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Abstract
In the last years, some marketing studies have focused on understanding brand experience, defined as the customer responses evoked by brand-related stimuli. The aim of this paper is to analyze in-depth the role of the brand experience in consumer-brand relationships, studying this concept and measuring the antecedents and the consequences of it. Coherently, it’s set up a conceptual model for examined the relationships among four brand constructs: brand experience, brand knowledge, word-of-mouth, brand preference. An empirical research has been camped out to measure: 1. brand experience as perceived by youth Italian consumers for thirteen product categories; 2. the strength of the relationships among brand experience, its antecedents and consequences, as recognized in conceptual model; 3. if and how the brand experience has effects on its consequences more positively for a selected group of brands, defined experiential brands.
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1. Introduction
In the last years, several studies have focused on understanding in-depth the role of the experience (Pine, Gilmore, 1999; Schmitt, 1999, 2003, 2008; Smith, Wheeler, 2003; Meyer, Schwager, 2007) as marketing driver to provide superior value for the customers and co-create new value with the customers (Bendapudi, Leone, 2003; Prahalad, Ramaswamy, 2004; Vargo, Lush, 2004; Payne, Storbacka, Frow, Knox, 2009). These studies follow Holbrook & Hirschman’s pivotal research on experiential marketing (1982), which emphasized the role of emotions, context and symbolic aspects of customer experience. According to Schmitt (2003), the customer experience management is the process of managing a customer’s entire experience with a product, a brand or a company. In this perspective, a firm principally has to: 1. build an experiential platform, based on a series of touch point – “customer corridor”, in accordance with Meyer, Schwager (2007: p.119) - providing a superior value for the customers; 2. manage the consumer-brand relationship (Fournier, 1998), designing brand experience (Payne, Storbacka, Frow, Knox, 2009) measured through customer perceptions generated by brand-related stimuli. According to Brakus, Schmitt, Zarantonello (2009: p.52), in this paper we consider brand experience as the “sensations, feelings, cognitions and behavioural responses evoked by brand-related stimuli that are part of brand design and identity, packaging, communications and environments”.

The aim of this paper is to analyze the role of the brand experience in consumer-brand relationships, studying and measuring antecedents and consequences of it. The paper is organized as follows: first, there is a marketing literature review on customer experience. Second, it’s defined brand experience and examined the antecedents and consequences of this construct: brand knowledge, word-of-month and brand preference. Third, it’s proposed a conceptual model that recognized the cause-effect relationships among brand experience, its antecedents and consequences. The conceptual model, with its hypothesized relationships between variables and constructs, is verified through empirical research. Coherently with theoretical model, the empirical research had the following objectives: 1. measuring brand experience as perceived by youth Italian consumers for thirteen product categories; 2. measuring the strength of the relationships among brand experience, its antecedents and consequences, as recognized in conceptual model; 3. measuring if and how the brand experience has effects on its consequences more positively for the so called experiential brand. The findings of the research are explored in terms of managerial implications, limits and future research opportunities.

2. Theoretical background
Conceptualizing brand experience has been the mean focus of scholars researches on experiential marketing and, in particular, on customer experience. Holbrook and Hirschman’s research on hedonic consumption (1982) is the first study examining, in-depth, the experiential nature of consumer behaviour. The Authors put in evidence the role of emotions, fantasies, feelings and fun as key drivers of consumer behaviour processes in the field of hedonistic products. Afterwards, Pine and Gilmore (1998, 1999), with the experience economy, analyze how marketing strategies create brand image, emphasizing the characteristics of customer experience during the stages of purchase and use of products. In this perspective, the main aim of the firm is to embed goods and services in an experiential brand, developing (Pine and Gilmore, 1998): 1. customer co-evolution, because customers play a key role in creating the performance or event that carry out the experience; 2. customer connection (or environmental relationship), that links customers to the performance or event.
Schmitt (1999, 2003) examines how firms build experiential marketing strategies in the customer relationship management. He looks at customer experience management (CEM) as the process of managing a customer’s entire experience with a product, a brand or a company. Others Authors, moreover, recognize the creating distinctive customer experience as a process of value co-creation with own customers (Prahalad, Ramaswamy, 2000, 2003, 2004; Bendapudi, Leone, 2003; Cantone, Risitano, 2007): it yields higher economic value for the firms (Pine, Gilmore, 1999) because creates superior customer life time values. Customer experience management differs from customer relationship management because it focuses on the experience in place of the customer, rather than the history of customer’s purchasing patters. CEM strategies are able to create value for both the customer and for the firm (Verhoef, Lemon, Parasuraman, Roggeveen, Tsiros, Schlesinger, 2009). The customer experience occurs when customer and brand (or company) come into interaction (touch point); this contacts provokes some responses. The customer experience is a strictly personal relationship and implies the customer’s involvement at different levels (Gentile, Spiller, Noci, 2007): rational, emotional, sensorial, physical, spiritual. There are two kinds of customer-firm contacts (Meyer, Schwager, 2007): direct and indirect. Direct contacts generally happen during the phases of purchase and use; they are, generally, initiated by the customer. Instead, indirect contacts, most often, involve unplanned encounters with representatives of a company’s products, services or brands; they take the form of (positive or negative) word-of-mouth, advertising, news reports, etc.

2.1 The brand experience in a relational perspective
In post-modern economy, consumer-brand relationships (i.e. Fournier, Yao, 1997; Fournier, 1998) are based not only on firm-to-customer (or customer-to-firm) bilateral interactions, but also on customer-to-customer multilateral interactions which drive the value co-creation processes (Prahalad, Ramaswamy, 2000, 2003, 2004). In the service-dominant logic perspective (Vargo, Lush, 2004), the customer engage dialogues and interactions with other customers (i.e. brand communities), such as with their suppliers during the product design, delivery and consumption phases. In many industries, brand communities are becoming an interesting form of open innovation network to develop new products and/or services (Füllen, Matzler, Hoppe, 2008). To create value the firm has, priority, to understand and learn how customer co-create activities (Payne, Storbacka, Frow, Knox, 2009). For example, the element of brand identity could be co-defined by firm with customers; the co-creation process is especially understandable in consumer groups such as brand communities or tribes (Covà, Covà, 2002). When the customers search, choice and use products and/or services, they are exposed to various specific brand-related stimuli, such as identity elements, community recommendations, communication tools and other environmental aspects. These are the main learning sources of customer responses that generate the brand experience. According to Brakus, Schmitt, Zarantonello (2009), we consider brand experience as “sensations, feelings, cognitions and behavioural responses evoked by brand-related stimuli that are part of brand design and identity, packaging, communications and environments”. These Authors define brand experience construct and validate a brand experience scale based on four dimensions: sensory, affective, intellectual and behavioural. In the empirical research, we have adopted a shorten version of this scale, using twelve items (Zarantonello, Schmitt, Brakus, 2007), three items for each of the four brand experience dimensions (see Paragraph 3.2 – Brand Measures).

2.2 Antecedents and consequences of brand experience
Brand experience has a strategic role for managing consumer-brand relationships in the perspective of value co-creation (Payne, Storbacka, Frow, Knox, 2009). This is one of the
sources generating brand equity and brand’s competitive advantage. Building, managing and measuring customer-based brand equity (CBBE: Keller, 1993, 2003, 2007), during all phases of consumer-brand relationships, could be the best marketing approach to maximize customer equity (Leone, Rao, Keller, Luo, McAlister, Srivastava, 2006). Therefore, to measure the long-term profitability of own customers’ portfolio (Gambarino, Johnson, 1999), any firm needs to manage strategically the set of brand equity sources. According to this approach, and coherently with others recent researches, there are three main kinds of sources for managing and measuring CBBE (Risitano, 2004; Cantone, Risitano, 2007): knowledge-related (i.e. awareness, image, association), experience-related (i.e. attitude, affinity, personality), trust-related (i.e. satisfaction, word-of-mouth, commitment, loyalty). Having before defined brand experience as a set of multidimensional responses evoked by brand stimuli, our research’s hypothesis consider sources of Knowledge-related Brand Equity (KrBE) as antecedents of brand experience and the sources of Trust-related Brand Equity (TrBE) as consequences of brand experience.

The main antecedent of brand experience - in our conceptual model - is brand knowledge, namely the set of descriptive and evaluative brand information stored in consumer memory (Keller, 2003). It is composed by two main components: brand awareness and brand image. According to Keller (2003), brand awareness is connected to the strength of the brand node in the “associative network memory” (Anderson, 1983; Krishnan, 1996), or trace in memory, as expressed by consumers’ ability to identify the brand under different conditions. The brand image, instead, is the set of the customer’s perceptions about a brand, expressed by the brand associations held in customers’ memory. In others words, these former are the other informational nodes linked to the brand node in the “associative network memory” and evoke the deepest meaning of the brand for the customers (Keller, 2003).

Instead, the main consequences of brand experience can be considered the sources of Trust-related Brand Equity (TrBE), such as brand preference (Cobb-Walgren, Ruble, Donthu, 1995), brand satisfaction (Delgado-Ballester, Munuera-Aleman, 2005), brand attachment (Thomson, MacInnis, Park, 2005), brand commitment (Chaudhuri, Holbrook, 2001), word-of-mouth (East, Hammond, Wright, 2007) and brand loyalty (Oliver, 1997, 1999). In this paper we analyze, in particular, two consequences of brand experience: word-of-mouth and brand preference. Word-of-mouth is the informal advice about brand which spread among customers. It is often based on customer satisfaction (Woodal, 2003) and, therefore, it may be positive or negative encouraging or discouraging the brand choice (East, Hammond, Lomax, 2008). Instead, brand preference is a measure of customers’ brand choices and, consequently, of the brand’s strategies effectiveness, in terms of competitive outcome (e.g. brand’s market share in the product category).

3. Empirical research

An empirical research has been carried out to analyze the role of brand experience in the consumer-brand relationships, for selected experiential and no-experiential brands competing in the Italian market. For this purpose, we have set up a conceptual model to analyze the relationships among the four brand constructs (see Figure 1): brand knowledge (BK), brand experience (BE), word-of-mouth (WoM), brand preference (BP).

3.1 Methodology and research design

In a preliminary phase of our research (March-April 2009), we have got selected the brands for which to measure the relationships among the aforesaid brand constructs. Through in-depth interviews with four marketing managers and a quantitative survey with a sample of post-graduated students (n=18), we have identified thirteen representative brands of
consumption choices for youth Italian consumers. The interviewed marketing managers are in charge to leading firms of product or service market (Vodafone, Barilla, L’Oreal, Zero9). Instead, the interviewed post-graduate students were attending the “Master in Marketing Management” at Faculty of Economics, University of Naples Federico II. The findings of preliminary survey have allowed to categorize the brands in two groups: experiential brands (EX-Brand), and no-experiential brands (NoEX-Br and). We have considered as experiential brands: Nike (sportswear), Red Bull (energy drink), PlayStation (entertainment systems), iPod (mp3 player), Ikea (Scandinavian-style home furnishings), Mulino Bianco (bakery products), Nutella (chocolate cream), Nokia (mobile phone), Heineken (alcoholic drink). Instead, we have recognized as no-experiential brands: Geox (shoes), Tempo (paper handkerchiefs), Colgate (dental and oral care product), Duracell (batteries). A questionnaire with “closed and open answers” was submitted to the respondents of the sample. To them, was asked to evaluate their experiences with brands, on the base of a seven-point Likert scale (1 = “extremely disagree,” and 7 = “extremely agree”) for questions with “closed” answers. We prepared four different versions of the questionnaire; each version included three experiential brands and one no-experiential brand. The interviews were conducted in May-July 2009 on sample of youth Italian consumer. The sample (n=259) was stratified with two variables representative of Province of Naples (N=3.059.196 people; ISTAT, 2001): the class of age (20-24, 25-29, 30-34) and the gender (male and female).

3.2 Research hypothesis

Structural equation modelling (XLSTAT 2009) was adopted to test the proposed conceptual model and to verify the following hypothesis:

H1 – No-experiential brands have lower mean values of brand experience than the experiential brands.

H2 – Brand knowledge (BK) is positively related to brand experience (BE).

H3 – Brand experience (BE) is positively related to word-of-mouth (WoM).

H4 – Brand experience (BE) is positively related to brand preference (BP).

H5 – Word-of-mouth (WoM) is positively related to brand preference (BP).

H6 – For experiential brands, brand experience (BE) affects both to word-of-mouth (WoM) and brand preference (BP) more positively than all set of selected brands.

For the empirical research was adopted the PLS (Partial Least Squares) approach to structural equation model, known as PLS Path Modelling (Tenenhaus, Esposito, Chatelin, Lauro, 2005). This is a component-based estimation technique, a method that provide an estimate of the latent variables in such a way that they are the most correlated to each other and the most representative of each corresponding block of manifest variables. This technique is to be considered as a generalization of Principal Component Analysis.

3.3 Brand Measures

Brand Experience Measure

According to Zarantonello, Schmitt, Brakus (2007), we have got adopted a shorten version of brand experience scale based on twelve items, with three items for each of the four brand experience dimensions. We used an Italian adaptation of brand experience scale, tested and validate in a recent research (Zarantonello, 2008). The respondents of the sample have evaluated brand experience (BE) using a seven-point Likert scale (1 = “extremely disagree,” and 7 = “extremely agree”). As sensory items (Sense), the questions posed to them were as follows: “I find this brand interesting in a sensory way”; “This brand makes a strong impression on my visual sense or other senses”; “This brand does not appeal to my senses”. As feelings dimension (Feel), we asked: “This brand induces feelings and sentiments”; “I do
not have strong emotions for this brand”; “This brand is an emotional brand”. Instead, the cognitive sphere (Think) was investigated with the questions: “This brand stimulates my curiosity and problem solving”; “I engage in a lot of thinking when I encounter this brand”; “This brand does not make me think”. Finally, to elicit behavioural elements (Act) we asked “I engage in physical actions and behaviours when I use this brand”; “This brand results in bodily experiences”; “This brand is not action oriented”. Therefore, the adopted conceptual model works with four manifest variables for measuring brand experience (Figure 1): sense, feel, think, and act.

**Brand Knowledge Measure**
According to Keller (2003), two useful measures of brand knowledge (BK) are brand awareness (BAw) and brand image (BIm). Brand awareness has been analyzed at two levels: 1. as brand recall, that is if the brand was cited by respondents as one of three main brands in the product category; 2. as brand recognition, verifying if the brand was recognized by respondents (Yes/No). For this analysis, was proposed modified logo for each selected brands (e.g. having just 40% of the letters in brand name). It was submitted as a stimuli to the respondents. Instead, brand image has been analyzed measuring three dimensions (Keller, 2003): strength, favourability and uniqueness of brand image. The respondents revealed their perceptions about each brand on the base of a seven-point Likert scale (1 = “extremely low,” and 7 = “extremely high”). Therefore, the conceptual model works with two manifest variables for measuring brand knowledge (Figure 1): awareness and image.

**Word-of-Mouth Measure**
For measuring word-of-mouth (WoM), we analyzed both the respondents’ behaviour in the past and the intent to recommend the brand to other customers in the future. The form of questions was the following: “In the last twelve months, have you recommended the brand XXX?” (Yes/No); “Do you intend to recommend the brand XXX during the next twelve months?”. For the second questions, the respondents could ask on the base of a seven-point Likert scale (1 = “extremely improbably,” and 7 = “extremely probably”). Therefore, the conceptual model works with three manifest variables for measuring word-of-mouth (Figure 1): past WoM_Yes, past WoM_No (dichotomy), intent to WoM.

**Brand Preference Measure**
Brand preference was measured both as past purchasing customer behaviour and as intention to buy the brand in the next future. The form of questions was the following: “In the last twelve months, have you buy the brand XXX?” (Yes/No); “Do you intend to buy the brand XXX during the next twelve months?”. For the second questions, the respondents could ask with a seven-point Likert scale (1 = “extremely improbably,” and 7 = “extremely probably”). Therefore, the conceptual model works with three manifest variables for measuring brand preference (Figure 1): past purchase_Yes, past purchase_No (dichotomy), intent to purchase.

**3.4 Findings**
**Phase 1: measuring the brand experience**
*Figure 2* illustrate the estimated structural equation model to measure brand experience. All path coefficients in the model are significant (ps < 0.01). The unidimensionality of latent variables in outer model – measured analysing the covariance of related manifest variables - was satisfactory (Dillon-Goldstein’s rho > 0.7: Sense = 0.906; Feel = 0.886; Think = 0.873; Act = 0.862). We analyzed, also, the discriminant validity through a comparison of average variance extracted (AVE) for each brand experience dimension with its shared variance,
calculated with all other constructs in the study (manifest and latent variables). According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), the average variance extracted must be greater than shared variance for discriminant validity to be established. The findings confirm the discriminant validity for each brand experience dimension \( AVE_{Sense} = 0.764; \ AVE_{Feel} = 0.719; \ AVE_{Think} = 0.695; \ AVE_{Act} = 0.675; \ Shared\ Variance = 0.604 \). Moreover, the estimated model fits the data well: \( GFI = 0.999 \) (Goodness of Fit Index: value between 0 and 1).

The measurement of brand experience in Italian market of thirteen selected brands – see the brand experience values in Table 1, normalized in 0-100 scale - demonstrate the existing of nine experiential brands (value > 50.0) and four no-experiential brands (value < 50.0). The Nutella brand (chocolate cream) has the higher mean value with 66.13; the Colgate brand (dental and oral care product) has the lower mean value with 38.14. So, H1 is accepted.

**Phase 2: analyzing the relationships among the brand constructs**

The conceptual model proposed in the paper allows to analyze the relationships among the antecedent and consequences of brand experience (see Figure 1). To verify the unidimensionality of the outer models for each latent variable, we have adopted the Dillon-Goldstein’s rho index or, in absence of this, the principal component analysis of the blocks. A block is considered unidimensional if Dillon-Goldstein’s rho is larger than 0.7 or if the first eigenvalue of the correlation matrix is higher than 1, while the others are smaller (Tenenhaus, Esposito, Chatelin, Lauro, 2005). These conditions have been satisfied for each four brand constructs (see Table 2). Moreover, for analyzing the monofactorial among manifest variables and latent variables, it has been measured the cross-loadings. In Table 3, it’s possible to verify that all manifest variables are really monofactorial (mostly related to its latent variable). We have evaluated the weights, the standardized loadings and the communalities of the each manifest variables related to four brand constructs. Particularly, the findings of communalities are satisfactory (see Table 4). They put in evidence how much of the each manifest variable variability in the q-th block is explained by its own latent variable \( \xi_q \) (values between 0 and 1). Verifying the findings of the confidence interval for each standardized loadings and relative weight, we have accepted all the manifest variables in the model. The finding of discriminat validity analysis for the four brand constructs proposed in conceptual model have been following: \( AVE_{BK} = 0.655; \ AVE_{BE} = 0.683; \ AVE_{WoM} = 0.858; \ AVE_{BP} = 0.763; \ Shared\ Variance = 0.742 \). Figure 3 illustrate the estimated structural equation model measuring the casual relationships among four brand constructs. All path coefficients in the model are significant (\( ps < 0.01 \)). The estimated model fits the data well: \( GFI = 0.894 \) (Goodness of Fit Index: value between 0 and 1). The findings show that brand knowledge has a good positive relation to brand experience (path coefficient = 0.603). It’s demonstrates that brand knowledge is an antecedent of brand experience (H2 accepted). Brand experience is not strongly positively related both to word-of-mouth and brand preference (path coefficients, respectively, is 0.254 and 0.085). Instead, brand knowledge is more positively related to word-of-mouth than brand experience (path coefficient = 0.436). Therefore, H3 and H4 are accepted even if the path coefficients aren’t so high. Word-of-mouth affects brand preference positively (path coefficient = 0.464), so H5 is accepted. Moreover, we observe that the values of \( R^2 \) index (value between 0 and 1) - measuring each regression in structural model – are not very high (see Figure 3). Therefore, these findings demonstrate that brand preference and word-of-mouth could have other antecedents not analyzed in this research.

Finally, Table 5 shows that defining the structural equation model only with experiential brand data, brand experience (BE) is more positively related both to word-of-mouth (WoM) than brand preference (BP).The path coefficients of this model (values respectively 0.286 and
0,187) are more high than path coefficients of the model with all brands selected (experiential and no experiential: path coefficients respectively 0,254 and 0,085). So, H6 is accepted.

4. Discussion and managerial implication
The brand experience scale has demonstrated to be an important marketing tool to measure the customer responses. The four dimensions of this scale have discriminant validity in the estimated model. Particularly, the finding show that the “feel” dimension has a significant role than other brand experience dimensions in the consumer-brand relationships management. Furthermore, the measurement of brand experience on thirteen selected brands have allowed to define the ranking of these, defining nine experiential brands (EX-Brand) and four no-experiential brands (NoEX-Brand) and putting in evidence the role of experiential dimensions for each selected brand. These findings highlight the most strategic kinds of customer responses – for each selected brands - in the customer experience management. Moreover, the findings of analysis on estimated conceptual model have demonstrated that brand knowledge is a antecedent of brand experience. This underlines the importance to create an high brand awareness and a strong, favour and unique level of brand image as the first stage of strategic brand equity management. Instead, it’s not very relevant the role of brand experience as antecedent both of word-of-mouth than of brand preference, even if they are positively related, as path coefficients have demonstrated. Probably, these findings highlight that there are others brand constructs – not supposed in the empirical research - strategically relevant to manage consumer-brand relationships. Analyzing in-depth the findings, it’s possible to observe that for EX-Brand the brand experience is more positively related as antecedent. This confirms the strategic role of brand experience in the long-term brand equity management of the firms. Many companies are maximizing the value co-creation with own customers adopting experiential tools in the marketing strategies, such as event, corporate blog, temporary store, brand community, non-conventional solution, etc. (e.g. Apple, Starbucks, Nike, Red Bull, Kenwood, Nokia, Coca-cola, etc.). For these firms, brand experience measurements could be in the future one of the most important topics to sustain the brand equity management.

5. Limits and future research opportunities
The paper has some limitations, particularly in the empirical study. First, in the field research design the sampling procedure was not probabilistic. The sample was defined in a specific geographic area (Province of Naples) and just for class of age (20-34 years). Second, the findings of discriminat validity analysis for two brand constructs proposed in conceptual model – brand knowledge and brand experience - have the AVE values inferior of shared variance. Third, even if the estimated model fits the data very well - as revisable thought the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) analysis - the values of R² index are not very high. These observations allows to defining several opportunities for future researches. It would be valuable the conceptual model on (probabilistic) sample in other geographical areas: in Italian context, analysing the same selected brands; or in European city (comparable with Naples), defining a new cluster of brands representative of consumption choices of youth consumers. Future research should also examine the relationships among brand experience and other brand constructs – specially trust-related - such as brand attachment, brand commitment and/or brand satisfaction. Finally, other researches could use qualitative statistical analysis methods (in-depth interview, focus group, etc.) for studying comparatively the influence of brand experience on two/three specific category products.
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**Figure 1** – The general conceptual model.

**Figure 2** – The main findings of brand experience model.

**Table 1** – The brand experience measurement of the selected brands.
Figure 3 – The main findings of general conceptual model.

Table 2 – The unidimensionality analysis of latent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variables</th>
<th>Numbers of dimension</th>
<th>Cronbach’ α</th>
<th>Dillon - Goldestein’ ρ</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAND KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>2.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD OF MOUTH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND PREFERENCE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – The discriminant validity analysis.
### Table 4 – The weight, the loadings and the communality analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variables</th>
<th>Manifest variables</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Standardized loadings</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Inferior limit (95%)</th>
<th>Superior limit (95%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAND KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAND EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
<td>Sense</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORD OF MOUTH</strong></td>
<td>Intent to WoM</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WoM_Yes</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WoM_No</td>
<td>-0.334</td>
<td>-0.952</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>-0.959</td>
<td>-0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAND PREFERENCE</strong></td>
<td>Purchase_Yes</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase_No</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
<td>-0.888</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>-0.914</td>
<td>-0.841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5 – The relationship among the four brand constructs.

**A comparative analysis between all selected brands and experiential brands data.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variables</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Pr &gt;</th>
<th>Path coefficients (BRAND EXPERIENCE)</th>
<th>Path coefficients (WORD OF MOUTH)</th>
<th>Path coefficients (BRAND PREFERENCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong> (BRAND EXPERIENCE)</td>
<td>All selected brands</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>590.712</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential brands</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>445.569</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong> (WORD OF MOUTH)</td>
<td>All selected brands</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>327.820</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential brands</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>235.435</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong> (BRAND PREFERENCE)</td>
<td>All selected brands</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>248.792</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential brands</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>219.697</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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