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Abstract
The aim of this research paper was to approach the impact of brand experiences, brand equity and corporate branding on brand loyalty. The sample of this research consisted of 413 employees selected on a random basis from 10 Jordanian companies. A questionnaire-based survey was used in order to collect the required data. The research model consisted of three independent variables (brand experiences, brand equity and corporate branding) and one dependent variable (brand loyalty). Brand experiences were divided into three sub-dimensions: brand sensory experience, brand affective experience significantly and brand cognitive experience. Brand equity was sectioned into seven factors: perceived quality, staff behavior, ideal self-congruence, life style-congruence, environment, trust and brand identification. On the other hand, corporate branding was studied in terms of corporate associations, corporate activities, corporate values, corporate personalities, and functional benefits. All dimensions included in this research were measured using a valid and reliable questionnaire developed based on a deep literature review. The results of this research confirmed positive as well as significant effects of all independent dimensions on brand loyalty, except sensory and cognitive experiences. The main contribution of this paper can been seen in closing the gap in research in favor of the impact of brand experiences, brand equity and corporate branding on brand loyalty in Jordanian companies as well assign identifying that Jordanian customers are mainly focused on affective experience of a brand rather than on sensory or cognitive experiences. Managers and researchers can benefit from this research by utilizing such concepts to enhance brand loyalty and conducting further studies to explore other factors critical factors that might improve brand loyalty. The major limitation of this research is related to the sample region since it was conducted in two cities only. Future research should consider other companies and employees form other governorates in Jordan.
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1. Introduction
One of the most important themes of branding theory is the relationship between a customer and a brand, a relationship that results in brand loyalty (Sahin et al., 2011; Al-Hawary, 2013b). According to them, brand experience is a major input required for such a relationship. Veloutsou (2015) found that customer brand relationship is a critical factor in customer brand loyalty. Aurier and Lanauze (2012) approached the influence of brand relationship on one dimension of brand loyalty (attitudinal loyalty) and found that brand relationship positively affects brand loyalty (Al-Hawary, 2013a). In their empirical study in China, Guo et al. (2011) examined customers’ perceptions of brand functions and hence explored the relationship between brand functions and brand loyalty. Their results underlined the positive impact of brand functions on brand loyalty. Shukla (2009) contributed a positive impact of contextual factors (i.e., age, family values, peer influences, social influence, life style, and financial status) on both brand loyalty and switching. The critical significance of brand building has been cited in many previous works. Examples of beneficial outcomes of brand building include competitive advantage (Su and Tong, 2015), customer or brand loyalty (Veloutsou, 2015), intention to purchase (Tolba and Hassan, 2009) and profitability (Matzler et al., 2008). The focus of this research paper is on brand loyalty.

According to the marketing literature, brand loyalty is a function of different variables such as brand trust and affect (Matzler et al., 2008; Al-Hawary, 2013b), customer perceived quality (Karikaya and Barnes, 2010; Alshurideh et al., 2017; Al-Hawary and Harahsheh, 2014; Al-Hawary and Hussien, 2016; Al-Hawary et al., 2013), perceived brand equity (Frank and Watchravesringkan, 2016), perceived brand trust (Zboja and
Voorhees, 2006), brand experience (Ueacharoenkit and Cohen, 2011, Sahin et al., 2011, Walter et al., 2013, Wulandari, 2016), and customer brand relationship (Veloutsou, 2015). Another bundle of research emphasized additional factors i.e., corporate branding dimensions (Souiden et al., 2006, Guo et al., 2011, So et al., 2013 and Khan et al., 2016), emotional attachment (So et al., 2013), customer-related contextual factors (Shukla, 2009), brand associations (Severi and Ling, 2013) as well as brand equity (Ali and Muqadas, 2015, Ahmad and Hashim, 2011 a and Shin et al., 2014).

However, there is a noticeable lack of studies conducted to investigate the impact of key factors such as brand experiences, brand equity and corporate branding on brand loyalty, particularly in Jordan. Therefore, the present study designed to close this gap. Both researchers as well as managers are expected to benefit from this study.

2. Literature review and hypotheses development

2.1 Brand experiences

Brand experience is a new concept in marketing. It is a customer brand-driven response originated from brand-related attributes such as identity and design (Sahin et al., 2011). Wulandari (2016) defined brand experience as a perception of a customer founded on his or her contacts with a brand. Examples of such contacts include search for a product, exchange of product-related information, perceptions towards brand image, brand promotion, and brand consuming. Ha and Perks (2005) defined brand experience as a customer familiarity with a brand. Ueacharoenkit and Cohen (2011) argued that a customer’s experiences are perceived in cases in which customers search for, purchase, and consume products. Hence, they classified a customer experience into four types, which are product experience, service experience, shop experience and consumption experience. In terms of brand experience dimensions, Ishida and Taylor (2012) argued that this construct comprises four dimensions: brand sensory experience, brand affective experience, brand behavioral experience, and brand intellectual experience.

Ueacharoenkit and Cohen (2011) investigated the impact of brand experience and brand loyalty through three variables, namely brand personality, satisfaction and brand trust exercising responses of a sample of 400 Thai participants. They used five dimensions of brand experience, which are sensory experience, affective experience, behavioral experience, intellectual experience, and social experience. Walter et al. (2013) and Sahin et al. (2013) applied Brakus et al.’s (2009) model in which brand experience composed of four dimensions: sensory experience, affective experience, behavioral experience, and intellectual experience. Huang et al. (2015) examined the impact of brand experiences on brand resonance using brand sensory experience, brand cognitive experience, brand affective experience and relational brand experience as four dimensions of brand experience. Following Huang et al. (2015), this study employs sensory, cognitive and affective experience as three dimensions of brand experience.

According to Hulten (2011), brand sensory experience represents customers react to a brand through their five human senses. Shamim and Butt (2013) defined brand affective experience as a customer’s emotional attachment to a brand. Brand cognitive experience, on the other hand, was defined as thinking processes directed to customers to enhance their creativity and assumptions about a brand (Schmitt, 2010). Brand experience is different from other constructs such as brand equity and corporate branding. Next sections of this paper discuss these other variables.

2.2 Brand equity

Davcik and Sharma (2015) regarded brand equity as a value of brand implanted in customer’s mind and emerged in his or her perceptions and expectations. Ahmad and Hashim (2011) defined brand equity in terms of the influence of brand-related knowledge on a customer’s response toward brand marketing. Yoo and Donthu (2001) deemed brand equity as a difference in customers’ responses towards a branded product and an unbranded product when both products have identical features and receive a same level of stimulant marketing efforts. In their study on the influence of brand equity on brand attitude and brand loyalty, Shin et al. (2014) and Fayrene and Lee (2011) cited several definitions of brand equity from which one can extract numerous keywords related to brand equity such as value added, customers’ perceptions, customers’ associations, customers’ behaviors, customers’ loyalty and knowledge or familiarity of a brand. Consequently, brand equity is a value added to either a customer or a company emerged based on
customers' perceptions, associations, behaviors, loyalty as well as familiarity with a brand. Concerning brand equity dimensions, Aaker (1991), in his brand equity model, conceptualized brand equity with respect to five assets or liabilities: brand loyalty (a degree of loyalty of a customer to a brand), brand awareness (customers' knowledge of a brand), perceived quality (quality level provided by a brand), brand associations (brand-driven triggers affect a customer buying decision), and other assets such as competitive advantage. Tolba and Hassan (2009) subdivided measurement models used to appraise brand equity into two models: component-based models and holistic models.

Ali and Muqadas (2015) listed seven dimensions of brand equity, namely physical quality, ideal self-congruence, life style-congruence, staff behavior, trust, environment and brand identification. Ahmad and Hashim (2011) conceptualized brand equity (knowledge) as a construct includes service staff, self-image congruence and brand awareness. Yoo and Donthu (2001) conducted a study in order to develop a measure of brand equity. Their sample includes 650 students from universities in South Korea and America. They confirmed that brand loyalty, brand awareness, brand associations, and perceived quality are four reliable and valid sub-dimensions of brand equity. Sheng and Teo (2012) adapted the same dimensions to measure brand equity among mobile users in Taiwan. Shin et al. (2014) used perceived quality, brand image as well as brand awareness as three dimensions of brand equity. Fayrene and Lee (2011) proposed a model to measure brand equity involves the following dimensions: brand awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality, and brand associations. Consistent with Tolba and Hassan (2009) this study adopts the component-based model of brand equity. Hence, the current study conceptualized brand equity in terms of seven sub-dimensions, i.e., perceived quality, staff behavior, ideal self-congruence, life style-congruence, trust, environment, and brand identification as applied in Ali and Muqadas (2015) and Davcik and Sharma (2015) studies.

2.3 Corporate branding

Shahri (2011) make a distinction between product brand and corporate brand and stated that product brand is concerned with a product and a customer, while corporate brand is related to an organization as a whole. Therefore, corporate branding can be defined as a process of adding a value to products, either goods or services, provided by a corporation (Khan et al., 2016). Balmer and Greyser (2006) described corporate marketing as an umbrella covers corporate branding, corporate identity, corporate communications, corporate image, and corporate reputation. Einwiller and Will (2002) defined this concept as a process of ensuring a good position, reputation of a brand by building relationships with the brand's stakeholders and by establishing effective internal and external communications with them. In their work on the impact of corporate branding dimensions on consumers' product evaluation among Japanese and American customers, Souiden et al. (2006) divided corporate branding into four sub-dimensions: corporate name, corporate image, corporate reputation, and corporate loyalty.

Khan et al. (2016) studied the impact of corporate branding on brand loyalty conceptualizing corporate branding in terms of five dimensions: corporate associations, corporate values, corporate activities, corporate personalities, and benefits (functional and symbolic benefits). Anisimova (2013) evaluated the impact of corporate brand on consumer satisfaction and conceptualized corporate branding in terms of corporate activities, associations, personalities, values as well as brand benefits (functional, emotional and symbolic benefits). Concurrently, So et al. (2013) in their work on corporate branding, customer emotional attachment, and brand loyalty categorized corporate branding into six constructs: corporate associations, corporate activities (corporation social initiatives), corporate values (a corporation mission statement), corporate personalities (corporate characteristics), functional benefits (functional or material attributes of products), and symbolic benefits (moral attributes associated with products). Following Anisimova (2013), So et al. (2013) and Khan et al. (2016), this study deemed corporate branding as a construct composed of corporate associations, activities, values, personalities and functional benefits.

2.4 Brand loyalty

Ali and Muqadas (2015) defined brand loyalty as for a concept related to re-purchase intention and psychological commitment. In the same trend, Dehdaishi et al. (2012) defined brand loyalty as a long-term relationship grounded on a customer's re-purchase intention and continuous commitment towards a
brand. Wulandari (2016) adopted Oliver’s (2010) definition of brand loyalty in which the concept identified as a variable with two sub-factors: a customer commitment to re-purchase and to re-patronize a good or a service. Malik et al. (2013) looked at brand loyalty as a relationship between a customer and a particular brand irrespective of any other competitive brands. Keller (2001) regarded brand loyalty as a sub-dimension of brand resonance, which represents the psychological relationship with a brand. Ercis et al. (2012) divided loyalty into two types: full loyalty and brand loyalty, they also divided brand loyalty into affective and continuance loyalty. According to them, affective loyalty is more related to the emotional attachment between a customer and a brand; hence, customers do not switch to another company. In contrast, customers with continuance loyalty tend to switch to another competitor.

Iglesias et al. (2011) measured brand loyalty utilizing two sub-dimensions: behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty. Shukla (2009) considered brand loyalty and brand switching as two dimensions of customers behavioral intentions. They added that brand loyalty is related to purchase volume and frequency, re-purchase intention, in addition to when customers switch to another brand. According to Zeithaml et al. (1996) cited in Zboja and Voorhees (2006), behavioral intentions can be divided into five types: re-purchase intention, loyalty, word-of-mouth, complaint and desire to pay a premium price. In their study on the mediating role of customer satisfaction in the relationship between brand equity and brand loyalty, Ali and Muqadas (2015) indicated that brand loyalty could be measured using two dimensions: behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty. They used the attitudinal approach to evaluate brand loyalty because of their sample's nature.

Dehdaashli et al. (2012) measured brand loyalty applying seven items imply a customer’s attitudes towards a brand and its features along with its performance, match between a customer wants and a product features, a customer's preference of a brand, in addition to a customer continuous wish to examine a brand. Severi and Ling (2013) suggested two approaches to understand brand loyalty: cognitive and behavioral approaches. Latif et al. (2014) proposed a framework for building brand loyalty. Their model encompasses four factors: customer familiarity of a brand, customer satisfaction with a brand, customer trust in a brand, and customer attitudinal loyalty. In the current study, brand loyalty is measured in terms of behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty with reference to So et al. (2013), Matzler et al. (2008) and Iglesias et al. (2011). Based on Tolba and Hassan (2009), behavioral loyalty is a customer's willingness to re-purchase a brand. Attitudinal loyalty is a customer's commitment towards a brand.

2.5 Brand experiences and brand loyalty

As for the relationship between brand experience and brand loyalty, Sahin et al. (2011) carried out a research on global brands in order to explore the influence of brand experience, trust and satisfaction on brand loyalty. Using a sample consisted of 258 subjects from Turkey; they found a positive impact of brand experience on brand loyalty. Huang et al. (2015) examined the impact of brand sensory, affective and cognitive experiences on brand relational experiences and explored the impact of brand relational experience on brand awareness and brand loyalty. They used channel type, either online or offline, as a moderator factor. Their results confirmed that brand sensory, affective and cognitive experiences are significantly related to brand relational experience, which in turn affects brand resonance as measured by brand awareness and brand loyalty. Iglesias et al. (2011) investigated the mediating role of affective commitment in the relationship between brand experience and brand loyalty. Using a sample contains 366 students in business school in Spain. The results indicated that affective commitment significantly mediated the relationship between brand experience and brand loyalty.

Sheng and Teo (2012) studied the mediating role of customers experience in the relations between product attributes and brand equity. They conducted a survey on a sample consisted of 262 participants in Taiwan. Their findings showed a significant mediation of customer experience in such a relationship. Walter et al. (2013) conducted a study utilizing Brakus et al. (2009) brand model (brand sensory, affective, behavioral and intellectual experience) with a sample comprised 57 university students for both Germany and Canada. One of their results showed a significant impact of brand experience on customer loyalty. Baser et al. (2015) considered brand experience as a significant antecedent of brand loyalty. Brakus et al. (2009) agreed that there is a direct and an indirect effect of brand experience on brand loyalty through brand associations. The present study postulates that brand experiences (sensory experience, affective
experience and cognitive experience) have a significant impact on brand loyalty. Therefore, the following hypotheses were supposed:

- **H1:** Brand sensory experience significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H2:** Brand affective experience significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H3:** Brand cognitive experience significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.

### 2.6 Brand equity and brand loyalty

According to Tuominen (1999), brand equity provides both firms and customers with various benefits. For firms, brand equity increases brand loyalty in addition to marketing efficiency and effectiveness while for customers it improves their information-based shopping. Ali and Muqadas (2015) explored the impact of brand equity on brand loyalty in Pakistani restaurant sector. They employed seven dimensions of brand equity, namely physical quality, ideal self-congruence, life style-congruence, staff behavior, trust, environment and brand identification. Their results pointed out that brand equity dimensions significantly and positively related to brand loyalty through customer satisfaction. Ahmad and Hashim (2011) studied the relationship between brand equity and customer loyalty in hotel industry in Malaysia. They used a sample consisted of 500 participants from conferences attendees in four hotels. Their results revealed that brand equity has an indirect effect on loyalty in presence of customer satisfaction as a mediator variable.

Loureiro and Miranda (2011) found that one of the main contributions brand equity is the enhancement of brand loyalty. Shin et al. (2014) examined the impact of brand equity on brand attitude and brand loyalty based on data collected from 400 participants visited an international travel show exhibited in Seoul, Korea. Their results accepted only the hypothesis that brand awareness positively affects brand loyalty and rejected the hypotheses that perceived quality and brand image positively influence brand loyalty. Using five dimensions of brand equity (physical quality, staff behavior, ideal self-congruence, life style-congruence, and brand identification), Aluregowda (2013) found that these dimensions influence brand loyalty. The current study presumed that brand equity dimensions have a significant impact on brand loyalty. Hence, the following hypotheses were suggested:

- **H4:** Perceived quality significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H5:** Staff behavior significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H6:** Ideal self-congruence significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H7:** Life style-congruence significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H8:** Environment brand equity significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H9:** Trust significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.
- **H10:** Brand identification significantly and positively relates to brand loyalty.

### 2.7 Corporate branding and brand loyalty

So et al. (2013) explored the influence of corporate branding dimensions on customer's emotional attachment and brand loyalty. Using a sample consisted of 315 Malaysian participants; they found that corporate branding is one factor of other different factors that play a critical role in enhancement of customer's emotional attachment and brand loyalty. Khan et al. (2016) investigated the mediating role of emotional attachment in the relationship between corporate branding and brand loyalty. The study was carried out using a sample of 132 participants of customers who prefer luxury fashion brands in Pakistan. Interestingly, they pointed out that corporate benefits only (functional and symbolical benefits) have a significant impact on brand loyalty. The other dimensions of corporate branding used in their study (corporate associations, corporate activities, corporate values, corporate personalities were found to have no significant impact on brand loyalty.

Guo et al. (2011) examined the influence of brand functions on brand loyalty among Chinese customers. They categorized those functions based on three basic needs of a customer: functional, experiential, and symbolic needs. Hence, it was concluded that a customer is satisfied if a brand satisfies his or her needs through brand-related benefits. Their results indicated that brand functions (benefits) are significantly predicting brand loyalty. So et al. (2013) developed and tested a framework in order to examine the impact of corporate branding on both customer emotional attachment as well as brand
loyalty. Out of corporate branding dimensions used, two dimensions only, i.e. corporate associations and functional benefits, have a significant effect on brand loyalty. Kaynak et al. (2007) cited a positive relationship between brand associations and brand loyalty. Anisimova (2007) conducted a study to explore the relationship between corporate branding and brand loyalty using a sample consisted of 285 customers of automobile industry in Australia. Her results highlighted that corporate values, corporate personality and functional benefits have a positive impact on brand loyalty. The present study presumed that corporate branding has a significant influence on brand loyalty. Therefore, the following hypotheses were presumed:

- **H11**: Corporate associations significantly and positively relate to brand loyalty.
- **H12**: Corporate activities significantly and positively relate to brand loyalty.
- **H13**: Corporate values significantly and positively relate to brand loyalty.
- **H14**: Corporate personalities significantly and positively relate to brand loyalty.
- **H15**: Functional benefits significantly and positively relate to brand loyalty.

3. **Research framework**

Figure 1 shows the conceptual framework of the current study, which consists of three independent variables (brand experiences, brand equity and corporate branding) and dependent variable (brand loyalty).
4. Methodology of research

4.1 Measurements

Brand sensory, affective and cognitive experiences are measured using six items adopted from Anisimova (2007) and Huang et al. (2015). Brand equity is measured adopting fourteen items from Ali and Muqadas (2015), Davcik, and Sharma (2015). Ten items adopted from Anisimova (2013) and Khan et al. (2016) to measure corporate branding. Table 2 displays variables and number of items used to measure those variables. On the other hand, four items adopted from So et al. (2013), Matzler et al. (2008) and Iglesias et al. (2011) to measure brand loyalty.

Table 2. Variables and no. of items used in the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Brand experiences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anisimova (2007) and Huang et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Brand sensory experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Brand affective experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brand cognitive experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Brand equity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ali and Muqadas (2015) and Davcik and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Physical quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sharma (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Staff behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ideal self-congruence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Life style-congruence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Trust</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Brand identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Corporate branding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anisimova (2013) and Khan et al. (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Corporate associations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Corporate activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Corporate values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Corporate personalities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Functional benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Brand loyalty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>So et al. (2013), Kaynak et al. (2007),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Behavioral loyalty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Matzler et al. (2008) and Iglesias et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Attitudinal loyalty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Reliability and validity

Cronbach’s coefficient alpha as well as coefficients of composite reliability was used to measure constructs’ reliability. The results indicated that all constructs employed in the present study are reliable since alpha values and composite reliability values are higher than 0.7 (Anisimova, 2013). The average variance extracted (AVE) was used to measure the discriminant validity. The results showed that AVE values are all higher than 0.5 (Peng et al., 2014). The results pointed out that all measures have acceptable validity. Table 3 displays the results of reliability and validity tests.

Table 3. Results of reliability and validity tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Brand experiences</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Brand sensory experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Brand affective experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Brand cognitive experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Brand equity</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Physical quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variables | Cronbach’s α | AVE | Composite reliability
--- | --- | --- | ---
5 | Staff behavior |  | |
6 | Ideal self-congruence |  | |
7 | Life style-congruence |  | |
8 | Trust |  | |
9 | Environment |  | |
10 | Brand identification |  | |
* | Corporate branding | 0.88 | 0.75 | 0.69 |
11 | Corporate associations |  | |
12 | Corporate activities |  | |
13 | Corporate values |  | |
14 | Corporate personalities |  | |
15 | Functional benefits |  | |
* | Brand loyalty | 0.81 | 0.69 | 0.74 |

### 4.3 Model fit

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The results showed a good model fit based on the following indices: The comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.932, the goodness of fit index (GFI) = 0.922, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.072 and the normalized Chi-square (χ²/df = 1.79).

### 4.4 Sample and data collection

A sample consisted of 413 employees were randomly selected from 10 companies in fashion industry in Amman, the capital city of Jordan and Irbid. The required data was collected using the questionnaire that developed for the purpose of the current study. A high response rate was cited (91%).

### 5. Data analysis and results

According in Hair et al. (1998 as cited in Anisimova, 2013), multiple regression analysis can be used in order to identify any predictable changes in more than one independent variable in favor of changes in independent variables. Hence, this method was used to test research hypotheses. The results shown in Table 4 clarified four regression models of independent variables. It was revealed that all hypotheses were supported except two; H1 and H3 that presumed positive impacts of brand sensory and cognitive experiences on brand loyalty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
* | Brand experiences |  |  |
H1 | Brand sensory experience | 0.215 |  |
H2 | Brand affective experience | 0.329** |  |
H3 | Brand cognitive experience | 0.241 |  |
* | Brand equity |  |  |
H4 | Physical quality | 0.321** |  |
H5 | Staff behavior | 0.411** |  |
H6 | Ideal self-congruence | 0.314** |  |
H7 | Life style-congruence | 0.293** |  |
H8 | Trust | 0.267** |  |
H9 | Environment | 0.333** |  |
H10 | Brand identification | 0.357** |  |
* | Corporate branding |  |  |
H11 | Corporate associations | 0.441*** |  |
H12 | Corporate activities | 0.401** |  |
H13 | Corporate values | 0.211** |  |

Table 3. Results of regression models
6. Discussions and conclusions

This study aims at exploring relationships between brand experiences, brand equity as well as corporate branding and brand loyalty. Three types of experiences were used (brand sensory, brand affective and brand cognitive experiences). Brand equity encompasses seven dimensions (physical quality, staff behavior, ideal self-congruence, life style-congruence, trust, environment, brand identification). On the other hand, corporate branding was measured using five dimensions (corporate associations, corporate activities, corporate values, corporate personalities, functional benefits). Finally, the dependent variable (brand loyalty) was measured as a whole was using two dimensions (behavioral and attitudinal loyalty).

The findings indicated that brand sensory and cognitive experience has no influence on brand loyalty while brand affective experience has a significant effect on brand loyalty. Huang et al. (2015) deemed the three brand experiences used in this study as significant predictors of brand relational experience, which in turn has a significant impact on brand loyalty. Consistent with Ali and Muqadas (2015), Ahmad and Hashim (2011) and Aluregowda (2013), the results indicated that all brand equity related hypotheses in this research were supported.

Concerning the results of corporate branding, it was found that all corporate branding dimensions (corporate associations, activities, values, personalities and functional benefits) have a significant impact on brand loyalty. Khan et al. (2016) found that functional benefits only has significant impact on brand loyalty, while other variables such as corporate associations, corporate activities, corporate values, and corporate personalities have no significant influences on brand loyalty. So et al. (2013) found that both corporate associations and functional benefits have a significant effect on brand loyalty. In the same vein, Anisimova (2007) cited that corporate values, corporate personality and functional benefits have a positive impact on brand loyalty. Generally stated, it was concluded that brand affective experience, corporate associations, corporate activities, corporate values, corporate personalities, and functional benefits, physical quality, staff behavior, ideal self-congruence, life style-congruence, trust, environment, and brand identification significantly and positively predicts brand loyalty.

7. Implications, limitations and future research

This research has three main contributions. First, it takes in part in closing the literature gap related to the relationship between brand experiences, brand equity and corporate branding in Jordanian companies. Second, the study confirmed those Jordanian customers are more concerned with affective brand experiences rather than sensory or cognitive experiences. Finally, the study instructs Jordanian managers to take brand equity dimensions as well as corporate branding dimensions into their considerations as main priorities that can elevate brand loyalty. The study was conducted only in two main cities in Jordan, which were Amman and Irbid due to cost considerations. Therefore, further research is required to expand the sample of this research as well as to tackle more variables.
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