

A Study on Relationship between Brand Loyalty States – In the Context of Virtual Smartphone Brand Communities

¹Nandukrishna T Ajith & ²Linda Susan Mathew

¹Strategic Coordinator, AlphaFork Technologies, Angamaly, Kerala (India)

²Assistant Professor, CET School of Management, College of Engineering, Trivandrum, Kerala (India)

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 13 March 2019

Keywords

Brand Loyalty, Loyalty states, Cognitive Loyalty, Conative Loyalty, Affective Loyalty, Behavioral loyalty

Corresponding Author

Email: nandukrishnatajith[at]gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Brand loyalty as a sequential process comprises of 4 distinctive states such as- Cognitive, Affective, Conative and behavioral Loyalty. This study explores the effect of one brand loyalty states on preceding brand loyalty state in the context of virtual brand communities for smartphones. The study was conducted on a simple random sample of 260 members in branded communities. Results showed that Cognitive Loyalty has a positive effect on affective brand loyalty, conative brand loyalty has an effect on behavioral brand loyalty. There is no significant effect of effective brand loyalty on conative brand loyalty

1. Introduction

Oliver (1999) defines brand loyalty as a sequential process comprising of 4 distinctive states such as- Cognitive, Affective, Conative and behavioral Loyalty. They suggest that purchasing (Repeat) behavior is based on appropriate performance (cognition), appropriate attitude (affect), and appropriate intention (conation). Cognitive loyalty, the first phase of loyalty is based on brand beliefs. In this stage a person prefers one brand over the other based on beliefs about brand characteristics. Härtel et al. (2008) defines Cognitive loyalty as a psychological preference for brand which consists of positive brand thoughts and beliefs. Whereas affective loyalty is developed from a series of satisfactory usage experiences, it can be reduced through competitive offerings (Sambandam & Lord,1995). Worthington (2009) defines affective loyalty as an emotional connection with the brand. Conative loyalty roots from repeated instances of positive feelings towards the brand and thus represents a stronger level of loyalty than affective loyalty. According to Oliver (1999) Behavioral loyalty is the ultimate level of loyalty, and it is about overcoming obstacles during repurchase. Considering brand loyalty as sequential process, This paper tries to find out effect of a brand loyalty level on the preceding brand loyalty state.

2. Literature Review

Jang et.al (2008) defines community by using 3 dimensions - location, social interaction and bonding. They defines brand communities as a place where people meet build relationships based on the collective identity of brand community.

Yoshida et.al (2018) Integrated various streams of theoretical reasoning like social identity theory and customer engagement theory, they examine the relationship between consumer responses in social media and brand loyalty Japanese professional sports. Data were collected through online survey from 309 members. They found opinion seeking characteristics and the entertainment value of social media

page have positively influence on online brand community identification which in turn has a positive impact on brand engagement in social media engagement.

Ramesh Kumar et.al (2005) examines the composite effect of brand benefits, symbolism, trust, genetic influence and price consciousness among consumers on brand loyalty for toothpastes. Results shows that there is a significant effect of brand benefits, trust and price consciousness on brand loyalty. Results recommends that marketers should balance the traditional views of brand loyalty with the emerging views of brand migration

Worthington (2009) believes that human behavior is a composition of three dimensions: Cognitive dimension, emotional dimension, and behavioral dimension. Hence, the author therefore considers brand loyalty as the fusion of these 3 aspects. The author follows the Oliver's (1999) model of brand loyalty by excluding conative loyalty dimension. They also develop a brand loyalty audit framework that uses a tri-dimensional approach to brand loyalty, which includes behavioral loyalty, emotional and cognitive loyalty. They propose a three dimensional matrix (cognitive, emotional and behavioral loyalty) to enable a brand loyalty audit.

Heiner et.al (2006) explains that even though Oliver's 1997 four-stage loyalty model has recently subjected to critical examination, the role of moderating variables has not considered. They found that shows that these moderators variables has an impact on the development of the loyalty stages. Moderator variables that found to have an effect on loyalty model are age, income, education, price orientation and membership in loyalty programs

3. Objectives

1. To find the Impact of cognitive brand loyalty on affective brand loyalty
2. To find the impact of affective brand loyalty on conative brand loyalty

- 3. To find the impact of conative brand loyalty on behavioral brand loyalty

4. Research Methodology

Study was conducted on a sample of 260 members in a virtual smartphone brand community in Trivandrum District of Kerala. Simple random sampling technique was employed. Primary data was collected through questionnaires and collected data was analyzed using MS Excel

5. Data Analysis

Impact of Cognitive Brand Loyalty on Affective Brand Loyalty

Hypotheses:

- H₀: There is no significant effect of cognitive brand loyalty on affective brand loyalty
- H₁: There is an effect of cognitive brand loyalty on affective brand loyalty

Table 5.1: Regression Statistics

Observations	260.000
Sum of weights	260.000
DF	258.000
R ²	0.660
Adjusted R ²	0.659
MSE	0.362
RMSE	0.601

Table 5.2: Model parameters

Source	Value	Standard error	t	Pr > t	Lower bound (95%)	Upper bound (95%)
Intercept	0.713	0.143	4.977	< 0.0001	0.431	0.995
Cognitive Loyalty	0.874	0.039	22.376	< 0.0001	0.797	0.951

Total Affective Loyalty = 0.712680523829356+0.873998258389389*Cognitive Loyalty

Inference

P value obtained is less than 0.05 (Table 5.2), hence rejecting the null hypothesis. There is an effect of Cognitive Loyalty on Affective Loyalty. R²= 0.660 (Table 5.1), which indicates that Cognitive loyalty shows 66.6% variance over Affective loyalty

Effect of Affective Brand Loyalty on Conative Brand Loyalty

Hypotheses:

- H₀: There is no significant effect of affective brand loyalty on conative brand loyalty
- H₁: There is an effect of affective brand loyalty on conative brand loyalty

Table 5.3: Regression Statistics

Observations	260.000
Sum of weights	260.000

DF	258.000
R ²	0.662
Adjusted R ²	0.660
MSE	0.475
RMSE	0.689

Table 5.4: Model parameters

Source	Value	Standard error	T	Pr > t	Lower bound (95%)	Upper bound (95%)
Intercept	-0.094	0.164	-0.575	0.565	-0.417	0.229
Total Affective Loyalty	0.935	0.042	22.458	< 0.0001	0.853	1.016

Inference

P value obtained is less than 0.05 (Table 5.4), hence accepting the null hypothesis. There is no effect of affective Loyalty on conative brand loyalty

Impact of Conative Brand Loyalty on Behavioral Loyalty

Table 5.5 Regression Statistics

Observations	260.000
Sum of weights	260.000
DF	258.000
R ²	0.552
Adjusted R ²	0.550
MSE	0.488
RMSE	0.699

Table 5.6: Model Parameters

Source	Value	Standard error	T	Pr > t	Lower bound (95%)	Upper bound (95%)
Intercept	0.773	0.134	5.757	< 0.0001	0.509	1.038
Total Conative Loyalty	0.655	0.037	17.831	< 0.0001	0.583	0.727

Behavioral Loyalty = 0.773+0.655*Conative Loyalty

Inference

P value obtained is less than 0.05 (Table 5.5), hence rejecting the null hypothesis. There is an effect of conative loyalty on behavioral loyalty. R²= 0.552 (Table 5.6), which indicates that conative loyalty shows 55.2% variance over emotional engagement

6. Conclusion

The objective of this study was to find the impact of a brand loyalty states on preceding brand loyalty stage. Simple random sample of 220 members in an online brand community were selected for the study. Regression analysis was conducted in between cognitive brand loyalty state and affective brand loyalty, Between affective brand loyalty and conative brand loyalty, and between conative brand loyalty and behavioral brand loyalty. It was found that cognitive brand loyalty has a positive effect on affective brand loyalty and there

is a positive effect between conative brand loyalty and behavioral brand loyalty. There is no significant relationship between affective brand loyalty and conative brand loyalty.

More studies on the topic have to conduct in different industry and demographic contexts.

References

1. Evanschitzky, H., & Wunderlich, M. (2006). An Examination of Moderator Effects in the Four-Stage Loyalty Model. *Journal Of Service Research*, 8(4), 330-345. doi: 10.1177/1094670506286325
2. Härtel, C., & Russell-Bennett, R. (2010). Heart versus mind: The functions of emotional and cognitive loyalty. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 18(1), 1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ausmj.2009.10.003
3. Jang, H., Ko, I., & Koh, J. (2007). The Influence of Online Brand Community Characteristics on Community Commitment and Brand Loyalty. *2007 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS07)*. doi:10.1109/hicss.2007.544
4. Oliver, R. (1999). Whence Consumer Loyalty?. *Journal Of Marketing*, 63, 33. doi: 10.2307/1252099
5. Ramesh Kumar, S., & Advani, J. (2005). Factors Affecting Brand Loyalty: A study in an emerging market on fast moving consumer goods. *Journal Of Customer Behaviour*, 4(2), 251-275. doi: 10.1362/1475392054797223
6. Sambandam, R., & Lord, K. (1995). Switching behavior in automobile markets: A consideration-sets model. *Journal Of The Academy Of Marketing Science*, 23(1), 57-65. doi: 10.1007/bf02894612
7. Worthington, S., Russell-Bennett, R., & Härtel, C. (2009). A tri-dimensional approach for auditing brand loyalty. *Journal Of Brand Management*, 17(4), 243-253. doi: 10.1057/bm.2009.24
8. Yoshida, M., Gordon, B., Nakazawa, M., Shibuya, S., & Fujiwara, N. (2018). Bridging the gap between social media and behavioral brand loyalty. *Electronic Commerce Research And Applications*, 28, 208-218. doi: 10.1016/j.elerap.2018.02.005