

An Analysis of Factors Influencing Brand Preference and Customer Satisfaction.

Dr. K. Arivazhagan, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor & Head, PG & Research Department of Commerce, Government Arts College, Chidambaram,
Tamilnadu-608102

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2025.1409000058>

Abstract: This Article completely evaluates the primary data to verify objective 5 and 6 of the research. The main aim of this chapter is to sharply estimate the perceptual difference among the customers preferring brands of cellular phones. The One-way ANOVA and multiple regression analysis are used to analyze the primary data comprises of independent and dependent variables.

Key Words: Cellular Phones, Technology, occupation, income, family and friends, gender, variables, segments, etc.

Introduction

The reasons for preferring the brand cellular phone namely style, Update Technology, status, better Offer, Hobby, defect, broken lost, influence by the family and friends, compliment are considered as dependent variable the age, gender, marital status, qualification, occupation, monthly income, work experience are considered as independent variables. The influence of independent variables on dependent factors completely identified through one way analysis of variance. This method compares the individual segments of independent variables.

Influence of age of the cellular customers on their reasons for preferring the brands

The present research article deals with different age of the customers namely 15-20/21-25/26-30/31-40/41-50/51& above.

Table 5.1 ANOVA-Age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	2.512	1	2.512	3.321	.039
	With in Groups	309.294	622	.756		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	.102	1	.102	.166	.684
	With in Groups	252.749	622	.618		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.988
	With in Groups	308.448	622	.754		
	Total	308.448	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	.091	1	.091	.123	.726
	With in Groups	301.962	622	.738		
	Total	302.054	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	.039	1	.039	.059	.809
	With in Groups	273.550	622	.669		
	Total	273.590	623			
Defect	Between Groups	.955	1	.955	1.005	.317
	With in Groups	388.756	622	.951		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	5.505	1	5.505	6.692	.010
	With in Groups	336.481	622	.823		

	Total	341.987	623			
Lost	Between Groups	1.941	1	1.941	4.638	.032
	Within Groups	171.207	622	.419		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	5.504	1	5.504	6.423	.012
	With in Groups	350.491	622	.857		
	Total	355.995	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	98.517	3	32.839	35.860	.053
	With in Groups	372.710	620	.916		
	Total	471.227	623			

From the table it is found that Style ($F=3.321$, $p=0.039$), Broken ($F=6.692$, $p=0.010$), Lost ($F=4.638$, $p=0.032$), influence from family and friends ($F=6.423$, $p=0.012$) differs significantly with respect to age of the cellular phones customers. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of age group.

It is concluded that the customers in the age group 21-25 years strongly agreed towards brand preferring due to style (mean = 4.36) compared to customers with age group 51& above (mean = 3.15). The customers between 41 to 50 years strongly agreed towards their brand preferring due to their Cellular phones broken (mean=4.08) compared to customers with the age group 15 to 20 years. It is further concluded that the customers in the age group 31 to 40 strongly agreed towards their brand preferring when their cellular phones are lost (mean =4.04) compared to customers with age group 21 to 25 years (mean = 3.08) Whereas the customers in the age group 31 to 40 years (mean = 4.01) strongly agreed to have influenced by their family and friends for brand preference to new ones compared to customers in the age group 41 to 50 years.

Influence of gender of the cellular phone's customers on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the gender of the customers namely male and female. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5. 2 ANOVA-gender

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	34.654	3	11.551	16.963	.000
	With in Groups	277.151	620	.681		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	55.994	3	18.665	38.588	.000
	With in Groups	196.858	620	.484		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	40.049	3	13.350	20.243	.000
	With in Groups	268.399	620	.659		
	Total	308.448	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	39.927	3	13.309	20.665	.000
	With in Groups	262.127	620	.644		
	Total	302.054	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	25.734	3	8.578	14.086	.000
	With in Groups	247.856	620	.609		
	Total	273.590	623			
	Between Groups	74.141	3	24.714	31.874	.000

Defect	With in Groups	315.570	620	.775		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	13.294	3	4.431	8.211	.000
	With in Groups	219.666	620	.540		
	Total	232.961	623			
Lost	Between Groups	10.775	3	3.592	9.003	.000
	With in Groups	162.373	620	.399		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and Friends	Between Groups	25.121	3	8.374	10.300	.000
	With in Groups	330.874	620	.813		
	Total	355.995	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	62.779	3	20.926	30.504	.000
	With in Groups	279.207	620	.686		
	Total	341.987	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=16.963, p=0.000$), Update technology ($F=38.588, p=0.000$), status ($F=20.243, p=0.000$), status ($F=20.665, p=0.000$),

better offer ($F=20.665, p=0.000$) Hobby ($F=14.086, p=0.000$), defect ($F=31.874, p=0.000$), broken ($F=8.211, p=0.000$), lost ($F=9.003, p=0.000$), influence of family and friends ($F=10.300, p=0.000$), compliment ($F=30.504, p=0.000$) differs significantly with respect to gender of the customers of cellular phones. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of age group.

It can be concluded that the male customers strongly agree towards brand preference of Cellular phones due to update technology (mean=4.25), status (4.07), defect (mean=4.12), lost (mean=4.01) compared to females customers. It is further inferred that the female customers strongly agreed towards brand preference due to style (mean=4.05), better offer (4.12), hobby (4.18), broken (mean=4.25), influence of friends and family (mean=4.16) and compliment (mean = 4.19) compared to male customers.

Influence of marital status of the cellular phone customers on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the marital status of the customers namely Unmarried and married customers. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5.3 ANOVA–Marital status

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	19.254	2	9.627	13.426	.000
	Within Groups	292.551	621	.717		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	7.717	2	3.859	6.422	.002
	Within Groups	245.134	621	.601		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	20.041	2	10.021	14.176	.000
	Within Groups	288.407	621	.707		
	Total	308.448	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	38.991	2	19.496	30.237	.000
	Within Groups	263.062	621	.645		
	Total	302.054	623			
	Between Groups	36.401	2	18.201	31.308	.000

Hobby	Within Groups	237.188	621	.581		
	Total	273.590	623			
Defect	Between Groups	34.938	2	17.469	20.090	.000
	Within Groups	354.773	621	.870		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	5.276	2	2.638	4.727	.009
	Within Groups	227.685	621	.558		
	Total	232.961	623			
Lost	Between Groups	2.043	2	1.021	2.435	.089
	Within Groups	171.106	621	.419		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	54.739	2	27.370	37.068	.000
	Within Groups	301.256	621	.738		
	Total	355.995	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	15.298	2	7.649	9.553	.000
	Within Groups	326.689	621	.801		
	Total	341.987	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=13.426, p=0.000$), Update technology ($F=6.422, p=0.002$), status ($F=14.176, p=0.000$), Better offer ($F=30.237, p=0.000$), Hobby ($F=31.308, p=0.000$), defect ($F=20.090, p=0.000$), broken ($F=4.727, p=0.00$), influence from family and friends ($F=37.068, p=0.000$), compliment ($F=9.555, p=0.000$) differs significantly with respect to marital status of the customers. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of marital status of the customers.

It is concluded from the above table that the unmarried customers strongly agreed towards brand preference due to style (4.28), updated technology (mean = 4.30), hobby (mean = 4.22) and moderately agreed towards defect (mean = 3.28) whereas married customers strongly agreed towards brand preference of cellular phones due to status (mean = 4.27), better offer (mean = 4.33), lost (mean = 4.41), influenced by the family and friends (mean = 4.63) and moderately agreed towards compliment (mean = 3.58).

Influence of qualification of the cellular phone customers on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the qualification of the customers namely SSLC/HSC/Diploma/UG/PG/Other. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5.4 ANOVA-Qualification

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	3.476	1	3.476	4.611	.032
	Within Groups	308.329	622	.754		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	22.395	1	22.395	39.746	.000
	Within Groups	230.456	622	.563		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	12.694	1	12.694	17.554	.000
	Within Groups	295.755	622	.723		
	Total	308.448	623			
	Between Groups	19.640	1	19.640	28.444	.000

Better offer	Within Groups	282.413	622	.690		
	Total	302.054	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	34.088	1	34.088	58.213	.000
	Within Groups	239.501	622	.586		
	Total	273.590	623			
Defect	Between Groups	9.705	1	9.705	10.445	.001
	Within Groups	380.007	622	.929		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	1.547	1	1.547	2.735	.099
	Within Groups	231.413	622	.566		
	Total	232.961	623			
Lost	Between Groups	14.711	1	14.711	37.975	.000
	Within Groups	158.437	622	.387		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	66.677	1	66.677	94.259	.000
	Within Groups	289.318	622	.707		
	Total	355.995	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	13.131	1	13.131	16.331	.000
	Within Groups	328.856	622	.804		
	Total	341.987	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=4.611, p=0.032$), Updated technology ($F=39.746, p=0.000$), Status ($F=17.554, 0.000$), better offer ($F=28.444, 0.000$), Hobby ($F=58.213, p=0.000$), Defect ($F=10.445, 0.001$) Lost ($F=37.975, p=0.000$), Influence from the family ($F=94.259, p=0.000$), compliment ($F=16.331, p=0.000$) differs significantly with respect to qualification of the customers using cellular phones. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of qualification group.

It is concluded from the above table that the customers holding Diploma qualification strongly agreed to switch over to other Cellular phones due to latest technology (mean = 4.13) compared to customers with qualification with SSLC (mean=3.36). The study reveals that customers with PG qualification strongly agree their switch over due to style (mean=4.22) compared to customers with HSC qualification (mean=3.48) and those with UG qualification (3.42) moderately agreed towards their preference due to better offer compared to customers with other qualifications (mean = 3.44) . The study further revealed that customers with HSC qualification strongly agreed (mean = 4.02) and PG qualification (mean = 4.19) towards preference over to other brands due to hobby, defect and lost compared to customers other qualifications towards hobby (mean = 3.02), defect (mean = 3.16) and lost (mean = 3.15). Customers with SSLC qualification strongly agreed towards switch over due to influence from family and friends (mean = 4.08) and compliment (mean = 4.11) compared to employees with other qualification towards influence from family and friends (mean =3.41) and compliment (mean = 3.39).

Influence of occupation of the cellular phones customers on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the occupation of the customers. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5.5 ANOVA–Occupation

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	137.338	1	137.338	321.959	.000
	Within Groups	174.467	622	.427		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	47.047	1	47.047	93.498	.000

	Within Groups	205.804	622	.503		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	113.434	1	113.434	237.903	.000
	Within Groups	195.014	622	.477		
	Total	308.448	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	93.454	1	93.454	183.234	.000
	Within Groups	208.600	622	.510		
	Total	302.054	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	39.116	1	39.116	68.232	.000
	Within Groups	234.473	622	.573		
	Total	273.590	623			
Defect	Between Groups	230.661	1	230.661	593.146	.000
	Within Groups	159.051	622	.389		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	7.944	1	7.944	14.440	.000
	Within Groups	225.017	622	.550		
	Total	232.961	623			
Lost	Between Groups	40.640	1	40.640	125.438	.000
	Within Groups	132.509	622	.324		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	45.549	1	45.549	60.008	.000
	Within Groups	310.447	622	.759		
	Total	355.995	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	153.067	1	153.067	331.381	.000
	Within Groups	188.920	622	.462		
	Total	341.987	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=321.959$, $p=0.000$), Updated technology ($F=93.498$, $p=0.000$), status ($F=237.903$, $p=0.000$), Better offer ($F=183.234$, $p=0.000$), Hobby ($F=68.232$, $p=0.000$), defect ($F=593.146$, $p=0.000$), broken ($F=14.440$, $p=0.000$), lost ($F=125.438$, $p=0.000$), influence from family and friends ($F=60.008$, $p=0.000$), compliment ($F=331.381$, $p=0.000$) differs significantly with respect to occupation of the customers. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of occupation of the customers.

It is concluded from the above table that the customers with salaried group strongly agreed towards brand preference due to style (4.54) and lost (mean = 4.43) comparing to student customers towards style (mean = 3.27) and lost (mean=3.47). The customers with business class strongly agreed towards shifting due to update technology (mean = 4.59) compared to customers with other occupation (mean = 3.01). It is further revealed that customers with professional occupation strongly agreed towards preference due to status (mean=4.44) and better offer (mean= 4.01) compared to customer with salaried groups concerned to status (mean = 3.09) and better offer (mean = 3.16). The customers working as home maker strongly agree towards brand preference due to defect (mean = 4.29) and lost (mean = 4.62) comparing to customer with professional qualification (mean = 3.78) whereas customers with professional occupation moderately agreed towards hobby (mean = 3.94). The study further revealed that business customers strongly agreed towards preference due to broken (mean 4.55) and compliment (mean =4.20) comparing to customers with other occupation concerned to broken (3.13) and compliment (mean =3.68).

Influence of monthly income of the cellular phones customers on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the monthly income of cellular phones customers. The relationship between independent and

dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5.6 ANOVA–monthly income

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	32.160	3	10.720	15.602	.000
	Within Groups	279.645	620	.687		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	18.272	3	6.091	10.567	.000
	Within Groups	234.580	620	.576		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	64.865	3	21.622	36.127	.000
	Within Groups	243.583	620	.598		
	Total	308.448	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	39.419	3	13.140	20.362	.000
	Within Groups	262.635	620	.645		
	Total	302.054	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	44.524	3	14.841	26.370	.000
	Within Groups	229.066	620	.563		
	Total	273.590	623			
Defect	Between Groups	66.136	3	22.045	27.729	.000
	Within Groups	323.575	620	.795		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	45.547	3	15.182	32.971	.000
	Within Groups	187.413	620	.460		
	Total	232.961	623			
Lost	Between Groups	29.371	3	9.790	27.714	.000
	Within Groups	143.777	620	.353		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	44.761	3	14.920	19.511	.000
	Within Groups	311.234	620	.765		
	Total	355.995	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	23.142	3	7.714	9.847	.000
	Within Groups	318.845	620	.783		
	Total	341.987	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=15.602, p=0.000$), Update technology ($F=10.567, p=0.000$), status ($F=36.127, p=0.000$), better offer ($F=20.362, p=0.000$), Hobby ($F=26.370, p=0.000$), Defect ($F=27.729, p=0.000$), broken ($F=32.971, p=0.000$), lost ($F=27.714, p=0.000$), influence from family and friends ($F=19.511, p=0.000$), compliment ($F=9.847, p=0.000$) differs significantly with respect to monthly income earned by the cellular phones customers. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of monthly income of the customers.

Therefore it is concluded from the above table that the customers earning a monthly income of Rs.50000 and above strongly agree to switch over to new brands due to style (mean = 4.62) , updated technology (mean = 4.78) and status (mean = 4.71) compared to

customers with monthly income Rs.20001 to Rs.30000 (mean=3.32). The study further revealed that customers in the income group below Rs.10000 strongly agreed to switch over due to better offer (mean=4.09), and lost compared to customers with income groups of Rs.30001 to Rs.40000 (mean= 3.96). The customers earning a monthly income of Rs. Rs.40000 to Rs.50000 strongly agreed to switch over to other brands due Hobby (mean = 4.06), defect (mean = 4.15) compared to customers earning a monthly income of Rs.10001 to Rs.20000 concerned to hobby (3.85) and defect (3.82) and moderately agreed for brand preference when the mobile phone is broken concern to customers with income below 10000 (mean=4.01). The analyses also revealed that the customers earning a monthly income of Rs.20001 to Rs.30000 strongly agreed to have influenced by their family members (mean=4.18) and receiving compliments (mean = 4.25) from well wishers compared to customers with other income groups.

Influence of work experience of the cellular phones customers on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the work experience of cellular phones customers. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5.7 ANOVA–Work experience

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	57.661	3	19.220	30.781	.000
	Within Groups	254.144	620	.624		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	25.859	3	8.620	15.455	.000
	Within Groups	226.993	620	.558		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	83.766	3	27.922	50.579	.000
	Within Groups	224.682	620	.552		
	Total	308.448	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	55.455	3	18.485	30.508	.000
	Within Groups	246.599	620	.606		
	Total	302.054	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	9.555	3	3.185	4.909	.002
	Within Groups	264.035	620	.649		
	Total	273.590	623			
Defect	Between Groups	97.341	3	32.447	45.168	.000
	Within Groups	292.370	620	.718		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	69.483	3	23.161	57.662	.000
	Within Groups	163.478	620	.402		
	Total	232.961	623			
Lost	Between Groups	4.987	3	1.662	4.024	.008
	Within Groups	168.161	620	.413		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	17.892	3	5.964	7.179	.000
	Within Groups	338.104	620	.831		
	Total	355.995	623			
	Between Groups	33.071	3	11.024	14.524	.000

Compliment	Within Groups	308.916	620	.759		
	Total	341.987	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=30.781, p=0.000$), Update technology ($F=15.455, p=0.000$), status ($F=50.579, p=0.000$), better offer ($F=30.508, p=0.000$), Hobby ($F=4.909, p=0.002$), defect ($F=45.168, p=0.000$), Broken ($F= 57.662, p=0.000$), Lost ($F=4.024, p=0.008$), Influence from family and friends($F=7.179, p=0.000$), compliment ($F=14.524, p=0.000$) differs significantly with respect to years of work experience. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of years of work experience.

Therefore it is concluded that the customers having 6-10 years of work experience strongly agreed towards preference to different brands due to style (mean = 4.11) and update technology (mean = 4.51) compared to customers having 31 years and above experience.(mean = 3.02)

It is inferred that customers having 0-5 years of experience strongly agreed towards brand preference due to status (mean =4.11) and better offer (mean = 4.66) comparing to customers having 26-30years of experience (mean = 3.13). The study also revealed that customers having 11-15 years of experience strongly agreed towards brand preference due to hobby (mean = 4.27), defect (mean = 4.43)and broken (mean = 4.57) compared to customers having 21-25 years of experience concerned to hobby (mean=3.81),defect(mean=3.60) and broken(mean= 3.40).. Customer having 16-20years of experience strongly agreed towards brand preference due to lost (mean=4.59), influence from their family and friends (mean = 4.61) and compliment from well-wishers (mean = 4.63) compared to customers have 0-5 years of experience towards lost (mean = 3.87), influence from family (mean = 3.81) and compliment (mean = 3.89).

Influence of years of using cellular phones by the customers of cellular phones on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the years of using cellular phones by the customers. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5.8 ANOVA–Years of using cellular phones

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	16.260	3	5.420	7.464	.000
	Within Groups	295.545	620	.726		
	Total	311.805	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	17.734	3	5.911	10.233	.000
	Within Groups	235.118	620	.578		
	Total	252.852	623			
Status	Between Groups	25.282	3	8.427	12.113	.000
	Within Groups	283.166	620	.696		
	Total	308.448	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	13.871	3	4.624	6.530	.000
	Within Groups	288.182	620	.708		
	Total	302.054	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	24.278	3	8.093	13.211	.000
	Within Groups	249.312	620	.613		
	Total	273.590	623			
Defect	Between Groups	2.406	3	.802	.843	.471
	Within Groups	387.305	620	.952		
	Total	389.711	623			
Broken	Between Groups	1.247	3	.416	.730	.535
	Within Groups	231.714	620	.569		
	Total	232.961	623			

Lost	Between Groups	14.527	3	4.842	12.425	.000
	Within Groups	158.621	620	.390		
	Total	173.148	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	25.589	3	8.530	10.507	.000
	Within Groups	330.406	620	.812		
	Total	355.995	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	14.870	3	4.957	6.167	.000
	Within Groups	327.117	620	.804		
	Total	341.987	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=7.464$), update technology ($F=10.233$), Status ($F=12.113$), Better offer ($F=6.530$), Hobby ($F=13.211$), Defect ($F=12.425$), Broken ($F=10.507$), Lost ($F=6.167$), Influence from family and friends ($F=4.137$), Compliment ($F=6.609$) differs significantly with respect to years of using cellular phones. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of years of using cellular phones. It is analyzed that customers using cellular phones for 1-2 years strongly agree towards switchover due to style (mean = 4.33), updated technology (mean = 4.40) and status (mean = 4.38) comparing to customer using cellular phones for 9 years and above moderately switch over due to style (mean = 3.99), updated technology (mean = 3.81) and status (mean = 3.75). It is further analyzed that customers using the Cellular phones for 0-1 years strongly agreed to switchover due to better offer (mean = 4.02) compared to other customers. Customers using the cellular phones for 2-3 years and 7 to 8 years have similar opinion on preference over due to hobby (mean = 4.39) and defect (mean = 21) compared to customers using the cellular phones from 6 to 7 years concerned to hobby (mean = 3.41) and defect (mean = 3.48). The study further analyzed that customers using cellular phones for 3-4 years and 5-6 years strongly agreed to brand preference over due to broken (mean = 4.04) and lost (mean = 4.10) compared to customers using the cellular phones for 8-9 years concerned to broken (mean = 3.89) and lost (3.91). It is finally concluded that customers using the cellular phones since 4-5 years moderate agreed toward brand preference due to influence from family (mean = 3.94) and friends and compliment (mean = 3.60) compare to customer different years of using cellular phones.

Influence of period of replacement of cellular phones by the customers of cellular phones on their reasons for brand preference

The present research deals with the period of replacement of cellular phones by the customers. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is established through one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as presented below.

Table 5.9 ANOVA–Period of replacement

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Style	Between Groups	94.669	3	31.556	34.108	.000
	Within Groups	376.557	620	.925		
	Total	471.227	623			
Update technology	Between Groups	79.704	3	26.568	39.699	.000
	Within Groups	272.376	620	.669		
	Total	352.080	623			
Status	Between Groups	117.153	3	39.051	46.992	.000
	Within Groups	338.223	620	.831		
	Total	455.375	623			
Better offer	Between Groups	35.101	3	11.700	21.557	.000
	Within Groups	220.897	620	.543		
	Total	255.998	623			
Hobby	Between Groups	92.935	3	30.978	44.818	.000
	Within Groups	281.320	620	.691		

	Total	374.255	623			
Defect	Between Groups	124.169	3	41.390	42.850	.000
	Within Groups	393.131	620	.966		
	Total	517.299	623			
Broken	Between Groups	65.244	3	21.748	42.806	.000
	Within Groups	206.778	620	.508		
	Total	272.022	623			
Lost	Between Groups	123.171	3	41.057	86.962	.000
	Within Groups	192.154	620	.472		
	Total	315.324	623			
Influence of family and friends	Between Groups	76.129	3	25.376	32.836	.000
	Within Groups	314.540	620	.773		
	Total	390.669	623			
Compliment	Between Groups	38.909	3	12.970	26.985	.000
	Within Groups	195.614	620	.481		
	Total	234.523	623			

From the table it is found that style ($F=34.108$), update technology ($F=39.699$), Status ($F=46.992$), Better offer ($F=21.557$), Hobby ($F=44.818$), Defect ($F=42.850$), Broken ($F=42.806$), Lost ($F=86.962$), Influence from family and friends ($F=32.836$), Compliment ($F=26.985$) differs significantly with respect to period of replacement of cellular phones. This leads to mean wise comparison of each segment of period of replacement of cellular phones. It is analyzed that customers replacing cellular phones for 2-3 years strongly agree towards switch over due to style (mean= 4.33), updated technology (mean= 4.40) and status (mean=4.38) comparing to customer replacing cellular phones with a period of 4-5 years moderately switch over due to style (mean = 3.99), updated technology (mean = 3.81) and status (mean = 3.75). It is further analyzed that customers replacing Cellular phones within 0-1 years strongly agreed to switch over due to better offer (mean = 4.02) compared to customers replacing within 7-8 years. Customers replacing within 1-2 years and 9 and above years have similar opinion on preference over due to hobby (mean=4.39) and defect (mean=21) compared to customers using the cellular phones from 5-6 years concerned to hobby (mean = 3.41) and defect (mean=3.48). The study further analyzed that customers replacing cellular phones within 3-4 years and 8-9 years strongly agreed to switch over due to broken (mean = 4.04) and lost (mean = 4.10) compared to customers replacing 6-7 years concerned to broken (mean = 3.89) and lost (3.91). It is finally concluded that customers replacing the cellular phones within 3-4 years moderate agreed toward switch over due to influence from family (mean = 3.94) and friends and compliment (mean=3.60) compare to customer different years of using cellular phones.

Influence of Factors of Brand Preference Behaviour Of Cellular Phones Customers on The Reasons for Preference from Cellular Phones

Influence of the eight reasons for preference over to different Cellular phones namely style, update technology, status, better offer, hobby, defect, broken, lost as dependent factor and the factors of brand preference behavior of the customers namely brand preference attitude, produce evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction are independent factors being established through multiple regression analysis in the following section.

Impact of brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on style

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors style and the independent factors brand preference attitude, produce evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, and level of satisfaction gives the following results.

Table 5.10 Model Summary for brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on style

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Error of the Estimate
Dimension	1	.937 ^a	.877	.25071

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

From the above table it is found that $R=.937$, $R\text{ Square}=.877$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .876$ and standard error of the estimate = .25071 clearly showed that the independent variables explained 87.7% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.11 ANOVA^b brand preference behavior of cellular phone customers on style

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	221.751	6	36.959	587.974	.000 ^a
	Residual	30.989	617	.063		
	Total	252.740	623			

Predictors:(Constant),Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: style

From the above table, it is found that $F=587.974$, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable style. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.12 Coefficients brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std.Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.673	.011		327.627	.000
	Preference attitude	.644	.011	.906	57.420	.000
	Product evaluation	.102	.011	.143	9.080	.000
	Product preference	.126	.011	.177	11.246	.000
	Promotional strategies	.027	.011	.038	2.402	.017
	Purchase decision	.033	.011	.046	2.939	.003
	Satisfaction	-.011	.011	-.016	-.993	.321

Dependent Variable: style

From the above table 5.12, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=57.420$, $P=.000$), product evaluation ($t=9.080$, $p=0.000$), product preference ($t=11.246$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=2.402$, $p=0.017$), purchase decision ($t=2.939$, $p=0.003$) is statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it is concluded that the customer of cellular phones based on the preference, promotional strategies and stylish appearance of cellular phones take the decision to purchase new Cellular phones by preference over to different brands of Cellular phones that provide them the satisfaction in using it.

Impact of brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on updated technology

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors updated technology and the independent factors brand preference attitude, produce evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction gives the following results.

Table 5.13 Model Summary- brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on updated technology

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Dimension	1	.928 ^a	.861	.859	.22724

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

From the above table it is found that $R=.928$, $R\text{ Square}=.861$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .859$ and standard error of the estimate = .22724 clearly showed that the independent variables explained 86.1% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.14 ANOVA brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on updated technology

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	157.277	6	26.213	507.616	.000 ^a
	Residual	25.458	617	.052		
	Total	182.735	623			

Predictors:(Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: Update Technology

From the above table, it is found that $F=507.616$, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable updated technology. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.15 Coefficients^a -brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on updated technology

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std.Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.839	.010		377.756	.000
	Preference attitude	.127	.010	.211	12.527	.000
	Product evaluation	.495	.010	.819	48.692	.000
	Product preference	.162	.010	.268	15.968	.000
	Promotional strategies	.130	.010	.215	12.778	.000
	Purchase decision	.093	.010	.154	9.145	.000
	Satisfaction	-.018	.010	-.029	-1.720	.086

a. Dependent Variable: Update Technology

From the above table 5.15, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=12.527$, $P=.000$), product evaluation ($t=12.527$, $p=0.000$), product preference ($t=48.692$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=12.778$, $p=0.000$), purchase decision ($t=9.145$, $p=0.000$) is statistically significant at 5% level. It is analyzed from the above table that the customer of cellular phones prefers and evaluates different brands of Cellular phones and various promotional strategies that specify the latest updated technology oriented cellular phones for their daily usages.

Impact of brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on status

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors status and the independent factors brand preference attitude, produce evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction gives the following results

Table 5.16 Model Summary - brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on status

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Dimension	1	.952 ^a	.906	.905	.19808

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

From the above table it is found that $R=.952$, $R\text{ Square}=.906$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .905$ and standard error of the estimate = .19808

clearly showed that the independent variables explained 90.6% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.17 ANOVA^b - - brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on status

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	186.505	6	31.084	792.251	.000 ^a
	Residual	19.343	617	.039		
	Total	205.848	623			

Predictors:(Constant),Satisfaction,Purchasedecision,Promotionalstrategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: Status

From the above table, it is found that $F=792.251$, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable status. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.18 Coefficients^a - - brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on status

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std.Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.784	.009		427.111	.000
	Preference attitude	.086	.009	.135	9.748	.000
	Product evaluation	.084	.009	.130	9.435	.000
	Product preference	.594	.009	.924	66.932	.000
	Promotional strategies	.034	.009	.053	3.807	.000
	Purchase decision	.029	.009	.046	3.323	.001
	Satisfaction	.065	.009	.101	7.293	.000

Dependent Variable: Status

From the above table 5.18, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=9.748$, $P=.000$), product evaluation ($t=9.435$, $p=0.000$), product preference ($t=66.932$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=3.807$, $p=0.000$), purchase decision ($t=3.323$, $p=0.001$) is statistically significant at 5% level. It is concluded from the above table that the type of cellular phones, its brand, appearance, quality, and price decides the customer's status. Thereby the customers evaluate the cellular phones they prefer and take the decision to purchase the product that provides them satisfaction in using it.

Impact of brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on better offer

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors better offer and the independent factors brand preference attitude, produce evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction gives the following results

Table 5.19 Model Summary - Brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on better offer

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Dimension	1	.912 ^a	.832	.830	.26933

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

From the above table it is found that $R=.912$, $R\text{ Square}=.832$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .830$ and standard error of the estimate = .19808 clearly showed that the independent variables explained 90.6% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.20 ANOVA^b - brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on better offer

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	176.703	6	29.451	406.003	.000 ^a
	Residual	35.761	617	.073		
	Total	212.465	623			

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: Better Offer

From the above table, it is found that $F=406.003$, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable status. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.21 Coefficients^a - brand preference behaviour of cellular phones customers on better offer

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.887	.012		322.719	.000
	Preference attitude	.228	.012	.349	18.884	.000
	Product evaluation	.119	.012	.182	9.849	.000
	Product preference	.068	.012	.104	5.615	.000
	Promotional strategies	.531	.012	.814	44.080	.000
	Purchase decision	-.006	.012	-.009	-.461	.645
	Satisfaction	.005	.012	.008	.445	.657

Dependent Variable: Better Offer

From the above table 5.21, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=18.884$, $P=.000$), product evaluation ($t=9.849$, $p=0.000$), product preference ($t=5.615$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=44.080$, $p=0.000$) is statistically significant at 5% level. It is revealed from the above table that the customers of cellular phones switchover to different brands of cellular phones while better offers are provided by the manufacturers of that particular brand of cellular phones

Impact of brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on Hobby

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors hobby and the independent factors brand preference attitude, product evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction gives the following results

Table 5.22 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Dimension 1	.941 ^a	.885	.883	.22117

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

From the above table it is found that $R=.941$, $R\text{ Square}=.885$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .883$ and standard error of the estimate = .22117 clearly showed that the independent variables explained 88.5% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.23 ANOVA^b

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	185.023	6	30.837	630.405	.000 ^a

1	Residual	24.116	617	.049		
	Total	209.139	623			

Predictors:(Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: Hobby

From the above table, it is found that $F=630.405$, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable hobby. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.24 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std.Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.581	.010		362.002	.000
	Preference attitude	.079	.010	.122	7.972	.000
	Product evaluation	.096	.010	.148	9.651	.000
	Product preference	.086	.010	.133	8.726	.000
	Promotional strategies	.258	.010	.399	26.104	.000
	Purchase decision	.528	.010	.816	53.362	.000
	Satisfaction	-.026	.010	-.040	-2.618	.009

Dependent Variable: Hobby

From the above table 5.24, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=7.972$, $P=.000$), product evaluation ($t=9.651$, $p=0.000$), product preference ($t=8.726$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=26.104$, $p=0.000$), purchase decision ($t=53.362$, $p=0.000$) is statistically significant at 5% level. The study reveals that different customers have different hobbies. Some of the customers of cellular phones also develop an hobby of frequently preference over to different brands that are attractive and within their budget for which they are majorly attracted by the promotional strategies promoted by the manufacturers of different brands of Cellular phones that enforces the customers of cellular phones to evaluate and take the decision of purchasing cellular phones.

Impact of brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on defect

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors defect and the independent factors brand preference attitude, produce evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction gives the following results

Table 5.25 Model Summary

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Dimension	1	.906 ^a	.820	.818	.30187
a. Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude					

From the above table it is found that $R=.906$, $R\text{ Square}=.820$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .818$ and standard error of the estimate = .30187 clearly showed that the independent variables explained 82% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.26 ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	205.222	6	34.204	375.336	.000 ^a
	Residual	44.926	617	.091		
	Total	250.148	623			

Predictors:(Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: Defect

From the above table, it is found that 375.336, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable defect. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.27 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std.Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.435	.014		254.427	.000
	Preference attitude	.077	.014	.109	5.690	.000
	Product evaluation	.313	.014	.442	23.157	.000
	Product preference	.057	.014	.081	4.218	.000
	Promotional strategies	.157	.014	.221	11.603	.000
	Purchase decision	.123	.014	.174	9.125	.000
	Satisfaction	.512	.014	.723	37.886	.000

Dependent Variable: Defect

From the above table 5.27, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=5.690$, $P=.000$), product evaluation ($t=23.157$, $p=0.000$), product preference ($t=4.218$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=11.603$, $p=0.000$), purchase decision ($t=9.125$, $p=0.000$) is statistically significant at 5% level. It is concluded that the customer switch over to new brands due to defectiveness in their cellular phones instrument for which purpose they evaluate different products of Cellular phones available in the market and prefer the best that long lasts.

Impact of brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on broken

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors broken and the independent factors brand preference attitude, produce evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction gives the following results

Table 5.28 Model Summary

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Dimension	1	.549 ^a	.302	.293	.45269

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

From the above table it is found that $R=.549$, $R\text{ Square}=.302$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .293$ and standard error of the estimate = .45269 clearly showed that the independent variables explained 30.2% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.29 ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	43.679	6	7.280	35.523	.000 ^a
	Residual	101.031	617	.205		
	Total	144.710	623			

Predictors:(Constant),Satisfaction,Purchasedecision,Promotionalstrategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: Broken

From the above table, it is found that $F=35.523$, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable broken. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.30 Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	3.864	.020		190.870	.000
Preference attitude	.175	.020	.325	8.639	.000
Product evaluation	.040	.020	.074	1.959	.051
Product preference	.145	.020	.269	7.138	.000
Promotional strategies	.156	.020	.289	7.678	.000
Purchase decision	.088	.020	.164	4.356	.000
Satisfaction	-.044	.020	-.082	-2.166	.031

Dependent Variable: Broken

From the above table 5.30, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=8.639$, $P=.000$), product preference ($t=7.138$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=7.678$, $p=0.000$), purchase decision ($t=4.356$, $p=0.000$) and satisfaction ($t=-2.166$, $p=0.031$) is statistically significant at 5% level. It is concluded that the customer take the decision of buying new Cellular phones when their present one is broken. They select the cellular phones based on the product evaluation, preference, promotional strategies developed by the manufactures and satisfaction.

Impact of brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers on lost

The application of regression analysis on the dependent factors lost and the independent factors brand preference attitude, product evaluation, product preference, sales promotional strategies, purchase decision, level of satisfaction gives the following results

Table 5.31 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Dimension 1	.452 ^a	.204	.194	.47310

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

From the above table it is found that $R=.452$, $R\text{ Square}=.204$, adjusted $R\text{ Square} = .194$ and standard error of the estimate = .47310 clearly showed that the independent variables explained 20.4% variance, which is statistically significant and forces to verify the regression fit.

Table 5.32 ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	28.295	6	4.716	21.070	.000 ^a
Residual	110.345	617	.224		
Total	138.640	623			

Predictors: (Constant), Satisfaction, Purchase decision, Promotional strategies, Product preference, Product evaluation, Preference attitude

Dependent Variable: Lost

From the above table, it is found that $F=21.070$, $P=.000$ are statistically significant at 5% level. Therefore it can be concluded that the regression fit is significant and independent variables brand preference behavior of cellular phones customers explained the dependent variable lost. This leads to the verification of individual influence of variables.

Table 5.33 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.045	.021		191.165	.000
	Preference attitude	.143	.021	.271	6.755	.000
	Product evaluation	.103	.021	.196	4.869	.000
	Product preference	.101	.021	.192	4.787	.000
	Promotional strategies	.116	.021	.220	5.477	.000
	Purchase decision	.032	.021	.061	1.524	.128
	Satisfaction	-.022	.021	-.042	-1.043	.298

Dependent Variable: Lost

From the above table 5.33, it is found that the preference attitude ($t=6.755$, $P=.000$), product evaluation ($t=4.869$, $p=0.000$), product preference ($t=4.787$, $p=0.000$), promotional strategies ($t=5.477$, $p=0.000$) is statistically significant at 5% level. When the present phone is lost, the customers prefer to buy new cellular phones for which purpose they evaluate the product preferred by them after studying the promotional strategies and its specialties quoted by the manufactures of cellular phones.

Works Cited

- Costa, Janeen Arnold, Introduction to Gender Issues and. Consumer Behavior, Janeen Arnold Costa, ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1-10.1994.
- Wehrli, Hans Peter and Uta Jüttner, "Beziehungs marketing in Wertsystemen," Marketing: Zeitschrift für. Forschung und Praxis, Vol. 1, 1996.
- Harvey, Michael G. & Speier, Cheri & Novicevic, Milorad M., "[The impact of emerging markets on staffing the global organization: A knowledge-based view](#)," [Journal of International Management](#), Elsevier, vol. 5(3), pages 167-186, 1999.
- Mary Jo Bitner, Bernard H. Booms, Lois A. Mohr, Critical Service Encounters: The Employee's Viewpoint, Journal of Marketing, Vol. 58, 1995.