
International Forum
Vol. 15, No. 1
June 2011
pp. 41-56

FEATURE

**The Synergy of Building up Brand Equity:
A Perception of the AIIAS Experience**

Eric Y. Nasution

Abstract: *This study dealt with how AIIAS brand identity has developed into a perceived corporate reputation by taking into consideration the critical success factors of its development. Expressing this synergistic interaction mathematically, $R = f(B + BC + P)$; where R = reputation, BC = brand-customers relationship, and P = the management performance of developing the institution's critical success factors. The study used AIIAS and its stakeholders as the main respondents, who were mostly male foreigners between 30 and 50 years old, who converted into the SDA belief because of their colleagues at work over the last fifteen years. The study used a survey method to address the problem of "how AIIAS' stakeholders, particularly the students, recognized the main statements of AIIAS corporate brand identity as corporate reputation identity of the institution." This was the basis of the values of brand equity. The study concluded that the development of critical success factors like educational specialization, systematic strategic planning, and the capability of developing its core competencies in the trilogy of higher education, were mainly perceived as the motivators for the growth of AIIAS brand equity. These critical success factors seemed to be the manifestation of the synergy in AIIAS brand equity values.*

As many marketing specialists put it, a company without a clear brand identity cannot logically market and sell its products or services successfully, because the consumers are not convinced of its existence in the market. This article reviews the core of brand equity, then outlines the conceptual framework of the study, the research questions, research design, analysis of the survey and the summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations.

The Core of “Brand Equity”

According to Keller (2008), the word *brand*, which is generally defined as the corporate identity for its product or service, originated from the Old Norse word *brandr*, which means *burn* (p. 2). Livestock owners in the past practiced marking their livestock by burning hot-molded iron and stamping it on the skin of the cattle. This was their way of marking their livestock property for the purpose of easier inventory-taking and identification. By virtue of the competitive advantages of the livestock business, the livestock brand will be accepted in the market and this is the time when its brand gains an added value. As Keller (2008) puts it, “brand equity” refers to the added-value or premium gained from a brand-consumers relationship (pp. 16, 83). Below are two conceptual strategic development concepts of how brand is converted into a reputation, which leads to increased brand equity, raised by Kerin and Peterson in 2004 (please refer to the second paragraph below) and Rampersad in 2008 (see below).

Kerin and Peterson (2004) explained some of the main steps of how brand equity is established through a series of value-added factors. They explained that “brand equity can be developed by positive brand awareness, establishment of meaning of the brand in the consumers’ minds, derivation of the proper consumers’ response to its brand identity, and establishment of consumers’ loyalty in its brand identity” (p. 137). However, prior to this brand-consumers relationship, marketing specialists generally agree that procedures for brand positioning must first be performed. Chandra (2001) found that from a number of positioning strategies, the most widely practiced were those according to the brand attributes, benefits, price and quality (p. 79).

Rampersad (2008) included the idea that the minimum critical success factors from any educational institution can develop further conceptualization, formulation and implementation of the successful brand equity, as reflected in the CB-to-RID paradigm in Figure 1. These factors include development of vision and mission; strategic plan formulation and implementation; teaching specialization; core competence in teaching, research and community outreach; corporate culture; an accreditation system; a self-sufficient financing system and a performance evaluation system (pp. 80-82).

In the profit-oriented setting, the above-mentioned critical success factors vary according to the companies’ competitive advantages that gradually develop and build up brand equity through increased sales, market shares, and larger cash flows. Some of the brand equity values of multi-national companies with large growth rates as Nokia, Toyota, BMW, Samsung and Dell, in terms of their growth rates from 2004 to 2005, are presented below in Table 1. It recorded Samsung’s growth as the largest at 19% in 2005, followed by Dell at 15%. Nokia and Toyota recorded a 10% growth with BMW at 8%, the lowest among

those presented. The profit-oriented organizations' values of brand equity are normally the concern of the V.P. for Marketing and Strategic Plan Advisor. Even though the model to arrive at the brand equity was not mentioned by the authors in Table 1, in the real business life these brand equity values are computed as the sum of total expected present value of the organization's cash flow discounted at a hurdle rate of the cost of developing that brand identity. The following formula was used to derive the value of an organization's brand equity:

$$BE (pv) = \sum_{t=1}^n CF (1/(1+k)^t), \text{ where}$$

- BE (pv) = Brand equity value at present value (pv) terms
- CF = Periodical cash flows that the brand generates, which are computed as the sum of net profit plus all relevant non-cash charges (depreciation + amortization + deferred taxes, if any)
- k = Cost of capital for developing the brand equity which is always expressed in terms of % cost for developing it, whether it is financed by debt or equity.
- n = Period in terms of months, quarters or years the cash flows generated by the brand are to be projected, which will not normally exceed 5 years.
- t = Time of the beginning of the period, which is 1 or the first month, quarter or year.

In response to the question pertaining to the number of years required in the projection scenario, many organizations use a range of three to five years as reasonable time span under which the present value of a brand equity is projected. Welsch and associates have (1988) stated that "realistic profit planning time span is not beyond five years" (pp. 37, 177).

Table 1
Brand Equity of A Few Selected Well-known Products in 2004-2005

Brand	Country	2005 (\$ Bio)	2004 (\$ Bio)	Growth %
Nokia	Finland	26.5	24.0	10
Toyota	Japan	24.8	22.7	10
BMW	German	17.1	15.9	8
Samsung	Korea	15.0	12.6	19
Dell	USA	13.2	11.5	15

Source: Robert Berner & David Kiley, Global Brands, *Business Week*, August 1, 2005, p. 86-94.

Similar principles for deriving the brand equity value can be applied to the other service providers, such as an educational institution, as long as there is a value creation process. In the case of AIIAS, the value of its brand equity was computed using mathematics of finance at an approximate cost of maintaining the institution's brand identity as the hurdle rate during the period of 2000-2009. The value of brand equity had grown at a very conservative rate of 1.6% during the first five years or from P 217.3 million to P 231.8 million.

The value of AIIAS brand equity for the next second five years (2004-2009) grew even at a faster rate of 4.7% per year compared to that of the previous five years. Notice that AIIAS had built up brand equity values that were not very much different from those of its fund balances at the end of the three periods, years 2000, 2004 and 2009 (see Table 2). This indicates that the brand name, Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies (AIIAS) did not produce the necessary premium.

Koller, Goedhart, and Wessels (2005) define a premium as the amount of goodwill that a company is capable of creating (p. 137). In interpreting this concept of premium, we may simply express the equation as follows: $Prem = BE - NW$, where $Prem$ = premium, BE = brand equity and NW = net worth or fund balance. The question we need to ask is whether the brand name AIIAS is capable of creating this premium or goodwill in the eyes of its stakeholders. Elsewhere, this concept of premium or goodwill, is clearly explained as

The sum total of imponderable qualities which attract the customers to a business; in essence it is the expectancy of continued patronage for whatever reason. This continued patronage to a brand identity is then the prime concern for building up the value of brand equity. (Rezaee, 2001, p. 169)

Table 2
Values of AIIAS Brand Equity 2000 – 2009 (In Millions of Pesos)

Year	Equity * (Million Pesos)	Fund Balance (Million Pesos)	Growth **	
			Equity (%)	Fund Balance (%)
2000	217.3	232.0	-	-
2004	231.8	261.7	1.6	3.1
2009	291.4	316.2	4.7	3.9

* Refers to the institution's fund balance, which was computed using a capital budgeting technique at a 10% cost of developing brand reputation. Refer to the formula for deriving brand equity above.

** Based on a compounded growth rate, i.e. from P 217.3 to P 231.8 million, a growth rate of 1.6% was derived.

*** Perceived as the result of the following critical success factors: Improved strategic planning, better development of core competences, and offering more specializations.

Conceptual Framework of the Survey

Many are confused as to what *brand* and *reputation* are. They aren't able to discern how brand relates to reputation. One way of explaining this difference is that brand is "inside out" while reputation is "outside in" (Foley, 2006, p. 3). Foley (2006) further elaborates that a "strong brand is only the start of a Balanced Brand. Without the support provided by a strong reputation, it can topple easily" (p. 3). He added that "all reputations are built over time, more through actions than through words" (p. 53).

In this survey, I have designed a paradigm called *CB-to-RID* or "corporate brand-to-reputation identity development," which I apply to the Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies (AIAS). This is based on the idea that corporate reputation is a function of the corporate brand, its performance, and the brand-customer relationship:

$$R = f(B + BC + P), \text{ where}$$

R = Corporate reputation,

B = Corporate brand,

BC = Brand-customers relationship,

P = Management performance of developing critical success factors, and

f = Function of or dependent on

With the application of this CB-to-RID on a higher educational institution like AIAS, I have defined a corporate brand as "an identity an organization seeks to commercially sell to its market"—while a corporate reputation is defined as "market interpretation of an organization's brand identity." These two definitions essentially fit John Foley's concept on the two identities, corporate brand and corporate reputation. The American Marketing Association has defined "brand" as a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, that is intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competition (as cited in Keller, 2008, p. 2). On the basis of free association or interpretation of the AIAS logo, the following are the brand identities of the institution, depicted as B in the above equation (Adventist International Institute, 2010-2012, p. 4):

- Adventist = Holistic Adventist values, which depicts Christ as the Alpha and Omega the believers are waiting for, translated into the following brand statements:
 - Educator of holistic Adventist values.
 - Integrator of faith and learning.
- International = Provider of education with international perspectives.

- Institute = Center of academic excellence, and
- Advanced Studies = Quality graduate education, translated into the following brand statements:
 - Provider of quality Christian graduate education.
 - Developer of Christian professionals and leaders.

The CB-to-RID paradigm in Figure 1 explains the process of how brand identity becomes a brand reputation from the time the institution's stakeholders are aware of its existence up to the time they patronize, including those of how the eight critical success factors interact to qualify the institution to gain a strong brand reputation, i.e. vision and mission development, strategic plans development, teaching specialization, core competence development and so on.

The motors of the CB-to-RID paradigm are rested with the underlying three-pronged-conceptual-framework stemming from Day's concept of value management, Keller's (2009) concept of communication process, and Foley's brand-reputation process. Day (2007) stated that "the essential idea of enhancing shareholders' value through the company brand is that management should be concerned with value management" (p. 353). While Keller (2009) had proposed a building-block which he called "customer-based brand equity pyramid that lays out the awareness-knowledge-preference-patronage process of turning a plain brand identity into brand equity" (p. 60). The last underlying concept for the CB-to-RID is the conceptual framework proposed by John Foley (2006), who said that "brand identity can be converted to brand reputation by means of performance, workplace, products, leadership, citizenship, governance, and innovation" (pp. 24-25). In the CB-to-RID paradigm, in light of Foley's concept the author has modified the eight critical success factors to adjust into an educational institution setting. The first (vision and mission development), second (strategic plans development), fifth (corporate culture development) and seventh (a self-sufficient financing system) are manifested in Foley's governance and leadership factors. The third (teaching specialization), fourth (core competence development) and sixth (accreditation establishment) factors belong to Foley's product and innovation factors; while the eighth factor (a performance evaluation system) is basically performance monitoring as a control system.

CB-to-RID

1 st : Vision and mission development	5 th : Corporate culture development
2 nd : Strategic plans development	6 th : Accreditation establishment
3 rd : Teaching specialization	7 th : Self-sufficiency financing system
4 th : Core competences development	8 th : Performance evaluation system

BRAND (plain)	Awareness → Knowledge → Preference → Patronage	REPUTATION (brand equity)
Awareness = Consumers are aware of the organization’s brand identity. Knowledge = Consumers know more about the performance of the brand. Preference = Consumers begin to like or prefer the brand prior to patronage. Patronage = Consumers patronize the brand by becoming loyal clients.		

Note: CB-to-RID is corporate brand-to-reputation identity development.

Figure 1. CB-to-RID paradigm to build up brand identity to become reputation.

No organization, without developing the proper critical success factors, will reach a stage where their corporate brand identity will become as strong as their corporate reputation identity. Without this, the larger value of brand equity will not be achieved. The following are some of the conceptual bases for the successful achievement of brand reputation identities or the larger value of brand equity:

- Wilkes (1998) suggested at least five steps in sharing responsibility and authority of how to equip people for service, particularly in developing the above critical success factors within a Seventh-day Adventist organization. These are by encouraging our colleagues to serve, qualifying them to serve, understanding their real needs, giving them the right instruction, and praying for them. Without this suggested encouragement, an educational institution might run into the possibility of not developing its critical success factors well. Once this occurs, the institutions’ clients can easily switch to other institutions for a more quality educational service (p. 189).
- Roberto suggests that “brand switching is inevitable” (1987, p. 77). It is therefore imperative for any organization to develop its strategic marketing properly in order to avoid brand switching.

- Churchill (1995) proposed a turnover table, also known as brand-switching matrix as a method to further evaluate the impact of the increase or decrease of consumers' loyalty to the company's brand (p. 170). The brand-switching matrix method basically conveys to marketers the idea for strategic moves they should always implement to maintain consumers' loyalty to prevail in favor of the organization's brand performance.
- A healthy educational institution with clear development programs on its critical success factors normally has a clear direction on achieving organizational effectiveness. Kerin and Peterson (2004) emphasized organizational effectiveness in terms of customers' satisfaction, increasing market share and earning the highest income (p. 48).
- Evans and Dean (2003) stated that "*okyakusama* means both customer and honorable guest" (p. 133).
- Still in the realm of developing the critical success factors, Koch (2008) shared the rules for enforcing these critical success factors by introducing the 80/20 formula, "with 20% resources, the organization is able to get 80% result"—some of them are applicable to the success of a higher educational institution. The applicable golden rules are the following: Specialize in a very small niche; develop a core skill; choose a niche that the institution enjoys, where it can excel and stand a chance of becoming an acknowledged leader in the industry; realize that knowledge is power; identify the institution's market and the choice of core customers to serve them best; identify where 20% of effort gives 80% of result; learn from the best; employ as many net value staff as possible; and use funds efficiently as leverage (pp. 195-196).

Research Questions

The main focus of the problem of the study was to explore how AIIAS' stakeholders, particularly the students, recognized the synergistic effects of building brand identity to become reputation identity of the institution, which would be the basis of brand equity values. Specifically, it sought to test and answer the following questions and hypotheses:

1. In terms of its alternative statements of corporate brand identity, how was AIIAS reputation generally perceived by different groups of its stakeholders?
2. How did statements of corporate brand identity that motivated students to study at AIIAS differ according to their demographic and behavioristic variables? The related hypothesis at a significance level of 5% is that "the statements of corporate brand identity that motivated

- students to study at AIIAS did not differ according to their demographic and behavioristic variables.
3. How were those statements of corporate brand identity perceived differently from those of the other Seventh-day Adventist educational institutions?
 4. How did the ranks on the perception of the perceived critical success factors that built up AIIAS reputation differ according to the types of stakeholders? The related hypothesis at a significance level of 5% is that “the ranks of the perceived critical success factors that built up AIIAS reputation did not differ by types of stakeholders.

Research Design

The study was basically descriptive, describing the demographic and behavioral profile of the respondents who perceived how the AIIAS reputation was identified. The respondents of the survey were classified according to the types of AIIAS stakeholders presented in Table 3.

The survey made use of an instrument which was designed by the researcher. The data were gathered through the courtesy of the faculty and staff at AIIAS and good friends from the Silang, Cavite community, who collected them from the respondents of the survey. For the data analysis, the survey utilized simple means and standard deviations, chi-square (X^2), and non-parametric statistics.

Table 3

Sampling of Respondents according to the Type of Stakeholders

Respondents	Population Size (N)	Sample size (n)	% Sample-to-total population
AIIAS			
Administrators	10	6	60.0%
Faculty	26	16	61.5%
Staff	45	17	37.8%
Students	180	97	53.9%
Surrounding Community (AIIAS Church members, suppliers, banks, utility providers, Municipal Office civil servants)	25	20	80.0%
Total respondents	286	156	

Analysis of the Survey

The survey revealed that most respondents were male foreigners from 30 to 50 years old, who had converted to the Adventist faith because of their colleagues at work over the last fifteen years (see Table 4 for details).

Table 4
Respondents by Demographic and Behavioristic Variables

Variable	Component	f	Valid %	Cum %
Demographics				
Gender	Male	93	59.6	59.6
	Female	63	40.4	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	
Nationality	Filipino	43	27.8	27.8
	Non-Filipino	113	72.2	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	
Age	Less than 30	46	29.2	29.2
	Between 31 – 50	87	55.6	84.8
	Above 50	23	15.2	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	
Degree	Bachelor	95	61.1	61.1
	Master's	42	27.1	88.2
	Doctoral	19	11.8	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	
Behavioristic				
Converted to SDA	Relatives	25	16.0	16.0
	In school	10	6.3	22.3
	At work	95	61.1	83.4
	At the Church	26	16.6	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	
Length of time (in SDA faith)	Between 1 – 5	68	43.8	43.8
	Between 6 – 10	37	23.6	67.4
	Between 11 – 15	26	16.7	84.1
	Between 16 – 20	13	8.3	92.4
	Above 20	12	7.6	100.0
	Total	156	100.0	

The survey revealed that the common brand identities that were generally perceived were the following: AIIAS offered an education that integrated faith and learning as indicated by $x = 4.750$, followed by quality Christian education and education that offered international perspectives as indicated by the $x = 4.667$ and $x = 4.583$, respectively (see Table 5 for details).

All mean perceptions seemed to be in the vicinity of 4.000, which indicated that most respondents agreed with the three statements of brand identities analyzed above, including those who did business with AIIAS like its suppliers, banks, utilities providers (electricity and water), hospitals, security agents, law offices, and others.

The survey also revealed that perception on the statements of corporate brand identity that motivated students to study at AIIAS did not differ according to behavioristic variables, but mostly differed according to demographic variables, except by age. When the respondents were grouped by gender, nationality and education, it indicated that their perceptions on AIIAS statements of corporate brand identity did differ signifying that they were not motivators to further study at AIIAS. According to gender the computed X^2 of 14.276 was larger than that of the critical one at 12.592 for a df of 6. While according to nationality and education, both at the computed X^2 of 15.035 were larger than that of the critical X^2 of 12.592 (see Table 6).

Table 5
Ranks of AIIAS Reputation As Generally Perceived by Its Stakeholders

Rank	x	Sd	Brand Identity	Source
1	4.750	0.866	Faith and learning education	Seminary students
2	4.667	0.516	Quality Christian education	Administrators
3	4.583	0.669	International perspectives	Faculty
4	4.417	0.669	Quality Christian education	Staff
5	4.250	0.937	Faith and learning education	Graduate School. Students
6	3.917	0.900	International perspectives	AIIAS relations

Table 6

AIIAS Student Perceptions on Corporate Brand Identities that Motivated Them to Further Study (Seminary: n = 61; and Graduate School: n = 36; or $\Sigma n = 97$)

Variable	df	χ^2 table	χ^2 computed	Interpretation
Gender	6	12.592	14.276	Reject the H : 0
Nationality	6	12.592	15.035	Reject the H : 0
Age	12	21.026	11.470	Accept the H : 0
Education	6	12.592	15.035	Reject the H : 0
Way of conversion	18	28.869	14.017	Accept the H : 0
Length of time (in the faith)	24	36.415	19.683	Accept the H : 0

However, 41 out of the total 156 respondents or around 26.3% did not perceive that the above statements of AIIAS brand identities were the motivators for them to pursue their education at AIIAS. Unfortunately, half of the above portion didn't state any reasons. From all other reasons, around 22.9% of them perceived that they pursue their education at AIIAS, because AIIAS offers on-line learning modality, which will facilitate their decision to still finish their study, just in case they can not attend classes on a full-time basis. Some of the reasons they gave were summarized in Table 7.

The seminary students perceived that education at AIIAS was differentiated from that of other Adventist and non-Adventist higher educational institutions, while the graduate school students didn't think so. The two highest perceptions of the Seminary students were centered on the idea that AIIAS was specifically differentiated in the following way:

Table 7

Respondents' Other Reasons to Study at AIIAS

Reason	Seminary		Graduate School		Total	%
	Reasons	No reason	Reasons	No reason		
Spiritual excellence	1		1		2	5.7%
Best Christian educ.	3		0		3	8.6%
As scholars	2		3		5	14.3%
On-line modality	6		2		8	22.9%
MDiv and DDiv.	2		0		2	5.7%
Cheaper tuition	1		0		1	2.9%
Stated no reasons		15		5	20	39.9%
Total other reasons	15	15	6	5	41	100.0%

- Where faith and learning were integrated (x = 4.75; SD = 0.62), and
- Where Adventist values were nurtured and developed (x = 4.67; SD = 0.65).

On the other hand, the Graduate School students didn't perceive that education at AIIAS was differentiated from that of other educational institutions. This was revealed by their mean perception of a little above than 2.000, which indicated that all brand identity attributes were perceived to be similar to those of other educational institutions (see Table 8). Nevertheless, the Graduate School students did tend to perceive AIIAS as an international educational institution which integrated faith and learning in the educational process. This was revealed by the following:

- Education with international perspectives (x = 2.61; SD = 1.27), and
- Education which integrated faith and learning (x = 2.39; SD = 1.32).

Table 8

AIIAS Differentiated Brand Identities

Description	QCE	Ac Ex	F n L	P n L	Intl	Ad Val	Overall Means
Seminary (n = 61)							
Means	4.58	4.58	4.75	4.33	4.50	4.67	Differentiated*
SD	0.99	0.90	0.62	0.99	0.67	0.65	
Rank	3	3	1	5	4	2	
Graduate school (n = 36)							
Means	2.11	2.25	2.39	2.28	2.61	2.08	Not
SD	1.24	1.16	1.32	1.28	1.27	1.32	Differentiated
Rank	5	4	2	3	1	6	
Range of perception							
1 st highest means	Integrator of faith and learning						4.75
2 nd highest means	Education with Adv. values						4.67
1 st lowest means	Education with Adv. values						2.08
2 nd lowest means	Quality of Christian education						2.11

Note: QCE=Quality Christian education. Ac Ex=Academic excellence. F n L=Faith and learning. P n L = Professionals and leaders; Intl = International perspectives; Ad Val = Adventist values

*Differentiation is a marketing concept of how students look at AIIAS quality program. It is expressed in terms of a simple mean, not to be construed as statistical significance.

Perception of critical success factors that built up AIIAS brand equity did not differ at all by type of stakeholders. The computed X^2 of -80.2 was far below the 11.07 critical X^2 at 5 degree of freedom. This means that no matter who was asked, the responses were the same. The result revealed that the critical success factors perceived as being administered by AIIAS (in ranked order) were the following (see Table 9):

- AIIAS offered specialized educational programs as particularly perceived by the Seminary students, even though those from the Graduate School didn't think quite the same way.
- AIIAS has a clear vision for quality Christian education and mission for developing leaders through a distinctively SDA graduate education that excels in spirituality and the trilogy of higher education; teaching, research and community outreach, by virtue of a systematic strategic plan.
- AIIAS was perceived as being able to develop its core competence in the field of teaching, research and community outreach.

Table 9

*Ranks of AIIAS Stakeholders Perception Means (x) on the Development of Critical Success Factors as Strategies to Build Up Brand Equity. ****

C S F*	Admin n = 6	Faculty n = 16	Staff n = 17	Sem Stud n = 61	Grad Sch Stud n = 36	Business Relation n = 20	Means (x)	RANK **
1 st	9	18	14	1	13	18	12.2	2
2 nd	8	20	12	5	17	16	13.0	3
3 rd	4	14	9	5	14	12	9.7	1
4 th	12	18	10	6	15	18	13.2	4
5 th	18	24	14	4	11	18	14.8	6
6 th	18	21	10	2	17	18	14.3	5
7 th	18	18	12	7	22	21	16.3	7
8 th	23	25	21	3	19	20	18.5	8

*CSF = Critical success factors (refer to the paradigm in Figure 1)

**Rank 1 (highest mean perception) and 8 (lowest mean perception)

***Computed $X^2 = -80.2$; $df = 5$, Critical $X^2 = 11.07$ (5% level of significance). This suggests that ranks on AIIAS stakeholders' mean perceptions (x) on the development of critical success factors as strategies to build up brand equity did not differ at all.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the survey, it was concluded that AIIAS was generally perceived as an international educational institution that integrated faith and learning. Respondents grouped according to behavioristic variables and by age perceived that statements of corporate brand identity were the motivators to study at AIIAS. The development of critical success factors like the educational specialization, systematic strategic planning system implemented by AIIAS, and the capability to develop its core competence in the trilogy of higher education, were mainly perceived as the motivators for the growth of AIIAS brand equity. These critical success factors seemed to be the manifestation of the synergy in AIIAS brand equity values. The synergistic development of these critical success factors is reflected by the continuous improvement of a quality trilogy of higher education (teaching, research, and community service), through the accreditation system, and by strengthening faculty's core competences through a better faculty development system. Additional suggestions could include creating a special marketing and development division headed by a vice president for Marketing and Development to recruit more international students, integrating a continuous faith and learning process, diversifying the educational programs beyond on-campus learning (opening up more distance-learning centers and expanding on-line learning), and other related activities. These would reinforce the synergy of the author's CB-to-RID paradigm, building brand equity for the institution.

References

- Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies. (2010-2012). *Academic bulletin*. Silang, Philippines.
- Chandra, G. (2001). *Global marketing (Pemasaran Global)*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: ANDI Publishing.
- Churchill, Jr., G.A. (1995). *Marketing research: Methodological foundations*, 6th Ed. Orlando, FL: The Dryden Press.
- Day, A.L. (2007). *Mastering financial modelling*. London, U.K., Systematic Finance.
- Evans, J. R., & Dean, J. W. (2003). *Total quality: Management, organization and strategy*. Mason, OH: Thomson/South-Western.
- Foley, J. (2006). *Balanced brand: How to balance the stakeholder forces that can make or break your business*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Keller, K. L. (2008). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity*. Jurong, Singapore: Pearson Education South Asia.
- Kerin, R. A., & Peterson, R. A. (2004). *Strategic marketing problems: Cases and comments*, 10th Ed. New Jersey, U.S., Pearson Education.
- Koch, R. (2008). *The 80/20 principle: The secret to achieving more with less*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Koller, T., Goedhart, M., Wessels, D., & McKinsey & Company. (2005). *Valuation: Measuring and managing the value of companies*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rampersad, H. K. (2008). *Authentic personal branding*. Jakarta, Indonesia: PPM Publishing.
- Rezaee, Z. (2001). *Financial institutions, valuations, mergers and acquisitions: The fair value approach*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Roberto, E. L. (1987). *Applied marketing research for data-based marketing decisions*. Manila, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Spurr, W. A., & Bonini, C. P. (1973). *Statistical analysis for business decisions*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Welsch, G. A., Hilton, R. W., & Gordon, P. N. (1988). *Budgeting: Profit planning and control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wilkes, C. G. (1998). *Jesus on leadership*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House.

Eric Y. Nasution, PhD
Professor, Business Department
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies
Silang, Cavite, Philippines