

The Evolution of a Robust and Reliable Brand Experience Scale in the Malaysian Context: An Empirical Evidence

[http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.5\(4\).59-67.2021](http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.5(4).59-67.2021)

Iman AL-Fakhri, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1773-6941>

PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Business and Finance, Department of Marketing, American University of Madaba, Jordan

Tariq Tawfeeq Yousif Alabdullah, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1494-6983>

PhD, Associate Professor, College of Administration and Economics, Accounting Department, University of Basrah, Iraq

Abstract

The way consumers perceive, engage, and behave in today's global marketplace is everything. Human connection is increasingly important in creating memorable experiences by offering the required interactions. As a response, marketers compete fiercely, and classic marketing ideas and tactics are no longer successful or enticing consumers. Marketers needed fresh ways to captivate customers; thus, experiential marketing was born. As an outcome, the concept of experience is today regarded as a backbone of the experience economy, in which experiential marketing has solidified its position as a valuable contributor to marketing expertise. In nations other than the United States, particularly in Malaysia, there is a severe lack of a scale that measures brand experience. Thus, it is reasonable to begin research verifying and assessing brand experience dimensions in the Malaysian setting. In 2021 the number of smartphone users in Malaysia is estimated to reach 29 million. Consequently, with the growing population, Malaysia's number of smartphone users is expected to increase by 1.74 million by 2025. Therefore, the study's theoretical contribution is to develop a powerful, dependable brand experience scale that can be utilized to assess brand experience in the Malaysian setting. The study's practical benefit is that it provides marketers with methods for measuring in the Malaysian setting. Therefore, marketers may get a competitive edge by determining which unique, for instance, affective, sensory, intellectual, and behavioral, that will attract millennial consumers in Malaysia when buying a smartphone.

Keywords: Brand Experience Dimensions, Brand Experience Scale, Experiential Marketing, Smartphone, Millennial Generation.

JEL Classification: M31.

Cite as: AL-Fakhri, I., Alabdullah, T.T.Y. (2021). The Evolution of a Robust and Reliable Brand Experience Scale in the Malaysian Context: An Empirical Evidence. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 5(4), 59-67. [http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.5\(4\).59-67.2021](http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.5(4).59-67.2021).

Received: 30 October 2021

Accepted: 08 December 2021

Published: 30 December 2021



Copyright: © 2021 by the author. Licensee Sumy State University, Ukraine. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In marketing practice, the brand experience possessed a great deal of interest. Recognizing how consumers experience brands is crucial in generating appropriate marketing tactics for services and goods, as per marketing practitioners (Davis, 2009). Relevant and appropriate branding in marketing can lead to increased revenues for an item and additional items connected to that brand. A brand represents a firm's personality that defines a service, product, or organization by symbol term, design, sign, name, or a combination of these and how it connects with consumers (Aaker, 1991; Keller & Lehmann, 2006). Proper branding in marketing may lead to increased sales that include not only one but also other products identical to that particular brand. As a result, a brand is a persona that defines a service, product, or even the company (design, symbol, sign, term, or name) a variety of these, including ways it interacts with consumers. As a result, the psychological aspects of marketing are distinguished under the experiential concept. For instance, brand associations, such as attitudes, beliefs, experiences, images, perceptions, feelings, and thoughts, are associated with the brand from the experiential aspect. Moreover, the brand experience comprises every interaction aspect regarding the brand, which is regarded as the experiential aspect. Therefore, brand experience is a person's perception of a brand's

behavior (Ha and Perks, 2005). As per Brakus et al. (2009), most experience studies to date have concentrated on category experiences and utilitarian (usefulness) product qualities rather than brand experiences. People mainly discovered the utilitarian product qualities during times in which they browse for, shop for, and purchase brands. Consumers are, nevertheless, subjected to a variety of brand-related stimuli; for instance, in the literature of branding, brand identification is one of them. The term “brand identity” was utilized to describe a company's ability to generate or sustain a distinctive set of brand connections. It might be a good deal that provides emotional, self-expressive, or functional advantages.

Additionally, the term can make a little difference if the links are physical, emotional/symbolic, or both (Alsem & Kosteljik, 2008). While previous research has demonstrated that brand experience influences short-term outcomes, for instance, satisfaction and loyalty, the issue remains whether brand experiences impact consumer lifetime value (Brakus et al., 2009). According to the Malaysian Department of statistics, Malaysians are one of the most digitally connected societies globally, with roughly 80% of the population having access to the internet mainly through mobile networks. Thus, marketers will be able to identify which specific brand experience dimensions (BEDs), for instance, affective, sensory, intellectual, and behavioral, captivate the millennial generation's attention while buying a smartphone in Malaysia by reviewing and conceptualizing the dimensions of brand experience and establishing a reliable measurement for the Malaysian context

2. Literature Review

2.1 Brand Experience. Several types of research have examined certain BEDs or the scale of total brand experience. For instance, Nambisan and Watt (2011) concentrated on the Online Community Experience and employed four dimensions to quantify it (hedonic, pragmatic, usability, and sociability). The *pragmatic dimension* depicts a location in which fresh product suggestions may be obtained and answers to difficulties with particular items. The *hedonic dimension* reflects consumers' excitement and enjoyment from visiting a location, in which the major prime focus in a particular area of interest (i.e., the brand or product). The *usability dimension* (which represents the customers' encounter in maneuvering and utilizing the online community environment) and the *sociability dimension* (which displays the social encounters consumers gain from interacting within the online product community) are the two other dimensions. The importance of the Online Community Environment construct as a precursor to consumers' perceptions and attitudes concerning product, company, and service quality was also discovered to have potential relevance. Additionally, Nambisan and Watt (2011) and Wang, Hernandez, and Minor (2010) explored the two dimensions' impact of online aesthetics on website experience. Consumers' perceptions of online service satisfaction and quality amid customer service are influenced by aesthetic appeal (tied to a website's perceived originality and significance) and aesthetic formality (connected to a website's perceived organization and command). The findings discovered that aesthetic formality positively impacts perceived online service quality, whereas aesthetic appeal significantly impacts satisfaction. This research examines the brand experience's constructs to determine the depth of every BEDs. It includes four factors: affective, sensory, behavioral, and intellectual, as proposed by Brakus et al. (2009). It is the opposite of concentrating on the overall brand experience concept or a particular dimension of brand experience.

2.1.1 Dimensions of Brand Experience. This research will employ the (Brakus et al., 2009) brand experience scale that encompasses four experience dimensions: behavioral, intellectual, affective, and sensory. Therefore, there could be a description for the brand experience such as the subjective, internal consumer reactions (feelings, cognitions, and sensations) and behavioral responses obtained via brand-related stimuli found in a brand's packaging, communications, settings, identity, and design.

2.1.2 Sensory (SENSE) Brand Experience Dimension. Customers might satisfy their need for sophistication via sensory encounters (Xu & Chan, 2010). As per Schmitt (1999), SENSE marketing operates to produce sensory experiences via sound, sight, taste, smell, and touch. SENSE marketing can be utilized to distinguish organizations and goods, encourage consumers, and create value to items (via aesthetics or excitement, for instance) (Schmitt, 1999).

2.1.3 Affective (FEEL) Brand Experience, Dimension of Brand Experience. Affective experiences (FEEL) are marketing appeals to customers' inner emotions and sentiments, aiming to provide practical experiences that vary from modestly favorable feelings associated with a brand to powerful pride and delight feelings, according to (Schmitt, 1999). Additionally, (Xu & Chan, 2010) define the feel experiences as the consumers' feelings of fun and pleasure. As a result, the finest customer connections are emotional or effective. When firms accomplish not just in meeting specific demands but also making interactions delightful, consumers are more likely to remain loyal, even when a mistake occurs (Pine & Gilmore, 1999).

2.1.4 Behavioral (ACT) Brand Experience Dimension of Brand Experience. Moreover, (Xu & Chan, 2010) describe act experiences as a reflection of personal relationships with consumers with a brand and company that aids in the development of individual behaviors and lifestyles. ACT marketing enhances consumers' lives, according to (Schmitt, 1999), by offering them how to operate things in industrial markets and business-to-business, focusing on their tangible encounters, including different lifestyles and relationships.

2.1.5 Intellectual (THINK) Brand Experience Dimension of Brand Experience. Subsequently, (Xu & Chan, 2010) describe thinking of experiences as meeting consumers' need to discover chances that would allow them to grow their skills and acquire new things. THINK marketing engages with the ability of the mind to provide cognitive, problem-solving ideas that connect clients artistically, according to (Schmitt, 1999). THINK employs surprise, intrigue, and provocation to appeal to target customers' divergent and convergent thinking. For new technological items, THINK campaigns are frequent.

2.1.6 The Pivotal Role of Brand Experience on the Millennial Generation. This generation, which outpaced the elderly and Generation X, was raised alongside the internet, cutting-edge technology, and many communication outlets varying from cell phones to Twitter and Facebook (Williams & Page, 2010). On the other hand, Millennials were bombarded with expensive commercials and advertising starting as they were kids, and consequently, they were wary of any marketing initiatives. iY Generation, iPod Generation, First Globals, Nexters, Ne(x)t Generation, Dot Net, We Generation, Gen Wired, Net Generation, Why Generation, Echo Boomers, and Millennials are among the various titles ascribed to Generation Y, according to Williams and Page (2010).

The Millennials are the baby boomers' children (people born in 1946 to 1964) born between 1982 and 2000 (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). This group consists of various age groups: teens aged 10 to 12, adolescents aged 13 to 18, and young adults aged 19 to 33, with a combined spending power of \$733 billion as mentioned by Philip Kotler and Gary Armstrong (2012). As a result, the Millennials are a hugely appealing market. Here, they were born and raised during a period of enormous as well as rapid shift, which included nearly full job chances for women, dual-income households as the norm, a huge range of family forms considered ordinary, considerable decency for cultural and ethnic diversity, along with highly elevated public consciousness, and computers in the household and classrooms. Millennials account for around 62% of the Malaysian workforce. The Millennial generation grew up in a technologically advanced period, with every youngster holding a gadget in their hands. Millennials, unlike previous generations, have a plethora of options at their fingertips, thanks to technological advancements in the last decade. Millennials have come to believe that if they do not receive what they want from one source, the abundance of information is accessible in seconds via hundreds of television stations to pick from, the Internet, and various shopping centers every ten miles. Furthermore, millennials are outspoken, bashful, Facebook addicts, iPhone users, and multi-taskers. With a tweeting Blackberry in one hand, an ear to their iPhone, and an eye on the newest download.

Provided the Millennial generation's selective nature, Williams, and Page (2010) deduced that this generation appreciates "experience". As a result, by understanding the high-tech savvy Millennial consumer, smartphone businesses can figure out ways to achieve their demands by offering pleasant brand experiences to Millennial Smartphone customers. Upon having a favorable brand experience with a specific Smartphone brand, customers will tend to buy a similar brand of Smartphone. As a consequence of positive brand experiences, mobile firms will effectively establish powerful brand experiences among the millennial group, which is anticipated to number two billion users globally. Given this generation's sheer magnitude and their purchasing power, businesses, manufacturers, advertisers, and marketers must rethink their marketing and business strategies, as mentioned by Rendell et al. (2011) and Abushammala et al. (2015).

3. Methodology

3.1 Forward and Back Translation. As per Yamkovenko et al. (2007), the instrument's translation is critical since translation mistakes might change the instrument's intended meaning, jeopardizing its reliability and validity. The latest research employed (Chen, Holton, and Bates, 2005) forward-then-backward translation technique to eliminate translation mistakes and ensure practicality in gathering data in the Malaysian setting. The questionnaire was given to Specialists from Universiti Sains Malaysia's School of Language, Literature, and Translation to translate the English edition survey questions into the Malay edition. The School of Management's associate professor viewed the questionnaire for substance and meaning and deemed it the desired intent. The questionnaire was then returned to Universiti Sains Malaysia's School of Language, Literature, and Translation to be translated from Malaysian to English by a specialist unfamiliar with management principles. A second translated version could be obtained and compared. The translators met in

the second phase to settle on the proper phrasing by comparing the two translated versions. The updated part was then translated into English by an established English and Malay translator in the third phase. Ultimately, the author analyzed the backward-translated questionnaire items and found no differences in interpretation between the initial questionnaire items and the backward-translated version.

3.2 Content Validity. The measures' content validity is a strategy that guarantees that the measures sufficiently assess the ideas meant to be tested, which is the first step in the pre-test process (Sekaran, 2010). As a result, pre-testing of the questionnaire is critical in ensuring that the desired information is sent in each inquiry and the goal is achieved.

3.3 The Study Case. The initial pre-test on the questionnaire was executed in the present research, and it revealed that all questionnaire parts were unreliable. Moreover, the experts discovered that while the brand experience scale was very reliable in Brakus (2009)'s study, it was highly unreliable in the Malaysian setting, with sensory dimensions of (0.451), affective dimensions of (0.346), behavioral dimensions of (0.274), and intellectual dimensions of (0.62). As a result, a subsequent pre-test was performed among 30 USM undergraduate students who met the qualifying conditions of becoming a member of Generation Y and possessing a smartphone. People that did not have a smartphone but belonged to the requisite generation could not grasp the significance of the queries and hence would not be applicable to the research, which is why screening requirements had to be met. Participants were requested to fill in the questionnaire and offer comments on ambiguous questions, challenging questions, trouble comprehending questions, and questionnaire mistakes.

Verbal feedback was offered to assure that suggestions were interpreted in the problem. Most adjustments were created in response to doubt complexity and ambiguity; several questions seemed to be uncertain, and participants didn't have an idea of what they meant; in more detail, for example, "The smartphone brand that I am using builds a solid image on my sense of vision" should be corrected to "The smartphone brand that I am using is appealing to see". The questionnaire was supposed to be revised to enable for easy interpretation and clearness in guidance, but this was not the case. Additionally, based on the learners' feedback, the author incorporated two additional items to each BEDs to boost the depth and transparency of what each dimension is attempting to assess. Furthermore, four academicians' two professors and two associate professors from the school of management were invited to conduct an expert review on the measurement items. Recommendations were evaluated for applicability and handled when it was appropriate. Lastly, the following pre-test revealed excellent reliability, with scores varying from (0.83) for sensory dimension, (0.81) for effective dimension, (0.76) for behavioral dimension, and (0.79) for intellectual dimension. The high reliability of the second pre-test ensured that the proper information was conveyed in all questions and the goal was achieved.

Table 1.1. First Pre-Test for Brand Experience Dimensions

No	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Sensory dimension	0.45
2	Affective dimension	0.34
3	Behavioral dimension	0.27
4	Intellectual dimension	0.62

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

Table 1.2. Second Pre-Test for Brand Experience Dimensions

No	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Sensory dimension	0.51
2	Affective dimension	0.32
3	Behavioral dimension	0.34
4	Intellectual dimension	0.52

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

Table 1.3. Third Pre-Test for Brand Experience Dimensions

No	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Sensory dimension	0.83
2	Affective dimension	0.81
3	Behavioral dimension	0.76
4	Intellectual dimension	0.79

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

Modified Brand Experience Scale. Past studies have indicated the direct and indirect effects of brand experience on short-term outcomes such as satisfaction and loyalty. However, scholars argue the importance of investigating the influence of brand experience on long-term consequences such as brand equity (Rust et al., 2000; Vogel et al., 2008; Brakus et al., 2009). Accordingly, this study intends to investigate the influence of brand experience on long-term outcomes such as brand equity. Therefore, the measurements for this variable will be adapted from Brakus et al. (2009); the brand experience scale which captures the four dimensions of brand experience, using three items adapted from Brakus et al. (2009) and adding two self-constructed items to each of the four dimensions of the brand experience scale namely, five items for sensory dimension, five items for affective dimension, five items for behavioural dimension, and five items for intellectual dimension. Respondents will have to answer five items for each scale dimension, for example, ‘The smartphone brand that I am using is attractive to see’ or ‘I feel happy when I use this smartphone brand.’ Respondents will have to give answers to 20 items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree = 1’ to ‘strongly agree = 5.’ Measurements of the brand experience items are illustrated in Table 1.4 which exhibits the measurements of the brand experience components.

Table 1.4. The Brand Experience Measurement

No	BE	Source	Cronbach's Alpha
	Variable explanation: Brand experience is conceptualized as the subjective, internal consumer responses (cognitions, feelings and sensations) as well as behavioral responses induced by brand-related stimuli that are part of a brand's identity and design, environments, communications and packaging.	(Brakus, 2009)	
	<i>Sensory (Sense) Dimension</i>		0.83
	<u>Original items:</u>		
1.	This brand leads to a robust impression on my visual senses and also in other senses.		
2.	I find this brand interesting in a sensory way.		
3.	This brand does not appeal to my senses.		
	<u>Adapted Items:</u>		
1.	The Smartphone which I am dealing with is gorgeous to see.	Adapted (Brakus, 2009)	
2.	The Smartphone which I am dealing with feels nice to touch.		
3.	The Smartphone brand that I am using has a delightful ringtone to hear.		
4.	The Smartphone brand that I am using is comfortable to carry.	Self-constructed	
5.	The Smartphone brand that I am using is graceful.		
	<i>Affective (Feel) Dimensions</i>		0.81
	<u>Original items:</u>		
1.	This brand induces feelings and sentiments.		
2.	I do not have strong emotions for this brand.		
3.	This brand is an emotional brand.		
	<u>Adapted Items</u>		
1.	I am happy in using my Smartphone brand.	Adapted (Brakus, 2009)	
2.	I am not happy with the Smartphone brand that I am using (a). Smartphone brand that I am using effects my emotions (link love and hate).	Adapted (Brakus, 2009)	
3.	I feel proud when using my Smartphone brand. I have fun when I use my Smartphone.	Self-constructed	
	<i>Behavioral (Act) Dimensions</i>		0.76
	<u>Original items:</u>		
1.	I engage in physical actions and behaviors when I use this brand.		
2.	This brand results in bodily experiences.		
3.	This brand is not action-oriented.		
	<u>Adapted items:</u>		
1.	My Smartphone helps me take photographs.		
2.	My Smartphone enables me to listen to songs.	Adapted (Brakus, 2009)	
3.	My Smartphone enhances my lifestyle (for example, task planner, spender, and calorie counter).		
4.	My Smartphone constantly keeps me connected (for example, email, WhatsApp, Facebook, Twitter).	Self-constructed	

Table 1.4 (cont.). The Brand Experience Measurement

5.	My Smartphone helps me navigate my way when traveling (for example, an application such as Maps and Waze)	Self-constructed	
Intellectual (Think) – Dimensions			0.79
Original items:			
1.	I engage in a lot of thinking when I encounter this brand.		
2.	This brand does not make me think.		
3.	This brand stimulates my curiosity and problem-solving.		

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

4. Findings

4.1 Convergent Validity. The amount of agreement between the multiple items employed to identify the same ideas is utilized to establish convergent validity (Ramayah et al., 2011). To assess convergent validity among item measures, Hair et al. (2010) recommended average variance extracted (AVE), composite reliability, and factor loadings. Moreover, the suggested loading cut-off value is 0.6, which was applied in the ongoing investigation (Chin, 1998b). Furthermore, Gholami, Sulaiman, Ramayah, and Molla (2013) employed a similar loading cut-off value (0.6) and found significant outcomes. Due to a loading value of less than 0.6, five items (Affective dimension = 1, Intellectual dimension = 1, Behavioural dimension = 1) had been removed from the primary loading evaluation in this investigation. Later, the variable AVE's values were investigated. The AVE, known as the mean-variance calculated from a construct's item loading, was all over the required value of 0.5 or higher (Hair et al., 2010). According to Barclay et al. (1995), the AVE acquired for each construct in this research ranged from 0.512 to 0.691, which is deemed reasonable. The average variance extracted (AVE) assesses the variance recorded by the indicators in relation to measurement error, and it must be larger than 0.50 to vindicate utilizing a construct. Table 1.5. below illustrates the (AVE) acquired for each construct of the research.

Table 1.5. Outcomes of Measurement Model (Constructs Reliability and Validity of the Latent Constructs' Summary)

Constructs	Measurement Items	Loading	AVE	CR
Affective Dimension	ADIM, 1	0.840	0.657	0.884
	ADIM, 2	0.842		
	ADIM, 3	0.822		
	ADIM, 4	0.731		
Behavioural Dimension	BDIM, 1	0.736	0.512	0.806
	BDIM, 2	0.655		
	BDIM, 3	0.806		
	BDIM, 5	0.654		
Intellectual Dimension	IDIM, 1	0.873	0.691	0.899
	IDIM, 2	0.700		
	IDIM, 3	0.877		
	IDIM, 4	0.862		
Sensory Dimension	SDIM, 1	0.695	0.519	0.843
	SDIM, 2	0.689		
	SDIM, 3	0.740		
	SDIM, 4	0.803		
	SDIM, 5	0.666		

Note: AVE= Average Variance Extracted, CR= Composite Reliability

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

This investigation also examined the Composite Reliability (CR), reflecting how well the observable variables can explain the latent variable (Tseng, 2011). The composite reliability performed activities that were equivalent to the Cronbach alpha's internal stability assessment. On the other hand, the composite reliability prioritizes indicators during model evaluation depending on their reliability; consequently, the composite reliability is better suited to PLS-SEM than the Cronbach's alpha (Hair et al., 2011). Moreover, composite reliability values range from 0.6 to 0.7 for exploratory investigations. Furthermore, 0.7 to 0.9 for additional in-depth investigations are considered adequate (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The composite reliability was found to be within 0.80 to 0.89, exceeding the cut-off values of 0.6 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988) as well as 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978). In addition, this investigation satisfies every criterion for convergent validity.

Table 1.6. Final Composite Reliability Results for Data Analysis

No.	Variable	CR
1	Sensory dimension	0.84
2	Affective dimension	0.88
3	Behavioral dimension	0.80
4	Intellectual dimension	0.89

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

Table 1.7. Final Composite Reliability Results for Data Analysis

No.	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Sensory dimension	0.84
2	Affective dimension	0.88
3	Behavioral dimension	0.80
4	Intellectual dimension	0.89

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

4.2 Final Pilot Test of the Questionnaire. A pilot study has been conducted to verify the reliability and validity of all questionnaire components. As per Sekaran (2010), a pilot study was conducted to evaluate and eliminate ambiguous or biased items and modify the questionnaire's framework to make it simpler to interpret and analyze. Thus, according to George and Gordon (2010), a pilot study to conduct a preliminary survey or develop a scale should have at least 30 representative respondents from the targeted population. As a result, in January 2015, the author handed 30 questionnaires to undergraduate students. This process ensures that the pilot study includes an adequate number of respondents representing the target demographic. The Cronbach's alpha was adopted to do a reliability study. The research variables demonstrated sufficient reliability, with Cronbach's alpha in the range of 65 to 82, according to the pilot study findings. The responses of the people who took part in the survey were considered. Before printing and delivering the finalized questionnaire version to research participants, it was double-checked for clarity and reliability. Consequently, a Strong and reliable questionnaire is ready to be distributed to the study population. The findings of the pilot study are presented in Table 1.8.

Table 1.8. Pilot Study Reliability Test

No.	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Sensory dimension	0.76
2	Affective dimension	0.65
3	Behavioral dimension	0.82
4	Intellectual dimension	0.71

Source: Al-Fakhri, I.K. (2017). Influence of Brand Experience on Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity of the smartphone Millennial Users

5. Discussion

The current study adapted Brakus (2009) brand experience scale, which has been widely validated in the United States and Western countries. However, the scale exhibited very low reliability when tested among undergraduate university students in Malaysia. Consequently, the current study underwent steps to overcome the problem and produce a valid instrument. Therefore, three pre-tests were carried out among focus groups consisting of 30 undergraduate students, offering their insights into the ambiguity of wording and considering all suggestions and recommendations. In addition, the questionnaire went through content validity, back to back translation, convergent validity and finally, the pilot test ensured the emergence of a reliable and robust brand experience scale that can be applicable to the Malaysian context.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

This article's primary aim is to evaluate the brand experience dimension; second, to debate and conceptualize the notion of brand experience and recognize its influence on the millennial generation; thirdly, brand experience dimensions have been measured in western countries. However, there has been a void in measuring brand experience dimensions in the Malaysian context. Therefore, the current study has developed a reliable and robust questionnaire to evaluate brand experience dimensions in the Malaysian context. The study's practical value is revealed by determining how several brand experience dimensions might influence a consumer's encounter with a particular brand. Consequently, marketers may obtain a competitive edge by choosing which brand experiences dimension might uniquely appeal to a company's consumers and meet their demands. As a result, this investigation will provide recommendations for the upcoming study that will empirically quantify the brand experience dimensions' influence on Millennial Smartphone users in Malaysia.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: Iman AL-Fakhri; data curation: Iman AL-Fakhri; formal analysis: Iman AL-Fakhri, investigation: Iman AL-Fakhri; methodology: Iman AL-Fakhri; project administration: Iman AL-Fakhri; resources: Iman AL-Fakhri; software: Iman AL-Fakhri; supervision: Iman AL-Fakhri; validation: Iman AL-Fakhri; visualization: Iman AL-Fakhri; writing - original draft: Iman AL-Fakhri; writing - Iman AL-Fakhri review & editing: Iman AL-Fakhri, Tariq Tawfeeq Yousif Alabdullah.

Funding. There is no funding for this research.

References

1. Aaker, D.A. (1991). *Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name*: Free Press. 299 p. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
2. Abushammala, S.N., Alabdullah, T.T.Y., & Ahmed, E. R. (2015). Causal Relationship between Market Growth and Economic Growth. Comparison Study. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(33), 31-36. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
3. Alsem, K.J., & Kosteljik, E. (2008). Identity based marketing: a new balanced marketing paradigm. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(9/10), 907-914. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
4. Ahmed, E.R., Alabdullah, T.T.Y., Shaharudin, M.S., & Putri, E. (2020). Further Evidence on the Link between Firm's Control Mechanisms and Firm Financial Performance: Sultanate of Oman. *Journal of Governance and Integrity*, 4(1), 1-6. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
5. Bagozzi, R.P. (2007). On the meaning of formative measurement and how it differs from reflective measurement: comment on Howell, Breivik, and Wilcox (2007). *Psychological Methods*, 12(2), 229-237. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
6. Bagozzi, R.P., Yi, Y., & Phillips, L.W. (1991). Assessing construct validity in organizational research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3), 421-458. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
7. Brakus, J.J., Schmitt, B.H., & Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand experience: What is it? How is it measured? Does it affect loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 73(3), 52-68. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
8. Brakus, J.J., Schmitt, B.H., & Zhang, S. (2008a). 13. Experiential attributes and consumer judgments. *Handbook on brand and experience management*, 174. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
9. Brakus, J.J., Schmitt, B.H., & Zhang, S. (2008b). Experiential attributes and consumer judgments. *Handbook on Brand and Experience Management*, Bernd H. Schmitt and David Rogers, eds. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
10. Chen, H.C., Holton III, E., & Bates, R. (2005). Development and validation of the learning transfer system inventory in Taiwan. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(1), 55-84. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
11. George A. Johanson, & Gordon P. Brooks. (2010). Initial Scale Development: Sample Size for Pilot Studies. *Sage Journals*, 70(3), 394-400. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
12. Gholami, R., Sulaiman, A.B., Ramayah, T., & Molla, A. (2013). Senior managers' perception on green information systems (IS) adoption and environmental performance: Results from a field survey. *Information & Management*, 50(7), 431-438. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
13. Ha, H.Y., & Perks, H. (2005). Effects of consumer perceptions of brand experience on the web: Brand familiarity, satisfaction and brand trust. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4(6), 438-452. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
14. Hair, J.F., Black, W., Babin, B.J.Y., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis. A global perspective*. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
15. Keller, K.L., & Lehmann, D.R. (2006). Brands and branding: Research findings and future priorities. *Marketing Science*, 25(6), 740-759. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
16. Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2012). *Principles of Marketing (14th Edition, ed.)*. ENGLAND: Pearson Education Limited. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
17. Lancaster, L.C., & Stillman, D. (2010). *The M-factor: How the Millennial generation is rocking the workplace*: HarperCollins e-books. 324 p. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
18. May, H., & Hearn, G. (2005). The mobile phone as media. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 8(2), 195-211. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
19. Nambisan, P., & Watt, J.H. (2011). Managing customer experiences in online product communities. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(8), 889-895. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
21. Pine, B.J., & Gilmore, J.H. (1999). *The experience economy: work is theatre & every business a stage*: Harvard Business Press. 254 p. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
22. Ramayah, T., Lee, J.W.C., & In, J.B.C. (2011). Network collaboration and performance in the tourism sector. *Service Business*, 5(4), 411-428. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

23. Rendell, M., Karen Vander Linde, Yildirim, L. (2011). Millennials at work – perspectives from a new generation. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
24. Rust, R.T., Zeithaml, V.A., & Lemon, K.N. (2000). Driving customer equity: How customer lifetime value is reshaping corporate strategy: Free Pr. 304 p. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
25. Schmitt Bernd, H. (1999). *Experiential Marketing: How to get customers to sense, feel, think, act and relate to your company and brands: The Free Press, New York.* 312 p. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
26. Schmitt, B. (2009). The concept of brand experience. *Journal of Brand management*, 16(7), 417-419. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach.* London: Wiley. 432 p. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
28. Vogel, V., Evanschitzky, H., & Ramaseshan, B. (2008). Customer equity drivers and future sales. *Journal of Marketing*, 72(6), 98-108. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Williams, K.C., & Page, R.A. (2010). Marketing to the Generations. *Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business*, 3(4), 8-10. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
30. Xu, J.B., & Chan, A. (2010). A conceptual framework of hotel experience and customer-based brand equity: Some research questions and implications. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(2), 174-193. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
31. Yamkovenko, B.V., Holton III, E., & Bates, R.A. (2007). The Learning Transfer System Inventory (LTSI) in Ukraine: The cross-cultural validation of the instrument. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31(5), 377-401. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)