SMARTPHONE BRANDS DESIGN AND BUYING DECISION

Nicoleta DOSPINESCU
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania
dnicole@uaic.ro
Dana Beatrice FLOREA
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania
dana_beatrice@yahoo.com

Abstract
The wide range of mobile phones transform the decision making process of buyers in a tough assignment. One of the conditions that a smartphone to be successful on the market, when technical services and features offered are perceived as undifferentiated, represent elements of visual impact. The design is now one of the most important agents of satisfaction of the consumer universe of experiences.
We intend to study the perception of the Romanian "Y Generation", students, about the smartphones design elements. The findings of this research study would be significant to smartphone producers, in understanding the bases for student's preferences between Apple and Samsung brands of smartphone. The knowledge gained from this research could provide some elements to build strong brand equity and identity that would lead to increasing their sales volume.
Research Problem
The research problem refers to observing and determining the factors leading mobile phone design influence on the buying decision and positioning brands Samsung and Apple on the Romanian market, according to the perceptions of "Y generation".
The research methodology
The research methodology includes documentary research and quantitative research using a questionnaire on the 120 respondents. The respondents ("Y Generation") are students from three faculties that exist in the North-East of Romania, Iasi City: Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Law. The conducting research involved electronic survey using GoogleDocs online platform. The data were analyzed using SPSS, version, 17.0. The most recent consumer surveys (Lee & Calugar-Pop, 2015) *confirm that 18 – 24 years age-group has the highest penetration in terms of smartphone ownership with 85% in Finland and the UK. We use the same type of sample because the situation is similar in Romania.*

Key words: *Brand Design, Smartphones, decision to buy, „Y generation", challenge.*

JEL Classification: *M37, M31*

I. INTRODUCTION

The need for mobility, the need to communicate over long distances and access to desired information anytime, anywhere were factors that determined fulminant evolution of mobile technology. Time spent in online by Y Generation has skyrocketed. This brought the need for portability, continuous communication and fast access to the Internet and social networks in real time with a high speed. Attention was directed to smart mobile phones, which have the ability to run multiple commands simultaneously, more than a laptop sometimes. If we analyze the target market of smartphones, it appears that this product is mainly targeted at people active in fashion, who value their image. Wide range of mobile phones, transform decision making process of buyers in a tough assignment.

What are the factors, in terms of design influencing consumers in purchasing decision? The difference between success and loss of the smartphones companies is given by how it finds consumer sensitivities and expectations about favorite products. The conclusions will deal with student preference between Apple and Samsung Smartphone, how student are influenced by brand name, the role different component of brand equity and brand identity plays in student brand preference.

II. DESIGN OR UTILITY? APPLE VS. SAMSUNG

Since technology is embedded into students' lives (Dahlstrom, Walker, & Dziuban, ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology, 2014), they are recognized as the most important consumers of college and university information technology services (Dahlstrom & Brooks, ECAR Study of Faculty and Information Technology, 2014). A recent comprehensive survey in the US colleges reveals that the ownership of

smartphones among undergraduate students is 86% in 2014 up from 76% since the previous year and at much higher rates than the general adult population (Dahlstrom & Brooks, ECAR Study of Faculty and Information Technology, 2014).

The importance of product quality, focus on core competencies and value offered to customers are, of course, very important factors in the purchasing decision, but they are not the only attraction irresistible. (Strimbei, Dospinescu, Strainu, & Nistor, 2015) asserts that "nowadays, architectural software systems are increasingly important because they can determine the success of the entire system". The differentiation is a very important factor in today's society. Multiple personality needs to create points of differentiation overall positive impression. Design has become one of the most important agents of satisfaction of the consumer experiences universe. According to (Schmitt & Simson, 2002) the most important design elements of mobile phones are: ***size, color, the display the shape, angle-based approach, camera, material.***

Chia-Ju & Hao-Yun (2014) presented the results of their research. They showed, from their survey that 71% of the subjects were willing to spend more money to buy their favorite brand of smartphone. In addition, the analysis of the eye tracking data indicated some significant differences in the sequential position of viewing the phones' logos. The viewing of most subjects focused on the smartphone brand rather than on the product specifications and price.

Çelikl, Eygü, & Oktay (2015) in their study on Turkish students found that monthly individual income and smartphone use in years have an increasing and decreasing impact on the use of a specific brand, respectively. Results also reveal that monthly household income, price of current smartphone, product design, product weight, and after purchase services have both increasing and decreasing influence regarding a specific brand preference. But what is the situation for Romanian students? (Anastasiei, 2000) said that "the new corporations resulting from mergers and acquisitions often face serious cultural problems due to the cultural differences that inherently appear in such organization". The consumer's perception of the brand is considered as a key concept for brand acceptance, while the level of association between the consumer and the brand will substantially reflect the satisfaction of consumer's needs and the brand's functional attributes (Ataman & Ülengin, 2003), (Hankinson & Cowking, 1993).

Cronin & Taylor (1992) found that the satisfaction felt after the first trial of a brand directed customers to prefer the same brand in their decisions to repurchase it. (Oliver, 2003) investigated the relationship between customer satisfaction and brand loyalty, and found a positive relationship between these two variables. That is, if consumers feel satisfied with the first experience of buying, they will possibly decide to buy the same smartphone or series of products of the same brand in the future. In addition, (Berry, 2000) suggested that trust is very important for satisfaction. (Danilet & Petrusca, 2012) assert that "the objective of relationship marketing is to establish and maintain long term relationships that translate into customer loyalty".

The image created by Apple products is that it provides high quality products, made using an innovative technology that holds a great creativity and design specific. Apple personality is defined by the fact that it not sells only high-tech products, but also a mark. In other words, the company sells a mix of hopes, dreams and aspirations. Smartphones customers are drawn to brands that can be identified itself by the specific and special characteristics. Using the slogan "Think Different", Apple transmits to its customers that buying a product that is part of their product range allows them to think differently, to be creative, to be special. The market segment targeted by Apple is that customers with high-income, with a different lifestyle, innovative and high levels of education. Although Apple launched powerful and innovative products, such as the iMac and iPod, its secret lies in inciting the customer to establish lasting emotional bonds with them.

The internationally success of Apple products is due to differentiation to other existing brands. Design plays an important role in the perception of the products. Innovative nature and especially different supply of the Apple company always surprise customers. Apple has increasingly become a global brand known, whose strategy is placed into the category of sustained innovation, creativity, design and reputation (Danciu & Murea, 2009).

Apple has a branding strategy that focuses on emotion. The starting point is the experience from using Apple products. Apple brand personality is defined by lifestyle, imagination, passion, freedom, innovation, hopes, dreams and aspirations. Apple brand is very close to its users, it is loved, and there is a real sense of community among its users. The company's main competence remains the exceptional experience that it offers by superb interfaces. The distinctive feature of each product remains ease of use and elegant design. Users who migrated to Apple want a better data security.

Samsung product quality**,** care for its consumers and very consistent policy of offering a portfolio of cutting-edge products that have made Samsung to rank among the top brands in mobile.

On the other hand, Samsung has managed to successfully reinvent their brand image. From being perceived as a brand that sells cheap, copied from Japanese product design, Samsung has become a successful brand viewed with respect to compliance created between brand image and product quality. On the mobile market, Samsung smartphones are more affordable than Apple, so Samsung manages to compete with the leader of this market segment. Because of its new stylish models with a unique design, Samsung manages to stay on top of consumer preferences mobile.

Lately, Samsung has managed to transform its image from the "value for money", to a picture of brand who show innovation by changing marketing strategy that puts the wishes and needs of consumers on the first place. Samsung differentiate themselves through more affordable prices than Apple, but also through the fact that if a component of smart phones deteriorates it can be easily changed with a new ones from Samsung representative, unlike Apple does not offer changing parts for damage or wear over time. Samsung was able to develop its own set of loyal customers: a group that consists people who are fun Android platform, and users who are „anti-Apple". These are people who do not want to use Apple products because of the monopolized nature of the company. Users Samsung products, choose to use gadgets because they transmit accessibility, innovation, variety, performance and modern design.

Remedios & Nathwani (2014) concluded that each of the brand equity and identity dimensions of Apple smartphone when compared to Samsung brand equity and identity dimensions reveals that Apple has relatively high strong brand equity and brand identity than Samsung.

III. RESEARCH RESULTS

The research problem refers to observing and determining the factors most important in terms of design influence on the decision to purchase mobile phones, as well as how Samsung and Apple brands are positioned according to the "Y generation " perception on their design.

Objectives	Hypotheses
1. We want to know if Apple Mania phenomenon, by smartphones design, spreads by the "Y generation" of the Iasi city.	H1. The age, gender and faculty has a significant influence on respondents' assessments on the concept Apple Mania.
2. We want to know what from the structure design influences the buying decision.	H2. Smartphone brand has a positive influence in buying decision.
3.We want to find out how brands Samsung and Apple are positioned according to the "Y generation" perception on the design.	H3. The level of education, age and gender are not factors that respondents directly determine the ranking of brands Samsung and Apple in terms of smartphones design
4. We want to know whether the product design generates brand awareness.	H4. Loyalty to the brand is influenced by post-purchase satisfaction

The Sample and Data collection

The period of data collection was conducted over 10 days in the period 05.12.2015 - 22.05.2015. The sample used in this research is composed of 120 respondents, 60 females and 60 males, aged 18-25 years in the city of Iasi, Romania, which has a smartphone Samsung or Apple.

The questionnaire was distributed to groups composed of students from Iasi, from the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, the Faculty of Law group and the Faculty of Medicine group existing on Facebook. We chose these faculties because their students are very numerous and generally have different views on products, but also on social life. The research was conducted using GoogleDocs online platform.

Research results

The filter type question is to see if they have a smartphone and to observe how many respondents have one of two brands of smartphones. The table below shows that 62.5% of them own a mobile phone brand Samsung, and 37.5 % of them have an Apple-branded phone.

Table 1. Users of mobile phones branded Samsung or Apple

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Samsung	75	62,5	62,5	62,5
	Apple	45	37,5	37,5	100,0
	Total	120	100,0	100,0	

Objective. 1– We want to know if Apple Mania phenomenon, by smartphones design, spreads by the "Y generation" of the Iasi city.

H1. The age has a significant influence on respondents' assessments on the concept Apple Mania

To the next question: "How much do you appreciate the concept Apple Mania?" we obtained the results shown in table 2

Table 2. Assessments of Apple Mania by Iasi' Students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	a little	3	2,5	6,7	6,7
	neutral	10	8,3	22,2	28,9
	a lot	15	12,5	33,3	62,2
	the most	17	14,2	37,8	100,0
	Total	45	37,5	100,0	
Missing	I do not own Apple phone	75	62,5		
Total		120	100,0		

In table 2 we can see that respondents opted in a percentage of 14.2% for "the most" followed by version "more" with a percentage of 12.5%. 8.3% have opted to "neutral", while 2.5% think current Apple Mania "less".

Table 3. Anova, likes for Apple Mania depending on respondent gender

Report

How much do you appreciate Apple Mania?

Respondent's Gender	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Median
Female	4,25	24	,794	4,00
Male	3,76	21	1,044	4,00
Total	4,02	45	,941	4,00

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
How much do you appreciate Apple Mania? Respondent's Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	2,668	1	2,668	3,160	,083
	Within Groups		36,310	43	,844		
	Total		38,978	44			

As we can see in Table 3 from above, the coefficient of appreciation of females for the power Apple Mania is 4.25. Male people appreciate this with 0.49 less than women, reaching a level of appreciation of the phenomenon of 3.76. In the ANOVA table, the value of Sig = 0.083> α = 0.05 and hence we accept hypothesis H0. For a 5% risk there is no significant differences in the assessment of Apple trend, between the two groups.

Table 4. Anova, Likes for Apple Mania depending on the age of respondent

Report

How much do you appreciate the Apple Mania?

Respondent's Age	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Median
19	4,67	3	,577	5,00
20	2,75	4	,500	3,00
21	3,17	6	,753	3,00
22	4,25	12	,754	4,00
23	4,13	8	1,126	4,50
24	4,75	4	,500	5,00
25	4,25	8	,707	4,00
Total	4,02	45	,941	4,00

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
How much do you appreciate the Apple Mania? Respondent's Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	15,353	6	2,559	4,116	,003
	Within Groups		23,625	38	,622		
	Total		38,978	44			

According to the results obtained by using ANOVA, Sig = 0.003 <α = 0.005 thus rejecting the hypothesis H0. For a confidence level of 95% and a risk of 5%, we can say that there are significant differences of assessment of Apple Mania trend by age groups. People who appreciate the the power Apple Mania are mostly persons of 24 years old. The degree of appreciation is higher for this age because people are informed about the latest trends and keep up with everything new and in vogue. Also, the phenomenon is appreciated by

people aged 19 years who are interested to be membership in a group and they appreciate a lot the technology and fashion.

Table 5. Anova, Likes for „Apple Mania" depending on the faculty where the respondent study

Report

How much do you appreciate Apple Mania?

The Faculty where respondent study	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Median
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration	4,00	14	,961	4,00
Faculty of Law	3,94	17	,899	4,00
Faculty of Medicine	4,14	14	1,027	4,50
Total	4,02	45	,941	4,00

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
How much do you appreciate Apple Mania Faculty where respondent study	Between Groups	(Combined)	,322	2	,161	,175	,840
	Within Groups		38,655	42	,920		
	Total		38,978	44			

For Sig = 0.840> α = 0.05 it appears that is accepted hypothesis H0. For a risk of 5%, we can say that there is no significant differences of assesment about the current Apple Mania generated by the students from the three universities. From this, we can deduce that the level of education does not influence how the appreciation is triggered by Apple.

Objective no.2: We want to know what exactly, from the design structure, influences the buying decision.

H2. Smartphone brand has a positive influence in buying decision.

For the task: „*Rate on a scale from 1 to 5, the importance of which had the following factors in deciding to purchase a mobile phone*" we obtain the answers presented in table 6.

Table 6. The influence factors that belong to *the structure design* of smartphones

		Color	Size	Photo Camera	Form	Material	Brand
N	Valid	120	120	120	120	120	120
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3,42	3,68	3,40	4,24	3,60	4,34
Median		4,00	4,00	4,00	5,00	4,00	5,00

For the goal number 2, the factor that influences the most in buying decision is "brand" with a coefficient of 4.34, followed by the smartphone "form" with 4.24. "Size" is in third place with 3.68, and "the material" recorded value 3,60 ; the coefficient associated of factor "color" is 3.42, and the last, "camera" get 3.40.

➢ **We want to check whether there are big differences between average of the influence factors belonging to *the structure design of smartphones* and the average on faculties.**

Table 7. Anova, The influence factors of design - Faculty of the respondent

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Color* Faculty where the respondent study	Between Groups	(Combined)	,017	2	,008	,004	,996
	Within Groups		219,150	117	1,873		
	Total		219,167	119			
Size * Faculty where the respondent study	Between Groups	(Combined)	,650	2	,325	,265	,768
	Within Groups		143,675	117	1,228		
	Total		144,325	119			
Photo Camera * Faculty where the respondent study	Between Groups	(Combined)	5,450	2	2,725	1,778	,174
	Within Groups		179,350	117	1,533		
	Total		184,800	119			
Shape * Faculty where the respondent study	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,267	2	,633	,624	,538
	Within Groups		118,725	117	1,015		
	Total		119,992	119			
Material * Faculty where the respondent study	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,250	2	,625	,483	,618
	Within Groups		151,550	117	1,295		
	Total		152,800	119			
Brand * Faculty where the respondent study	Between Groups	(Combined)	6,067	2	3,033	2,711	,071
	Within Groups		130,925	117	1,119		
	Total		136,992	119			

From the table above it can be seen that the value of Sig for each variable is greater than the significance threshold $\alpha = 0.05$, which means that it supports the hypothesis H0 for a rist 5%. From these results we find that there are no significant differences between the importance of the influence factors of the smartphones design and the Faculty where the respondents are studying.

Table 8. The average of the design influence factors according to the Faculties

Report

The Faculty where the respondent study		Color	Size	Photo Camera	Shape	Material	Brand
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration	Mean	3,40	3,70	3,70	4,13	3,73	4,07
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	1,411	,911	1,244	1,114	1,301	1,385
	Median	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,50	4,00	5,00
Faculty of Law	Mean	3,43	3,75	3,23	4,37	3,60	4,63
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	1,357	1,235	1,097	,897	1,057	,774
	Median	4,00	4,00	3,00	5,00	4,00	5,00
Faculty of Medicine	Mean	3,43	3,58	3,28	4,23	3,48	4,33
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	1,338	1,152	1,358	1,000	1,037	,917
	Median	3,00	3,50	3,00	4,00	4,00	5,00
Total	Mean	3,42	3,68	3,40	4,24	3,60	4,34
	N	120	120	120	120	120	120
	Std. Deviation	1,357	1,101	1,246	1,004	1,133	1,073
	Median	4,00	4,00	4,00	5,00	4,00	5,00

From Table 8, we can make a ranking of the design influence factors for all three faculties.

Thus, for the students from Faculty of Economics and Business Administration "the shape" is on the top position with a coefficient of 4.13, followed by "brand" 4, 07. In third place stands "material" with 3,73, and on fourth place are “the size” followed by “photo camera” on the fifth places with 3.70. Last in this ranking is "color" with only 3.40.

For the students from Faculty of Law, the ranking is as follows: 4.63 "brand" is in the first place, and "the shape" get it ranks second with a score of 4.37. "Size" recorded a value of 3.75, followed by "material" with 3.60. The last two places are "color" with 3.43 and "camera" with 3.23.

For the students from Faculty of Medicine ranking is as follows: first is the "brand" with 4.33, followed by "shape" with 4.23. "Size" is ranked third with 3.58 and fourth place is "material" with 3.48. The last two places are "color" with 3.43 and "camera" with 3.28.

➢ **We want to check if there are any differences between average of influence factors that are part of the design structure of mobile phones and respondent's age.**

Table 9. Anova, The factors of influence for smartphones design - The Respondent age

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Color * Respondent Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	18,728	6	3,121	1,760	,114
	Within Groups		200,439	113	1,774		
	Total		219,167	119			
Size * Respondent Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	14,612	6	2,435	2,121	,056
	Within Groups		129,713	113	1,148		
	Total		144,325	119			
Photo Camera * Respondent Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	11,547	6	1,925	1,255	,284
	Within Groups		173,253	113	1,533		
	Total		184,800	119			
Shape * Respondent Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	3,109	6	,518	,501	,807
	Within Groups		116,883	113	1,034		
	Total		119,992	119			
Material * Respondent Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	3,145	6	,524	,396	,880
	Within Groups		149,655	113	1,324		
	Total		152,800	119			
Brand * Respondent	Between Groups	(Combined)	4,407	6	,734	,626	,709
	Within Groups		132,585	113	1,173		
	Total		136,992	119			

As we can see in the above analysis, the value of Sig in all cases is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, which means that we accept the hypothesis H0. Therefore, there are no significant differences between respondents' age and factors of importance.

Table 10. The average of influence design factors depending on age

The respondent's age		Color	Size	Photo Camera	Shape	Material	Brand
19	Mean	2,45	3,36	3,27	4,09	3,36	4,45
	N	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Std. Deviation	1,293	1,286	1,489	,944	1,120	,820
20	Mean	3,33	3,25	2,92	4,33	3,83	4,17
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12
	Std. Deviation	,985	1,215	1,165	,651	1,030	1,030
21	Mean	3,47	4,21	3,42	4,26	3,53	4,05
	N	19	19	19	19	19	19
	Std. Deviation	1,349	,787	1,387	,872	1,349	1,433
22	Mean	3,38	3,74	3,76	4,26	3,71	4,35
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34
	Std. Deviation	1,596	1,189	1,182	1,109	1,142	,981
23	Mean	3,33	3,17	2,94	3,94	3,39	4,33
	N	18	18	18	18	18	18
	Std. Deviation	1,414	1,150	1,392	1,434	1,378	1,237
24	Mean	3,64	3,91	3,45	4,55	3,82	4,36
	N	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Std. Deviation	1,120	,831	,934	,522	,751	1,027
25	Mean	4,13	3,87	3,53	4,33	3,53	4,73
	N	15	15	15	15	15	15
	Std. Deviation	,834	,834	,990	,900	,915	,799
Total	Mean	3,42	3,68	3,40	4,24	3,60	4,34
	N	120	120	120	120	120	120
	Std. Deviation	1,357	1,101	1,246	1,004	1,133	1,073

Objective no. 3: We want to find out how brands Samsung and Apple are positioned according to the "Y generation" perception on the design.

H3. The level of education, age and gender are not factors that respondents determine directly the ranking of brands Samsung and Apple in terms of smartphones design.

Our research reveals the results from the table 11.

Table 11. Classification of the brand Samsung depending on design

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low Class	18	15,0	15,0	15,0
	Middle Class	66	55,0	55,0	70,0
	High Class	36	30,0	30,0	100,0
	Total	120	100,0	100,0	

These results show that "Y Generation" positioned Samsung brand as follows: 15% is for the "low class", 55% is for "middle class" and 30% is for "high class".

Table 12. Classification of the brand Apple depending on design

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low Class	5	4,2	4,2	4,2
	Middle Class	22	18,3	18,3	22,5
	High Class	93	77,5	77,5	100,0
	Total	120	100,0	100,0	

These results show that "Y Generation" positioned Apple brand as follows: 4.2% is granted for the "low class", 18.3% is for "middle class" and 77.5% is for "high class".

➢ ***We want to check whether there are differences in Samsung brand positioning according to age groups of respondents.***

Tabel 13. Anova, Samsung of the brand positioning - Age of respondents

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position the brand Samsung based phone design * respondents' age	Between Groups	(Combined)	1,282	6	,214	,483	,820
	Within Groups		50,018	113	,443		
	Total		51,300	119			

As can be seen in Table 13, the value of Sig = 0.820> α = 0.05; for a 5% risk, it supports the hypothesis H0, which means that there are significant differences of opinion between how is positioned Samsung brand and the age groups of respondents.

➢ ***We want to check whether there are differences in Samsung brand positioning and respondents' gender.***

Table 14. Anova, Samsung brand positioning - respondents' gender

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position theSamsung brand depending on phone design * respondents' gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	,133	1	,133	,307	,580
	Within Groups		51,167	118	,434		
	Total		51,300	119			

For Sig = 0.580> α = 0.05 that is accepted hypothesis H0 for a 5% risk. Thus, no significant differences of opinion between feminine and masculine about the Samsung brand positioning in terms of design.

➢ ***We want to check whether there are differences in Samsung brand positioning and the faculty where the respondents are studying.***

Table 15. Anova, *Samsung brand positioning - Faculty where the respondents study*

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position the brand Samsung depending on phone design * Faculty where the respondents study	Between Groups	(Combined)	,200	2	,100	,229	,796
	Within Groups		51,100	117	,437		
	Total		51,300	119			

From Table 15 it is noted that the value of Sig = 0.796> α = 0.05, which means that for the risk of 5% is accepted hypothesis H0. There are no significant differences between the students opinion from the three faculties and Samsung brand positioning in terms of design.

- ***We want to check whether there are differences in Apple brand positioning according to age groups of respondents***

Table 16. Anova, Apple brand positioning – Respondent Age

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position the brand Apple depending on phone design * Respondent Age	Between Groups	(Combined)	,066	6	,011	,037	1,000
	Within Groups		33,401	113	,296		
	Total		33,467	119			

For Sig = 1> α = 0.05 H0 hypothesis is accepted. For a 5% risk we can say that there are no significant differences between age groups and brand positioning Apple in terms of design.

- ***We want to check whether there are differences between Apple brand positioning and respondents gender***

Table 17. Anova, Apple brand positioning - Respondents Gender

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Apple brand position depending on the design of mobile phones * Respondent Gender	Between Groups	(Combined)	,033	1	,033	,118	,732
	Within Groups		33,433	118	,283		
	Total		33,467	119			

Sig's value from Table 3.18 is 0.732> α = 0.05. From this table we can see that hypothesis H0 is accepted, which means there are no significant differences between female and male persons on the Apple brand positioning.

- ***We want to check whether there are any differences between Apple brand positioning and the perceptions of students from the 3 different faculties.***

Table 18. Anova, Apple brand positioning – Respondents Faculty

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Apple brand position depending on the design of mobile phones * Respondent's Faculty	Between Groups	(Combined)	,267	2	,133	,470	,626
	Within Groups		33,200	117	,284		
	Total		33,467	119			

As can be seen the value of Sig = 0.626> α = 0.05 which means that it supports the hypothesis H0 for a 5% risk. Thus, from the above analysis there is no significant differences of opinion between the three faculties and Apple brand positioning in terms of design.

Objective 4: We want to know whether the product design generates brand awareness.
H4. Loyalty to the brand is influenced by post-purchase satisfaction

- We want to analyze what is the level of post-purchase satisfaction of the students from the three faculties

Table 19. The level of post-purchase satisfaction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very unsatisfied	3	2,5	2,5	2,5
	Unsatisfied	6	5,0	5,0	7,5
	Neutral	10	8,3	8,3	15,8
	Satisfied	48	40,0	40,0	55,8
	Very satisfied	53	44,2	44,2	100,0
	Total	120	100,0	100,0	

The majority of respondents were "very satisfied" with a value of 44.2%, followed by respondents "satisfied" with 40.0%. 8.3% are "neutral" and 5% said they were "unsatisfied". Respondents "very unsatisfied" after acquisition are only 2.5% of the sample chosen. When we analized brands Apple and Samsung regarding their design, we found that most respondents have placed them on the scale of "high class" and "middle class" and their level of post-purchase satisfaction was 44.2% meaning “very satisfied”. That means that mobile design is a factor that could create brand awareness.

- **We want to check if after this acquisition, the students would make purchases from the same brand?**

Table 20. Users Loyalty

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	108	90,0	90,0	90,0
	No	12	10,0	10,0	100,0
	Total	120	100,0	100,0	

The 90% of respondents said they would make purchases from the same brand. Only 10% of respondents gave a negative answer. This high percentage of loyalty may be due to the previously analyzed satisfaction, where most of mobile phone users said they were "very satisfied". We can say that brand loyalty is influenced by post purchase satisfaction

- **We want to find out what would be the obstacles that would be willing to overcome students to acquire preferred brand.**

Table 21. Overcoming obstacles in buying preferred brand

		High launch price	Long waiting until the appearance of the new model of smartphone on Romanian market	The uncertainty of the acquisition sites	The complexity of software
N	Valid	120	119	120	120
	Missing	0	1	0	0
Mean		3,28	2,45	2,87	1,82
Median		4,00	2,00	3,00	1,00

From Table 21 above it can be seen that the most difficult obstacle to overcome in the respondents 'opinion is "the high price launched of the new smartphones” registering a coefficient of 3.28. Ranking second in the obstacle is "uncertainty of the acquisition site" with 2.87 and on the third place is "long waiting to appear on the Romanian market" with 2.45. The easiest obstacle that research reveals is "software complexity" with only 1.82.

Following this analysis we find that the degree of loyalty of users is very high because the desire to have a smartphone from the brand wanted is very high, so that they can easily pass over the complexity of software or the long waiting to its appear on Romanian market. Uncertainty websites acquisition is an obstacle important enough to respondents, ranking third among obstacles, but not so difficult that they no longer command the internet, even at the risk of being cheated. The first place among the most difficult obstacles in buying preferred brand is "high launch price" mobile phones, and this impediment can be due to income levels of students surveyed.

IV. RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

The research performed allowed us to study the design influence on the decision to purchase mobile phones. For this purpose the results achieved by applying the questionnaire on the 120 respondents were analyzed using SPSS, version, 17.0. We present the following conclusions based on research objectives and hypotheses set at the beginning of the analysis.

Regarding the number Samsung's mobile phone users, it was found that 62.5% of people of the respondents using this model of smartphone. For Apple brand, the number of users was 37.5% of people.

Apple phenomenon defines a consumer as "customer of the brand." He is aware of all the devices launched by the favorite brand and cannot stand without the latest iDevice sites for more than a few minutes after their official launch. The first objective for research was propagation phenomenon "Apple" to "Generation Y" in the North-East of Romania, Iasi City. After data analysis, we concluded that the users of smartphones from the Apple brand are a percentage of 14.2% this year. For a clearer demarcation of people who appreciate the Apple phenomenon we analyzed the average between the gender of respondents and the phenomenon assessments. Thus, it was found that feminine people appreciate the Apple phenomenon with a factor of 4.25 from a maximum of 8.01 and male people appreciate this phenomenon with 3.76, compared to the same value. The difference between phenomenon assessments and gender of respondents is given by the higher sensitivity of women to the idea of being fashionable, to appreciate products exclusive luxury.

After analyzing the Apple phenomenon on the age of groups we found that people aged 24 years like it the best. This age is prolonged adolescence and is well defined by the membership need to the group. For the Apple phenomenon analysis on that three faculties we obtained the following result: the students from the Faculty of Medicine appreciate it with a factor of 4.14 out of a maximum of 12.06, followed by the students from the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration with a coefficient of 4 and then, the students from the Faculty of Law with 3.94.

The most important elements that are part of the structure of smartphone design influences the buying decision in the following order: first is brand mobile phone (4.34), ranking second is the shape (4.24), the size is on third place (3.68), the fourth is material (3.60) and then the color (3.42), followed very closed by the camera (3.40) on the sixth place. We also analyzed of the importance of these brand elements depending of students' age using Anova test and we concluded that there are no significant differences between the importances of them. Also we found that there are no major differences in hierarchies of the design influence elements of mobile phones selected by the students of the three faculties.

From the research, it has been observed that the positioning of Samsung and Apple phones brands on the design established a hierarchy between the two. Thus, the Samsung was positioned in the category "middle class" by 55% and Apple was positioned in the "high class" by 77.5% of the students. For the two brands have not found significant differences between their positioning in terms of design and age, gender, faculty where respondent study.

To find out if the product design generates brand awareness (brand preference, loyalty and satisfaction level), we analyzed the post-purchase satisfaction of respondents. After the analysis, we concluded that 44.2% of respondents said they were very satisfied while people very unsatisfied with their purchase were 2.5% of all respondents. After their purchase, 90% of respondents said they will shop from the same brand, and 10% gave a negative answer. So, we found that for a 5% risk, there are no significant differences between brand owned and the fidelity of phone users, people have a strong relationship with their smartphones brand. The attitude of respondents about the obstacles that must be overcome for the purchase of preferred brand was: the most difficult obstacle -"high price launch" of a new smartphones, followed by "uncertainty acquisition sites." On the third rank was "long waiting until is on the Romanian market" and on the fourth rank was "software complexity." Since brand image and preference take their respectable place on especially future marketing strategies, better understanding consumers' brand preference behavior will be an actually essential experience for successful future marketing policies. In this manner, this paper mainly purposes to understand factors that may possibly affect young consumers' brand preference. Undergraduate students are principally taken into consideration owing to their relatively compulsive use among others.

V. REFERENCES

1. Anastasiei, B. (2000). Fenomene culturale în achiziţiile şi fuziunile internaţionale. Cross-Cultural Management Journal, 2(3).
2. Ataman, B., & Ülengin, B. (2003). A note on the effect of brand image on sales. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 12(4), 237-250. doi:10.1108/10610420310485041
3. Berry, L. (2000). Cultivating service brand equity. Academy of Marketing Science, 28(1), 128-137.
4. Çelikl, A., Eygü, H., & Oktay, E. (2015). A study on factors influencing young consumers' smartphone brand preference in Erzurum, Turkey. European Journal of Business and Economics, 10(2).
5. Chia-Ju, L., & Hao-Yun, L. (2014). The Deep Impression of Smartphone Brand on the Customers' Decision Making. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 338-343.
6. Cronin, J., & Taylor, S. (1992). Measuring service quality. Journal of Marketing, 56(3), 55-68.
7. Dahlstrom, E., & Brooks, D. (2014). ECAR Study of Faculty and Information Technology. Louisville: ECAR.
8. Dahlstrom, E., Walker, J., & Dziuban, C. (2014). ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology. EDUCAUSE Center for Analysis and Research.
9. Danciu, V., & Murea, M. (2009). Marketing internaţional-cazuri, analize, probleme. Bucharest: ASE Publishing House.
10. Danilet, M., & Petrusca, C. (2012). Developing the Research Instrument for Measuring Loyalty within the Financial-Accounting Services. International Conference "Marketing – from information to decision" 5th Edition.
11. Hankinson, G., & Cowking, P. (1993). Branding in Action. Michigan: McGraw-Hill.
12. Lee, P., & Calugar-Pop, C. (2015). Global Mobile Consumer Survey. Deloitte. Retrieved from http://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/technology-media-and-telecommunications/articles/global-mobile-consumer-survey.html
13. Oliver, R. (2003). Cognitive, affective and attribute bases of the satisfaction response. Journal of Consumer Research, 418-430.
14. Remedios, R., & Nathwani, D. (2014). A study to examine the brand preferences of students towards Apple v/s Samsung smartphone. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development, 1(7), 213-220.
15. Schmitt, B., & Simson, A. (2002). Estetica în Marketing- Managementul Strategic al mărcilor, identităţii şi imaginii. Bucharest: Teora.
16. Strimbei, C., Dospinescu, O., Strainu, R., & Nistor, A. (2015). Software Architectures – Present and Visions. Informatica Economica Journal, 19(4). doi:10.12948/issn14531305/19.4.2015.02