

**Athens Institute for Education and Research
ATINER**



**ATINER's Conference Paper Series
MED2015-1888**

**Design Impact through Brand Equity Approach:
Example of Telecommunication Sector in
Lithuania**

**Nikolaj Ambrusevic
Associate Professor
Department of Creative Entrepreneurship and Communication
Vilnius Gediminas Technical University 1 Traku Street
Lithuania**

An Introduction to
ATINER's Conference Paper Series

ATINER started to publish this conference papers series in 2012. It includes only the papers submitted for publication after they were presented at one of the conferences organized by our Institute every year. This paper has been peer reviewed by at least two academic members of ATINER.

Dr. Gregory T. Papanikos
President
Athens Institute for Education and Research

This paper should be cited as follows:

Ambrusevic, N. (2016). "Design Impact through Brand Equity Approach: Example of Telecommunication Sector in Lithuania", Athens: ATINER'S Conference Paper Series, No: MED2015-1888.

Athens Institute for Education and Research
8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10671 Athens, Greece
Tel: + 30 210 3634210 Fax: + 30 210 3634209 Email: info@atiner.gr URL:
www.atiner.gr
URL Conference Papers Series: www.atiner.gr/papers.htm
Printed in Athens, Greece by the Athens Institute for Education and Research. All rights reserved. Reproduction is allowed for non-commercial purposes if the source is fully acknowledged.
ISSN: 2241-2891
18/05/2016

Design Impact through Brand Equity Approach: Example of Telecommunication Sector in Lithuania

Nikolaj Ambrusevic

Associate Professor

**Department of Creative Entrepreneurship and Communication
Vilnius Gediminas Technical University 1 Traku Street
Lithuania**

Abstract

Within the existing literature on design little attention has been paid to the evaluation of contribution of design to business development. This paper examines the role of design in developing the telecommunications industry. Furthermore, it represents an attempt to reveal the frames of evaluation that can be used in order to strengthen the relations between business and consumers.

The methodology of research includes analysis of scientific literature, systematic review of scientific statements and results of empirical research. The empirical research involves customer survey, expert survey based on multi-factorial analysis and competitor array analysis. The latter is conducted with representatives of telecommunication companies revealing the main element stressing the importance of design.

The obtained research results: (i) may be implemented while creating a variety of strategies which are aimed to facilitate business development in the changing world of internationalization; (ii) may provide practical solutions in the moments of facing economic uncertainty and specific problems in business environment; (iii) may be treated as an object of scientific discussion and further research.

Keywords: Brand equity, Design, Lithuania, Marketing management, Telecommunications.

Introduction

The telecommunication market is one of the fastest growing markets in Lithuania. At the moment the sector of information and communication technologies of Lithuania creates 2.2% of the country's Gross Domestic Product, makes 2.5% of the country's export and attracts nearly one billion Euros of foreign direct investment. Moreover, regarding statistical data Lithuania is one of the leading countries in the European Union in terms of internet access and the number of SIM cards and smart phones per 100 people (Statistics Lithuania, 2015).

After a long transition from a planned type economy to a market system the country experienced rapid changes. As a result, the monopolistic market of telecommunications with the dominance of one company was replaced by oligopoly with tough competition between three main telecommunication service providers. There are several stages that may be outlined in this process. They include the following: (i) the privatization of the Lithuanian telecommunication company by a Scandinavian investor in 1998; (ii) fast growth and aggressive marketing of mobile phone providers focusing attention on the needs of the youth; (iii) following acquisition of mobile phone providers by global brands such as Vodafone Group Plc. and TeliaSoneira AB. The activity of foreign investors in Lithuania changed the understanding of importance of design in competition. Unfortunately, design still has not been recognised as an important tool of marketing management in the telecommunication market in Lithuania.

The author of the paper **aims** to bring forward a methodology which evaluates the importance of design in different groups which could be implemented in the development of the brand equity in the telecommunication market in Lithuania.

In order to achieve the aim, the following **tasks** are presented in the paper:

- *to provide a literature review in order to establish the main theoretical background regarding importance of design, understanding of brand equity and guidelines evaluating design impact through brand equity;*
- *to present a comprehensive methodology of empirical research investigating the opinion of customers, experts and representatives of the telecommunication sector in Lithuania;*
- to provide findings based on an empirical research results analysis stressing importance of design in brand equity in a case of Lithuanian sector of telecommunications.

The aim of the paper is based on practical relevance. Regarding recently developed strategic patterns of the European Union all member countries are interested in creating a new type of economy with technologically oriented export and a growing number of technologically equipped working places. Thus, in order to promote competition and achieve better results, businesses

should be more aware of the positive impact of design on the market performance.

Literature Review

Understanding of the Importance of Design

The design thinking concept has been around for many years now (Dym et al., 2005; Best, 2006; Brown, 2008). Scientists investigating different aspects of business management confirm that design helps identify and differentiate goods and services, simplify the purchasing process for customers, aid in the processing of information about products, and make them feel confident of their purchase decision. Design has become an important company asset, and focus on creation of design equity is needed (Borja de Mozota, 2003; Brakus et al., 2009).

One of the main issues that still has to be resolved is the question of how to evaluate the impact of design. Borja de Mozota (2003) concludes that in terms of rapid design evaluation research should be focused on comprehensive measurements of design equity (Borja de Mozota, 2003). It can determine the overall importance of design in extending the product or services and benefiting the company in a financial way.

While there are many approaches available, it is still uncertain which method is the most appropriate. The main scientific problem is related to the nature of the term "design", which may have the meaning of the purposeful or inventive arrangement of parts or details, or a plan, a project of certain graphic vision creation, and understanding of a method of creative problem solution.

Two main points of view regarding the importance of design in developing modern business may be distinguished: design-driven *innovation approach* and *brand equity approach*.

Innovation approach. In order to remain competitive companies have to innovate (Munsch, 2004; Dell’Era and Verganti, 2009). For innovative projects they often rely on teams for the development of innovative products and services (Kazanijan and Carnevale, 1989; Hoegl et al. 2004). In the scientific literature many articles have confirmed that design highly contributes to the process of innovation (Verganti, 2009). Some authors find something that may be hardly implemented by other enterprises in a short period of time as one of the main sources of competitive advantage for a company (Steinbock, 2005). Others remind us of a special role of innovation in customer behaviour creation that secures positive product consumption experience (Citrin et al., 2000).

As a result, there are two main definitions of innovation distinguished in scientific literature. The narrow definition may be presented as a "successful implementation of creative ideas within an organization" (Amabile, 1996, p. 1), and in a broad sense "innovation is the use of ideas in order to create more value with further introduction and wide use" (Chesbrough, 2003, p. 45).

Back in 1943 Joseph Schumpeter, an Austrian-born American economist and political scientist, who greatly contributed to the science of innovation

management in his classification provided a detailed explanation of innovation distinguishing the following aspects: (1) introduction of products and services unknown for customers; (2) invention of new method of production; (3) finding new markets; (4) identification of new materials; (5) organisation of new working principles (Antonelli, 2003). The role of design may be expressed here in the ability to take advantage of other ideas to reveal new possible combinations and to create a new quality. This result depends on opportunities that may be found in the environment. Another expert in the field of management, Peter Drucker (2007), distinguished seven innovation opportunities: (1) unexpected changes; (2) focus on the need; (3) need of a new process; (4) market and business structure; (5) demographics; (6) perception of changes, and (7) new knowledge.

Unexpected changes provoke the creation of new solutions in a risky environment. For the company it can result in unexpected success and failure at the same time (Christensen, 2013).

Focusing on the need is important in terms of changing expectations. In order to avoid differences in evaluations of customer expectations and the understanding of producer following aspects should be constantly analysed: overall economic and market structure, branch activities, and internal processes in organisation (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995).

Need of a new process may be dictated by identification of market needs that allow to provide beneficial elements in the process of product creation (Chesbrough, 2003). Certainly, a company is interested in finding and implementing cheaper and easier-to-use tools or technically advanced and economically beneficial processes.

Market and business structure involves the analysis of all elements of macro-environment such as new competitors, new customers, distinguished products, production and marketing changes, new substitutes and complementary products or services (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995).

Demographics stand for the analysis of the customer's main structure elements such as number, age, culture, occupation, education, incomes (Araujo and Gava, 2012).

Change in perception notes changes in customer behaviour on a psychographic level. Some authors (Godart, 2012) warn about importance of emphasising one-off fashion and long-term changes in customer perception.

New knowledge: The most common example of a new type of innovation is a complex of required specific knowledge. The biggest threat is related to a long time gap between the invention of a prototype and its commercial applications that reduces possibilities for successful application (Chesbrough, 2003).

Innovation itself may be evaluated in three different approaches:

Innovation as achievement: Regarding Clark and Fujimoto (1991) this understanding of innovation is more applicable for technologically or time defined processes, where innovation creates new solutions. At the same time scientists argue that the innovation as achievement approach rarely occurs in

practice. Moreover, the implementation of new ideas is a very risky process, both technologically and in sense of market acceptance (Moll et al., 2007).

Innovation as outcomes: This concept of innovation evaluation means that innovation pursues commercial and social impact, which is not planned and, ultimately, extends expectations (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995). Christensen (2013) notes that the social impact of innovation usually appears to be a side effect rather than pursued one. Thus, the main focus should be placed on economic aspects in innovation evaluation.

Innovation as ability to change: This concept is defined as a process, which determines target actions focused on the creation of new ideas in a long-term period (Tang, 2005). The majority of the authors (Chesbrough, 2003; Araujo and Gava, 2012; Christensen, 2013) agreed that this method of innovation evaluation should be in use by small innovative companies that are flexible and willing to learn. In this regard, innovation should be actively managed and the focus of design should be oriented towards the support of innovative activities, encouraging the emergence of new ideas resulting in commercialisation.

Brand approach: Many scientists see the main purpose of design in creating a strong brand or logo. Verganti (2009) argues that design driven brand identity helps in getting feedback from customers, strengthening the quality and reputation of the company (Verganti, 2009). Olins (2003) represents a narrow point of view on the importance of design and states that a design-driven approach towards a brand makes a strong impact on the customers' emotional level (Olins 2003). Best (2006) delivers a broader understanding of the role of design and specifies that design could help companies in identifying communication management and making brands more visible and tangible. It underlines the strategic role of design (Hines and Bruce 2007).

Understanding of Brand Equity

An American organizational theorist David Aaker (1996) provides a framework for brand equity referring to a set of assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol that add to or subtract from the value provided by a product or service to a firm and or to the firm's competitors. According to the author brand's assets can be categorized in five groups: (1) brand loyalty, (2) brand name awareness, (3) brand's perceived quality, (4) brand's association in addition to the perceived quality, (5) other proprietary brand assets like patents, trademarks, channel relationships, etc. Brand equity provides value to a company in the sense of price premium, trade leverage, or competitive advantage. In other words, the quality of the investments in brand's creation is a crucial factor.

Three main roles of the brand can be distinguished in marketing management:

Brand as a competitive advantage: Brands have meanings that can be leveraged in the support of products and service offerings (Saxena, 2009).

Brand as differential impact: Meaningful differences between brands including the issue of brand equity that are considered to relate to a broad multidimensional model that may be defined as "customer-knowledge" of the brand (Kay, 2006).

Brand identity: Brand identity consists of core identity and extended identity. David Aaker (1996) defines the core identity as the everlasting fundamental nature which is most likely to be sustained. The extended identity, however, includes those elements which complete and enhance the core identity strengthening what the brand represents.

Alina Wheeler (2010) states that every effective brand is supported by positioning a strategy that drives planning, marketing, and sales. Positioning takes advantage of changes in demographics, technology, marketing cycles, consumer trends, and gaps in the market to find new ways of appealing to the public. Kotler and Keller (2012) go further and describe **positioning** as "the act of designing the company's offering and image to occupy a distinctive place in the minds of the target market".

Brand identity consists of unique associations that a company wants consumers to have when confronted with the brand (Okonkwo, 2007). As a result, brand awareness supports associations, which drive attitudes that increase loyalty and provoke purchases. According to Keller (2003) the brand value is created at the stage when customers have (1) a high level of awareness, (2) strong, favourable and unique brand associations, (3) positive brand attitudes, (4) intense brand attachments and loyalty, and (5) a high degree of brand activity.

Although there are different approaches regarding the role of design presented. Gorb (1990) summarized suggestions involving a design-thinking concept into an organisational strategy and distinguished four main outcomes that are:

- product, which due to its unique design has a higher level of value and outweighs additional expenses in process of production;
- environment, as a company has more opportunities on the market in attracting new investors;
- information is important in attracting new customers and promoting loyalty;
- corporate identity is related to the overall strategy and focuses on better financial results.

Design Impact through Brand Equity

Borja de Mazoto (2003) argues that design should be incorporated into the strategy of an organisation. The success of design depends on how it complies with the company's overall strategic orientation (Table 1).

Table 1. *Comparison of Business Goals and Needs in Design*

Business goal	Need in design
To become a design leading company	Global design
To launch a new product	New product development
To launch a new brand	Development of the name and graphic design
To expand market share	Web design and packaging design
To implement diversification of activities in a new market	Product design or brand development
To improve research and development policy	Concept development

Source: Borja de Mozota, 2003.

Initial research of the evaluation of the design impact originated from the marketing measurement of brand equity (Abratt and Bick, 2003). Many scientists have suggested their own way in equity measurement:

- measurement of brand strength (Keller, 2003, Lassar et al., 1995);
- evaluation the equity of brand extension (Park et al., 1996);
- single-source scanner panel data to estimate equity (Kamakura and Rossel, 1993);
- valuation of equity across local and global markets (Aaker 1996, Montameni and Shahrokhi, 1998).

Although managers and researchers use various perspectives to study brand equity, customer based approaches look at it from consumer's perspective- either an individual one or an organisational one. The premise of customer-oriented brand equity models is that the power of a brand lies in what customers have seen, read, heard, learned, thought, and felt about the brand over time (Lindstrom, 2005).

Ghodeswar (2008) presents a model for developing a brand which is focused on brand positioning. The following factors are typically measured:

- distinctiveness (the brand's differentiation from others),
- quality (the reputation of the brand and well it actually performs),
- value (the strength of performance for the brand),
- image (the extent to which the brand conveys the intended image),
- loyalty (the degree of commitment to the brand).

Some authors (Keller, 2003, Ailawadi et al., 2001) suggest using their developed brand measurement model distinguishing evaluation of customer mind-set, product market and financial market (Table 2).

Table 2. Brand Equity Measurement

Factor of evaluation	Measures
Customer mind set	Assess sources of brand equity diagnostic, predict brand's potential surveys, <u>do not provide a single measure</u>
Product market	Brand's performance in the marketplace <u>price premium, market share, relative price "more complete", appealing but hypothetical!</u>
Financial market	Brand as financial asset <u>purchase price when a brand is solid/acquired, licensing fees, and royalties</u>

Source: Keller, 2003; Ailawadi et al., 2001.

In conclusion, there is still no unified design or brand equity measurement model created, and the debate over the appropriate method of valuation continues in both, scientific literature and the business world. Recently, commercial valuation of design has been led by DesignEquity (a UK-based company specializing in valuing design and helping companies in achieving outstanding results) and many ad design magazines, marketing and management consulting organisations.

Empirical Research

Empirical Research Methodology

The research **aims** at discovering differences in evaluation of the importance of design in different target groups of the telecommunication sector in Lithuania. More precisely, this research has a double objective: firstly, to analyse the opinion on the role of design in different target groups and, secondly, to evaluate how those results may be implemented on a company's managerial level by creating a strong brand in order to achieve better business results.

The research methodology consists of three parts:

1. qualitative survey of the telecommunication sector's clients;
2. experts' survey based on multi-factorial evaluation of opinion of marketers;
3. interview with telecommunication sector representatives.

In the first research method the sample of 135 clients of the telecommunication sector has been analysed. Interviews were conducted in a 3-months period, from January 2015 to April 2015. The interview consisted of 13 questions and lasted on average 10 minutes. The survey focused on revealing the main factors important for the clients in the telecommunication sector showing their innovation or brand oriented attitude toward design. The second hypothesis of the survey may be formulated as a prediction that the mindset of customers depends on the image of the company that has been created by managers in the market.

Another method used in the research was an *expert survey*. It is a unique type of survey, when a group of people with good knowledge of marketing are selected to evaluate and analyse the situation. Podvezko (2011) characterises this method as "in practice, a decision-making person is often faced with the problem of choosing the best alternative from the available options. This may be the choice of the best technological or investment options. In particular, the choice of the best technological or investment project or determination of an enterprise which is the best according to its financial and commercial activities or strategic potential, etc. should be made".

It is quite common that experts' opinions differ; therefore, it is important to assess the degree of compatibility of their opinions. Hence, a method of multiple criteria was in use. This method is based on ranking possible alternatives, when experts assess all indices depending on their personal opinion and acquired knowledge. Degree of compliance provides information regarding representatives of the results (Kardelis, 2002). By having compatible opinions multi-factorial data analysis has to be performed, revealing the opinion of one expert representing the results of all participated specialists (Malhotra and Birks, 2000). An expert survey helps identify the most important factors according to the experts' opinion (Podvezko, 2011).

7 members of the Lithuanian Marketing Association participated as main experts in the research. They had to evaluate 8 elements taken from the answers of a previous survey describing examples of good design in the telecommunication sector (see Table 4 in appendices). The purpose of this research was to establish the best combination of both - innovation and brand orientated design factors - in the telecommunication sector.

Finally, in a third research representatives of telecommunication companies were asked to evaluate their own performance based on a provided set of factors. 7 representatives of sales and communication departments in different stores of all telecommunication companies took part in this research. The results were illustrated using competitor array technique.

According to Gordon (1989) competitor array aims to establish one's own position against the competitors. Experts' evaluations may be in use as a measurement of positioning criteria. It is possible to establish best and worst evaluations for the certain criteria in the set of competitors (Gordon, 1989).

Since some enterprises have decided to participate in the research anonymously the real names of companies have been changed to "Company A", "Company B" and "Company C".

Result Analysis

Several observations may be concluded based on the empirical research data analysis:

- There are two main target groups distinguished in a number of respondents such as business clients and young individual customers of age 18-25, amounting to 26% and 33% of all respondent respectively.
- The majority of the business clients represents innovation-oriented attitude towards design. After being asked to describe a good design for

a telecommunication company, they chose "innovative product", "outstanding assistance/service", and "good quality of product and service".

- As a majority of young customers were more concerned about an "affordable price", "attractive interior", and "visible brand" they focused more on evaluating what impact design had on the brand.
- All answers of respondents regarding the understanding of good design were summarized and presented as 8 main elements: (1) attractive interior, (2) innovative product, (3) outstanding assistance/service, (4) good quality of product and service, (5) affordable price, (6) visible brand, (7) intensive commercial/communication, (8) good image.
- Multi-factorial evaluation based on experts' research revealed the opinion of marketers stating that the elements taken from the respondents survey should be awarded as following: "attractive interior" - 0.25, "innovative product" - 0.25, "outstanding assistance/service" - 0.1, "good quality of product and service" - 0.1, "affordable price" - 0.1, "visible brand" - 0.05, "intensive commercial/communication" - 0.1, "good image" - 0.05. The significance of the evaluations was proved in a process of ranking (see Table 5 in appendices) by concordant coefficient W (equal 0.77) and χ^2 (37.9) criteria, which exceeded χ^2_{cr} (14.07). After calculating weighed normalised values evaluations of the 4-th expert appeared to be representing the opinion of the whole group of experts (see Table 6 in appendices).
- Finally, representatives of telecommunication companies evaluated their performance in the market. Results are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Telecommunications Sector Competitor Array

Factors of evaluation	Weights of experts	Company A		Company B		Company C	
		Average	Value	Average	Value	Average	Value
Attractive interior	0.25	4.6	1.15	4.0	1.00	4.0	1.00
Innovative product	0.25	5.0	1.25	4.6	1.15	4.2	1.05
Outstanding assistance/service	0.1	4.2	0.42	3.4	0.34	3.6	0.36
Good quality of product and service	0.1	4.4	0.44	4.4	0.44	4.2	0.42
Affordable price	0.1	4.2	0.42	4.4	0.44	5.0	0.50
Visible brand	0.05	4.2	0.21	4.0	0.20	3.8	0.19
Intensive commercial/communication	0.1	4.0	0.40	3.8	0.38	4.2	0.42
Good image	0.05	4.0	0.20	4.2	0.21	3.8	0.19
Results	-	-	4.49	-	4.16	-	4.13

Company A was awarded with the highest score for innovative product and attractive interior. Summarizing this with the results of customer service the explanation may be as following: the company is more focused on the needs of business clients and creates the image of an innovative company providing good quality products. The interior of the selling outlets reminds environment of a technological laboratory with an ability to touch and use every device making the first impression unforgettable. Customers and representatives of company agree that the weakest point in designing a company's management is confusing the image and fragmented communication. Lately the company has been organizing several mass events in order to attract young audience and to re-launch the brand reflecting the status of sub-division of a global telecommunication company.

Company B is trying to cover both segments - business and individual clients - at once, so the results of competitor array represents balance in evaluations. Similarly, the highest evaluation goes for innovative product, though the evaluation is less impressive comparing to the Company A. However, the company holds leading positions in case of "good image" representing perfect combination of good quality of goods and services and affordable prices.

Company C focuses on needs of young private customers and distinguishes own advantages with a low price level. At the same time, the company is not capable of providing a good level of quality of products and services that creates many negative associations around the brand. Thus, being "price-friendly" the company stays in the minds of the target audience. This confirms the hypothesis that the mind-set of customers depends on the image of the company created in the market.

Limitations of the Study

Due to competitive landscape of the Lithuanian telecommunication market the main limitation of the study is related to the lack of primary data. Telecommunication companies are not willing to provide information and are operating their own data sources. Some information is available in reports of market research companies which are based on specific methodology.

Although the results of the competitor array allows creating main guidelines for companies positioning, it would be more beneficial to compare the gained results to the responses of clients. Evaluation of clients would create a perception map and could be in use while comparing gathered results with a positioning map. Differences in the evaluation of distinguished elements would have a "wake-up call" effect, warning about the misunderstanding between customer expectations and company's management. Overall, the research has confirmed that the experts' survey based on multi-factorial analysis may be in use as an effective tool distinguishing the main elements of company positioning and comparing business performance with competitors.

Findings

Evaluating the impact of design has revealed the differences in treating the importance of design in a developing business. There may be two main concepts analysing the importance of design such as innovation oriented impact and brand oriented impact. The first concept is broader in use and involves the investigation of product, processes and overall attitude towards environmental changes. The second one focuses mainly on the problems of marketing management and the usage of design as one of many marketing tools.

Suggested methodology evaluating the impact of design developing activity in the telecommunication market covers different levels of investigation and consists of three parts: survey investigating opinion of customers, expert survey revealing opinion of marketing professionals, and competitor array based on evaluation of business representatives establishing positioning of the enterprises.

The empirical research has shown that in different target groups the understanding of the impact of design differs. Business sector represents innovation-oriented model of design understanding. Analysis of the clients' survey has shown that business representatives associate good design of the telecommunication sector with "innovative product", "outstanding assistance/service" and "good quality of product and service", while the majority of young individual customers are more focused on an "affordable price", "attractive interior" and "visible brand" and represent a brand oriented attitude towards design.

Representatives of the Lithuanian Marketing Association recommend evaluating design based positioning on "attractive interior" and "innovative products". Those elements are essential, but not sufficient. The competitor array revealed that other factors may outweigh the difference.

In the conclusion, the design driven concept is on early stages of development in Lithuania. The first books dedicated to the problem of design evaluation have been published in Lithuania just recently. It explains why so many customers and business representatives understand design as part of marketing, and why the impact of design should be evaluated through the evaluation of brand equity first.

It is important to emphasize that at the same time more and more business representatives understand the overall impact of design and try to involve it in a process of company management, starting with marketing and marketing communications.

Appendices

Table 4. *Experts' Evaluations in Multi-factorial Analysis*

Factors:	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Expert 6	Expert 7
Attractive interior	0.1	0	0.25	0.25	0.1	0.25	0.15
Innovative product	0.15	0.3	0.25	0.25	0.2	0.15	0.2
Outstanding assistance/service	0.2	0.15	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.25	0.1
Good quality of product and service	0.15	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.15	0.15
Affordable price	0.1	0	0.1	0.1	0.15	0.05	0.1
Visible brand	0.1	0.2	0.05	0.05	0.2	0.05	0
Intensive commercial/communication	0.2	0.15	0.1	0.1	0.05	0.1	0.1
Good image	0	0	0.1	0.05	0.05	0	0.2
Total:	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 5. *Results of Ranging of Experts' Evaluations in Multi-factorial Analysis*

Factors:	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Expert 6	Expert 7
Attractive interior	6	7	1.5	1.5	5.5	1.5	3.5
Innovative product	3.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	3.5	1.5
Outstanding assistance/service	1.5	4.5	7.5	4.5	3.5	1.5	6
Good quality of product and service	3.5	2.5	4.5	4.5	5.5	3.5	3.5
Affordable price	6	7	4.5	4.5	3.5	6.5	6
Visible brand	6	2.5	7.5	7.5	1.5	6.5	8
Intensive commercial/communication	1.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	7.5	5	6
Good image	8	7	4.5	7.5	7.5	8	1.5

Table 6. *Weighed Normalised Values of Experts' Evaluations in Multi-factorial Analysis*

Factors:	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Expert 6	Expert 7
Attractive interior	0.63095	0.73611	0.15774	0.15774	0.57837	0.15774	0.36806
Innovative product	0.19444	0.05556	0.08333	0.08333	0.08333	0.19444	0.08333
Outstanding assistance/service	0.17262	0.51786	0.8631	0.51786	0.40278	0.17262	0.69048
Good quality of product and service	0.38194	0.27282	0.49107	0.49107	0.6002	0.38194	0.38194
Affordable price	0.90476	1.05556	0.67857	0.67857	0.52778	0.98016	0.90476
Visible brand	0.94048	0.39187	1.1756	1.1756	0.23512	1.01885	1.25397
Intensive commercial/communication	0.1994	0.59821	0.59821	0.59821	0.99702	0.66468	0.79762
Good image	1.3968	1.2222	0.7857	1.3095	1.3095	1.3968	0.2619
Total:	4.8214	4.8502	4.8333	5.0119	4.7341	4.9673	4.7421

References

- Aaker DA (1996) Measuring Brand Equity Across Products and Markets. *California Management Review* 38(3): 102-120.
- Abrat R, Bick G (2003) Valuing Brands and Brand Equity: Methods and Processes. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship* 8: 21-39.
- Ailawadi K, Lehmann D, Neslin S (2001) Market Response to a Major Policy Change in the Marketing Mix: Learning from P&G's Value Pricing Strategy. *Journal of Marketing* 65(1): 44-61.
- Amabile TM (1996) Creativity and Innovation in Organizations. *Harvard Business Review* Jan.: 1-15.
- Antonelli C (2003) *The Economics of Innovation, New Technologies, and Structural Change*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Araujo L, Gava R (2012) Proactive Companies: How to Anticipate Market Changes. *Business & Management Collection*. Series: Fundacao Dom Cabral.
- Best K (2006) *Design Management: Managing Design Strategy, Process and Implementation*. Lausanne, Switzerland: AVA Publishing SA.
- Borja de Mozota B (2003) *Design Management: Using Design to Built Brand Value and Corporate Innovation*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.
- Brakus JJ, Schmitt BH, Zarantonello L (2009) Brand Experience: what is it? How is it measured? Does it Affect Loyalty? *Journal of Marketing* 46(2): 222-233.
- Brown SL, Eisenhardt KM (1995) Product Development: Past Research, Present Findings, and Future Directions. *Academy Management Review* 20(2): 343-378.
- Brown T (2008) Design Thinking. *Harvard Business Review* Jun.: 1-10.
- Chesbrough HW (2003) *Open Innovation: the New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Christensen C (2013) *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fall*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

- Citrin AV, Sprott DE, Silverman SN, Stem DE Jr. (2000) Adoption of Internet Shopping: the Role of Consumer Innovativeness, *Industrial Management & Data Systems* 100(7): 294-300.
- Clark KB, Fujimoto J (1991) *Product Development Performance*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Dell'Era C, Verganti R (2009) The Impact of International Designers on Firm Innovation Capability and Consumer Interest. *International Journal of Operations and Innovation Management* 29(9): 870-893.
- Drucker PF (2007) *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Dym CL, Agogino AM, Eris O, Frey DD, Leifer LJ (2005) Engineering Design Thinking, Teaching, and Learning. *Journal of Engineering Education* 94(1): 103-120.
- Ghodeswar BM (2008) Building Brand Identity in Competitive Markets: a Conceptual Model. *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 17(1): 4-12.
- Godart F (2012) *Unveiling Fashion: Business, Culture, and Identity in the Most Glamorous Industry*. Hampshire, UK: Insead Business Press.
- Gorb P (1990) *Design Management: Papers from the London Business School*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Gordon I (1989) *Beat the Competition: How to Use Competitive Intelligence to Develop Winning Business Strategies*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Publishers.
- Hines T, Bruce M (2007) *Fashion Marketing. Contemporary Issues*. London, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hoegl M, Winkauf K, Gemuenden HG (2004) Interteam Coordination, Project Commitment, and teamwork in Multiteam R&D Projects: A Longitudinal Study. *Organization Science* 15(1): 38-55.
- Kamakura WA, Russell GJ (1993) Measuring Brand Value with Scanner Data. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 10(Mar.): 9-22.
- Kardelis K (2002) *Mokslinių tyrimų metodologija ir metodai (Methods and methodology of Scientific Research)*. Šiauliai, Lithuania: Judex.
- Kay MJ (2006) Strong Brands and Corporate Brands. *European Journal of Marketing* 40(7/8): 742-760.
- Kazanijan PA, Carnevale PJ (1989). Positive Effects of Within-Group Cooperation on Between-Group Negotiation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 19(12): 977-992.
- Keller KL (2003) How do Brands Create Value? *Marketing Management*, (May/June 2003): 27-31.
- Kotler P, Keller K (2012) *Marketing Management* (14th ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Lassar W, Mittal B, Sharma A (1995) Measuring Customer-Based Brand Equity. *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 12(4): 11-19.
- Lindstrom M (2005) *Brand Sense: how to Build Powerful Brands through Touch, Taste, Smell, Sight & Sound*. London, UK: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Malhotra NK, Birks DF (2000) *Marketing Research*. London, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Moll I, Montana J, Guzman F, Parellada FS (2007) Market Orientation and Design Orientation: a Management Model. *Journal of Marketing Management* 23, 9-10 (Nov. 2007), 861-876.
- Montameni, R., Shahrokhi, M. 1998. Brand Equity Valuation: a Global Perspective. *Journal of Product Brand Management* 7(4): 275-290.

- Munsch K (2004) Outsourcing Design and Innovation. *Research Technology Management* 4(1): 27-30.
- Okonkwo U (2007) *Luxury Fashion Branding: Trends, Tactics, Techniques*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Olins W (2003) *On Brand*. London, UK: Thames and Hudson.
- Park CW, Jun SY, Shocker AD (1996) Composite Branding Alliances: an Investigation of Extension and Feedback Effects. *Journal of Marketing Research* 22(Nov.): 453-366.
- Podvezko V (2011) The Comparative Analysis of MCDA Methods SAW and COPRAS. *Engineering Economics* 22(2): 134-146.
- Saxena R (2009) *Marketing Management* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Statistics Lithuania (2015) Statistical Department at Lithuanian Government. Retrieved from <http://www.stat.gov.lt>. [Accessed: 20 March 2015]
- Steinbock D (2005) Design and Mobile Innovation. *Design Management Review* 16(4): 55-62.
- Tang J (2005) Competition and Innovation Behaviour. *Research Policy* 35(1): 68-82.
- Verganti R (2009) *Design-driven Innovation: Changing the Rules of Competition by Radically Innovating what Things Mean*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Wheeler A (2010) *Designing Brand Identity: An Essential Guide for the Whole Branding Team*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.