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ABSTRACT

Consumers’ long-term relationships with a brand are crucial drivers of a brand’s sustainable competitive advantage. Taking a differentiated view on brand relationship quality (BRQ), the authors examine the brand performance implications of its emotional and cognitive component on word-of-mouth communication, willingness to pay a price premium, and consideration set size, which in turn increase the customer’s share of wallet and the revenue per customer. Based on a sample of real customers, the empirical study shows that emotional BRQ is a strong predictor of consumers’ loyalty behavior (in terms of a reduced consideration of competitive brands, a higher willingness to pay a price premium, and finally a higher revenue), while cognitive BRQ more strongly influences the consumers’ word-of-mouth.
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The relationships consumers develop with brands have become a research topic of increasing interest in the marketing literature (e.g., Aggarwal, 2004; Fournier, 1998). It has been acknowledged that consumers may attach meaning and feeling to brands, and that consumers differ not only in how they perceive and evaluate brands but also in how they relate to brands (e.g., Albert, Merunka, and Valette-Florence, 2008; Fajer and Schouten, 1995; Monga, 2002).

In today’s highly competitive business environment strong and long-lasting consumer-brand relations play a key role for a brand’s sustainable competitive advantage (Srivastava, Fahey, and Christensen, 2001). Thus, researchers and practitioners alike are highly interested in the prediction and control of the maintenance of consumer-brand relationships. A focus of interest has been on the quality of these relationships (so-called brand relationship quality (BRQ); e.g., Fournier, 1994; 1998). BRQ is defined as a “customer-based indicator of the strength and depth of the person-brand relationship” (Fournier, 1994, p. 124). Thus, BRQ is perceived by the consumer and reflected in his thoughts, feelings, and behaviors towards a brand (Fournier, 1994). Prior research has usually described and operationalized brand relationship quality as a higher-order construct with different interrelated relationship facets such as commitment, intimacy, and love (e.g., Fournier, 1994; 1998).

We argue that BRQ includes a cognitive and an emotional component. The cognitive component of BRQ results from an evaluative judgment based on cognitive beliefs and evaluations of the brand and its performance. Emotional BRQ, on the other hand, is reflected in the emotional feelings towards the brand and the personal connection to the brand. The differentiation between emotion and cognition is rooted in the classical distinction between feeling and knowing as two facets of human experience (Hilgard, 1980) and has been applied in different academic fields. In attitude research, for example, it has been stated that attitudes consist of affective and cognitive dimensions (e.g., Batra and Ahtola, 1990; Breckler and Wiggins, 1989; Crites, Fabrigar, and Petty, 1994). Furthermore, social psychologists generally agree that interpersonal relationships comprise cognitive and emotional components (e.g., Berscheid and Peplau, 2002; Gabriel and Gardner, 2004).

The explicit distinction between emotional and cognitive components of BRQ is of high relevance since prior research in psychology has argued that affect (i.e., feelings) and cognition (i.e., beliefs) have distinct influences on human behavior (Millar and Tesser, 1986; Wilson and Dunn, 1986). Consequently, we also expect the emotional and cognitive components of BRQ to have different consequences on consumer behavior and brand performance. To the best of our knowledge, the implications of cognitive versus emotional components of BRQ on brand performance have not yet been empirically examined.

In our study, we address this research opportunity. First, we conceptually discuss and empirically examine the emotional versus cognitive components of BRQ. Second, we analyze the brand performance implications of these components among real customers. Specifically, our objective is to examine the effects of emotional versus cognitive BRQ on word-of-mouth communication, consumers’ willingness to pay a price premium, consideration set size, share of wallet and revenue per customer.

**CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

In our study we focus on two components of BRQ: a cognitive and an emotional component. Together, these two components cover the most important aspects of relationship quality discussed in social psychology (Fletcher, Simpson, and Thomas, 2000).

The first component results from the cognitive evaluation of a brand and its performance. We base this *cognitive component* of BRQ on the conceptualization of relationship quality in
the relationship marketing field, where satisfaction and trust are often considered as the main dimensions of relationship quality (e.g., Crosby, Evans, and Cowles, 1990). Satisfaction and trust are both constructs that represent an overall evaluation about a relationship partner (Selnes, 1998). Together, trust and satisfaction combine to a relationship quality component that is characterized by a high confidence in the quality and reliability of the brand. Trust arises from an accumulated knowledge that allows a person to make confident predictions regarding the likelihood that a relationship partner will meet his obligations (Johnson and Grayson, 2005). In a branding context brand trust represents “the willingness (…) to rely on the ability of the brand to perform its stated function” (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001, p. 82) and reflects the consumer’s expectation of the brand’s competence (Blomqvist, 1997). Satisfaction arises from meeting or exceeding performance expectations (e.g., Fournier and Mick, 1999; Oliver, 1993). In a branding context, satisfaction can be defined as an overall evaluation of a brand based on all experiences with that brand over time (see also Garbarino and Johnson, 1999).

The second component of BRQ results from the emotional connection that a consumer forms to a brand. We base this emotional component of BRQ on theories of love in social psychology (e.g., Sternberg, 1986). Love can be defined as an emotion evoked in relation to a particular other (Shaver, Morgan, and Wu, 1996). It seems clear that emotion-laden relationships between consumers and brands cannot be regarded as completely analogues to the forms of interpersonal love. However, in consumer behavior research, it is argued that love is a common consumption-related emotion (Richins, 1997; Kleine, Schultz, and Allen, 1995), and that consumers may have “love-like” feelings for brands (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). According to the triangular theory of love (Sternberg, 1986), love includes three components: passion, intimacy, and commitment. In line with Shimp and Madden (1988), who have adopted Sternberg’s theory to the study of consumer-object relations, we argue that these love components may also characterize strong, emotional consumer-brand relationships. In the context of brands, passion reflects a state of intense longing for the brand and a feeling of incompleteness when separated from the brand (Fournier, 1994). Consistent with Sternberg’s definition of intimacy in an interpersonal context (1986), we define intimacy as a feeling of closeness and connectedness to a brand. In a brand context intimacy may be consistent with the term liking and refers to feelings of attachment to a brand (Shimp and Madden, 1988). Finally, commitment reflects the “internal forces that bind a partner to a relationship” (Fournier, 1994, p. 131) and the desire to maintain the brand relationship over time (see also Sternberg, 1986).

Our first set of hypotheses relates to the performance implications of the two components of BRQ. In these hypotheses, we focus on the general effects and the relative impact of cognitive and emotional BRQ on different behavioral intentions of the consumer (i.e., willingness to pay a price premium, consideration set size, and word-of-mouth), which in turn influence behavioral outcomes (i.e., share of wallet), and finally economic outcomes (i.e., revenue per customer).

An important outcome variable of BRQ is the consumer’s willingness to pay a price premium (Aaker, 1996). Willingness to pay a price premium is defined as the excess price a consumer is willing to pay for a brand over comparable products (e.g., Netemeyer et al., 2004). In general, the willingness to pay a price premium is based on the extent a consumer associates value with a brand (Aaker, 1996; Park and Srinivasan, 1994). Cognitive BRQ is characterized by confidence in the quality and reliability of the brand and reflects the expectation of the consumer that the brand will cause a positive outcome in terms of brand performance (i.e., functional benefit). Thus, the perceived risk associated with choosing such a brand is smaller than the perceived risk associated with choosing another less familiar and less trusted brand (Selnes, 1998). This reduction of the perceived purchase risk may be a benefit for which a consumer is willing to pay a higher price. However, a price premium is not only paid for functional benefits
(associated with cognitive BRQ) but also for the symbolic and emotional benefits (associated with emotional BRQ) of a brand (Sethuraman, 2000). Research in social psychology states that individuals who are strongly emotionally attached to someone, are more likely to invest in and make sacrifices for that person (Bowlby, 1980; Collins and Feeney, 2000). Transferred into a branding context, consumers’ emotional relationship to a brand should influence their willingness to make financial sacrifices (i.e., to pay a price premium) in order to obtain the brand and the associated emotional benefits (Thomson, MacInnis, and Park, 2005). Thus, we hypothesize:

**H1a: Cognitive BRQ has a positive effect on the willingness to pay a price premium.**

**H1b: Emotional BRQ has a positive effect on the willingness to pay a price premium.**

Due to intense competition in many industries and the resulting improvements in production technology and product quality, the functional differences between many brands are often rather small. Consequently, consumers may have a high cognitive BRQ (which is derived from the perceived quality and expected performance of a brand; Sweeney and Soutar, 2001) with several competitive brands at the same time, so that the level of their cognitive BRQ does not vary strongly across these competitive products and brands. Against this background, it is worthwhile mentioning that general consumer research has acknowledged the importance of also considering the emotional aspects of consumer behavior (e.g., Burke and Edell, 1989; Cohen and Areni, 1991). More specifically, the emotional aspects and benefits of brands may play a more prominent role for consumer behavior than the functional brand attributes and benefits (e.g., Biel, 1993). These emotional benefits are derived from the feelings or affective states the brand generates (Sweeney and Soutar, 2001) and reflect the emotional component of BRQ. In social psychology, it is stated that a person immersed in a highly emotional relationship perceives the relationship partner as differentiated and important for him (Hazan and Shaver, 1994). In a branding context, emotional brand benefits associated with emotional BRQ have the potential to strongly differentiate one brand from another – especially, since consumers form a strong emotional relationship (i.e., high emotional BRQ) usually with only a limited number of brands (Thomson, MacInnis, and Park, 2005). These brands tend to be of high personal relevance for the consumer and are therefore perceived as different from other (emotionally less relevant) brands. The resulting strong and unique brand associations are an important driver of consumers’ willingness to pay a price premium (Keller, 1993). Thus, we hypothesize:

**H1c: Emotional BRQ has a stronger effect on the consumer’s willingness to pay a price premium than cognitive BRQ.**

In order to simplify their decision process, consumers generally do not consider all available brands in a product category and limit the number of brands they would consider purchasing to a smaller subset, the so-called consideration set (e.g., Roberts and Lattin, 1997). The size of the consideration set may be affected by relationship quality in two ways. First, if the consumer shows a high cognitive BRQ with regard to a specific brand, competitive brands have to reach that positive level of cognitive evaluation in order to be considered as suitable alternatives (Raju and Unnava, 2005). Several brands with significantly lower perceived functional benefits may fail to come close to this level, and thus may not be included in the consideration set. Second, consumers develop an intense emotional attachment (i.e., love) to only a small number of brands (Thomson, MacInnis, and Park, 2005). A brand the consumer is highly emotionally attached to is, therefore, perceived as superior and irreplaceable, which reduces the temptation of the consumer to consider and try competitive brands (Fournier, 1994). Hence, we hypothesize:

**H2a: Cognitive BRQ has a negative effect on the consideration set size.**

**H2b: Emotional BRQ has a negative effect on the consideration set size.**
Consumers often use screening criteria to evaluate and reduce the number of alternative brands that will ultimately be considered buying. A simple screening rule relies on memory accessibility (Chakravarti and Janiszewski, 2003). In general, emotional evaluations are faster than cognitive evaluations, suggesting that they are more accessible in memory than evaluative information (e.g., Verplanken, Hofstee, and Janssen, 1998). Erevelles (1992; 1998), for example, showed that the affective components of attitude positively influence the accessibility and recall of brands. Thus, a brand a consumer is emotionally attached to may be more salient in memory, what in turn inhibits the recall of other brands in the same product category (recall inhibition effect; Rundus, 1973). The retrieval of a brand that is highly evaluated on the cognitive BRQ component, however, involves an elaborate, unit integrative process. Such a brand is less likely to be as readily prominent or as easily activated in memory as a brand with a dominant emotional component that involves more direct and stronger associations between the product category and the specific brand (Everelles and Horton, 1998). The stronger these associations are, the more accessible and salient the brand is in consumer’s memory relative to other brands in the same product category. Consequently, we propose the following hypothesis:

**H2c: Emotional BRQ has a stronger effect on consideration set size than cognitive BRQ.**

Generating positive word-of-mouth (WOM), which refers to “informal communications directed at other consumers about the ownership, usage, or characteristics of particular goods and services and/or their sellers” (Westbrook, 1987, p. 261), has become an important tool for marketers (Liu, 2006). It has been shown that consumers provide WOM to praise brands with which they have a strong relationship (see also Brown et al., 2005). Consequently, BRQ should be an important driver of positive word-of-mouth communication. There are a number of studies supporting the notion that favorable WOM is affected by satisfaction (e.g., Heitmann, Lehmann, and Herrmann, 2007; Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, and Gremler, 2002; Wangenheim and Bayón, 2007) and trust (e.g., Garbarino and Johnson, 1999; Gremler, Gwinner, and Brown, 2001; Ranaweera and Prabhu, 2003). Thus, cognitive BRQ consisting of satisfaction and trust should have a positive effect on consumers’ WOM. Prior research has also shown that salient affective responses to consumption objects (Westbrook, 1987) and particularly the love consumers feel towards a brand (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006) stimulate consumers’ positive WOM communication. Emotional brand relationships are important for the consumer’s identity (Fournier, 1998) since the people and the things that consumers love strongly influence their sense of who they are (Ahuvia, 2005; Belk, 1988). By recommending the brand to which he feels emotionally attached to (i.e., high emotional BRQ) to other people, a consumer can make a statement about himself and construct his identity (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). Based on these considerations, we hypothesize:

**H3a: Cognitive BRQ has a positive effect on positive word-of-mouth.**  
**H3b: Emotional BRQ has a positive effect on positive word-of-mouth.**

When comparing the strength of H3a versus H3b, we argue that consumers tell other persons more about objective and rational brand-related facts than about their emotional relationship with a brand. This argument is supported by the observation, that when recommending a brand to other persons, consumers tend to talk explicitly about the characteristics of the brand’s products and services (Westbrook, 1987). Here, consumers base their recommendations and information they give to other consumers mostly on their experiences with the brand and the specific functional attributes and benefits the brand provides. This recommendation behavior of consumers underlines the importance of cognitive BRQ for positive WOM. Compared to the cognitive component of BRQ, emotional BRQ is a more holistic concept and does not provide the consumer with objective arguments that can be used to convince other consumers. Fur-
thermore, emotional BRQ reflects the consumer’s personal feelings towards a brand, and the corresponding information may be communicated to only a few persons (i.e., emotional self-disclosure; Laurenceau, Barrett, and Pietromonaco, 1998). Thus, we hypothesize:

H3c: Cognitive BRQ has a stronger effect on positive word-of-mouth than emotional BRQ.

The consumer’s willingness to pay a price premium, the reduction of the consideration set size, and the positive word-of-mouth communication are behavioral intentions that signal the motivation to strengthen the relationship with a brand by behaving in a loyal manner. An important measure of behavioral loyalty to a brand is the customer’s share of purchase in the product category, the so-called share of wallet (e.g., Bowman, Farley, and Schmittlein, 2000; Bowman and Narayandas, 2001), which reflects the percentage of money spent on a specific brand relative to the money spent for other brands in the according product category (Cool et al., 2007). A consumer who is willing to pay a price premium for the respective brand may also buy the corresponding brand, if other brands were cheaper, what consistently leads to a higher share of wallet of the brand with the respective consumer. Furthermore, the higher the number of brands a consumer considers buying (i.e., large consideration set size), the more other brands he may also really buy. Thus, the amount of money he spends on this product category will be divided through a higher number of possible brands, what reduces his share of wallet with regard to the respective brand. Finally, in line with cognitive consistency theory (Festinger, 1957), it seems reasonable that consumers who recommend a brand to others will also buy this brand for themselves. Reichheld (2003), for example, argues that recommend intention is a very good metric at predicting consumers’ purchasing behavior. Consequently, we hypothesize the following:

H4: Willingness to pay a price premium has a positive effect on share of wallet.

H5: Consideration set size has a negative effect on share of wallet.

H6: Positive word-of-mouth has a positive effect on share of wallet.

Per definition it is plausible that the more a consumer buys a specific brand relative to other brands in the corresponding product category (i.e., high share of wallet for this specific brand), the higher is the revenue of this consumer for the respective brand. This is in line with Anderson and Mittal (2000, p. 116) who state that “retained customers are a revenue-producing asset for the firm”. Thus, we hypothesize:

H7: Share of wallet has a positive effect on revenue per customer.

METHOD

We collected our data using an online survey, and sent out 5000 invitation emails to members of the frequent flyer program of a large European airline. There are several arguments that speak for a brand in the airline industry as a research object. First, given the high competition in the service sector, and especially in the airline industry, long-term consumer relationships may be particularly important for service brands (e.g., Chang and Chieng, 2006). However, only few studies have analyzed brand relationship quality in the service domain (e.g., Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel, 2004; Chang and Chieng, 2006). Another essential criterion in selecting this product category was that the brand should have a customer relationship management (CRM) program with accessible customer data, since we wanted to analyze the brand relationship of real customers and link the customers responses to real objective measures (such as revenue of the individual customer). Furthermore, this industry context seems appropriate be-
cause a variety of different consumers travel by air, allowing for a diversified consumer sample and hence a higher generalizability with regard to consumers.

The online questionnaire was filled out by 631 male and female customers between 25 and 65 years. All items used for our measurement scales were largely based on empirically validated scales from prior studies and were measured – with few exceptions (i.e., consideration set size, share of wallet, and revenue per customer) – with 7-point-Likert-scales anchored by ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘strongly agree’ (see the Appendix for all scales and individual items). Revenue (per customer) represents an objective measure: we obtained individual revenue information from the airline’s database.

To assess measure reliability and validity of our constructs, we ran confirmatory factor analyses for each factor individually using AMOS 17.0. The corresponding results are reported in the Appendix. Overall, these results indicate good psychometric properties for all constructs (based on the recommendations of Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Bagozzi and Yi, 1988; Nunnally, 1978). Finally, we assessed discriminant validity on the basis of the criterion that Fornell and Larcker (1981) propose. The results indicated that there are no problems with respect to discriminant validity.

RESULTS

Based on our conceptual discussion, we tested a two-factor model of BRQ (i.e., cognitive and emotional component BRQ), where the five dimensions (satisfaction, trust, commitment, passion, intimacy/connectedness) load on two second-order factors. The two-factor model provided a good fit: RMSEA = .069, SRMR = .030, NFI = .968, NNFI = .968, and CFI = .976. Evidence of discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker 1981) between the two components of BRQ was also obtained: the average variance extracted (cognitive BRQ = .78, emotional BRQ = .75) exceeded the squared correlation between the two components (.72). The two-factor model of BRQ showed also significant improvements in fit over a one-factor model, where all five dimensions of BRQ load on only one second-order factor (chi-square difference was significant: Δχ² = 78.5; p < .01).

Using AMOS 17.0 we modeled the structural relationships posited by our conceptual framework shown in Figure 1, and calculated measures of global fit. All common criteria of overall fit were met in our confirmatory factor analysis basic model (RMSEA = .064, SRMR = .038, NFI = .940, NNFI = .947, and CFI = .956.), which suggests that our model acceptably fits the empirical data (e.g., Bagozzi and Yi, 1988, Browne and Cudeck, 1993).

In Figure 1, we report the resulting parameter estimates, which are used to test H1 to H7. Supporting hypotheses H1a and H1b, the strength of both cognitive and emotional BRQ positively affect the consumer’s willingness to pay a price premium (cognitive BRQ γ = .20; p < .05; emotional BRQ γ = .67; p < .01). As postulated in hypothesis H1c, the impact of emotional BRQ on the willingness to pay a price premium is higher than the effect of cognitive BRQ (Δχ² = 3.73; p < .1). Considering the impact of BRQ on consideration set size, we found no significant effect of cognitive BRQ on consideration set size (γ = .02; n.s.). Thus, we need to reject H2a. However, emotional BRQ has a strong negative effect on the consideration set size (γ = .41; p < .01), supporting H2b. Furthermore, emotional BRQ has a significantly higher effect on consideration set size than cognitive BRQ (Δχ² = 4.09; p < .05), what leads us to the confirmation of H2c. Our results provide also strong empirical evidence for hypotheses H3a and H3b: BRQ has a significant positive effect on WOM (cognitive BRQ γ = .74; p < .01; emotional BRQ γ = .22; p < .01). As proposed in hypothesis H3c, cognitive BRQ has a significantly stronger effect on WOM than emotional BRQ (Δχ² = 21.07; p < .01). Finally, share of wallet is influenced by the willingness to pay a price premium (β = .32; p < .01), by the considera-
tion set size ($\beta = -.11; p < .01$), and by WOM ($\beta = .14; p < .1$). Share of wallet in turn positively affects the revenue per customer ($\beta = .24; p < .01$). Thus, hypotheses H4 – H7 are supported.

In addition to the analyses of the proposed hypotheses, we calculated the total effect of cognitive and emotional BRQ on revenue by summing up the indirect effects of cognitive and emotional BRQ on revenue via the mediators of our research model (consistent with the procedure of Preacher and Hayes 2008). The results indicate that emotional BRQ has a slightly higher total indirect effect on revenue than the cognitive BRQ. Thus, our results reveal that the emotional component of BRQ is a stronger overall predictor of brand performance.

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

In our study, we were able to show that BRQ has different implications for brand performance – depending on which component of BRQ is taken into consideration (cognitive versus emotional BRQ). Our findings suggest that the distinction between these two components has important consequences for brand performance implications. Future research on BRQ should, therefore, also consider the emotional versus cognitive component of BRQ in order to better understand the effects of BRQ. Since our study examined a single industry setting, an avenue of future research would be to replicate our findings within other product categories (e.g., hedonic versus utilitarian products).

Due to its impact on brand performance, BRQ has also important implications for brand management. In analyzing real customers of a company and their actual turnover, we were able to show that BRQ really pays off, also in terms of economic performance implications. Overall, the results show that emotional BRQ is a stronger predictor of consumers’ loyalty behavior (in terms of a reduced consideration of competitive brands, a higher willingness to pay a price premium for the respective brand, and finally a higher revenue) than cognitive BRQ. Cognitive BRQ, however, was found to strongly influence the consumers’ word-of-mouth. Thus, while the emotional relationship quality mainly increases the loyalty behavior of existing customers, cognitive BRQ helps to attract new customers via positive word-of-mouth communication of existing customers. Both the retention of existing customers and the attraction of new customers are crucial drivers for the sustainable future of a brand (e.g., Bruhn, 2003). Marketing managers should, therefore, try to positively influence both emotional and cognitive BRQ of their customers. However, since our results revealed that the emotional component of BRQ is a slightly stronger overall predictor of brand performance, it may pay off to place more emphasis on the emotional component of a consumer-brand relationship, which supports the call for emotional branding as a central cornerstone of differentiation and sustainable competitive advantage (e.g., Atkin, 2004; Zaltman, 2003). Therefore, besides providing high quality and functional benefits, it may pay off for companies to emphasize and differentiate the emotional aspects of their brands in order to build and maintain consumer-brand relationships (Kim, Lee, and Lee, 2005).
FIGURE 1
RESULTS OF HYPOTHESES TESTING

*P ≤ .1; **P ≤ .05; ***P ≤ .01
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## APPENDIX
### MEASUREMENT SCALES AND PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Values (S.D.)</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Factor Reliability</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive BRQ</strong></td>
<td>- Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.95 (1.25)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trust</td>
<td>5.49 (1.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional BRQ</strong></td>
<td>- Commitment</td>
<td>4.31 (1.48)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intimacy/Closeness</td>
<td>4.50 (1.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Passion</td>
<td>3.06 (1.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>(based on Oliver, 1993; Aaker, Fournier, and Brasel, 2004)</td>
<td>5.26 (1.26)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I am (consistently) satisfied with my decision to fly with X.</td>
<td>4.75 (1.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I am completely satisfied with X.</td>
<td>4.85 (1.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- X offers exactly what I expect from an airline company.</td>
<td>4.75 (1.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td>(based on Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001)</td>
<td>5.56 (1.11)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I rely on X.</td>
<td>5.28 (1.28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- X is an honest brand.</td>
<td>5.65 (1.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td>(based on Fournier, 1994)</td>
<td>4.70 (1.48)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I feel very loyal to X.</td>
<td>4.13 (1.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- X can count on me to always be there.</td>
<td>4.09 (1.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intimacy/Closeness</strong></td>
<td>(based on Fournier, 1994)</td>
<td>4.68 (1.75)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Compared to other airlines, I feel strongly connected to X.</td>
<td>4.32 (1.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passion</strong></td>
<td>(based on Fournier, 1994)</td>
<td>3.31 (1.82)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There are times when I really long to fly with X again.</td>
<td>2.82 (1.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I feel like something’s missing when I haven't flown with X for awhile.</td>
<td>3.61 (1.78)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to Pay a Price Premium</strong></td>
<td>(based on Netemeyer et al., 2004)</td>
<td>3.61 (1.78)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The price of X would have to go up quite a bit before I would switch to another airline brand.</td>
<td>2.97 (1.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consideration Set Size</strong></td>
<td>(based on Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006; Maxham, 2001)</td>
<td>2.64 (1.08)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many other airlines would you consider booking/flying? (1) I would consider no other airline than X. (2) I would consider 1-3 other airlines. (3) I would consider 4-6 other airlines. (4) I would consider more than 6 other airlines. (5) I would consider all possible airlines.</td>
<td>4.44 (1.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I would recommend X to many people.</td>
<td>4.92 (1.53)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I would recommend X to my friends.</td>
<td>4.60 (1.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Word-of-Mouth</strong></td>
<td>(based on Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006; Maxham, 2001)</td>
<td>4.44 (1.78)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I have recommended X to many people.</td>
<td>4.92 (1.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I would recommend X to my friends.</td>
<td>4.60 (1.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If my friends were planning an air travel, I would tell them to fly with X.</td>
<td>63.17 (23.91)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of Wallet</strong></td>
<td>- What percentage of all your flights in the last 3 years have you done with X?</td>
<td>63.17 (23.91)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>- Provided by airline company in categories from 1 (lowest revenue) to 11 (highest revenue)</td>
<td>4.60 (3.10)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>