



ISSN Online 2617-359X



Brand Equity and Customer Citizenship Behaviour among Students of Selected Universities within Mount Kenya Region

Ann Bonareri, Clement Nkaabu & Guyo S. Huka

ISSN: 2617-359X

Brand Equity and Customer Citizenship Behaviour among Students of Selected Universities within Mount Kenya Region

^{1*}Ann Bonareri, ²Clement Nkaabu & ³Guyo S. Huka

¹³Department of Marketing, Meru University of Science and Technology

²Department of Marketing, Bomet University College

*Corresponding author's e-mail: amoywaywa@must.ac.ke

How to cite this article: Bonareri, A., Nkaabu, C. & Guyo, S. H. (2022). Brand Equity and Customer Citizenship Behaviour among Students of Selected Universities within Mount Kenya Region, *Journal of Marketing and Communication*, Vol. 5(1), 80-92. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6020>

Abstract

The growing number of higher learning institutions in Kenya and around the world has emphasized the importance of brand equity in customer decision-making. Despite the role of brand equity, enrollment in public universities has been declining in the past three years. The study was conducted to establish the effect of brand equity on customer citizenship behaviour among students of selected universities within Mount Kenya region. The study was anchored on Keller brand theory. A descriptive research survey was utilized and a target population of 600 4th year students were selected from universities within Mount Kenya region. A sample size of 240 students was selected through simple random sampling. Primary data was collected using both closed and open-ended questionnaires. Data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistics including correlation and regression analysis. Results indicated an R squared of 0.565. This denoted that brand equity explains 57% of the variations in the customer citizenship behavior. Findings also indicated that brand equity had a positive and significant effect on customer citizenship behavior ($\beta=0.912$, $p<0.05$). This suggested that a marginal increase in brand equity will lead to 0.912 increase in customer citizenship behavior. The study concluded that brand equity significantly contributes to improved customer citizenship behavior (57%). The study recommended that universities' management should consider engaging in strong advertising and marketing campaigns so as to create more brand awareness and hence build customer citizenship behaviour. The university administrators should make sure the brand image conjures cleanliness. They should also create a positive and inviting environment. The government and ministry of education policymakers should also promote brand equity in Kenyan universities.

Keywords: *Brand Equity, Customer Citizenship Behaviour, University students*

1.0 Introduction

According to Groth (2015), brand equity is far less clear, complex, and obscure in countries like the United States, necessitating a more thorough, nuanced, and tribal approach to brand design and communication. Simple fixes are no longer sufficient. To develop relevance and encourage bottom-up relevance, simplicity must be implemented at a complicated level. To establish a strong cultural footprint in markets around the world, brands must assume local relevance. Local brands help organizations stay still when the marketing environment changes. To stay agile and active and continue to create value, brands must now do the opposite.

Brands are currently in a profound ideological crisis in nations like South Africa, and traditional communication forms are getting increasingly stale and out of date. The major global brands' universal principles and homogeneous messaging have worn thin, and they are no longer relevant for an increasingly demanding clientele seeking authenticity at any cost. This is especially true for the younger generation and customers in huge growing countries like Nigeria or Egypt, where underlying cultural values are significantly different, according to Bove (2016).

In Tanzania, brand equity refers to the financial value gained from a customer's impression of a product or service's brand name, rather than the product or service itself. It is the premium value that educational institutions take from the product or service resulting in a recognizable name versus the same equivalent. Customers are willing to pay a greater price for a product or service when they can receive the same product or service for a lower price from competitors with favorable brand equity. Simply described, a brand asset is a product or service's added value. The power of a successful brand to capture client preferences and experiences is its ultimate value. In fact, for universities and other higher education organizations, branding is increasingly becoming a strategic priority to create significantly distinct brands that effectively express their advantages (Jevens, 2012).

Customer Citizenship Behavior (CCB) is an activity of customer choice versus the regular needs for exchange across different institutions in Kenya, according to Christian Gllide, Stefano Pace, Simon, Pervan, and Carolyne Strong (2011). The results of their study, "Exploring the Limits of Customer Behavior: Managers should grasp the time, location, and practice in which their brand might play a role, according to "A Focus on Consumer Rituals." This will enable colleges to position their brands to benefit from and participate in CCB initiatives. Youjae Yi, Tashik Hong, and Hyoji Lee (2013), another behavior related to the client's citizenship comes from the basic behavior of the client's citizenship.

The concept of customer citizenship behaviour is useful in this study as it shows the extent to which customers rely on the perception of various brands in the higher education institutions in Kenya. CCB helps in the understanding on why students who are the main customers in the higher education institutions to prefer one university over the other. Any business or public entity involved in higher education is referred to as a Higher Education Institution (HEI). It is any post-secondary education that provides education. Higher Education institutions in Kenya are face with a lot of challenges such as competition, inadequate government funding, inadequate infrastructure, lack of research development and overcrowded libraries. In the recent past there had been mushrooming of public universities as a result of upgrading technical colleges. Thus, there is need for them to position their brands in such a way of attracting both the direct entry and mature entry students.

1.1 Research Problem

The growing number of higher learning institutions in Kenya and around the world has emphasized the importance of brand equity in customer decision-making. Kohonor (2012) studied the role of brand equity on a number of different learning institutions. His study established that 85% of customers who want to join higher learning institutions always look at the branding of the university. This was because the dimensions of brand equity often affect the preferences and intentions of customers to consume the institutions services.

Despite the role of brand equity, enrollment in public universities has been declining in the past three years (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2020). KNBS report recorded that the country's total university enrollment declines by 1.9% to 509,473 in the academic year (2019-2020), from 519,462 in the previous academic year, with enrollment in public universities decreasing by 4.7%, from 433,245 in 2018-19 to 412,845 before the end of the academic year (2019-2020). The decline in university enrollment points out to poor customer citizenship behaviour, which results in a decline in demand for university services.

Miller (2014) studied the emergence of many universities in Kenya which has increased competition amongst themselves. His study further looked into the need for career enrichment of the citizens which has prompted the expansion of, and competition of higher learning institutions. The study established that the Higher Education Institutions should leverage their brands by enhancing marketing strategies and providing a variety of programmes in order to attract and retain more students because there is a steady increase of the learners and the stiff competition among the higher education institutions. However, the study failed to focus on brand equity, customer satisfaction and citizenship behaviour constructs.

Okonkwo (2017) investigated how branding affects customer satisfaction in higher education institutions. The study indicated that exerting pressure among higher learning institutions and how they offer their services to its customers influence customer satisfaction. According to his study, higher learning institutions employ sales promotion and personal selling to enhance in customer citizenship behaviour and customer satisfaction. The study, however, highlighted a conceptual gap because it did not focus on crucial qualities of brand equity, such as brand image, brand loyalty, brand awareness, and perceived quality. The current study focused on these four dimensions.

In the financial sector, Rambocas, Kirpalani, and Simms (2018) explored the relationship between brand equity and client behavioral intentions. Customer satisfaction was also investigated as a mediating factor, as well as the moderating effects of customer age, education, and gender on this relationship. Customer happiness partially mediates the relationship between brand equity and customer behavioral intentions, according to the findings. The findings also support the idea that customer age and education have a moderating effect on the link between customer happiness and switching. However, the research was conducted in the financial sector, which is different from the education sector. The contextual differences make it impractical to generalize the findings to explain the situation in the education sector. In light of the research dilemma, this study attempted to close the knowledge gap by establishing the influence of brand equity on customer citizenship behavior among students from Mount Kenya's institutions.

1.2 Research Hypothesis

H₀: There is no statistically significant effect of brand equity on customer citizenship behaviour among students of selected universities within Mount Kenya region.

2.0 Literature Review

Professor David Aaker of the University of California created Aaker's Brand Theory in 1987. According to the notion, brand equity is made up of moderating effects on customer happiness, brand equity, brand loyalty, and brand association, which are then integrated to give the value that the product or service offers. Brand management, according to Aaker, starts with brand loyalty, which is a diverse set of brand affiliations that discloses what the brand is and gives consumers the ideal brand image. As a result, Aaker's theory provides a comprehensive look at the concept of brand equity and how to assess it. This notion can be applied at various levels of the marketing process. Enhance product productivity, increase customer loyalty to a brand, and occasionally differentiate from competitors, for example.

The most thorough theory of brand equity is provided by Aaker (1992), which consists of five unique assets that are sources of value generation. Brand loyalty, brand awareness, perceived brand quality, brand associations other than customer happiness, and other proprietary brand assets like patents, trademarks, and channel links are all examples of these assets. Aaker's brand theory is concerned with the study of the influence of brand equity on consumer civic behavior in the marketing arena, which indicates the value of brands. The concept of brand value is fascinating and goes far further than it appears. Brand owners generally believe that well-known brands will generate more sales and reputation in the market than lesser-known brands. Many methodologies and studies have been used to understand the concept of brand equity at Aaker's Brand Equity. Customers and brands have presented a variety of criteria and methods for determining brand equity. According to cognitive psychology, brand equity is determined by customer awareness and their relationship with the brand; nevertheless, the information economy demonstrates that the monetary value it can provide is an asset, since a strong brand name is a quality product identifier and a brand parameter (Fox, 2011).

Aaker (1992), in Aaker Brand Equity Theory, believes that a focus on brand loyalty is often an effective way to manage equity related to the moderating effect of customer satisfaction and brand equity as a central and essential element of the brand is one of the variables examined. The ability of potential purchasers to recognize or remember that a brand belongs to a specific product category that they have used before has a moderating effect on customer happiness and brand fairness. At the recognition level, it can create a sense of brand familiarity as well as signify identity, engagement, and awareness, and at the recall level, it can further affect choice by influencing which brands are considered and chosen. Customer satisfaction and brand capital are essential moderators for many colleges, and they are at the heart of a strong brand's strength. Most conceptual conceptions of brand equity emphasize the importance of experience. Because customers prefer to buy brands they recognize, the limiting impact of customer satisfaction and brand equity results in high purchase rates, which boosts the company's profitability and sales (Baldauf et al., 2012).

Brand Equity and Customer Citizenship Behaviour

According to Kotler and Armstrong (2015), brand equity is made up of short-term incentives that drive people to buy or sell a product or service. Brand capital is also used in advertising, personal selling, and promotional things supplied to intermediates and end customers, according to Kotler. His research shows that coupons, discounts, samples, and lotteries are some examples of brand equity. The advantage of brand equity is that the short-term nature of the program (eg coupons or lottery with expiration) often drives sales over its duration. Customers are enticed to buy when they are offered incentives such as cent certificates or discounts. Because profits are typically ephemeral and sales fall after a transaction is closed, brand equity cannot be the main basis for a campaign (Berkowitz et al., 2013).

Owaga (2011) did a study on the differences between brand equity and personal selling which implied that the different is impersonal. According to his research, brand equity sends a strong message to the audience from a known source. Furthermore, the study discovered that the function of brand equity, which is employed in advertising in higher education for both personal and business markets, has grown considerably in recent years, and the institution is now a portion of advertising revenue. Higher education institutions must first ensure that their brand equity plan is in line with their entire marketing strategy (Channon, 2015).

In his study of the impact of branded capital on university performance, Channon (2015) discovered that branded capital is increasingly being used to provide incentives for improved performance. Many institutions now give bonuses for meeting sales goals, as well as additional incentives like sweepstakes, freebies, and vacations, all of which help to build brand equity. His research also discovered that transactional clients are more inclined to switch universities than new long-term accounts when it comes to brand equity (Channon, 2015). Brand assets build good relationships with diverse audiences of educational institutions by receiving favorable publicity, building good company equity, and confronting or rejecting unfavorable rumors, stories, and events (Kotler & Armstrong, 2015).

Furthermore, Thuo (2014) points out that the main purpose of brand equity is to increase awareness and gain editorial coverage, as opposed to paid media space as seen by the desired consumer base of higher education institutions. Brand assets are more of a core business and are intended to enhance the position of higher education institutions with specially targeted audiences (Channon, 2015). Brand capital is defined as the presentation and promotion of items and services, according to study. Customers and the institution's sales personnel have direct interaction (Thuo, 2014). Although the concept of marketing higher education institutions was quite outdated until recently, brand ownership has long been the most essential communication channel in higher education institutions.

Brand equity is discussed by Kotler (2012). His research shows that building direct ties with carefully chosen individual clients elicits an immediate response and fosters long-term customer relationships (Kotler and Armstrong, 2015). It is the use of direct channels to reach and deliver goods and services to customers without the need of marketing intermediaries. Direct mail, catalog, telemarketing, interactive television, website, and mobile equity are some of these channels. It's one of the most popular methods of customer service.

Furthermore, viral marketing based on brand equity has become a common strategy in modern marketing. This term refers to a wide range of aggressive marketing tactics. This includes paying people to spread positive word of mouth for institutional products via email, blogs, and cell phones. It also entails establishing a multi-level sales system in which customers receive commissions for introducing friends by describing a company's brand equity (Thuo, 2014).

Kotler (2012) shows that the traditional marketing mix approach used in the marketing of goods is not sufficient for effective marketing and management of services due to the specificity of services. The service marketing strategy then needs to be supplemented with brand equity. People tend to understand an organization through its branding, which influences the perceptions of buyers who are institutional customers and other customers in the service environment. Processes include the actual procedures, mechanisms and flow of activities through which services are delivered. It is the provision of services and operating systems (Thuo, 2014).

Any compensated form of impersonal communication about an organization, product, service, or idea from an identified sponsor is known as brand equity (Berkowitz et al., 2013). Ownership of a brand is a highly prevalent mode of communication. It is a persuasive environment that allows the seller to repeat the message over and over again. It offers the opportunity to

showcase educational institutions and their products through the skillful use of prints, tones and colors.

3.0 Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive research survey design. The accessible target population was 600 4th year students of selected universities within Mount Kenya region. To get the needed sample size of 240 respondents from the study, simple random sampling was used. Primary data was collected using both closed and open-ended questionnaires. The questionnaires were carefully structured and pre-tested and adjusted to meet the demands of the study. Data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistics including correlation and regression analysis.

4.0 Results and Discussion

This section presents descriptive and inferential statistics results.

Descriptive Statistics on Brand Image

Table 1: Brand Image

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std. Dev
The University brand has a very favorable brand	7.70%	10.30%	16.00%	42.30%	23.70%	3.64	1.18
It has a brand equity that evokes cleanliness	12.90%	12.90%	17.50%	33.50%	23.20%	3.41	1.32
It has cheerful and appealing atmosphere	9.80%	2.60%	18.00%	34.00%	35.60%	3.83	1.22
The University brand provides exciting events for its students (example, new fresher's night)	12.90%	3.10%	25.80%	33.50%	24.70%	3.54	1.26
The learning environment in the University is very conducive	10.80%	8.80%	26.30%	26.30%	27.80%	3.52	1.28
It has a more attractive equity than other university brands	11.90%	8.20%	19.10%	39.20%	21.60%	3.51	1.25
University has very good traditions	11.30%	7.20%	16.50%	38.10%	26.80%	3.62	1.27
Average						3.58	1.25

The majority of respondents (66.0%) believed that the university brand was extremely favorable (mean = 3.64, SD = 1.18). The findings revealed that 56.7 percent of respondents felt that brand equity generates purity (Mean = 3.41 SD = 1.32). The results also showed that most of the respondents, 56.7%, agreed that there was a pleasant and interesting atmosphere (mean = 3.83, SD = 1.22). The results further indicate that the majority of respondents 56.7% agree with the statement that university brands provide interesting events for their students (eg Neue Mann night) (mean score = 3.54, SD = 1.26). In addition, most respondents (54.1%) agree with the statement that the learning environment at the university is very good (mean = 3.52, SD = 1.28).

Additional results show that the majority of respondents 60.8% agree that they have more attractive capital than other university brands (mean = 3.51, SD = 1.25). In addition, the majority of respondents, 64.9%, agreed that their university has a very good tradition (mean = 3.62, SD = 1.27). The average answer is 3.58 which means the majority of respondents agree with the statement about brand image. This implied that most of the respondents acknowledged the importance of brand image as a component of brand equity and this was expected to impact on customer citizenship behavior.

Descriptive Statistics on Brand Loyalty

Table 2: Brand Loyalty

Average	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std.Dev
I am very proud to be associated with this University	12.40%	14.40%	5.70%	33.00%	34.50%	3.63	1.40
I intend to join this university for my postgraduate studies	5.20%	13.40%	4.10%	30.40%	46.90%	4.01	1.23
This university will always remain as my first-choice university.	4.60%	17.50%	6.70%	41.20%	29.90%	3.74	1.19
I would recommend this university to others	9.80%	4.60%	26.80%	36.60%	22.20%	3.57	1.17
I would not switch to another University brand no matter what	12.40%	6.70%	9.80%	24.70%	46.40%	3.86	1.39
Average						3.76	1.28

The results in Table 2 show that at 67.5% the majority of respondents agreed that they were very proud to join the university (mean = 3.63, SD = 1.40). Furthermore, the majority of respondents (77.3%) indicated that they want to continue their postgraduate studies at the institution (mean = 4.01, SD = 1.23). The results further show that the majority of respondents 71.1% agree that their university will always be my first choice (mean = 3.74, SD = 1.19). Majority of respondents agreed that they would recommend this university to others, with 58.8% agreeing. (Mean = 3.57, SD = 1.17). The results further indicated that the majority of respondents amounting to 71.1% agreed that they would definitely not switch to another university brand (mean = 3.86, SD = 1.39).

The mean of the replies was 3.76, indicating that the majority of people agreed with the statement about brand loyalty. This implied that most of the respondents acknowledged the importance of brand loyalty as a component of brand equity and this was expected to impact on customer citizenship behavior.

Descriptive Statistics on Brand Awareness

Table 3: Brand Awareness

Statement	Strongly			Strongly			Mean	Std.Dev
	Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Agree	Agree		
I am aware of the University brand	12.40%	0.50%	3.60%	18.00%	65.50%		4.24	1.33
I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of the University	7.20%	6.70%	10.30%	23.70%	52.10%		4.07	1.24
Some characteristics of the University come to mind quickly	10.30%	2.60%	6.20%	18.60%	62.40%		4.20	1.30
I can recognize my university brand among other competing brands	13.40%	1.00%	8.20%	23.70%	53.60%		4.03	1.37
Average							4.14	1.31

The results in Table 3 show that at 83.5%, the majority of respondents agree that they know the university brand (mean value = 4.24, SD = 1.33). The findings also revealed that 75.8% of respondents agreed with the assertion that they could recall the university insignia or logo quickly (mean = 4.07, SD = 1.24). In addition, the results showed that most of the respondents (81.0%) agreed that some university characteristics emerged quickly (mean = 4.20, SD = 1.30). The results further show that the majority of 77.3% of respondents agree that they can recognize their university brand among other competing brands (mean = 4.03, SD = 1.37). The average mean of the replies was 4.14, indicating that the majority of the respondents agreed with the brand awareness statement. This implied that most of the respondents acknowledged the importance of brand awareness as a component of brand equity and this was expected to impact on customer citizenship behavior.

Descriptive Statistics on Perceived Quality

Table 4: Perceived Quality

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std.Dev
The university staff gives students individual attention	7.20%	1.00%	21.10%	19.60%	51.00%	4.06	1.19
The employees are dressed and appear in a clean, neat, and professional manner.	7.70%	10.30%	25.30%	26.80%	29.90%	3.61	1.23
The university has convenient operation hours for all of its students.	13.40%	5.70%	12.40%	21.10%	47.40%	3.84	1.42
The crew delivers prompt service within the time range specified.	9.30%	9.30%	12.40%	26.80%	42.30%	3.84	1.32
The staff properly resolves student problems.	10.80%	8.20%	15.50%	23.70%	41.80%	3.77	1.35
The team is always eager to assist students.	7.70%	5.70%	15.50%	24.20%	46.90%	3.97	1.25
Inquiries are promptly addressed	14.90%	14.90%	21.60%	19.10%	29.40%	3.33	1.42
Average						3.77	1.31

Table 4 shows that majority of respondents (70.6 percent) believed that their university staff paid personalized attention to students (mean = 4.06, SD = 1.19). Furthermore, the majority of respondents (56.7%) felt that personnel were clean, tidy, dressed adequately, and dressed appropriately (mean = 3.61, SD = 1.23). Furthermore, the majority of respondents (68.5%) felt that the university provides comfortable working hours for all students (mean = 3.61, SD = 1.23). Furthermore, the majority of respondents (69.1%) believed that the employees provided prompt service within the stipulated time frame (Mean = 3.84, SD = 1.32).

Moreover, the results showed that the majority of 65.5% of respondents agreed that the staff handled student complaints effectively (mean = 3.77, SD = 1.35). Additional results showed that the majority of respondents, 71.1%, agreed that staff were always willing to help students (mean = 3.77, SD = 1.35). Furthermore, the majority of respondents (48.5%) felt that the questions should be forwarded to their university right away (mean = 3.33, SD = 1.42).

The average number of responses was 3.77, showing that most individuals agreed with the statement about perceived quality. This meant that the majority of respondents recognized the relevance of perceived quality as a component of brand equity, which would have an impact on consumer citizenship behavior.

The respondents were further asked to describe brand equity in their institution. The respondents indicated that brand equity has been influenced by programs offered by the specific universities, the university reputation, the students' interaction with the various faculties as well as promotions using public relations and e-media.

Descriptive Statistics on Customer Citizenship Behavior

Table 5: Customer Citizenship Behavior

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Std.Dev
This university comes highly recommended by me to potential students.	11.90%	2.60%	7.20%	32.50%	45.90%	3.98	1.31
My family members and I suggest this university.	11.90%	0.00%	15.50%	28.90%	43.80%	3.93	1.29
I recommend this university to anyone interested in furthering their education.	9.80%	3.10%	26.30%	26.30%	34.50%	3.73	1.24
I tell my friends about this university.	11.90%	14.90%	15.50%	33.00%	24.70%	3.44	1.33
I explain to other students on other resources in the university	9.80%	3.60%	16.00%	39.20%	31.40%	3.79	1.21
I fill out lecturer evaluation forms	11.90%	0.50%	12.90%	27.80%	46.90%	3.97	1.3
When the university asks for information, I respond.	4.10%	7.70%	13.40%	22.20%	52.60%	4.11	1.16
I can share my thoughts and feelings with the university administration	10.80%	5.20%	8.20%	28.40%	47.40%	3.96	1.32
I am always ready to defend my university	11.30%	7.20%	16.50%	38.10%	26.80%	3.62	1.27
I am always ready to market my university	10.80%	14.40%	14.90%	30.40%	29.40%	3.53	1.34
Average						3.81	1.28

The results in Table 5 show that at 78.4% the majority of respondents agreed that they would recommend their university to prospective students (mean = 3.49, SD = 1.32). The results further indicated that a majority of 72.7% of respondents agreed that they would recommend their university to family members (mean = 3.93, SD = 1.29). Furthermore, the majority of respondents (60.8%) agreed that they would recommend their university to anyone who are interested in pursuing higher education (mean score = 3.93, SD = 1.29). Majority of respondents (57.7%) agreed that they would suggest their university to family members (mean score = 3.44, SD = 1.33). The results also showed that 70.6% of respondents agreed that they explained other university resources to other students (mean = 3.79, SD = 1.21). Additional

results showed that the majority of respondents 74.7% agreed that they filled out the teacher evaluation form (mean = 3.97, SD = 1.30).

The findings revealed that 74.8 percent of respondents consented to share information when the university requested it (mean score = 4.11, SD = 1.16). The results further indicated that most of the respondents, 75.8%, agreed that they could share their thoughts and feelings with the university management (mean = 3.96, SD = 1.32). The results showed that most of the respondents, 64.9%, agreed that they were always ready to defend their university (mean = 4.11, SD = 1.16). The results further show that the majority of respondents, 59.8%, agree that they are always ready to bring my university to market (mean = 3.53, SD = 1.34).

The average mean of the replies was 3.81, suggesting that the majority of people agreed with the statement on customer civic conduct. This implied that most of the respondents demonstrated positive customer citizenship behavior. The respondents were further asked to describe how else their institution would do to promote customer citizenship behaviour. The following were some of the areas that were stated could help to promote customer citizenship behaviour in universities; improving students' commitment, improving student trust, improving the university infrastructure, increasing brand assets as well as associations.

Effect of brand Equity on Customer Citizenship Behaviour

Linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of brand equity on customer citizenship behavior. Table 6 shows the model summary results.

Table 6: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.752 ^a	.565	.563	.657127

Results in Table 6 indicate an R squared of 0.565. This denoted that brand equity explains 57% of the variations in the dependent variable which is customer citizenship behavior. The findings indicated that brand equity is satisfactory variable in explaining customer citizenship behavior. Table 7 presents the ANOVA outcome.

Table 7: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	107.686	1	107.686	249.379	.000 ^b
Residual	82.909	192	.432		
Total	190.594	193			

The F statistic of 249.38 and a p value of 0.000 less than 0.05 critical value suggest that the whole model was statistically significant, as shown in Table 7. This imply that brand equity is a significant predictor of customer citizenship behavior. Regression coefficient results were presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Regression Coefficients

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	.395	.225		1.753	.081
Brand Equity	.912	.058	.752	15.792	.000

Dependent Variable: Customer Citizenship Behaviour

Results in Table 8 shows that brand equity ($\beta=0.912$, $p<0.05$) has a positive and significant effect on customer citizenship behavior. This imply that a unit improvement in brand equity would lead to 0.912 units improvement in customer citizenship behavior. The conclusions of the study corresponded with those of Ovidiu (2015), who found that brand loyalty generates value by lowering marketing costs and leveraging trade, hence improving customer citizenship

behavior. The findings also concurred with Asop (2017) conclusion that quality had a significant effect on sales performance in production companies.

The null hypothesis, H_0 : There is no statistically significant effect of brand equity on customer citizenship behaviour among students of selected universities within Mount Kenya region was rejected since the p value of 0.000 was less than 0.05.

The hypothesized model [$Y = \beta_0 + \beta X + \varepsilon$] becomes;

$$Y = 0.395 + 0.912X$$

Where;

Y=Customer citizenship behavior

X= Brand Equity

6.0 Conclusion

This study concludes that there is a positive and significant relationship between brand equity and customer behavior. Thus, brand capital makes a significant contribution to customer citizenship behavior among students at selected universities in the Mount Kenya region. The key aspects of the brand equity focus are brand image, brand loyalty, brand awareness and perceived quality.

7.0 Recommendation

The university management should pay special attention to university brand with the aim of creating citizenship behavior in students and increasing the number of students. Furthermore, university administration should pay close attention to what constitutes brand loyalty, as some customer behavioral patterns, such as purchasing apathy, cheap pricing, and avoidance of significant switching costs, may not represent loyalty.

The university management should ensure that they have a brand image that evokes cleanliness. They should also ensure cheerful and appealing atmosphere. This will enhance citizenship behavior. The report also suggested that policymakers in the government and ministry of education should adopt measures that promote brand equity. Such policies should encourage colleges that are well-suited to the changing environment, resulting in student satisfaction and improved citizenship behavior.

Furthermore, the study suggested that university marketers in Kenya engage in powerful advertising and marketing initiatives to raise brand awareness and, as a result, build customer citizenship behaviour. The university management should also ensure they create brand loyalty of the university by ensuring they offer quality education which can enhance competitiveness and thus increase the number of students enrolling in the universities.

REFERENCES

- Asopa, V. N. (2017) 'Tea Institution of Kenya: The Cup that Cheers has Tears' Kenyan
- Berkowitz et al., (2013). Ethical implications of the relationship of purpose to role and function in customer service. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 8, 65-73.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00382018>
- Channon, (2015). Getting the Most out of Advertising and Promotion. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 50-60.
- Fox, R. F. (2011, November). Warning Advertising May Be Hazardous to Your Health: Ads Pose a Threat to Physical, Emotional, Social, and Cultural Well-Being. *USA Today (Society for the Advancement of Education)*, 130, 62+.
- Gilde, C., Pace, S., Pervan, S. J., & Strong, C. (2011). Examining the boundary conditions of customer citizenship behaviour: a focus on consumption ritual. *Journal of strategic Marketing*, 19(7), 619-631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2011.603053>
- Kotler, P. (2012). *Kotler on marketing*. Simon and Schuster.
- Miller, (2014). The effect of worldviews on customer service. In J. E.Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in customer service and communication management* (pp. 327-355). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Owaga, (2011). *Excellent customer service and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rambocas, M., Kirpalani, V. M., & Simms, E. (2018). Brand equity and customer behavioural intentions: a mediated moderated model. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-09-2016-0139>
- Thuo, (2014). *Excellent customer service and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.