



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT SCIENCES



www.hrmars.com

ISSN: 2226-3624

Assessment of Determinants of Beer Brand Loyalty Building in Nigeria and Challenge

James O. Abugu, Johnson U. Ozo, Tobun G. Olugbenga

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/v7-i3/4377> DOI: 10.6007/IJAREMS/v7-i3/4377

Received: 05 April 2018, Revised: 22 April 2018, Accepted: 28 May 2018

Published Online: 03 June 2018

In-Text Citation: (Abugu, Ozo, & Olugbenga, 2018)

To Cite this Article: Abugu, J. O., Ozo, J. U., & Olugbenga, T. G. (2018). Assessment of Determinants of Beer Brand Loyalty Building in Nigeria and Challenge. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 7(3), 47–59.

Copyright: © 2018 The Author(s)

Published by Human Resource Management Academic Research Society (www.hrmars.com)

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen

at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Vol. 7, No. 3, July 2018, Pg. 47 - 59

<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJAREMS>

JOURNAL HOMEPAGE

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics>



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT SCIENCES



www.hrmars.com

ISSN: 2226-3624

Assessment of Determinants of Beer Brand Loyalty Building in Nigeria and Challenge

James O. Abugu, Ph.D

Dept. of Marketing, FBA Enugu Campus, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Johnson U. Ozo, Ph.D

Dept. of Marketing, FMS, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki Nigeria

Tobun G. Olugbenga

Nigeria Breweries Plc, 9th Mile Corner, Enugu

Abstract

The study seeks to ascertain; how quality and price, availability, awareness creation of beer can build strong customers loyalty and to establish if competition amongst existing Beer brands in Nigeria can pose significant challenge to building Beer brand loyalty. A cross sectional survey was adopted for the study. Questionnaire was used to elicit relevant data from 411 consumers and 229 marketers that constituted the respondents. Relevant data collected were analysed and presented in a cross-tabulations frequencies and percentages while hypotheses formulated for the study were tested using inferential statistics. The findings reveal that quality and price of beer, availability, awareness creation about existing brands of beer, respectively lead to building beer brand loyalty and that existing different brands of beer in Nigeria lead to increase in competition and to a challenge in building Beer brand loyalty. It was drawn that in building Beer brand loyalty, quality should be aligned with price as a justification and perceived by the consumers. Moreover ensuring availability and creation of product awareness because is mainly when consumers can access brand of Beer through proper awareness, that loyalty abound. Breweries in Nigeria need not therefore rest on their competitive advantage but should continually improve on product quality and other factors established through research as propelling forces to loyalty.

Keywords: *Assessment, Determinants, Beer Brand, Loyalty, Building, Challenge.*

Introduction

Product marketing in Nigerian economy is at a level where competition is stiff and producers are branding and re-branding regularly as a strategy to gain competitive edge. Branding is the act of identifying a product or service with a name, sign, symbol, design or even the combination of these aimed at distinguishing the product or service of a seller or a group of sellers from those of

the competitors (Abugu, 2015). Kotler, (1997) mentioned that it may be a product, famous personality, idea etc. Keller (2003) stated that among the ways a seller can differentiate his product from other products is basically by branding. It is according to Kapferer (2007) a name that influences a buyer, a name with power to influence buyers.

For every conceivable item or service there are often many brands that offer close alternative choices to the consumers. When a consumer with several choices of brands that offer close alternatives, chooses a particular brand repeatedly he/she is said to be loyal to that brand. It is repeat purchasing behavior that reflects a conscious decision to continue buying the same brand (Solomon, 2011). When a seller has a brand to which some consumers are loyal; the seller benefits in three major ways; brand loyalists are willing to pay a higher price for the product and higher prices for branded products are justified by consumers quality assumptions that come with the brand name, the seller (producer) incurs less cost to make the sale in respect to incurring extra cost convincing the buyers and finally, the loyal brand customers acts as unofficial "brand ambassadors and spokes person" that usually tend to convert other non-users to the use of the brand through word of mouth or through their action (Henry & Quansah, 2013; Woodside & Ozcan (2009).

Brewery industries in Nigeria are facing stiff challenges occasioned by the alternative brand of products produced and customers are somewhat faced with making choice amongst existing alternative brands. Among Beer brands that competes in Nigeria Beer markets are: Star, Harp, Life, Guinness Stout, 33, Legend Stout, Hero, Turbo King, Smirnoff Ice etc.

A strong brand with loyal consumer is very important to the success of any business as loyalty is an important key to the success of business (Craner, 1995).

Therefore, what challenge will producer face not only to attain loyalty status, but also to retain the status against other competing brands? These among others are the questions a seller or producer must find answers to in order to remain strategic in the market. Loyalty is associated with trust which according to Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) is relying on a brand that performs its stated functions Riegelcherer et al., (2005) Corritore et al (2003), Johnson and Grayson (2003) see trust as leading to rational choice. Brand needed to be associated with any thing positive. Such association contains its meaning to consumer and are used in making purchase decisions (Aaker, 1991).

The hypotheses guiding the study therefore are:

1. Quality and price of beer do not significantly promote building of brand loyalty in the Nigeria beer industry,
2. Availability of beer brand does not significantly lead to consumers loyalty.
3. Creating of awareness of the image, logo and name of bear brand does not significantly lead to consumers loyalty, and that
4. Competition does not significantly pose any challenge in building beer brand loyalty in Nigeria beer industry.

Methods

This study was carried out in Enugu State, South East Nigeria. The area of study were mainly Enugu Metropolis which according to Eneh and Ogbuefi-Chima (2013) cited in Eneh, Abugu and

Anichebe (2016) include; Garriki, Obiagu, Akwuke, Emene, Abakpa, Ogbete, Ogui Iva-Valley, Nike, New Haven, Awkunanaw, Uwani, Achara-layout, Maryland, Trans-Ekulu Government Reserved Areas (GRA) and Independence Layout. This is because these areas were observed by the researchers to constitute greater number of Beer Marketers and Consumers in the state. Two sets of population were used for this study. These are; the Marketers of various Beer products, brands (Guinness Stout, Turbo king, legend Stout, Smirnoff Ice, Guilder, 33, Star, Hero, Life, Harp etc) and the consumers all within the areas of the study as stated above. The participated consumers who are all males with formal and informal educational background and between 20 and 60 years were drawn from a population of the said areas which is a total of 920,409 people (Eneh, Abugu and Anichebe, 2016).

Sample size for consumers of Beer: The sample size was determined using formula by Taro Yamani as in Uzoagulu, 1998;

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where n = sample size

N = Population of Enugu metropolis which is 920,409 (Eneh, Abugu and Anichebe, 2016)

e = Level of significance (0.05)

1 = Unity

$$n = 920,409 + 920,409 \times 0.05 \times 0.05$$

$$n = 400.$$

However, in order to ensure robust result the sample size was increased to 411 (antrcision rate). This is because the higher the sample size the better the outcome. Cross sectional survey was adopted for the study. The first stage sampling employed single random sampling technique to select Beer Consumers in the area under review. The respondents were approached at different restaurants and beer drinking centres within Enugu metropolis and issued with the questionnaire. Second stage involved convenience sampling method used to select 229 marketers (less 14 copies wrongly completed or not returned) used for the study. The marketers were between 25 and 65 years old and made up of 127 males and 102 females with first school leaving certificate as minimum educational qualification.

The third stage involved a total of 229 Marketers and 411 Consumers of beer in retail outlets and beer drinking centres within the areas of study that constituted 640 respondents used for the study and were systematically selected as follows:

13 Beer Marketers and 24 Consumers respectively were conveniently selected out of each of the 16 neighbourhoods of the said metropolis because they tend to have similar number of Beer Marketers and Beer Consumers whereas 21 of the Beer Markers and 27 consumers were purposively selected from Abakpa Nike being the remaining neighbourhood of the metropolis, largely because it was observed by the researchers to have the largest number of Beer Marketers and consumers. A pilot survey was conducted on selected marketers and consumers of Beer under review to ensure the reliability of the research instrument. Upon their responses Cronbach's alpha coefficient test was applied using the SPSS software to ensure the reliability of the research instrument (questionnaire) on alpha level at 0.05. An alpha coefficient of 0.798 was

obtained and was adjudged high to be used as reliable instrument for data collection. The questionnaire contains 5 point Likert-Scaled options: [strongly agreed (SA), Agreed (A), Undecided (U), Disagreed (D), and strongly Disagreed (SD)] from which the respondents' responses were coded and used for analyses. The questionnaire which borders on the earlier stated hypotheses for the study were administered to the respondents in the selected neighbourhoods of the metropolis under study as stated above.

Results

Table 1: Consumers responses on choice of brand of beer is dependent on quality and price

	Frequency	Valid percent %	Cumulative percent%
Strongly agreed	229	55.71	55.71
Agreed	100	24.33	80.04
Undecided	35	8.52	88.56
Disagreed	32	7.79	96.35
Strongly disagreed	15	3.65	100.0
Total	411	100.0	

Source: Field Study, 2017.

Table 1 analysed the data on opinion of the customers with preference for brands of beer whether the brands they choose provide them high quality value for the prices paid. 229(55.71%) strongly agreed, 100(24.33%) agreed while 35(8.52%) remained undecided, and 32(7.79%) disagreed but 15(3.35%) strongly disagreed. Thus, it can be argued that the quality of the chosen beer account for its price which the customers are comfortable with and prepared to pay.

Table 1.2: Description of risk(s) involved in changing from one brand of beer to the other.

			Consumers		Total
			No preference	Have preference	
Strongly agreed		Frequency	6	94	100
		%	1.5%	22.9%	24.3%
Agreed	High	Frequency	8	76	84
		%	1.9%	18.5%	20.4%
Undecided	Neutral	Frequency	29	8	37
		%	7.1%	1.9%	9.0%
Disagreed	Low	Frequency	65	4	69
		%	15.8%	1.0%	16.8%
Strongly disagreed		Frequency	121	0	121
		%	29.4%	.0%	29.4%
Total		Frequency	229	182	411
		%	55.7%	44.3%	100.00

Source: Field Study, 2017.

In table 1.2, the awareness of the consumers regarding the brands of beers they consume are obtained through their descriptions of the risks involved in changing from one brand to another. Among those without preference, 6(1.5%) felt the risk involved is very high. 8 (1.9%) feel it is high 29(7.1%) were indifferent but 65(15.8%) reported that low risks are involved while 121(29.9%) felt the risk involved is very high likewise 76(18.5%) who felt it is high but 8 (1.9%) remained indifferent while 4 (1.0%) others felt it is low.

Test of Hypothesis one

The first hypothesis seeks to find out if quality and price of brand of beer purchased has significant effect on brand loyalty building, the responses of the two categories of consumers (those with preference and those without preference) as contained in table 1.2 of the study on brand awareness data and their beer consumption frequency data were correlated and compared to establish the statement of hypothesis one.

Statistical test method used

Pearson’s product moment correlation (correlated matrix)

Decision

Reject H_0 if correlation coefficient between (brand quality and price with preference) and (Brand quality and without preference) is significant $p < 0.05$, otherwise accept the H_0 .

Table 1.3: Test Result for Hypothesis One

		Brand awareness	With preference	Without preference
Quality and price	Pearson correlation	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N			
With preference	Pearson correlation	.734(**)	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	182	182	
Without preference	Pearson correlation	.696(**)	.403(**)	1
	Sig. (2 – tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	229	182	229

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

Given the table 1.3, there is strong positive correlation between the quality of beer and brand choice (consumers with preference, $y = 0.0734^{**}$, $p = 0.000$).

Therefore, considering the strength of the correlation, it can be deduced that there is a difference between the correlations of (consumer with preference) and (consumers without preference) on brand quality and price.

At the two levels, γ is significant and $p < 0.05$, thus H_0 would be rejected and the corresponding alternative hypothesis, H_1 would be accepted. That is, "Quality and price of beer purchased has a significant effect on brand loyalty building"

Table 2: Beer that are most widely available attract most significant purchases and loyalty.

	Frequency	Valid percent %	Cumulative percent %
Strongly agreed	88	38.4	38.4
Agreed	85	37.1	75.5
Undecided	27	11.8	87.3
Disagreed	19	8.3	95.6
Strongly disagreed	10	4.4	100.0
Total	229	100.0	

Source: Field Study, 2017.

In the above table 2, 88(38.4%) of the Beer Marketers strongly agreed that greatest preference for brands of beer is based on most widely availability brands, 85(37.1%) agreed, 27(11.8%) were undecided 19(8.3%) disagreed, 10(4.4%) strongly disagreed.

Test of Hypothesis two

Hypothesis two as stated previously seeks to know if availability of brands from which consumers can choose from is a problem for building brand loyalty for beers in the Brewery Industry in Nigeria. Research question 2 completed by Beer Marketers to that effect was used for testing this hypothesis (see Table 2.1 below).

Decision Rule

Reject H_0 if $X^2_{cal} > X^2_{tab}$, otherwise, accept H_0

Table 2.1: Test Result for hypothesis two

	O _i	E _i	O _i -e _i	(O _i -e _i) ²	$\frac{(O_i - e_i)^2}{E_i}$
Strongly agreed	88	45.8	42.2	1,780.8	38.88
Agreed	85	45.8	39.8	1,536.64	33.55
Undecided	27	45.8	-18.8	353.44	7.72
Disagreed	19	45.8	-26.8	718.24	15.68
Strongly disagreed	10	45.8	-35.8	1281.64	27.98
	229				123.81

Source: Field Study, 2017.

From table 2.1, $X^2_{cal} = \frac{(oi-ei)^2}{ei} = 123.81$

At $\alpha = 0.05$, of (degree of freedom) = 5-1, df 4

$X^2_{tab} = 9.488$

Thus, $X^2_{cal} = 123.81 > X^2_{tab} = 9.488$

Decision

From the above computation, $X^2_{cal} > X^2_{tab}$, therefore the hypothesis which states that “The availability of beer brand significantly lead to consumers loyalty in the Nigerian beer industry” would be accepted.

Table 3: How would you rate the influence of your awareness/knowledge of the Image, Logo, and name of the Beer Brand You Consume?

			Consumers		Total
			“A” No preference	“B” Have preference	
RQ 15	Strongly agreed	Frequency	12	55	67
		%	2.9%	13.4%	16.3%
	Agreed	Frequency	69	116	185
		%	16.8%	28.2%	45.0%
	Undecided	Frequency	31	2	33
		%	7.5%	.5%	8.0%
	Disagreed	Frequency	73	8	81
		%	17.8%	1.9%	19.7%
	Strongly disagreed	Frequency	44	1	45
		%	10.7%	.2%	10.9%
Total	Frequency		229	182	411
	%		55.7%	44.3%	100.0%

Source: Field Study, 2017.

In table 3, the respondents who have preference for the choice of beer as a result of knowledge/awareness of the brands image, logo and name of the brand of affected beer 55(13.4%) of them rated strongly agreed while 116(28.2%) rated agreed 2(.5%) rated undecided 8(1.9%) disagreed 1(.2%) reported strongly disagreed. Those who do not have preference for the brands of beer consumed 12(2.9%) rated that strongly agreed for the knowledge/awareness of the image, logo and name of the brands of beer. Also, 69(16.8%) among them rated agreed 31(7.5%) undecided, 73(17.8%) disagreed and 44(10.7%) strongly disagreed.

Test of Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three seeks to find out if brand loyalty is a function of brand awareness. Considering the responses of the group of customers that reported that they have preference for brands of beer, especially their responses on Brand Awareness in table 3 (“A” & “B”).

Pearson’s product moment correlation (y) would be used to correlate the responses of the consumers with preference on the two groups of questions identified above (“A” & “B”) as in the said table 3.

Decision Rule

Reject H_0 if (y) is not significant and P. 0.05, otherwise, accept H_0

Table 3.1: Correlations

		Brand loyalty	Brand awareness
No preference	Pearson correlation	1	.970(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	189	182
With preference	Pearson correlation	.970(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	182	182

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

Source: Field Study, 2017.

From table 3.1, the Pearson correlation coefficient ($y = 0.970^{***}$, $p = 0.000$) is significant at 0.05 level $p < 0.05$ level, $p < 0.05$, thus, the stated hypothesis 3 would be accepted. That is, “Brand loyalty is a function of brand awareness”.

Table 4: Beer Marketers views on “Competition among the producers of the Beers pose challenge in building brand loyalty”

		Frequency	Valid percent %	Cumulative percent %
Valid	Strongly agreed	66	28.8	28.8
	Agreed	89	38.9	67.7
	Undecided	18	7.9	75.5
	Disagreed	36	15.7	91.3
	Strongly disagreed	20	8.7	100.0
	Total	229	100.0	

Source: Field Study, 2017.

Table 4, shows that 66(28.8%) of the marketers strongly agreed that competition among the producers of beers constitute challenge in building brand loyalty 89(38.9%) concurred by also just agreeing 18(17.9%) were undecided, 36(15.7%) disagreed, but 20(8.7%) strongly disagreed to the notion raised.

Test of Hypothesis four

Hypothesis four seeks to find out if competition poses significant challenge in building brand loyalty among Beer Consumers in the Nigerian brewery industry. Table 4.1 provides the data to be used in testing this hypothesis.

Statistical Test Methods Used

- i. Pearson’s product moment correlation (y) would be used to test the relationship between the responses given by the two categories of consumers covered in the study (those with preference for brands of beer and those without preference).

Decision Rule

Reject H_0 if $(X^2_{cal} > X^2_{tab})$ and where r is significant at $(P < 0.050)$

Otherwise, accept H_0

Table 4.1: Correlation between responses given by the two categories of consumers in respect for the level of perceived risks in brand switching based on competition

		No preference	With preference
No preference	Pearson correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	229	
With preference	Pearson correlation	.644(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	182	182

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

Source: Field Study, 2017.

Table 4.1 presents the result of the correlation between the responses of the consumers regarding the challenge posed by competition in building loyalty for brands of beer in the Nigerian brewery industry. The Pearson’s correlation coefficient at $(r= 0.644, p = 0.000)$ is significant at 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is a strong positive correlation between their responses.

Decision

Based on the above computation, the hypothesis 4 which states that “competition amongst brewers poses challenge in building brand loyalty in the Nigerian brewery industry” is accepted.

Discussion

Quality and price of beer brand has significant effect on brand loyalty building. Since there is a relationship between brand loyalty and quality of brand such that if a consumer is aware of a brands quality (in terms of unique attributes and expected benefits derivable from the brand) such consumer is likely to be loyal to the brand refer to table 1, 1.2 and the test of hypothesis to that effect. This agrees with (Henry and Quansh, 2013) who contended that consumers tend to go for a particular brand if perceived to be of quality and as opined by (Quelch, 1987) that consumers are of the expectations that in order to be satisfied and delighted there should be acceptable correlation between the price they pay for their choice of brands and utmost quality associated with the brand. Davis (2002) stated that a brand that deserves loyalty provides high quality performance. Price is also a consideration factor in choice criterion as price conscious

buyers normally compare price of competing brands before choosing. Price represents a unique opportunity to create loyalty, retain existing customers and attracts prospective ones.

Availability of beer brand significantly lead to consumer loyalty as consumers are more willing to go for beer that is accessible. At the second level of brand loyalty, it has been brand preference, buyers rely on previous experiences with the product when choosing it, if available, over competitors products. (Boone and Kurtz, 2006). Effective distribution is one of the main way to build brand successfully (Marvolti, 1999). Result obtained from the tested hypothesis shows that $X^2_{cal} = 123.81 = 123.81$, $x^2_{tab} = 9.488$ indicating that $x^2_{cal} > x^2_{tab}$ justifying that availability of beer brand significantly lead to consumers loyalty in Nigeria beer industry and market.

Brand loyalty is a function of brand awareness. Pearsons product moment correlation between the brand loyalty data and brand awareness data shows a strong positive correlation with $r=0.970^{**}$, $p = 0.000$). Kumar and Meenakshi (2013) included well balanced communication among the factors used in building brand. Table 3 of the study provides support to the foregoing. As consumers become aware of existing product usually through marketing communications, loyalty is enhanced.

Competition poses a significant challenge in building brand loyalty for beer in the Nigerian brewery industry. As opined by Driggs (2007) where there are a lot of brands in the markets, it constitute problems in building loyalty. Multiple and very close substitute as is readily found in Beer Markets in Nigeria expose some beer consumer to brandless or difficulty in becoming loyal to a particular beer especially when the competitors constantly provide rival incentives targeted at wowing consumers.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In view of the findings of the study, we draw thus; Beer consumers align price with quality. Availability of beer creates awareness and choice. Brand loyalty is a function of brand awareness and competition in beer market poses significant challenge in brand loyalty building. Based on the above, we recommend that;

- Price attached to beer should be commensurate with the quality
- Beer should be widely available to the target market followed by awareness creation
- Product differentiation and modification needed to be regular.
- Engagement in research to track and comply with trends in the market stands strategic

References

- Aaker, D.A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the value of a Brand Name*. New York: The free press. Pp. 101-117.
- Abugu, J. O. (2015). *Principles and Practice of Modern Marketing*. Revised ed. Enugu Newmoon Publishers.
- Boone, L.E. and Kurtz, D.L. (2006) *Contemporary Marketing* 12th ed. TSA. Thomson Corporation.
- Chaudhary, A. and Holbrook, M.B. (2001). The Chain of Effects from Brand Trust and Brand Effect to Brand Performance: The Role of Brand Loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65, pp. 81-93.

- Corritore, C.L., Kracher, B., and Weidenbeck, S. (2003). Online Trust: Concepts, Evolving themes, a Model. *International Journal of Human- Computer Studies*. Vol. 58, pp.737-758.
- Crainer, S. The Real Power of Brands: Making Brands work for competitive Advantage. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Davis, S. (2002). Implementing your BAM 2 Strategy: 11 steps to making your Brand a more valuable Business Asset. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 503- 513,
- Eneh, O. C., and Ogbuefi –Chima, F.I. (2013) “Receding Hairlines: Prevalence, Importance cause, prevention and Remediation’s among Nigerian city Women” *Journal of applied Sciences and Development*, 4(1-4):17-54.
- Driggs, W. (2007) The true Driver of Loyalty Retrieved from [CRM.com:http://www.destinationcrm.com/articles](http://www.destinationcrm.com/articles).
- Eneh, O.C. Abugu, J. and Anichebe, N.A. (2016) “Indoor Air Pollution Management: Decongesting Households and Offices of Toxic Waste Electrical Electronic Equipment in Enugu, Nigeria *Jokull Journal* 66(10)23-32.
- Henry, B and Quansah, M.K. (2013). Mobil telecommunication networks choice among Ghanaians. *Management letters* 3. 1839-1859. Retrieved from www.growingscience.com.
- Johnson, D., and Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and Affective Trust in Service Relationships. *Journal of Business Research*. Vol. 58, pp. 5 00-507.
- Kapferer, J. (2007). The new strategic brand management. 3rd ed. London Kogan page limited.
- Keller, K.L. (2003), Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity. Second Edition, *Upper Saddle River*, New York: Prentice Hall, p. 168-194.
- Kotler, P and Armstrong, G. (2010). Principles of Marketing 13th ed. New Jersey Pearson ed. Inc.
- Kotler, P. (1997). Marketing Management, 9th Edition. USA: *Prentice Hall*. Pp. 469-475.
- Lewis, J.D., and Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a Social Reality. *Social Forces*, Vol. 63, Pp. 967-985.
- Mariotti, J.L. (1999). Smart things to know about Brands and Branding. Oxford: Capstone, pp.146-157.
- Quelch, J.A. (1987). Marketing the premium product. *Business horizons*. 30(3), 38-45.
- Reigeisberger, J., Sasse, M.A, and McCaithy, 3D. (2005). The Mechanics of Trust: A framework for research and design. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, Vol. 6, pp. 38 1-422.
- Sahay, A. (2007). How to reap high profits with dynamic pricing. MIT Sloan. *Management Review*, 48, 53-60.
- Sheth, J.N., and Parvatiyar, A. (1995). Relationship Marketing in Consumer Markets: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 23(4), 255-271.
- Solomon, R.M. (2011). Consumer behaviours 9th ed. New Jersey Pearson ed. Inc.
- Uzoagulu, A.E. (1998) Practical Guide to Writing Research Project in Tertiary Institutions. John Jacob’s Classic Publishers Ltd. Enugu, Nigeria.

About the Authors

James O. Abugu (Corresponding Author) is a Ph.D holder in Marketing and lecturer 1 in the Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Nigeria Nsukka. His research focuses on Consumer and Buyer Behaviour, Marketing Management and Agricultural and Food Marketing others include; Logistics and Supply Chain Management and Marketing Cooperative.

Johnson U. Ozo holds Ph.D in Marketing and is a senior lecturer in Marketing Department of Faculty of Management Sciences Ebonyi State University, Nigeria. His research focuses on Marketing and Market Research, Consumer Behaviour and Sales Management. He is currently the Head and postgraduate coordinator of the Department of Marketing.

Gbeyenga O. Tobun holds a postgraduate Diploma in Marketing. He is a sales Representative of Nigerian Breweries Plc. 9th Mile Corner, Enugu Nigeria. His interest includes Markets for Brand Preference and Sales Management. He has travelled widely, covering a number of sales territories in all the states of the federation.