

A STUDY ON FACTORS AFFECTING BRAND PREFERENCE: AN EMPIRICAL APPROACH

Ms. Ankita Popli¹ , Prof. (Dr.) Manish Madan²

¹Research Scholar, Pacific University, Udaipur

² Founder & Chairman, International Association of Research & Development Organization , Delhi

ABSTRACT

In this era of throat-cut competition, it is very essential for a brand to be in the minds of customers for its sustainability. This study focused on exploring the factors of brand knowledge that make brand a preferred brand as well as to understand the brand experience factors developed due to impact of brand interactions. This study further focused on understanding the impact of brand knowledge and brand experiences which helps in making brand, a preferred brand. To achieve these focused areas, six hypothesis were created at 5% level of significance which were further analyzed with the help of various statistical tools like correlation and multiple regression analysis. The analysis was done with the help of SPSS 20 version software to investigate the impact of preferred brand on the intention to re-purchase and various recommendations were given in the end.

Keywords –Brand experience, brand knowledge, brand preference, correlation, multiple regression.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term brand is neither the physical entity nor it is the actual service. It is the customers only which make any product a brand. Branding is done in the minds of the customers. **Kevin Keller** defined brand knowledge as awareness of the brand name and belief about the brand image. Valuable beliefs are reliable beliefs – consistent and durable. In addition to belief, consumer experience is a significant part of brand knowledge and understanding. Consumer experience consists of emotions, sentiments, excitements, sensations, and activity. Brand awareness is connected to the perceived depiction of the brand (**Peter and Olson 2001**). In the terms of a layman, the brand awareness and understanding of customers is basically the information of product that is stored in the memory of the customers. This brand knowledge includes full description of the product as well as the evaluated and criticized brand information. The perception, observation and opinion of the customers about the actions of brands is known as brand experience. A brand experience is basically the interface among the individual and a tangible or intangible brand. Hence a brand experience can include one or more of a recipient's five senses and cause any kind of response. Experiencing the brand through a variety of situations creates in the mind of a potential consumer a kind of profile full of feelings and attitudes about the brand, helping the consumer to psychologically predict what items associated with it are likely to be like. Preference for

any brand reflects an aspiration of customer to use a particular product(s) or service(s) of a company; even when there are equally-priced and equally-available alternatives. In fact, more often than not, brand preference indicates a desire to seek out a specific product or service even when it requires paying more or expending more effort to obtain it! Brand preference is important to companies because it provides an indicator of their customers' loyalty, the success of their marketing tactics, and the strength of their respective brands. The notion of preference has been considered in different disciplines such as economists, psychologists, sociology. On the other hand there is no commonly agreed definition of preference among these disciplines.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Brands are important valuable intangible assets for companies, a distinctive tool that builds a long-term relationship with the consumers, and protects its' rights (Kolter et al., 2009). The first three decision-making phases of brand loyalty constitute the focal point of brand preference. It describes the stated preference toward certain brands over time, accompanied by behavioural consistency (Moschis et al., 1984). Brand preference is distinct from attitudinal loyalty (Mattila, 2001); however, both assume that consumers' strong beliefs about the brand cognitive structure enhance brand loyalty (Kim et al., 2011). Rossiter and Bellman, (2005) suggested different levels of preferences and their corresponding states of loyalty. There is strong brand preference for single or multiple brands; the state at which consumers can be loyal to a certain brand. Economically, the main target of the consumer in the choice task is to satisfy his preference and select the alternative with maximum utility (Rizvi, 2001). Brand liking is related to the strength of positive brand assets (Anselmsson et al., 2008). Brand commitment refers to the deep emotional attachment of consumers to brands (Carlson et al., 2008; Desai and Raju, 2007). Petruzzellis (2010) compared the impact of hedonic and utilitarian benefits on consumer brand choices of mobile phones. He categorized consumers into three groups. The brand huggies refers to those who use mobiles to keep in touch with their distant life. Technology enthusiasts focus on the technology and technical performance more than social life, while pragmatists focus on price. The results of that study demonstrated the importance of hedonic attributes over the utilitarian attributes in mobile choices. The study of Tzou and Lu (2009) addressed the impact of brand attachment on the use fashion technology (laptop-Sony Vaio) and the mediating role of utilitarian and hedonic brand attributes. The results supported the significant indirect impact of brand attachment on fashion technology usage mediated by the hedonic factors. Moreover, the findings show insignificant impact of the brand usefulness on fashion technology usage and negative impact of the perceived ease of use on behaviour. Lin (2002) found that differences on brand preferences can be related to demographics and/or psychographic variables.

III. RESEARCH GAP

As per the review of literature it was observed that most of the prior studies concerned with examining the impact of brand experience on brand loyalty (Brakus et al, 2009; Biedenbach and Marell, 2010; Pullman and Gross, 2004), brand relationship (Chang and Chieng, 2006), satisfaction (Ha and Perks, 2005; Morgan-Thomas and Veloutsou, 2011 Rose et al, 2012), and brand value (Tsai, 2005). However, this considers being the first study assuming the direct impact of brand knowledge, brand experience on brand preference and consequently on the re-purchase intention and recommendation to others.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

1. To explore the brand knowledge factors that make brand a preferred brand.
2. To understand the brand experience factors developed due to impact of brand interactions.
3. To understand the impact of brand knowledge and brand experiences in making brand a preferred brand.
4. To investigate the impact of preferred brand on the intention to re-purchase and recommendation to others.

V. HYPOTHESES OF STUDY

The following Hypotheses were formulated as follows:-

Here HO represents Null Hypothesis and HA represents Alternative Hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1:-

H01: There is no significant relationship between Demographic factors (Age, Gender, Income, Education, and Marital Status) with that of the Brand Preference.

HA1: There is significant relationship between Demographic factors (Age, Gender, Income, Education, and Marital Status) with that of the Brand Preference.

Hypothesis 2:-

H02: There is no significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the Brand Preference.

HA2: There is significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the Brand Preference.

Hypothesis 3:-

H03: There is no significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

HA3: There is significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Hypothesis 4:-

H04: There is no significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the Brand Preference.

HA4: There is significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the Brand Preference.

Hypothesis 5:-

H05: There is no significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

HA5: There is significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Hypothesis 6:-

H06: There is no significant relationship between Brand Preference with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

HA6: There is significant relationship between Brand Preference with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main objectives of the study are to understand the impact of brand knowledge and brand experience on the brand preference and consequently leading to the intention to re – purchase and recommendation to others. In

order to achieve this objective, the researchers had employed the deductive approach of the research and followed the step by step procedure. The theoretical foundation of the proposed hypothesis is obtained from the literature. However the researchers do not maintain completely the deductive approach of research and apart from this the primary data was obtained to add on variables that were missing in the existing literature.

a. Research Design

This study is trying to investigate the dimensions of brand preferences and consequently its impact on the intention to re – purchase and recommendation to others. As the literature plays a vital role in the theoretical foundation of the proposed hypothesis, so the research design in this study is being divided in two stages viz. first stage comprised of the exploratory stage as the researcher has been interested in gaining insights about the factors affecting the customer preferences for different brand while second stage comprised of the primary data obtained from cross sectional sample survey about the characteristics of the customers. This second stage research design is called descriptive – explanatory stage. A systemized and organized study was done to reach the desired objectives of the study.

b. Focus Group

The most frequently used method in marketing and business research is focus groups which examine attitude, behavior, emotions, experiences etc. of the customers about a particular product or service. From this method some important factors and priorities were noticed that were missing in the literature. The main objective of introducing focus group in this study as it helps in qualitative analysis of data. In this study the same particular questions in sequence given to four focus groups. These four focus groups consisting of homogeneous participants. The sampling frame of the focus group survey includes respondents living in Delhi of both the genders. This focus group helped in investigating the differences across the respondents. The focus groups are formed on the basis of gender, age and education level of the respondents. There were eight respondents in each focus group and were arranged using a snowball technique.

Sources of Data

To cater the need of the research, the researchers have used primary data through self-constructed structured Questionnaire and as far as the secondary data is concerned that was obtained from various reports, web sites, and journals etc.

c. Sampling Technique

For this study, the population is the respondents living in Delhi which are users of mobile phones of different genders. Cross sectional research design was adopted. Non Probability convenience sampling technique was used to gather data from the respondents because the sampling frame is unavailable.

d. Data Collection Technique

Self – constructed structured questionnaire was used to gather data from the respondents living in various areas of Delhi and using mobile phones. As the shopping malls are expanding and flourishing in Delhi so the researchers decided to approach respondents in various malls of Delhi. A sample size of 300 was considered good for the study. A total of 351 filled questionnaires were received from the respondents. Out of these 26 questionnaires were discarded and 325 questionnaires were used for the study.



Various statistical tests like Normality, Reliability and Validity tests were done to fulfill the necessary and sufficient conditions of statistical tools. Hypothesis testing was done with the help of correlation and regression analysis using statistical analysis software SPSS version 21.

e. About the Questionnaire

In order to develop a questionnaire to reach the desired objective a study of Churchill (1979, 1995) was followed. In the questionnaire there were nine sections. Section A consisting of demographic profile of the respondents. Section B contains 7 statements related to brand preference of the respondents. Section C contains 3 statements related to intention to re – purchase and recommendation to others. Section D contains 28 statements related to brand experience of the respondents. Section E contains 7 statements related to brand knowledge of respondents. Statements were rated on five-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The measurement items are adapted from the studies of Duarte and Raposo, (2010); Hellier et al., (2003), Jamal and AL-Marri, (2010), Overby and Lee, (2006), and Sirgy et al., (1997).

VII. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

a. Test of Normality

Table 1: Results of K – S test for Normality

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Brand Knowledge	.135	325	.000	.926	325	.000
Brand Experience	.172	325	.000	.883	325	.000
Brand Preference	.192	325	.000	.804	325	.000
Re-purchase Intentions and Recommendation to others	.144	325	.000	.914	325	.000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk (K-S test) of normality was done to make sure that data is normally distributed or not. From table 1 it is clear that all the results are found to be insignificant as in all the cases p<.001. Thus, the distribution of data is found to be normal.

b. Reliability Analysis

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
Brand Knowledge(BK)	0.814	7
Brand Experience(BE)	0.713	28
Brand Preference(BP)	0.838	7
Re-purchase and Recommendation (RR)	0.772	3
Whole Questionnaire	0.784	45

In order to check the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach’s Alpha test was applied. The value of Cronbach’s alpha is found to be 0.814 in brand knowledge, 0.713 in brand experience, 0.838 in brand preference, and 0.772 in re-purchase and recommendation to others of the questionnaire, which is well above than 0.6. Also the overall value of Cronbach’s alpha is 0.784. As the value of Cronbach’s Alpha is more than 0.6, which considers the instrument to be reliable for the study. Therefore, the high Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient in this study represents a high consistency and reliability among statements in questionnaire.

c. Validity Analysis

Table 3: KMO and Barlett’s test of Sphericity

Brand Knowledge (BK)	KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.823
	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	8372.136
		Df	255
		Sig.	0.000
Brand Experience (BE)	KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.882
	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	9284.128
		Df	198
		Sig.	0.000
Brand Preference (BP)	KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.811
	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	8812.829
		Df	190
		Sig.	0.000
Re-purchase and Recommendation to others (RR)	KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.942
	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	8126.228
		Df	195
		Sig.	0.000

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test was done to measure the homogeneity of variables and Bartlett's test of sphericity was done to test for the correlation among the variables used. From **table 3**, it is found that the value for Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was more than 0.6 in all the parts of questionnaire, as it is 0.823 in brand knowledge, 0.882 in brand experience, 0.811 in brand preference, and .942 in re-purchase and recommendation to others. Also Bartlett's Test of Sphericity has significant value less than 0.05 at 5 % level of significance in all the parts of questionnaire. Thus it is concluded that instrument is accepted for the study.

d. Coefficients of Correlation

Karl Pearson Coefficient of correlation was calculated to find the significant relationships between different dimensions.

Table 4: Coefficient of Correlation

		BK	BE	BP	RR
Pearson Correlation Coefficient	RR	- 0.027	0.217	0.816	1
Sig. (2 – tailed)		0.821	0.091	0.000*	-
Pearson Correlation Coefficient	BP	0.724	0.836	1	0.816

Sig. (2 – tailed)		0.000*	0.000*	-	0.000*
Pearson Correlation Coefficient	BE	0.758	1	0.836	0.217
Sig. (2 – tailed)		0.000*	-	0.000*	0.091
Pearson Correlation Coefficient	BK	1	0.758	0.724	- 0.027
Sig. (2 – tailed)		-	0.000*	0.000*	0.821

From Table 4, it is quite clear that Brand Preference is significantly associated with re-purchase and recommendation to others. Brand preference is significantly associated with Brand knowledge, Brand experience and re-purchase and recommendation. However there is some association in some variables while some have no relationship at all.

VIII. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Hypothesis 1:-

H01: There is no significant relationship between Demographic factors (Age, Gender, Income, Education, and Marital Status) with that of the Brand Preference.

HA1: There is significant relationship between Demographic factors (Age, Gender, Income, Education, and Marital Status) with that of the Brand Preference.

Relationship between Demographic factors and Brand Preference

Table 5: Relationship between Demographic factors and Brand Preference

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	1.722	0.031		11.297	0.000*
Demographic factors	0.724	0.028	0.736	11.582	0.000*

Table 5 indicates that the multiple regression analysis identifies that brand preference is positively affected by demographic factors. It is clear that the demographic factors contribute to the brand preference. Since the positive relationship is found between both the variables. Since p – value is less than 0.01 that means it is significant at 1% level of significance so the alternative hypothesis is supported that is there is significant relationship between demographic factors with that of the brand preference.

Table 6: Regression Analysis – demographic factors and brand preference

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	S.E. of estimates	F	Sig.
1	0.821	0.674	0.651	0.6124	143.28	0.000*

a: Predictors: (Constant), Demographic factors, b: Dependent variable: Brand Preference

Table 6 shows the association between the demographic factors and brand preference of customers using mobile phones in Delhi. The coefficient of correlation between demographic factors and the brand preference of customers is 0.821 and the value of R square is 0.674. Thus around three fourth of variation in dependent

variable that is brand preference of product is explained by the independent variable demographic factors. Since the Adjusted R square is found to be 0.651 which indicates that 65.1% of the variation in brand preference of customers is explained by the demographic factors. The significant value is found to be 0.000 which is below than 0.05, thus it is significant at 5% level of significance. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. So, there is significant relationship between Demographic factors (Age, Gender, Income, Education, and Marital Status) with that of the Brand Preference.

Hypothesis 2:-

H02: There is no significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the Brand Preference.

HA2: There is significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the Brand Preference.

Relationship between Brand Knowledge and Brand Preference

Table 7: Relationship between Brand Knowledge and Brand Preference

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	1.247	0.214		13.726	0.000*
Brand Knowledge	0.658	0.084	0.636	13.226	0.000*

Table 7 indicates that the multiple regression analysis identifies that brand preference is positively affected by brand knowledge. It is clear that the brand knowledge contribute to the brand preference. Since p – value is less than 0.01 that means it is significant at 1% level of significance so the alternative hypothesis is supported that is there is significant relationship between brand knowledge with that of the brand preference.

Table 8: Regression Analysis – brand knowledge and brand preference

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	S.E. of estimates	F	Sig.
1	0.724	0.524	0.518	0.5242	136.82	0.000*

a: Predictors: (Constant), Brand Knowledge, b: Dependent variable: Brand Preference

Table 8 shows the association between the brand knowledge and brand preference of customers using mobile phones in Delhi. The coefficient of correlation between brand knowledge and the brand preference of customers is 0.724 and the value of R square is 0.524. Thus more than half of variation in dependent variable that is brand preference of products is explained by the independent variable brand knowledge. Since the Adjusted R square is found to be 0.518 which indicates that 51.8% of the variation in brand preference of customers is explained by the brand knowledge. The significant value is found to be 0.000 which is below than 0.05, thus it is significant at 5% level of significance. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. So, there is significant relationship between brand knowledge with that of the Brand Preference.

Hypothesis 3:-

H03: There is no significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

HA3: There is significant relationship between Brand Knowledge with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Relationship between Brand Knowledge and Re-purchase Intentions and Recommendation to others

Table 9: Relationship between Brand Knowledge and Re-purchase Intentions and Recommendation to others

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	1.427	0.416		28.626	0.881
Brand Knowledge	- 0.026	0.041	0.061	28.618	0.826

Table 9 indicates that the multiple regression analysis identifies that re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is negatively affected by brand knowledge. It is clear that the brand knowledge did not contribute to the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others. Since p – value is more than 0.01 that means it is not significant at 1% level of significance so the null hypothesis is supported that is there is no significant relationship between brand knowledge with that of the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Table 10: Regression Analysis – brand knowledge and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	S.E. of estimates	F	Sig.
1	- 0.027	0.001	- 0.082	0.2421	146.22	0.837

a: Predictors: (Constant), Brand Knowledge, b: Dependent variable: re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others

Table 10 shows the association between the brand knowledge and re-purchases intentions and recommendation to others using mobile phones in Delhi. The coefficient of correlation between brand knowledge and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is – 0.027 and the value of R square is 0.001. Since the Adjusted R square is found to be - 0.082 which indicates that the negative variation in re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is explained by the brand knowledge. The significant value is found to be 0.837 which is above than 0.05, thus it is insignificant at 5% level of significance. Thus, null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected. So, there is no significant relationship between brand knowledge with that of the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Hypothesis 4:-

H04: There is no significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the Brand Preference.

HA4: There is significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the Brand Preference.

Relationship between Brand Experience and Brand Preference

Table 11: Relationship between Brand Experience and Brand Preference

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	1.718	0.621		11.262	0.000*
Brand Experience	0.738	0.012	0.733	11.684	0.000*

Table 11 indicates that the multiple regression analysis identifies that brand preference is positively affected by brand experience. It is clear that the brand experience contributes to the brand preference of customers. Since p – value is less than 0.01 that means it is significant at 1% level of significance so the null hypothesis is rejected and can be concluded that there is significant relationship between brand experiences with that of the brand preference of customers.

Table 12: Regression Analysis – brand experience and brand preference

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	S.E. of estimates	F	Sig.
1	0.836	0.699	0.682	0.2162	136.26	0.000*

a: Predictors: (Constant), Brand Experience, b: Dependent variable: Brand Preference

Table 12 shows the association between the brand experience and brand preference of customers using mobile phones in Delhi. The coefficient of correlation between brand experience and brand preference is 0.836 and the value of R square is 0.699. Since the Adjusted R square is found to be 0.682 which indicates that the 68.2% variation in brand preference of customers is explained by the brand experience. The significant value is found to be 0.000 which is below than 0.05, thus it is significant at 5% level of significance. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. So, there is significant relationship between brand experiences with that of the brand preference of customers.

Hypothesis 5:-

H05: There is no significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

HA5: There is significant relationship between Brand Experience with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Relationship between Brand Experience and Re-purchase Intentions and Recommendation to others

Table 13: Relationship between Brand Experience and Re-purchase Intentions and Recommendation to others

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	2.714	0.031		27.682	0.813
Brand Experience	0.264	0.018	0.288	29.816	0.081

Table 13 indicates that the multiple regression analysis identifies that re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is not affected by brand experience. It is clear that the brand experience did not contribute much to the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others. Since p – value is more than 0.01 that means it is not significant at 1% level of significance so the null hypothesis is supported that is there is no significant relationship between brand experience with that of the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Table 14: Regression Analysis – brand experience and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	S.E. of estimates	F	Sig.
1	0.217	0.047	0.042	0.2186	138.21	0.528

a: Predictors: (Constant), Brand Experience, b: Dependent variable: re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others

Table 14 shows the association between the brand experience and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others using mobile phones in Delhi. The coefficient of correlation between brand experience and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is 0.217 and the value of R square is 0.047. Since the Adjusted R square is found to be 0.042 which indicates that only the 4.7% variation in re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is explained by the brand experience. The significant value is found to be 0.528 which is above than 0.05, thus it is insignificant at 5% level of significance. Thus, null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected. So, there is no significant relationship between brand experience with that of the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Hypothesis 6:-

H06: There is no significant relationship between Brand Preference with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

HA6: There is significant relationship between Brand Preference with that of the re – purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Relationship between Brand Preference and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others

Table 15: Relationship between Brand Preference and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	β		
(Constant)	3.726	0.041		11.615	0.000*
Brand Preference	0.812	0.046	0.862	11.264	0.000*

Table 15 indicates that the multiple regression analysis identifies that re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is positively affected by brand preference. It is clear that the brand preference contribute to the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others. Since p – value is less than 0.01 that means it is significant at 1% level of significance so the alternative hypothesis is supported that is there is significant relationship between brand experience with that of the re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others.

Table 16: Regression Analysis – brand preference and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	S.E. of estimates	F	Sig.
1	0.816	0.666	0.662	0.4216	146.21	0.000*

a: Predictors: (Constant), Brand preference, b: Dependent variable: re-purchase intentions and recommendations to others

Table 16 shows the association between the brand preference of customers using mobile phones in Delhi and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others. The coefficient of correlation between the brand preference of customers and re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is 0.816 and the value of R square is 0.666. Thus 66.6% of variation in dependent variable that is re-purchases intentions and recommendation to others is explained by the independent variable brand preference. Since the Adjusted R square is found to be 0.662 which indicates that around three fourth of the variation in re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others is explained by the brand preference. The significant value is found to be 0.000 which is below than 0.05, thus it is significant at 5% level of significance. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. So, there is significant relationship between re-purchase intentions and recommendation to others with that of the Brand Preference.

IX. CONCLUSION

1. The study reveals the brand preference determinants. This study concentrates on multiple factors that constitute customer knowledge and experience of the brand which enables the determination of salient factors in preference formation. Thus, the study highlights the importance of experiential responses besides the cognitive component of brand knowledge in predicting consumer preferences.
2. It is observed from statistical analysis that brand experiences directly affect the customer brand preferences.
3. The brand experience plays a significant role in delivering the value created by the brand attributes that shape consumer preferences.

4. The findings reveal the full mediating role of brand experience in terms of the relationship between brand personality and brand preferences.
5. The research defines the components of brand experience: sensory, emotional, intellectual and behavioural. These are evoked by contacting the brand at different levels of involvement.
6. The study reveals the determinants of re-purchase intentions and recommendation of brand to others.
7. The study reveals that demographic factors play a vital role in the brand preference.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As far as the technological products are concerned like mobile phones, building the brand preference is not so easy. Customers using technological products are rational and irrational in their preferences. In such kind of products brand experience plays very important role in the preferences of brand. Customers using the brands can advertise the product through word of mouth to non-users through their experience.
2. Price is critical, it is important in terms of developing consumer preferences for technological brands. Pricing of technological products is one of the company's important decisions. The rapid technological advancement and innovation makes the product life short and volatile; therefore, companies place great emphasis on the pricing decision.
3. To position the brand based on symbolic associations, practitioners need to differentiate between the construct of self-congruity and brand personality. The findings did not support the direct impact of brand personality on either brand preference or repurchase intention.
4. The objective of branding strategy is to frame consumer perceptions and preferences for certain brands. Through this study, managers can develop an experiential branding strategy; position, build, and conceive the brand in consumers' mind aligning the brand experience.
5. Managers need to take advantage of consumer responses induced from the technological product examined characteristics and affecting their preferences. They need to put emphasis on building strong hedonic experiences for consumers.
6. Managers can benefit from other types of experiences unperceived by the consumers but created by the company itself. Thus, broadening its experiential appeal from sense and feel to think and explore relate and act appeal. Taking advantage of enhancing consumer preferences and purchasing decisions using multiple experiential dimensions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anselmsson, J., Johansson, U., and Persson, N. (2008). The Battle of Brands in the Swedish Market for Consumer Packaged Food: A Cross-Category Examination of Brand Preference and Liking. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(1), 63-79.
- [2] Biedenbach, G., and Marell, A. (2010). The Impact of Customer Experience on Brand Equity in a Business-to-Business Service Setting. *Brand Management*, 17(6), 446-458.
- [3] Brakus, J.J., Schmitt, B.H., and Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand Experience: What Is It? How Is It Measured? Does It Affect Loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 73(3), 52-68.
- [4] Carlson, B.D., Suter, T.A., and Brown, T.J. (2008). Social Versus Psychological Brand Community: The Role of Psychological Sense of Brand Community. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(4), 284-291.



- [5] Chang, Pao-Long., and Chieng, Ming-Hua. (2006). Building Consumer–Brand Relationship: A Cross-Cultural Experiential View.*Psychology and Marketing*, 23(11), 927-959.
- [6] Churchill, G.A. (1995). *Marketing Research Methodological Foundation*, 6th ed. The Dryden Press.
- [7] Desai, K.K., and Raju, S. (2007). Adverse Influence of Brand Commitment on Consideration of and Preferences for Competing Brands.*Psychology and Marketing*, 24(7), 595-614.
- [8] Duarte, P.A.O., and Raposo, M.L.B. (2010). A PLS model to Study Brand Preference: An Application to the Mobile Phone Market, in *Handbook of Partial Least Squares*, Springer Handbooks of Computational Statistics.
- [9] Ha, Hong-Youl., and Perks, H. (2005), Effects of Consumer Perceptions of Brand Experience on the Web: Brand Familiarity, Satisfaction and Brand Trust.*Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 4(6), 438-452.
- [10] Hellier, P.K., Geursen, G.M., Carr, R.A., and Rickard, J.A. (2003). Customer Repurchase Intention: A General Structural Equation Model.*European Journal of Marketing*, 37(11/12), 17 - 63.
- [11] Jamal, A., and Al-Marri, M. (2007). Exploring the Effect of Self-Image Congruence and Brand Preference on Satisfaction: the Role of Expertise.*Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(7/8), 613-629.
- [12] Johar, J. S., Berkman, H. (1997). Assessing the Predictive Validity of two Methods of Measuring Self-Image Congruence.*Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(3), 229-241.
- [13] Kim, D., Magnini, V. P., and Singal, M. (2011). The Effects of Customers' Perceptions of Brand Personality in Causal Theme Restaurants.*International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 448-458.
- [14] Kotler, P., Keller, K.L., Brady, M., Goodman, M., and Hansen, T. (2009). *Marketing Management*, Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- [15] Lin, Ching-Feng. (2002). Segmenting Customer Brand Preference: Demographic or Psychographic.*Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 11(4), 249-268.
- [16] Mattila, A. (2001). Emotional Bonding and Restaurant Loyalty.*Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42(6), 73–79.
- [17] Morgan-thomas, A., and Veloutsou, C. (2011). Beyond Technology Acceptance: Brand Relationships and Online Brand Experience.*Journal of Business Research*, 13(2), 25 – 38.
- [18] Moschis, G.P., Moore, R.L., and Stanley, T. J. (1984). An Exploratory Study of Brand Loyalty Development.*Advances in Consumer Research*, 11(1), 412-417.
- [19] Overby, J. W., and Lee, Eun-Ju. (2006). The Effect of Utilitarian and Hedonic Online Shopping Value on Consumer Preference and Intentions.*Journal of Business Research*, 59(10), 1160-1166.
- [20] Peter, J. P., and Jerry C. Olson (2001). *Consumer Behavior*, Chicago: Irwin.
- [21] Petruzzellis, L. (2010). Mobile Phone Choice: Technology Versus Marketing: The Brand Effect in the Italian Market.*European Journal of Marketing*, 44(5), 610-634.
- [22] Pullman, M.E., and Gross, M.A. (2004). Ability of Experience Design Elements to Elicit Emotions and Loyalty Behaviors.*Decision Sciences*, 35(3), Summer, 551-578.
- [23] Rizvi, S.A.T. (2001). Preference formation and the axioms of choice, *Review of Political Economy*, 13(2), 141-159.
- [24] Rossiter, J.R., and Bellman, S. (2005). *Marketing Communications: theory and applications*, Pearson.

- [25] Rose, S., Clark, M., Samouel, P. and Hair, N. (2012). Online customer experience in e-retailing: an empirical model of antecedents and outcomes, *Journal of Retailing*, 88(2), 308-322.
- [26] Sirgy, M.J., Grewal, D., Mangleburg, T.F., Park, Jse-ok., Chon, Kye-Sung., Claiborne, C. B.,
- [27] Tsai, Shu-pai. (2005). Utility, cultural symbolism and emotion: a comprehensive model of brand purchase value, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 22(3), 277-291.
- [28] Tzou, R.C. and Lu, H.P. (2009). Exploring the emotional, aesthetic, and ergonomic facets of innovative product on fashion technology acceptance model, *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 28(4), 311-322.