[The Impact Of Brand Engagement, Brand Love, Brand Interactivity, And Overall Brand Equity On Purchase Intention Of Mobile Brand.]

Saira Jessani
Lecturer, Department of Management Science Indus University
saira.jessani@indus.edu.pk
Mahwish Qutub
Visiting faculty, Media science Department, Iqra university, Karachi, Pakistan
Email: mahwish.qutub@iqra.edu.pk
Uzma Khalid
PhD Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Greenwich University, Karachi, Pakistan
Email: uzmakhalid329@gmail.com
Asadullah Lakho
Senior Lecturer, Department of Business Admininstration, Iqra University, Karachi, Pakistan
Email: asadullah.lakho@iqra.edu.pk
Mariam Shahid
Lecturer, Department of Management Science Indus University

Review Type: Double Blind Peer Review

ABSTRACT

Brand interactivity (BI) plays a crucial role in fostering customer engagement. This study aims to examine the influence of brand engagement, brand love, brand interactivity, and overall brand equity on consumers' purchase intentions toward mobile phone brands operating in Karachi. To collect data, 300 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 263 were deemed valid and used for analysis. The data was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and PLS (Partial Least Squares), with PLS-SEM employed for hypothesis testing.A total of seven hypotheses were formulated. The results revealed that brand engagement significantly and positively affects brand love, brand interactivity, and purchase intention. Likewise, brand interactivity positively influences both brand engagement and purchase intention. Additionally, brand love has a strong positive impact on overall brand equity, while overall brand equity significantly enhances purchase intention.The study is grounded in the Social Exchange Theory and the Interpersonal Theory of Love. Based on the findings, it is recommended that future research should expand the scope by gathering data from multiple cities to enhance generalizability and gain broader insights

Keywords: Brand interactivity, purchase intention, brand love, brand engagement and overall brand equity.

Introduction

In the modern era, mobile phones have become essential tools in everyday life, especially within a global context marked by environmental challenges stemming from unsustainable production and consumption practices (Bengtsson et al., 2018). Over the past 25 years, there has been a growing scholarly interest in exploring the dynamic interactions between mobile phone brands and consumers. This study contributes to existing literature on customer–brand relationships by integrating elements such as brand engagement, emotional attachment (brand love), and perceived brand value to understand consumer preferences for innovative mobile technologies.

Mobile phones are not only vital communication tools but also significant marketing instruments, with brand equity serving as a critical intangible asset for companies (Barrio et al., 2019; Khanna et al., 2019; Surucu et al., 2019). Successful market performance demands various strategies to foster customer loyalty toward specific mobile brands (Hadi & Azim, 2011). One of the key behavioral indicators of customer loyalty is purchase intention, which plays a fundamental role in shaping actual buying decisions (Durianto & Liana, 2004; Pi et al., 2011; Pavlou & Gefen, 2004). According to Hosein (2012), purchase intention can be assessed through the level of awareness and interest consumers have in a mobile product. Interest reflects consumers' emotional connection to a device,

influencing their decision-making. Thus, purchase intention refers to the likelihood that a consumer will decide to buy a mobile device after evaluating its features and benefits.

Since 2005, the concept of brand engagement has garnered attention in academic marketing literature, particularly with the introduction of advanced features such as high-resolution cameras and extended memory capacities (Islam & Rahman, 2016; Brodie et al., 2011). Brand engagement plays a crucial role in fostering customer attachment and loyalty, leading to deeper emotional connections between consumers and mobile brands (Hollebeek et al., 2014; Kandampully et al., 2015). Mobile phones serve as the primary focus of this study due to their popularity among target audiences and their ability to fulfill both functional and experiential needs. Mobile brands actively strive to engage consumers through platforms like social media, television, and word-of-mouth marketing, aiming to build emotional bonds and brand love through these channels.

To strengthen these emotional ties, companies should emphasize interactive and hedonic experiences that align with consumers' expectations. Interactivity, in this context, is the perceived ability of consumers to engage meaningfully with their mobile devices. The perceived level of interactivity depends on the user's individual experience and interpretation of how effectively the mobile device facilitates learning and usability (Wu, 2006). A high level of interactivity enhances perceived ease of use, allowing users to navigate features according to their preferences while delivering relevant and timely content across multiple platforms. Consumer purchase intention has emerged as a vital metric influencing organizational performance. In today's competitive marketplace, customers are presented with a wide array of mobile brands and options (Giovani et al., 2013). Satisfied customers are more likely to develop future purchase intentions, explore new product lines, and engage in positive word-of-mouth promotion. Thus, understanding the drivers behind purchase intentions remains a core focus of marketing research (Verma, 2020). This study explores how brand equity affects consumers' intention to purchase mobile phones, extending prior research that has primarily focused on other product categories, such as branded footwear (Arshad & Victor, 2020). There is limited research examining the influence of brand engagement on purchase intention within the mobile industry, despite its recognized importance in shaping consumer perceptions (Kumar & Nayak, 2019). In Pakistan, particularly in the competitive mobile market of Karachi, there is a lack of recent studies exploring the impact of brand-related factors on consumer buying behavior.

As consumer preferences evolve due to changing lifestyles, rising incomes, and higher education levels, businesses must adapt their offerings and strategies accordingly. Companies that fail to align with shifting consumer behavior risk losing market share. Engaging advertisements and innovative marketing tactics are essential to capturing consumer interest. In a highly competitive mobile market, continuous innovation and

research investment are necessary to keep pace with changing consumer demands. Only those brands that effectively align with customer preferences are likely to succeed (Sakkthivel, 2011).Given the significance of brand engagement, brand love, interactivity, and brand equity in shaping purchase intentions, this study seeks to examine their collective impact on consumers' purchasing decisions regarding mobile phones in Karachi. The primary objective is to assess how these brand-related variables influence the likelihood of consumers choosing a particular mobile brand..

Theoretical Background

The Social Exchange Theory (SET) proposed by Homans (1958) offers insight into human social behavior, particularly in the context of economic exchanges. According to SET, interactions between parties such as between providers and consumers entail the reciprocal exchange of resources, which are not limited to monetary benefits. These exchanges may also include intangible rewards such as appreciation, affection, and emotional validation (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The theory highlights two fundamental concepts: exchange relationships and the notions of value and utility. When consumers experience positive service interactions, they are more likely to develop favorable perceptions of the brand, which may lead to enhanced brand loyalty. Complementing SET, the Interpersonal Theory of Love also sheds light on the relationship between consumers and branded products. As Ahuvia (2005) explains, consumer-brand love parallels interpersonal love, progressing from general perceptions to deep emotional attachments, often resulting in a kind of brand obsession (Fehr & Russell, 1991). This theory has been applied to branding through the self-expansion model (Aron & Aron, 1986), where consumers incorporate the brand into their self-concept when the brand aligns with their identity and emotional needs (Ahuvia, 1993). Consequently, a consumer may develop emotional affection for a brand, driven by both strong reciprocal exchanges and a deep sense of personal connection. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) describe brand love as encompassing passion, emotional bonding, favorable brand evaluations, a sense of uniqueness, and affectionate expressions toward the brand—elements that distinguish it from interpersonal love. This emotional attachment also links to the concept of which reflects psychological commitment and consumer involvement (Hsieh & Chang, 2016). Within this context, Social Brand Engagement (SBE) has emerged, emphasizing the role of social media in enhancing consumer-brand interaction (Laroche et al., 2012).

According to SET, brand equity arises from the strength of the consumer-brand relationship and is perceived as a social asset.In terms of purchasing behavior, brand love explains how individuals develop strong emotional bonds with brands, including mobile devices (Shimp & Madden, 1988). Love, in this context, is defined as a deep emotional experience that shapes how consumers think, feel, and behave toward the brand (Rubin,

1973). Similar to interpersonal relationships, trust plays a critical role in shaping brand preferences and loyalty (Fehr, 1988).Furthermore, purchase intention is influenced by consumers' positive perceptions of a brand, which enhances their loyalty and willingness to promote it through word-of-mouth (Brynjolfsson & Smith, 2000; Oliver, 1999). In digital environments, SET provides a useful framework to understand consumer decisions related to information-sharing and fraud prevention, where the perceived benefits must outweigh the perceived risks for engagement to occur (Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Liu et al., 2016). While Homans (1958) emphasizes individual-level exchanges, Blau (1964) extends the framework to broader social interactions.

Literature Review

Febrian and Fadly (2021) examined how customer satisfaction—shaped through electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM)—influences brand equity and ultimately affects purchase intention. The study also introduced culture as a moderating variable. The independent variables included brand equity (BE), eWOM, and customer satisfaction (CS), with purchase intention (PI) as the dependent variable. Using the Theory of Planned Behavior as a conceptual foundation, the researchers applied the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) method on data collected from 280 Indonesian consumers via non-probability sampling. The results confirmed that customer satisfaction, brand equity, and eWOM significantly influenced purchase intention, with cultural context playing a mediating role. The study further recommended the use of celebrity endorsements to enhance the spread and impact of eWOM. Ray et al. (2021) investigated various determinants of brand equity and how they influence consumer intentions toward e-learning service providers. Key predictors included brand presentation, external communications, customer experience, brand meaning, brand awareness, and customer satisfaction, with purchase intention as the outcome variable. Drawing on Career Theory, the authors used both Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and PLS-SEM to analyze survey responses from 378 participants. Their findings highlighted customer experience as a key driver of both satisfaction and brand meaning. They also validated a complex structural model, revealing that customer satisfaction and brand equity are strong predictors of purchase intention.Arshad and Victor (2020) focused on how brand equity affects the purchase intentions of students buying branded shoes in Bahrain. The independent variables included brand loyalty, brand recognition, brand association, and perceived quality, while the dependent variable was purchase intention. The conceptual model was built on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory. Using Cronbach's Alpha to test reliability and inferential statistics for hypothesis testing, data were collected from 300 students—180 from public universities and 120 from private institutions. The study confirmed that brand equity significantly influences purchase decisions, and suggested that future research should explore segmentation variables for

deeper insights. Choedon and Leo (2020) analyzed the impact of Social Media Marketing Activities (SMMA) on purchase intention within Korean beauty product firms, with a focus on brand equity and social brand engagement. The study employed both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis based on the Theory of Planned Behavior. Data from 332 respondents indicated that five positive elements of SMMA had strong associations with brand equity, social brand engagement, and purchase intention. The research emphasized the role of social engagement in guiding marketing strategies and influencing consumer behavior. Dabbous et al. (2020) explored how interactions in online environments affect offline purchase intentions. The study emphasized the importance of content quality and peer interactions via social media in shaping consumer-brand relationships. Data were gathered from 392 valid responses out of 600 distributed surveys, specifically targeting Millennials with active Facebook accounts who followed athletic brands. Using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), the findings showed that content quality and brand perception significantly influence consumer engagement and brand awareness, which mediate the relationship between online interactions and offline purchasing behavior. However, the study noted limitations in its sample—focused solely on Millennials and limited to two online media variables—and relied on purchase intention rather than actual purchase data. Horsfall (2020) aimed to assess the influence of brand equity on customer purchase intention within the telecommunications sector. The study applied signaling theory and used regression techniques to examine variables such as brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, and brand equity. With data collected from 200 respondents, the results confirmed that brand equity significantly impacts purchase intention, reinforcing its strategic importance for firms in highly competitive markets. Khan et al. (2020) developed and tested an integrated model exploring the influence of brand experience and brand love in the halal product sector. Independent variables included brand experience, brand love (intimacy and passion), loyalty, satisfaction, and trust, while the dependent variables were purchase intention and word-of-mouth (WOM). Grounded in the Theory of Planned Behavior, the study used Confirmatory Factor Analysis and PLS-SEM for hypothesis testing. Data from 372 Muslim consumers in Malaysia revealed that brand experience and emotional connection (brand love) strongly influence both purchase intention and WOM behavior. The study advocated for culturally aware branding strategies and multi-context evaluations. Castillo and Fernández (2019) aimed to assess the impact of digital influence through eWOM on brand engagement and purchase intention. Using Covariance-Based Structural Equation Modeling (CB-SEM) and drawing from multiple theoretical frameworks, the study employed a longitudinal design with lagged data collection to establish causal relationships. Independent variables included digital influence, eWOM, brand engagement, and brand perceived

value. Based on responses from 280 participants, the findings showed that perceived digital influence significantly affects brand engagement and ultimately increases **purchase intention.**

Brand Love and Overall Brand Equity Brand love, rooted in the interpersonal theory of love, extends the idea of emotional affection beyond people to include brands, especially those that offer convenience (Shimp & Madden, 1988). Consumers often develop warm, affectionate feelings toward brands (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Batra et al., 2012), which in turn enhances their appreciation for the brand (Roberts, 2005). Brand equity refers to the additional value a brand adds to a product, perceived through the lens of the company, market, or consumer (Leuthesser, 1988; Farquhar, 1989). It has been conceptualized as a set of brand-related assets and liabilities (Aaker, 1991), or as the differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer reactions to marketing (Keller, 1993). Yoo and Donthu (2001) developed a one-dimensional scale to measure brand equity. Several studies have explored the connection between brand love and brand equity. For instance, Sallam (2015) and Cho et al. (2015) suggest that brand love positively influences consumer loyalty, ultimately strengthening brand equity. According to Gonçalves et al. (2010), strong emotional connections—such as brand love—are central to the perceived value consumers assign to a brand. Similarly, Andre (2015) confirms a positive correlation between brand affection and equity, suggesting that when consumers favor a brand, they are more likely to choose it over competitors, thereby increasing its value. Boyle (2007) introduced an appreciation framework to evaluate both experiential satisfaction and perceived brand value, showing that emotional attachment (brand love) influences consumer behavior, including purchasing decisions, and contributes to building brand equity.Modern consumers often demonstrate loyalty, advocacy, and purchase behaviors based on various influences—including religious, societal, and ethical considerations—even when they are not deeply committed to a brand. These actions reflect both financial and non-financial contributions to brand value (Boyle, 2007; Machado et al., 2019). Research in emotional branding (Gobe, 2001), cultural branding (Holt & Holt, 2004), experiential marketing (Daehyun, 2002), and relationship marketing (Morgan & Hunt, 1994) all support the strong theoretical and practical link between brand love and brand equity. High levels of brand love lead to favorable consumer outcomes (Nikhashemi et al., 2019; Rambocas et al., 2018), which ultimately enhance long-term returns on both tangible and intangible brand assets (Cho & Hwang, 2020; Zhang et al., 2020).

H1: Brand love has positive impact on brand equity.

Brand Love and Brand Engagement

Based on the interpersonal theory of love, brand love legitimizes the emotional attachment individuals can feel toward objects, including products like smartphones

(Shimp & Madden, 1988). According to Rubin (1973), a consumer's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses are influenced by the feelings of love they experience. These emotions enhance a consumer's acceptance and attachment to a brand (Hwang & Kandampully, 2012). Brand love is understood as an intense emotional affection that loyal consumers hold toward a brand (Albert et al., 2009). It reflects the depth of emotional connection a satisfied customer has with a brand, often built through loyalty and reinforced by positive word-of-mouth (Reimann et al., 2012). Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) also characterize brand love as the emotional and passionate bond loyal customers develop with a brand. In the present study, brand love is conceptualized as a blend of perceived quality, emotional attachment, and passion. As customers discover new and useful features in technological products such as smartphones, their affection for the brand tends to increase (Palusuk et al., 2019), leading to enhanced purchase behavior and brand engagement (Kang, 2015). Grounded in social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and cost-benefit analysis, brand engagement is a recurring post-purchase behavior (Izogo & Jayawardhena, 2018). Initially described by Kahn (1990) as the extent to which individuals invest their personal selves into work roles, brand engagement has evolved to include customer behaviors beyond purchasing. It encompasses brand-related actions driven by intrinsic motivations (Doorn et al., 2010). In the context of social media, brand engagement often leads to brand love (Dessart, 2017). A higher level of engagement reflects a deeper emotional attachment, which encourages customers to form and sustain brand relationships (Zainol et al., 2016). For this study, brand engagement is defined following Hollebeek et al. (2014) as comprising cognitive processing, affection (love), and activation. Prior research supports that brand engagement is a precursor to brand love (Borges et al., 2016; Seo et al., 2017; Wallace et al., 2014).

H2: Brand engagement has positive impact on brand love.

Brand Engagement and Overall Brand Equity

Brand engagement refers to the ongoing process of maintaining and nurturing the relationship between customers and brands. Grounded in social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), brand engagement is understood as a multidimensional concept, encompassing both emotional and behavioral components (Frimpong & McLean, 2018; Solem & Pedersen, 2016). It includes various forms of consumer interaction with brands, such as engagement through advertising, product usage, and social interaction (Vernuccio et al., 2015). Brand engagement is viewed as a hierarchical process that involves stages of contribution and consumption (Vale & Fernandes, 2018). In the context of modern marketing, social media brand engagement plays a crucial role by fostering stronger emotional and behavioral connections between consumers and brands (Brodie et al., 2013). This interaction often enhances consumer loyalty and brand advocacy. Brand equity, on the other hand, refers to the value derived from consumers' perceptions of a

brand name. It reflects not only consumer attitudes but also financial and stakeholder perspectives (Davcik et al., 2015). Under uncertain conditions, brand equity significantly influences consumer decision-making processes (Dac et al., 2013). As Keller (1993) explains, consumer responses to brand knowledge directly impact the effectiveness of brand marketing strategies. According to Aaker (1991; 2009), brand equity consists of a set of assets and liabilities that are linked to a brand and contribute to or detract from its value. These elements influence customer awareness and trust in the brand (Konecnik & Gartner, 2007; Gordon et al., 1993), making brand equity a key factor in building long-term brand success.

H3: Brand engagement has positive impact on brand equity.

Brand Interactivity and Brand Engagement

Brand interactivity refers to the process of providing experiential information that enables others to share similar brand-related experiences. It represents the extent to which consumers form impressions of a brand through direct interactions (France et al., 2016). According to Frimpong and McLean (2018) and Solem and Pedersen (2016), brand engagement is a multifaceted construct that encompasses emotional, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions. It also reflects post-purchase behavior patterns of consumers (Izogo & Jayawardhena, 2018). Brand interactivity enables two-way communication strategies between consumers and brands (Fiore et al., 2005; Merrilees & Miller, 2001). Prior research has shown that brand collaboration fosters strong brand equity and deepens brand engagement (Bento et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2014). With the rise of social media platforms, brand interactivity has significantly increased, driven by advancements in technology and the ease of sharing relevant content within communities (Al-Htibat & Garanti, 2019; Prasad et al., 2019; Vernuccio et al., 2016). Social media posts related to tourism, for instance, reveal various types of interactive behaviors (Hollebeek et al., 2014; Mishra et al., 2018; Sijoria et al., 2018). To achieve key business goals, it is essential to foster consumer engagement with the brand (Harmeling et al., 2018; Menguc et al., 2017). Research suggests that online media interactivity positively influences attitudes toward brands and companies (Dou, 2013; Sicilia et al., 2005). Moreover, brand interactivity enhances sustainable and positive brand-consumer relationships (Merrilees, 2002; Ou et al., 2014), while also fostering trust (Merrilees & Fry, 2003). It often incorporates enjoyable interactive elements such as engaging content and gamified experiences (Agichtein et al., 2008; Manthiou et al., 2013; Merrilees & Fry, 2002). Brand engagement, as described by Vale and Fernandes (2018), is the comprehensive process involving brand usage, commitment, and co-creation. Studies have also indicated that increased consumer interactivity can lead to shifts in brand engagement levels (Hoyer et al., 2010).

H4: brand interactivity has positive impact on brand engagement.

Brand Engagement and Purchase Intention

Brand engagement refers to the extent of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional activity exhibited by consumers during their interaction with a brand (Hollebeek et al., 2014). It is widely recognized as a key factor influencing consumer behavior, including brand attitude, self-association with the brand, and purchase intention (Bowden, 2009; Wong & Merrilees, 2015; France et al., 2016; Harrigan et al., 2017; Luo et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2017). Purchase intention is defined as the customer's perception and attitude toward a brand, and can be evaluated based on relevant information, interest, and consumer involvement with the brand (Madahi & Sukati, 2012; Hosein, 2012).Interest reflects the mindset of consumers; information refers to supplementary knowledge about the brand; and attending indicates the consumer's actual engagement, which can influence their decision to purchase. Previous research has established that brand engagement has a direct and positive impact on purchase intention (Brodie et al., 2011; Gummerus et al., 2012; Hollebeek, 2011; Prentice et al., 2018; Vivek et al., 2012). Moreover, the degree of consumer engagement significantly influences brand success and purchase behavior (So et al., 2014).Brand engagement is fostered through consumer-brand interactions and the development of dependent relationships (Bra et al., 2017). However, the nature of brand engagement varies across industries. For instance, in the tourism sector, customer engagement leads to more favorable brand attitudes, increased trust, and greater brand loyalty (So et al., 2016).Furthermore, companies often leverage celebrity (VIP) endorsements to enhance brand engagement, loyalty, and purchase intention. Such endorsements strengthen brand recognition, which in turn boosts both engagement and consumers' intent to purchase (MacInnis et al., 2002; Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999).

H5: Brand engagement has positive impact on purchase intention

Brand Interactivity and Purchase Intention

Brand interactivity refers to the communication and feedback loop between a brand and its consumers. It plays a crucial role in shaping consumers' purchase intentions (Pavlou & Stewart, 2000). According to Cho and Leckenby (1991), increased brand interactivity leads to a stronger intention to purchase. In the context of e-commerce, interactivity has been shown to positively influence consumer buying behavior. Social media platforms have further transformed the nature of interaction between brands and consumers, enabling two-way communication and fostering deeper brand relationships (Gallaugher & Ransbotham, 2010).When making purchasing decisions, consumers typically evaluate the product before committing. Factors such as brand equity, loyalty, and engagement significantly influence these decisions (Chandon et al., 2005). Strong brand equity enhances consumer willingness to buy (Walgren et al., 1995), while emotional connections such as brand love further increase the likelihood of purchase (Rodrigues, 2019). Participation in online communities also impacts purchase intentions by creating shared brand experiences and peer influence (Prentice et al., 2019).Purchase intention

reflects a consumer's buying behavior, often driven by personal preferences and emotional attachment. Consumers tend to develop strong attitudes toward their preferred products (Lloyd & Luk, 2010), and the decision to purchase is considered a cognitive process that involves evaluation, comparison, and judgment.

H6: Brand interactivity has positive impact on purchase intention.

Overall Brand Equity & Purchase Intention

Brand equity refers to the collection of assets and liabilities linked to a brand (Aaker, 1991), or the distinct impact that brand-related knowledge has on consumer responses to brand marketing activities (Keller, 1993). Yoo and Donthu (2001) developed a unidimensional scale to measure this concept. Brand equity encompasses a broad spectrum, as it includes consumers' long-term experiences, emotional associations, and knowledge about the brand. It represents the perceived value of a brand in the consumer's mind and serves as an assurance of product quality (Hazee et al., 2017).Purchase intention is defined as the consumer's willingness or inclination to buy a specific product (Ariffin et al., 2018). It reflects the intensity of the consumer's motivation to make a purchase (Lee et al., 2017), and is influenced by their behavior, perceptions, and attitudes. As Ghosh (1990) noted, purchase intention is a valuable tool for predicting consumer buying behavior. Research has consistently shown a strong relationship between brand equity and purchase intention (Tolba & Hassan, 2009; Hung et al., 2011). Higher brand equity typically leads to stronger consumer preferences and an increased likelihood of purchase (Jani & Han, 2014; Pappu et al., 2005).Numerous scholars argue that brand equity significantly influences consumer buying decisions (Cobb-Walgren et al., 1995; Dehghani & Tumer, 2015). Consumers often make purchasing choices not solely based on product quality or functionality, but also due to the symbolic meaning and value associated with the brand (Aji et al., 2020). Therefore, brand equity becomes a crucial determinant of consumer behavior, including their purchasing intentions (Bae et al., 2020; Civelek & Ertemel, 2019). According to Buil et al. (2013), brand equity is a strong predictor of purchase intention, a view supported by Moreira et al. (2017), who found a significant correlation between these two constructs.

H7: Overall brand equity has positive impact on purchase intention.

Methodology

This study focuses on examining the impact of brand engagement, brand love, brand interactivity, and overall brand equity on purchase intention among consumers in Karachi, Pakistan. It aims to provide a clear understanding of how these brand-related constructs influence consumer purchase intention toward specific brands (Krautz, 2017). A quantitative research method is employed to investigate how purchase intention is affected by brand engagement, brand love, brand interactivity, and brand equity. A correlational research design has been adopted to assess the relationship between the

independent variables (brand engagement, brand love, brand interactivity, and brand equity) and the dependent variable (purchase intention) (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016).The target population for this study comprises the general public in Karachi, Pakistan, selected using a random sampling technique. Given the widespread use of smartphones and the dynamic nature of consumer preferences, the study seeks to capture current behavioral trends. Data collection was carried out through a structured and adapted questionnaire, with items drawn from validated sources: brand engagement from Hollebeek et al. (2014) and Verma (2020); brand love from Wallace et al. (2014) and Verma (2020); brand equity from Yoo and Donthu (2001) and Verma (2020); brand interactivity from France et al. (2016), Adhikari and Panda (2019), Dessart et al. (2015), Hollebeek and Macky (2019),

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Out of a total of 263 respondents, 130 (49.4%) were female, while 133 (50.6%) were male. Regarding age distribution, 144 individuals (54.8%) fell within the 18–24 age group, 81 (30.8%) were aged 25–31, 29 (11.0%) were between 32–38 years, and 9 (3.4%) were above 39 years. In terms of educational qualifications, 127 respondents (48.3%) were undergraduates, 93 (35.4%) were graduates, and 43 (16.3%) held postgraduate degrees. When it came to preferred mobile brands, 72 respondents (27.4%) used iPhones, another 72 (27.4%) preferred Samsung, 42 (16.0%) used Oppo, 20 (7.6%) favored Vivo, and 57 (21.7%) selected other brands.

Construct Validity

Construct validity reflects how well the measurement items capture the underlying theoretical constructs within a specific sample, enabling the findings to be generalized to the broader population (Hair et al., 2014). As noted by Fornell and Larcker (1981), to establish sufficient indicator reliability, the outer loadings of measurement items should surpass 0.708, as shown in the table below. Moreover, composite reliability (CR) is recognized as a more reliable and less biased metric of internal consistency than Cronbach's alpha, with a CR value of 0.70 or above considered acceptable (Alarcón & Sánchez, 2015). In the present study, all constructs report CR values greater than 0.70, indicating strong reliability. Similarly, Cronbach's alpha values for each construct also exceed the 0.70 benchmark, reinforcing the internal consistency and reliability of the measurement model.

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity indicates the degree to which a construct is positively correlated with other measures of the same concept, demonstrating that the indicators effectively converge on a common underlying idea (Hair et al., 2017a). Chin (1998) explains that redundancy analysis is used to evaluate convergent validity by comparing a formatively measured construct with a corresponding reflective measure. This step is essential when

testing formative measurement models within the PLS-SEM approach. A commonly applied metric for assessing convergent validity is the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), which measures how much variance in the indicators is explained by the construct compared to the variance due to measurement error. According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), an AVE value above 0.50 indicates sufficient convergent validity. In this research, all constructs demonstrate AVE values greater than 0.50, confirming that the indicators reliably capture the intended constructs.

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity refers to the extent to which a construct is truly distinct from other constructs, both conceptually and empirically (Alarcón & Sánchez, 2015). It ensures that each construct measures a unique aspect of the model, thereby confirming that the data is accurate and the constructs are not overlapping. Establishing discriminant validity is essential to verify that variables intended to measure different concepts are not highly correlated. There are three commonly used methods to assess discriminant validity in PLS-SEM: the Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross-loadings analysis, and the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations. Each of these techniques provides insight into whether constructs are sufficiently distinct from one another within the measurement model.

Fornell-Larcker:

According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is represented along the diagonal in the Fornell-Larcker criterion matrix, where it is used to establish the correlation of each construct with itself. It serves as a benchmark to assess discriminant validity by comparing the square root of the AVE with the inter-construct correlations. Additionally, as Chin (1998) notes, AVE also provides insight into the degree of distinction between different groups of variables, helping to determine how well each construct is separated from others within the model.

Cross loading:

Value should be greater to its own value in raw and Column as shown below the table (Hair et al., 2011)

Heterotrait- Monotrait:

According to Clark and Watson (1995), all Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio values should be below 0.90 to confirm adequate discriminant validity. As shown in the table below, all HTMT values in this study fall within the acceptable range, indicating that the data meets the required discriminant validity criteria.

Path Analysis

The structural model was evaluated using the bootstrapping technique with 5,000 subsamples at a 5% significance level, as recommended by Hair et al. (2014). The findings, summarized in the table below, reveal several statistically significant relationships. Brand

Engagement (BE) demonstrates a strong positive influence on Brand Love (BL) (P < 0.000, β = 0.749), Overall Brand Equity (OBE) (P < 0.000, β = 0.326), and Purchase Intention (PI) (P < 0.000, β = 0.217). Moreover, Brand Interactivity (BI) significantly predicts BE (P < 0.000, β = 0.680) and PI (P < 0.000, β = 0.293). The results also show that BL has a significant positive effect on OBE (P < 0.000, β = 0.474), and OBE, in turn, significantly affects PI (P < 0.000, β = 0.414).The table further outlines the impact of the dimensions of Brand Love: BL on Hedonic Quality (HQ) (P < 0.000, β = 0.863), BI on Passion (PASS) (P < 0.000, β = 0.863), and BL on Emotional Attachment (EMO) (P < 0.000, β = 0.884). Additionally, the dimensions of Brand Engagement show significant relationships: BE influences Affective Engagement (AFFEC) (P < 0.000, β = 0.886), Active Engagement (ACT) (P < 0.000, β = 0.882), and Cognitive Engagement (COG) (P < 0.000, β = 0.788). These results provide strong support for the proposed hypotheses and affirm the robustness of the structural model.

R2

The R^2 value, or coefficient of determination, indicates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables in the model (Hair et al., 2011). As outlined in the table above, the model accounts for 46% of the variance in Brand Engagement (BE), 56% in Brand Love (BL), 56% in Overall Brand Equity (OBE), and 68% in Purchase Intention (PI). Specifically, PI is explained by 68% through variables such as Activation, Affection, Brand Love, Cognition, Emotion, Overall Brand Equity, and Passion. According to the guidelines provided by Hair et al. (2011), R^2 values of 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25 are interpreted as substantial, moderate, and weak, respectively. Based on these thresholds, the model exhibits moderate to substantial predictive capability.

4.9 Q2

Predictive relevance, referred to as Stone–Geisser's Q^2, evaluates the model's capacity to predict the indicators of endogenous latent variables and is determined using the blindfolding procedure in SmartPLS (Hair Jr. et al., 2014). A Q^2 value greater than zero signifies that the model has predictive relevance for a given endogenous construct (Hair et al., 2011), whereas a value below zero indicates a lack of such relevance (Rigdon, 2014; Sarstedt et al., 2014). In the present study, the endogenous construct Purchase Intention produced a Q^2 value of 0.448 using the cross-validated redundancy approach, demonstrating strong predictive relevance for this variable.

Conclusion

This study investigates the impact of brand engagement, brand love, brand interactivity, and overall brand equity on customer purchase intention, incorporating second-order constructs such as affection, activation, and cognition (for brand engagement) and high quality, emotion, and passion (for brand love). The research framework is grounded in

Social Exchange Theory and the Theory of Interpersonal Love. The results, based on data collected from customers in Karachi, Pakistan, reveal that brand engagement has a significant and positive influence on purchase intention, supporting findings from earlier studies (e.g., Prentice et al., 2019). Additionally, brand engagement significantly enhances brand love, aligning with previous literature (Dessart, 2017). This relationship suggests that customers who are emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally engaged with a brand are more likely to develop feelings of love towards it. The findings further confirm that overall brand equity significantly impacts purchase intention, consistent with research in related domains such as mobile technology adoption (Wang & Li, 2012). The study also supports the assertion that brand interactivity positively influences both brand engagement and purchase intention, echoing the findings of Hollebeek et al. (2014) and Nelson (2005). Similarly, the relationship between brand engagement and brand equity is reaffirmed (Hepola et al., 2017). Moreover, the study demonstrates that brand love significantly influences overall brand equity, in line with Verma (2020). The structural model shows that among the antecedents, affection plays a central role in brand engagement, while passion is a key element of brand love. Thus, fostering these dimensions can strengthen the customer-brand relationship. All the constructs studied— brand engagement, brand love, brand interactivity, and brand equity—exhibit a positive and significant effect on purchase intention. This supports the broader literature emphasizing the importance of interactive and emotional brand strategies (Pavlou & Stewart, 2000; Verma, 2020). The research highlights a systematic pathway: engaging customers fosters brand love, which in turn enhances brand equity, ultimately driving purchase intention. Modern marketing efforts, especially via social media and digital platforms, can effectively facilitate this engagement. Providing immediate responses, personalized interactions, and emotional content can elevate customer experiences and increase brand attachment.Additionally, brand interactivity is pivotal in sustaining customer attention and driving behavioral outcomes. Features such as product transparency, interactive content, and feedback mechanisms help customers make informed decisions and encourage positive word-of-mouth. Furthermore, the findings suggest that a well-crafted brand name and detailed product information can positively influence consumer behavior and trust. Finally, the study underscores the need for continuous consumer engagement, not only pre-purchase but also through after-sales services and product innovations. Customer criticism on digital platforms should be welcomed and used constructively to improve brand performance and maintain competitive advantage.

Limitations and Future Research

This research is limited to Karachi and reflects only the consumer perspective, excluding manufacturer or seller viewpoints. Financial and resource constraints limited the sample

size. Future research should extend to other regions of Pakistan, incorporate larger and more diverse samples, and consider additional variables and perspectives, including those of producers and retailers, to enhance the generalizability and depth of findings.

References

Ahuvia, A. C. (1994). I love it. Towards a unifying theory of love across diverse love objects.

Akturan, U. (2018). How does greenwashing affect green branding equity and purchase intention? An empirical research. Marketing Intelligence & Planning

Alarcón, D., Sánchez, J. A., & De Olavide, U. (2015, October). Assessing convergent and discriminant validity in the ADHD-R IV rating scale: User-written commands for Average Variance Extracted (AVE), Composite Reliability (CR), and Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT). In Spanish STATA meeting (Vol. 39). Universidad Pablo de Olavide.

Albert, N., Merunka, D., & Valette-Florence, P. (2009). The feeling of love toward a brand: Concept and measurement. ACR North American Advances.

Al-Htibat, A., & Garanti, Z. (2019). Impact of interactive eReferral on tourists behavioral intentions. Marketing Intelligence & Planning

Al-Qudah, O. (2020 Evidence from Jordan. Management Science Letters, 10(13), 3135-3142.). The effect of brands' social network content quality and interactivity on purchase intention:

Arnold, D. M., Burns, K. E., Adhikari, N. K., Kho, M. E., Meade, M. O., & Cook, D. J. (2009). The design and interpretation of pilot trials in clinical research in critical care. Critical care medicine, 37(1), S69-S74.

Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1986). Love and the expansion of self: Understanding attraction and satisfaction. Hemisphere Publishing

Arshad, R. M., & Victor, S. (2020). An Empirical Studfy on the Relationship of Brand Equity to Purchase Intention: A study of branded shoes in the Kingdom of Bahrain. iKSP Journal of Business and Economics, 1(1).

Bengtsson-Palme, J., Kristiansson, E., & Larsson, D. J. (2018). Environmental factors influencing the development and spread of antibiotic resistance. FEMS microbiology reviews, 42(1), fux053.

Bento, M., Martinez, L. M., & Martinez, L. F. (2018). Brand engagement and search for brands on social media: Comparing Generations X and Y in Portugal. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 43, 234-241.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Borges, A. P., Cardoso, C., & Rodrigues, P. (2016). Consumer's love for functional brands: the Aspirin case. International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Healthcare Marketing.

Bougenvile, A., & Ruswanti, E. (2017). Brand equity on purchase intention consumers' willingness to pay premium price juice. Journal of Economics and Finance, 8(1), 12-18.

Brynjolfsson, E., & Smith, M. D. (2000). Frictionless commerce? A comparison of Internet and conventional retailers. Management science, 46(4), 563-585.

Carroll, B. A., & Ahuvia, A. C. (2006). Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love. Marketing letters, 17(2), 79-89

Chakraborty, U. (2019). The impact of source credible online reviews on purchase intention: The mediating roles of brand equity dimensions. Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing.

Cheung, G. W., & Wang, C. (2017). Current approaches for assessing convergent and discriminant validity with SEM: Issues and solutions. In Academy of management proceedings (Vol. 2017, No. 1, p. 12706). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.

Chen, R., Zhou, Z., Zhan, G., & Zhou, N. (2020). The impact of destination brand authenticity and destination brand self-congruence on tourist loyalty: The mediating role of destination brand engagement. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 15, 100402

Cheung, M. L., Pires, G., Rosenberger, P. J., & De Oliverira, M. J. (2020). Driving consumer–brand engagement and co-creation by brand interactivity. Marketing Intelligence & Planning

Chin, W. W. (1998). Commentary: Issues and opinion on structural equation modeling.

Choedon, T., & Lee, Y. C. (2020). The effect of social media marketing activities on purchase intention with brand equity and social brand engagement: Empirical evidence from Korean cosmetic firms. Knowledge Management Research, 21(3), 141-160.

Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (2016). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of management, 31(6), 874-900.

Dabbous, A., & Barakat, K. A. (2020). Bridging the online offline gap: Assessing the impact of brands' social network content quality on brand awareness and purchase intention. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 53, 101966.

Dash, G., Kiefer, K., & Paul, J. (2021). Marketing-to-Millennials: Marketing 4.0, customer satisfaction and purchase intention. Journal of Business Research, 122, 608-620.

Dehghani, M., & Tumer, M. (2015). A research on effectiveness of Facebook advertising on enhancing purchase intention of consumers. Computers in Human Behavior, 49, 597-60

Del Barrio-García, S., & Prados-Peña, M. B. (2019). Do brand authenticity and brand credibility facilitate brand equity? The case of heritage destination brand extension. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 13, 10-23.

Dessart, L. (2017). Social media engagement: a model of antecedents and relational outcomes. Journal of Marketing Management, 33(5-6), 375-399.

Dessart, L. (2017). Social media engagement: A model of antecedents and relational outcomes. Journal of Marketing Management, 33(5–6), 1–25.

Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2015). Consumer engagement in online brand communities: a social media perspective. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Dixit, S., Badgaiyan, A. J., & Khare, A. An integrated model for predicting consumer's intention to write online.

Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. Journal of marketing research, 28(3), 307-319.

Donaldson, B., & O'toole, T. (2007). Strategic market relationships: from strategy to implementation. John Wiley & Sons.

Dou, X. (2013). User experience of mobile interactivity: How do mobile websites affect attitudes and relational outcomes?

Durianto, D., & Liana, C. (2004). Analisis efektivitas iklan televisi softener soft & fresh di Jakarta dan sekitarnya dengan menggunakan consumer decision model. Jurnal Ekonomi Perusahaan, 11(1), 35-55.

Dwivedi, A. (2015). A higher-order model of consumer brand engagement and its impact on loyalty intentions. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 24, 100-109.

Febrian, A., & Fadly, M. (2021). The Impact of Customer Satisfaction with EWOM and Brand Equity on E-Commerce Purchase Intention in Indonesia Moderated by Culture. Binus Business Review, 12(1), 41-51.

Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. Journal of personality and social psychology, 55(4), 557.

Fehr, B., & Russell, J. A. (1991). The concept of love viewed from a prototype perspective. Journal of personality and social psychology, 60(3), 425.

Fiore, A. M., Kim, J., & Lee, H. H. (2005). Effect of image interactivity technology on consumer responses toward the online retailer. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 19(3), 38-53.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of marketing research, 18(1), 39-50.

Foroudi, P., Jin, Z., Gupta, S., Foroudi, M. M., & Kitchen, P. J. (2018). Perceptional components of brand equity: Configuring the Symmetrical and Asymmetrical Paths to brand loyalty and brand purchase intention. Journal of Business Research, 89, 462-474.

France, C., Merrilees, B., & Miller, D. (2016). An integrated model of customer-brand engagement: Drivers and consequences. Journal of Brand Management, 23(2), 119-136

Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2014), A Primer on Partial Least Squares

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. European business review.

Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). Sage Publications.

Harmeling, C. M., Moffett, J. W., & Palmatier, R. W. (2018). Conclusion: informing customer engagement marketing and future research. In Customer Engagement Marketing (pp. 307-323). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Hepola, J., Karjaluoto, H., & Hintikka, A. (2017). The effect of sensory brand experience and involvement on brand equity directly and indirectly through consumer brand engagement. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 26(3), 282–293

Hollebeek, L. D. (2011). Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty nexus. Journal of marketing management, 27(7-8), 785-807.

Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. Journal of interactive marketing, 28(2), 149-165.

Hollebeek, L. D., & Macky, K. (2019). Digital content marketing's role in fostering consumer engagement, trust, and value: Framework, fundamental propositions, and implications. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 45, 27-41.

Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. American journal of sociology, 63(6), 597-606.

Horsfall, H. A. R. C. O. U. R. T. (2020). BRAND EQUITY AND PURCHASE INTENTIONS OF TELECOMMUNICATION FIRMS IN RIVERS STATE OF NIGERIA. Journal DOI, 6(9).

Hosein, N. Z. (2012). Measuring the purchase intention of visitors to the auto show. Journal of management and marketing research, 9(1), 1-17.

Hoyer, W., Chandy, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M., & Singh, S. (2010). 'Customer Participation in Value Creation. Journal of Service Research, 13(3), 283-296.

Hsieh, S. H., & Chang, A. (2016). The psychological mechanism of brand co-creation engagement. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 33, 13-26.

Hutter, K., Hautz, J., Dennhardt, S., & Füller, J. (2013). The impact of user interactions in social media on brand awareness and purchase intention: the case of MINI on Facebook. Journal of Product & Brand Management

Hwang, J., & Kandampully, J. (2012). The role of emotional aspects in younger consumer-brand relationships. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Izogo, E. E., & Jayawardhena, C. (2018). Online shopping experience in an emerging e-retailing market. Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing.

Jiménez-Castillo, D., & Sánchez-Fernández, R. (2019). The role of digital influencers in brand recommendation: Examining their impact on engagement, expected value and purchase intention. International Journal of Information Management, 49, 366-376.

Junaid, M., Hou, F., Hussain, K., & Kirmani, A. A. (2019). Brand love: the emotional bridge between experience and engagement, generation-M perspective. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of management journal, 33(4),

Kalimutho, M., Nones, K., Srihari, S., Duijf, P. H., Waddell, N., & Khanna, K. K. (2019). Patterns of genomic instability in breast cancer. Trends in pharmacological sciences, 40(3), 198-211.

Kandampully, J., Zhang, T. C., & Bilgihan, A. (2015). Customer loyalty: a review and future directions with a special focus on the hospitality industry. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.

Kang, A. (2015). Brand love–moving beyond loyalty an empirical investigation of perceived brand love of Indian consumer. Arab Economic and Business Journal, 10(2), 90-101

Kothari, C. R. (2004). Research methodology: Methods and techniques. New Age International.

Lambe, C. J., Wittmann, C. M., & Spekman, R. E. (2001). Social exchange theory and research on business-to-business relational exchange. Journal of business-to-business marketing, 8(3), 1-36.

Laroche, M., Habibi, M. R., Richard, M. O., & Sankaranarayanan, R. (2012). The effects of social media based brand communities on brand community markers, value creation practices, and brand trust and brand loyalty. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(5), 1755-1767.

Liu, C., Zhang, Y., & Zhang, J. (2020). The impact of self-congruity and virtual interactivity on online celebrity brand equity and fans' purchase intention. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Lee, D., Moon, J., Kim, Y. J., & Mun, Y. Y. (2015). Antecedents and consequences of mobile phone usability: Linking simplicity and interactivity to satisfaction, trust, and brand loyalty. Information & Management, 52(3), 295-304.

Lee, J. K., Hansen, S. S., & Lee, S. Y. (2018). The effect of brand personality self-congruity on brand engagement and purchase intention: The moderating role of self-esteem in Facebook. Current Psychology, 1-13.

Leventhal, R. C., Wallace, E., Buil, I., & de Chernatony, L. (2014). Consumer engagement with self-expressive brands: brand love and WOM outcomes. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Liu, M. T., Wong, I. A., Tseng, T. H., Chang, A. W. Y., & Phau, I. (2017). Applying consumer-based brand equity in luxury hotel branding. Journal of Business Research, 81, 192-202.

Liu, Z., Min, Q., Zhai, Q., & Smyth, R. (2016). Self-disclosure in Chinese micro-blogging: A social exchange theory perspective. Information & Management, 53(1), 53-63.

Luga, V., Zhang, L., Viloria-Petit, A. M., Ogunjimi, A. A., Inanlou, M. R., Chiu, E., ... & Wrana, J. L. (2012). Exosomes mediate stromal mobilization of autocrine Wnt-PCP signaling in breast cancer cell migration. Cell, 151(7), 1542-1556.

Machado, J. C., Vacas-de-Carvalho, L., Azar, S. L., André, A. R., & dos Santos, B. P. (2019). Brand gender and consumer-based brand equity on Facebook: The mediating role of consumer-brand engagement and brand love. Journal of Business Research, 96, 376-385.

Martins, José, et al. "How smartphone advertising influences consumers' purchase intention." Journal of Business Research 94 (2019): 378-387

Merrilees, B. (2016). Interactive brand experience pathways to customer-brand engagement and value co-creation. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change (2e éd.). New York, É.

Moradi, H., & Zarei, A. (2011). The impact of brand equity on purchase intention and brand preference-the moderating effects of country of origin image. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 5(3), 539-545.

Nawaz, S., Jiang, Y., Alam, F., & Nawaz, M. Z. (2020). Role of Brand Love and Consumers' Demographics in Building Consumer–Brand Relationship. SAGE Open, 10(4), 2158244020983005

Nelson, M. R. (2005). Exploring consumer response to "advergaming". Online consumer psychology: Understanding and influencing consumer behavior in the virtual world, 156-182.

Neuman, W. (2006). Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (6th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty?. Journal of marketing, 63(4_suppl1), 33-44.

Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of applied psychology, 74(1), 157.

Otero, C., & Wilson, G. P. (2018). Effects of brand love and brand equity on repurchase intentions of young consumers. International Review of Management and Marketing, 8(4), 7.

Palusuk, N., Koles, B., & Hasan, R. (2019). 'All you need is brand love': a critical review and comprehensive conceptual framework for brand love. Journal of Marketing Management, 35(1-2), 97-129.

Pavlou, P. A., & Gefen, D. (2004). Building effective online marketplaces with institution-based trust. Information systems research, 15(1), 37-59.

Pavlou, P. A., & Stewart, D. W. (2000). Measuring the effects and effectiveness of interactive advertising: A research agenda. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 1(1), 61-77.

Pi, Z., & Khan, F. (2011). An introduction to millimeter-wave mobile broadband systems. IEEE communications magazine, 49(6), 101-107.

Pool, J. K., Asian, S., Abareshi, A., & Mahyari, H. K. (2018). An examination of the interplay between country-of-origin, brand equity, brand preference and purchase intention toward global fashion brands. International Journal of Business Forecasting and Marketing Intelligence, 4(1), 43-63.

Poorter, L., van der Sande, M. T., Thompson, J., Arets, E. J., Alarcón, A., Álvarez-Sánchez, J., ... & Peña-Claros, M. (2015). Diversity enhances carbon storage in tropical forests. Global Ecology and Biogeography, 24(11), 1314-1328

Prentice, C., Han, X. Y., Hua, L. L., & Hu, L. (2019). The influence of identity-driven customer engagement on purchase intention. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 47, 339-347.

Ray, A., Bala, P. K., Chakraborty, S., & Dasgupta, S. A. (2021). Exploring the impact of different factors on brand equity and intention to take up online courses from e-Learning platforms. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 59, 102351.

Reimann, M., Castaño, R., Zaichkowsky, J., & Bechara, A. (2012). How we relate to brands: Psychological and neurophysiological insights into consumer–brand relationships. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22(1), 128-142.

Rigdon, E. E. (2014). Rethinking partial least squares path modeling: breaking chains and forging ahead. Long Range Planning, 47(3), 161-167.

Rubin, Z. (1973). Liking and loving: An invitation to social psychology. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sakkthivel, A. M. (2011). Modelling of determinants influence consumer behaviour towards different technology products. International Journal of Electronic Finance, 5(1), 84-103.

Sallam, M. A., & Wahid, N. A. (2015). The effects of satisfaction and brand identification on brand love and brand equity outcome: the role of brand loyalty. European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 4(9), 42-55.

Santoso, C. R., & Cahyadi, T. E. (2014). Analyzing the impact of brand equity towards purchase intention in automotive industry: a case study of ABC in Surabaya. iBuss Management, 2(2).

Schönrich, G., & Raftery, M. J. (2019). The PD-1/PD-L1 axis and virus infections: a delicate balance. Frontiers in cellular and infection microbiology, 9, 207

Senthilnathan, S. (2012). The relationship of brand equity to purchase intention. IUP Journal of Marketing Management, May.

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). Research methods for business: A skill building approach. John Wiley & Sons.

Seo, Y., Kelleher, C., & Brodie, R. J. (2017). Broadening brand engagement within the service-centric perspective: an intersubjective hermeneutic framework. Journal of Service Theory and Practice.

Shimp, T. A., & Madden, T. J. (1988). Consumer-object relations: A conceptual framework based analogously on Sternberg's triangular theory of love. ACR North American Advances.

Solem, B. A. A., & Pedersen, P. E. (2016). The effects of regulatory fit on customer brand engagement: an experimental study of service brand activities in social media. Journal of Marketing Management, 32(5-6), 445-468.

TAHERDOOST, H. 2016. How to Design and Create an Effective Survey/Questionnaire; A Step by Step Guide. International Journal of Advance Research in Management, 5(4), 37-41.

Thabane, L., Ma, J., Chu, R., Cheng, J., Ismaila, A., Rios, L. P., ... & Goldsmith, C. H. (2010). A tutorial on pilot studies: the what, why and how. BMC medical research methodology, 10(1), 1-10.

Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research directions. Journal of service research, 13(3), 253-266.

Verma, P. (2021). The Effect of Brand Engagement and Brand Love upon Overall Brand Equity and Purchase Intention: A Moderated–Mediated Model. Journal of Promotion Management, 27(1), 103-132.

Wallace, E., Buil, I., & De Chernatony, L. (2014). Consumer engagement with self-expressive brands: brand love and WOM outcomes. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Wang, W.-T., & Li, H.-M. (2012). Factors influencing mobile services adoption: A brandequity perspective. Internet Research, 22(2), 142–179.

Wu, G., & Wu, G. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring the perceived interactivity of websites. Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising, 28(1), 87-104.

Xueming, Y., & Naveen, D. (2001). Developing and Validating a Multidimensional Consumer-Based Brand Equity Scal. Journal of Business Research, 52, 1-14.

Yasin, M., & Shamim, A. (2013). Brand love: Mediating role in purchase intentions and word-of-mouth. Journal of Business and Management, 7(2), 101-109

Yu, M., Liu, F., Lee, J., & Soutar, G. (2018). The influence of negative publicity on brand equity: attribution, image, attitude and purchase intention. Journal of Product & Brand Management.

Yusuf, A. S., & Busalim, A. H. (2018). Influence of e-WOM engagement on consumer purchase intention in social commerce. Journal of Services Marketing.

Zainol, Z., Omar, N. A., Osman, J., & Habidin, N. F. (2016). The effect of customer–brand relationship investments' dimensions on customer engagement in emerging markets. Journal of Relationship Marketing, 15(3), 172-199.

Zhang, L., Viloria-Petit, A. M., Ogunjimi, A. A., Inanlou, M. R., Chiu, E. & Wrana, J. L. (2012). Exosomes mediate stromal mobilization of autocrine Wnt-PCP signaling in breast cancer cell migration. Cell, 151(7), 1542-1556.

Journal of Management & Social Science

VOL-2, ISSUE-3, 2025