationship point of view I would say they just need to be there you know, sort of like, for you when you - when you need them. I don’t say like you must phone me every week or something like that, but even if they come around to you and just say you know like how’s everything? Is there any issues and stuff that you can think that we need to deal with or etcetera.

FIELDWORKER: How often do you need them to come around?

PARTICIPANT H1: You know I would say even if it’s every three months or six months. Just come and do a courtesy visit and actually see, you know.

FIELDWORKER: Okay. So you say they must come
around quarterly?

PARTICIPANT H1: Ja.

FIELDWORKER: Every three months, okay. Alright. Now PARTICIPANT H1 we're coming to the end of the questionnaire. How did you experience this questionnaire and what changes would you make to this survey if there is any?

PARTICIPANT H1: How did I experience it? No I think it was - it was very - basically covered everything.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: Okay. There was just I think one, there was like ja, one question that was - that I felt was a bit like repetitive.

FIELDWORKER: Yes.

PARTICIPANT H1: About how do I feel about my insurance company.

FIELDWORKER: Okay.

PARTICIPANT H1: And…

FIELDWORKER: Alright that’s fine. Are there any other comments that you would like to make as we
PARTICIPANT H1: No.

FIELDWORKER: No. Now if I need to obviously add on to this, you know, maybe some more data, am I able to contact you via telephone?

PARTICIPANT H1: Yes, you can do that.

FIELDWORKER: Lovely, thank you so much. Thank you. Now PARTICIPANT H1 we - oh - that's my business card which I forgot to give you.

PARTICIPANT H1: Okay thank you. I don't have one here, I think.

FIELDWORKER: Now I think - have this one - I can - now I did mention on my email to you that everything is incentivized. All our interviews are incentivized. Now there's a Cavendish Square gift voucher and a Woolworths gift voucher and Exclusive Books gift voucher to the value of R200. Please take your pick.

PARTICIPANT H1: Oh my goodness.

FIELDWORKER: I know.

PARTICIPANT H1: I'll - you know what I'll take the Woolworths one. I've got an Exclusive Books one…
FIELDWORKER: I think so too.

PARTICIPANT H1: That I still haven't used.

FIELDWORKER: Well thank you so much for your time

PARTICIPANT H1 and have a lovely, lovely day.

PARTICIPANT H1: Thank you very much.

FIELDWORKER: Thank you.
PARTICIPANT H1: It's a pleasure.
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