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Abstract

The main aim of this study is to build and test a model that includes determinants of brand equity in fast food restaurants industry. Designed questionnaire was distributed to customers sample in fast food restaurants in Egypt. Data were obtained from 307 respondents and were analyzed using Amos.18 and Spss.16 to test hypotheses established in a research model. The results indicated that there is a positive significant relationship between perceived value and customer satisfaction. The results revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between customer satisfaction and customer trust. It is found that there is a positive significant relationship between customer satisfaction, customer trust and brand equity.
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1. Introduction

The term relationship marketing has become very widely used in recent years Palmer (1998). Sheth et al. (2015) mentioned that relationship marketing is considered the dominant paradigm in both firm practice and marketing research. Morgan and Hunt (1994) mentioned that relationship marketing is building long term relational exchanges. Peck, et al. (1999) indicated that there are four linked dimensions in relationship management process; they are identifying the value propositions, defining appropriate customers' segments, designing the delivery systems of value and maintaining customers' satisfaction. On the other hand, Donaldson and O'Toole (2002) identified several components that are important in implementation of customer relationship management; they are setting realistic targets and assessing performance, maintaining dialogue with customers, measuring customer satisfaction and managing customer service, managing the gap between organization and customer, emphasizing on quality and investing in people. Henning-Thurau et al. (2002) indicated that relationship quality is a construct including main dimensions which describe the nature of relationships between firms and consumers. Dewulf et al. (2001) indicated that relationship quality is a construct that consists of three main dimensions they are commitment, satisfaction and trust. Garbarino and Johnson (1999) defined relationship quality as a total assessment of the depth of relationship between organization and customer. Cheng et al. (2008) mentioned that when the customer's needs and wants are fulfilled, relationship quality will be achieved. Reichheld and Teal (1996) indicated that providing value to the customer is considered the first objective of the firms. Theilemann et al. (2018) mentioned that today customers are seeking the benefit that exceeds the monetary sacrifice they have paid to purchase a good or service. Simon (2015) indicated that customer perceived value must meet or exceed customer expected value. Theilemann, et al. (2018) mentioned that explaining customer perceived value in restaurants is still a target for both researchers and practitioners.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Perceived Value

Hu et al. (2009) indicated that providing perceived value to the customer is one of the main approaches when serving customers. Many authors set different definitions for perceived value. Babin (2001) mentioned that perceived value is considered a construct consisting of a single dimension by some and as a construct consisting of multiple dimensions by others. Hu et al. (2009) stated that there are a number of distinct definitions of customer perceived value. These definitions can be classified into two main perspectives. The first perspective considers perceived value as a relationship between benefits and sacrifices (Cronin, et al., 2000; Zeithaml, 1988).
Hauser and Urban (1986) mentioned that customer assesses the perceived value based on the comparison between functional utility and economical costs related to purchased product or service. Zeithaml (1988) defined value as a benefit that customer receives for the money paid. Zeithaml et al. (1996) defined perceived value as the benefits obtained from a product or service in compared other alternatives. Woodruff (1997) defined perceived value as customers' evaluations of the results of using the product in different situations. Ryu et al. (2007) explained perceived value as a comparison between perceived benefits related to buying and using the product and perceived sacrifices related to paying the price. Boksberger and Melsen (2011) defined value as the perception of a customer interaction with the firm or of the final result of this interaction. The second perspective considers perceived value as a construct that has multidimensions (Sanchez, et al., 2006; Sweeney and Soutar, 2001). Sheth, et al. (1991), Sweeney and Soutar (2001) indicated that there are four types of the perceived value; they are functional, monetary, emotional and social. Sheth et al. (1991) suggested five types of consumption perceived value; they are conditional functional, emotional, social, and cognitive. Wang et al. (2004) consider the firm's ability to provide perceived value to the customers as very necessary in fostering a distinctive advantage over competitors.

2.2 Customer Satisfaction

Many authors set different definitions for customer satisfaction. Hunt (1977) described satisfaction as an evaluation of an emotion. Oliver (1980) defined customer satisfaction as the feeling resulting from the comparison between the expected service and the perceived service. Crosby et al. (1990) defined consumer satisfaction as a feeling resulting from customer's total evaluation of all aspects related to firm over time. Caruana, et al. (1998) defined level of customer satisfaction with the service as a result of customer's evaluation of actual service encounter compared to expected service encounter. Cronin, et al. (2000) defined customer satisfaction as customer's evaluation of the total consumption experiences. Hellier, et al. (2003) defined customer satisfaction as customer's feeling of pleasure related to the ability of the service to fulfill his or her expectations. Kotler (2003) defined customer satisfaction as customer's feeling of delight or disappointment resulted from the comparison between product's perceived performance and its expected performance. Weiss, et al.,(2005) mentioned that customer satisfaction results when a customer's perception of a given service encounter matches his/her expectations for that encounter. Ueltschy et al. (2009) defined customer satisfaction as the response of the customer that is based on his/her evaluation of prior expectations and actual perceptions of the product/service. Raposo et al. (2009) defined customer satisfaction as customer's feeling which is based on confirmation or disconfirmation of his/her expectations. Chen et al. (2009) mentioned that customer satisfaction is directly influenced by confirmation or disconfirmation resulted between customer's pre-purchase expectations and his/her post-purchase perceptions of a product or service. Lee et al. (2011) defined customer satisfaction as a customer's reaction to long-term service relationship. Nam et al. (2011) defined customer satisfaction as customer's response to the total last purchasing experience. Loureiro, et al. (2014) stated that there are two types of customer satisfaction; they are transactional and cumulative. Anderson et al. (1994) stated that in transactional satisfaction view customers evaluate specific service encounter or consumption situation. Nam et al. (2011) stated that in a cumulative satisfaction view customers evaluate the total experience with a product or service. Johnson and Fornell (1991) defined cumulative satisfaction as total customer evaluation based on all experiences with the firm and the product. Harris and Harrington (2000) stated that customer satisfaction is achieved if the firms exert every effort to meet customer's needs. Ueltschy et al. (2009) stated that many firms considered customer satisfaction an effective intangible asset for gaining competitive advantage globally.

2.3 Customer Trust

Some authors set different definitions for customer trust. Moorman, et al. (1992) defined trust as a willingness to rely on a confident exchange partner. Moorman, et al. (1992) defined customer trust as the degree of customer confidence in a business's reliability. Doney and Cannon (1997) defined credibility as the expectancy that institution's promises will be kept. Doney et al. (1998) mentioned that trust is the predisposition to depend on another party. Doney, et al. (2007) defined customer trust as a benevolence which entails a belief in the other party's favorable and positive intentions. Scheer (2012) defined trust as the belief that one's channel partner will fulfill its obligations and will behave in an honest manner. Hoq, et al. (2010) indicated that confidence and reliability of both parties are crucial in building trust. Hurely (2006) suggested six dimensions of trust; they are shared values, beliefs, interests, benevolent intentions, capability, integrity and transparency.

2.4 Brand Equity

Tran and Cox (2009) mentioned that brand equity from the individual consumer perspective is a multidimensional construct including the components of brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality,
brand trust, brand preference and brand loyalty. Hutton (1997) concluded that brand equity is measured by customers' willingness to pay a premium price to purchase their favorite brand and recommending this brand to others. Davis and Doughlass (1995) defined brand equity as a viable asset for producers. Shocker and Weitz (1988) defined brand equity as the incremental cash flow resulting from revenues of products with a brand name over those of unbranded ones. Lemon, et al. (2001) indicated that customer equity is the sum of profits acquired from current and new customers. So, brand equity can be measured through determinants that affect profits of current and new customers. So, Brand equity can be measured through customer loyalty or repeated purchases, positive word of mouth that helps the firm to acquire new customers and customer's expenditure. Reich, et al. (2006) distinguished between attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. Attitudinal loyalty refers to customer's intentions to repeat the purchasing whereas behavioral loyalty refers to customer's repeated purchasing behaviour. Patterson and Spreng (1997) defined repurchase intention as consumers' evaluation of future purchases from the same company based on their previous experience. Oliver (1999) defined customer loyalty as a deep commitment to re-buy a preferred product or service in the future. Hellier, et al. (2003) mentioned that customer loyalty is the degree of customer's repeating purchase from a certain service company and customer's expenditure on that service. Lee, et al. (2008) defined customer loyalty as the customer's intention to repurchase from the current firm. Palazon and Delgado (2009) mentioned that brand loyalty allows consumers to buy a brand and refuse to switch to another brand. Blackston (1995) concluded that consumers who are highly loyal are willing to pay more to purchase the brand and are less likely to switch to other brands when price is high or when competitors offer promotional price. Blackston (1995) mentioned that strong company's brand can lead to consumer loyalty. Westbrook (1987) defined word of mouth as customer's communications directed at other customers about specific product or its seller. Swan and Oliver (1989) mentioned that word of mouth is the degree to which consumers praise a firm and its products and recommend them to others. Buttle (1998) mentioned that word of mouth is the customers' oral evaluation of a firm's products. Harrison-Walker (2001) mentioned that word of mouth is the personal communication between sender and receiver regarding a product brand. Harrison-Walker (2001) mentioned that word of mouth is the degree of talking to others about advantages of a firm and its products or services. Londono, et al. (2017) mentioned that the tendency to pay for receiving certain product or service is called intention to pay.

2.5 Perceived Value and Customer Satisfaction

McDougall and Levesque (2000) concluded that perceived value is the main determinant of customer satisfaction. Hellier, et al. (2003) indicated that perceived value affects positively customer satisfaction. Qin, et al. (2010) pointed out that customer perceived value affects directly customer satisfaction. Hume and Mort (2010) found that perceived value has a direct and positive relationship to customer satisfaction. Chang, et al. (2010) found that customer perceived value affects significantly customer satisfaction. Ryu, et al. (2012) concluded that customer perceived value is a significant factor affecting customer satisfaction. Chang (2013) indicated that perceived value is a significant predictor of customer satisfaction. Gallarza, et al. (2013) concluded that customer satisfaction is an outcome of customer perceived value. Roig, et al. (2013) found that customer satisfaction is affected directly and positively by functional value, emotional value and social value. Singh (2015) indicated that customer evaluation process includes three stages; they are perceived image, perceived value and customer satisfaction. Gallarza, et al. (2016) concluded that customer satisfaction is influenced significantly and positively by quality value, monetary value and emotional value. Liu and Tse (2018) indicated that price and value of full-service restaurants affect significantly and positively customer satisfaction. Mahmoud, et al. (2018) pointed out that customer satisfaction is influenced significantly by customer value. Lee and Phau (2018) found that monetary value, quality value, emotional value and social value have a significant impact on total perceived value which has a significant impact on customer satisfaction. According to the above discussion, this study suggests the first hypothesis:

H1: There is a positive significant relationship between perceived value and customer satisfaction.

2.6 Perceived value and customer trust

Dedeoglu, et al. (2019) found that brand trust was affected positively by both hedonic and functional values. Berreiaes, et al. (2017) found that customers' e-trust is explained by quality value, monetary value and emotional value of mobile banking applications. Moliner, et al. (2007) concluded that the formation of customer trust is influenced by emotional value. According to the previous discussion, this study suggests the second hypothesis:

H2: There is a positive significant relationship between perceived value and customer trust.

2.7 Customer Satisfaction and Customer Trust

concluded that consumer trust is affected positively by consumer satisfaction. Song, et al. (2019) found that customer satisfaction influences positively customer trust. According to the above discussion, this study suggests the third hypothesis:

H3: There is a positive significant relationship between customer satisfaction and customer trust.

2.8 Customer Satisfaction and Brand Equity

Some previous studies emphasized that there is a positive significant relationship between customer satisfaction and dimensions of brand equity (customer loyalty-customer word of mouth - customer spending). Alves, et al. (2019) confirmed that customer loyalty is influenced positively by total customer satisfaction. Song, et al. (2019) found that customer satisfaction has a positive impact on customer loyalty. Gallarza, et al. (2016) concluded that customer loyalty is influenced significantly by customer satisfaction. Loureiro, et al. (2014) concluded that loyalty intentions are affected significantly and directly by satisfaction. Chang (2013) found that customer satisfaction affects significantly customer loyalty. Gallarza, et al. (2013) found that customer satisfaction has a strong positive impact on customer loyalty. Roig, et al. (2013) found that the effect of customer satisfaction on customer loyalty is direct and positive. Ou, et al. (2011) confirmed that customer satisfaction influences positively on customer loyalty. Edward and Sahadev (2011) concluded that customer retention is influenced directly by customer satisfaction. Chang, et al. (2010) concluded that customer satisfaction influences positively by consumer satisfaction. Hume and Mort (2010) concluded that repurchase intentions are affected positively by customer satisfaction. Molinari, et al. (2008) concluded that there is a positive link between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions. Moliner, et al. (2007) found that customer satisfaction has a significant impact on customer loyalty. Ball, et al. (2004) indicated that customer satisfaction firstly explains customer loyalty. Kitapci, et al. (2013) concluded that both repurchase intention and positive word of mouth are influenced positively by customer satisfaction. Dolarslan (2014) concluded that customer satisfaction has positive effects on repurchase intentions, positive word of mouth and willingness to pay more. According to the previous discussion, this study suggests the fourth hypothesis:

H4: There is a positive significant relationship between customer satisfaction and brand equity.

2.9 Customer Trust and Brand Equity

Some previous studies emphasized that there is a positive significant relationship between customer trust and dimensions of brand equity (customer loyalty-customer word of mouth-customer spending). Brown, et al. (2019) indicated that trust affects loyalty significantly and positively. Alves, et al. (2019) confirmed that customer loyalty is influenced positively by customer trust. Song, et al. (2019) found that there is a positive relationship between customer trust and customer loyalty. Esterik- Plasmeijer and Raaij (2017) concluded that customer loyalty is explained by customer trust. Arcand, et al., (2017) indicated that customer trust significantly impacts customer loyalty. Jalilvand, et al. (2017) indicated that customer trust affects significantly and positively customer loyalty. Chinomona (2016) concluded that brand trust influences positively on brand loyalty. Loureiro, et al. (2014) found that customer trust directly impacts loyalty intentions. Chang (2013) concluded that customer trust influences significantly customer loyalty. Ou, et al. (2011) confirmed that customer loyalty is affected positively by customer trust. Moliner, et al. (2007) concluded that customer trust has a significant impact on customer loyalty. Ball, et al. (2004) found that customer trust influences directly on customer loyalty. Jalilvand, et al. (2017) indicated that customer trust is significantly associated with customer intention to disseminate positive word of mouth. Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) demonstrated that customer behavioral intentions are influenced by customer trust. Zeithaml, et al. (1996) mentioned that behavioral intentions have three key dimensions; they are willingness to repurchase products or services from a company, to recommend the company and to say positive comments about its services and to pay a premium price for its products or services. According to the above discussion, this study suggests the fifth hypothesis:

H5: There is a positive significant relationship between customer trust and brand equity.

2.10 Perceived Value and Brand Equity

Previous studies emphasized that there is a positive significant relationship between perceived value and dimensions of brand equity (customer loyalty-customer word of mouth-customer spending). Gill, et al. (2007) found that customer behavioral intentions are influenced significantly, directly and positively by customer perceived value dimensions. Molinari, et al. (2008) concluded that perceived value influences significantly and positively on repurchase intentions. Edward and Sahadev (2011) found that customer retention is influenced significantly and positively by perceived value. Roig, et al. (2013) concluded that social value influences directly and positively customer loyalty. Senic and Marinkovic (2014) indicated that emotional value is the strongest
antecedent of attitudinal loyalty. Tarus and Rabach (2013) concluded that customer loyalty is explained by perceived service value. Jahanzeb et al. (2013) found that customer based brand equity is influenced significantly and positively by perceived value. Dolarslan (2014) found that repurchase intentions, positive word of mouth and willingness to pay more are influenced positively by perceived value. Hanaysha (2018) found that a purchase decision (customer loyalty-customer word of mouth-customer spending) is influenced positively by perceived value. According to the above discussions, this study suggests the following hypotheses:

H6: There is a positive significant relationship between perceived value and brand equity.

H7: Customer satisfaction mediates the relationship between perceived value and brand equity.

H8: Customer trust mediates the relationship between perceived value and brand equity.

3. Proposed Model

Figure 1 illustrates the proposed model of the study. It includes the hypothesized relationships. The factors under investigation are perceived value, customer satisfaction, customer trust and brand equity. Accordingly the researcher aims to examine the mentioned relationships on fast food restaurants in developing context namely Egypt.

4. Methodology

4.1 Sample and Data Collection

Data was collected from customers of fast food restaurants located in Cairo, the capital of Egypt, through distributing designed questionnaire to visiting customers. Sample size was 384 customers of fast food restaurants in Egypt. Sample size was calculated by sample size calculator according to the following assumptions: population size = 20,500,000 customers, confidence level = 95%, allowed margin error = ± 5% and level of accuracy = 50%. The number of valid questionnaires is 307. Response rate was 79.95%. The demographic characteristics of respondents are shown in table 1.
Table 1. Respondents' demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Less than 18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-less than 30</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-less than 40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-less than 50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-less than 60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-less than 3000</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3000-less than 6000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6000-less than 10000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10000-less than 15000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15000 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-secondary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above secondary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma or master</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Research Measures

To measure perceived value the researcher used measures which were used in previous studies (Zeithmal, 1988; Turley and Milliman, 2000; Lee, et al., 2004; Petrick, 2002; Itani, et al., 2019; Boo, et al., 2009; Lee, et al., 2011; Kabadayi, et al., 2017). To measure customer satisfaction the researcher used the measures which were used in previous studies (Song, et al., 2019; Cronin, et al., 2000; Spreng, et al., 1996; Fornell, 1992; Laroche, et al., 2004). The (Gansan and Hess, 1997) scale was used to measure customer trust. To measure brand equity the researcher used measures which were used in previous studies (Oliver, 1997; Pritchard, et al., 1999; Lewis and Soureli, 2006; Reith, et al., 2006; Yi and Gong, 2013; Hellier, et al., 2003). Measurement items are shown in the appendix. Table 2 shows that all constructs exhibited acceptable composite reliability values exceeding the minimum limit 0.7 suggested by Bagozzi (1994).

Table 2. Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Number Of Items</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value (PV)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction (CS)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Trust (CT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Equity (BE)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that AVE (average variance extracted) for all constructs were equal or greater than 0.5 confirming internal consistency and convergent validity Fornell and Larcker (1981).

Table 3. Convergent validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Trust</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Equity</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 shows that the square root of AVE for each construct was greater than the absolute value of the correlation of each pair of constructs confirming discriminant validity.

Table 4. Discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Square root of AVE</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the construct validity of measures of research a confirmatory factor was computed. Fit indices of the CFA model for relationship quality are as follows: $\chi^2/DF = 72.345/21 = 3.445$, $P = 0.000$, RMR = 0.055, GFI = 0.953, AGFI = 0.898, NFI = 0.954, RFI = 0.921, IFI = 0.967, TLI = 0.943, CFI = 0.967, RMSEA = 0.089. $\chi^2/DF \leq 3$, RMR and RMSEA $\leq 0.08$ and GFI, AGFI, NFI, RFI, IFI, TLI and CFI $\geq 0.9$. Fit values are well within acceptable range. These values indicated that there is a good fit between structural model and data Bryne (2010). All correlations are significant at 0.001. This result is presented in table 5.

Table 5. CFA model for relationship quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Standardized Regression weight</th>
<th>Un standardized Regression weight</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV→F1</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV→F1</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>10.558</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV→F1</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>15.786</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS→F2</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS→F2</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>11.231</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE→F3</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE→F3</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>15.581</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE→F4</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE→F4</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>17.489</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ***: $P < 0.001$.

5. Results

The proposed hypotheses in the proposed model (H1-H6) were tested by using structural equation modeling technique (SEM) through path analysis. Table 6 shows the results of both analysis for the research model.

Table 6. Path analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Path</th>
<th>Standardized Regression weight</th>
<th>Un standardized Regression weight</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV→CS</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS→CT</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>14.096</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS→BE</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.613</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT→BE</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>4.209</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ***: $P < 0.001$.

Fit indices of both analysis for the research model are as follows: $\chi^2/DF = (7.670/2 = 3.835)$, $P = 0.000$, RMR = 0.046, GFI = 0.976, AGFI = 0.878, NFI = 0.959, RFI = 0.876, IFI = 0.964, TLI = 0.891, CFI = 0.964. Fit values are well within acceptable range. These values indicated that there is a good fit between structural model and data. Figure (2) shows the tested model.
Figure 2. Tested model

It was concluded that there is a positive significant relationship between perceived value of fast food restaurant products and customer satisfaction with them. So, H1 was supported. It was found that there is no significant relationship between perceived value of fast food restaurant products and customer trust in them. So, H2 was rejected. Results indicated that there is a positive significant relationship between customer satisfaction and customer trust. So, H3 was supported. Results revealed that there is a positive significant relationship between customer satisfaction and brand equity. So, H4 was supported. It was found that there is no significant relationship between perceived value and brand equity. So, H6 was rejected. Results indicated that customer satisfaction mediates the relationship between perceived value and brand equity. So, H7 was supported. Table 7 shows the mediating effect of customer satisfaction on the relationship between perceived value and brand equity. So, H8 was rejected.

Table 7. The mediating effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV→CS→BE</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Discussions and Conclusions

According to the results of the study, positive perceived value of good and service of a restaurant leads to high level of customer satisfaction which leads to high level of customer trust. Both high level of customer satisfaction and high level of customer trust lead to high brand equity which means high customer loyalty to the restaurant, positive word of mouth about a restaurant and high spending for purchasing products of restaurant.

7. Managerial Implications

The main role of management of a restaurant is to determine customers' expectations and to provide customers with suitable products that meet or exceed these expectations to achieve high level of customer satisfaction. Management of a restaurant should consider that offered products' benefits are greater than prices of these products to achieve high positive customer perceived value. The customers of the restaurant use some criteria to
evaluate the restaurant as whole. These criteria are called dimensions of restaurant quality. These criteria are fresh, tasty, safe and healthy food; lower prices of meals; variety of menu items; appropriateness of interior design and background music and lower waiting time to get the meals. The management of restaurant should provide its customers with these expectations at the highest level.

8. Limitations and Future Research

The current study explained how brand equity can be formed in fast food industry. There is a need to implement other researches to explain how brand equity can be formed in other industries.
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Appendix: (Questionnaire)

**Q1: Indicate The Degree Of The Agreements With The Following Proposals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Value</strong></td>
<td>(1= Extremely Disagree-5=Extremely Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Compared to the price I pay, I get a reasonable quality.</td>
<td>Zeithmal, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Compared to the quality I get, I pay a reasonable price.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Purchasing From my fast food restaurant delivers me a superior net value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Globally, my fast food restaurant is worth the money paid to buy from it.</td>
<td>Turley and Milliman, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Globally, my fast food restaurant is worth the time spent to buy from it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Globally, my fast food restaurant is worth the energy spent to buy from it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- The money spent at my fast food restaurant is lower than expected.</td>
<td>Lee, et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- The prices at my fast food restaurant are reasonable for the level of meals and services offered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- The price of purchasing from my fast food restaurants is reasonable.</td>
<td>Petrick, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- The meals and services provided by my fast food restaurants are worth the cost.</td>
<td>Itani, et al., 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- I got much more than I paid for when purchasing from my fast food restaurants</td>
<td>Boo, et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Eating at my fast food restaurant gave me pleasure.</td>
<td>Lee, et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Eating at my fast food restaurant is enjoyable.</td>
<td>Kabadayi, et al., 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- The money spent at my fast food restaurant is lower than expected.</td>
<td>Song, et al., 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- I am satisfied with the taste and smell of the food at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- I am satisfied with waiting time at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I am satisfied with the service at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I am satisfied with interior design and background music at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- I am satisfied with the safety of food at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- I am satisfied with variety of menu items at my fast food restaurants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I am satisfied with prices at my fast food restaurants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- I am satisfied with my decision to eat at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td>Cronin, et al., 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- My choice to eat at my fast food restaurant was a wise one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- I think I did the right thing when I chose to eat at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- I feel that my experience with my fast food restaurants is enjoyable.</td>
<td>Spreng, et al., 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- My fast food restaurant is good as good as I expected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- My fast food restaurants entirely fulfills my needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- My fast food restaurant usually meets my expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- I am satisfied with my experiences at my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td>Fornell, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- My experiences at my fast food restaurant have exceeded my expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- In general, my satisfaction level related to my fast food restaurant is high.</td>
<td>Laroche, et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- My fast food restaurant is reliable.</td>
<td>Ganesan and Hess, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- My fast food restaurant's foods are safe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- My fast food restaurant keeps its promises offered to its customers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- My fast food restaurants pays its close attention to its customers’ needs and interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- My fast food restaurant is attentive to its customers' problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- No fast food restaurant offer better meals and services than my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td>Oliver, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- I like my fast food restaurant more than other fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I visit my fast food restaurant regularly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I will continue to visit my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- I am a loyal customer to my fast food restaurant.</td>
<td>Pritchard, et al., 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- I always buy from my fast food restaurant as it is the best choice for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7- I will not buy from another fast food restaurant.  
8- I intend to continue purchasing from my fast food restaurant.  Lewis and Soureli, 2006  
9- I prefer my fast food restaurant to other fast food restaurants.  
10- I will be a customer of my fast food restaurant even if it moderately raises its prices.  Reith et al., 2006  
11- I am very loyal to my fast food restaurant.  
12- In the future, I intend to keep eating at my fast food restaurant.  Yi and Gong, 2013  
13- If asked, I would say a positive things about my fast food restaurant to my neighbors, friends and relatives.  
14- If asked, I would recommend my fast food restaurant to my neighbors, friends and relatives.  
15- If asked, I would encourage my neighbors, friends and relatives to deal with my fast food restaurant.  
16- Over the last years, I have purchased all of my meals from my fast food restaurant.  Hellier et al., 2003  
17- I purchase from my fast food restaurants frequently.  

Q2: Mention the name of most important fast food restaurant that you deal with.

Q3: Mention the Gender:

☐ Male ☐ Female

Q4: Choose the category that indicates to your age:

☐ Less than 18 years
☐ From 18 years to less than 30 years
☐ From 30 years to less than 40 years
☐ From 40 years to less than 50 years
☐ From 50 years to less than 60 years
☐ 60 years and more

Q5: Choose the category that indicates to your monthly income:

☐ Less than LE.1000
☐ From LE.1000 to less than LE.3000
☐ From LE.3000 to less than LE.6000
☐ From LE.6000 to less than LE.10000
☐ From LE.10000 to less than LE.15000
☐ LE.15000 or more.

Q6: Choose the category that indicates to your education level:

☐ Pre secondary school ☐ Secondary School ☐ Above secondary school
☐ Bachelor ☐ High Diploma or Master ☐ PHD
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