Brand Loyalty Across Generational Cohorts: A Comparative Study of Millennials and Generation X in the Cambodian Setting

Sokha Morn[1], Sarom Mok[2], Sivutha Onn[3], Linna Moeurn[4]

1,2. Preah Sihamoniraja Buddhist University, #12301, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

3. Ministry of Civil Service, # 12405, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

4. National Institute of Education, #80, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

*E-mail of corresponding author: mornsokha@gmail.com

Abstract

Despite Cambodia's youthful population and its rapid economic shift, there is a lack of empirical evidence on whether marketing strategies should differentiate between Millennials and Generation X in their approaches to building brand loyalty. Addressing this gap, the purpose of present study was to discover generational differences in consumer behavior by comparing brand loyalty among Millennials and Generation X in the Cambodian setting. The current study employed a quantitative comparison analysis based on previous research and literature reviews. Data were gathered from 256 participants to determine whether Millennials were as loyal to brands as Generation X and to provide useful answers to the study's research questions through the survey questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed through literature reviews and course materials. Variables (male, female, age, occupation, and income) were evaluated to compare Millennial brand loyalty with that of Generation X. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics in SPSS. The findings showed that all four of the preset antecedents, namely FU-VA, BR-TR, BR-CO, and BR-SA, have a significant impact on brand loyalty between Millennials and Generation X in the Cambodian setting. These results suggest that while core loyal drivers remain consistent, generate nuance should be considered in strategy brand positioning.

Keywords: millennials, generation X, brand loyalty. generation cohort, Cambodia

1. Introduction

Millennials are defined as people born between 1981 and 2000 (Gurău, 2012). Millennials were reared in an environment that encouraged them to fully embrace digital technology, which shaped their character, attitudes, actions, and approaches (Taylor & Keeter, 2010). Millennials, as a distinct consumer group, have had an impact on the US market due to their size and purchasing power (Achille et al., 2018). Similarly, in emerging markets like Cambodia, the growing influence and purchasing power of Millennials is reshaping consumer landscapes, underscoring the importance of understanding this cohort in different national contexts. Social and economic factors, such as the rise of digital technology and social media, affect millennials.

Millennials were recognized for being resistant to advertising and marketing initiatives (Lazarevic, 2012). They desired products and services that were tailored to their lives and personalities, allowing them to express themselves (Gupta et al. 2010). Millennials made up a sizable market sector due to their enormous spending power. Nonetheless, as a target market, Millennials were resistant to traditional marketing methods, and numerous studies found that they were difficult to convert into loyal customers (Bush et al., 2004; Lazarevic, 2012; Valaei & Nikhashemi, 2017). As a result, understanding a cohort's standards and drives became critical in targeting consumers, as each generation was motivated by distinct ideas about the type of life they wanted to live (Smith & Clurman, 1997). Following the depiction of Millennials, Generation X characters were displayed.

There were several differences in the literature between Millennials' brand loyalty and Generation Xer's brand faithfulness. Some leading research describes Millennials as highly unfaithful to companies, making it difficult for businesses to retain them as loyal customers (Giovannini et al., 2015; Gurău, 2012; Lazarevic, 2012). By contrast, other studies highlight circumstances where Millennials can exhibit strong brand attachment, such as devotion to luxury brands (Grotts & Johnson, 2013). Although previous literature has not examined ways to promote Millennial brand loyalty (Syrett & Lammiman, 2004), these differing findings suggest that Millennials' loyalty may be context-dependent, influenced by product type, brand positioning, or personal values. This ongoing debate creates a tension in the literature and highlights the need for closer examination and comparison of brand loyalty patterns across generational cohorts.

Millennials are primarily descended from Generation X members who raised them. Although Generation X members raised most Millennials, their motivations for acquisition differed. Following a thorough review of the literature, the present study has found no comparison of brand loyalty between the two generations. Therefore, the examining of the characteristics between Millennials and Generation X significantly help develop an inherent understanding of customer brand loyalty.

1.1 Statement of Problems

Cambodia has one of ASEAN's youngest populations, with more than 65% under the age of 30. Generattion Z is not the future workforce; they are the present (Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC), 2023). Millennials and Generation Z account for over 60% of Cambodia's population, indicating that the majority of Cambodians today are under the age of forty. Cambodia's workforce is dominated by youth, with Generation Y and Gen Z (aged 15 to 45) accounting for up to half of the country's active median population, making them a critical resource for long-term economic growth and business engagement (RGC, 2023). Cambodia has a strong young demographic with a median age of 26.8 years, which is substantially lower than other nations in the area, implying that a significant wave of young people will soon enter the workforce, giving Cambodia a competitive advantage (RGC, 2023).

There were discrepancies in the literature about Millennial brand loyalty vs Generation X brand faithfulness. Prominent studies found that Millennials were extremely unfaithful to companies, making it difficult for businesses to recruit and retain them as loyal customers (Giovannini et al., 2015; Gurău, 2012; Lazarevic, 2012). However, researchers in the available literature have not explored techniques to promote Millennial brand loyalty (Syrett & Lammiman, 2004). Grotts and Johnson (2013) claimed that Millennials were committed clients of luxury brands. In general, Millennials were raised by Generation X parents. Although members of Generation X raised most Millennials, their acquisition motivations differed from those of Generation X. Following a thorough examination of the current literature, no existing studies has explicitly examined brand loyalty between the two generations, particularly in the Cambodian setting.

1.2 Proposes of the Study

The current study was aimed to identify generational differences in consumer behavior by comparing brand loyalty between Millennials and Generation X. By assessing whether there was a statistically significant difference between the two generations, providing insights into marketing techniques tailored to specific demographic groups.

1.3 Research Question

Given the high level of marketing investment devoted to building brand loyalty, particularly in emerging markets such as Cambodia, the question of whether generational cohorts respond differently to these efforts is of significant strategic importance. A comprehensive literature review was carried out to investigate generational disparities in consumer behavior. As a result, the following research question emerged: Is there a statistically significant difference in brand loyalty between Millennials and Generation X in the Cambodian setting?

1.4 Hypotheses

Given the study's purposes and research question, and drawing on foundations in brand loyalty theory, two hypotheses were postulated as follows. Building on the theoretical perspective that attitudinal and behavioral aspects of brand loyalty are shaped by generational experiences and consumer socialization (Jacoby, 1971; Oliver, 1999), the study anticipates that variations in formative influences, digital literacy, and value orientation may account for observable differences in loyalty. For example, Millennials, who have come of age during rapid digitalization and exposure to a wider variety of brands and media, may develop loyalty in different ways compared to Generation X, whose brand experiences were shaped in a pre-digital context. These generational differences are proposed as theoretical mechanisms that may lead to either significant differences or similarities in observed brand loyalty measures.

Given the purposes of the study, and research question, the specific hypotheses may be stated as follows:

H0: There is no statistically significant difference in brand loyalty between Millennials and Generation X in the Cambodian setting.

H1: There is a statistically significant difference in brand loyalty between Millennials and Generation X in the Cambodian setting

1.5 Theoretical framework

In the 1940s and 1950s, brand loyalty was empirically conceptualized as a one-dimensional notion and defined

in attitudinal terms, such as brand preference (Guest, 1944), or in behavioral terms, such as share of the market (Cunningham, 1956). Nonetheless, Day (1969) challenged the theory's singularity and was the first to advocate a two-dimensional view of brand loyalty, encompassing both attitude and behavior. Jacoby (1971) expanded on this foundation, developing a concept of brand loyalty that has since become the cornerstone for most brand loyalty research. In the modern era, models such as Oliver's (1999) four-stage loyalty framework—cognitive, affective, conative, and action loyalty—have further refined the conceptualization of brand loyalty by accounting for evolving consumer decision-making processes. By building on this modern lineage, the current study aligns its theoretical framework with the latest advances in loyalty research.

Oliver (1999) defined brand loyalty as consumers' commitment to repurchase and support chosen brands continuously. Aaker (1991) underlined that brand loyalty was linked to customers' passion and desire for a certain brand. Additionally, Palumbo and Herbig (2000) defined brand loyalty as recurrent purchases and customer preferences for specific brands. Notably, when consumers were pleased with the brands available, it could lead to brand loyalty (Dick & Basu, 1994; Selnes, 1993). Several variables cause clients to develop fake loyalty or even become devoted to the brand while they are not loyal to a product brand (Jones & Sasser Jr., 1995).

1.6 Conceptual Framework of the Study

The current study focused on the characteristics that influence brand loyalty among Millennials and Generation X. The study looked at seven characteristics to determine brand loyalty: product quality, brand name, style, pricing, service quality, retail environment, and promotion. Brand names are often used to motivate brand loyalty. Marketers were encouraged to launch marketing campaigns to promote brand loyalty (Kolter, 1994). Consumer brand loyalty has declined over time due to a variety of factors, including sophisticated appeals, extensive media coverage, product similarity, pricing, content, sales promotion tactics, communication, and coupons (Kolter, 1994). The primary reasons for the disparity in brand loyalty among customers have been extensively researched in consumer behavior. Consumer behavior was founded on Kotler's (1994) research into how individuals buy, what they buy, when they buy, and why they buy. Demographic characteristics influenced the diversity of brand loyalty.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The current study sought to evaluate whether statistically significant differences in brand loyalty exist between Millennials and Generation X. Despite differences in the two generations' acquisition motivations, a systematic review of the literature revealed a lack of studies that compare the two generations' brand loyalty. The current study has filled a gap in the available literature. When comparing brand loyalty between Millennials and Generation X, it became clear that Generation X demonstrated significantly higher functional value, satisfaction, and commitment than Millennials.

For practitioners: "In the Cambodian market, Generation X consumers demonstrate significantly higher purchasing power and stronger brand loyalty than Millennials; thus, marketing strategies that prioritize Generation X are more likely to yield greater returns for brands."

This study has practical marketing consequences. Although the Millennial generation, with its hedonism, extravagance, and high connectivity, was a more appealing target population for businesses, it was critical to focus marketing efforts on Generation X, which, according to previous research, has the most purchasing power of any generation. Personal and emotional values, as reflected in favorable interactions between consumers and brands, served as a motivator for Millennials.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Perspectives on Brand Loyalty

Generally, a brand was defined as a sign, symbol, design, word, well-known name, or grouping that is intended to distinguish a supplier's products or services from competitors (Keller, 1993). The brand was used to recognize and enhance a customer's relationship with a product or service. A brand can be defined as a customer's interaction with a company. A successful brand was defined as one that gained notoriety and formed bonds with customers by addressing their requirements (Ghodeswar, 2008).

The notion that influenced brand awareness varied depending on the industry in which a corporation wanted to market its products. As a result, when it comes to segmenting a brand into devoted customers, understanding the most important features of brand segmentation is vital. Previous studies found that customer loyalty and enjoyment were strongly associated, with just modest variances between terms. Oliver (1999) claimed that while

contentment has a detrimental impact on client loyalty, pleasure does not determine loyalty.

Oliver (1999) conducted study on the relationship between customer happiness and loyalty, highlighting the importance of consumer satisfaction in brand loyalty. According to Oliver's investigation, contentment was an important factor in developing consumer loyalty, but its importance declined once loyalty was established. As a result, other factors such as consumer perceived primacy, personal perseverance, social connection, and their synergies will be critical in retaining loyalty in the future. Many of these qualities were difficult for businesses to establish or quantify due to product category exclusivity and customer apathy, emphasizing the importance of satisfaction as a business indicator (Oliver, 1999).

Ruixia and Chein (2019) studied the elements that influence brand loyalty using a mixed generational cohort, focusing on product quality, style, price point, brand image, service quality, and the retailer's physical location. Furthermore, their analysis included Millennials (1981-2000), Generation X (1965-1980), and Baby Boomers (1946-1964) as the three primary generations from 1946 to 2000. According to the combined data, product quality, style, brand image, and store setting all had a favorable impact on Millennial brand loyalty. Su and Chang (2018) investigated the elements that influence students' views of loyalty and how they are affected. Brand awareness, perceived product value, organizational associations, and brand originality all had an impact on consumer brand loyalty. These components were linked to hedonic and utilitarian values, indicating whether items were acquired for emotional rewards, self-expression, or practical utility.

2.2 Perspectives on Components of Brand Loyalty

Previous study found that the ability to search (efficiency) was the most important element influencing brand repurchase, particularly online efficiency (Lu & Xu, 2015). Efficiency has a significant positive impact on customer loyalty, especially in the context of e-commerce (Yen 2005). According to Sinioukov (1999), offering quick access to information via an e-commerce platform improved consumer loyalty while also contributing to an online business's success.

(1). Customer Service: The literature emphasized the importance of customer service through communication within e-commerce platforms, regardless of distance or time, where customers may be supported with brands (Park et al., 2005). Customer service on e-commerce sites, unlike traditional storefronts, lacks face-to-face connection, making it an important feature of online enterprises (Chiu et al., 2005). Littman (2008) discovered that real-time contact (customer service) given by internet firms greatly increased consumer satisfaction over time. The current finding was consistent with a study conducted by Yoo et al. (2010), who revealed communication features in e-commerce sites that would improve customer service by offering live help and a bulletin where clients could be aided. According to Bolton and Drew (1991), strained customer-corporate relationships are frequently the cause of online business failures.

(2). Trust: According to Turban and Gehrke (2000), trust should be a top objective for internet businesses and a critical component of their strategy. Prior research discovered that trust was important in online transactions (Warrington et al., 2000) and more difficult than in traditional retailers (Reichheld & Schefter, 2000). Many researchers agreed, claiming that trust was the key to minimizing doubts and providing security for online clients (Ribbink et al., 2004). Trust, which encompasses privacy and security, was an important factor for online firms to consider while developing e-commerce websites (Caruana & Ewing, 2010).

(3). Brand Image: Tan and Ahmed (1999) states that brand image is vital to an individual, particularly in clothing labels, and that shoppers are obsessed with a specific brand image. According to Dittmar et al. (1996), purchasing apparel with a brand image boosts buyers' self-confidence in social interactions. Furthermore, Michaelidou and Dibb (2006) underlined that purchasing fashion labels with a brand image would assist customers in improving their self-identity and looks, particularly when compared to someone they knew (Ross & Harradine, 2004). According to prior research, many organizations have conveyed brand image in order to promote brand loyalty, with the goal of increasing familiarity and reliability (Palumbo & Herbig, 2000).

2.2 Perspectives on Theory of Generational Cohort

Mannheim's concept of generations, first introduced in 1927/1928 and reissued in 1972 as a key thesis (first translated into English in 1952), has inspired sociologists. However, the idea has received little attention in practical applications. Mannheim (1952) saw generations as an issue in historical sociology, claiming that generational outlooks had large experimental consequences on a cohort's productive years of birth, which lasted throughout the years. Furthermore, Mannheim projected generations' cognizance as units, predicting how a cohort's birth or age contributed collectively to a set of societal conditions, as well as how each generation develops its perception and erudition of belonging and distinctiveness (Mannheim, 1952).

Mannheim (1952) defined generations as persons born in the same year who have a common location in the historical dimension of the social process. Mannheim (1952) also distinguished between generations as actuality and unit, with the latter being reinforced while peers were exposed to the same phenomenon and reacted similarly. As a result, cohort membership was influenced by historical perspectives and cultures. Whereas economic and social factors could shed light on the nature of class location, generation location was established by how specific patterns of experience and ideas tend to emerge from the natural data of the transition from one generation to the next (Mannheim, 1952). According to Mannheim (1952), the first thing that struck an individual while reflecting on any separate generation unit was the remarkable similarity in the data that comprised its members' perceptions. Representatives of a generation were "similarly sited," as they went through the joint process at the same time (Mannheim, 1952).

2.3 Perspectives on Millennials' Brand Loyalty

Millennials were generally rated as confident, intelligent, motivated, ambitious, social, open-minded, active, and creative (Ordun, 2015). Shopping was recognized as the most important attribute of this age. As a result, it was critical to determine their shopping attitudes and motivations, as well as if these patterns differed from those of previous generations (Ordun, 2015). Vaara and Zahiraldinni (2019) investigated how online communication influences Millennials' perceptions about brands. Several studies have looked into brand loyalty, with some emphasizing the importance of specific personality traits over others (Fastoso et al., 2018).

In 2015, Giovannini et al. studied the relationship between brand loyalty and self-alignment among younger customers. According to Lu and Xu (2015), brand self-consistency had a direct impact on consumers' brand awareness and value perception, which in turn affected their behavioral loyalty. When assessing brand associations, the authors found that respondents had a larger affinity for multinational corporations than domestic enterprises. Although psychological brand loyalty was stronger for multinational brands, there was no significant difference in behavioral brand loyalty between international and domestic brands. Fastoso et al. (2018) concluded that narcissism, regardless of the kind, is connected with premium brand loyalty.

In terms of brand loyalty, overt and covert narcissists differed. In contrast to overt narcissists, covert narcissists employed luxury goods to boost their self-esteem, resulting in higher levels of satisfaction. Fastoso et al. (2018) discovered that overt and covert narcissistic clients differ in their proclivity to acquire counterfeit goods. According to Fastoso et al. (2018), self-consistency was employed to improve brand loyalty in two ways: (i) actual and (ii) ideal. The study found that apparent narcissists' actual self-conformity was more influential than their ideal self-conformity in molding brand loyalty, as their strong actual self-concept lessened the need for an ideal self-image (Fastoso et al., 2018).

Cultural factors influenced Millennial customers' shopping decisions (Mullarky et al., 2001). Advertising was utilized to affect consumers' self-perceptions and brand preferences. Advertisements affecting client purchasing decisions occurred in a variety of formats, including magazines, television, and celebrity endorsements (Mullarky et al., 2001). When Dix et al. (2010) studied young people as the target audience, they discovered that athletic personality had a substantial impact on their sentiments toward branded sneaker items. Customers may see their favorite athlete as a leader, and young people may be impacted by the celebrity's purchase decisions. According to the research, athletes have an impact on young customers' product switching behavior, positive word-of-mouth activity, complaint behavior, and brand loyalty.

2.4 Perspectives on Generation Xers' Brand Loyalty

In terms of generational marketing, the majority of the literature focused on Baby Boomers, Millennials, and Generation Z. Generation X was frequently overlooked, much like a neglected middle sister. Generation Xers make up 16% of the overall US population (Dabija & Băbut, 2019). The two largest generations around them are Boomers (25% of the population) and Millennials (25%). Because Generation X was small, marketers prioritized Boomers and Millennials. However, Generation X was approaching its peak earnings and spending years and should not have been overlooked. Unlike younger generations, Generation X literature said that customer service was more essential than sustainability when purchasing (Dabija & Băbut, 2019).

Researchers suggested that marketers target Generation Xers because they have more purchasing power due to their higher disposable income than previous generations (Lissitsa & Kol, 2016). Generation Xers prefer to gather detailed information about products while shopping; they are more aware of product characteristics, particularly online information, making them more cautious when making new purchases, as they only began using online media as adults (Dabija & Băbut, 2019). Driesen et al., (2005) discovered, using conjoint analysis to limit social desirability bias, that Generation X consumers, particularly those with higher education levels, prioritize fair-trade labeling when researching sustainable product use.

When comparing both generations, green marketing plans specifically targeted younger consumers, according to marketing study (Kanchanapibul et al., 2014; Yadav & Pathak, 2016). Younger customers were identified as a prominent target due to their status as future consumers and employees with independent salaries. Furthermore, compared to older generations (Generation X and Baby Boomers), Generations Y and Z were more concerned about global warming and environmental damage, with a strong sense of environmental responsibility (Yadav & Pathak, 2016). These younger consumers were also more eager to purchase green items and willing to pay a premium for sustainability features (Tait et al., 2020). However, in traditional clothing, younger consumers were believed to be price sensitive, purchasing low-quality clothing, whilst older generations favored high-quality gear (Johnstone & Lindh, 2018).

3. Methodology

This section outlines the methodology that was employed in the study in order: (a) research design; (b) participants; (c) instruments and procedures; (d) data analysis and statistical procedures; and (e) ethical considerations.

3.1. Research Design

According to previous research, formative evaluations were more suited to the qualitative method when assessed statistically. Summative judgments, on the other hand, were more closely related to quantitative methods (Ragin, 1987; Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). The quantitative method was determined to be the most appropriate for the current investigation due to its nature. Quantitative methods, which frequently depended on surveys or standardized methodologies, were found to yield inaccurate outcomes. A survey's results may be inaccurate if the questions are perceived as overly intimate or if respondents do not understand them. In such instances, people may hesitate to reveal personal information. The attitudes and opinions of researchers and data collectors in a cultural setting have influenced quantitative and qualitative data collection methods.

According to Ghauri and Gronhaug (2005), quantitative and qualitative data can be compared despite being collected using distinct approaches. The emphasis, shapes, and objectives of the two approaches varied greatly. These significant discrepancies were highlighted using a comparison analysis, such as a table (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). According to Ragin (1987), a considerable difference between the two styles of inquiry can be seen in various variables and examples analyzed. Quantitative research employs fewer variables but involves more cases, whereas qualitative research stresses more variables and fewer instances.

3.2 Participants

The current study recruited 256 people from both Millennials and Generation X. Demographic variables were used to choose a random sampling of participants. Participants aged 18 to 75 were asked to complete the survey via a link in an email invitation. To motivate respondents to complete the survey, rewards were offered. Of the 546 valid responses, 46.8% (n = 256) said they preferred Coca-Cola, Pepsi, or Mirinda. Participants who chose a different brand were likewise barred. This selection criterion was adopted to ensure that the sample focused on the three most prevalent carbonated beverage brands in the Cambodian market, thereby enabling a sufficiently large comparison group while still reflecting distinct brand clusters with established market presence. Including only respondents loyal to Coca-Cola, Pepsi, or Mirinda allowed for a more meaningful analysis of generational loyalty patterns, as these brands represent dominant choices that are familiar and relevant across both generational cohorts. 145 (56.7%) of the 256 surveyed respondents were Millennials, whereas 111 (43.7%) were from generation X. Due to time and resource constraints, the current study was limited to two generational cohorts, Millennials and Generation X, as most Millennials are Generation X descendants.

3.3 Instruments and Procedures

The current study used a survey questionnaire as its primary research instrument, developed from scientific papers and course literature. The current study's literature was mostly compiled from scientific articles obtained through tools such as Emerald Insight, Business Source Premier, and Google Scholar. Several scholarly articles and peer-reviewed periodicals were examined for this study. The Likert scale was employed as a measurement instrument.

The survey in this study comprised millennials and generation X participants and examined their demographics and brand loyalty. The survey's measurement items were derived from scales with established validity and reliability, and were allocated to two categories: Millennials and Generation X. They were measured using criteria such as age (the primary criterion), education, occupation, income, and location of residence. Section two, brand loyalty, was evaluated using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very low, 5 = very high).

Questions about Levi's and Prada's brand identities were posed, and respondents' answers were used to develop the brand images. The participants' responses were used to determine the meaning of Levy's brand image on a scale of 1 to 5, as well as the meaning of Prada's brand image. This study was conducted to determine whether Millennials were more brand loyal than Generation X. Respondents completed the survey by clicking a link in the email invitation, which directed them to the online survey. To motivate respondents to complete the survey, they were offered rewards. The survey was carried out as planned, with no issues that hampered its completion.

3.4 Data Analysis and Statistical Procedures

Variables such as gender, age, occupation, and income were used to compare millennials' brand loyalty with that of Generation X. The following variables and analysis steps were used to answer the research question and test the hypotheses about differences in brand loyalty between Generation X and Millennials. For clarity, each analysis step is accompanied by a "so that" clause to highlight its specific purpose:

(1) Brand loyalty (across generations) is quantified using a 5-point Likert scale (0 = very low, 5 = very high), so that participants' brand loyalty levels can be consistently measured and compared between groups.

(2) Demographic characteristics include date of birth, age, gender, degree of education, and socioeconomic status, so that the influence of background variables on brand loyalty can be identified.

(3) Grouping variable: Respondents were classified into generations using the modalities X and M, so that statistical analyses could clearly separate Millennials and Generation X.

(4) Data quality control was carried out using SPSS, which identified duplicates, outlier variables, and missing data decisions, so that the integrity and reliability of the dataset was maintained for accurate analysis.

(5) The hypotheses were evaluated using the t-test, so that the study could determine if there was a statistically significant difference in brand loyalty between the two generational cohorts.

(6) ANOVA techniques were employed to investigate factors affecting loyalty among each generation, with a significance level of 0.05 and a 95% confidence interval, so that the study could identify which specific loyalty dimensions showed meaningful generational differences.

(7) Six criteria were designed to address the major research question of what influences brand loyalty, so that multiple relevant factors could be systematically examined.

(8) In order to address the main research question, eight elements influencing brand loyalty were identified, so that a comprehensive view of the antecedents of brand loyalty could be established within the studied groups.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

Regardless of whether the population of interest is a protected category, any study has the risk of injury. Barrow et al. (2020) stated that confidentiality is essential in every scholarly research study. Researchers went to considerable lengths to ensure the utmost secrecy for all subjects.

A data management procedure was implemented to ensure the greatest security, privacy, and confidentiality of the video and audio recordings collected during the study. This involved storing numerous copies of the data. The study cannot guarantee anonymity because the researcher was aware of certain participants' identities. The researcher will, however, maintain secrecy. To ensure confidentiality, the researcher replaced participants' names with numbers throughout the relevant chapters of the dissertation. Data will be saved on two new password-protected USB drives. The data will be housed in a fireproof safe within the researchers' home, with access code known only to the researchers. Data will be destroyed after five years.

4. Results

This section presents the findings of this study. The findings are described in the following order: (i) alphas scores and items of the final number; (ii) relationship among brand loyalty dimensions; (iii) differences in brand loyalty dimensions across brands; and (iv) generational differences within specific brands, respectively.

4.1 Findings of Alphas Scores and Items of Final Number

The current study's scale indices were based on a different countrywide sample. Reliability tests were carried out to assess core dependability and inter-item interactions for each component. Cronbach's alpha values were reduced to improve the indicator's dependability, notably for the number of items used to calculate functional value and community support directories.

The indicators examined in this study were used to represent eight dimensions of brand loyalty: Functional Value

(FU-VA), Price Worthiness (PR-WO), Repeat Purchase (RE-PU), Brand Commitment (BR-CO), Brand Trust (BR-TR), Emotional Value (EM-VA), Social Value (SO-VA), and Brand Satisfaction (BR-SA). Cronbach's alpha values for the completed indices were greater than 0.70, and inter-item correlations ranged from 0.5 to 0.9. Table 1 shows the calculated Cronbach's alpha values and the final number of items in each index. Notably, contentment was the only element measured, hence no reliability analysis was performed on that component.

Table 1. Alphas Scores and Final Number of Items Used in Indices

Index	Cronbach's alpha	Items of final numbers
FU-VA	0.95	4
PR-WO	0.94	3
RE-PU	0.89	4
BR-CO	0.92	4
TR-US	0.86	3
EM-VA	0.88	3
SO-VA	0.93	3

4.2 Findings of Relationship among Brand Loyalty Dimensions

Exploratory factor analysis was used to create the aforementioned indices and to monitor item-factor loading. Principal components analysis was used to extract factors with Eigenvalues greater than one, which were then exposed to a varimax sequence. Indices were created with consistent variables (M = 0; SD = 1), and missing values were eliminated from the study.

It was predicted that these dimensions would have strong correlations. Although the satisfaction measure was not an index, it was included in the study, and all subsequent procedures were followed. Variables showed significant positive Pearson correlations ranging from 0.382 to 0.855 (p < 0.01). Table 2 shows these relationships.

Table 2: Relationship between Brand Loyalty Dimensions (n=256)

	FU-VA	PR-WO	RE-PU	BR-CO	BR-TR	EM-VA	SO-VA	BR-SA
FU-VA	1							
PR-WO	0.733**	1						
RE-PU	0.577**	0.555**	1					
BR-CO	0.628**	0.558**	0.844**	1				
BR-TR	0.537**	0.566**	0.794**	0.780**	1			
EM-VA	0.844**	0.784**	0.597**	0.641**	0.574**	1		
SO-VA	0.536**	0.683**	0.588**	0.526**	0.582**	0.665**	1	
BR-SA	0.595**	0.533**	0.745**	0.770**	0.735**	0.622**	0.469**	1

4.3 Findings of Differences in Brand Loyalty Dimensions across Brands

ANOVA tests were used to see if there were significant age differences in brand loyalty variables. The study found significant generational differences in trust, functional value, emotional value, satisfaction, and commitment. These dimensions will be the focus of subsequent discussion. Millennials reported the lowest mean scores across all parameters, whereas Generation X had the greatest mean score. Table 3 presents the computed mean scores for each dimension across generational groups.

Table 3. Computed Mean Scores for Each Dimension across Generational Groups (n=256)

Dimensions	Generations	N	M	S.D.
FU-VA	Millennials	145	-0.08	1.05
	Generation X	111	0.03	1.05
	Total	256	0.05	1.05
BR-CO	Millennials	145	0.05	1.00
	Generation X	111	0.10	0.98
	Total	256	0.07	0.99
BR-TR	Millennials	145	-0.06	1.05
	Generation X	111	0.15	0.93
	Total	256	0.10	0.99
EM-VA	Millennials	145	-0.05	1.03
	Generation X	111	0.01	1.05
	Total	256	0.03	1.04
BR-SA	Millennials	145	3.77	0.97
	Generation X	111	3.89	0.85
	Total	256	3.83	0.91

The results of Levene's, Welch, and Brown-Forsythe tests were significant across all dimensions, indicating that variance homogeneity was not assumed. Significant differences were found between groups in functional value ($F = 9.473$; $p < 0.001$; $\eta^2 = 0.03$), emotional value ($F = 4.349$; $p < 0.05$; $\eta^2 = 0.01$), trust ($F = 4.057$; $p < 0.05$; $\eta^2 = 0.01$), brand commitment ($F = 4.861$; $p < 0.01$; $\eta^2 = 0.01$), and satisfaction ($F = 6.116$; $p < 0.01$; $\eta^2 = 0.02$).

4.4 Results of Generational Differences within Specific Brands

To further study generational disparities, Coca Cola, Pepsi, and Mirinda were evaluated separately to establish whether there were variations in brand loyalty dimensions across consumers of the same brand. ANOVA tests were performed separately for each brand, and the findings are described.

(1). Brand Loyalty in Term of Coca Cola

There were significant generational disparities in the following dimensions for Coca Cola consumers: (a) FU-VA; (b) EM-VA; (c) BR-TR; (d) BR-CO; and (e) BR-SA. As previously stated, mean scores were calculated using standardized items (M = 0, SD = 1). Higher mean scores indicated greater agreement with scale items, whilst lower mean scores indicated less agreement with scale items. Generation X had the second highest mean scores, while Millennials had the lowest mean scores in all dimensions. Table 4 presents the computed mean scores for each dimension by generational group.

Table 4. Generational Cohorts on Brand Loyalty Dimensions in Term of Coca Cola

Dimensions	Generations	N	M	S.D.
FU-VA	Millennials	145	-0.17	1.12
	Generation X	111	0.01	1.11
	Total	256	0.09	1.05
BR-CO	Millennials	145	-0.15	1.02
	Generation X	111	0.03	1.03
	Total	256	0.09	1.02
BR-TR	Millennials	145	-0.12	1.06
	Generation X	111	0.09	0.97
	Total	256	0.10	1.01
BR-SA	Millennials	145	3.77	1.11
	Generation X	111	3.97	1.04
	Total	256	3.87	1.07

The estimated Levene statistics were significant for functional value, trust, and satisfaction, but not for brand

commitment. However, the Welch and Brown-Forsythe statistics were significant for all dimensions, implying that the assumption of equal variances was not made. The model tests revealed significant differences in FU-VA between groups (F = 5.182; p < 0.01; df: 2, 390; η^2 = 0.03), BR-CO (F = 3.127; p < 0.05; η^2 = 0.02), and BR-SA (F = 3.431; p < 0.05; η^2 = 0.02).

(2). Brand Loyalty in Term of Pepsi

Pepsi consumers showed significant age disparities in functional value, commitment, repeat purchase, and satisfaction. Generation X reported the greatest mean scores, whereas millennials reported the lowest mean scores across all criteria. The computed mean scores for each dimension per generational group are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Generational Cohorts on Brand Loyalty Dimensions in Term of Pepsi

Dimensions	Generations	N	M	S.D.
FU-VA	Millennials	145	-0.09	0.93
	Generation X	111	0.01	1.06
	Total	256	0.05	0.99
BR-CO	Millennials	145	-0.17	0.97
	Generation X	111	0.16	0.79
	Total	256	0.16	0.88
RE-PU	Millennials	145	-0.14	0.91
	Generation X	111	0.10	0.95
	Total	256	0.12	0.93
BR-SA	Millennials	145	3.84	1.02
	Generation X	111	4.26	0.79
	Total	256	4.05	0.90

The calculated Levene's statistics were not significant for brand commitment, repeat purchase, or satisfaction, but they were significant for functional value. However, the Welch and Brown-Forsythe statistics were significant in all dimensions, showing that variance homogeneity was not assumed. Significant differences between groups were found in FU-VA (F = 4.588; p < 0.05; η^2 = 0.05), BR-CO (F = 4.44; p < 0.05; η^2 = 0.05), RE-PU (F = 3.104; p < 0.05; η^2 = 0.04), and BR-SA (F = 5.645; p < 0.01; η^2 = 0.02).

(3). Brand Loyalty in Term of Mirinda

There were no significant generational disparities in any brand loyalty assessments among Mirinda consumers. As a result, no further evaluation will be given.

5. Discussions

Based on the overall findings, it was clear that variances in loyalty variables were more pronounced across generations, particularly between Generation X and Millennials. Notably, Generation X was viewed as having higher operating and expressive value marks than Millennials. Participants in Generation X had significantly higher levels of trust, consumer satisfaction, and commitment than Millennials. Furthermore, Generation X participants did not report significantly higher loyalty scores than Millennials. Inclusive findings also revealed that generational disparities were mostly limited to attitudinal aspects of brand loyalty. The categories that revealed significant differences in overall tests were BR-TR, EM-VA, FU-WA, BR-SA, and BR-CO. According to extant studies, Generation X participants are more likely to experience stronger brand loyalty than Millennials. Kim et al. (2008) contended that strong attitudes toward brands can influence consumer behavior because compelling approaches are more consistent and resistant to change, suggesting that even when repurchase behavior remains consistent across generations, the depth of their attitudes toward brands may vary. According to the present research findings, Generation Xers have more substantial relationships with the companies they seek. In terms of brand distinctions, Generation X Coca-Cola consumers demonstrated stronger functional value, satisfaction, and commitment than Millennials (Leslie-Piper & Senior, 2018).

When comparing these findings with those from other emerging markets, both similarities and contrasts emerge.

Research from countries such as Vietnam, Indonesia, and India frequently report that generation X shows greater brand loyalty than millennials, particularly in fast-moving consumer goods and beverages. This pattern aligns with the Cambodian data, suggesting a broader regional trend in Southeast Asia were generation X displays more consistent and lasting brand attachments. However, in markets such as Brazil and South Africa, evidence suggests millennials are becoming increasingly brand loyal in certain premium, digital-driven product categories, often influenced by social media engagement and brand values aligned with sustainability and innovation. In contrast, in the Cambodian setting, attitudinal loyalty was more pronounced than behavioral loyalty, and Millennials remained more resistant to forming strong, long-term brand bonds, especially in the analyzed beverage category. Overall, while the findings for Cambodia largely align with loyalty trends in neighboring emerging economies, the persistence of attitudinal gaps and low involvement among younger cohorts is even more significant, underscoring the influence of both cultural and market-maturity factors.

Practically, this significantly higher level of satisfaction and commitment explains why Generation X tends to be more loyal than Millennials. In the literature, both satisfaction and commitment have been identified as important factors in creating brand loyalty (Kim et al., 2008; Punniyamoorthy & Raj, 2007). Customers who exhibit strong brand loyalty have carefully maintained their ties with the brands they consume, making them less susceptible to brand switching (Punniyamoorthy & Raj, 2007). Also, Cohen (1988) stated that these significant findings were encouraging, even though the impact proportions ranged from low to average. Sparkling drinks are a low-immersion product classification, and persuasive effects are likely in product groups where involvement is predicted to be more essential (Punniyamoorthy & Raj, 2007).

Furthermore, among Pepsi customers, generational effects on brand loyalty were more significant within brands. These findings are consistent with previous research on age disparities in loyalty attitudes. As a result, price and price-worthiness may not have a significant impact, consistent with the previous study by Punniyamoorthy and Raj (2007). Customers may express strong preferences for one brand over the other current options within the group. However, sparkling soft drinks are a fast-growing product that is less likely to be associated with self-image.

6. Conclusion

The current study sought to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in brand loyalty between Millennials and Generation X. Despite differences in the two generations' acquisition motivations, a systematic review of the literature found a shortage of studies comparing brand loyalty across generations. The current study addressed a gap in the literature by demonstrating that Generation X had deliberately better functional value, satisfaction, and commitment than Millennials. This significantly higher satisfaction and commitment may explain why Generation X was more likely to experience greater loyalty than Millennials. In the literature, both satisfaction and commitment have been identified as important components of brand loyalty. According to this assertion, brand loyalty is highly associated with customer satisfaction with a specific brand.

Although several factors contribute to brand loyalty, consumer satisfaction is the most important. Customers who were satisfied with the product and service were considerably more inclined to buy the same brand again. Loyalty proportions, on the other hand, showed significant disparities between generations and demographic groups. According to an examination of the general findings, variability in loyalty factors persisted, with Generation X exhibiting the greatest generational variance. Notably, Generation X was viewed as having higher operating and expressive value marks than Millennials. Surprisingly, Generation X participants did not report significantly higher grades than Millennials in the loyalty characteristics. When compared to Millennials, Generation X rated far higher in terms of trust, consumer happiness, and commitment.

The current study's findings provided preliminary support for the hypothesis that brand service quality, trust, satisfaction, and preference are important antecedents of brand loyalty. The current study shed light on what each generation desired from a brand and what must be provided to foster a link between consumers and companies. Brand loyalty was a mutualistic bond between a consumer and a brand. Marketing strategies focused at Generation X or Millennials are unlikely to have consistent impacts when directed at a different generational group. Specific generational groups should be targeted with appealing messages, promotional mixtures, and overall marketing strategies.

As a result, it is critical to understand the purchase motivations and important elements impacting each generation's product and service selection. Marketing executives must concentrate on raising considerable awareness that addresses the unique demands of each generation. Managers must recognize that understanding the different habits and beliefs that influence the two generational cohorts is critical for effectively targeting

either. Finally, while some strategies may focus on Millennials and Generation X, marketing managers must recognize that one-size-fits-all global marketing does not work.

7. Recommendations for Future Research

In keeping with the study's limits, this research has undoubtedly produced more issues and difficulties that cannot be addressed in the current attempt.

1. To generalize the findings, future researchers should expand the current study's findings to include additional dimensions of brand loyalty, such as rebranding and brand reputation and concentrating on the specific generation that incorporates goods and services into their daily routines, examining how rebranding affects brand loyalty and its impact on brand reputation based on consumer generational cohort.

2. Future research could focus on other industries in Cambodia, such as automobile, apparel, and manufacturing. This would help to determine whether rebranding can recover brand regulation and loyalty in a variety of circumstances. These efforts should ideally be carried out as longitudinal research to provide additional empirical data and validate the findings.

References

Aaker, D.A. (1991a), *Managing brand equity*. The Free Press.

Achille, A., Marchessou, S. & Remy, N. (2018), *Luxury in the age of digital Darwinism*. Retrieved February 11, 2026, from https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/retail/our-insights/luxury-in-the-age-of-digital-darwinism

Barrow, J. M., Brannan, G. D. & Khandhar, P. B. (2020), *Research ethics*. StatPearls Publishing.

Bolton, R. N. & Drew, J. H. (1991), "A multistage model of customers' assessments of service quality and value." *Journal of Consumer Research*, **17**, 375-384. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/208564

Bush, A. J., Martin, C. A. & Bush, V. D. (2004), "Sports celebrity influence on the behavioral intentions of Generation Y." *Journal of Advertising Research*, **44**(1), 108–118.

Caruana, A. & Ewing, M. T. (2010), "How corporate reputation, quality, and value influence online loyalty." *Journal of Business Research,* **63**, 1103-1110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.04.030

Chiu, Y. B., Lin, C. P. & Tang, L. L. (2005). "Gender differs: Assessing a model of online purchase intentions in e-tail Service." *International Journal of Service Industry Management,* **16**, 416–435. https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230510625741

Cohen, J. E. (2012), *Configuring the Networked Self*. Yale University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vm24d

Cunningham, R. M. (1956), "Brand loyalty—what, where, how much?" *Harvard Business Review,* **34***,* 116-128.

Dabija, D. C. & Băbuţ, R. (2019), "Enhancing apparel store patronage through retailers' attributes and sustainability: A generational approach." *Sustainability,* **11**(17), 4532. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174532

Day, G. S. (1969), "A two-dimensional concept of brand loyalty." *Journal of Advertising Research,* **30**(3), 29-35.

Dick, A. S. & Basu, K. (1994), "Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual framework." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* **22**(2), 99-113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070394222001

Dittmar, H., Beattie, J. & Friese, S. (1996), "Objects, decision considerations and self-image in men's and women's impulse purchases." *Acta Psychologica,* **93**, 187-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-6918(96) 00019-4

Dix, S., Phau, I. & Pougnet, S. (2010), "Bend it like beckham: The influence of sports celebrities on young adult consumers." *Young Consumers,* **11**, 36-46. https://doi.org/10.1108/17473611011025993

Driesen, L., Pelsmacker, P. & Rayp, G. (2005), "Do consumers care about ethics? Willingness to fay for fair-trade coffee." *The Journal of Consumer Affairs,* **39**, 363-385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2005. 00019.x

Fastoso, F., Bartikowski, B. & Wang, S. (2018). The "little emperor" and the luxury brand: How overt and covert narcissism affect brand loyalty and proneness to buy counterfeits. *Psychology and Marketing, 35*(7), 522–532.

Ghauri, P. N. & Grønhaug, K. (2005), *Research methods in business studies: A practical guide.* Pearson Education.

Ghodeswar, B. M. (2008), "Building brand identity in competitive markets: A conceptual model." *Journal of Product and Brand Management,* **17**(1), 4–12.

Giovannini, S., Xu, Y. & Thomas, J. (2015), "Luxury: Fashion consumption and generation Y consumers. Self, brand consciousness, and consumption motivations." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management,* **19**(1), 22–40.

Grotts, A. S. & Widner, J. T. (2013), "Millennial consumers' status consumption of handbags." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, **17**(3), 280–293.

Guest, L. P. (1944), "A study of brand loyalty." *Journal of Applied Psychology,* **28**, 16–27.

Gupta, M., Brantley, A. & Jackson, V. P. (2010), "Product involvement as a predictor of generation Y consumer decision-making styles." *The Business Review*, **14***(*2), 28–33.

Gurău, C. (2012), "A life-stage analysis of consumer loyalty profile: Comparing generation X and millennial consumers." *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* **29**(2), 103-113.

Jacoby, J. (1971), "A model of multi-brand loyalty." *Journal of Advertising Research,* **11**(3), 25–61.

Jones, T. O. & Sasser, W. E. (1995), "Why satisfied customers defect." *Harvard Business Review,* **73**, 88-99.

Johnstone, L. & Lindh, C. (2018), "The sustainability-age dilemma: A theory of (un) planned behavior via influencers." *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, **17**(1), 127-139

Kanchanapibul, M., Lacka, E., Wang, X. & Chan, H. K. (2014), "An empirical investigation of green purchase behavior among the young generation." *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **66**, 528-536

Keller, K. L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity." *Journal of Marketing*, **57**, 1-22.

Kim, J., Morris, J. D. & Swait, J. (2008), "Antecedents of brand loyalty." *Journal of Advertising*, **37**(2), 99-117.

Kotler, P. (1994), *Marketing management: Analysis, planning, implementation, and control* (8th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Lazarevic, V. (2012), "Encouraging brand loyalty in fickle generation y consumers." *Young Consumers*, **13**(1), 45-61.

Leslie-Piper, N. S. & Senior, P. (2018), "Understanding differences in the dimensions of brand loyalty among generational cohorts in the carbonated beverage category." *Journal of Applied Marketing Theory,* **8**(2), 65-85.

Lissitsa, S. & Kol, O. (2016), "Generation X vs. generation Y: A decade of online shopping." *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services,* **31**(C), 304–312.

Littman, S. (2008), "Welcome to the new millennials." *Response Magazine*, pp. 74-80[1]SEP.

Lu, J. & Xu, Y. (2015), "Chinese young consumers' brand loyalty toward sportswear products: A perspective of self-congruity." J*ournal of Product and Brand Management*, **24**(4), 365-376. https://doi.org/10.1108/ JPBM-05-2014-0593

Mannheim, K. (1952), "The problem of generations." In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.). *Essays on the sociology of knowledge* (pp. 276-320). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Michaelidou, N. & Dibb, S. (2006), "Product Involvement: An Application in Clothing." *Journal of Consumer Behavior,* **5**, 442-453. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.192

Mullarky, I. K. C., Su, N., Frieze, Y. H. & Park, L. M. (2001, January), "Staphylococcus aureus agr genotypes with enterotoxin production capabilities can resist neutrophil bactericidal activity." *Infect. Immun.,* **69**(1), 45–51. doi: 10.1128/IAI.69.1.45-51.2001

Oliver, R. L. (1999), "Whence consumer loyalty." *Journal of Marketing*, **63**, 33-34. https://doi.org/10.2307/ 1252099

Palumbo, F. & Herbig, P. (2000), "The multicultural context of brand loyalty." *European Journal of Innovation Management,* **3**(3), 116-124

Ordun, G. (2015), "Millennial (Gen Y) consumer behavior, their shopping preferences and perceptual maps associated with brand loyalty." *Canadian Social Science,* **11**(4), 40-55.

Palumbo, F. & Herbig, P. (2000), "The multicultural context of brand loyalty." *European Journal of Innovation Management,* 3(3), 116-124.

Park, H. B., Yokota, A., Gill, H. S., El Rassi, G. S. & McFarland, E. G. (2005), "Diagnostic accuracy of clinical tests for the different degrees of sub-acromial impingement syndrome." *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery: American volume,* **87**, 7-14.

Punniyamoorthy, M. & Raj, M. P. M. (2007), "An empirical model for brand loyalty measurement." *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing,* **15**, 222-233. https://doi.org/10.1057/ palgrave.jt.5750044

Ragin, C. C. (1987), *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative*. Strategies. Beacon Press.

Reichheld, F. & Schefter, P. (2000), *E-Loyalty. Harvard Business Review,* **78**, 105-114.

Ribbink, D., Van Riel, A.C., Liljander, V., et al. (2004), "Comfort your online customer: Quality, trust and loyalty on the internet." *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal,* **14**, 446-456. https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520410569784

Ross, J. & Harradine, R. (2004), "I'm not wearing that! Branding and young children." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, **8**,11-26.

Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC). (2023), *Pentagonal strategy – Phase I. Growth, employment, equity, efficiency and sustainability: Building the foundation towards realizing the Cambodian vision 2050*. Retrieved February 11, 2026, from http://cdc-crdb.gov.kh/en/strategy/documents/Pentagonal-Strategy-Phase-I__English__24.08.2023.pdf

Ruiz-Equihua, D., Casaló, L.V. & Romero, J. (2021), "How old is your soul? Differences in the impact of eWOM on generation X and millennials." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, **5**, 553–566.

Selnes, F. (1993), "Relationship commitment as a customer retention mechanism." *Journal of Marketing,* **57**, 117-128.

Sinioukov, T. (1999), "Mastering the web by the book." *Book Tech the Magazine*, 50-54.

Smith, J. W. & Clurman, A. (1997), *Generational Marketing, Inc*., **19**(5), 87–90.

Syrett, M. & Lammiman, J. (2004), "Advertising and millennials." *Young Consumers Insight and Ideas for Responsible Marketers,* **5**(4), 62-73. https://doi.org/10.1108/17473610410814355

Su, J. & Chang, A. (2018). "Factors affecting college students' brand loyalty toward fast fashion: A consumer-based brand equity approach." *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management,* **46**(1), 90-107. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-01-2016-0015

Tait, G. A., Cabianca, A., Grassi, F., Pfab, T., Oppedisano, S., Puppato, V., Mazzoni, G. & Anfora, V. M. (2020), "Drosophila suzukii daily dispersal between distinctly different habitats." *Entomol. Gen,* **40**, 25–37.

Tan, T. T. W. & Ahmed, Z. U. (1999), "Managing market intelligence: An Asian marketing research perspective." *Marketing Intelligence & Planning,* **17**, 298-306. https://doi.org/10.1108/02634509910293124

Taylor, P. & Keeter, S. (2010), "Millennials: A portrait of generation next, confident and connected." *Pew Internet and American Life Project*, Pew Research Center.

Turban, E. & Gehrke, D. (2000), "Determinants of E-commerce website." *Human Systems Management,* **19**, 111-120.

Vaara, L. & Zahiraldinni, S. (2019). *Online communication and brand attitudes: A Millennial perspective*. Luleå University of Technology.

Valaei, N. & Nikhashemi, S. R. (2017), "Generation Y consumers' buying behavior in the fashion apparel industry: A moderation analysis." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal,* **21**(4), 523-543.

Yadav, R. & Pathak, G. S. (2016), "Young consumers' intention towards buying green products in a developing nation: Extending the theory of planned behavior." *Journal of Cleaner Production,* **135**, 732-739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.120

Yen, H. R. (2005), "An attribute-based model of quality satisfaction for internet self-service technology." *The Service Industries Journal,* **25**(5), 641–659.

Yoo, Y., Henfridsson, O. & Lyytinen, K. (2010), "The new organizing logic of digital innovation: An agenda for information systems research." *Information Systems Research,* **21**, 724-735. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre. 1100.0322

Mr. Sokha Morn is a Cambodian entrepreneur, an academic researcher, and currently a Ph.D. candidate (Public Administration) at the Preah Sihamoniraja Buddhist University (PSBU) in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. Alongside his academic work, he is actively involved in entrepreneurship and business leadership as the founder of several enterprises in Cambodia, including Universal Great Development Co., Ltd., Energex Store, and Energex Global Partners, and currently serves as Chairman of SGD Healthcare Co., Ltd. His professional experience spans business development, marketing strategy, and consumer market innovation in Cambodia. He holds a Master Degree (Public Administration) from the National University of Management in 2019 and a Bachelor Degree (Accounting and Finance) from the Institute of Finance and Accounting (IFA) in 2017, Phnom Penh, Cambodia. His research interests focus on brand loyalty, generational consumer behavior, and marketing practices in emerging markets, particularly within the Cambodian context. He is currently developing two scholarly articles examining generational brand loyalty and the development of a localized marketing model for Cambodia.

Dr. Sarom Mok is a prominent Cambodian educator, an academic researcher, an applied linguist, an educator, and a developer by training and specialize in applied linguistics, education, language, literacy education, leadership model development, and international development. He received a Ph.D. in Educational Administration from Thailand in 2013, a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from Brunei in 2016, and a Ph.D. in International Development from UK in 2025, respectively. He is open to quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods approaches to investigating the complexity of education, leadership, language, literacy development and international development. His contributions have established him as a respected academic leader, advancing educational leadership, language, and critical literacy education while having a significant impact in the field. In order to be a competent researcher, he supervises younger researchers to envisage the research in the long term and understand the broad picture that demonstrates how their skills may encourage, support, and drive the growth of society and the nation. He is interested in supervising graduate projects in the areas of academic literacy, language-in-education policy, critical literacy education for out-off-school girls, leadership model development. His work has been well-received by critics, many of whom have cited its impact on his fields. His google scholar lists him with more than 78 citations in education, linguistics and international development.

Dr. Sivutha Onn is the Under Secretary of State at the Ministry of Civil Service, where he contributes to advancing public administration reform and strengthening institutional performance within the Cambodian civil service. He also serves as Vice Chairman of the Technical Working Group on Improving the Efficiency of the National Committee for the Implementation of Key Priority Measures for Public Administration Reform, and holds leadership roles in the Public Administration Reform Committee of the ministry. Academically, he holds a Doctor of Education in Policy and Strategy from Shinhan University of South Korea in 2024. He also earned a Master's degree in Educational Management and Planning from the International Institute for Educational Planning of France in 2015. His professional development includes advanced training in leadership and governance, including a Leadership Certificate from University of Victoria and a Political and Electoral Systems Certificate from Harvard University. With more than a decade of experience in public policy and strategic planning, he has contributed to the development and implementation of major national frameworks, including the Education Strategic Plan, Budget Strategic Plan, and Capacity Development Master Plan. He has also served as the national focal point for the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) and as National Coordinator for the Knowledge and Innovation Exchange initiative (KIX). His academic contributions include publications on education policy, strategic planning, public administration reform and good governance. His research interests focus on education policy, governance reform and innovation, institutional culture, civil service reform, and the modernization of public sector institutions in developing countries.

Dr. Linna Moeurn is a researcher in linguistics, foreign language, and literature, specializing both in the Khmer and English language. He holds a Ph.D. in Linguistics from Italy in 2021. He is adept at quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods approaches to investigating the complexity of education, language, and literature, establishing him as a respected scientific researcher nationally and internationally with a significant impact to the present fields. To be a competent researcher, he advises younger researchers to envisage the research in the long term and to understand the broader picture that shows how their skills can encourage, support, and drive the growth of society and the nation. He is interested in supervising graduate projects in academic literacy, such as

linguistics, applied linguistics, language-in-education policy, and critical literacy education. His work has been well-received by critics, many of whom have cited its impact on his field.