International Journal of Economic Practice and Policy
Volume XX, Issue 2, Year 2023

Professional Article

UDC 339.138:003.65
DOI 10.5937/skolbiz2-47409

BRAND-RELATED MARKETING METRICS

Saša Ćirić*
Neoplanta doo, Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia

Abstract: *Adequate measurement is crucial for brand management but represents a real challenge for marketers. Choosing adequate indicators to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of brand investments is one of the prerequisites for brand success. The most common problem is the sensitivity of individual indicators to recognize the level of brand presence in the minds of customers or consumers and the effectiveness of certain indicators in terms of long-term brand investment. This paper presents the most commonly used marketing indicators related to the brand and the advantages and disadvantages of influencing its value. Through the analysis of secondary data, using the desk research method, the author will look at the theoretical framework for selecting and defining marketing metrics related to the brand through relevant literature and scientific papers dealing with this topic. Finally, the author will recommend how the critical determinants of brand value should be measured and the selection of adequate indicators regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of brand investment.*

Keywords: *marketing metrics, brand value, brand image and awareness, mental presence, brand investment*

JEL classification:

MARKETING METRIKE U VEZI SA BRENDOM

Sažetak: *Adekvatno merenje je jedna od veoma važnih aktivnosti u okviru brend menadžmenta i predstavlja pravi izazov za marketare. Izbor adekvatnih indikatora za merenje efektivnosti i efikasnosti ulaganja u brend je jedan od preduslova za uspeh brenda. Najčešći problem koji se javlja ogleda se u osetljivosti pojedinih indikatora da*

* ciricsasa@gmail.com

prepoznaju nivo prisutnosti brenda u svesti kupaca ili potrošača, kao i efektivnost određenih indikatora u pogledu dugoročnog ulaganja u brend. U skladu sa navedenim, cilj ovog rada je da predstavi najčešće korišćene marketing indikatore u vezi sa brendom, kao i njihove prednosti i nedostatke u pogledu uticaja na vrednost brenda. Autor će kroz analizu sekundarnih podataka, metodom istraživanja za stolom, sagledati teorijski okvir za izbor i definisanje marketing metrike u vezi sa brendom kroz relevantnu literaturu i naučne radove koji se bave ovom tematikom. Na kraju, kao zaključak istraživanja autor će dati preporuku na koji način bi trebalo meriti ključne determinante vrednosti brenda, kao i izbor adekvatnih indikatora sa aspekta efektivnosti i efikasnosti ulaganja u brend.

Ključne reči: *marketing metrikE, vrednost brenda, imidž i svest o brendu, mentalna prisutnost, ulaganja u brend.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Branding is one of the most common topics in marketing theory and practice. For the quality implementation and evaluation of all activities aimed at branding a particular product or service and raising the brand value, it is necessary to choose adequate metrics. Based on the opinions of relevant economy stakeholders, who are actively engaged in this topic, there is room for improvement in how key determinants of brand value are measured (Ćirić, 2023).

The present paper will first look at Keller's customer-based equity and provide an overview of indicators for measuring brand value based on Keller's concept of "customer-based brand equity." Then, we will look into the indicators which show the effectiveness and efficiency of investing in the brand, focusing on the positive and negative aspects of brand-related marketing metrics. This can shed light on certain discrepancies in research dealing with the above topic.

In order to achieve the goals presented in the introductory part of this paper, desk marketing research methodology will be applied. Seven books were cited, and the results from seven scientific papers dealing with this topic were analyzed in detail. We also used data from independent surveys by Kantar and the Institute for Practitioners in Advertising (IPA).

Within the paper's results, the theoretical framework for defining brand and brand equity will first be presented, followed by indicators dealing with the determinants of brand values and the parameters of effectiveness and efficiency of brand investments.

2. CONSUMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY AND ITS INDICATORS

Several theoretical approaches deal with measuring brand equity. The most common is the Keller approach. According to Keller (1993), customer-based brand equity denotes the knowledge that differentiates the brand and arises from the consumer's reaction to the brand's marketing activities. Consumer-based brand equity is present among consumers who have had experience with the brand, i.e., the brand is in their memory and causes solid and unique associations. In this regard, the knowledge that consumers have about the brand is an indicator of the value of the brand (Keller, 1993). It shows how customers react to specific marketing activities related to the brand and the level of brand presence in the awareness of customers or consumers, which differentiates it from the competition. Brand equity is defined through two critical determinants: brand awareness and brand image. Brand awareness shows how much the brand is present in the consumer's memory and how many recognize it, i.e., know what it is. Brand image shows the set of associations that customers have about the brand (Keller, 1993). The critical question is how to measure brand awareness and brand image, i.e. the key parameters that will show whether investing in a brand produces the expected results.

2.1. BRAND AWARENESS INDICATORS

Brand awareness is the most commonly used indicator to measure "brand health", mainly through continuous brand tracking research. This parameter was created in 1950 within one of the first brand models: the AIDA model (awareness, interest, desire, action). It is also used in the Ehrenberg ATR model, which implies awareness, purchase, and repeated purchase (Romaniuk, 2023). Brand awareness is the first determinant of brand equity. It shows the strength and ability to connect the brand to the consumer's memory so that consumers recognize the brand in different circumstances. A brand is recognized as a product or service that has a specific function. Brand awareness includes two components. Brand recognition is a confirmation by the consumer that he has had previous experience with the brand. Brand recall is the ability of the consumer to "draw" the brand from memory when considering the category or needs this category meets or some other related impulse (Keller, 1993).

There are two approaches to measuring brand awareness. In spontaneous referencing, respondents must indicate the brand without any clues, such as a word or an image that would remind them of the brand or product category. In orchestrated referencing, respondents are given names or visuals typical of brands in the category (e.g., product images) based on which they recognize or do not recognize a particular brand. As a result of these two approaches, three metrics usually arise in respondents' surveys: Top of Mind Awareness, Spontaneous Awareness and Prompted Awareness (Romaniuk, 2023).

Top-of-Mind Awareness (TOM) shows the brand first listed by respondents based on spontaneous guidance. For example, which brands in the pâté category do you know?

Spontaneous awareness entails all brands in the category that are listed without reminders, regardless of the order in which they are given. For example, respondents would list all brands in the pâté category they know.

Prompted awareness encompasses all the brands recognized with the help of a clue in the form of the name and a product or brand image. For example, respondents would be shown brand names and images with the brand name, logo, and product image.

If we analyze the above three metrics, the conclusion is that TOM gives a wrong picture because it only shows the presence in the consciousness of brand customers and excludes customers who do not buy or very rarely buy a brand, who are critical to the growth of a brand (Sharp, 2010; Romanik & Sharp, 2016). On the other hand, if large brands, which have a high market share and, therefore, a large number of customers, decide to enter a new category, they will have a very high TOM, even significantly higher than those with a leading position in that category. A good example is Google Pixel, a mobile phone with a significantly larger TOM than the iPhone and Samsung. However, its market share is very small compared to these two leading brands. Therefore, two indicators are sufficient: spontaneous awareness and prompted awareness. The latter is helpful for smaller brands because it shows the number of customers who have not heard of the brand and how much their number decreases after brand marketing activities.

According to Romaniuk (2023), there are numerous advantages to using brand awareness as an indicator of the effectiveness of brand investment. First, the customers who lack brand awareness are identified. The goal of each brand is to reduce the number of customers who do not have brand awareness through various activities. So, this indicator is very useful because it shows how much a particular brand activity increases the number of customers with brand awareness. Secondly, it is essential when launching a new brand, i.e., when brand awareness is almost nonexistent. In these situations, it is very effective to monitor the growth rate of the number of customers familiar with the brand with the help of this indicator.

Additionally, when brands with a small number of customers and low market share want to increase the intensity of marketing activities, brand awareness is a valuable indicator for measuring the effects of brand activities. Moreover, when a well-known brand wants to enter a new category, this indicator is helpful because it shows how many customers associate this brand with that category.

For example, when Plazma (a Serbian brand of biscuits) famous for sweets expanded its product range to the crackers category, the success of the launch of savoury Plasma products was probably because cracker/savoury products buyers were familiar with the brand. Finally, sometimes, customers only purchase a specific product category for a certain period, e.g., baby food. After the baby grows up, parents no longer buy the category unless a new baby arrives. In this case, brand awareness is a very useful indicator to see if customers who enter the category of those who need a product, e.g., when they have a baby, have brand awareness.

The limitation of brand awareness indicators is reflected primarily in the reliability of identifying the possibility that the brand will be drawn from the customer's memory when considering the product category. First, the sensitivity of recording situations where the brand's presence in the consumer's consciousness is declining is questionable. Also, the limitation of the indicator is the failure to take into account the context in which the brand or category is considered. Namely, when surveying, there is no description of situations that represent the customer's points of contact with the category and affect the selection of the brand. These situations create certain signals that can initiate the intention or consideration to buy the brand.

2.2. MENTAL AVAILABILITY PARAMETERS

In order to more reliably measure the brand's presence in customers' minds and its ability to be drawn from the customer's memory when considering a particular product category, we can use mental availability parameters (Romaniuk, 2023). These parameters also help us look at the brand image and the other determinants of consumer-based brand equity (Keller, 1993). According to Romaniuk (2023), parameters of mental presence include mental market share (MMS), mental penetration (MPen), network size (NS), and Share of Mind (SOM).

Mental market share (MMS) is a metric that shows the "relative strength of the brand in consumer consciousness" (Vaughan, Corsi, Beal & Sharp, 2021, p. 667). The indicator is relative to the competition, which means that if all brands grow at the same rate, the mental market share will remain the same regardless of the growth of brands. It is essential to define the list to contain the brands that will remain dominant in the category in the future. MMS is calculated using CEP (contact entry point) and attributes. For example, in the meat products industry, a CEP would be when *I need to serve guests*, and the attribute is a great taste or a high percentage of meat. MMS is calculated by dividing the total number of CEPs and attributes related to a brand by the total number of CEPs and attributes for all the other brands in the same product category.

$$\text{MMS}=\frac{\text{total number of CEPs and attributes for the brand,}}{\text{total number of CEPs and attributes for all the other brands in the category}} \tag{1}$$

Vaughan, Corsi, Beal and Sharp (2021) explain how mental market share can be determined in four steps. The first step would be to determine the brands within a particular product category to be investigated (for example, brands A, B and V).

The second step determines the points of contact with the CEP (category entry point) and attributes. The total number of different attributes that can be established for all these brands is, for example, 15 (which would be offered to each respondent).

In the third step, the respondents state which brands they associate with each defined attribute. Vaughan et al. (2021) use the technique "choose any", which implies that in addition to the attribute "great taste", respondents can list none, one, two or all three brands offered (A, B, V) represented by the name and logo. The number of links leading to 15 defined attributes will generally not be 15 because zero, one, or more links can lead to each attribute. For example, in the case of surveying 100 respondents, the maximum number of links of all respondents to all attributes would be 1500 for one and 4500 for all three brands. The total number of links in 100 respondents can be 1000 for brand A, 1200 for brand B and 900 for brand V.

The fourth and final step is to calculate the mental market share by dividing the total number of links leading from each brand to different attributes by the total number of links leading from all investigated brands to all attributes. This applies to all respondents. In this case, for brand A, the mental market share would be obtained as a quotient of 1000 and 3100 (1000+1200+900), i.e., 31%.

Mental Penetration (MPen) is a parameter that refers to the percentage of people who have at least one association with the observed brand. This metric shows the reach of a particular brand in terms of associations, i.e., the number of consumers who have at least one brand association (CEP and/or attribute). Reach is the maximum number of consumers for whom there is a probability that at the time of making a purchase decision, a particular brand will "come to mind", i.e. based on the association we have; they will extract from the memory the brand to which the given association or attribute is attached MPen is a relative indicator and is calculated when the number of buyers of the category with at least one association to the given brand is divided by the total number of buyers who buy all brands in the category.

Network size (NS) is the network of associations which shows the number of CEPs and attributes the brand possesses. Do certain brand activities increase and refresh the average number of associations (CEP and attributes)? NS is a metric that shows the number of associations the consumer has with the brand, looking only at people with at least one association with the brand, which we identified by analyzing the previous parameter – MPen.

$$\mathrm{NS} = \frac{\text{All CEPs and attributes associated with brand A}}{\begin{array}{c}\text{MPen for brand A}\\ (\mathit{number\ of\ customers\ with\ at\ least}\ 1\ \mathit{association\ with\ brand}\ \mathrm{A})\end{array}} \qquad (2)$$

Share of Mind (SOM) represents the share of associations regarding a particular brand in the total of associations for all competing brands within the observed category. Only the consumers with at least one brand association are analyzed, which is a key difference compared to Mental Market Share (MMS). SOM is the ratio between the average number of associations a particular brand has with a consumer with at least one brand association and the average number of associations these consumers have with all other brands in the category. For example, suppose a particular brand has an average of 5 associations, while the average number of associations for all brands in a category is 10. In that case, the brand in question has a 50% mental share with consumers who had at least one association with the brand. All consumers who have no associations and/or have never heard of a particular brand are excluded from this analysis.

3. INDICATORS FOR MEASURING THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF BRAND INVESTMENTS

Effectiveness indicators refer to those that have a significant effect on business, primarily on profit. On the other hand, efficiency indicators show what was achieved per unit of realized investment, i.e., the efficiency of the invested capital (Binet & Field, 2013).

3.1. EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

Effectiveness indicators are profit, sales, market share, loyalty, penetration and price elasticity. These indicators are most commonly measured over a year and are excellent indicators of long-term growth (Binet & Field, 2013). This paper will discuss penetration and price elasticity in more detail.

Penetration is a measure that shows how many people have, at least once, bought a brand or category of products over a certain period (Sharp, 2010). It is one of the most important parameters for measuring the effectiveness of brand investments because the growth of penetration is the key to brand growth. Sharpe (2010) emphasized the importance of penetration through several laws on customer behaviour. According to Sharpe (2010), as well as Romanik and Sharp (2016) the most important is the law of double danger that said: Brands with lower market share have significantly fewer customers, who are somewhat less loyal in terms of purchase and attitudes towards the brand. Binet and Field (2013) analyzed 996 campaigns within the IPA Effectiveness Awards and found that 47% of campaigns target the acquisition of new customers, i.e., the growth of penetration. The success of these campaigns in terms of sales and profit growth is significantly higher compared to campaigns that target existing customers and focus on loyalty (Binet & Field, 2013). A survey by Kantar shows that the most frequently selected brands by consumers are the brands with the largest number of customers, i.e., high penetration (Kantar Worldpanel, 2023). Penetration is often a relative indicator and is calculated as a ratio of the number of customers of a particular brand and the number of customers of all other brands in the observed category in a certain period.

Price elasticity, as the most specific parameter related to the brand, "is a measure of the sensitivity of demand to price, and is calculated by comparing the percentage of change in the amount of demand with the percentage of change in price" (Kotler, Wong, Saunders, & Armstrong, 2007, pp. 675-676).

$$\text{Price elasticity} = \frac{\%\ of\ change\ in\ demand}{\%\ of\ change\ in\ price} \tag{3}$$

For example, if the assumption is that demand drops by 10%, in a situation where the seller raises the price by 2%, the elasticity is -5%. The minus sign reflects the inverse relationship between the price and the demand. If the price increases by 2% and the demand drops by 1%, the price elasticity is - 0.5, i.e., the demand is inelastic. Generally, the lower the elasticity, the more it pays off for brands to increase the price. The demand is inelastic for values smaller than -1. Above -1, the demand is elastic. If the elasticity is -1, then the demand is ideally elastic, i.e., if the price decreases, the demand (i.e. the sales) increases by the same percentage. And vice versa, if the price increases, the sale will decrease by the same percentage. Products with highly dependent consumers (e.g., cigarettes) or products that do not have many substitutes (e.g., fuel) have a very low price elasticity, significantly lower than products and services where there are many substitutes, such as consumer goods (Sharp, 2017)

In the last few decades, price has become the most important instrument. Marketers have almost forgotten about the other 3P (product, promotion, distribution) because all other activities work well if the price is adequately formed. When the price is not adequately determined, the brand or company will not achieve the expected profit. In order to adequately form the price, it is very important to know its elasticity, which has a major impact on making a profit or, if it is not successful, on creating a loss for the brand and/or company (Mironov, 2022).

Many companies have price segments that are often defined by the level of customer-perceived quality. There are usually the following price segments based on the price-quality ratio (Sharp, 2010, p. 154):

- lower price and basic quality without any additional functionalities or benefits for customers, i.e., consumers,
- medium level of price and quality,
- a segment with a high price for expensive products or services that justify a high price with their characteristics.

However, customers of one price segment occasionally buy products from other price levels, and the percentage of those who buy in the second segment depends on the size of the segment, i.e., on the number of customers in it. This customer behaviour pattern is called the law of double danger (Sharp, 2010). Segments with more customers have a smaller percentage of those who buy in other segments, while smaller segments with less penetration have more customers who buy in other price segments. Customers who buy brands from the cheapest segment sometimes buy significantly more expensive brands and vice versa. Price promotions also greatly influence this behaviour when more expensive brands from the category can be purchased at significantly lower prices. However, price promotions (price reductions) do not affect the attraction of new customers. They mainly attract already existing customers who buy in larger quantities and make stock, which results in a decrease in future sales. Thus, price promotions temporarily affect established brands (Sharp, 2010) A very important question is, when the price drops by a certain percentage, how much will the brand's sales increase, i.e., what is the price elasticity of the observed brand or product? Price elasticity ranges from -2.3% to -4% (Sharp, 2010).

Several situations affect the increase in price elasticity. First, lowering the price brings the brand closer to the reference price (the price consumers perceive to be adequate for the benefit they receive from the product or service) (Sharp, 2010). Also, if the price reduction is promoted at the point of sale, it becomes visible to many customers. In these situations, reductions can bring big sales growth, especially if the reduction is significant (e.g., 40%). It can increase sales from 280% to 400% (Totten & Block, 1997).

Brands with a low market share have higher price elasticity, whereas brands with a higher market share and higher penetration have lower price elasticity. This is due to the law of natural monopoly, according to which brands with a large market share have more customers who rarely buy and are the most loyal (Sharp, 2010; Romanik & Sharp, 2016). So big brands have a monopoly over customers who rarely buy (light category buyers). This difference in elasticity tells us that small brands can make a greater increase in turnover with a price decrease. On the other hand, if they increase the price, they have a significantly greater decrease in sales compared to large brands.

When the price rises above the normal price, there is a more significant impact on sales when the price rises (decrease in brand sales) than in the situation when the brand lowers the price (increase in brand sales) - if we exclusively observe the effects of price changes and exclude price promotions (price highlighting) at the point of sale. In a situation where the regular price is similar to the competition, the price elasticity is significant whether or not prices are raised or lowered.

Suppose one compares the investment in the price (price reduction) with the investment in advertising. In that case, the conclusion is that price promotions have a greater effect on brand sales but have a very small reach because they target only customers in stores in that period. In contrast, advertising has a far greater reach because it targets a larger number of consumers in this category but has a smaller effect on sales. However, price reductions motivate customers to buy more than they usually spend, so each price action also takes from future purchases, i.e., future sales and profits. In addition to the negative effect on profits, price reductions, especially drastic reductions over 40%, reduce the reference price and thus increase the brand's price elasticity (Sharp, 2010). Promotional prices are equal to heroin in terms of brand. It is easy to start but difficult to stop. Once the brand customers are used to regularly buying on sale, it is very difficult to change this habit and continue building a brand on some other basis. The strategies that brands apply in order to avoid lowering the price and price promotions are improving the perceived quality by customers or consumers - communicating quality through highlighting the benefits over the competition; retaining the price, so investing in advertising allows it to make more profit, rather than lowering the price and lowering its profit rate; as well as raising the quality and price, which can position a particular brand in a higher price range with higher profit rates (Kotler, Wong, Saunders, & Armstrong, 2007).

The analysis of the IPA campaign database shows that investing in price reductions and various activities aimed at benefiting the customer in the form of lower prices affects price elasticity and reduces the brand's value in the long run. On the other hand, continuous investment in the brand in the long term reduces price elasticity. It increases the customers' intention to buy without permanent and drastic price reductions, which in the short term has a greater effect on sales but, in the long term, badly affects the brand's long-term profitability (Binet & Field, 2013).

According to Matthew (2023), long-term brand construction is essential for robust prices, and there are three key elements to increase prices without dropping sales, i.e., to reduce the brand's price elasticity. The first is to reach as many customers as possible, focusing on customers who have never purchased a brand. Over 2,000 case studies show the failure of companies that have strengthened price power by targeting existing brand customers. Another very important element is emotion. If a brand provokes strong feelings in people, they will forget the reason and purchase regardless of price (Matthew, 2023). It is virtually impossible to convince customers to buy more with rational arguments. The third element is familiarity. Campaigns aimed at making the brand famous significantly reduce price elasticity. They are very good at supporting raising the price of the brand. The best way to achieve familiarity and evoke emotions in customers is creativity.

3.2. EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

Efficiency indicators refer to measuring the efficiency of the invested capital, mainly in the short term. According to Binet & Field (2010), these include Return on Marketing Investment (ROMI) and Extra Share of Voice (ESOV).

Return on Investment (ROI) shows how much the company has earned on the invested capital. ROI is expressed as a percentage on an annual basis. To calculate ROI, profit is divided by the cost of investment (Šćepanović, 2016).

$$\text{ROI} = \frac{profit}{ivestment} \tag{4}$$

This indicator is most commonly used in finance to calculate returns on invested capital. ROI is the generic ratio name, and dozens of variations start with "RO…" (Šćepanović, 2016). In marketing, the ROMI (Return on Marketing Investment) is used, where the brand's profit is compared with the marketing investment in the brand. ROMI shows the effectiveness of investing in the brand, that is, the annual return on investment in marketing. However, ROMI depends on the profitability of the brand's category and the brand's goals in terms of its target group (Binet & Field, 2010). If the brand focuses on existing customers, it does not need significant investments in advertising because the customers know a lot about the brand and easily notice advertisements when addressed by a brand they know (Sharp, 2010; Romanik & Sharp, 2016). In this scenario, ROMI will be very good regarding investment efficiency. However, the effectiveness will be significantly worse because the penetration, i.e., the number of customers, will remain at the same or lower level. The market share is also likely to stay the same because only existing customers are targeted, and the key to brand growth is the acquisition of new customers who have not bought the brand so far and customers who rarely buy the product category of the brand (Sharp, 2010; Romanik & Sharp, 2016). Another downside to this indicator is that it does not include the effect of year-end penetration growth in terms of future sales brought by customers acquired in the observed year (Sharp & Dawes, 2001). Thus, the question arises as to how much ROMI is an adequate way to measure efficiency in marketing, given that it cannot measure long-term effects. According to Jefferson (2021) the performance of a company today is largely not the result of the work of its current marketing director, but primarily due to the work of its predecessors.

Excess Share of Voice (ESOV) is an indicator of brand growth and consists of two independent indicators. The first is the Share of Voice (SOV), or the brand's participation in the overall advertising of the category through all communication channels. The second is Share of Market (SOM), which represents the ratio of the sales of a brand or company and the total sales of the market of that product category. It can be expressed quantitatively and financially (Šćepanović, 2016). The IPA campaign database shows that brands with stable market share (SOM) also have stable participation in advertising the entire category (SOV). There is an evident correlation between these two parameters, so for the brand's growth, the SOV must be larger than the SOM. If the situation is reversed, the brand's sales will fall, consequently decreasing SOM. This is especially important for brands with low market share and low penetration. Their SOV should be constantly larger than SOM to ensure continuous growth. On the other hand, brands with more customers and significant market share can have a similar relationship between SOV and SOM and maintain a stable market position.

The growth rate of a brand depends on the difference between SOV and SOM. This difference represents ESOV-Extra Share of Voice. So, the equation is ESOV = SOV – SOM. The percentage of brand growth is proportional to the difference between SOV and SOM and is calculated as $\Delta(\mathrm{SO}<) = \alpha$ x ESOV. The constant α is 0.05 for many categories located in the IPA database. It is 0.03 for the categories of consumer goods (FMCG) and 0.12 for brands in the services categories. The value of 0.05 shows us that it is necessary for the ESOV, i.e., the difference between SOV and SOM, to be 20% in order for the market share (SOM) to increase by 1%.

4. CONCLUSION

The analysis shows that not all the parameters are equally useful. First, despite the existing limitations, brand awareness has its application. However, using only spontaneous and conducted awareness without TOM is enough.

The mental availability parameters (MMS, MP, NS, SOM) are superior to brand awareness parameters. This set complements the brand awareness parameters, enabling a more accurate measurement of brand presence in customer awareness. Brand image is measured based on brand associations, i.e., connecting the brand with the attributes and points of contact with the product category. The parameters of mental availability also show how much certain market activities impact customers' perceptions. In qualitative terms, there are two types of data: the share of total brand associations in the total number of associations of all other brands in the category (MMS) and the data on the average number of brand associations per customer (NS). In terms of reach, we have the number of people who have at least one brand association, which shows the current reach of people who at least know something about the brand and how it changes based on marketing activities (MP). Finally, using SOM allows us to compare to competitors as the share of the average number of brand associations is compared to associations of all other brands among customers who know the brand (MP).

The analysis of parameters related to the effectiveness of brand investments shows the importance of penetration and price elasticity as key indicators that show whether the brand's value is growing and whether the implemented activities will bring brand growth, especially in the long run. Penetration shows whether activities expand the number of brand customers. Price elasticity is crucial for the growth of brand value and brand profitability.

The analysis of the efficiency parameters, primarily ROMI, shed light on the negative sides of this metric and its limited application in marketing. On the other hand, ESOV, particularly SOV, are essential in brand growth and measuring the effectiveness of brand investment. It provides information on the percentage of increase in advertising investment necessary for the targeted brand growth. Extra advertising participation (ESOV), although composed of two parameters (SOV and SOM), is straightforward to use, and the data for its calculation are readily available. Most brands already have this data, so no additional surveys are needed.

Future research should conduct quantitative research on several product categories to confirm the assumption that these five indicators represent a crucial metric related to the brand. The interrelationship between these indicators and how they correlate with brand growth and profit can also be analyzed.

REFERENCES

Binet, L., & Field, P. (2013). *The Long and the Short of It: Balancing Short and Long-Term Marketing Strategies.* The IPA Databank

Ćirić, S. (2023). *Brand Image Measurement.* In *Strategic Management and Decision Support Systems in Strategic Management* (560-569). Subotica, Republic of Serbia: Faculty of Economics, University of Novi Sad.

Jefferson, M. (2021). *Purpose could be 'the death of brands', warns Byron Sharp.* Retrieved from https://www.marketingweek.com/byron-sharp-purpose-death/

Kantar (2023). *Brand Footprint 2022*. Worldpanel Division. Retrivered from https://www.kantar.com/campaigns/brand-footprint/explore-the-data

Keller, K. L. (1993). *Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity*. Journal of Marketing, *57*(1), 1–22.

Kotler, F., Wong, V., Saunders, J., & Armstrong, G. (2007). *Principles of Marketing.* Belgrade, Republic of Serbia: Mate.

Matthew, V. (2023). *Long-term brand building plus creative advertising is the key to firmer pricing*. Retrieved from https://www.marketingweek.com/creativity-pays-les-binet/

Mironov, A. (2022). *Playbook for brand growth in turbulent economic times: key learnings from the IPA's webinar with Les Binet*. Retrieved from www.linkedin.com/pulse/playbook-brand-growth-turbulent-economic-times-key-from-mironov/

Romaniuk, J. & Sharp, B. (2016). *How Brands Grow.* Oxford University Press, Australia.

Romaniuk, J. (2023). *Better Brand Health*. Oxford University Press, Australia.

Šćepanović, B. (2016). *The Bible of controlling German philosophy of achieving goals.* Belgrade: MCB Edukacija.

Sharp, B. (2010). *How Brands Grow: What Marketers Don't Know*. Oxford University Press, Australia

Sharp, B. (2017) *Marketing: Theory, records, practice*. Oxford University Press, Australia.

Sharp, B., & Dawes, J. (2001). *What is Differentiation and How Does It Work? Journal of Marketing Management, 17(*7-8), 739-759.

Vaughan, K., Corsi, A. M., Beal, V., & Sharp, B. (2021). *Measuring advertising's effect on mental availability*. *International Journal of Market Research, 63*(5), 665-681.

Delivered: 06.11.2023.
Accepted: 12.12.2023.