

Appiah, Dominic and Ozuem, Wilson ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0337-1419> (2019) Effects of innovative patterns of smartphones on brand switching. In: 24th UK Academy for Information Systems International Conference, 9-10 April 2019, University of Oxford, UK. (Unpublished)

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/4722/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
 - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Effects of Innovative Patterns of Smartphones on Brand Switching

Dominic Appiah
Arden University, United Kingdom

Wilson Ozuem
University of Cumbria, United Kingdom

Abstract

Undoubtedly, recent technological advancement in smartphones has completely altered how information is accessed, shared, and created. Consumer purchase intentions and choice has recently been influenced by the emergence of disruptive innovation in smartphones. Recent advancement in technology has caused a major shift in the use of smartphones from its conventional purpose of communication to include additional features that have created a greater market and altered the purchase behaviour of the consumers. In this modern era of technological advancement, users of smartphones expect other advanced features such as media support, Internet connectivity and special applications. The current paper discusses significant effects of innovative patterns of smartphones on consumers purchase intentions and brand switching. To conclude, the paper provides relevant practical and managerial implications for the development of marketing strategies.

Keywords: Smartphone, Brand Switching, Brand Loyalty, Consumer Behaviour.

Introduction and Background

The evolution of the Smartphone has impacted significantly on consumer behaviour and choice. Mobile phone technology was initially used only for communication purposes but has recently advanced to include additional features that have created a greater market and altered the purchase behaviour of the consumers (Slawsby et al., 2003; Dwivedi, 2015; Appiah & Ozuem, 2018). This has brought about significant increase in the number of Smartphone users.

The Smartphone continues to have a significant shift from the traditional use for communication to a device with various applications. Users of smartphones, however expect rather advance features such as media support, internet connectivity and special applications (Jones, 2002; Hansen, 2003 and Norazah, 2013). Hence Smartphones are considered radically innovative products due to their additional features which are similar to miniature computers (Appiah, Ozuem & Howell, 2019).

The intense growth in the usage of Smartphones have created greater perception and expectations (Edell & Burke, 1987; Aaker, 1997; Dickinson, Ghali, Cherret, Speed, Davis & Norgate, 2014; Wang et al., 2012). Innovations in hardware and software have triggered enormous growth in the Smartphone market, since the multi-functional operations in these devices generate the trust in technology that consumers expect. Trust in Smartphone devices and their features ultimately adds brand recognition and this is the primary factor that affects intentions to purchase (Nah et al., 2003).

Aims and Significance

Market disruptions are the major cause of brand switching. Market disruptions are major events occurring in a market that threaten customer-brand relationships (Fournier, 1998; Appiah, Ozuem & Howell, 2016). This paper investigates the phenomenon of the brand switching behaviour of consumers in a competitive market, namely the Smartphones industry, with implications of its innovative patterns on brand switching.

The bulk of research on brand switching covers customers' intentions to assess possible substitutes of a particular product category to maximise the functional utility of product attributes (Seiders and Tigerts, 1997). With expectations of product function, insufficient attention has been paid to the socio-psychological attributes and social meanings of brands triggered by disruptive innovations (Rao et al., 2000; Appiah et al., 2019).

Drawing from the above, this paper explores existing literature on brand loyalty to examine the effects of innovative patterns in the smartphones on customer loyalty. Despite extensive studies on brand loyalty (Ozuem and Lancaster, 2012; Zeithaml, 1998; Ozuem, Thomas, & Lancaster, 2016), minimal research have been carried out to establish how market disruptions impact negatively customer-brand relationships and strategies companies may adopt to gain competitive advantage by repositioning themselves to sustain brand loyalty when disruptions occur in today's complex and globalised business environment (Lam et al., 2010).

Secondly, this paper focuses on Smartphones as the product category because it represents a context in which brand switching is most likely to occur because of the multiple alternatives and short inter-purchase frequencies (Hung and Ho, 2017). Notably, the market for Smartphones is probably the most dynamic in terms of innovation and the rate of change in the technology and product innovation disrupting the market is staggering (Azize et al., 2013; Cecere et al., 2015).

Finally, the paper could also benefit organisations from a managerial point of view, especially brand and customer relationship managers who must devise customer relationship strategies to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage (Da Silveira, et al., 2013; Stokburger-Sauer et al., 2012).

Theoretical Framework and Contextualisation

Switching occurs when a customer is motivated to review available alternatives in a marketplace due to a change in competitive activity in the marketplace (Seiders & Tigert, 1997; Appiah, Ozuem & Howell, 2017). Similarly, Hogan and Armstrong (2001) posited that brand switching is about replacing an incumbent resource with a more valuable one to achieve competitive advantage. Sathish, Kumar, Naveen and Jeevanantham (2011) indicated that brand switching is a consumer behaviour that sees the behaviour of consumers differ based on the satisfaction level of consumers with providers or companies. Hence brand switching can be defined as the process of being loyal to one product or service, and switching to another, due to dissatisfaction or any other problems. They further argue that even if a consumer is loyal to a particular brand, if the brand does not satisfy his/her needs the consumer may switch to a competing brand. Therefore, management needs to constantly evaluate and redirect its resources and capabilities in order to maintain a strong position relative to competitors (Itami & Roehl, 1987).

Consumer loyalty is defined as the degree to which a consumer exhibits repeat purchasing behaviour from a service provider, possesses a positive attitudinal disposition toward the provider, and considers using only this provider when a need for this service arises (Gremler & Brown, 1996; O’Keeffe, Ozuem, Lancaster, 2016; Ozuem, Thomas & Lancaster, 2016). Losing a consumer is a serious setback for a firm in terms of its present and future earnings. In addition to losing the benefits discussed above, the firm needs to invest resources in attracting new consumers to replace the ones it has lost and this incurs expenditure on advertising, promotions and initial discounts. Peters (1987) shows that it can cost five times more to acquire a new consumer than to retain an old one. Consequently, retaining an established current consumer base is much more attractive and viable than searching for new consumers.

Product characteristics are likely to affect exploratory tendencies such as brand switching proponents (BSPs) and innovation in product contexts with a large number of available alternatives and a short inter-purchase frequency (Hoyer & Ridgway, 1984). These characteristics include product involvement, perceived risk, brand loyalty, perceived brand differentiation/similarity, hedonism (or pleasure) and strength of preference (Hoyer & Ridgway, 1984; Van Trijp, Hoyer & Inman, 1996). When individuals are highly involved with a product and loyal to a brand, their propensity to switch is likely to be lower (Hoyer & Ridgway, 1984; Sloot, Verhoef & Franses, 2005).

Individuals who are involved with a product have ‘a narrow latitude acceptance’ (Sherif & Sherif, 1967); thus, they are unlikely to be persuaded to switch. Similarly, according to Sloot et al. (2005), loyal consumers are less likely to switch to another brand. Persuasion to switch may be manifested in the form of sales promotions such as offers and discounts, which have been found to encourage switching across various product contexts (Kahn & Louie, 1990).

Further, high perceived risk indicates that individuals are concerned with losses resulting from their purchases (Mitchell, 1999). High perceived risk leads to avoidance tendencies and behaviours (e.g. commitment to a brand, repeat purchase behaviour) as consumers are ‘more often motivated to avoid mistakes than to maximise utility in purchasing’ (Mitchell, 1999, p. 163). Further, perceived similarity between brands within a product class indicates that individuals are likely to exhibit switching tendencies, such as alternating among familiar brands within a product class (Hoyer & Ridgway, 1984).

Hedonism may also encourage switching within specific categories of products (Hoyer & Ridgway, 1984; Van Trijp et al., 1996). Hedonism is associated with enjoyment or pleasure that an individual derives from specific products (Griffin, Babin & Modianos, 2000). Consumers are more intrinsically motivated with products that are associated with affective (hedonic) sensations (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982); thus the repeated consumption of such products is likely to elicit switching tendencies (Van Trijp et al., 1996).

Market disruptions are the major cause of brand switching. Market disruptions are major events occurring in a market that threaten customer–brand relationships (Fournier, 1998; Stern, Thompson & Arnould, 1998; Appiah, Ozuem & Howell, 2016). Disruption is defined as a situation where markets cease to function in a regular manner, typically characterised by rapid and large market declines. For instance, disruptions in the financial markets are caused by a glut of sellers willing to trade at any price, combined with the near or total absence of buyers at a particular time. In these circumstances, prices can decline precipitously (Shapiro, 2010).

The theory of disruptive innovation introduced by Christensen (1997) offers an explanation for the displacement of industry by smaller competitors, which are almost always new entrants (Bower & Christensen, 1995; Christensen, 2013). Disruptive innovation is an innovation that helps create a new market and eventually goes on to disrupt an existing market (Ozuem, Howell & Lancaster, 2008). The term is used in business and technology literature to describe innovations that improve products or services in ways that markets do not expect; first by designing for a different set of consumers in the new market, and later by lowering prices in the existing market.

According to McGrath (2011), the theory's explanatory power comes from the notion that industry incumbents and new entrants follow different technology trajectories. Industry leaders tend to focus on sustaining innovations that continuously improve their flagship products and increase their overall performance in attributes that are perceived as being important for their existing customer base. Over time, the performance increase achieved through sustaining innovations begins to overshoot the needs of the best customers who pay the most, whereas the new entrants' disruptive products become good enough to meet the needs of the dominant.

Conclusions and Managerial Implications

Managerially, this paper provides pointers for brand and customer relationship managers in terms of how to devise customer relationship strategies to achieve a sustainable competitive advantage.

First managerial implication based on findings from this study indicates that innovative brands such as Apple and Samsung are susceptible to disruption at their initial stages. This drives huge interest that may interrupt consumer-brand relationships, yet with time this interest may become fragile. Based on this finding, this paper proposes that brand managers must allocate investment to build stronger consumer-brand relationship at the maturity stage of a product life cycle to resist switching during disruptions. Managers must invest in marketing activities that improves consumers' perceived quality and self-brand congruity to extend the maturity stage of a brand. This will help provide resistance to switching over time.

Also, consumers form strong relationships with those brands which they perceive to have values and personality associations that are congruent with their self-concept (Da Silveira et al., 2013; Stokburger-Sauer et al., 2012; Lam et al., 2013). This forms key consideration for brand managers in brand positioning as consumers appear to use brand associations to assess congruence between their 'selves' and the brand. For instance, renowned brands like Samsung and Apple relate their brand identities to consumers' identities (Arnould and Thompson, 2005; Grayson and Martinec, 2004). Therefore, marketers must aim to create strong consumer-brand relationships with brands by developing a brand that matches with their identified lifestyle (Badrinarayanan and Laverie, 2011; He et al., 2012; Yeh et al., 2016).

Finally, this paper suggests that while non-innovative consumers are less likely to identify with a specific brand of Smartphone, brand managers can develop consumer-brand relationship among such consumers by concentrating on key drivers such as perceived quality and innovation. Brand managers need to have awareness of the fact that even though the perceived quality of established brands may not seem to influence consumers at the initially, innovation contribute to the dissipation over a long period of time.

REFERENCES

- Aaker J. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Market Research*, 34: 347–56
- Albert, N., & Merunka, D. (2013). The role of Brand love in consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30, 258–266.
- Appiah, D., Ozuem, W. and Howell, E. K. (2019). Disruptive Technology in the Smartphone Industry: Identity Theory Perspective. In Wilson Ozuem and Gordon Bowen (2019) *Leveraging Computer-Mediated Marketing Environment*. IGI Global. Hershey
- Appiah, D., Ozuem, W., Howell, E. K. (2016). Towards a Sustainable Brand Loyalty: Attitudinal Loyalty Perspective. Eighteenth Annual International Conference. Global Business and Technology Association. Dubai, UAE.
- Appiah, D. and Ozuem, W. (2018). Issues With the Importance of Branding, Brand Personality and Symbolic Meaning of Brands in the Smartphone Industry. In Zuopeng (Justin) Zhang (2018) *Global Information Diffusion and Management in Contemporary Society*. IGI Global. Hershey
- Appiah, D., Ozuem, W., and Howell, K.E. (2017). Brand Switching in the Smartphone Industry: A Preliminary Study. Global Business and Technology Association Conference. Vienna, Austria.
- Barnes, S. J., and Scornavacca, E. (2004). Mobile Marketing: The Role of Permission and Acceptance. *International Journal of Mobile Communications*, Vol.2, No.2, pp. 128-139
- Bower, J. L. and Christensen, C. M. (1995). Disruptive Technologies: Catching the Wave. *Harvard Business Review*. (2-3), 43-53.
- Christensen, C. M. (2013). *The Innovators Dilema: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Dickinson, J. E., Ghali, K., Cherrett, T., Speed, C., Davies, N., and Norgate, S. (2014). Tourism and the smartphone app: capabilities, emerging practice and scope in the travel domain. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(1), 84-101
- 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.
- Edell, J. A., and Burke, M. C. (1987). The power of feelings in understanding advertising effects. *Journal of Consumer research*, Vol.14, No.3, pp.421-433.
- Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 24 (3), 343-73
- Felix, R. (2015). The state of the Global Smartphone Market. Statista Infographics. Retrieved from: <https://www.statista.com/charts/2512/smartphone-market-share>. (Assessed, 24th September, 2016)
- Gartner (2016). Worldwide Smartphone grew 9.7 percent in Fourth Quarter of 2015. Retrieved from: <http://www.Gartner.com/newsroom>. (Assesed, 24th September, 2016).

Gremler, D. D. and Brown, S. W. (1996). Service Loyalty; its Nature, Importance and Implications, in Edvardsson B., Brown, S. W., Johnston, R. and Scheuing, E. (Eds), *QUIS V: Advancing Service Quality: A Global Perspective*, ISQA, New York, NY

Griffin, M., Babin, B. J. and Modianos, D. (2000). Shopping Values of Russian Consumers: The Impact of Habituation in a Developing Economy. *Journal of Retailing*, 76, 33–52.

Hansen, L. (2003). Service Layer Essential for Future Success. Ericsson Mobility World, General Article, (June), available at: <http://www.ericsson.com>

Hogan, E. J. and Armstrong, G. (2001). Toward a Resource Based Theory of Business Exchange Relationships: The Role of Relational Asset Value. *Journal of Business to Business Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 3-28.

Hoyer, W. D. and Ridgway, N. M. (1984). Variety seeking as an explanation for exploratory behaviour: A theoretical model. In: *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 11. (ed. by T.C. Kinnear), pp. 114–119. Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT.

Itami, H. and Roehl, W. T. (1987). *Mobilizing Invisible Assets*, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jones, S. (2002). 3G Launch Strategies, Early Adopters, Why & How to make them yours. Tarifica report.

Kahn, B. E. and Louie, T. A. (1990). Effects of Retraction of Price Promotions on Brand Choice Behaviour for Variety-Seeking and Last-purchase Loyal Consumers. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27, 279–289.

Massoud, S., and Gupta, O. K. (2003). Consumer perception and attitude toward mobile communication. *International Journal of Mobile Communications*, 1 (4): 390-408.

McGrath, R. G. (2011). When your Business Model is in Trouble. *Harvard Business Review*, (January-February), pp. 96-8.

Mintel Group (2017). *Smartphone Purchasing Process*. London

Mitchell, V.-W. (1999). Consumer Perceived Risk: Conceptualisations and Models. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33, 163–195.

Nah, F. F.-H., Zhao, F. and Zhu, W. (2003). Factors influencing Users' Adoption of Mobile Computing, in Mariga, J. (Ed.), *Managing E-commerce and Mobile Computing Technologies Book*. Hershey, PA: Idea Group Inc.

Norazah, M. S. (2013). Students' dependence on smart phones: The influence of social needs, social influences and convenience. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, Vol. 30 Issue: 2, pp.124-134

Ozuem, W., Howell, K.E., and Lancaster, G. (2008). Communicating in the New Interactive Marketplace. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42 (9/10), 1059-1083.

Ozuem, W., Thomas, T and Lancaster, G. (2016). The Influence of Customer Loyalty on Small Island Economies: An empirical and Exploratory Study. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 24 (6). pp. 447-469.

O'Keefe, A., Ozuem., W & Lancaster, G. (2016). Leadership Marketing: an Exploratory Study, *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 24 (5), 418-443

Park R. E. (1959). *Race and Culture*. Glencoe, ILL: The Free Press.

Park, J. K. and Yang, S. (2006). The Moderating Role of Consumer Trust and Experiences: Value Driven Usage of Mobile Technology. *International Journal of Mobile Marketing*, 1, (2), 24-32.

Peters, T. (1987). *Thriving on Chaos*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sathish, M., Kumar, K.S., Naveen, K.J. and Jeevanantham, V. (2011). A Study on Consumer Switching Behaviour in Cellular Service Provider: A Study with reference to Chennai. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 2 (2) 72.

Seiders, K., and Tigert, D. J. (1997). Impact of Market Entry and Competitive Structure on Store Switching/Store Loyalty. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*. 7 (3) 227-247

Shapiro L. M. (2010). *Severe Market Disruption on 6th May, 2010: Congressional Testimony*. Collingdale, PA: Diane Publishing Co.

Sherif, C. W. and Sherif, M. (1967). *Attitude, Ego-involvement, and Change*. Westport, CT: Green Wood Press.

Slawsby, A., Leibovitch, A. M., and Giusto, R. (2003). *Worldwide Mobile Phone Forecast and Analysis, 2003-2007*. IDC Report, No. 29586.

Sloot, L. M., Verhoef, P.C. and Franses, P. H. (2005). The Impact of Brand Equity and the Hedonic Level of Products on Consumer Stock-Out Reactions. *Journal of Retailing*, 81, 15–34.

Stern, B. B., Thompson, J. C. and Arnould, E. J. (1998). Narrative Analysis of a Marketing Relationship: The Consumer's Perspective. *Journal of Psychology and Marketing*, 15 (3), 195–214.

Van Trijp, H. C. M., Hoyer, W. D. and Inman, J. J. (1996). Why Switch? Product Category-Level Explanations for True Variety-Seeking Behaviour. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33, 281–292.

Wang, D., Park, S., and Fesenmaier, D. R. (2012). The Role of Smartphones in Mediating the Touristic Experience. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(4), 371-387