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ABSTRACT
The Apple iPhone brought a whole new level on interface and features such as incorporating the iPod technology as well as multi-touch technology which let users to control everything using only their fingers. The research on the level of customer trust/satisfaction on buying an iPhone has been done across the world as it was one of the first hand phone that was release by Apple.

Customer satisfaction is a blurred and concrete concept and the actual expression of the state of satisfaction will vary depending on individual's needs and it also depends on the product or service. The level of trust/satisfaction can also vary depending on other options the customer may have and other products against which the customer can compare the organization's products. It also distinguishes six qualities of attributes such as basic factors, excitement factors, performance factors, indifferent attributes, questionable attributes and reverse attributes. The objective of this research is to analyze the level of loyalty/satisfaction of having an iPhone based on certain factors. This research will look into factors such as price and quality where each factors has its respective advantages or disadvantages to affect the customer's level of trust/satisfaction. This is because every diverse consumer has their own priority of need before even getting a new hand phone. The research will be focusing on the capability of the iPhone and what it has to offer to the customers that makes it different and better than its competitors. These capabilities refer back to the factors which were mentioned earlier in the paragraph earlier. Technology for hand phones has been developing endlessly with new features offered as time passed. Apple's new range of products, especially the iPhone shows such vast improvement. The research first looks at the background of the company which is Apple and what they have offered to their customers before launching the iPhone. Next, the research will provide detailed explanation and information on each factor that will affect the customer's satisfaction.
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1.1 INTRODUCTION
The term customer loyalty is used to describe the behavior of repeat customers, as well as those that offer good ratings, reviews, or testimonials. Some customers do a particular company a great service by offering favorable word of mouth publicity regarding a product, telling friends and family, thus adding them to the number of loyal customers. However, customer loyalty includes much more. It is a process, a program, or a group of programs geared toward keeping a client happy so he or she will provide more business. Customer loyalty can be achieved in some cases by offering a quality product with a firm guarantee. Customer loyalty is also achieved through free offers, coupons, and low interest rates on financing, high value trade-ins, extended warranties, rebates, and other rewards and incentive programs. The ultimate goal of customer loyalty programs is happy customers who will return to purchase again and persuade others to use that company's products or services. This equates to profitability, as well as happy stakeholders.

Apple Inc. is an American multinational corporation that designs and manufactures consumer electronics, computer software, and personal computers. The company's best-known hardware products include
Macintosh computers, the iPod, the iPhone and the iPad. Apple software includes the Mac OS X operating system; the iTunes media browser; the iLife suite of multimedia and creativity software; the iWork suite of productivity software; Aperture, a professional photography package; Final Cut Studio, a suite of professional audio and film-industry software products; and Logic Studio, a suite of audio tools. As of January 2010 the company operates 284 retail stores in ten countries, and an online store where hardware and software products are sold. As of the third quarter of 2009, it is the tenth largest company in the world. We have selected apple because of quality, class, expensive simple, Sleek, Fantastic, Simple, and Complex Smart, Beautifully designed. Stylish, Classic, technology driven expensive, expensive slick, expensive, trendy Mint, reliable, fresh, Innovative, Modern clean, efficient, crisp Slick, efficient, worth-it Mint.

2.1 CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Brand Trust: Borrowing Bainbridge’s (1997) words, a trustworthy brand places the consumer –rather than a particular service or product – at the center of its world and relies more on understanding real consumer needs and fulfilling them. Brand trust goes beyond the consumer’s satisfaction with the functional performance of the product and its attributes. Brand trust has been defined as a feeling of security held by the consumers in their interaction with the brands, such that it is based on the perceptions that the brand is reliable and responsible for the interests and welfare of the consumers”. In their study, the authors defined brand trust as the willingness of the average consumer to rely on the ability of the brand is reliable and responsible for the interests and welfare of the consumers “

Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) defined brand trust as consumers “willingness to rely on the ability of the brand to perform is stated functions”. Based on such a conceptualization, they developed uni-dimensional measurement scale. Delgado-Ballester, Munuera-Aleman, and Yague-Guillen (2003) proposed that a uni-dimensional conceptualization completely ignores the motivational aspects associated with the concept, which may limit the conceptual richness of the phenomenon. Thus, they defined brand trust as “the confident expectations of the brand’s reliability and intentions in situations entailing risk to the consumer”. Since consumer believe that a brand’s positive intentions towards their welfare and interests is essential for it to be perceived as trustworthy, this conceptualization represents an improvement over a single dimension conceptualization that suppresses the construct space and reduces its conceptual richness. In addition, a multidimensional conceptualization is consistent with research on trust in the psychology and marketing literatures. Taking an entirely different approach, Lau and Lee (1999) viewed brand trust as the willingness to rely on the brand’, and offered a measurement scale that focused on the brand itself rather than specific dimensions. Brand trust in their view, is more or less a global measure of a consumer’s overall feeling or dispositional tendency towards.

2.2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Branding can be especially important in retailing, given its highly competitive nature and its strong influence on patronage behavior. Thus, the increasingly widely used view of the retailer as brand is one of the most important trends in retailing. At the same time, empirical studies regarding the retailer as a brand have only been pursued on relatively rare occasions so far; while substantially more research has been conducted on store image. Saurabh and Mahajani (2013) provided a framework to work upon the marketing aspect of miraculous claims made by brand that may be in congruence to the aesthetic appeal for brand managers and researchers. The study also showed that technical product specifications and evidence were most effective in enhancing consumer’s beliefs, and this factor lead to a positive perception in the minds of the consumers about products with an aesthetic appeal.

Chattopadhyay (2013) concluded that for food and grocery purchase, location was the prime consideration for the respondents of Kolkata and Bhubaneshwar, while it was range for both – respondents from Patna and Ranchi. Ambience was the least important parameter for the respondent populations from the four state capitals (Kolkata, Bhubaneswar, Patna and Ranchi). For apparel purchase range or assortment was the most important parameter for the respondent populations from the four state capitals. That behavioral pattern of the respondents with respect to frequency of visit, preferred group size during shopping, and decision maker in choosing a shopping destination revealed a fairly uniform pattern across the state capital locations.
Albert and Merunka (2013) proposed and tested a model of brand love that included both its antecedents and consequences. The model was rooted in a causal approach and featured established consumer-brand relationship constructs (brand identification, brand trust and brand commitment). The results demonstrated strong relationships between the two antecedents (trust and identification) and brand love.

Malik (2012) found that through there are multitudinous opportunities that have not been tapes by the retailers, they can be successful by paying more attention towards the customers’ needs and desires. Today’s customers are not just influenced by price and quality. There are many other factors that pull them towards a store. The retailers have to focus on these factors that are, formulating the right marketing strategies in order to tap an increased customer base and become successful in this competitive environment.

Malik (2011) indicated that variety in products, availability of necessary goods under the same roof, reasonable and fixed prices, and location of organized retail outlets close to residence or work place played a significant role in motivating the consumers to visit the organized retail outlets. They authors also observed a significant relationship between customer satisfaction and the dimensions of service quality of organized retail outlets, that is, product characteristics, price factor, physical aspects, promotional schemes, and personnel interaction.

Kumar and Gogai (2011) examined the consumers buying behavior and brand loyalty with regards to processed liquid packed milk in Guwahati. They found that consumers buying behavior is very complex process, as it involves not only the economic factors, but also the emotional factors. However, marketers need to study consumer behavior as it helps them to position their products better and develop effective marketing strategies. Consumer buying is also influenced by culture and subculture. Habits, likes and dislikes of people belonging to a particular culture or subculture can affect the marketing firm to a greater extent. The social class to which the individual belongs tells about the type of products the individual prefers. Other factors that influence the buying behavior are social factors like reference group and family, persona factors like age, life cycle, and occupation and psychological factors like motivation, perception and attitude of the customers.

Kaushal and medhavi (2011) focused on identifying the prominent factors affecting shopping mall buying behavior. A sample of 157 respondents was chosen on the basis of convenience sampling and customer intercept survey was conducted in prominent shopping malls. Twenty four factors affecting shopping mall consumer’s behavior were identified. The three most prominent factors that were identified were Quality, Time saving and Price.

Sung, Kim, and Jung (2010) conceptualized and investigated the impact of brand personality on brand trust brand affect and brand loyalty. The overall findings indicated the different brand-personality dimensions influences brand trust and brand effect in different ways, which in turn increase the level of brand loyalty. Sung and Kim (2010) proposed that some brand personality dimensions relate more to brand trust, whereas other dimensions relate more to brand affect. The results suggested that sincerity and ruggedness brand personality dimensions are more likely to influence the level of brand trust than brand affect, whereas the excitement and sophistication dimensions relate more to brand affect than to brand trust. Guenzi, Johnson, and Castaldo (2009) found that trust in the salesperson trustworthiness positively affect only trust in the salesperson. Store environment has a positive impact only on overall trust in the store. Store communication fosters all three levels of customer trust, while store assortment increases both overall trust and trust in store branded products.

Swoboda, Haelsig, Schramm-Klein, and Morschett (2009) found that in retailing, consumer involvement had a moderating effect on the influence of retailers attributes on brand equity. The direction of this influence differed, however, from one perceived retailer attribute to the next. Whereas the influence of price, communication, and store design is greater on highly involved consumers than on those with low involvement, the influence of service and assortment is greater in consumers with low involvement. Since consumers with a different level of involvement have a different perception of retailers attributes, this factor is relevant to retail branding.

Zboja and Voorhess (2008) provided a preliminary examination of the relationship between brands, retailers, and consumers. The results suggested that the halo effect exists between consumer’s perception of brands and retailers. The findings demonstrated that consumers trust in, and satisfaction with a
retailer, mediates the effects of brand trust and satisfaction on customer repurchase intentions,

**Consumer satisfaction**

In most literature related to behavioral intentions, overall satisfaction was integrated as a dominant factor of purchase intentions with reference to brand loyalty (Spreng et al., 1996). In the viewpoint of Bloomer and Kasper (1995), customer loyalty is one of the considerable paths with which customer satisfaction about product or services received is expressed. For this reason brand loyalty is at heart of strategic marketing. Soloman (1994) explored that purchase decisions of loyal customer may become a habit in nature, even quite simple and provide satisfaction with current brand(s) as a result. Many scholars concluded that satisfaction is one of the important determinants of customers’ loyalty (Jamal and Anastasiadou, 2007; Bearden and Teel, 1983; Dick and Basu, 1994). Bontis et al. (2007) conducted the research and found that customer satisfaction improves reputation in the services markets. Reputation partially intervene the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty and the relationship between satisfaction and recommendation. Tovikkai and Jirawattananukool (2001) pointed out that realizing the fact that retaining existing consumers are easier than finding new consumers. Consumers who have high purchase frequency are most likely considered as satisfied with the products.

**Trust**

Morgan and Hunt (1994) described that “Trust is an important factor in the development of marketing relationships and exists when one party has confidence in an exchange partner’s reliability and integrity” (p. 23). Ballester and Aleman (2001) described that trust and satisfaction are conceptually connected. As variables that generate consumer commitment especially in the situation of high involvement. Anderson and Narus (1990) argued that trust arise when someone hold a belief that the second persons actions would cause affirmative effects for his/herself. Accordingly, in order to trust a brand, consumers should perceive quality as favorable object.

### 2.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To ascertain the factors affecting brand trust.
- To analyses how Apple I Phone is building brand trust among the customers.
- To identify the various factors influencing retail consumer brand trust in the organized retail sector and also to validate the scale developed for brand trust in the Indian organized retail sector.

### 2.4 NEED FOR THE STUDY

- Study on measuring the brand trust of Apple so that will help the company to promote the brand in particular region.

### 2.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- Lack of cooperation from consumers of Apple.
- The response may be influenced by personal basis.
- Convenience sampling was used and hence all the limitations related to this may also become part of the findings of the study.

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

As the basic input of my study is primary data the research methodology mainly used is questionnaire. As a part of the collection data, questionnaire is printed and distributed to the consumers of Apple. This questionnaire contains a set of questions, which are needed for collecting data. Options are supplied for all most all the questions to make the procedure simple for the consumers. It deals with the objective of a research study, the method of defining the research problem, type of data collected, methods used for collecting and analyzing the data.

#### 3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

“Descriptive Research” this study is undertaken in order to ascertain and able to describe the characteristics of the variable of interest in a situation. Descriptive research includes surveys and fact-finding enquiries of different kinds.

A research is a systematic plan to study a scientific problem.
- Visited the customers across the Coimbatore & gathered information required as pre the questionnaire.
- The research design is non-probability research design and descriptive research.

#### 3.2 RESEARCH TYPE

Descriptive research is using for this study Descriptive research describes an event or a phenomenon. Descriptive studies aims at portraying accurately the characteristics of a particular group or
situation. Descriptive research is concerned with describing the characteristics of a particular individual or group. Here, the researcher attempts to present the existing facts also the real facts or the occurrence through the observation.

3.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
Some researchers also found no impact of these variables on customers brand loyalty. There is need to identify the relation service quality, service customer satisfaction, and tri Sane of them found positive impact of services on customers brand loyalty.

3.4 SAMPLING DESIGN
Sampling Method The sampling method selected is convenience sampling. Convenience sampling method is the sampling method where the items that are most conveniently available are selected as part of the sample. Since this is more convenient and less costly, this method is selected.

Sample Size Sample selected is 206 from the consumers of Apple

3.5 DATA COLLECTION METHOD
Primary Data
➢ Personal Investigation
➢ Questionnaire
➢ Information from consumers of Apple

3.6 STATISTICAL TOOLS
The test is carried out using SPSS where the variables that are to be tested are entered and results are identified. The various test are done by the using SPSS are factor analysis, correlation, chi-square.

3.7 TOOLS USED
➢ Chi-square
➢ Anova
➢ Ranking test

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
Frequency Table
➢ 40% of respondents belong to 26-25 age group
➢ 79% of the respondents are male
➢ 53% of the respondents are UG
➢ 38% of the respondents are students

CHI-SQUARE
➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & downloading requirements to the respondents

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & picture quality requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & processing speed requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & touch requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & resistance of water requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & reliability requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & long lasting requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & screen protection requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & audio/visual quality requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & service line requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & provide service very sincerely requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & price, physical evidence requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & security requirements to the respondents.

➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & supporting software requirements to the respondents.
P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & east to transferring data from apple to other devices requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & connectivity requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & power saving mode requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & storage space requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis age of the respondents & quality requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & downloading/uploading requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & battery consumption time requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & resistance of water requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & long lasting requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & screen protection requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & portable requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & price, physical evidence requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & applications peripherals requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & security requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & customization requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & fast auto-focus requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & connectivity (wi-fi, gps, usb) requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents & figure scanner t requirements to the respondents.

P≤0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis educational qualification of the respondents.
respondents & additional accessories requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & picture quality requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & sound clarity requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & battery consumption time requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & processing speed requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & touch requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & durability requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & resistance of water requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & screen protection requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & price, physical evidence requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & applications peripherals requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & supporting software requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & features requirements to the respondents.

P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, accept alternative hypothesis occupation of the respondents & additional accessories requirements to the respondents.

ANOVA

H0=There is no significance relation between occupation & performance

H1= There is a significance relation between occupation & performance
➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e., there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & downloading/uploading requirements of the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, Reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & picture quality requirements of the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & sound clarity requirements of the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & battery consumption time requirements of the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, Reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & processing speed requirements of the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & touch requirements of the respondents.

H⁰=There is no significance relation between occupation & service
H¹=There is a significance relation between occupation & service
➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & outlet performance requirements to the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, Reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & quality of spares requirements to the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & service line requirements to the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & provide guaranty/warranty to their accessories requirements to the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & provide services very sincerely requirements to the respondents.

H⁰=There is no significance relation between occupation & price, physical evidence requirements to the respondents
H¹= There is a significance relation between occupation & technology
➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & applications peripherals requirements to the respondents
➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & security requirements to the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & integrated operating system requirements to the respondents
➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & providing software requirements to the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & supporting software requirements to the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents &east to transferring data from apple to other devices requirements to the respondents.

H⁰=There is no significance relation between occupation & features
H¹= There is a significance relation between occupation & features
➢ P<=0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & camera requirements to the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & camera requirements to the respondents.
between occupation of the respondents & fast auto-focus requirements to the respondents

➢ P≤ 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & connectivity (wi-fi, gps, usb) requirements to the respondents

➢ P≤ 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between occupation of the respondents & finger scanner requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between occupation of the respondents & storage space requirements to the respondents

H0=There is no significance relation between educational qualification & performance

H1= There is a significance relation between educational qualification & performance

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & downloading/uploading requirements to the respondents

➢ P≤ 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & picture quality/display requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & Sound clarity requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & battery consumption time requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & processing speed requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & touch requirements to the respondents.

H0=There is no significance relation between educational qualification & service

H1= There is a significance relation between educational qualification & service

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & outlet performance requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & quality of spares requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & service line requirements to the respondents

➢ p≥0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & provide guaranty/warranty to their accessories requirements to the respondents

➢ P≤ 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & price, physical evidence requirements to the respondents.

H0=There is no significance relation between educational qualification & technology

H1= There is a significance relation between educational qualification & technology

➢ P≤ 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & applications peripherals requirements of the respondents

➢ P≤ 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & provide services very sincerely requirements to the respondents.
between educational qualification of the respondents & security requirements of the respondents
➢ p>=0.05 accept null hypothesis, reject alternative hypothesis i.e. there is no significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & integrated operating system requirements to the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & Customization requirements of the respondents
➢ P<= 0.05 reject null hypothesis, Accept alternative hypothesis i.e. there is a significance relation between educational qualification of the respondents & east to transferring data from apple to other devices requirements of the respondents.

RELIABILITY TEST

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .899             | 50         |

With the help of using SPSS version 16.0 for the data analysis so, we see that the Alpha in reliability test for the all variables combine is 0.899 which is more than the 0.6 so from this we conclude that the data which we have gather from different People is reliable for the further tests in our research.

RANKING TEST

| PARTICULARS            | RANK |
|------------------------|------|
| Performance            | 3    |
| Technology             | 1    |
| Quality                | 2    |
| Service                | 4    |
| Features               | 5    |
| Additional accessories  | 6    |

Conclusion
To build customer loyalty is not a easy job. Customers switch to other brand very easily if other company offers much better product than yours. To build customer loyalty do not only mean to make customer buy your product again and again but attach customer emotionally so they never switch to another brands.

Our research study shows that Customer Satisfaction, Trust and service have an high impact on customer loyalty and perceived value have no impact on it. So Apple Inc. Must focus on Customer satisfaction, trust and service as it help them to keep customer loyal for a longer period of time.

Scope for further Research
This research will be very beneficial for those who want to investigate further in this area. The three variables Customer satisfaction, Trust and Service must be taken more carefully because all variables significantly impact on brand loyalty. This research
has many questions in need of future investigation. Further work need to be done on perceived value as it did not shows some significant impact on brand loyalty. Future researchers must collect both quantitative and qualitative data about each of the variables from different sources to support their research study work and they must document all the information and data in a correct manner. The questionnaire must be perfectly design in order to collect respondent response in an effective and efficient way.
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