Spring 5-1-2018

Consumer-Brand Relationships: How and Why We Form Them

Kristian Perez

Consumer-Brand Relationships: How and Why We Form Them

A Capstone Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Renée Crown University Honors Program at
Syracuse University

Kristian Alexis Perez

Candidate for Bachelor of Arts Degree in Psychology
and Renée Crown University Honors
Spring 2018

Honors Capstone Project in Psychology

Capstone Project Advisor: _____
Stanislav Treger, Ph.D.

Capstone Project Reader: _____
Eunkyu Lee, Ph.D.

Honors Director: _____
Chris Johnson, Interim Director

Abstract

Humans are inherently social creatures. For this reason, it is important to understand the role of social psychology in all other disciplines. This study focuses on the role of social psychology in marketing and brand management. The goal of any brand manager is to develop and foster a mutually beneficial relationship between brand and consumer. The nature of human relationships has been studied in the past and significant results have been found. The purpose of this study is to test if those results still occur when the relationship involves a brand rather than another person. Studies such as this one are of interest because they can help future brand managers understand the formation of the relationships they seek.

This study provided 200 participants with a questionnaire regarding their relationship to their favorite brands. The questions were a combination of free response, multiple choice, and likert scales aimed at assessing loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives. These questions were modified from Rusbult's Investment Model Scale, which was used to study person-to-person relationships. Correlations and T-Tests were used to analyze relationships within the data set. Using Cronbach's alpha, all likert scale items were found to be reliable at levels of .769 or higher. Significant correlations were found between loyalty and the individual constructs of investment, satisfaction, and commitment for all three brands in question. T-Tests showed no significant differences between men and women but some significant differences between those who have switched from their favorite brands in the past and those who have not. In conclusion, some significant relationships were found between the constructs assessed.

Executive Summary

Brand managers are always looking for new and innovative ways to fulfill the needs of their current consumers as well as expand to new markets. However, almost every product is constantly competing with similar products produced by rival brands. The way that brand managers try to mitigate this competition is to create strong relationships between their brand and their consumer. This Capstone project focuses on looking at the individual constructs that make up a relationship: loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and the perceived quality of alternatives. A questionnaire of 33 items was given to 200 participants via Amazon's Mechanical Turk program then subsequently analyzed in relation to already existing person-to-person relationship studies.

The questionnaire consisted of three different types of questions: free response, multiple choice, and likert scales. Participants were first asked to pick their favorite three brands. The free response questions were aimed at allowing participants to elaborate a little bit on how and why they chose those brands as well as give explanatory responses to some of the other questions. The multiple-choice questions asked participants demographic related questions such as their yearly income. Majority of the questionnaire used likert scale questions. Likert scales group a series of related questions or statements (in this case statements were used) and then ask the participant to select a scaled rating for each, in this case using agreement or disagreement with the statement.

The questions selected to be included in the questionnaire were selected via three different categories. This first was for the purposes of establishing the demographics of the participants. This category of questions included age, income, and biological sex. The second category was for the main purpose of this study, which was to look at loyalty to favorite brands.

These questions were based on Rusbult's Investment Model Scale. Rusbult's scale looks at the same constructs but with person-to-person relationships. For this study, those questions were modified to reflect language relevant to consumer-brand relationships. The third category of questions was for supplemental information regarding the brands in question. This category of questions included asking about a participant's temptation to switch brands, if the participant was involved in any reward programs, and all the "why" free responses.

Initially, participants for this study were supposed to be young adults aged 18 and over from the United States. However, after running into problems of not being able to collect enough responses through the original platform (reddit) the questionnaire had to be moved to a different platform. Amazon's Mechanical Turk proved to be very useful because responses were guaranteed unlike with reddit. Amazon's Mechanical Turk is a program where users around the world can sign up as "workers". Those seeking the responses of the workers sign up as "requesters". Requesters then pay workers a certain amount (ranges from a few cents to a few dollars depending on the length of the task) once they have finished the required task. One issue that I ran into at this stage was that this program did not allow me to specify the restrictions on who could or could not participate in my study. Because of this, I ended up with responses from adults all over the world, which was a much wider parameter than I had originally intended. This forced me to eliminate the demographic question regarding yearly income because participants reported their income in different currencies without specifying which one. Another major issue was the language barrier between the English used in the survey and the language spoken by some of the participants. Again, this was due to having to expand the parameters for including participants. This forced me to have to eliminate about 70 responses from my data set.

After eliminating the responses that were invalid for the purposes of this study I was able to begin analyzing the results. Most of my analyses only required simple correlations and a few t-tests in addition to the reliability tests of the questionnaire as a whole.

Using Cronbach's alpha, all likert scale items were found to be reliable. Significant correlations were found between loyalty and the individual constructs of investment, satisfaction, and commitment for all three brands in question. There were no significant correlations between any of the constructs and the perceived quality of alternatives except for with brand 2 results. Brand 2 resuls showed a slightly significant correlation between investment and perceived quality of alternatives. I believe this to be a testing error that would not reappear in modified future studies.

T-tests found that there were no significant differences between men and women in terms of how they rated their favorite brands on the scales. However, there were some differences between participants who have switched from their favorite brands in the past and those who have not.

In conclusion, there are significant interactions between the main constructs that make up a person-to-person relationship also found in consumer-brand relationships. These results are important because they show the similarities in how people form relationships with objects or ideas other than other people. Brand managers can now apply these results to form better relationships between their brands and their consumers by focusing on the constructs most related to loyalty and translating them to the marketing world. These results can also be used in future studies regarding different types of relationships.

Table of Contents

Preface

Having worked on this study for the past year and a half has really enabled me to grow as an individual and as a scholar. There were many bumps along the road from the initial idea stage of this study to the time when it actually came to fruition. These setbacks only helped me learn and become better prepared should I decide to pursue further research in the future. I now have a much better understanding of the entire process and what it takes to produce a good study. My mentor's guidance was invaluable and such a great help throughout this whole process. My mentor allowed me to take control of my own work but was still always there as a resource. Through working together in this way I was able to experience the true nature of coming up with a study and making sure it produced valuable results.

That being said I truly believe the purpose of this study to be important and one that should be further explored. Just understanding the nature of human relationships in general can be such a useful tool in the future not only in the marketing realm but other fields as well. This study is just one step towards learning more about how different types of relationships work and what we find valuable in them. I hope this study will assist in future research regarding consumer-brand relationships and other types of relationships as well.

Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by thanking Dr. Stanislav Treger for agreeing to be my mentor throughout this whole process. As I mentioned earlier, his ability to guide while still letting me take charge of this capstone was invaluable. I would not have learned half as much as what I did without his assistance. I'm very grateful for his consistent support from the very beginning of this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Eunkyu Lee for showing an interest in my research and being my reader.

Advice to Future Honors Students

As a student who was not really sure what to expect out of this whole capstone process, I wanted to share a little bit of my experiences with future honors students. First of all I would advise you to start thinking about your capstone topic as early as possible. Even though it may seem far away it is actually much closer than you think. Beginning to form ideas early makes it much easier to find mentors and potential readers who would be interested in helping you and working with you on your research. It also gives you more time to run multiple trials of your research if necessary.

On that note, I would also advise you to not procrastinate when actually working on your final deliverable. Make sure to try and do at least a little bit every day. Your future self will really appreciate not being swamped with added work during your last semester.

One last thing I want to say is to not be afraid to fail. All results are valuable even if they turn out not to be the results you were looking for. Findings can be surprising sometimes but don't think that is necessarily a bad thing. All that means is that there is always room for future research to be done.

With that, have fun! This work is tough but it is also very rewarding when you see your final product. Congratulate yourself for making it all the way to the very end!

Introduction

There have been studies regarding relationships but not many specifically regarding consumer-brand relationships (Fournier 1998). Most of the studies that have been done focus on traditional branding and brand loyalty research (Fournier 1998). Traditional branding research includes things such as how to create a brand and features necessary to create a successful brand (Wheeler 2009). These values include vision, meaning, authenticity, differentiation and much more (Wheeler 200) but nothing that looks at the brand from the consumer's end. The few studies that have been done with a focus on the consumer look at very specific things such as consumer-brand relationships on social media platforms (Jain 2018) or how certain visual aids presented with brand names can seem more attractive to people lacking social interaction (Orth 2017). The most informative source I have found is a book for brand managers that *is* focused on the consumer side of brand management. However, this book is not primarily research based and does not provide any new or useful empirical research (Chertonay 2011). These studies are great and have given this community very useful information but none of it tells us how consumer-brand relationships are formed and maintained. Fournier's 1998 study looks at the brand as a partner in the eyes of the consumer and this study aims to continue on that research by introducing non-marketing related concepts and models.

The primary paper used as a reference for this study is Rusbult's "The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size" (1998). This paper was composed of three different studies looking to assess The Investment Model Scale's ability to measure the levels of constructs used to define person-to-person relationships. This model came from asking the questions, "how do people form relationships?" and "what makes someone stay in a relationship?". These are exactly the

questions I have regarding consumer-brand relationships. For the purposes of my own study, I primarily focused on the first two studies in this paper. The first study aimed to solidify the model scale's reliability and validity. This is important because I would be using this model scale to assess the potential constructs in consumer-brand relationships. Any results achieved would only be of importance if the model scale used to measure them were valid and reliable. The second study in this paper worked on improving the reliability of the version of the model scale used in study 1. An analysis of the results showed strong reliability throughout the model scale making it perfect to utilize in this new study.

A recent review by Ghani (2018) has taken a close look at the trends following consumer-brand relationship research since the 1980's. This review has also found a lack of empirical results. A review that is this recent and still not finding enough data for such an important topic is yet another reason why this survey is just the first step towards getting the information we need.

Method

Participants:

The participants for this study were originally going to be young college aged adults from Syracuse University. However, there was a setback trying to get the study onto the SONA website (used by Syracuse University researchers to find participants) and the parameters had to be expanded. Participants were now going to be young adults over the age of 18 from the United States. We then ran into problems of not being able to collect enough responses through the new desired platform, reddit. The questionnaire then had to be moved to a different platform. Amazon's Mechanical Turk proved to be very useful because responses were guaranteed unlike with reddit. This program however does not allow researchers to specify the restrictions on who can participate in a study. Because of this, I ended up with responses from adults over the age of 18 from all over the world, which was a much wider parameter than was originally intended. In the end there were a total of one hundred and thirty participants (n=130). Sixty-four participants (n=64) were male, sixty-five participants (n=65) were female, and one participant (n=1) declined to answer. Participants' ages ranged from 20 years of age to 70 years of age with a mean of 33 years of age. Participants' residence varied to many countries besides the United States.

Procedure

Participants in this study were all members of Amazon's Mechanical Turk. Amazon's Mechanical Turk is a program where users around the world can sign up as "workers". Those seeking the responses of the workers sign up as "requesters". Requesters then pay workers a certain amount (ranges from a few cents to a few dollars depending on the length of the task) once they have finished the required task. I first registered my account with Amazon and went

through the process of uploading my questionnaire and designating a desired amount of participants (n=200) and a certain stipend for their participation ($0.50). Once the survey went live any of Amazon's workers could find the survey and opt to participate in it. Workers would only be compensated if the survey was done to completion. Because of the change in parameters, some participants were not from the United States and did not fluently understand English. This forced me to eliminate seventy responses (n=70) from my intial data set of 200.

The remaining one hundred and thirty participants (n=130) each completed the survey and received their compensation at the end. The survey contained free response, multiple choice, and likert scales.

Questionnaire

This survey began by asking participants to list their three favorite brands and proceed to elaborate on their very first encounter with each brand. The goal of these questions was to get participants thinking about what initially drew them to these brands and their memories of these brands since then. These memories and feelings would assist them in answering the subsequent questions. Participants were then asked a series of questions to assess various constructs of a relationship. These constructs and general questions were taken and transformed to fit the consumer-brand relationship context from Rusbult's Investment Model Scale. Rusbult's Investment Model Scale is designed to measure commitment, satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives in terms of person-to-person relationships. The questions were re-worded so that they would make sense when discussing consumer-brand relationships. In addition to those constructs, loyalty was also assessed. The survey then ended with questions regarding demographics (See appendix A).

Predictions

My hypothesis was that we would find significant correlations between loyalty to each brand and all the constructs, commitment, investment, satisfaction, and quality of alternatives. I also hypothesized finding significant differences in reported levels of the constructs between the sexes and between the group of participants that have switched away from their previous favorite brands and the group that has not.

Results

Questionnaire Reliability

There were three items that assessed investment for each of the three brands. Cronbach's alphas for each assessment of investment in brands were .769, .781, and .821 respectively.

There were four items that assessed satisfaction for each of the three brands. Cronbach's alphas for each assessment of satisfaction in brands were .8, .789, and .829 respectively.

There were three items that assessed commitment for each of the three brands. Cronbach's alphas for each assessment of commitment in brands were .872, .862, and .858 respectively.

Brand 1

Results of the Pearson correlation for brand 1 showed a significant positive association between loyalty and investment ($r(130)= .368$, $p<.01$), loyalty and satisfaction ($r(129)= .426$, $p<.01$), loyalty and commitment ($r(130)= .605$, $p<.01$), investment and satisfaction ($r(129)= .313$, $p<.01$), investment and commitment ($r(130)= .419$, $p<.01$), and satisfaction and commitment ($r(129)= .623$, $p<.01$).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare levels of each construct (loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives) for male and female participants. There were no significant differences.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare levels of each construct (loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives) for participants who switched brands and participants who did not. There was a significant difference in levels of satisfaction for those who switched ($M= 5.13$, $SD= 1.2$) and those who did

not (M= 5.8, SD= 1); (t(127)= -3.409, p= .001). There was no significant difference in levels of loyalty, investment, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives. (See appendix B-1)

Brand 2

Results of the Pearson correlation for brand 2 showed a significant positive association between loyalty and investment (r(130)= .522, p<.01), loyalty and satisfaction (r(129)= .486, p<.01), loyalty and commitment (r(130)= .591, p<.01), investment and satisfaction (r(129)= .482, p<.01), investment and commitment (r(130)= .510, p<.01), investment and perceived quality of alternatives (r(129)= .187, p= .034) and satisfaction and commitment (r(129)= .708, p<.01).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare levels of each construct (loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives) for male and female participants. There were no significant differences.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare levels of each construct (loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives) for participants who switched brands and participants who did not. There was a significant difference in levels of investment for those who switched (M= 4.3, SD= 1.27) and those who did not (M= 5, SD= 1.33); (t(128)= -2.912, p= .004). There was a significant difference in levels of satisfaction for those who switched (M= 5.16, SD= .95) and those who did not (M= 5.64, SD= 1.03); (t(127)= -2.622, p= .01). There was a significant difference in levels of commitment for those who switched (M= 5.38, SD= 1.2) and those who did not (M=5.87, SD= 1.13); (t(128)= -2.268, p= .025). There was a significant difference in levels of loyalty for those who switched (M= 4.76, SD= 1.55) and those who did not (M= 5.69, SD= 1.31); (t(128)= -3.624,

p<.001).There was no significant difference in levels of perceived quality of alternatives. (See appendix B-2)

Brand 3

Results of the Pearson correlation for brand 3 showed a significant positive association between loyalty and investment (r(129)= .494, p<.01), loyalty and satisfaction (r(130)= .511, p<.01), loyalty and commitment (r(130)= .604, p<.01), investment and satisfaction (r(129)= .491, p<.01), investment and commitment (r(129)= .559, p<.01), and satisfaction and commitment (r(130)= .581, p<.01).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare levels of each construct (loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives) for male and female participants. There were no significant differences.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare levels of each construct (loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives) for participants who switched brands and participants who did not. There was a significant difference in levels of investment for those who switched (M= 4.31, SD= 1.4) and those who did not (M= 4.98, SD= 1.3); (t(127)= -2.742, p= .007). There was a significant difference in levels of satisfaction for those who switched (M= 5.02, SD= 1.17) and those who did not (M= 5.68, SD= 1.03); (t(128)= -3.35, p= .001). There was a significant difference in levels of commitment for those who switched (M= 5.36, SD= 1.28) and those who did not (M=5.92, SD= 1.07); (t(128)= -2.665, p= .009). There was a significant difference in levels of loyalty for those who switched (M= 4.83, SD= 1.72) and those who did not (M= 5.57, SD= 1.39); (t(128) = -2.683, p=

.008). There was no significant difference in levels of perceived quality of alternatives. (See appendix B-3).

Tables

Brand 1 - Correlations

	Loyalty	Investment	Satisfaction	Commitment	Qual. Alt.
Loyalty	1	.368**	.426**	.605**	.159
Investment	.368**	1	.313**	.419**	.128
Satisfaction	.426**	.313**	1	.623**	.003
Commitment	.605**	.419**	.623**	1	.114
Qual. Alt.	.159	.128	.003	.114	1

Brand 2 - Correlations

	Loyalty	Investment	Satisfaction	Commitment	Qual. Alt.
Loyalty	1	.522**	.486**	.591**	.170
Investment	.522**	1	.482**	.510**	.187*
Satisfaction	.486**	.482**	1	.708**	.073
Commitment	.591**	.510**	.708**	1	.136
Qual. Alt.	.170	.187*	.073	.136	1

Brand 3 - Correlations

	Loyalty	Investment	Satisfaction	Commitment	Qual. Alt.
Loyalty	1	.494**	.511**	.604**	.127
Investment	.494**	1	.491**	.559**	.089
Satisfaction	.511**	.491**	1	.581**	.029
Commitment	.604**	.559**	.581**	1	.051
Qual. Alt.	.127	.089	.029	.051	1

**significant at 0.01 level
*significant at 0.05 level

Data Analysis

Questionnaire Reliability

The results from the reliability testing show that the items used to assess investment, satisfaction and commitment were reliable. This means all items were testing the same individual construct.

Brand 1

Results from brand 1 correlations show that there are positive correlations between all constructs assessed except for perceived quality of alternatives. This means that as investment, satisfaction, or commitment to brand 1 increase, so does loyalty to brand 1.

Results from brand 1 t-tests show that there are no significant differences between men and women in levels of each construct for brand 1. There are significant differences however, between participants who switched from their favorite brand in the past and those who have not in levels of satisfaction in brand 1.

Brand 2

Results from brand 2 correlations show that there are positive correlations between all constructs assessed. This means that as the perceived quality of alternatives, investment, satisfaction, or commitment to brand 2 increases, so does loyalty to brand 2.

Results from brand 2 t-tests show that there are no significant differences between men and women in levels of each construct for brand 2. There are significant differences however, between participants who switched from their favorite brand in the past and those who have not in levels of loyalty, investment, satisfaction, and commitment to brand 2.

Brand 3

Results from brand 3 correlations show that there are positive correlations between all constructs assessed except for perceived quality of alternatives. This means that as investment, satisfaction, or commitment to brand 3 increases, so does loyalty to brand 3.

Results from brand 3 t-tests show that there are no significant differences between men and women in levels of each construct for brand 3. There are significant differences however, between participants who switched from their favorite brand in the past and those who have not in levels of loyalty investment, satisfaction, and commitment to brand 3.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to determine whether the constructs that apply to person-to-person relationships, particularly loyalty, investment, satisfaction, commitment, and perceived quality of alternatives, also apply to consumer-brand relationships. This was to be done by determining whether or not there were any interactions between these constructs when in a consumer-brand context.

For all three brands assessed, loyalty was positively correlated with investment, satisfaction, and commitment. These correlations support my original hypothesis that person-to-person relationship constructs can be extended to consumer-brand relationships. However, there was only one correlation with perceived quality of alternatives and it was positively correlated with investment in brand 2. I believe this to be a testing error due to its contradictory meaning; as investment in your favorite brand goes up so does your perceived quality of the alternatives. Exploring this would require further research. I believe the problem here to be with the fact that there was only one item on the survey used to assess perceived quality of alternatives. This is something that can be fixed in a future study.

Another result that supports my hypothesis was that there were differences in levels of certain constructs between participants who had switched from a previous brand before and those who had not. However, brand 1 results were very different from brand 2 and 3 results. Brand 1 only showed a difference in levels of satisfaction whereas brand 2 and 3 showed differences in levels of all constructs except perceived quality of alternatives. This might be an issue that needs to be looked at further or simply due to the types of brands that were being evaluated (food vs electronics brand). One result that came out contrary to my hypothesis was that there was no

difference in levels for these constructs between men and women. I do not believe that this result needs any further testing.

Weaknesses:

There were many weaknesses that I found in my study that I believe could be easily remedied for future studies. The first was the very initial mishap with finding participants. I believe results may have been a little stronger if participants had all been native English speakers. I believe that the language barrier as well as cultural differences regarding material objects played a role in the strength of the results from this study.

The second weakness was the reduced number of participants. After going through responses that clearly did not reflect an understanding of the questions being asked and eliminating them from the data set I was left with a little more than half of the participant responses that I had started with. From the beginning I was hoping to get more than 200 responses so having been left with only 130 was really a disappointment and an error that can be easily solved the next time around.

The third weakness was in the design of the survey itself. This was my very first survey that I had created all on my own from start to finish. I realized when looking through the data and running analyses that there were different questions I could have asked and certain item sets that could have benefited from more items in their set. I don't believe this harmed this particular survey in any way other than any assessments involving the perceived quality of alternatives. However, I do believe that fixing this survey could benefit the results that come next.

In the future I believe it would be valuable to fix the weaknesses noted above and attempt this study, or a similar one, again.

Conclusion

Brand managers are constantly looking for ways to strengthen their brands' image in the eyes of their consumers. The best way to do this is by creating strong consumer-brand relationships. Studies have been done in the past that look at person-to-person relationships as well as consumer-brand relationships but not many on how one type of relationship may be similar or dissimilar to the other. The goal of this study was to see how much of the constructs in person-to-person relationships apply to consumer-brand relationships. In order to do so I took Rusbult's Investment Model Scale and modified it to fit this context. The results of doing this lead to the conclusion that there are in fact similarities between person-to-person relationships and consumer-brand relationships. They may not have been completely the same, but there are enough similarities that merit further research.

Many of the similarities found in this study were similarities that were predicted in my hypothesis. These similarities included correlations between most of the constructs assessed in this survey. A couple of the differences I believe were due to survey construction error such as the lack of involvement of one of the constructs, perceived quality of alternatives. The other differences I believe were valid results of the study such as the lack of differences between men and women.

Based on these results I believe future research would be valuable in further assessing different types of relationships such as consumer-brand relationships. I believe brand managers will be able to use this information to further tailor their ideas towards creating stronger consumer-brand relationships.

Works Cited

Chernatony, L. D., McDonald, M., & Wallace, E. (2011). *Creating powerful brands*. Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research,24*(4), 343-353. doi:10.1086/209515

Ghani, N. H., & Tuhin, K. W. (2018). EVOLUTION OF CONSUMER BRAND RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal,17*(1), 1-9. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.libezproxy2.syr.edu/docview/2024349097?accountid=14214.

Jain, N. K., Kamboj, S., Kumar, V., & Rahman, Z. (2018). Examining consumer-brand relationships on social media platforms. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning,36*(1), 63-78. doi:10.1108/mip-05-2017-0088

Orth, U. R., Cornwell, T. B., Ohlhoff, J., & Naber, C. (2017). Seeing faces: The role of brand visual processing and social connection in brand liking. *European Journal of Social Psychology,47*(3), 348-361. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2245

Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships,5*(4), 357-387. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00177.x

Wheeler, A. (2009). *Designing brand identity: A complete guide to creating, building and maintaining strong brands*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Appendix

A. Questionnaire

Brand1: Please list your favorite brand (from now on referred to as Brand 1).

_____

Brand2: Please list your second favorite brand (from now on referred to as Brand 2).

_____

Brand3: Please list your third favorite brand (from now on referred to as Brand 3).

_____

IE1: Please describe your initial encounter with Brand 1 in detail.

_____

IE2: Please describe your initial encounter with Brand 2 in detail.

_____

IE3: Please describe your initial encounter with Brand 3 in detail.

_____

Loyalty: Please rate the degree to which you are loyal to each brand.

	Not loyal at all (1)	(2)	Somewhat loyal (3)	(4)	Quite loyal (5)	(6)	Extremely loyal (7)
Brand 1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 2 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 3 (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Inf1: Did your first encounter with Brand 1 influence your loyalty to it? If yes, how so?

_____

Inf2: Did your first encounter with Brand 2 influence your loyalty to it? If yes, how so?

_____

Inf3: Did your first encounter with Brand 3 influence your loyalty to it? If yes, how so?

_____

AdvFav: How often do you notice advertisements for your favorite brands?

	Never (1)	(2)	Sometimes (3)	(4)	Frequently (5)	(6)	All the time (7)
Brand 1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 2 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 3 (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

AdvComp: How often do you notice advertisements for competing brands?

	Never (1)	(2)	Sometimes (3)	(4)	Frequently (5)	(6)	All the time (7)
Brand 1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 2 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 3 (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

AdvCompApp: How appealing are the advertisements for competing brands?

	Not appealing at all (1)	(2)	Somewhat appealing (3)	(4)	Quite appealing (5)	(6)	Extremely appealing (7)
Brand 1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 2 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 3 (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

TempSw: How strong is your temptation to switch brands?

	Not strong at all (1)	(2)	Somewhat strong (3)	(4)	Quite strong (5)	(6)	Extremely strong (7)
Brand 1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 2 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 3 (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Switched: Have you ever switched brands?

	Yes (1)	No (2)
Brand 1 (1)	○	○
Brand 2 (2)	○	○
Brand 3 (3)	○	○

YSw1: Brand 1: Why or why not did you switch?

_____

YSw2: Brand 2: Why or why not did you switch?

_____

YSw3: Brand 3: Why or why not did you switch?

_____

RewardsProg: Do you participate in any rewards program with any of the brands you previously listed?

	Yes (1)	No (2)
Brand 1 (1)	○	○
Brand 2 (2)	○	○
Brand 3 (3)	○	○

Invest1: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your investment in Brand 1.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I have invested a substantial amount of time in this brand. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I have invested a substantial amount of money into this brand. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This brand is a part of me. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Invest2: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your investment in Brand 2.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly Agree (7)
I have invested a substantial amount of time in this brand. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I have invested a substantial amount of money into this brand. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This brand is a part of me. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Invest3: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your investment in Brand 3.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
I have invested a substantial amount of time in this brand. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I have invested a substantial amount of money into this brand. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This brand is a part of me. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Satisfaction1: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your satisfaction with Brand 1.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
I am satisfied with the quality of Brand 1 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am satisfied with the price of Brand 1 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 1 has a good method of receiving customer feedback (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
There is not much Brand 1 could do to improve my satisfaction (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Satisfaction2: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your satisfaction with Brand 2.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
I am satisfied with the quality of Brand 2 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am satisfied with the price of Brand 2 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 2 has a good method of receiving customer feedback (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
There is not much Brand 2 could do to improve my satisfaction (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Satisfaction3: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your satisfaction with Brand 3.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
I am satisfied with the quality of Brand 3 (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am satisfied with the price of Brand 3 (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brand 3 has a good method of receiving customer feedback (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
There is not much Brand 3 could do to improve my satisfaction (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Commitment1: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your commitment to Brand 1.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
I see myself continuing to purchase items from this brand for a long time. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel commitment to this brand. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would be upset if this brand went out of business. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Commitment2: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your commitment to Brand 2.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
I see myself continuing to purchase items from this brand for a long time. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel commitment to this brand. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would be upset if this brand went out of business. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Commitment3: Please rate the degree to which the following statements reflect your commitment to Brand 3.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	Disagree (3)	(4)	Agree (5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
I see myself continuing to purchase items from this brand for a long time. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel commitment to this brand. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would be upset if this brand went out of business. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Age: What is your current age (in years)?

_____

Sex: What is your biological sex?

- ○ Male (1)
- ○ Female (2)
- ○ Prefer not to answer (3)

YrlyIncome: What is your average yearly income (in US dollars)?

_____

B. T – Tests

B-1. Sex

Group Statistics

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AdvCompApp_1	1.00	64	4.1250	1.78619	.22327
	2.00	65	3.8769	1.77225	.21982
INV 1	1.00	64	5.344	1.3180	.1647
	2.00	65	5.023	1.3677	.1696
SAT1	1.00	63	5.645502646	1.220803126	.1538067367
	2.00	65	5.500000000	1.000000000	.1240347346
COM1	1.00	64	5.916666667	1.088662108	.1360827635
	2.00	65	6.179487179	1.013925476	.1257619774
Loyalty_1	1.00	64	5.5938	1.51939	.18992
	2.00	65	5.8923	1.26396	.15678

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
AdvCompApp_1	Equal variances assumed	.016	.901	.792	127	.430
	Equal variances not assumed			.792	126.930	.430
INV 1	Equal variances assumed	.127	.722	1.356	127	.178
	Equal variances not assumed			1.356	126.942	.177
SAT1	Equal variances assumed	2.553	.113	.739	126	.461
	Equal variances not assumed			.736	119.785	.463
COM1	Equal variances assumed	.238	.626	-1.419	127	.158
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.418	126.055	.159
Loyalty_1	Equal variances assumed	2.616	.108	-1.214	127	.227
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.212	122.238	.228

B-1. Switch

Group Statistics

	Switched_1	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AdvCompApp_1	1.00	43	3.8837	1.65053	.25170
	2.00	87	4.0460	1.83574	.19681
INV 1	1.00	43	5.395	1.1316	.1726
	2.00	87	5.098	1.4444	.1549
SAT1	1.00	43	5.127906977	1.198178296	.1827204772
	2.00	86	5.810077519	1.002745509	.1081288291
COM1	1.00	43	5.875968992	1.010587486	.1541131469
	2.00	87	6.145593870	1.070754219	.1147969020
Loyalty_1	1.00	43	5.4651	1.56371	.23846
	2.00	87	5.8966	1.29430	.13876

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
AdvCompApp_1	Equal variances assumed	1.901	.170	-.490	128	.625
	Equal variances not assumed			-.508	92.222	.613
INV 1	Equal variances assumed	1.621	.205	1.183	128	.239
	Equal variances not assumed			1.284	103.958	.202
SAT1	Equal variances assumed	1.312	.254	-3.409	127	.001
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.213	72.192	.002
COM1	Equal variances assumed	.007	.933	-1.376	128	.171
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.403	88.267	.164
Loyalty_1	Equal variances assumed	2.240	.137	-1.667	128	.098
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.564	71.269	.122

B-2. Sex

Group Statistics

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AdvCompApp_2	1.00	63	4.1587	1.82462	.22988
	2.00	65	3.7846	1.73649	.21538
INV2	1.00	64	4.869791667	1.389831030	.1737288787
	2.00	65	4.610256410	1.282317280	.1590518835
SAT2	1.00	64	5.5117	1.07868	.13484
	2.00	64	5.4023	.96734	.12092
COM2	1.00	64	5.614583333	1.114627373	.1393284216
	2.00	65	5.753846154	1.233610502	.1530105513
Loyalty_2	1.00	64	5.2344	1.48796	.18600
	2.00	65	5.4615	1.43698	.17824

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
AdvCompApp_2	Equal variances assumed	.418	.519	1.189	126	.237
	Equal variances not assumed			1.188	125.180	.237
INV2	Equal variances assumed	.343	.559	1.103	127	.272
	Equal variances not assumed			1.102	125.842	.273
SAT2	Equal variances assumed	1.917	.169	.604	126	.547
	Equal variances not assumed			.604	124.534	.547
COM2	Equal variances assumed	1.336	.250	-.672	127	.503
	Equal variances not assumed			-.673	126.078	.502
Loyalty_2	Equal variances assumed	.001	.975	-.882	127	.379
	Equal variances not assumed			-.882	126.677	.380

B-2. Switch

Group Statistics

	Switched_2	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AdvCompApp_2	1.00	45	3.9556	1.66454	.24814
	2.00	84	3.9643	1.84617	.20143
INV2	1.00	46	4.304347826	1.272357755	.1875989163
	2.00	84	5.003968254	1.329808642	.1450940181
SAT2	1.00	46	5.1576	.95067	.14017
	2.00	83	5.6416	1.03240	.11332
COM2	1.00	46	5.384057971	1.204861329	.1776471112
	2.00	84	5.865079365	1.129048180	.1231892559
Loyalty_2	1.00	46	4.7609	1.55184	.22881
	2.00	84	5.6905	1.30777	.14269

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
AdvCompApp_2	Equal variances assumed	1.327	.251	-.026	127	.979
	Equal variances not assumed			-.027	98.438	.978
INV2	Equal variances assumed	.167	.683	-2.912	128	.004
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.950	96.264	.004
SAT2	Equal variances assumed	1.114	.293	-2.622	127	.010
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.685	99.679	.008
COM2	Equal variances assumed	.082	.775	-2.268	128	.025
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.225	87.690	.029
Loyalty_2	Equal variances assumed	1.620	.205	-3.624	128	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.447	80.229	.001

B-3. Sex

Group Statistics

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AdvCompApp_3	1.00	64	4.2656	1.89605	.23701
	2.00	65	3.6923	1.72231	.21363
INV3	1.00	64	4.807291667	1.361870132	.1702337665
	2.00	64	4.635416667	1.369507629	.1711884536
SAT3	1.00	64	5.414062500	1.159175567	.1448969459
	2.00	65	5.425641026	1.093613392	.1356460468
COM3	1.00	64	5.666666667	1.122167215	.1402709019
	2.00	65	5.738461538	1.236724375	.1533967796
Loyalty_3	1.00	64	5.4219	1.47793	.18474
	2.00	65	5.1538	1.62241	.20124

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
AdvCompApp_3	Equal variances assumed	.640	.425	1.798	127	.075
	Equal variances not assumed			1.797	125.444	.075
INV3	Equal variances assumed	.039	.844	.712	126	.478
	Equal variances not assumed			.712	125.996	.478
SAT3	Equal variances assumed	.024	.876	-.058	127	.954
	Equal variances not assumed			-.058	126.313	.954
COM3	Equal variances assumed	1.346	.248	-.345	127	.731
	Equal variances not assumed			-.345	126.165	.730
Loyalty_3	Equal variances assumed	1.285	.259	.980	127	.329
	Equal variances not assumed			.981	126.243	.328

B-3. Switch

Group Statistics

	Switched_3	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AdvCompApp_3	1.00	48	4.0208	1.65657	.23911
	2.00	82	3.9390	1.92031	.21206
INV3	1.00	47	4.312056738	1.402902883	.2046344171
	2.00	82	4.983739837	1.300946621	.1436655207
SAT3	1.00	48	5.015625000	1.174197610	.1694808265
	2.00	82	5.675813008	1.028487084	.1135773982
COM3	1.00	48	5.361111111	1.275025301	.1840340503
	2.00	82	5.918699187	1.072874139	.1184791284
Loyalty_3	1.00	48	4.8333	1.71766	.24792
	2.00	82	5.5732	1.38805	.15328

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
AdvCompApp_3	Equal variances assumed	1.529	.218	.246	128	.806
	Equal variances not assumed			.256	110.389	.798
INV3	Equal variances assumed	.305	.582	-2.742	127	.007
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.686	90.091	.009
SAT3	Equal variances assumed	.106	.746	-3.350	128	.001
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.236	88.355	.002
COM3	Equal variances assumed	3.276	.073	-2.665	128	.009
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.548	85.510	.013
Loyalty_3	Equal variances assumed	3.598	.060	-2.683	128	.008
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.538	82.782	.013