

THE EFFECT OF CONSUMER CONFUSION ON BRAND LOYALTY ON LOW INVOLVEMENT PRODUCT CATEGORY

by:

Christian Tamburian

Faculty of Economics and Business
International Business Administration (IBA) Program
University of Sam Ratulangi Manado
email: cj_tamburian@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Consumer confusion has become an ever increasing problem as the rapid global market developments, lead consumers to receive a lot of information nowadays. Consumer confusion, which is caused by product similarity, choice and/or information overload, and the presence of ambiguous information, can negatively affect consumers' decision making and in fact consumers' brand loyalty, thereby also companies' profitability. The purpose of this quantitative study is to investigate how the three variables (i.e. similarity, overload, ambiguity) of Walsh et al.'s (2007) consumer confusion proneness model affect consumers' brand loyalty, concerning low involvement products. A conceptual framework based on consumer behavior and consumer confusion literature was utilized to form 4 hypotheses predicting the causality between the different variables. After validating and adapting the scale to data gathered through questionnaires regarding 100 consumers' purchasing habits of tooth paste, an analysis of the method multiple regressions revealed that none of the alternative hypothesis was accepted. However there is a relationship on the similarity confusion and brand loyalty variable, even though it is not significant but since the sign is negative as the theoretical expectations, there is an increase in similarity confusion that causes a decrease in brand loyalty. All implications are discussed, concluding with possible limitations and recommendations for further researches.

Keywords: *consumer confusion, brand loyalty*

INTRODUCTION

Research Background

In today's environment making decision gets even more complicated, where we have so many options from which to choose. Ironically for many moderns' consumers one of the biggest problems they have is not having too few choices but having too many (Solomon, 2009: 332). For instance, when someone enter the supermarket and approaching the appropriate aisle, he/she will be confronted by a lot of categories of goods and every category has various options, in which each option is represented by a numbers of different brands.

Consumers who bought a tooth paste can pick based on the size big, medium, or small, and also its available in color such as blue, green, grey or white, depends on your preferences. Besides this and the fact that consumer have to decide whether to buy a tooth paste for whitening teeth, sensitive teeth, for a fresh breath, total protection or for a deep clean while also considering the brand image. There is a lot of various tooth paste product in the market in fact there is more than 10 brands in the store in Indonesia (www.dlitb.com). Well, having too little choice does not satisfy the consumer, while having too much choice also leads to regret (Mooyman and Visser, 2007).

Consumers might find a lot of similar product that almost look alike each other or share the same function and capability but still a different brand. It is also not surprising that some companies choose to imitate characteristic of their successful enemy product, and it cause a similarity in a product. Most of what they might see as "new" in the marketplace is more like "innovative imitation" (Loken, et al., 1986). A confuse consumer may believe that two brands are made by the same companies or may mistake one for the other, and that will create the brand confusion, as you notice to buy a product like tooth paste is suddenly not as simple as one first

thought it to be. Awareness and knowledge of consumer confusion is relevant to successful marketing because confuse consumer are less likely to make rational decisions (Mitchell and Papavassiliou, 1999). In this situation there is no wonder that the consumer at times feel confused about which choice to make, consumer will abandon or postpone the purchase or even change to another brand, in order to avoiding dissatisfaction of their chosen product (Iyengar, et al., 2000) and not only that when the confused consumer is inefficient when choosing, but also giving advice to their friends, the negative word-of-mouth those will affect the business company by misleading others (Mitchell and Papavassiliou, 1997).

This research aims to investigate the three variables of consumer confusion that Walsh et al., (2007) divided, which are similarity, overload and ambiguity/ unclarity, and identifies the effect of each variables on brand loyalty especially on low involvement product category in this case tooth paste. People bought it with minimum of thought and effort because they are not of vital concern nor have any great impact on their lifestyle. Researchers have found that involvement can be directed at different object such as the actual product, a brand, advertisement, and/or purchase situations (Solomon et al., 2010: 191).

Consumer goods become a very tempting business today. One of the examples is dental product such as tooth paste, which people cannot live without needs of it in daily life. The choice of tooth paste as the example product for this research was validated by several factors. First of all, previous studies have found that consumer confusion is exists within this product category (Alarabi and Gronblad, 2012). And since tooth paste is classified as a low involvement product this is a perfect object to help investigate this study.

Written on Indonesia Commercial newsletter, September 2012 Indonesia market size for toothpaste is around 77.2 thousand tons in 2010. The market is dominated by five brands Pepsodent, Close Up, Formula, Ciptadent and Total Care. Pepsodent is a product of PT. Unilever Tbk, which is a pioneer in toothpaste industry in Indonesia operating since 1933. With a large production capacity and more complete variants of around 12 variants Pepsodent has a 60% share of toothpaste market in the country. Its market segments are from middle to high class members of the community.

Close Up is also a product of PT. Unilever Tbk launched in the 1990s. Close Up has also fairly succeeds in market competition with a market share of 9% and with market segments of middle to high class members of the community. Other popular brands include Formula produced by PT. Ultra Prima Abadi, with a market share of 10.5%. Its market target is also middle to high class members of the community. Following Formula is Ciptadent which is produced by PT. Lion Wings with a market share of 9.4%. Ciptadent's market segments are middle to lower class members of the community. Another brand which is quite popular is Total Care produced by PT. Filma Utama Soap with a market share of 5.4% and with market targets of middle to high class members of the community.

Less popular brands with small share of the marker include Enzim, Sensodyne, Smile Up, Daun Sirih, etc. Enzim, which is produced by PT. Enzim Bioteknologi Internusa, is a different type of toothpaste, produced without detergent material that it has no foam. All other products of toothpaste contain detergent hat cases foam. Enzim is a premium class, therefore, is relatively expensive. It prices range from Rp10.000 to Rp70.000 depending on the sizes which range from 50 ml to 100 ml. The prices of other types of toothpaste are around Rp6.000 per 190 grams. Enzim, therefore, is used mainly by high income people

Even though high involvements are more desire as the research objects since the outcomes are more measurable (Beatty et al., 1998), reflects another limitation to investigate a low involvement product; the outcomes might not be easy to measure. However, this limitation only to strengthen the reason for why researcher needs to increase focus on low involvement product, there is a need for more insight on the specific context and a greater discussion of why the result might be less measurable. Therefore this limitation is only seen as a further motivation to do a research regarding low involvement products

Several researches have investigated the connection between product involvement and consumer confusion (Mitchell and Papavassilou, 1997). The focus low involvement is interesting because some researcher tended to investigate high involvement product, meanwhile people are affected by low involvement product purchase more often and a wider scale than that of high involvement product, it could be argued that the affect on consumer confusion in such category would be a reoccurring issue and therefore worth acknowledging. This research worth to be investigate because there are some effects on Consumer confusion on brand loyalty since

they were mentioned with highest frequency in other literatures, but in this research it focusing on low involvement product.

Research Objectives

This research aims:

1. To identify the effect of overload confusion on brand loyalty in a low involvement product category.
2. To identify the effect of similarity confusion on brand loyalty in a low involvement product category.
3. To identify the effect of ambiguity confusion on brand loyalty in a low involvement product category.
4. To identify which variables of consumer confusion that affects brand loyalty the most.

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty is defined as keeping preferable to a specific product or service. To in other words, faithful consumers tend to pay money for the same brand of merchandise, and speak highly of its values. What more, they believe that their choice is better than others (Mao 2010:213). In general, brand loyalty can be defined as the strength of preference for a brand compared to other similar available options. This is often measured in terms of repeat purchase behavior or price sensitivity (Yee and Sidek 2008:221)

Consumer Confusion

Walsh et al. (2007) defined consumer confusion can be viewed as a condition that individuals may be prone to and which causes them to act differently and/or affects their decision making behavior. Consumer confusion is a cause and it can be arises from an inaccurate attribution of distinctive markings (Kapferer, 1995). Consumer confusion is also can be defined as a consequence that comes from information processing errors caused by information overload but may not arise purely through an information (Papavassiliou, 1995). Turnbull et al., (2000) stated consumer confusion as a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the market due to the consumer failure to develop a correct interpretation of various facts of a product or service, during the information processing procedure.

Consumer Confusion and Brand Loyalty

Mitchell and papavassiliou (1999) states brand loyalty is likely to be affected by consumer confusion, especially by similar stimuli because confused consumer, who perceived brand stimulus similarity and have trouble distinguishing products and manufacturers, will find it difficult to reward a manufacturer with their trust. In this case consumers' trust is likely to decline because they will not know which the "right" alternative is and which manufacturer to trust (Mitchell, Wals, and Yamin 2005). Brand loyalty also can be viewed as a strategic (conscious or non-conscious) reaction to overload confusion. As brand loyalty reflect the habitual purchasing and requires less decision making, information seeking and brand evaluation. The prospect of having to do less information processing and comparison is likely to be appreciated by those consumers who are prone to stimulus overload confusion (Mitchell, et al., 2005).

Previous Research

Yee et al., (2010) investigates whether consumer confusion exists and to determine the individual characteristic of those confused consumer in the Hong Kong Intimate apparel market and found that younger consumer have great unclarity confusion, overload confusion, and similarity confusion rather than elder consumer, and based on education level consumer with higher education level have great overall confusion except those with master qualification or above. And there is a significant negative relationship between overall confusion and "share or delegate" and "seek information" of confusion reduction strategies, nut there is a strong positive impact between unclarity confusion and consumer decision postponement while negative impact happened on dissatisfaction and cognitive dissonance. Alarabi and Gronblad (2012) investigate the three variables (i.e similarity, overload, ambiguity) of Walsh et al., (2007) affect consumers' decision postponement and brand loyalty and found that one hypothesis was supported; overload confusion proneness decrease brand and affecting decision postponement loyalty in a low involvement product category. Mooyman and Visser(2007) analyzed the effect of size and product variety to consumer satisfaction and found that for the existence of

the inverted U-shape relationship between the size of an assortment and the consumer satisfaction that was experienced. Results indicate that the optimum assortment size lies somewhere between 12 and 24 items. Also, contrary to expectations, a similarly shaped relationship was found with regard to satisfaction that consumers anticipated from different assortment sizes. The optimum for anticipated satisfaction lies between 12 and 30 items, so consumers' eyes are slightly larger than their stomachs.




Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

Research Hypothesis

The hypotheses of this research:

1. H1: Overload confusion, similarity confusion, and ambiguity confusion influence consumer brand loyalty simultaneously
2. H2: Overload confusion influence consumer brand loyalty partially
3. H3: Similarity confusion influence consumer brand loyalty partially
4. H4: Ambiguity confusion influence consumer brand loyalty partially

RESEARCH METHOD

Types of Research

The purpose of this research is to identify the possible effects of consumer confusion proneness on consumer brand loyalty. This research is causal. Causal since the purpose is to determine if one variable causes another variable to occur or change. This research is a quantitative method since using questionnaire as a tool to gather data and analysis.

Place and Time of Research

This research conducted at Manado city and occurred in public areas such as, universities, neighborhood, and mall. The study was conducted in Manado from June – September 2013 (4 Months) and the survey started on August 2013.

Population and Sample

Population is refers to the entire group of people, events or things of interest that researcher wants to make interferences (Sekaran et al., 2009:262). Population of this research is people in Manado who shop their own groceries including tooth paste. Sample is a subset of the population (Sekaran et al., 2009:263). The sample survey is mainly directed to consumers the population of Manado citizen and regarding sample on 100 consumers. The Probability sample design is simple random sampling.

Data Collection Method

The source of data that used is primary data which is the information that we obtained first-hand by the researcher on the variables of interest for the specific purpose of the study (Sekaran & Bougie, 2009) in this

study primary data is the data that collected from the questionnaire of respondent by direct survey, go to the field an spread the questionnaire.

Operational Definition and Measurement of Variables

1. Brand Loyalty (Variable Y) when a consumer buys products from the same manufacturer repeatedly rather than from other toward low involvement product category or in this case tooth paste. The measurement used Likert scale.
2. Similarity Confusion (X1) is propensity of consumer to think that different products in a product category are visually and functionally similar. In this research, consumers are in situation where consumers confuse one brand with each other.
3. Overload Confusion (X2) is consumers' difficulty when confronted with more product information and alternatives than they can process in order to get to know, to compare and to comprehend alternatives. In this research the consumers are in situation where there are a lot of option to choose and did and too many information about a products.
4. Ambiguity confusion (X3) is consumers' tolerance for processing unclear, misleading, or ambiguous products, product related information or advertisements. The situation when information provided on a product and/or service is not consistent with the consumer's previously held beliefs and convictions, ambiguity occurs in the understanding of the product.

The Variables and it indicators will be measure with Likert scale as a widely used rating scale that requires the respondents to indicate a degree of agreement or disagreement with each of a series of statements about the stimulus objects.

Data Analysis Method

Validity and Reliability Test

Reliability analysis is used to measure the correlation between multiple measurements of a construct in order to quantify some underlying dimension. The reliability of a measure is established by testing for both consistency and stability (Sekaran, 2009). The purpose of testing reliability is to determine the level of measurement non error, it means showing the consistency of measurement. Reliability was measured by using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, when the value of Cronbach's alpha increase the consistency also increases. If the coefficient value of Alpha less than 0.60 then the reliability is bad. Research instrument is acceptable if the test shows the alpha in the range of 0.7 and the reliability is good if above 0.80 (Sekaran, 2009).

Validity is a test of how well an instrument that is developed measures the particular concept it is intended to measure. Validity is the level extent to which of precision and accuracy of a measuring instrument to perform the functions of measuring in this study is the questionnaire. An instrument has high validity if it can deliver results in accordance with the purpose of measuring the measurements itself which is valid at 0.01 level or higher. The validity of testing can use the Product-Moment Correlation Pearson techniques. This research use the Pearson correlation significant one tailed test, that I have a prior test as the sign of (-) or (+) of the correlation. Questionnaires were used as a measuring instrument should qualify the validity of the content.

Multiple Regression Analysis Models

In a general Multiple Regressions is a statistical technique that simultaneously develops a mathematical relationship between two or more independent variables and an interval-scaled dependent variable, or in other explanation multiple regression used in a situation where two or more independent variables is hypothesized to affect one dependent variable.

Once gathered the data from the field, the next step to analysis the data and solving the problem using Multiple Regression Method, it also to test the hypotheses that have been stated. The data then inserted into the statical tools SPSS version 20.0. This method has been chosen to measure the effect of Similarity confusion (X1), Overload confusion(X2), and unclarity confusion(X3), on Consumen decision postponement (Y):

$$Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3$$

Where:

- Y = Brand Loyalty
 X1 = Similarity confusion
 X2 = Overload confusion

X3	=	Ambiguity Confusion
b ₀	=	Intercept
b ₁ , b ₂ , b ₃	=	The regression coefficient of each variable

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

Result

Validity and Reliability Tests

Validity test is used to know whether the instrument is valid or not. The validity test is using Pearson correlation significant two-tailed test which the instrument is valid if the score of indicator whether it has positive correlation or negative correlation is more than 0, 01 ($r \geq 0.01$). The value of Pearson correlation of similarity confusion is 1.72, overload confusion is 0.20, and ambiguity confusion is 0.036. It shows that the correlation between variables is more than 0.01 which indicate that the instrument is valid. The Cronbach Alpha is 0.612 which are more than 0.6. Therefore, the measurement instruments used for this research are reliable and the instrument can get the consistent result if used in different times.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple Regressions is used to determine the influence of some independent variables to dependent variable. Below is the result of multiple regression

Table 1. Multiple Regression Result

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
	(Constant)	3.809	.354		10.750	.000
1	Similarity Confusion	-.165	.104	-.193	-1.585	.116
	Overload Confusion	.101	.088	.144	1.151	.252
	Ambiguity Confusion	.151	.087	.191	1.733	.086

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

Source: data processed

The Equation is as follows:

$$Y = 3.809 + - 0.165 X1 + 0.101 X2 + 0.151 X3$$

The explanations of the equation are:

- Constant 3.809 shows the influence of Similarity confusion (X1), Overload confusion (X2), Ambiguity confusion (X3), and Brand loyalty (Y). It means that, in a condition where all independent variables are constant (zero), consumer buying behavior (Y) as dependent variable is predicted to be 3.809
- 0.165 is the slope Similarity Confusion (X1) meaning if there is an increasing in price while other variables are constant then consumer buying behavior is predicted to increase by -0.165
- 0.101 is the slope Overload Confusion (X2) meaning if there is an increasing in quality while other variables are constant then consumer buying behavior is predicted to increase by 0.101.
- 0.151 is the slope Ambiguity Confusion (X3) meaning if there is an increasing in advertisement while other variables are constant then Y consumer buying behavior is predicted to increase by 0.151.

Table 2 Table R and R²

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.243 ^a	.059	.030	.666

a. Predictors: (Constant), Ambiguity Confusion, Similarity Confusion, Overload Confusion

Source: data processed

The value of R is 0.243 indicating a low positive relationship between independent and dependent variable.

The value of R^2 is 0.059 meaning Similarity confusion, Overload confusion, and Ambiguity Confusion as independent variables are moderate negative and influence Brand loyalty as much as 5.9% while the rest 94.1% other factor is not included in this research.

Classical Assumption Test

The tolerance value of similarity confusion is 0.659, overload confusion is 0.628, ambiguity confusion is 0.811, which are more than 0.10. The VIF value of similarity confusion is 1.518, overload confusion is 1.592, ambiguity confusion 1.234, which are less than 10. So, the result of the tolerance and VIF value show that this research is free from multicollinearity. The patterns of the dots are spreading and the dots are spreading above and below the zero point of Y-axis. So, there is no heteroscedasticity in this regression. The dots are spreading near the diagonal line and follow the direction of the diagonal line. Therefore, the data is distributed normally. The result of Durbin Watson value is 1.656, and the Durbin Watson table value is 1.736 (100 sample, and 3 independent variables). Since the value of Durbin Watson count less than value of Durbin Watson table, and the value of Durbin Watson count more than 3 minus value of Durbin Watson table. So, there is an autocorrelation in this regression.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 3. F test Result

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.673	3	.891	2.006	.118 ^b
	Residual	42.637	96	.444		
	Total	45.310	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

b. Predictors: (Constant), Ambiguity Confusion, Similarity Confusion, Overload Confusion

Source: data processed

The F_{count} is 2.006 and the F_{table} is 2.47. Therefore, $F_{count} (2.006) < F_{table} (2.70)$. Since the F_{count} is less than F_{table} , the H_0 is accepted and the H_a is rejected. So, the variables of Consumer confusion proneness (similarity, overload and ambiguity confusion) has no effect on dependent variable which is consumer brand loyalty simultaneously. Consumer confusion proneness which are similarity confusion, overload confusion, and ambiguity confusion influence brand loyalty of low involvement product, in this case tooth paste, simultaneously. The result of f test where $F_{count} > F_{table}$ shows that the independent variables of similarity confusion, overload confusion and ambiguity confusion has no significance influence on dependent variable of consumer brand loyalty. So, that is Hypothesis 1 is rejected.

Table 4. T test Result

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	3.809	.354		10.750	.000
	Similarity Confusion	-.165	.104	-.193	-1.585	.116
	Overload Confusion	.101	.088	.144	1.151	.252
	Ambiguity Confusion	.151	.087	.191	1.733	.086

Source: data processed

The partial influence for each independent variable will be explained as follows:

1. Similarity confusion and Brand loyalty

The table shows that the T_{count} value of price is -1.585, and the T_{table} with the level of significance 95% is 1.985. The result is $T_{count} (-1.585) < T_{table} (1.985)$, and because the T_{count} is less than T_{table} , the H_0 is accepted and the H_a is rejected. It means that similarity confusion has no influence to brand loyalty. The negative sign indicate that it has negative relationship between independent and dependent variable. Consumer

confusion proneness, similarity confusion influence brand loyalty partially. The result of t test is: Similarity confusion = $T_{\text{count}} < T_{\text{table}}$. The result shows that overload confusion does not influence consumer brand loyalty partially. So, Hypothesis 2 is rejected

2. Overload confusion and Consumer Brand loyalty

The table shows that the T_{count} value of quality is 1.151 and the T_{table} with the level of significance 95% is 1.985. The result is $T_{\text{count}} (1.151) < T_{\text{table}} (1.985)$, and because the T_{count} is less than T_{table} , it means the H_0 is accepted and the H_a is rejected. It means that overload confusion has no significant influence to brand loyalty. Consumer confusion proneness, overload confusion influence brand loyalty partially. The result of t test is: Similarity confusion = $T_{\text{count}} < T_{\text{table}}$. The result shows that overload confusion also does not influence consumer brand loyalty partially. So, Hypothesis 3 is rejected.

3. Ambiguity confusion and Brand loyalty

The table shows that the T_{count} value of advertisement is 1.733 and the T_{table} with the level of significance 95% is 1.985. The result is $T_{\text{count}} (1.733) < T_{\text{table}} (1.985)$, and because the T_{count} is less than T_{table} , the H_0 is accepted and the H_a is rejected. It means that Ambiguity confusion has no significant influence to brand loyalty. Consumer confusion proneness, ambiguity confusion influence brand loyalty partially. The result of t test is: Similarity confusion = $T_{\text{count}} < T_{\text{table}}$. The result means the overload confusion has no significant influence on consumer brand loyalty. So, Hypothesis 4 is rejected.

Discussion

The result revealed that consumer confusion exist in low involvement product category but in the other way consumer confusion proneness, Similarity confusion (X1) Overload confusion (X2) Ambiguity T (X3) are proved to have no significant influence to consumer brand loyalty (Y) of low involvement product category tooth paste.

Similarity confusion

Similarity confusion does not influence consumer brand loyalty significantly. The instrument that used to measured the similarity confusion variable are, the design of packaging or the overall outer look of the tooth paste including color, font of the words, picture, the size of the box that used among the tooth paste brand. Even though there is no significance effect between similarity confusion and brand loyalty, it is important to know what is the negative sign that appears on t test which is -1.585 that it means similarity confusion did exist in this case, where people are admit that there are some similarity among tooth paste that causes them became unfaithful to their previous choice brand. For example the similarity among the tooth paste packaging, consumers sometimes might confuse about it, whether they were made by the same company or not, and the confused consumer will ended up buying the wrong brand without realize that they were actually did a switching brand activity. Consumer in Manado also shows that they are sometimes confused how to differentiate one brand and another, because when they're about to shop a tooth paste that they saw on TV commercial, they couldn't identified the tooth paste brand among the other brands. The negative sign also indicate where there is an increase in similarity confusion causes a decrease in consumer brand loyalty. The consumer cannot differentiate one brand and another and they are tend to buy anything that they saw more interesting on the store or a brand that look alike with the major brand, according to Alarabi et al (2007) because this is a low involvement product people are not really concern about which brand they should use and sometimes shows a switching brand activity. So it's hard to be loyal on one brand when they cannot differentiate one brand and another, or even care about the brand that they will choose. It is does not significant but since the sign is (-) as the theoretical expectation. Firms should make an effort to decrease the consumer confusion in the similarity among brands. The packaging should be unique and original so people can easily identified the brand that they used previously and does not tricked by the same packaging but different brand.

Overload confusion

Overload confusion does not influence consumer brand loyalty significantly. The instrument that used to measure the overload confusion variables are the overload brand in market, which brands is the best for them and the place that provide the specific brand they like to buy. Referring to the result, the contribution of overload confusion in consumer brand loyalty of low involvement product tooth paste does not significant. There's no significance influence, even though the consumers admit there are a lot of brands outside and sometimes they confused. The reason for this behavior is because consumer in Manado assumes that they were no problem with a lots of brand in Manado market, some of them already has one brand that they were loyal to,

for example from a little interview some of the consumers said since they were a kid their parents used to buy them pepsodent, and they grew using pepsodent as their tooth paste. It is become their habit to buy a pepsodent every time they went to the market, so even though there is a lot of brand in Manado it will not affect their habitual buying behavior in this case tooth paste. This is makes another brand competitor hard to penetrate the market, and need to put an extra effort in marketing to catch attention and break those habitual buying behavior of Manado consumer. This result is different with previous result, as previous literature has stated; overload in choice and information can easily cause consumers to feel dissatisfied of their choice of brand, which in turn decreases on brand loyalty Alarabi et all (2012).

Ambiguity confusion

Ambiguity confusion has no influence to consumer brand loyalty of low involvement category in this case tooth paste. The instruments that used to measure the ambiguity confusion are the features among tooth paste brand, the best feature of tooth paste that they need the most, and information that they get in the TV commercial compare with what actually the tooth paste can perform. According to the result it is seems Ambiguity confusion has no influence on consumer brand loyalty. It resulted that way because Ambiguity confusion is not the major concern of Manado consumers' even though its clearly present in the market of tooth paste, apparently they did not really concern about which feature they need to use whether its whitening, fresh breath, sensitive teeth, for gum problems, total protection, etc and also the consumers seems not really affect by the TV commercial and the information they got from advertisement. it doesn't influence their brand loyalty They keep buying the brand that they were loyal no matter what is the features. This result also supported by previous research that has the same output and reject H_4 . Where the increase in ambiguity confusion does not causes a decrease in brand loyalty. The presence of ambiguity within the Swedish detergent market can be confirmed, where marketing claims seem to be inconsistent with the respondents' previous beliefs and knowledge to an extent where the claims are not trusted at all.

Overall none of similarity, overload, and ambiguity confusion influence brand loyalty significantly, the R^2 result can prove that only 5.9% of consumer confusion affect brand loyalty while the rest 94.1% other factor is not included in this research. That is why there's still a need to investigate the connection between each consumer confusion proneness and perhaps if the scale was not simply measuring brand loyalty as a repetitive buying activity and instead considered actual consumer attitudes or behavioral loyalty towards preferred brand it would be easier to see how similarity, overload and ambiguity affecting brand loyalty. The other factors that affect brand loyalty for example are price, brand variety and attractiveness, size and brand reputation. According to Kinuthia et al (2012:230) based on their research of factors influencing brand loyalty in sportswear among Kenyan University Students. The results indicate that Kenyan university students who actively participate in swimming as a competitive activity will be loyal to swimwear brands based on factors such as Price and Variety; Attractiveness; and Size and Brand Reputation. These factors were found to have a positive relationship with brand loyalty.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

It can be drawn conclusions as follows:

1. Similarity confusion does not influence brand loyalty significantly but even though like that it has a negative relationship between overload confusion and brand loyalty. Where there is an increase in overload confusion causes a decrease in brand loyalty.
2. Overload confusion does not influence brand loyalty significantly. Although there is a presents of similarity confusion in the market but it doesn't influence consumer brand loyalty that much.
3. Ambiguity confusion also does not influence brand loyalty significantly, it has the same case with similarity confusion where ambiguity confusion exists in the market but it doesn't a major concern of a consumer that could affect consumers' brand loyalty.
4. Similarity confusion, overload confusion and, ambiguity confusion, are proved to have no significant influence simultaneously and partially on brand loyalty. The result shows none of H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4 were statistically occurred.

5. There is a theory that support the result, brand loyalty sometimes can be viewed as a consumers strategic conscious or non conscious to consumer confusion proneness, as a brand loyalty reflect the habitual purchasing that requires less decision making, information seeking and brand evaluation; some consumer more appreciate to having less comparison and information process (Mitchel et al. 2005).
6. Nowadays people cannot seem to avoid the confrontation of many alternatives. Even the purchase of a small basic product like tooth paste can subject the consumer to an aisle containing 20 brands alternatives. However, there are stores and other providers that specialize in offering their consumers a small choice set of products and services, as to simplify their decision making process. Yet, no matter how satisfying such offers are, the consumer still has to make the decision to choose such an alternative over all of the other options. In other words, the act of simplifying is in itself a complicated matter.

Recommendation

The recommendations are:

1. There is a need to investigate the connection between each consumer confusion proneness. Perhaps if the scale was not simply measuring brand loyalty as repetitive purchase, and instead considered actual consumer attitudes and different types of behavioral loyalty towards a preferred brand, it would be easier to deduce how similarity, overload and ambiguity confusion proneness actually affects brand loyalty. This is considered as an essential aspect since this could have a great impact on practitioners' perspective on the effects of brand look-a-likes. Finally, a reconstruction of the scale's brand loyalty questions would also make the tool more suitable for an eventual investigation of high involvement products, since the scale, as it is now, will not suffice for a fair representation of the dependent variable brand loyalty in a high involvement product category case.
2. Consumer confusion exists in the low involvement product category market like tooth paste even though it is not a vital concern of consumers' life but this kind of product category were bought in a large scale. That is why there should be a different between brands and make something that really stood out so people can remember, and industry needs to improve on tooth paste features so people can rely on or suits their needs and keep the good quality up to standard to make sure the consumers keep buying it every time they need a tooth paste.

REFERENCES

- Alarabi, S, & Gronbald S, 2012. The Effect of Consumer Confussion on Decision Postponement and Brand Loyalty on Low Involvement Product Category. *Master Thesis in Department of Business studies*.
- Iyenggar, S, Wells, R. E, & Schwartz, B, 2000. When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing?, *Journal of personality and social psychology*, Vol. 79, 995-1006.
- Mao, J, 2010. Consumer Brand Loyalty, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.5, No 7 July 2010.
- Mitchell, V.M, Walsh, G & Yamin M, 2005. Towards conceptual model of Consumer Confusion, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 32, 143-150.
- Loken, B, Ross, I. & Hinkle, R. L, 1986. Consumer confusion of Origin and brand similarity perceptions, *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, Vol. 5, P. 195-211.
- Mitchell, V.W, & Papavassiliou, V, 1997. Exploring consumer Confusion in Watch market, *Marketing Intellegence & Planning* 15(4), 164-172.
- Mitchell, V.W, & Papavassiliou, V, 1999. Marketing causes and implications of consumer confusion, *Advances in Consumer Research*, 32, 143-150.

- Mooyman, & Visser, 2007. More or Less?: The impact of assortment size and variety on consumer satisfaction, *Master's thesis MSc in Economics & Business Marketing Programme*, Rotterdam.
- Turnbull, P.W, Leek, S. & Ying, G., 2000. Customer Confussion: The Mobile phone market, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 16, 143-163.
- Sekaran Uma & Bougie Roger, 2009. *Research Methods for Business a skill building approach*, fifth edition, Wiley, Great Britain.
- Solomon, R. M, 2008. *Consumer Behavior: Buying, Having, and Being*, 9th ed., Edinburgh: Pearson Education.
- Walsh, G, Thorsten, H.T, & Mitchell, V.W, 2007. Consumer confusion proneness: scale development, validation and application, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(7-8), 697-721.
- Walsh, K, 1999. Marketing and public sector management, *European Journal of Marketing*, 28(3), 63-71.
- Yan Yee, Winnie, N.G. 2010, The Effect of Consumer Confusion on Purchasing Bras in Hong Kong Intimate Apparel Market. *Thesis for Degree of Bachelors of Arts*.
- Yee, W. F, Sidek, Y. 2008. Influence of Brand Loyalty on Consumer Sportswear, *Int. Journal of Economics and Management*, 2(2), 221-236.

