# Determinants Of Intention To Stay With A Brand Of Mobile Phone Among Undergraduates In Oyo Town

# AKANBI, Paul A, Ph.D

Department of Business Administration Faculty of Management Sciences Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo Oyo State, Nigeria. , pa.akanbi@acu.edu.ng +234-8034813651

# ADEYEYE, Tolulope C., Ph.D

Department of Business Administration Faculty of Commerce University of Eswatini, Swaziland

pp 354-362

# **ABSTRACT**

his study focused on the determinants of intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates with a particular reference to Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Nigeria. The objectives of this study were to determine whether Length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence, and involvement were predictors of intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone and also to establish the relationship between these factors and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Primary data was used for this study. The subjects of this study were four hundred and sixty-nine students in the university. The hypotheses formulated for this study were tested using Multiple Regression and Pearson Scorrelation.

Findings from this study revealed that length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence, and involvement were predictors of intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduate with F = 124.358; R = .573, Adj. R = .569; P < .01. The factors also positively correlated with intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

The study concluded and recommended that the management of mobile phone producers should try as much as possible to build the commitment to brand by consumers by introducing important features and attributes into their brands of phone in order to boost sales and gain customer loyalty.

**Keywords:** length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, involvement, intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone

### Introduction

The most important assets for a brand are the customers. Mobile phones have become a fundamental part of personal communication across the globe, consumer research has concentrated little specific attention to motives and choice underlying the mobile phone buying decision process. There are numerous complex factors that need to be taken into account when exploring mobile phone buying decision process, including both macro and microeconomic conditions that affect the evolution of mobile phone market in general and individual consumer sometimes motives and decision making in particular.

It is also important to distinguish between buying behavior referring to the choice between different mobile phone models and brands and change aspects referring to reasons that affect change. As the mobile phone market is a typical technology push driven market where products are created ahead of the recognition of existing recognized consumer needs (e.g., Gerstheimer and Lupp, 2004), mobile phone development is based on consumers □ possible future needs and thus companies that best hunch the technologies and services of future will be the leaders in the discipline (Nagel, 2003).

The emerging role of technology and in particular the Internet and the facilities provided to access information have made customer bargaining power stronger than ever before. The information era has given customers the opportunity to become more increasingly knowledgeable about products/services and aware of other competitive offers from alternative companies in the marketplace. Technology has become a source of pressure to companies, which gives the customer access to a wide range of alternatives, and forces companies to intensify their customer retention efforts. The wide range of promotions based on technologically-advanced solutions facilitates increasing the customer knowledge base toward what can be offered to them by companies in the marketplace. Customers become more knowledgeable and experienced with time and more sensitive to price, eventually becoming better negotiators (Butscher 2002; Reinartz and Kumar 2002).

The dynamic and competitive business environment has urged companies to pay considerable emphasis on building close ties with their customers and nurturing long-term relationships. With high competitions, customers become more able to switch to other competitors. Although many companies implemented marketing programs to retain customers and extend the relationships with them, some of these marketing programs are cost-based, which basically rely on financial incentives and/or financial constraints. These activities have in some instances shown effectiveness in attracting and keeping customers, however, they also caused detrimental effects on the resulting rapport.

Consumers actually develop feelings and associations with brands and then become loyal to them due to their □added value □ (i.e., their brand equity) (Barwise, 1993). Brands have become valuable assets to companies; and therefore, learning and understanding how to build, measure, and manage brand equity is of utmost importance (Kapferer, 2005). This study therefore examines the factors that determine the intention of undergraduates to stay with a brand of phone in Oyo town.

### **Objectives of the Study**

This study is generally targeted at the determinants of intention to stay with a brand of phone among undergraduates in Oyo town. There are six objectives that this study intends to achieve. They are:

- 1. To determine the joint and independent effect of length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and involvement on the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.
- 2. To assess the significant relationship between length of consumer decision process and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.
- 3. To evaluate the significant relationship between brand commitment and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.
- 4. To analyze the significant relationship between overall satisfaction and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.
- 5. To examine the significant relationship between consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.
- 6. To assess the significant relationship between involvement and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.

# Hypotheses of the Study

In line with the objectives of the study, the following hypotheses are tested in this study.

- **H1.** There is joint and independent effect of length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and involvement on the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.
- **H2.** There is a significant relationship between length of consumer decision process and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.
- **H3.** There is a significant relationship between brand commitment and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.
- **H4.** There is a significant relationship between overall satisfaction and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.

- **H5.** There significant relationship between consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.
- **H6.** There significant relationship between involvement and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone.

### Literature Review

Social Exchange Theory (SET) developed by Thibaut and Kelley (1959), had explained the reasons why individuals had personal relationships with others (Thibaut& Kelley, 1959). The theory also specified the appropriate time when the relationships started and ended. Thibaut and Kelley □s (1959) theory also emphasized on personal relationships, its costs and benefits. What rewards did people receive from a given relationship, and what costs did they pay to obtain those rewards? Social Exchange Theory posited that good deeds should be reciprocated (Blau, 1964). Mossholder, Settoon and Henagan (2005) had pointed to Social Exchange Theory which proposed that individuals who felt that they had received benefits from others would later feel an obligation and then compensate through effort and loyalty. Effort and loyalty usually could be seen from a sheer commitment to their job and strong intention to remain with the present employer. Employee s loyalty clearly fit within the framework of SET since it focused on citizenship behaviour whereby employees stop looking for a new job elsewhere since they felt obligated to stay and repay the organization for support they had received (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

SET provides an avenue of transaction between sense of obligation that had led to the sense of feeling responsibility in compensating what had been given by another party which in turn would motivate positive psychological responses as suggested by several researchers (e.g. Bunderson, 2001; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000). Through this positive psychological responses employees would tend to be more committed and loyal to the organization and stop looking for a job elsewhere (Bunderson, 2001; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000).

Organizational Scholarship (POS) by Cameron, Dutton, Quinn & Wrzesniewski (2003) explained the positive processes and outcomes of interactions between individuals and organization in organizational settingemphasized on the interactions between individuals and organizations in organizational settings and what both parties could benefit from these interactions (Cameron et al., 2003). Essentially, this transaction focused on the individual scapabilities and organizational processes that contributed to positive organizational outcomes. POS represented a perspective that including instrumental concern and emphasized on positive idea and human potential. Facilitation clearly fitted within the framework of

POS since it focused on an enhanced functioning within the work or family domain (Carlson et al., 2007). POS provided an explanation for the □purpose□ of facilitation and its potential for affecting □outcomes□ in social systems such as work and family. Positivity was viewed as functional because it activated a variety of forces that promoted individual and organizational strengths (Cameron et al., 2003; Fredrickson &Losada, 2005).

Conservation of Resources (COR) theory by Hobfoll (1989) provides a heuristic approach in identifying the specific type of resources for the facilitation of the positive interaction between work and family domain. Hobfoll (2001) provided a basis for identifying the specific type of resources. Resources are valued articles people seek to acquire and manage, and properties of the environment that can be utilized for a certain purpose such as personal characteristics, objects, conditions, energies, and support that serve as a means for the attainment of these objects (Hobfoll, 1989). Personal characteristics are traits or skills that resulted from one's orientation to the world such as self-efficacy and internal locus of control. Objects are valued because of their physical nature or the status obtained through their ownership such as one's car, home, clothes or other material goods. Energy resources, such as time, money, knowledge, and skills are those that aid in the acquisition of other resources such as time for work or family and opportunities for advancement. Conditions are resources that are sought after such as marriage, divorce, job characteristics, or seniority. Finally, support such as loyalty or intimacy preserves other types of resources (Carlson et al., 2007).

# Methodology

## **Research Design**

The design for this study is a survey design with length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence, involvement as independent variables and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates as dependent variable.

### **Participants**

The respondents of this study were four hundred and sixty-nine students of Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo consisting of two hundred and twenty six males and two hundred and forty three females with age from fifteen years to thirty years.

### **Instruments**

The questionnaire was employed as instrument for data collection for this study. The questionnaire was divided into seven sections. Section A measured the bio data of respondents, while section B measured the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone This scale was developed and validated by Burnham et al. (2003) by means of a 5-point Likert

scale ranging from very unlikely(5)to very likely (1). Section C measured the length of the consumer decision process. This scale was adapted from a scale developed by Kokkiadi and Blomme (2013) which consisted of two items by means of a 5-point Likert scale ranging from less than an hour (1)to a month (5).

Section D measured brand commitment and the scale was created and validated by Eisingerich and Rubera (2010). Brand commitment was measured with four items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree(5)to strongly disagree(1). Section E measured overall satisfaction. Westbrook (1980) developed a one-item scale for satisfaction. Section F measured Consumers ☐ Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence. Bearden et al. (1989) developed and validated the scale measuring consumers susceptibility to interpersonal influence. This scale consists of four items and was measured by means of a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). Section G measured Involvement. The scale used to measure involvement was developed and validated by Traylor and Joseph (1984). It consists of six items measured by means of a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree(1). The Cronbach alpha for Intention to Stay with Brand is .82, Length of Consumer Decision Process is .70, Consumers ☐ Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence is .79, Involvement is .90, and brand commitment is .87.

The scales were revalidated and the Cronbach reliability values gave results that were not less than 0.85.

### **Data Analysis**

The demographic information was analysed using frequency counts and simple percentage. Hypothesis 1 was tested using Multiple Regression while hypotheses 2 to 6 were analysed using Pearson S Correlation.

### **Results and Discussions**

### **Hypotheses Testing**

This section focused on the testing of the hypotheses formulated for the study.

### **Hypothesis 1**

H1: Length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and involvement can jointly and independently predict the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Table 1: Summary Table showing multiple regression of the effect of Length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and involvement on the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Variables	F- Ratio	Sig	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj	В	T	P
		of P			$\mathbb{R}^{2^{\circ}}$			
Length of consumer	124.358	.000	.757	.573	.569	.345	2.821	.012
decision						.5 15	2.021	.012
Brand commitment						.231	3.205	.001
Overall satisfaction						.353	2.735	.000
Consumer susceptibility						.259	3.169	.002
Involvement						.748	10.837	.000

Table 1 showed that the linear combination Length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and involvement and the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduate was significant. F = 124.358; R .757, R2 = .573, Adj. R2 = .569; P <. 01. The independent/predictor variables jointly accounted for a variation of about 57.3% the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates. The following showed the various relative contributions and levels of significance of the independent variables: Length of consumer decision process ( $\beta$  = .345, P <.05), brand commitment ( $\beta$  = .231, P <.05), overall satisfaction

 $(\beta = .353, P < .01)$ , consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence  $(\beta = .259, P < .05)$ , involvement  $(\beta = .748, P < .01)$ . It can be concluded that all the independent variables, (Length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and involvement) predicted jointly and independently the intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

# Hypothesis 2

**H2:** There is a significant relationship between the Length of consumer decision process and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Table 2: A table showing Pea rson? s Correlation between the Length of consumer decision process and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Length of consumer	2.85	1.520	469	.525**	.000	Sig
decision process	2.761	1.2210				
Intention to stay						

<sup>\*\*</sup> Sig. at .01 level

It is shown in Table 2 that there is a significant relationship between Length of consumer decision process and Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates (r = .525\*\*, N = 469, P < .01). The implication of this result is that a 1% shift in Length of consumer decision process will cause a 52.5% shift in intention to stay with a brand of

mobile phone among undergraduates. Hence, it could be deduced that Length of consumer decision process influenced Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates in the study.

H3: There is a significant relationship between brand commitment and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduate.

Table 4.2.3: A table show ing Pearson? s Correlation between brand commitment and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Brand commitment	2.7873	1.27379	469	.593**	.000	Sig
Intention to stay	2.761	1.2210				

<sup>\*\*</sup> Sig. at .01 level

It is shown in Table 3 that there is a significant relationship between brand commitment and Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates (r=.593\*\*, N=469, P<.01). The implication of this result is that a 1% shift in brand commitment will cause a 59.3% shift in intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates. Hence, it could be deduced

that brand commitment influenced Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates in the study.

### Hypothesis 4

H4: There is a significant relationship between overall satisfaction and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduate.

Table 4: A table showing Pearson? s Correlation between overall satisfaction and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Overall satisfaction	3.96	.192	469	.412**	.000	Sig
Intention to stay	2.761	1.2210				

<sup>\*\*</sup> Sig. at .01 level

It is shown in Table 4 that there is a significant relationship between overall satisfaction and Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates (r = .412\*\*, N=469, P<.01). The implication of this result is that a 1% shift in overall satisfaction will cause a 41.2% shift in intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates. Hence, it could be deduced that overall satisfaction influenced Intention to stay

with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates in the study.

# Hypothesis 5

H5: There is a significant relationship between consumers — susceptibility to interpersonal influence and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Table 5: A table showing Pearson ? s Correlation between consumer s? susceptibility to interpersonal influence and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Variable Mean Std. N R P Remark Dev. 469 Sig Consumers? susceptibility 2.7196 1.21786 .678 .000 to interpersonal influence 2.761 1.2210 Intention to stay

It is shown in Table 5 that there is a significant relationship between consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates(r = .678\*\*, N= 469, P < .01). The implication of this result is that a 1% shift in consumers  $\square$  susceptibility to interpersonal influence will cause a 67.8% shift in intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone

among undergraduates. Hence, it could be deduced that consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence influenced Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates in the study.

# Hypothesis 6

H6: There is a significant relationship between involvement and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Table 6: A table showing Pearson? s Correlation between involvement and intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Involvement	2.8193	1.17283	469	.745**	.000	Sig
Intention to stay	2.761	1.2210				

<sup>\*\*</sup> Sig. at .01 level

It is shown in Table 6 that there is a significant relationship between Involvement and Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates (r = .745\*\*, N= 469, P < .01). The implication of this result is that a 1% shift in involvement will cause a 74.5% shift in with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduate. Hence, it could be deduced that involvement influenced Intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduate in the study.

# **Concluding Remarks**

This study investigated the determinants of intention to stay with a brand of mobile phone among undergraduates in Oyo town focusing on Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria. This research concludes that Length of consumer decision process, brand commitment, overall satisfaction, consumers susceptibility to interpersonal influence and involvement were predictors of intention to stay with a brand of phone among undergraduates in Oyo town. The study also concludes that all the five variables or determinants were positively associated with intention to stay with a brand of phone among undergraduates in Oyo town. These findings are in consonance with previous studies with similar findings (Burnham et al.,2003; Rao et al., 2004; Schau et al., 2009; Sprott et al., 2009; Choi and Fishbach, 2011; Lambert-Pandraud and Laurent, 2010; Akanbi and Ayankola, 2013).

Based on the findings from this study it is concluded and recommended that efforts should be made by mobile phone producers such as Nokia, Samsung, Blackberry, iphone, Sony, HTC, Techno and others to effectively and efficiently manage technological components of their brands with a view to achieve brand loyalty. It is also recommended that the satisfaction in terms of functions, price, quality and aesthetic features of these brands of mobile phones should be upheld by mobile phone manufacturers in order to maintain brand loyalty.

The study recommended that the management of mobile phone producers should try as much as possible to build the commitment to brand by consumers by introducing important features and attributes into their brands of phone in order to boost sales and gain customer loyalty.

### References

Akanbi, P.A. and Ayankola, A.A. (2013). The Role of Relationship Marketing Orientation on Perceived Customer Loyalty. Elixir Marketing Mgmt. 65: 20044-20049.

Barwise P. (1993). Brand Equity: Snark of Boojum? International Journal of Research in Marketing 1:93 

104.

Bearden, W. O., Netemeyer, R. G., & Teel, J. E. (1989). Measurement of Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Sig. at .01 level

- Journal of Consumer Research, 15(4):473-481. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086%2F209186.
- Blau, P. (1964). Power and Exchange in Social Life. NY: John Inliley & Sons.
- Bunderson, J.S. (2001). How work ideologies shape the psychological contracts of professional employees: doctors responses to perceived breach. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 22:717 741.
- Burnham, T. A., Frels, J. K., & Mahajan, V. (2003).

  Consumer Switching Costs: A Typology,
  Antecedents, and Consequences. Journal of
  the Academy of Marketing Science, 31(2):
  1 0 9 1 2 6
  http://dx.doi.org/10.1177%2F0092070302
  250897.
- Butscher, A.S. (2002). Customer Clubs and Loyalty Programmes. Abingdon, Oxon, GBR: Gower Publishing Limited.
- Cameron K.S. Dutton, J. E. Quinn, R.E., and Wrzesniewski, A.(2003). Developing a discipline of Positive Organizational Scholarship. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton and R.E.Qinn(Eds), Positive Organizational Scholarship. San Francisco: Berrett □ Kochler.
- Choi, J., and Fishbach, A. (2011). Choice as an End Versus a Means. Journal of Marketing Research, 48(3): 544-554. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmkr.48.3.54
- Eisingerich, A. B., and Rubera, G. (2010). Drivers of Brand Commitment: A Cross-National Investigation. Journal of International Marketing, 18(2): 64-79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509%2Fjimk.18.2.64.
- Fredrickson, B.L. and Losada, M.F. (2005). Positive Effect and The Complex Dynamics of Human Flourishing, American Psychologist, 60(7):678-686.
- Gerstheimer, O. and Lupp, C. (2004). Needs versus technology ☐ The challenge to design third-generation mobile applications. Journal of Business Research, 57 (12): 1409-1415.
- Hobfoll, S.E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44, 513-524.
- Kapferer, J.N. (2005). The new strategic brand management. London: Kogan □ Page.
- Kokkiadi, L.K. and Blomme, R. J.=(2013). Consumers Intention to Stay with a Brand: An Examination of Potential Precursors to Brand Switching.

- International Journal of Marketing Studies, 5(1): 1-15.
- Lambert-Pandraud, R., & Laurent, G. (2010). Why Do Older Consumers Buy Older Brands? The Role of Attachment and Declining Innovativeness. Journal of Marketing, 7 4 (5), 104-121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmkg.74.5.104.
- Mossholder, K. W., Setton, R.P. and Nenagan, S.C. (2005). A relational perspective on turnover: Beamining, Structural attitudinal and behavioural predictors. Academy of Management Journal, 48(4): 807 □ 818.
- Nagel A. (2003). Beyond Knut Hoh□s Fusion Model, balancing market technology push. International Journal of Technology Management, 25 (6 □ 7): 614 □ 622.
- Rao, V. R., Agarwal, M. K., &Dahlhoff, D. (2004). How Is Manifest Branding Strategy Related to the Intangible Value of a Corporation? Journal of Marketing, 68(4):126-141.
- Reinartz, W. and Kumar, V. (2002): The Mismanagement of Customer Loyalty. Harvard Business Review. 80:86-94.
- Rhogdes L. and Eisenberger L. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A review of the Literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87: 698 

  714.
- Sprott, D., Czellar, S., and Spangenberg, E. (2009). The Importance of a General Measure of Brand Engagement on Market Behavior: Development and Validation of a Scale. Journal of Marketing Research, 46(1): 92-1 0 4 http://dx.doi.org/10.1509%2Fjmkr.46.1.92.
- Traylor, M. B., & Joseph, W. B. (1984). Measuring Consumer Involvement with Products: Developing a General Scale. Psychology & M a r k e t i n g , 1 (2): 65 77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002%2Fmar.4220010 207
- Thibaut, J.W. and Kelly, H.H. (1959). The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Westbrook. (1980). A rating scale for measuring product/service satisfaction. Journal of Marketing, 44(4): 68-72.