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ARTICLE DETAILS

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Even though there is an immense level of research related to the impact of product quality and service quality on consumers’ purchase intentions the role of satisfaction as the mediator between perceived product qualities, affective commitment, and repurchase intentions has not been cross-examined in previous literature. To understand how this mediating mechanism affects repurchase intentions, we advanced a conceptual model.

Design/Methodology/Approach: This study employed a quantitative research approach. Data were obtained using the convenience sampling method from a sample of 400 respondents. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 and Analysis of Moment Structure (AMOS) version 22.0 were used for the data analysis.

Findings: Results show that the relationship between perceived product quality, affective commitment, and repurchase intentions is partially mediated by customers’ satisfaction.

Implications/Originality/Value: understanding the underlying process of repurchase intentions of customers. The study is one of the exceptional efforts to provide evidence regarding the role of customer satisfaction as a mediating variable between independent and dependent variables.
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Introduction

In this stiff competition where an enormous number of companies are doing their business, a firm needs to make a strategy that is best suited for not only hunting but also maintaining their customers (Bocken et al., 2022). As the business environment is changing rapidly in terms of technological advancement, rivalry among the firms is getting fierce and also changes are occurring in consumers’ purchase configuration, considering these realities firms need to align themselves according to the changing environment. Today companies are increasingly focusing on crafting strategies to build long-term relationships with customers; henceforth firms are more focused on implementing a ‘marketing concept’, rather ‘selling concept’ by taking customers as a center of every activity. Therefore all these strategies can only be helpful if companies realize the significance of the purchase and repurchase intentions pattern of customers (Peres et al., 2023).

In the context of globalization, a firm needs to understand one of the value systems of the market i.e. customers (Gómez-Prado et al., 2022). Considering this, it is important to understand the attitude and behavior of customers toward purchase and repurchase in other words many researchers have studied these variables extensively see studies like (Alam & Purwanto, 2023; Bocken et al., 2022; Jatmiko, 2023; Lestari et al., 2023; Sinurat et al., 2023) because the firms need to be successful. Previous studies revealed that there is still a lot more work that has to be done when it comes to knowing the specifics related to the purchase intent and behavior of customers. Specifically, some researchers raised questions and have some doubts regarding the association between Affective Commitment (AC) of customers and Repurchase Intentions (RPI).

The role of Product Quality (PQ) and AC cannot be ignored in the context of market orientation because both factors are the sources of driving the RPI of customers, consequently, firms need to understand the role of these factors. In this stiff competition, firms need to change their orientation according to the changing environment (Rua & Santos, 2022). Companies also need to know about the relationship between Customer Satisfaction (CS) and the RPI of customers. It always remains challenging for companies to critically analyze how customers perceive the quality of the product at the individual level. However, researchers are not clear about the cognitive aspects like AC which might influence RPI, furthermore, the role of CS between PQ and AC is also not addressed in previous literature (Wijarnoko et al., 2023).

Firms are adopting different strategies at different levels. A meager understanding of customers’ dynamics may lead to failure, and this weakness may lead to results in poor performance of the firms (Bocken et al., 2022). Although there are so many other factors that can affect the overall performance of an organization, however, as far as different Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG’s) firms are concerned, insufficient studies are available that highlight the importance of these factors in the RPI of the customers (Rianto et al., 2023; Wijarnoko et al., 2023). Similarly, market orientation is a key to success for contemporary firms.

RPI is a psychological concept and it was earlier sketched by social psychologists. Social scientists observed specific behavior in some cases and referred to it as loyalty. Purchase intention is related to the decision-making of an individual to remain intact with a specific brand. Marketers and brand managers borrowed the concept in different contextual settings and linked it to consumer behavior that is depicted in the repeat purchases of customers. Customers always think about value while making a purchase decision, we can say that the value of a product or service is directly proportional to the positive evaluation of the customer. Customers make a comparison between the value and price of the product or service and when they feel that value is higher than the price of the product or service then they continue to be loyal to the product or service (Sinurat et al., 2023). Consequently, customers always work on the patterns of needs, value, and satisfaction which ultimately lead to positive behavior. Muhammad Harun Alrasyid et al. (2023) suggested that RPI can also be affected through intervening variables. Certainly, many
researchers had some doubts about the relationship between AC and RPI, and how AC can affect the RPI of customers (Alam & Purwanto, 2023). Some researchers believe that AC can affect the RPI without having a role of intervening variables (Lestari et al., 2023). This fact shows the importance of different mediators because researchers in the past suggested the importance of cognitive factors so that the emotional aspect of customers should not be neglected in measuring RPI (Jatmiko, 2023).

Also due to immense growth in almost every industry, companies are now facing immense competition as every firm in its particular industry is offering monotonous products and services. Nowadays giving a better quality is no longer a competitive advantage for firms, now firms need to focus on other strategies for survival. In recent years one of the strategies that got great attention is customer relationship management. This study aims to investigate whether PQ and AC towards products/brands via CS can affect RPI in FMCG’s context. In specific terms, this study intends to investigate the impact of PQ, and AC of customers on CS. Similarly, this study also investigates the impact of these variables through CS in FMCG’s context. We intend to answer the following questions through our research: Does PQ and AC influence CS? Does CS impact the RPI of the customers? Does CS mediate the relationship between PQ, AC, and RPI of the customers in FMCG’s context?

Literature Review
Product Quality
The literature has described a few definitions of PQ. For Instance, Aaker (1991) characterized quality as ‘the ability of the product or services to meet or exceed the expectations of the customer’ In addition, Sihombing et al. (2023) related PQ to outline quality, fabricating quality, and general quality. One of the primary meanings of PQ was proposed by Zeithaml (1988) as ‘the outlook or appearance of the product as contrasted and contending options shapes the customers’ viewpoint of PQ i.e. product esteem, trust, relationship esteem, and responsibility. PQ plays a main part in the purchase decision process of the products or services, PQ is the crucial part that plays a huge role in consumer’s purchase intention (Elyana et al., 2023). PQ has been a focus of attention for a long time and is considered among the most imperative factors (Widijowati, n.d.). PQ can be assessed by the attributes of a product which is primarily finished to fit the necessities and fulfillment of customers. When PQ meets the expectations of the customer suitably, the customer becomes satisfied with the specific brand (Wolniak & Grebski, 2023). Elyana et al. (2023) revealed that PQ is one of the fundamental variables in the coloration power of the product or service.

Affective Commitment
Commitment is a crucial element in creating customer loyalty that guarantees in a long-term connection and bond between firms and customers (Al Habsi & Al Dhuhli, 2023). In the background of his research concerning the edifice of commitment in customer-retailer relationships Kungwola (2023) defines commitment as a psychological state prompted by an individual’s thoughts, opinions, and moods which are demonstrated by the individual’s intent to initiate and nurture a long-lasting relationship because the individual feels indebted to do so. The above definition focuses on the importance of brand/product commitment by emphasizing how a dedicated customer is more likely to make an effort to preserve their relationship with a brand as compared to a non-committed one. Commitment is composed of two components Purnomo & Wardhani (2023): i.e. calculative commitment which is based on economic and rational criteria and AC which is activated by emotive and psychological drivers. Service quality is considered to contribute positively to the cultivation of future AC. In the context of the current study, we have examined the affective aspect of customer commitment. So, for the rest of this study the term ‘commitment’ will refer to AC and not calculative commitment. Commitment between two individuals exists when one of them considers the relationship important and is eager to put
significant effort into preserving this relationship (Puspitasari et al., 2023). Commitment indicates a relational link between two parties, which is crucial for the maintenance of long-term lucrative relationships. In summary, commitment plays a significant role in CS. AC is the cognitive component of devotion and concern of an individual towards objects. In the latest research, Budiyanti (2023) states that two parties who are dedicated and believe in the prominence of a connection will make efforts to reserve it and ensure it for the future. As proclaimed by Alkhawaldeh et al. (2017), AC is a vivacious component for building long-term relationships between customers and the company.

Customer Satisfaction

In marketing, the most imperative variable for customers’ basic fulfillment in obtaining a brand is satisfaction (Ngon, 2023). In addition, such fulfillment may lead purchasers to impart their insights to their companions or relatives (Firmansyah et al., 2023). Satisfaction can foresee the post-buy conduct of the customers. Post-buy assessment takes place after this procedure: with a specific goal to broaden the acknowledgment or experience from customers, firms need to give quality products that should have the ability to fulfill customers’ needs and demands. CS is an outcome of assessing product consumption (Alcuetas, Rosemarie Gaile, et al., 2023; Karim et al., 2023).

In the contemporary business approach, the most imperative factor for the firm is to fulfill the customers’ basic needs and wants and to create CS. Consequently, such fulfillments lead to RPI. CS is an outcome of evaluating the product or brand after consumption. CS can be operationalized by the states of mind towards items or brands. Ngon (2023) concluded that satisfaction alludes to a customer’s assessment of a particular exchange and transaction. A customer is fulfilled when a purchased product/brand performs better than the expectation of the customer. Past researchers unveiled two primary routes to post-buy fulfillment: satisfaction and customer disappointment. This study focused on post-buy fulfillment as the present literature on satisfaction contends that satisfaction is the most essential cognitive component for customers in case the customer evaluates the experience. CS can hold the existing customers, considering that it directly affects the RPI. Additionally, post-purchase satisfaction leads to customers’ loyalty. According to Alcuetas, Rosemarie Gaile et al. (2023) consumer loyalty is a rule that affects customers’ convictions and also repeat purchases. Customers may likewise recommend the products/brands to others based on their experience of satisfaction. Subsequently, the satisfied experience of the customer is directly linked with the revenue generation of the firm. Customers’ disposition shows why he/she is identified with the products. Firmansyah et al. (2023) concluded that consumer loyalty means the purchaser's eagerness to spend more. Contemporary research on CS distillates on the state of mind of customers, past experiences, esteem and comfort, and customers’ nature (Karim et al., 2023). Ngon (2023) uncovered three components that decide the relationship between CS and RPI i.e. social qualities of customers, loyalty, and desire. CS is the balance between conformance and performance quality of the product or a brand.

Repurchase Intentions

This subjective probability approach is on the basis that a particular behavior will bring up specific results (Widiyanto et al., 2023). In the parent theory i.e. Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), intention was not discussed with its behavioral and normative association which has the volitional control. At the center of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) are the intentions of individuals to perform a given behavior. Intention represents the motivational elements of a behavior, that is, the extent of conscious effort that a person will put forth to perform a behavior. Buyers’ purchase decision is considered a very complex process. Mondal and Hasan (2023) describe the five stages of the consumer decision-making process. It includes problem recognition, search, alternative evaluation, purchase, and outcomes. Consumer behavior is a set of processes that involves an individual’s selecting, purchasing, using, and disposal of a
product, service, or experience for the sake of satisfying a need. Farhan and Marsasi (2023) describe purchase behavior as the domain that includes psychological, social, and physical actions when customers purchase, use, and discard products, services, ideas, and practices. According to the TPB, subjective norms perceived behavioral control, and attitudes are the components that lead to the purchase intention of an individual. These factors served as a positive contribution towards predicting intentions as well as behaviors of the individual (Putri et al., 2023).

The RPI of a customer is related to “customer behavior, customer perception, and its attitude”. Intention serves as a direct component of an individual’s attitude which as a result transforms the individual’s behavior (Widiyanto et al., 2023). The product purchased reflects the social status and fulfills the psychological needs of the customer (Sinurat et al., 2023). The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) was explicitly introduced by Davis (1989) to predict the intention of people who use the information system and adapt it to anticipate the intentions of consumers’ purchase intentions. An individual develops an attitude based on particular beliefs about certain things and as a result, develops an intention towards those objects. Therefore, intention is the key factor for actual behavior. According to Lestari et al. (2023), CS has a positive and direct relationship with behavioral intention to repurchase.

**Theoretical Bones and Conceptual Model**

TPB is the theory that explains the attitude toward RPI. TPB is the expanded version of TRA; both were conceptualized by Ajzen in 1991. The restricting scope of the TRA in terms of behavior over which people have no control led to the expansion of the theory. The factor of interest in our study is CS which was used in both TRA and TPB. The TPB precisely focused on the relationship of AC with attitude that leads to intention. Previous empirical results of the studies on satisfaction indicated that there was no discernible pattern (Ajzen, 1991). Moreover, personal considerations tended to overshadow the impact of PQ. TPB has been adopted as the base for the conceptual framework for this study. Considering the literature that has been studied for the research, the independent variables that are identified for this study are PQ and AC. These relationships are tested with CS. The mediating variable in turn is tested with RPI.

**Hypotheses**

H1: PQ has a positive effect on the CS.
H2: AC has a positive effect on the CS.
H3: CS has a positive effect on the RPI.
H4: CS mediates the relationship between PQ and RPI.
H5: CS mediates the relationship between AC and RPI.
Study Design and Methodology
The study includes four latent variables. The variables are measured through 24 questions on a five-point Likert scale. Scales were adapted and modified based on the research setting and the nature of the study. PQ is assessed by using a scale developed and validated by Sweeney and Soutar (2001) which includes 5 items that capture the essence of perception towards the quality of the product. Respondents were asked to provide their views regarding the PQ using a five-point Likert-type scale. We assessed AC from the scale developed by Keiningham et al. (2015) which reflects high commitment and high activation regarding the purchase. To measure CS, we used measures developed by Caruana (2002) to assess the self-rated level of satisfaction. Respondents were asked to rate their current level of satisfaction on each of the 7 items by judging how well they believe they are satisfied with each attitudinal criterion. RPI was measured with 7 items using the scale developed by Mohseni et al. (2018). The content validity of the questionnaire was established by asking experts to review for any missing elements. Based on their comments, a few questions were deleted and altered in the final draft of the questionnaire. The objective was to alter the items according to the local meaning, understanding, and context.

FMCG’s customers were taken as respondents to get responses. Structured questionnaires were used as an instrument for data collection. A self-administered questionnaire was distributed among the respondents. A total number of 350 questionnaires were disseminated amongst the contributors of the survey out of whom 330 were received back. On scrutiny of the questionnaires, 14 were not usable. The leftover 325 were usable.

Data Analysis and Results
Normality Checks of the Data
Before analyzing the data, the normality of the data was checked through different indicators as can be seen in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: PQ= Perceived Product Quality; AC= Affective Commitment; CS= Customer Satisfaction; RPI= Repurchase Intentions

Validation of Measurement Model
To assess the measurement model, we applied Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to improve the internal stability of the measures. Individual CFA models of different latent variables showed some non-acceptable absolute and incremental fit indices; as a result, we applied modification indices to develop modified models. The modified models indicated a satisfactory level of fit, 5 items for PQ were subjected to CFA and all items showed acceptable factor loadings, with the indices being as follows: for PQ $\chi^2$/df=1.70, Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) =0.99, Normed Fit Index (NFI) =0.99, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) =0.99 and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) =0.04. The fit indices for AC were $\chi^2$/df =1.91, GFI =0.99 NFI =0.99, CFI =0.99, and RMSEA =0.05. 7 items for CS were subjected to CFA and the final fit indices were $\chi^2$/df =0.99, GFI =0.99, NFI =0.99, CFI =0.99, and RMSEA= 0.01 see Table 3 for details. 7 items for RPI were subjected to CFA. The fit indices for were $\chi^2$/df=2.93, GFI= 0.98, NFI =0.98, CFI =0.98, and RMSEA =0.06. Table 2 represents the CFA results of four variables along with nested CFA model results.
Two different approaches were considered in this study for evaluating discriminant validity i.e. we used Fornell and Larcker's (1981) guidelines. Authors mandated that if the square roots of AVE’s values are > than its correlation score among study variables, the constructs are considered to be dissimilar from the other. All four constructs satisfied this condition values can be seen in Table 3. The second approach we used for assessment is the confidence interval test. None of the interval values in this study had the value of 1 which ensured discriminant validity for this study.

We again used two approaches to claim convergent validity i.e. the NFI values and factor loadings as can be seen in Table 2 all the NFI values of four constructs are greater than 0.90 as guided by Ahire, Golhar, and Waller (1996), and no factor loadings are below 0.5 (Bagozzi & Phillips, 1982; Sila & Ebrahimpour, 2005), which ascertained the convergent validity.

As can be seen in Table 3 PQ and AC are positively correlated (r = 0.37), PQ and CS are positively correlated with each other (r=0.48), and PQ is positively correlated with RPI (r=0.32). AC is positively correlated with CS (r = 0.24), and also with RPI (r = 0.25). CS is found to be positively related to RPI (r=0.48), all correlations are significant at 0.01 level.

Hypotheses Testing
In hypotheses 1 and 2 we predicted that PQ and AC have a positive effect on the CS. As shown in Table 4 Model 2, we regressed CS w.r.t PQ. The results from Table 4 show that the effect of PQ on CS is statistically significant (F=95.64, β=0.48, p<0.001, R²=0.23) by AC. Hence H1 is accepted. Table 5 Model 2 we regressed CS again w.r.t AC the results show (F=20.27, β=0.24, p<0.001, R²=0.06), hence H2 is also supported. Hypothesis 3 states that CS has a positive effect on the PI. The results from Table 5 confirm that the effect of CS on RPI is statistically significant (F=99.56, p<0.001, β = 0.48, R² = 0.24). Hence H3 is also accepted.

Table 2 Individual and Nested CFA Results (N=318)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>FL [min-max]</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.72-0.88]</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.80-0.86]</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.75-0.88]</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>[0.72-0.89]</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nested Model</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>[0.68-0.79]</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: PQ= Perceived Product Quality; AC= Affective Commitment; CS= Customer Satisfaction; RPI= Repurchase Intentions; GFI= Goodness of fit index; NFI= Normed fit index; CFI= Comparative fit index; RMSEA= Root mean square error approximation

Table-3 Heterotrate-Monotrate (HTMT) Ratios and CMB Check (N=318)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>HTMT Ratios</th>
<th>Inner VIF Values (CMB Check)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>0.78†</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.83†</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.80†</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>0.82†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: PQ= Perceived Product Quality; AC= Affective Commitment; CS= Customer Satisfaction; RPI= Repurchase Intentions; †√ (AVE) Values in the Diagonal

Hypotheses Testing

Table 4 Direct and Indirect Effects of CS between PQ and RPI (N=318)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>AR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model1</td>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>6.02*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>36.30*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To check the mediation of CS between PQ and RPI, we followed a four-step approach developed by Baron and Kenny (1986). Model 1 in Table 4 confirms that the effect of PQ on RPI is statistically significant (F = 36.30, p < 0.001, β = 0.32, R² = 0.10). Thus, the second regression in the Model 2 model was carried out to confirm the effect of PQ on CS. The results provide (F = 95.64, p < 0.001, β = 0.48, R² = 0.23). The third regression was performed in Model 3 to predict the relationship between CS and RPI. The results provide (F = 99.56, p < 0.001, β = 0.48, R² = 0.24). In Model 4 when PQ and CS were regressed together on RPI, it can be seen that the β value significantly reduced from 0.32 to 0.11 and R² increased from 0.10 to 0.24, and the ΔR² = 0.14. Based on the change in β values, ΔR², and the condition for partial mediation i.e. c’ (0.11) < c (0.32) it is concluded that CS partially mediates the effects of PQ on RPI. An online Sobel test was also performed to check the significance of mediation. Hence H₄ is accepted.

The same four-step approach was used to check H₅ which is about the mediation of CS between AC and RPI. As can be seen in Table 5 Model1 produced results i.e. (F = 22.44, p < 0.001, β = 0.25, R² = 0.06). Model 2 provided (F = 20.27, p < 0.001, β = 0.24, R² = 0.06). The third regression in Model 3 provided (F = 99.56, p < 0.001, β = 0.48, R² = 0.24). In Model 4 when AC and CS were regressed together on RPI, the results can be seen in Table 5 that the β value is significantly reduced from 0.25 to 0.14 and R² increases from 0.06 to 0.26, and the ΔR² = 0.19. Based on a change in β values, ΔR², and the condition for partial mediation i.e. c’ (0.14) < c (0.25) it is concluded that CS partially mediates the effects of AC on RPI.
Discussion
This study contributes by adding to the existing literature on PQ and AC and their impact on RPI. In earlier literature on the domain, there was a clear indication that the PQ and AC would exhibit different results if applied in different environments, under different contexts and conditions. However, the earlier literature had no solid research with concrete reference to the impact of PQ and AC on RPI particularly through the mediating role of CS. In this study, the PQ brings along clear and distinctive value for impacting CS which transforms a significant effect onward on the RPI. The results of this study support the previous study findings of the distinctive nature of PQ and AC. Thus, the results of the study in hand claim that the different levels of RPI are caused due to the different tendencies of CS in response to PQ and AC. This tendency of CS plays a major role in transforming the impact of the PQ and AC, further serving as a medium between the actual drivers and that of the outcome of RPI.

This is proved from the results that there is a positive relationship between PQ as discussed in our study with CS, a cognitive factor. Likewise, the relationship of CS also stands established with the repurchase of FMCG products as evident from the results. It is also clear that AC also is driving the RPI of FMCG’s consumers.

Conclusion
The body of literature that inspired the need for this research suggested a positive relationship between PQ and RPI can be drawn through CS. Similar findings have also been revealed from our research in the FMCGs context. AC was also suggested as an integral element of driving RPI through CS. However, the findings of our study are imperative because the previous studies were conducted in different contexts and data were collected from different cultures and societies. Therefore, it can be concluded that CS is a consideration when customers are affectively committed to the firm.

Future Research
During the survey, quite a few numbers of new avenues for research were discovered. These include investigating the existing research model by enhancing the population to other industries, together with focusing on the consumer’s perception of PQ and AC. The sample has been taken to be convenient however it is also important if the consumer perceptions of hedonic brands can also add value to the existing stream of literature on consumer’s perceptions and post-buying behaviors.
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