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Abstract

The main purpose of the study was to evaluate the impact of brand reliability and brand intention on brand loyalty, brand equity, and overall satisfaction in the context of mobile telecommunication services of Bangladesh. Three specific brands were considered for the study includes Banglalink, GrameenPhone, and Robi. A convenient sample of 60 respondents was taken. Cranach alpha values calculated for each of the constructs considered in the study showed an acceptable level of internal consistency in the measured constructs. Both brand reliability and brand intention were found to affect the brand loyalty and the impact was found to be statistically significant. Similarly, both brand reliability and brand intention were found to affect the brand equity and the impact was found to be statistically significant. Finally both brand reliability and brand intention were found to affect the overall satisfaction and the impact was found to be statistically significant. Future research can be conducted by evaluating the impact of brand intention and brand reliability on some other constructs of interest. Moreover, future studies can also be conducted to evaluate the antecedents of both brand intention and band reliability.
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**Introduction:**

**Brand Reliability:**

Reliability is the first Brand Ability that the brand requires, in order to be a success in the marketplace. To be reliable, in effect, is to be able to deliver on time every time. When your brand promises a customer that the product will perform in a certain manner, within a certain time frame, you must consistently make sure that the promise is fulfilled or exceeded. Reliability is the degree to which an assessment tool produces stable and consistent results.

**Brand Intention:**

Brand Intention is brand strategy tool developed by freelance creative planning. Brand awareness is a customer's ability to recognize a particular brand based on its specific characteristics and images. In addition to this awareness, companies also need to focus on their customers' intent to buy a product or service. The beauty of a Brand Intention is that it is mutually beneficial to us all. It gives employees and customers alike meaning and can turn them into proud collaborators. And this is when the magic starts.

**Brand Equity:**

Brand equity refers to a value premium that a company generates from a product with a recognizable name when compared to a generic equivalent. Companies can create brand equity for their products by making them memorable, easily recognizable, and superior in quality and reliability. Mass [marketing campaigns](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/marketing-campaign.asp) also help to create brand equity. When a company has positive brand equity, customers willingly pay a high price for its products, even though they could get the same thing from a competitor for less. Customers, in effect, pay a price premium to do business with a firm they know and admire. Because the company with brand equity does not incur a higher expense than its competitors to produce the product and bring it to market, the difference in price goes to [margin](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/margin.asp). The firm's brand equity enables it to make a bigger profit on each sale.

**Overall Consumer Satisfaction:**

Customer satisfaction is defined as "the number of customers, or percentage of total customers, whose reported experience with a firm, its products, or its services (ratings) exceeds specified [satisfaction](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contentment) goals. Customer satisfaction is a term frequently used in [marketing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marketing). It is a measure of how products and services supplied by a company meet or surpass [customer](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Customer) expectation. It is seen as a [key performance indicator](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Key_performance_indicator) within business and is often part of a [Balanced Scorecard](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balanced_Scorecard). In a competitive marketplace where businesses compete for customers, overall customer satisfaction is seen as a key differentiator and increasingly has become a key element of business strategy.

**Industry Perspectives:**

**Origin of the TELEPHONE**

The fundamental change which a single invention brings to the world is exactly the telephone. Talking to dear ones far way with graceful ease and comfort of one's home is the benefit of this invention. In this modern world of mobile phones and Internet telephone, the fundamental shift to society that occurred with the discovery of the telephone is taken for granted.

In the old school days, kids were taught to tie two tin cans together using thin wire and holding them tightly separately from each other allowing sound to flow from one end to the other. This is a basic telephone is the one seen in the Flintstones cartoons but the real ones necessitate electricity and components.

This is an entirely different system used in ships in the shape of long pipes in the ship's bridge could be carried down to the engine room. The electric telegraph was made-up in the early 1800s and was constantly carrying messages of all sorts. There was always a craving to improve the telegraph. The knowledge of sound waves through teaching deaf students gave Alexander Graham Bell an idea to invent telephone.

Bell was recognized with being a gentle man and an inventor of telephone. He almost lost that honor as Bell and Elisha Gray, another prominent inventor applied for his patent for the telephone on the same day, the 14th of February 1876. Unfortunately, Bell's lawyer and the clerk of the patent office who had served in the Civil War and they conspired for Bell's patent registration first. The patent examiner called a halt to processing when he realized that both applications were similar until they could be demonstrated. Bell demonstrated the technique devised by Gray and was granted the patent. According to historians, Gray would have considered to be the inventor of telephone if Bell had not demonstrated first.

Only a year after Bell's patent was registered, the techniques of Alexander Graham Bell and Thomas Watson directly led to the first commercial telephone services. Other prominent scientists before Bell like Johann Reis of Germany and Antonio Meucci of Italy had also demonstrated telephone prototypes but their techniques were not very advanced.

The citizens of Boston benefited for the first time in 1877 with the installing of first telephone. Telephone switchboards were quickly invented allowing subscribers to talk to any phone associated to the same set of telephone lines. The first entered service in 1878 in New Haven. After first three years of commercial telephones, the United States boasted nearly thousands of telephones. With the invention of the telephone switchboard, subscribers needed a way to effectively attach with each other without connecting to an operator.

Early telephone exchanges were locally based and a subscriber could only talk to another subscriber on their own exchange by asking an operator to place the call. Long distance calls could not be placed from home. An appointment was needed with the central telephone office that could transmit over longer wire distances.

The actual telephone device used in the home underwent considerable development in the 1920s when Western Electric developed a phone that consisted of a handset including earpiece and microphone. This allowed subscribers to chat while moving for the first time. The Bell Model 102 was the very first development of this type of telephone still popular today.

Telephones didn't transform much after 1930s until the introduction of digital telephones and exchanges in the 1960s. By 2005, mobile phone connections in many developed nations outshined the fixed line connections.

**Origin of the MOBILE PHONE**

Mobile phones, particularly the smart phones have become our inseparable companions today.

However, the history of mobile phones goes back to 1908 when a US Patent was issued in Kentucky for a wireless telephone.

Mobile phones were invented as early as the 1940s when engineers working at AT&T developed cells for mobile phone base stations.

The very first mobile phones were not really mobile phones at all rather they were two-way radios that allowed people like taxi drivers and the emergency services to communicate.

Instead of relying on base stations with separate cells (and the signal being passed from one cell to another), the first mobile phone networks involved one very powerful base station covering a much wider area.

On 3 April 1973, Motorola were the first company to mass produce the first handheld mobile phone.

These early mobile phones are often referred to as 0G mobile phones, or Zero Generation mobile phones. Most phones today rely on 3G or 4G mobile technology.

Before cell phones, there were car phones. In fact, the original car phones weighed about 80 pounds. In 1947, an engineer at Bell Lab’s envisioned a futuristic phone network for their car phones. A call would bounce uninterrupted between cells of coverage. At the time the technology and the infrastructure for this did not exist. But it soon would. The car phones quickly became popular despite their limitations. Only a limited number of people could use the service at a time, which meant five to ten year waiting lists began to form. And existing customers could sometimes wait up to 30 minutes to place a call.

But then in 1973, Motorola engineer Martin Cooper showed what the future would look like: the DynaTAC 8000X.Based on Bell’s cell network concept, it was the world’s first handheld cell phone. Ten years and a one hundred million dollar investment later, Motorola finally released the phone to the public. The decade-long delay was caused by the need to build the cellular infrastructure the phone required to operate. The phone took t10 hours to charge, lasted 35 minutes and cost $3,995 which should be about $10,000 today.

 

[Martin Cooper](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Cooper_(inventor)) of Motorola made the first publicized handheld mobile phone call on a prototype DynaTAC model, on 3 April 1973. This is a reenactment in 2007.

Ahead of its time, the IBM Simon 1994 could be considered the world’s first smartphone, world’s first touch screen phone and the first phone to have software apps. It cost around $1,099 which should be around $1,800 today. The world’s first flip phone was Motorola StarTAC on 1996. Then in 2002, the world’s first Black Berryphone came in the name of Black Berry 5810. Then T-Mobile Sidekick again in 2002, and most importantly the best selling phone of all time Nokia 1100 in 2002. In 2004 Motorola Razr V3 came. In January 2007, Apple introduces the iPhone. They made it to get rid of the buttons and to get a giant screen.

Just one month after one of the most popular BlackBerry (BlackBerry Curve 8300 in May, 2007) devices released, the original iPhone hit shelves nationwide. It would go on to sell more than 6 million units, with new models introduced every year. The iPhone would forever change mobile phones, the computer industry, and technology forever. In 2008,the first phone to run android HTC Dream was introduced. In 2009, Samsung came with Samsung GT-17500. Then the first phone designed completely by Google which came in 2016 was Google Pixel.

Today’s cell phones are far cry from the $10,000 DynaTAC phone of 1983. And for many people the “phone” feature has become one of the least-used features. But in the future, phones could make another drastic change. The world Economic Forum thinks the first implantable phones will become commercially available by 2024.

**Landmarks in the history of Telecom Industry in Bangladesh**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1853: | Telegraph branch under Posts and Telegraph Department, British India. |
| 1971: | Reconstruction as Bangladesh Telegraph and Telephone Department under Ministry of Posts and Telecommunication |
| 1975: | Reconstruction as Telegraph and Telephone Board. |
| 1979: | Reconstructed as Bangladesh Telegraph and Telephone Board (BTTB) with to issue license for telecom and wireless services. |
| 1981: | Digital Telex Exchange in Bangladesh. |
| 1983: | Automatic Digital ITX started in Dhaka. |
| 1985: | Coinbox Telephone service introduced in Bangladesh. |
| 1989: | GENTEX Telegraph messaging service introduced in Bangladesh. |
| 1989: | Bangladesh rural Telecom Authority got license to operate exchanges in 200 upazilla. |
| 1989: | Sheba Telecom got license to operate exchange in 199 upazilla. |
| 1989: | Cellular mobile phone company Pacific Bangladesh Telephone Limited and Bangladesh Teleco got license. |
| 1995: | Card Telephone service introduced in Bangladesh By BTTB and TSS. |
| 1995: | Regulatory power of BTTB ttransferred of ministry (MoPT). |
| 1995: | 2nd & 3rd ITX installed in Dhaka. |
| 1996: | Govt. awarded 3 GSM licenses to provide sector to operate cellular mobile phone network to GP, AKTEL, Sheba Telecom (Banglalink) |
| 1998: | National Telecom Policy formulated. |
| 2000: | Very Small Aperture Terminal (VSAT) made open. |
| 2001: | Bangladesh Telecommunication Act, 2001 enacted to establish Bangladesh Telecommunication Regulatory Commission (BTRC). |
| **Achievements after the formation of BTRC** | |
| 2002: | BTRC formed and start its journey. |
| 2002: | ICT Policy formulated. |
| 2002: | BTTB joined SEA-ME-WE-4 Submarine Cable Consortium. |
| 2004: | Teletalk cellular mobile launched. |
| 2004: | 10 x Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) licenses awarded. |
| 2004: | Licensing Procedure regulation issued. |
| 2004: | Interconnection Regulation 2004 issued. |
| 2005: | Egypt-based Orascom acquired Sheba Telecom. |
| 2006: | NGN introduced in BTTB. |
| 2006: | SEA-ME-WE-4 Connectivity established. |
| 2007: | ILDTS Policy issued |
| 2007: | Introduced Tariff Circuit (Lowest Tk. 0.25, Highest Tk. 2.00). |
| 2007: | Revision of Interconnection Charge (Lowered from Tk. 0.66 to 0.40). |
| 2007: | Issued 4 Nationwide PSTN license. |
| 2008: | BTTB converted into Bangladesh Telecommunications Company Limited (BTCL) with 100% shares owned by Government and The Submaring Cable Project transformed into Bangladesh Submarine Cable Company Limited (BSCCL). |
| 2008: | Network Coverage in 3 hill track districts. |
| 2008: | 2 x BWA Licenses were auctioned. |
| 2008: | 3 x IGM, 2 x ICX, 1 x IIG Licenses issued in February by open auction. |
| 2008: | e-Filling for her own Satellite (Bangobondhu Satellite-1) at ITU. |
| 2009: | Internet Protocol Telephoony Service Provider (IPTSP) Operators launched. |
| 2009: | Establish 6 Spectrum Monitoring Station at Dhaka, Rangpur, Bogra, Sylhet, Khulna and Chittagong. |
| 2009: | 7 x International Terrestrial Cable (ITC) licenses issued. |
| 2009: | 2 x NTTN Services provided license issued. |
| 2009: | 12 x Vehicle Tracking Services license issued. |
| 2010: | Bangladesh elected as Council Member of ITU for 2011-2014. |
| 2010: | National Broadband Policy 2010 formulated. |
| 2010: | Adopted project on launching her own Satellite. |
| 2011: |  |
| 2012: | 3G mobile service introduced by state owned Teletalk in October. |
| 2012: | 4 x 2G Mobile Phone Services Licenses renewed in Aug. |
| 2013: | 3G Mobile Services License awarded to 4 Operator in September. |

**Mobile Phone Service Operators**

There are 6 mobile phone operators in Bangladesh, operating under the names of

* [Airtel](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Airtel_(Bangladesh)),
* [Banglalink](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Banglalink),
* [Citycell](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citycell),
* [Grameenphone](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grameenphone),
* [Robi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robi) and
* [TeleTalk](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/TeleTalk).

The number of mobile phone subscribers in Bangladesh as of April 2015 was 124.705 million, having risen from February 2009 figure of 45.21 million.

**Airtel:**

 (In [Bengali](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bengali_language): এয়ারটেল), in [Bangladesh](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bangladesh), is an independent product brand of [Robi Axiata](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robi" \o "Robi), since [Robi Airtel Limited](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robi" \o "Robi) is the Licensee of 'airtel' Brand in Bangladesh.

In 2010, [Warid Telecom](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Warid_Bangladesh" \o "Warid Bangladesh) sold a majority 70% stake in the company to [India](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/India)'s Bharti Airtel Limited for US$300 million. Bharti's proposal also included an initial $300-million investment in Warid for creating new shares in the company. The Bangladesh Telecommunication Regulatory Commission approved the deal on 4 Jan 2010. Bharti Airtel Limited took management control of the company and its board, and re-branded the company's services under its own 'airtel' brand from 20 December 2010.

In March, 2013, Warid Telecom sold its rest 30% share to Bharti Airtel's Singapore-based concern Bharti Airtel Holdings Pte Limited for US$85 million.

On 8 September 2013, Airtel Bangladesh received 5 MHz of the 3G spectrum at US$1.25 million.

In January 2016, [Robi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robi" \o "Robi) and Airtel Bangladesh announced that they intended to merge their operations in Bangladesh, that the combined entity would be called Robi, which would serve about 32 million subscribers, and in which [Axiata Group](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axiata" \o "Axiata) would own 68.7% of the shares, [Bharti Group](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bharti_Group" \o "Bharti Group) would own 25%, with the remainder owned by [NTT DoCoMo](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NTT_DoCoMo). The merger was completed in November 2016.

**Banglalink:**

 (In Bengali: বাংলালিংক) is one of the largest cellular service providers in Bangladesh with over 33 million subscribers. The success of Banglalink was based on a simple mission: “Bringing mobile telephony to the masses” - which was the cornerstone of its strategy. Through its innovative products and services Banglalink pursues to drive value for money among the masses. Fueled with strong core values such as Customer-Obsessed, Entrepreneurial, Innovative, Collaborative & Truthful - Banglalink has been working relentlessly to bring digital world to each and every customer to build a true digital Bangladesh. Over time, it moved from a traditional mobile operator towards a tech company.

Launched in February 2005, Banglalink was the catalyst in making mobile telephony an affordable option for the consumers in Bangladesh. It attained 1 million subscribers in just a few months by December 2005. The number of Banglalink users increased by 257% and stood at 3.64 million at the end of 2006, making it the fastest growing operator in the world of that year. In less than two years, Banglalink overtook Aktel (Now [Robi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robi" \o "Robi)) to become the second largest operator in Bangladesh. In 2008, Banglalink got past the landmark of 10 million subscriber base, and exceeded 25 million in 2012. The operator launched 3G service just a year later, followed by the launch of 4G service in February 2018.

As of January 2019, Banglalink had a subscriber base of 33.69 millions.It is a wholly owned subsidiary of Telecom Ventures Ltd. which is owned by Global Telecom Holding. VEON owns 51.9% shares of Global Telecom Holding following a business combination in April 2011, between VEON Ltd. and Wind Telecom S.p.A.

The growth of Banglalink over the years have been fueled with innovative products and services targeting different market segments, aggressive improvement of network quality and dedicated customer care, creating an extensive distribution reach across the country and establishing a strong brand that emotionally connected customers with Banglalink. It provides equal opportunities to employees and has always shown zero tolerance for any non-compliance activity. The company has relatively formed a flat organization and has been working relentlessly to bring digital world to each and every customer to build a true digital Bangladesh.

**Citycell:**

(In Bengali: সিটিসেল; Pacific Bangladesh Telecom Limited) was the oldest mobile operator of Bangladesh. It was the only mobile operator in the country using CDMA and EVDO technology. As of August 2016, Citycell's total mobile subscriber base was 0.142 million.Citycell is currently owned by SingTel (44.54%), Pacific Motors (37.95%) and Far East Telecom (17.51%). It is the smallest mobile operator of Bangladesh in terms of subscribers. It was shut down due to failure of paying dues as ordered by the High Court by the Bangladesh Telecommunication Regulatory Commission (BTRC) in 2016.

In 1989 Bangladesh Telecom Limited (BTL) was awarded a license to operate cellular, paging, and other wireless communication networks. Then in 1990 Hutchison Bangladesh Telecom Limited (HBTL) was incorporated in Bangladesh as a joint venture between BTL and Hutchison Telecommunications (Bangladesh) Limited. HBTL began commercial operation in Dhaka using the AMPS mobile technology in 1993 and became the 2nd cellular operator in South Asia (after Sri Lanka's Celltell, established on 1989). Later that year Pacific Motors bought 50% of BTL. By 1996 HBTL was renamed as Pacific Bangladesh Telecom Limited (PBTL) and launched the brand name 'Citycell Digital' to market its cellular products.

By the end of 2007 Citycell had refurbished its old brand identity and introduced a new logo and corporate identity; the new logo is very reminiscent of the old logo. However the slogan "because we care" has remained unchanged.

In early 2010 Citycell's senior management was reshuffled. A new CEO, Mehboob Chowdhury was brought in as well as a COO, David Lee. In February Chowdhury took office. He is an experienced executive, as he has had involvement with Aktel (now Robi), Warid (Now Airtel), Banglalink (Chief Commercial Officer 2005-2006) and Grameenphone (Director of Sales and Marketing 1998-2005)

On 20 October 2016, the Bangladesh Telecommunication Regulatory Commission suspended the spectrum allocation of Citycell due to huge amount of dues. But on 3 November 2016, the Supreme Court of Bangladesh directed the BTRC to reinstate its spectrum and on 6 November 2016, BTRC returned the suspended spectrum to Citycell.

**Grameenphone:**

 (In Bengali: গ্রামীণফোন) (DSE: GP,CSE: GP, widely abbreviated as **GP**, is the leading telecommunications service provider in Bangladesh, with more than 70 million subscribers and 46.3% subscriber market share (as of January 2019). It is a joint venture between [Telenor](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telenor) and Grameen Telecom Corporation. Telenor, a telecommunication company from Norway, owns a 55.8% share of Grameenphone, Grameen Telecom owns 34.2% and the remaining 10% is publicly held.

Grameenphone was the first company to introduce GSM technology in Bangladesh, and built the first cellular network to cover 99% of the country.

The idea of providing universal mobile phone access throughout Bangladesh, including its rural areas, motivated Iqbal Quadir to take action.He was inspired by the Grameen Bank micro-credit model and envisioned a business model where a cell phone can serve as a source of income. After leaving his job as an investment banker in the United States, Quadir met and successfully raised money from New York-based investor and philanthropist Joshua Mailman. He then returned to Bangladesh and worked for three years to gain support from organisations such as Grameen Bank and the Norwegian telephone company, Telenor.The result was a consortium with Telenor and Grameen Bank to establish the telecommunications company Grameenphone.

Grameenphone received a license for cellular phone operation in Bangladesh from the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications on 28 November 1996. The company started operations on 26 March 1997, Independence Day in Bangladesh.

Grameenphone originally offered a mobile-to-mobile connectivity (widely known as GP-GP connection), which created a lot of enthusiasm among the users. It became the first operator to reach the million subscriber milestone as well as ten million subscriber milestone in Bangladesh.

**Robi Axiata Limited:**

 DBA Robi (Bengali: রবি), is the second largest mobile network operator of Bangladesh. It is a joint venture between Axiata Group Berhad of Malaysia, Bharti Airtel Limited of India and NTT DoCoMo Inc. of Japan. Axiata holds 68.7% controlling stake in the entity, Bharti holds 25% while the remaining 6.3% is held by NTT DOCOMO of Japan.

The first merger of Bangladesh's telecom sector has come into effect with the beginning of the operation of Robi Axiata Limited as the merged company on November 16, 2016. Following the merger of Robi and airtel, the merged company is now known as Robi Axiata Limited. Having successfully completed the merger process, Robi has emerged as the second largest mobile phone operator in Bangladesh. The merged company has nationwide network coverage.

Robi first commenced operation in 1997 as Telekom Malaysia International (Bangladesh) with the brand name ‘AKTEL’. In 2010 the company was re-branded to ‘Robi’ and the company changed its name to Robi Axiata Limited. As of November 2016, Robi Axiata uses two brands 'robi' and 'airtel' for its mobile services. ‘airtel’ is as an independent product brand of Robi Axiata.Robi Axiata has spectrum on GSM 900, 1800 and 2100 MHz bands.

Robi Axiata Limited started as a joint venture company between Telekom Malaysia and AK Khan and Company. It was formerly known as Telekom Malaysia International Bangladesh Limited which commenced operations in Bangladesh in 1997 with the brand name 'AKTEL'. In 2008, AK Khan and Company exited the business by selling its 30% stake to Japan's NTT Docomo for US$350 million.

On March 28, 2010, 'AKTEL' was rebranded as 'Robi' which means Sun in Bengali. It also took the logo of parent company Axiata Group which itself also went through a major rebranding in 2009. In 2013, after five years of presence, Docomo reduced its ownership to 8% for Axiata to take 92%.

On January 28, 2016, it was announced that Robi Axiata and Airtel Bangladesh will merge in Q1 2016. The combined entity will be called Robi, to serve about 40 million subscribers combined by both networks. Axiata Group will own 68.3% share, while Bharti Group will own 25%. The remaining shares will be owned by NTT Docomo.Finally Robi and Airtel were merged on November 16, 2016 and Robi set sail as the merged company.

**Teletalk Bangladesh Limited:**

Whose brand name is 'Teletalk' (Bengali: টেলিটক) is the only state-owned GSM, 3G, LTE based mobile phone operator in Bangladesh that started operating in 2004. As on August 31, 2016, Teletalk has a subscriber base of 2.925 million.

Long distance operators (as per ILDTS Policy 2007)

On 25 February 2008 the Bangladesh Telecommunications Regulatory Commission awarded licenses for two Interconnection Exchanges (ICX), and three International Gateways (IGw), and one International Internet Gateway (IIG) to six firms through an open auction in February 2008. The incumbent BTTB got the same licenses too. And after then on 12 April 2012 the Bangladesh Telecommunications Regulatory Commission awarded licenses for twenty one Interconnection Exchanges (ICX), twenty two International Gateways (IGw), and thirty International Internet Gateway (IIG)

**Literature Review:**

**Does Brand trust matter to brand equity?**

**Introduction:**

Many organizations goal is to build a strong brand in the market place so that it provides them with a host of benefits such as less vulnerability to competitive marketing actions, larger margins, greater intermediary co-operations and support and brand extension opportunities.

Here comes the question what actually makes a brand?

Over the past two decades, this question has a significant theme in the brand building literature, resulting in a vast body of research on the salient concept of brand equity. A new way of approaching this question have been allowed by the conduct of new research steams in marketing such as long-term relationships, the creation of added value based on knowledge and experience, etc. Enriching our understanding of brand equity can help us in building a strong brand. We analyze brand equity with the perspective of relationship marketing and resource based approach specifically. Brand equity exists outside the firm and resides in the relationships of final users with brands, for which it’s considered to be relational market-based according to a recent literature. Relationship marketing is emerged through a dominant focus of both relationship marketing theorists and marketing practitioners that suggests trust to be the main factor in which a relationship is based on. In the branding literature the study of brand trust has not flourished, there has been little empirical research on it and this lack of research has been identified by Chaudhuri and Holbrook(2001). It’s affirmed by them that in the process of brand equity, the role of brand trust has not been explicitly considered. Both in the branding literature and current brand management practices, the importance of brand trust is highlighted theoretically. By examining the importance of brand trust in the development of brand equity this gap can be filled at which this study aims by simply considering and connecting both the resource-based approach of the firm and the relationship marketing literatures. Analyzing brand equity from a resource based approach which is considered as a relational market-based asset which ultimately leads to focus on brand trust.

**Brand equity as a relational market-based asset**

A firm can survive and earn wealth if it has the ability to create a superior value to the market. According to resource based view of a firm if a firm has resources that can enable the firm to effectively and at the same time efficiently produce a market offering that has value for some market segments can ultimately work as different sources of wealth creation. If a firm can perform it then it can achieve superior financial performance which will be reflected in higher dividends and value of stock. A significant proportion of organizational performance is determined by some intangible assets for example, the quality of experience personnel, corporate culture, knowledge, brand equity and so forth. For creating a sustainable competitive advantage, brand equity exhibits the quality required along with other intangible assets. It does some works such as, it helps to create defensible competitive positions, takes time to develop, helps to add value for customers, the position it creates is inherently complex and cannot be easily transferred to other organizations. It’s superior financial performance leads to some benefits such as higher margins, greater sales and market share, more responsive advertising and promotion, earlier market penetration, cheaper product line extensions. As a result a positive influence of brand equity will be found in the firm value. According to the branding literature, brand equity is relational market based asset because much of its value is a result of the brands external relationships with other members of the value chain for example, distribution channel and the final users. Brand equity is often not available and not owned by the firm for which it is and external asset. Brand equity may be expressed as a function of brand-customer relationships. Brand equity introduces trust as a key relational variable which enriches the understanding of brand equity and provides better performance prediction and assessment. Confident expectations and risk are the critical components of the definition of trust. Trust is defined as the confidence that one will find what is desired from another, rather than what is feared. This confidence represents that in an exchange, the relation party will not exploit another’s vulnerability. Trusting a brand means that there is high chances of getting positive outcomes for the customer from the brand. Brand trust is based on consumer’s belief of the brand having specific qualities that make it competent, consistent, honest, and responsible and so on. There are two dimensional idea of trust. The first dimension of brand trust is involving the ability and willingness to keep promises and satisfy customer needs which is technical or competence based in nature. The second dimension comprises the attribution of good intentions to the brand in relation to the customer’s interest and welfare. Therefore a trustworthy brand is one that consistently keeps its promises of value to customers through the way the product is produced, developed, sold, serviced and advertised. Dealing cooperatively with the customers in bad times when crisis arises.

**The contribution of brand trust to brand equity**

Brand trust develops from past experience and prior interaction because it’s development is portrayed by an individual’s experiential process of learning about the brand over time. It summarizes the consumer’s knowledge and experiences with the brand. It’s influenced by consumer’s evaluation of any direct contact (such as trial, usage) and indirect contact (such as advertising, word of mouth) with the brand. Consumption experience is the most relevant and important source of brand trust because it generates associations, thoughts and inferences that are more self-relevant and held with more certainty. It can claimed that the overall satisfaction as a general evaluation of the consumption experience with the brand ultimately generates brand trust. A key characteristic of any successful long term relationship building and maintain trustat the core which implies for brand equity as well. The conceptual connections of relationship aspects and the notion of loyalty is that trust is the cardinal driver of loyalty because it creates exchange relationships that are highly valued. Brand loyalty does not exclusively focuses on repeated purchase but on the internal dispositions or attitude towards the brand. The focus on behavior would otherwise not provide an adequate basis for a complete understanding of the relationship between brand and consumer. Brand loyalty underlies the continuous process of maintaining a valued and important relationship that has been created by trust. According to Sheth and Parvatiyar “the logic behind the existence of the brand is to transmit trust to the market, especially when direct contact between consumers and companies are not possible”. The unique value that consumers perceive in a brand might be the result of greater trust in that particular brand that other brands don’t provide.

**Objectives and Methodology of the Study:**

**Objectives of the Study:** The study intends to fulfill the following specific objectives:

1. To evaluate the historical evolution of the mobile telephone service industry in the world context.
2. To evaluate the historical evolution of the mobile telephone service industry in the context of Bangladesh.
3. To examine the organizational background of the selected mobile phone telecommunication operators in Bangladesh: Banglalink, GrameenPhone, and Robi.
4. To assess the reliability of the constructs used in the study: brand intention, brand reliability, brand loyalty, and brand equity.
5. To examine structural relationships among the various constructs considered in the study: brand intention, brand reliability, brand loyalty, and brand equity.
6. To assess the impact of brand reliability and brand intention on brand loyalty.
7. To assess the impact of brand reliability and brand intention on brand equity.
8. To assess the impact of brand reliability and brand intention on overall satisfaction.

**Methodology of the Study:** The methodology of the study can be clarified in terms of the following aspects:

1. **Sampling and Sample Size:** Non-probability sampling was used here. More specifically convenient sampling was used. This very process of sampling may hamper the generalization of the findings. The total sample size used was 60 in number.
2. **Instruments Used:** Instruments used to measure the various constructs are taken from ----------------------. Major constructs considered in this study include brand intention, brand reliability, brand loyalty, and brand equity.
3. **Analyses Used in the Study:** Frequency tables were constructed for the purpose of clarifying the characteristics of the respondents. Cronbach alpha values were calculated for each of the aforementioned constructs considered in the study for the purpose of assessing the reliability. A lower diagonal correlation matrix was constructed for assessing the structural relationships among the constructs considered in the study. First multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the impact of brand intention and brand reliability on the brand loyalty. Second multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the impact of brand intention and brand reliability on the brand equity.The final multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the impact of brand intention and brand reliability on the overall satisfaction.

**Findings of the Study:**

**Sample Characteristics**

F

requency distribution is a mathematical distribution whose objective is to obtain a count of the number of response associated with values of the variable and express these counts in percentage terms. In a frequency distribution one variable is considered at a time with the objective to obtain a count of the number of responses associated with different values of the variable (Malhotra & Dash, 2016-2017 ed).

A total of 300 samples were taken for the study. The sample characteristics of this study have been summarized in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sample Characteristics | | | | | |
| Variables | **Categories** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|  | | | | | |
| Gender | Male | 36 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| Female | 24 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
|  | | | | | |
| Education | SSC or below | 7 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| HSC | 7 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.7 |
| Bachelor | 50 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 95.0 |
| Masters or equivalent | 3 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
|  | | | | | |
| Profession | Student | 55 | 91.7 | 91.7 | 91.7 |
| Service Holder | 2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 95.0 |
| Business | 2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 98.3 |
| Other | 1 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
|  | | | | | |
| Average Monthly Family Income | 30,000 or below | 14 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 23.3 |
| 30,000 - 60,0000 | 22 | 36.7 | 36.7 | 60.0 |
| 60,000 - 90,000 | 16 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 86.7 |
| 90,000 - 1,20,000 | 6 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 96.7 |
| 1,20,000 or above | 2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Brands | Grameen Phone | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Banglalink | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Teletalk | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

A frequency distribution for a variable produces a table of frequency counts, percentages and cumulative percentages for all the values associated with that variable. Table ( ? ) gives the frequency distribution of respondents who participated in a research of measuring the consumer based brand equity in a Bangladesh perspective. In the left column total five variables can be identified. In the second column different categories of the sample has been listed for the study purpose. The third column shows the number of respondents checking each categories. For example, 132 respondents in this study has an income of 30,000 or bellow and 24 respondents has an income level of 120,000 or above. In the fourth column the percentage of respondent checking each category is listed. The fifth column show the valid percentage which is calculated by excluding the missing values. The column of calculated percentage and valid percentage will be same if there is no missing value present in the study. The last column shows the cumulative percentage after adjusting the missing of study.

**The Reliability of the Constructs Used**

U

sing a reliability test we can identify the consistency of the results in the research. To call a test reliable it should produce the same results if the research is conducted again. There are many ways to test the reliability of the research. For the research of the evaluation of the components of Brand Equity and Brand Resonance I would like to conduct an **inter-consistency reliability** test i.e. a way to gauge how well a test or survey is actually measuring what you want it to measure.

Cronbach's alpha is the most common measure of internal consistency ("reliability"). It is most commonly used when you have multiple Likert questions in a survey/questionnaire that form a scale and you wish to determine if the scale is reliable. If you are concerned with inter-rater reliability(Laerd. Statistics, Accesed in 2017). The following table shows

A commonly accepted rule for describing internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha is as follows(George & Mallery, 2003)(Kline, 2000), though a greater number of items in the test can artificially inflate the value of alpha(Cortina, 1993)and a sample with a narrow range can deflate it, so this rule should be used with caution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cronbach's alpha | Internal consistency |
|  |  |
| α ≥ 0.9 | Excellent |
| 0.9 > α ≥ 0.8 | Good |
| 0.8 > α ≥ 0.7 | Acceptable |
| 0.7 > α ≥ 0.6 | Questionable |
| 0.6 > α ≥ 0.5 | Poor |
| 0.5 > α | Unacceptable |

**Reliability of Brand Reliability**

There were two questions under the Perceived Quality construct for which a reliability test using the Cronbach’s Alpha was conducted and the results are summarized in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Q.1 | The likely quality of “ X “ is extremely high | |
| Q.2 | The likelihood that “ X “ would be functional is very high | |
| **Cronbach's Alpha** | | We can see that Cronbach's alpha is 0.8186, which indicates an Good level of internal consistency between the items for Brand reliability construct with this specific sample. |
| **.8186** | |

**Reliability of Brand Loyalty**

There were three questions under the Brand Intention construct for which a reliability test using the Cronbach’s Alpha was conducted and the results are summarized in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Q.1 | I consider myself to be loyal to “ X “ | |
| Q.2 | “ X “ would be my first choice | |
| Q.3 | I will not buy other brands if “ X “ is available at the store | |
| **Cronbach's Alpha** | | We can see that Cronbach's alpha is 0.7648, which indicates an Acceptable level of internal consistency between the items for Brand Intention construct using these questions with this specific sample. |
| **.7648** | |

**Reliability of Brand Equity**

There were two questions under the Brand Equity construct for which a reliability test using the Cronbach’s Alpha was conducted and the results are summarized in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Q.1 | I can recognize “ X “ among other competing brands | |
| Q.2 | I am aware of “ X “ | |
| **Cronbach's Alpha** | | we can see that Cronbach's alpha is 0.6526, which indicates a Queationable level of internal consistency between the items for Brand Equity construct using these questions with this specific sample. |
| **.6526** | |

**Reliability of Overall Customer Satisfaction**

There were two questions under the Overall Customer Satisfaction construct for which a reliability test using the Cronbach’s Alpha method was conducted and the results are summarized in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Q.1 | Some characteristics of “ X “ come to my mind quickly | |
| Q.2 | I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of “ X “ | |
| **Cronbach's Alpha** | | we can see that Cronbach's alpha is 0.7523, which indicates a acceptable level of internal consistency between the items for Overall Customer Satisfaction construct using these questions with this specific sample. |
| **.7523** | |

The relationships among the various constructs: The relationships among the various constructs were examined by using the following developed lower diagonal correlation matrix:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Constructs | Brand  Reliability | Brand  Intention | Brand  Loyalty | Brand  Equity | Overall  Satisfaction |
| Brand  Reliability | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Brand  Intention | .717\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |
| Brand  Loyalty | .597\*\* | .538\*\* | 1 |  |  |
| Brand  Equity | .484\*\* | .388\*\* | .638\*\* | 1 |  |
| Overall  Satisfaction | .485\*\* | .298\* | .233 | .287\* | 1 |

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

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

There is a positive relationship between ***brand reliability*** and ***brand intention*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand reliability*** and ***brand loyalty*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand reliability*** and ***brand equity*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand reliability*** and ***brand overall satisfaction*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand intention*** and ***brand loyalty*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand intention*** and ***brand equity*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand intention*** and ***overall satisfaction*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 95% level of confidence.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand loyalty*** and ***brand equity*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

There is a negative relationship between ***brand loyalty*** and ***overall satisfaction*** and the relationship is found to be statistically not significant.

There is a positive relationship between ***brand equity*** and ***overall satisfaction*** and the relationship is found to be statistically significant at 95% level of confidence.The impact of brand reliability and brand intention on brand loyalty:

Multiple Regression analysis will be the appropriate test statistics here due to the fact that all the variables are metric to test the impact of the ***brand reliability*** and ***brand intention*** on ***brand loyalty***. Also we want to see the impact of two independent metric variables (***brand reliability*** and ***brand intention***) on a single dependent metric variable (***brand loyalty***).

Regression analysis is a way of mathematically sorting out which independent variables do indeed have an impact on a dependent variable. The dependent variable is the main factor that we are trying to understand or predict and the independent variables are the factors we suspect have an impact on your dependent variable (Gallo, 2015).

Brand Loyalty

Brand Reliability

Brand Intention

Independent Variable

Dependent Variable

Now the Given Problem can be explained graphically in the following way:

Figure ( ): Graphical Model for Multiple Regression

Source: The Author

**The Impact of Brand Reliability and Brand Intention on Brand Loyalty:**

**Multiple Regression Equation**

The following Multiple Regression can be developed for the purpose of the analysis:

Y = b0 + b1x1 + b2x2

This can also be written as,

Where, Dependent Variable Y = brand loyalty  
 Independent Variable x1= brand reliability  
 x2= brand intention

Statistical Parameters b0&b1and b2

Brand loyalty = b0 + b1(brand reliability) + b2(brand intention)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficients** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.255 | .349 |  | 3.600 | .001 |
| Brand  Reliability | .360 | .124 | .435 | 2.906 | .005 |
| Brand  Intention | .229 | .151 | .227 | 1.517 | .135 |

Table ( ): Coefficient of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

By using the table calculated using SPSS the equation can be further simplify as

Brand Loyalty = 1.255 + .360 (Brand Reliability) + .229 (Brand Intention)

**Hypothesis Testing**

Now, the following Hypothesis can be developed here:

H0: Multiple R2pop = 0  
H1: Multiple R2pop ≠ 0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAs** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|  | Regression | 13.217 | 2 | 6.609 | 17.545 | .000(a) |
| Residual | 21.470 | 57 | .377 |  |  |
| Total | 34.688 | 59 |  |  |  |

Table ( ): ANOVA of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

The table shows the results of the regression analysis which was conducted using the SPSS software. From the table we can identify the Significance value is .000 which is less than the ‘α’ value 0.05.

Now, Sig. = 0.000 α = 0.05  
 0.000 < 0.05   
So, Sig. < α

The Null Hypothesis will H0be rejected because the value of the significance (0.000) is less than the required value of Alpha (0.05). So, it can be conducted that there is a relation among Brand Intention, Brand Reliability and Brand Loyalty.

**Partial Hypothesis Testing**

Partial Hypothesis is the hypothesis related to the regression co-efficient value of ‘b’. The partial hypothesis is calculated to know the effects of an independent variable on the dependent variable while holding other associated independent variables constant. The partial hypothesis of each of the ‘b’ value is given bellow:

**Brand Reliability**

The following Hypothesis can be developed for the calculation of Partial Hypothesis of Brand Reliability

H0: B1 = 0  
H1: B1 ≠ 0

From the table we can identify the value of: t = 2.906  
 α = 0.050  
 Sig = 0.005

The Null Hypothesis will be rejected because the value of significance (0.005) is less than the value of alpha (0.05). Now, it can be concluded that Brand Reliability is influencing the Brand Loyalty.

So, it can be interpreted that an increase by one unit in Brand Reliability will increase the Brand Loyalty by .360 units while holding the other independent variables constant.

**Brand Intention**

The following Hypothesis can be developed for the calculation of Partial Hypothesis of Brand Intention

H0: B2 = 0  
H1: B2 ≠ 0

From table no () we can identify the value of: t = 1.517  
 α = 0.050  
 Sig = 0.135

The Null Hypothesis will be accepted because the value of significance (0.135) is not less than the value of alpha (0.05). Now, it can be concluded that Brand Intention is influencing the Brand Loyalty.

So, it can be interpreted that an increase by one unit in Brand Intention will increase the Brand Loyalty by .229 units while holding the other independent variables constant.

**Co-efficient of Multiple Determinations**

The coefficient of determination denoted R2and pronounced "R squared", is the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the independent variable(s) (Stattrek, accessed on 2017). The following table was generated using the SPSS software for the determination of Co-efficient of Multiple Determination.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .617a | .381 | .359 | .61374 |

Table ( ): R2 of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

The Co-efficient of Multiple Determination is given by R2 = 0.381  
 = 38.1%

The variation in the Overall Brand Equity can be explained by the variation in Brand Reliability, Brand Intention, Brand Equity and Overall Customer Satisfaction by 38.1%.

**The Relative Contribution**

The relative contribution of the independent variable can be explained by the associated beta value of the independent variables. The associated beta value of the independent variables can be summarized in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The Relative Contribution | |
| Independent Variable | Beta value (β) |
| Brand Reliability | 0.434 |
| Brand Intention | 0.227 |

Table ( ): Relative Contributions in Overall brand Equity

Source: the author

From the partial hypothesis testing we have identified that Brand Reliability and Brand Intention has no significance over the Brand Loyalty.

So, between Brand Reliability and Brand Intention, it can be concluded that Brand Reliability has more relative contribution than the Brand Intention due to higher β value.

**The Impact of Brand Reliability and Brand Intention on Brand Equity:**

**Multiple Regression Equation**

The following Multiple Regression can be developed for the purpose of the analysis:

Y = b0 + b1x1 + b2x2

This can also be written as,

Where, Dependent Variable Y = brand equity  
 Independent Variable x1= brand reliability  
 x2= brand intention

Statistical Parameters b0&b1and b2

Brand equity = b0 + b1(brand reliability) + b2(brand intention)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficients** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.741 | .411 |  | 4.233 | .000 |
| Brand  Reliability | .374 | .146 | .424 | 2.556 | .013 |
| Brand  Intention | .091 | .178 | .084 | .510 | .612 |

Table ( ): Coefficient of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

By using the table calculated using SPSS the equation can be further simplify as

Brand Equity = 1.741 + .374 (Brand Reliability) + .091 (Brand Intention)

**Hypothesis Testing**

Now, the following Hypothesis can be developed here:

H0: Multiple R2pop = 0  
H1: Multiple R2pop ≠ 0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|  | Regression | 9.339 | 2 | 4.669 | 8.905 | .000(a) |
| Residual | 29.889 | 57 | .524 |  |  |
| Total | 39.228 | 59 |  |  |  |

Table ( ): ANOVA of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

The table shows the results of the regression analysis which was conducted using the SPSS software. From the table we can identify the Significance value is .000 which is less than the ‘α’ value 0.05.

Now, Sig. = 0.000 α = 0.05  
 0.000 < 0.05   
So, Sig. < α

The Null Hypothesis will H0be rejected because the value of the significance (0.000) is less than the required value of Alpha (0.05). So, it can be conducted that there is a relation among Brand Intention, Brand Reliability and Brand Equity.

**Partial Hypothesis Testing**

Partial Hypothesis is the hypothesis related to the regression co-efficient value of ‘b’. The partial hypothesis is calculated to know the effects of an independent variable on the dependent variable while holding other associated independent variables constant. The partial hypothesis of each of the ‘b’ value is given bellow:

**Brand Reliability**

The following Hypothesis can be developed for the calculation of Partial Hypothesis of Brand Reliability

H0: B1 = 0  
H1: B1 ≠ 0

From the table we can identify the value of: t = 2.556  
 α = 0.050  
 Sig = 0.013

The Null Hypothesis will be rejected because the value of significance (0.005) is less than the value of alpha (0.05). Now, it can be concluded that Brand Reliability is influencing the Brand Loyalty.

So, it can be interpreted that an increase by one unit in Brand Reliability will increase the Brand Loyalty by .374 units while holding the other independent variables constant.

**Brand Intention**

The following Hypothesis can be developed for the calculation of Partial Hypothesis of Brand Intention

H0: B2 = 0  
H1: B2 ≠ 0

From table no () we can identify the value of: t = 510  
 α = 0.050  
 Sig = 0.612

The Null Hypothesis will be accepted because the value of significance (0.612) is not less than the value of alpha (0.05). Now, it can be concluded that Brand Intention is influencing the Brand Equity.

So, it can be interpreted that an increase by one unit in Brand Intention will increase the Brand Equity by .091 units while holding the other independent variables constant.

**Co-efficient of Multiple Determinations**

The coefficient of determination denoted R2and pronounced "R squared", is the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the independent variable(s) (Stattrek, accessed on 2017). The following table was generated using the SPSS software for the determination of Co-efficient of Multiple Determination.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .488a | .238 | .211 | .72414 |

Table ( ): R2 of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

The Co-efficient of Multiple Determination is given by R2 = 0.238  
 = 23.8%

The variation in the Overall Brand Equity can be explained by the variation in Brand Reliability, Brand Intention, Brand Equity and Overall Customer Satisfaction by 23.8%.

**The Relative Contribution**

The relative contribution of the independent variable can be explained by the associated beta value of the independent variables. The associated beta value of the independent variables can be summarized in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The Relative Contribution | |
| Independent Variable | Beta value (β) |
| Brand Reliability | 0.424 |
| Brand Intention | 0.084 |

Table ( ): Relative Contributions in Overall brand Equity

Source: the author

From the partial hypothesis testing we have identified that Brand Reliability and Brand Intention has no significance over the Brand Equity.

So, between Brand Reliability and Brand Intention, it can be concluded that Brand Reliability has more relative contribution than the Brand Intention due to higher β value.

**The Impact of Brand Reliability and Brand Intention on Overall Satisfaction:**

**Multiple Regression Equation**

The following Multiple Regression can be developed for the purpose of the analysis:

Y = b0 + b1x1 + b2x2

This can also be written as,

Where, Dependent Variable Y = Overall Consumer Satisfaction  
 Independent Variable x1= brand reliability  
 x2= brand intention

Statistical Parameters b0&b1and b2

Overall Consumer Satisfaction = b0 + b1(brand reliability) + b2(brand intention)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficients** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.482 | .364 |  | 6.815 | .000 |
| Brand  Reliability | .437 | .129 | .559 | 3.375 | .001 |
| Brand  Intention | -.098 | .157 | -.103 | -.622 | .536 |

Table ( ): Coefficient of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

By using the table calculated using SPSS the equation can be further simplify as

Overall Consumer Satisfaction = 2.482 + .437 (Brand Reliability) + (-.098) (Brand Intention)

**Hypothesis Testing**

Now, the following Hypothesis can be developed here:

H0: Multiple R2pop = 0  
H1: Multiple R2pop ≠ 0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|  | Regression | 7.415 | 2 | 3.707 | 9.017 | .000(a) |
| Residual | 23.435 | 57 | .411 |  |  |
| Total | 30.850 | 59 |  |  |  |

Table ( ): ANOVA of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

The table shows the results of the regression analysis which was conducted using the SPSS software. From the table we can identify the Significance value is .000 which is less than the ‘α’ value 0.05.

Now, Sig. = 0.000 α = 0.05  
 0.000 < 0.05   
So, Sig. < α

The Null Hypothesis will H0be rejected because the value of the significance (0.000) is less than the required value of Alpha (0.05). So, it can be conducted that there is a relation among Brand Intention, Brand Reliability and Overall Consumer Satisfaction.

**Partial Hypothesis Testing**

Partial Hypothesis is the hypothesis related to the regression co-efficient value of ‘b’. The partial hypothesis is calculated to know the effects of an independent variable on the dependent variable while holding other associated independent variables constant. The partial hypothesis of each of the ‘b’ value is given bellow:

**Brand Reliability**

The following Hypothesis can be developed for the calculation of Partial Hypothesis of Brand Reliability

H0: B1 = 0  
H1: B1 ≠ 0

From the table we can identify the value of: t = 3.375  
 α = 0.050  
 Sig = 0.001

The Null Hypothesis will be rejected because the value of significance (0.005) is less than the value of alpha (0.05). Now, it can be concluded that Brand Reliability is influencing the Brand Loyalty.

So, it can be interpreted that an increase by one unit in Brand Reliability will increase the Overall Brand Intention by .437 units while holding the other independent variables constant.

**Brand Intention**

The following Hypothesis can be developed for the calculation of Partial Hypothesis of Brand Intention

H0: B2 = 0  
H1: B2 ≠ 0

From table no () we can identify the value of: t = -6.22  
 α = 0.050  
 Sig = 0.536

The Null Hypothesis will be accepted because the value of significance (0.536) is not less than the value of alpha (0.05). Now, it can be concluded that Brand Intention is influencing the Brand Loyalty.

So, it can be interpreted that an increase by one unit in Brand Intention will increase the Brand Loyalty by -.098 units while holding the other independent variables constant.

**Co-efficient of Multiple Determinations**

The coefficient of determination denoted R2and pronounced "R squared", is the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the independent variable(s) (Stattrek, accessed on 2017). The following table was generated using the SPSS software for the determination of Co-efficient of Multiple Determination.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .490a | .240 | .214 | .64121 |

Table ( ): R2 of Multiple Regression

Source: SPSS, the author

The Co-efficient of Multiple Determination is given by R2 = 0.240  
 = 24%

The variation in the Overall Consumer Satisfaction can be explained by the variation in Brand Reliability, Brand Intention, Brand Equity and Overall Customer Satisfaction by 24%.

**The Relative Contribution**

The relative contribution of the independent variable can be explained by the associated beta value of the independent variables. The associated beta value of the independent variables can be summarized in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The Relative Contribution | |
| Independent Variable | Beta value (β) |
| Brand Reliability | 0.559 |
| Brand Intention | -.103 |

Table ( ): Relative Contributions in Overall brand Equity

Source: the author

From the partial hypothesis testing we have identified that Brand Reliability and Brand Intention has no significance over the Overall Consumer Satisfaction.

So, between Brand Reliability and Brand Intention, it can be concluded that Brand Reliability has more relative contribution than the Brand Intention due to higher β value.

The entire partial Hypothesis can be summarized in the table given bellow:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Brand Reliability(B1) | Brand Intention  (B2) |
|  |  |
| H0: B4 = 0 | H0: B4 = 0 |
| H1: B4 ≠ 0 | H1: B4 ≠ 0 |
| t = 1.754 | t = 1.754 |
| α = 0.050 | α = 0.050 |
| Sig. = 0.080 | Sig. = 0.080 |
| Sig. < α | Sig. < α |
| H0 is accepted | **H0 is accepted** |

Table ( ): Summarized Partial Hypothesis

Source: The Author

So based on the summarized table we can come into the conclusion that only Perceived Quality and Brand Loyalty has influence on Overall Brand Equity. Brand Awareness and Brand Association has no significance value for Overall Brand Equity.

**Conclusion:**

The purpose of the project report was to see impact of brand reliability and brand intention on brand loyalty, brand equity, and overall satisfaction. The report is done on the context of mobile telecommunication services of Bangladesh for which three renowned brands were considered including Grameen Phone, Banglalink, and Robi. To get an accurate result a sample size of 60 respondents were taken and by using some research methodology the measurement was calculated. The result from the survey is acceptable and statistically significant and shows that brand reliability and brand intention has impact on brand loyalty, brand intention and overall customer satisfaction. Having identified the true calling of a brand we align it with the human wish it can empower. Projecting future scenarios will help it get to visions that lie beyond the ordinary and shine brighter than the convention in the market place. When the cause of a brand becomes a shared cause, it has the power to unify us in a cultural story that it collectively want to engage with and co-create. That is why we place the Brand Intention, Brand Reliability, Brand equity, Brand Equity and customer satisfaction at the heart of the customer journey to steer all brand behavior and innovations.

**Appendices:**

**Questionnaires Used in the Study:**

An Academic Survey

(The Impact of Brands Trust on Brand Equity)

Name (optional):

Phone Number (optional):

Gender: Male Female

Education:  SSC or below HSC Bachelor Masters or equivalent professional degree or above

Profession: Student Service Holder Business Others

Average Monthly Family Income: 30,000 or below 30,000—60,000 60,000—90,000

90,000 –1,20,000 above 1,20,000

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the following statements. Where 1 = highly disagreed, 2 = disagreed, 3 = neutral, 4 = agreed, and 5 = highly agreed.

# **Grameen Phone (GP)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SN | Statements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| BR1 | Grameen Phone is a brand name that meets my expectations |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR2 | I feel confidence in Grameen Phone |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR3 | Grameen Phone never disappoints me |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR4 | Grameen Phone guarantees satisfaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI1 | Grameen Phone would be honest and sincere in addressing my concerns |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI2 | I could rely on Grameen Phone to solve any problem with the product |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI3 | Grameen Phone would make any effort to satisfy me in case of a problem |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI4 | Grameen Phone would compensate me in some way for the problem with the product |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL1 | I consider myself to be loyal to Grameen Phone |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL2 | Only under extreme circumstances would I consider purchasing of this product different from Grameen Phone |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL3 | If the store was out of Grameen Phone, I would go somewhere else to buy some |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL4 | Even when another brand is on sale, I would prefer the brand Grameen Phone |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE1 | It makes sense to buy Grameen Phone instead of any other brand, even if they are the same |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE2 | Even if another brand has the same features as Phone, I would prefer to buy Grameen Phone |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE3 | If there is another brand as good as Grameen Phone, I prefer to buy Grameen Phone |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE4 | If another brand is not different from Grameen Phone in any way, it seems smarter to purchase Phone |  |  |  |  |  |

Please indicate the level of your overall satisfaction regarding Grameen Phone:

Very Dissatisfied. Dissatisfied. Neutral. Satisfied. Very Satisfied.

An Academic Survey

(The Impact of Brands Trust on Brand Equity)

Name (optional):

Phone Number (optional):

Gender: Male Female

Education: SSC or below HSC Bachelor Masters or equivalent professional degree or above

Profession: Student Service Holder Business Others

Average Monthly Family Income: 30,000 or below 30,000—60,000 60,000—90,000

90,000 –1,20,000 above 1,20,000

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the following statements. Where 1 = highly disagreed, 2 = disagreed, 3 = neutral, 4 = agreed, and 5 = highly agreed.

# **Banglalink**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SN | Statements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| BR1 | Banglalinkis a brand name that meets my expectations |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR2 | I feel confidence in Banglalink |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR3 | Banglalink never disappoints me |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR4 | Banglalink guarantees satisfaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI1 | Banglalink would be honest and sincere in addressing my concerns |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI2 | I could rely on Banglalink to solve any problem with the product |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI3 | Banglalink would make any effort to satisfy me in case of a problem |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI4 | Banglalink would compensate me in some way for the problem with the product |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL1 | I consider myself to be loyal to Banglalink |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL2 | Only under extreme circumstances would I consider purchasing of this product different from Banglalink |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL3 | If the store was out of Banglalink, I would go somewhere else to buy some |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL4 | Even when another brand is on sale, I would prefer the brand Banglalink |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE1 | It makes sense to buy Banglalink instead of any other brand, even if they are the same |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE2 | Even if another brand has the same features as Banglalink, I would prefer to buy Banglalink |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE3 | If there is another brand as good as Banglalink, I prefer to buy Banglalink |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE4 | If another brand is not different from Banglalink in any way, it seems smarter to purchase Banglalink |  |  |  |  |  |

Please indicate the level of your overall satisfaction regarding Banglalink:

Very Dissatisfied. Dissatisfied. Neutral. Satisfied. Very Satisfied.

An Academic Survey

(The Impact of Brands Trust on Brand Equity)

Name (optional):

Phone Number (optional):

Gender: Male Female

Education: SSC or below HSC Bachelor Masters or equivalent professional degree or above

Profession: Student Service Holder Business Others

Average Monthly Family Income: 30,000 or below 30,000—60,000 60,000—90,000

90,000 –1,20,000 above 1,20,000

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the following statements. Where 1 = highly disagreed, 2 = disagreed, 3 = neutral, 4 = agreed, and 5 = highly agreed.

# **Robi**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SN | Statements | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| BR1 | Robiis a brand name that meets my expectations |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR2 | I feel confidence in Robi |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR3 | Robi never disappoints me |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR4 | Robi guarantees satisfaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI1 | Robi would be honest and sincere in addressing my concerns |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI2 | I could rely on Robi to solve any problem with the product |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI3 | Robi would make any effort to satisfy me in case of a problem |  |  |  |  |  |
| BI4 | Robi would compensate me in some way for the problem with the product |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL1 | I consider myself to be loyal to Robi |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL2 | Only under extreme circumstances would I consider purchasing of this product different from Robi |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL3 | If the store was out of Robi, I would go somewhere else to buy some |  |  |  |  |  |
| BL4 | Even when another brand is on sale, I would prefer the brand Robi |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE1 | It makes sense to buy Robi instead of any other brand, even if they are the same |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE2 | Even if another brand has the same features as Robi, I would prefer to buy Robi |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE3 | If there is another brand as good as Robi, I prefer to buy Robi |  |  |  |  |  |
| BE4 | If another brand is not different from Robi in any way, it seems smarter to purchase Robi |  |  |  |  |  |

Please indicate the level of your overall satisfaction regarding Robi:

Very Dissatisfied. Dissatisfied. Neutral. Satisfied. Very Satisfied.
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