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ABSTRACT

The purposes of the present study were: (1) to develop a reliable and valid scale for three brand image dimensions (mystery, sensuality, and intimacy), (2) to empirically test Roberts’ (2004) lovemarks theory by examining the effect of the three brand image dimensions on the lovemark experience (brand love and respect), and (3) to examine the relationships among elements of brand equity (brand awareness, image, and loyalty), the lovemark experience, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, fashion information search, and gender.

Data were collected using an online survey and two samples, one consisting of college students and the other representing a national sample. A number of steps were involved in validating the scale. First, consistent with mystery, sensuality, and intimacy sub-themes proposed by Roberts (2004, 2006), three brand image dimensions were fleshed out based on a literature review, descriptive comments from the lovemarks Website, and findings from interviews. Twenty-one sub-themes of the brand image were identified, leading to the development of 137 representative items (i.e., 77 mystery, 25 sensuality, and 35 intimacy items).

Second, based on the factor loadings from exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, 22 items (i.e., six mystery, seven sensuality, and nine intimacy items) were retained. Based on data collected from undergraduate college students, reliability and convergent and nomological validity of the brand image scale were confirmed through Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Results indicated that the six mystery items reflected positive present experiences and positive memories from past experiences with
a brand. Seven sensuality items reflected pleasing visual sensations, and nine intimacy items captured consumer’s commitment and enjoyment.

Third, the final version of the brand image scale, containing 21 items (i.e., six mystery, six sensuality, and nine intimacy items), was verified based on the factor structure assessment using data collected from U.S. consumers and confirmatory factor analysis. Final validation (i.e., convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity) of the brand image scale was confirmed using SEM and the U.S. consumer data.

Regarding the second objective, Roberts’ (2004) lovemarks theory was tested using SEM. Results of the structural model showed that mystery and intimacy positively influenced both brand love and respect, but sensuality only influenced brand respect. To achieve the last objective, SEM was used to test a conceptual model, which examined the relationships among variables (brand awareness, image, love, respect, loyalty, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, fashion information search, and gender). As predicted, brand awareness was positively associated with brand image. However, contrary to predictions, brand awareness did not have a positive influence on brand loyalty, love, or respect. In support of the model, brand image positively influenced brand love, respect, and loyalty. Whereas findings supported the hypothesized significant path between brand love and brand loyalty, but it was in the opposite direction (negative), which might be explained by collinearity. The posited positive relationships between brand respect and brand loyalty and between brand loyalty and overall brand equity were supported.

Female consumers rated higher on fashion innovativeness than did male consumers, and female consumers searched more for information about fashion brands
than did male consumers, which supported the conceptual model. The relationship between brand awareness and fashion innovativeness did not receive support, but the level of fashion information search did have a significant influence on brand awareness. Finally, the present study added an additional path between fashion information search and brand image. Results revealed that fashion information search positively influenced brand image.

Findings empirically support that mystery, sensuality, and intimacy should be built into a brand experience to ensure a favorable brand image, leading to brand loyalty. The present study extended Keller’s (1993) consumer-based brand equity model by providing empirical support for the addition of the lovemark experience to the model.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a much broader array of product choices offered in the current market and ubiquitous marketing efforts, consumers often turn to a favorite brand to facilitate their purchase decisions. A brand includes a name, symbol, design, or experience that help consumers identify products, services, or differentiate offerings among competitors (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 2008; Neumeier, 2006). Brand identity, which is a group of associations developed by firms, communicates with consumers what a brand provides (Aaker, 2007; Keller, 2008). Branding helps consumers reduce risk by ensuring a certain level of product quality and specific attributes (Keller, 2008; Keller & Lehmann, 2006).

A firm should provide a clear brand identity to differentiate its offerings from global competitors (Keller, 2008; Neumeier, 2006). A number of marketing scholars have suggested that building a strong brand may maximize value and profits for the firm (Aaker, 1996; Esch, Langer, Schmitt, & Geus, 2006; Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Lim & O’Cass, 2001). In other words, a strong brand may help firms enhance company-based brand equity, which is the incremental market strength of a brand (Aaker, 1991, 1992, 1996, 2007; Keller, 1993, 2003; Lassar, Mittal, & Sharma, 1995; Neumeier, 2006). For instance, brands that have achieved worldwide relevance, leadership, and profits include luxury brands (e.g., Louis Vuitton, Gucci, Chanel, and Tiffany & Co.), retailers (e.g., NIKE, IKEA, H&M, Zara, and Adidas), automobiles (e.g., Toyota, Mercedes Benz, BMW, and Honda), and electronics (e.g., IBM, Microsoft, Samsung, and Apple) (Interbrand.com, 2009).

An increasing number of studies have emphasized the importance of brand equity in successful brand management (Aaker, 1991; Buil, de Chernatony, & Martinez, 2008;
Cobb-Walgren, Ruble, & Donthu, 1995; Esch et al., 2006; Jung & Sung, 2008; Keller, 1993, 2001; Kim, Kim, & An, 2003; Kim, Knight, & Pelton, 2009; Pappu, Quester, & Cooksey, 2005; Pappu & Quester, 2006; Tong & Hawley, 2009a, 2009b; Yoo & Donthu, 2001, 2002; Yoo, Donthu, & Lee, 2000). Brand equity provides a sustainable and competitive advantage as it allows the firm to compete based on brand value other than offering a lower price (Broyles, Schumann, & Leingpibul, 2009).

There are two different perspectives on brand equity, the aforementioned company-based brand equity and consumer-based brand equity (Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Koçak, Abimbola, & Özer, 2007). Consumer-based brand equity, one of the primary foci of the present study, is based on consumer perceptions of a brand in the decision-making process (Keller, 1993; Lassar et al., 1995). Keller (1993) presented a conceptual model of consumer-based brand equity, which proposed that a high level of brand awareness and a favorable brand image lead to brand loyalty, which consequently creates brand equity. Past consumer-based brand equity research has examined cognitive dimensions, such as brand awareness, perceived quality, brand image, and brand associations, as well as the behavioral dimension of brand loyalty (Aaker, 1991, 1992, 1995, 1996; Cobb-Walgren et al., 1995; Jung & Sung, 2006; Keller, 1993; Kim et al., 2009; Pappu et al., 2005; Yoo & Donthu, 2001, 2002; Yoo et al., 2000). However, this body of brand equity research did not capture an emotional aspect of the consumer’s experience, which has gained recent attention from both academia and industry.

Academic literature clearly addressed the importance of building a strong emotional relationship between consumers and brands (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Keller, 2001, 2008; Taylor, Cluch, & Godwin, 2004). Positive brand feelings (e.g., warmth,
affection, joy, and excitement) are seen as key criteria to build consumer-based brand equity (Keller, 2001). According to Keller's (2001) more recent conceptual framework, consumers’ positive brand feelings lead to favorable responses towards a brand, such as attitudinal attachment and behavioral loyalty. Lassar et al. (1995) have proposed that brand attachment/feelings are one of the brand equity dimensions. Similarly, recent literature on branding has argued that an emotional brand experience is important to foster brand loyalty and purchase intentions (Albert, Merunka, & Valette-Florence, 2008; Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Esch et al., 2006; Nowak, Thach, & Olsen, 2006; Pawle & Cooper, 2006; Taylor, Celuch, & Goodwin, 2004; Thomson, MacInnis, & Park, 2005). Moreover, brand consulting and advertising industry literature (Gobé, 2001; Lindstrom, 2005; Neumeier, 2006; Riesenbeck & Perrey, 2007; Roberts, 2004, 2006) has illustrated the importance of building deep emotional connections with consumers to augment brand loyalty.

Despite the growing perceived importance of deep emotional experience in branding and brand equity, little research has empirically tested such relationships. Among examples of empirical research on the topic, Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001), and Taylor et al. (2004) have examined the positive influence of brand affect on attitudinal/behavioral loyalty. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) found a positive association between brand love and brand loyalty. To add to this scant body of literature, the present study will include a variable tapping deep emotional experience when testing Keller’s (1993) consumer-based brand equity model, composed of brand awareness, image, and loyalty. Thus, the associations between deep emotional experience, dimensions of brand equity, and overall brand equity will be empirically examined in the present study.
Variables used to examine emotional experience associated with a brand include brand affect (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Taylor et al., 2004), brand attachment (Lassar et al., 1995; Thomson et al., 2005), and brand love (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006). Kevin Roberts (2004), the CEO of the global branding/advertising firm, Worldwide Saatchi & Saatchi, has proposed the importance of a highly charged, emotional relationship between a brand and consumers to build loyalty. Furthermore, he proposed that this connection results in a *lovemark experience*, which supersedes a *brand experience*. According to his *lovemarks* theory, lovemarks entail consumer offerings that result in both high levels of *love* and *respect*; whereas, a *brand* reflects an offering that has a high level of respect, but a low level of brand love. The present study will incorporate Roberts’ conceptualization of lovemarks (i.e., high brand love and respect) in a model of consumer-based brand equity (Figure 1.1).

Moreover, Roberts (2004, 2006) postulated that there were three dimensions of the brand experience, which lead to a *lovemark*. When a brand engages consumers on cognitive, sensory, and emotional levels, the brand evolves into a *lovemark*, which augments brand loyalty (Roberts, 2004, 2006). According to Roberts, to create a lovemark, a brand must provide the consumer with three dimensions of brand experience (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy). Mystery comes from tapping metaphors, dreams, and symbols from the past, present, or future. Sensuality entails stimulating the five senses. Intimacy involves creating a sense of the firm’s empathy, a consumer’s commitment, and enjoyment from owning or interacting with a brand. However, Roberts did not provide a scale to measure these three dimensions, nor have I found scales to measure these dimensions in marketing research literature. To fill this gap, the present
research will develop a reliable and valid measure of the three brand experience dimensions, which act as *lovemark* antecedents.

Conceptually, these three dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) capture cognitive, sensory, and emotional experiences or associations with a brand (Roberts, 2004). These dimensions tap experiences created by tangible/intangible aspects of the brand, which correspond to *brand image*. Research has measured brand image using general questions tapping a consumer’s attitudes, beliefs, opinions, and feelings associated with a certain brand (Esch et al., 2006; Lassar et al., 1995; Keller, 2001; Kim et al., 2003; Kim et al., 2009). I have found no scale that captures all three dimensions of brand image. Some researchers have focused on cognitive experience such as Lassar et al. (1995), Keller (2001), Kim et al. (2003), and Kim et al. (2009). Esch et al. (2006) examined both cognitive and emotional experience to measure brand image, but no research captured sensory experience with a certain brand. Thus, the present study will use the newly developed scale, capturing the three dimensions (i.e., cognitive, affective, and sensory experiences), as a holistic measure of *brand image*.

Demographic (e.g., age and gender) and psychographic characteristics (e.g., shopping styles and opinion leadership) have been found to affect search behavior and brand preference/choice (e.g., Beaudoin & Lachance, 2006; Beaudoin, Lachance, & Robitaille, 2003; Hogg, Bruce, & Hill, 1998; Nysveen, Pedersen, & Thorbjørnsen, 2005). For instance, female consumers are more likely than male consumers to search for product information (Darley & Smith, 1995; Meyers-Levy, 1988, 1989; Meyers-Levy & Maheswaran, 1991) and have higher interest in brands (Beaudoin & Lachance, 2006; Beaudoin et al., 2003). On average, female consumers are more fashion innovative than
male consumers (Beaudoin et al., 2003; Behling, 1992; Goldsmith, Stitch, & White, 1987). This level of innovativeness and information search may affect consequent level of fashion brand awareness.

**Objectives of Study**

The purpose of the present study is threefold: (1) to develop a reliable and valid scale measuring the three dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) of brand image, (2) to empirically test Roberts’ lovemarks theory by examining the effect of these three dimensions on the two lovemark elements (i.e., brand love and respect), and (3) to examine the relationships among elements of brand equity (brand awareness, image, and loyalty), the lovemark experience, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, fashion information search, and gender.
Definitions of Terms

The following definitions are the major terms investigated in the present study.

**Brand**: A unique element (e.g., name, symbol, design) that identifies the products or services of one organization from those of competitors, and contributes to enhancing the value of the offerings (Aaker, 1991; Farquhar, 1989, Solomon & Stuart, 2002).

**Brand awareness**: An ability to identify, recognize, or recall a brand in a certain category (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993).

**Brand equity**: Overall brand strength, which reflects the level of brand awareness, brand image, and brand loyalty consumers have for a certain brand (Keller, 1993, 2001).

**Brand image**: A consumer’s perceptions and feelings towards a brand shaped by direct/indirect brand experiences, which captures cognitive, sensory, and emotional aspects. These are reflected by the three dimensions of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy, respectively (Keller, 2001; Roberts, 2004, 2006).

**Brand love**: Deep emotional attachment consumers have with a certain brand (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Roberts, 2004).

**Brand loyalty**: A combination of favorable beliefs and attitudes for a particular brand (Keller, 1993; Oliver, 1999) and repeat purchase behaviors over time (Aaker, 1991).

**Brand respect**: A positive perception consumers have towards a particular brand, based on evaluation of brand performance (Roberts, 2004).

**Construct validity**: An assessment whether a scale measures the theoretical construct as intended and does not measure other concepts (Netermeyer et al., 2003).
**Content validity:** A measurement examining if a scale actually reflects the meaning and the original facets of the construct (DeVellis, 1991; Netemeyer, Bearden, & Sharma, 2003).

**Convergent validity:** An assessment if a construct is similar to other constructs that theoretically should be similar (Netemeyer et al., 2003).

**Criterion validity:** A measurement of the correlation between scales measuring one construct and the other type of measure of the same construct (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

**Discriminant validity:** An assessment if a construct is discriminant from other constructs that are theoretically related (Netemeyer et al., 2003; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

**Fashion innovativeness:** Willingness to try a new brand or product earlier than other members of society (Goldsmith & Flynn, 1992).

**Intimacy:** Affective and connective experiences between consumers and brands, influenced by the firm’s empathy and a consumer’s commitment, and a consumer’s enjoyment from owning or interacting with a brand (Roberts, 2004, 2006).

**Lovemark:** A brand experience that creates a highly charged, emotional relationship between the brand and consumers, a combination of high brand love and respect (Roberts, 2004).

**Mystery:** The cognitive experience shaped by past and present interactions with a brand as well as future dreams and aspirations (Roberts, 2004).
**Nomological validity:** An assessment of the correlation among constructs, if the constructs are empirically related as a predicted way, reflecting a theory (Netemeyer et al., 2003).

**Reliability:** An assessment of internal consistency and unidimensionality of measures (DeVellis, 1991; Netemeyer et al., 2003).

**Sensuality:** A pleasant sensory experience (vision, sound, touch, smell, and/or taste) due to branding elements such as product design, packages, displays, and music in a store (Roberts, 2004).

**Validity:** An assessment of a measure, whether the measure accurately captures the specific construct intended to measure (DeVellis, 1991).
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 2 provides the relevant literature and theoretical framework for the present study. The first section begins with a discussion of a brief history of branding and a discussion of branding from both business and consumer perspectives. The second section discusses the lovemarks theory including three dimensions of brand image (Roberts, 2004). In the third section, literature on consumer-based brand equity, forming a theoretical framework for the present study, is reviewed. The fourth section explores logical linkages among brand awareness, the three dimensions of brand image, the lovemark experience, brand loyalty, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, fashion information search, and gender. Based on the previous literature, a research model and thirteen hypotheses are presented (see Figure 2.2 and Figure 2.4).

2.1 Branding History

Prior to the 19th century, manufacturers were limited to trading their products in their local markets (Jones & Morgan, 1994; Moore & Reid, 2008). In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, through improvement of production processes, transportation, and communication, the industrial revolution led to the development of international trade among countries (Jones & Morgan, 1994; Keller, 2008). Domestic manufacturers expanded their businesses to buyers in foreign countries, beginning to use a trademark for consumers to recognize, and to differentiate products/service from those of global competitors (Moore & Reid, 2008). A trademark refers to any distinctive word, design, or non-descriptive mark attached to goods (Cohen, 1986). According to the American Marketing Association, between the nineteenth to early twentieth century, a brand was regarded the same as a trademark (e.g., a name, sign, logo, and symbol)
The purpose of branding during this period of time was to reinforce the perceived value of a product through positive associations that consumers have with it (Farquhar, 1989). The earliest U.S. branding pioneers were Levi Strauss & Co. (founded in 1853), Heinz (1869), Coca-Cola (1886), Tylenol (1893), Nabisco (1898), and Marlboro (1902). These brands defined their identity through associations with their products’ performance, tangible attributes, originality, and culture (Keller, 2008).

In the twentieth century, the purpose of branding evolved from associations with tangible product features to intangible, symbolic features emblematic of personality and lifestyle (Gobé, 2001; Healey, 2008; Moore & Reid, 2008; Neumeier, 2006; Schmitt, 1999). Traditional marketing focused on creating brands that provide tangible benefits through product features and quality; whereas, recent marketing has focused on intangible aspects of branding, tapping into sensory and emotional elements of brand experience (Gobé, 2001; Pine & Gilmore, 1999; Schmitt, 1999). Therefore, providing consumers with a deep emotional experience, associated with a brand, became increasingly important for brand managers seeking to obtain positive responses from consumers (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Gobé, 2001; Healey, 2008; Roberts, 2004, 2006; Thomson et al., 2005).

### 2.2 Branding

Today, a successful brand is one of the most important assets to many businesses (Broyles et al., 2009; Esch et al., 2006; Pappu & Quester, 2006; Keller & Lehmann, 2006). A brand is a unique element (e.g., name, symbol, and design) that identifies the products or services of one organization from those of competitors, and contributes to enhancing the value of the offerings (Aaker, 1991; Farquhar, 1989; Solomon & Stuart,
Therefore, branding is the process of using a name, symbol, design, and experience to differentiate goods/services by providing distinct images, associations, and experiences related to the offerings and firms (Neumeier, 2006; Schmitt, 1999). A consistent image, positive associations, and favorable attitudes formed from memorable experiences are essential in building a strong brand (Farquhar, 1989). Branding benefits both businesses and consumers in a variety of ways.

Benefits of Branding for Companies

Researchers agree that branding provides a variety of important benefits to the industry. First, a clear brand identity helps marketers successfully differentiate their offerings from their competitors (Aaker, 2007; Keller, 2008). Second, successful branding helps firms reduce advertising costs by increasing awareness of the brand name (Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Keller, 2008). Third, branding helps a firm to become a leader among the competitors in the same product category (Keller, 2008). As a consequence, a desirable brand identity not only helps increase the profit margin resulting from consumers’ willingness to pay a premium for products, it may lead to profitable brand extensions into the same or different market. Finally, certain characteristics of branding help firms safeguard their product features through legal protection from counterfeiting (Keller, 2008; Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Schmitt & Simonson, 1997).

Benefits of Branding for Consumers

Branding provides consumers with three major benefits: risk reduction, information efficiency, and self-expression (Aaker, 2007; Keller, 2003, 2008; Riesenbeck & Perrey, 2007). Keller (2008) argued that branding helps consumers decrease the chance of choosing a product that may not perform well or meet their expectations. Thus, risk
reduction is accomplished by providing assurance of consistent quality. Riesenbeck and Perrey (2007) suggested that branding may help consumers recognize and become aware of offerings in a specific product category, which helps them efficiently categorize vast amounts of information available about the product. Finally, branding involves creating cognitive structures that help consumers organize knowledge and experience regarding different products, which may help consumers transfer characteristics of the brand onto themselves (Riesenbeck & Perrey, 2007). This process, in turn, could affect consumers’ perception of a brand as a reflection of their personality, character, social status, and lifestyle (Aaker, 2007).

2.3 Lovemarks Theory

Hunt (2002) explained the nature of scientific theory, based on Rudner’s (1966) conceptualization of a theory: “a systematically related set of statements, including some lawlike generalizations, that is empirically testable” (Rudner, 1966, p.10). Hunt suggested a general theory should have three key criteria: (1) systematic connections, (2) interrelated law-like generalizations, and (3) empirical testing. First, systematic connections criterion implies all concepts/propositions in a theory are interrelated or deductively connected with each other in an formal language system which describes fundamental formation rules and definitions within a theory (Hunt, 2002). Second, lawlike generalizations criterion refers to a generalized framework, specifying a relationship between concepts or propositions in a theory (Hunt, 2002). Proposed concepts or propositions in a theory must be in the form of a generalized condition (e.g., if x increases, y will increase). Third, empirically testable criterion implies a theory must be applicable to other experimental conditions (e.g., using different sample or stimuli).
(Hunt, 2002). Robert’s (2004) lovemark framework meets two of three criteria (i.e., systematic connections and interrelated law-like generalizations), but it does not meet the empirical testing criterion. Thus, the present study empirically tests the lovemark framework by examining the connected relationships between the variables.

Roberts’ (2004) “lovemarks” theory suggested a company must go beyond creating a brand to creating a lovemark in order to build customer loyalty. According to Roberts’, a lovemark is defined as a deep emotional connection that distinguishes a lovemark experience from a brand experience. The author asserted that “lovemarks are brands, events, and experiences that people passionately love” (Roberts, 2006, p. 15). In Roberts’s view, a lovemark is defined as a combination of high brand love and respect. Roberts (2004, 2006) discriminated between lovemarks and brands, products, and fads, based on the level of love and respect experienced by a consumer (see Figure 2.1).

Products are noted as having low levels of love and respect, fads have a high level of love but a low level of respect, brands have a low level of love but high level of respect, and lovemarks have high levels of both love and respect. For example, Apple may be considered as having high love and high respect, whereas Dell may have a low level of love but high level of respect. Long waiting lines for a new product (e.g., a 3G ipad 2) show consumers’ high love and respect toward Apple brand, which consumers have not shown for Dell’s new product. A kipper tie may be an example of a fad (Roberts, 2005). The kipper tie has extreme breadth (4.5-5 inches) in garish colors and patterns resembling a kipper, which had a high level of love in the mid 1960s to late 1970s.

To create a lovemark, a brand must provide the consumer with three elements of experience: mystery, sensuality, and intimacy (Roberts, 2004, 2006). All these three
elements of experience are conceptualized as antecedents of a lovemark (Roberts, 2004). This research suggests that these lovemark antecedents can be viewed as three dimensions of brand image, because both lovemark antecedents and the brand image concept tap into consumers’ rational and emotional perceptions of and associations with a particular brand. Although these three dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) may not fully capture the entire brand image concept, the present study proposes these three dimensions do capture key experience-related associations of brand image. Each of these three dimensions will be discussed below.

![Figure 2.1. Love/Respect Axis Separating Lovemarks from Brands, Fads, and Products (Roberts, 2006, p. 18)](image)

2.3.1 The Three Dimensions of Brand Image

Brand image has been discussed as an important concept in consumer behavior, because consumers’ brand and product choices are based on their assessment of brand
image (Dobni & Zinkhan, 1990). Traditionally, marketing researchers (Bullmore, 1984; Dichter, 1985; Frazer, 1983; Gardner & Levy, 1955; Keller, 2001, 2008; Newman, 1957; Pohlman & Mudd, 1973) have acknowledged the cognitive and affective facets of experience associated with brand image; however, most studies have not captured the sensory aspect of brand experience.

Specifically, Dichter (1985) and Newman (1957) defined brand image as the total set of impressions shaped by consumer interactions (e.g., observation and consumption) with a brand. Bullmore (1984) and Gardner and Levy (1955) referred to brand image as beliefs, perceptions, feelings, and attitudes towards a brand. Frazer (1983) and Pohlman and Mudd (1973) argued that brand image is more strongly related to intangible aspects, such as social meanings and symbolic value than physical features of products. Similarly, Keller (2001, 2008) defined brand image as a consumer’s perceptions and feelings associated with a brand, its offerings, and imagery attributes, such as user profiles, purchase/usage situations, brand personality, values, history, heritage, and experiences.

Based on brand image definitions from previous studies and following Roberts’ (2004) *lovemarks* theory, the present study views brand image as an encapsulation of a consumer’s direct or indirect (e.g., through advertising) brand experience, with a focus on intangible aspects of the brand. Moreover, the present study proposes that mystery, sensuality, and intimacy represent facets of the cognitive, sensory, and emotional dimensions of brand image. According to Roberts (2004), these three dimensions of brand image positively contribute to creating a lovemark experience, which leads consumers to become avid fans of a certain offering by a company.
**Mystery**

The cognitive aspect of brand image reflects mental thoughts of a brand, which consumers establish by considering product attributes, service, performance, and symbolic or psychological meanings of a brand (Bullmore, 1984; Friedmann & Lessig, 1987; Gardner & Levy, 1955; Gensch, 1978). The personal meanings linked to memory of past brand experiences lead consumers to create a distinct perception towards a brand in their mind (Friedmann & Lessig, 1987).

Mystery captures the cognitive experience, shaped by past and present interactions with a brand as well as future dreams and aspirations reflecting a certain lifestyle (Roberts, 2004, 2006). As sub components of mystery, Roberts included the telling of great stories, which taps into a culture’s myths, iconic characters, and dreams; instills inspiration; and combines past, present, and future (see Table 2.1). Roberts (2004) believes that a firm delivers brand identity by telling a story of the brand. Great stories formed through brand experience may entail favorable myths and iconic characteristics that stimulate positive feelings and perceptions within consumers. Positive associations with the brand may result from the personal dreams, aspirations, or inspirational spirit expressed by the story. Consumers’ past brand experiences may influence their present and future perception towards a brand/firm.
Table 2.1. Elements of Roberts’ Mystery Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub components</th>
<th>Concept descriptions and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling great stories</td>
<td>- A firm tells a story to reflect brand identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Brand stories are a self-reflection of consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Great stories shaped by impressive experiences with brands, products, and retailers change consumer emotion or action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapping into natural myths and iconic</td>
<td>- The brand captures memorable global myths and icons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characters</td>
<td>- The brand creates global iconic characters instilled with meaning (e.g., Nike’s swoosh and Starbucks medallion logo) easy to remember.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapping into dreams</td>
<td>- The brand is associated with aspiration, such as a strong desire or ambition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The brand taps into personal dreams, which requires understanding of consumers’ lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on inspiration</td>
<td>- The brand offers inspiration, or a sudden brilliant idea, which have the power to transform lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- An inspirational spirit (e.g., the Olympic spirit) motivates and excites consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining the past, present, and future</td>
<td>- Meaning is shaped by the past and present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The past shapes the present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summarized from Roberts (2004, pp.134-147)

Sensuality

The sensory aspect of brand image refers to brand experiences, shaped through a consumer’s physical senses (i.e., vision, smell, sound, touch, and taste). Sensuality reflects pleasant sensory experiences (Roberts, 2004). Music in the store or on a Website, a color scheme or design style, and the smell of the store’s environment are examples of the sensory experiences that may lead to sensuality (see Table 2.2). Roberts (2004) proposes that visual elements of a product, such as a display, logo design, packages, and beautiful colors, music, olfactory stimulation, and variety in textures, foster emotional experiences. Other practitioners (Gobé, 2001; Schmitt & Simonson, 1997) agreed that providing sensory experience is very important for generating positive perceptions of a brand.
Table 2.2. Elements of Roberts’ Sensuality Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub components</th>
<th>Concept descriptions and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>• Visual product presentation, logo design, packages, and color scheme prompt particular emotions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Smell          | • Scent is a direct, personal, and specific experience, because scent is not transformed by judgments or beliefs.  
• Attractive olfactory stimulation increases sales.  
• Smell is intertwined with taste. |
| Sound          | • Quiet retail environment or certain tunes/tones/rhythm/melodies/volume in a store leads to specific moods or feelings. |
| Touch          | • Smooth, rough, hard, soft, wet, dry, hot, and cold texture stimulates senses. |
| Taste          | • Sour, sweet, salty, and bitter are types of taste that entail specific moods or feelings.  
• Apple advertised iMac in shades of strawberry and blueberry to arouse positive emotions. |

Source: Summarized from Roberts (2004, pp.156-194)

**Intimacy**

The emotional aspect of brand image refers to brand experiences involved a consumer’s feelings of interacting with a brand. Intimacy captures the affective and connective experiences between consumers and brands (Roberts, 2004). For example, a firm’s understanding of consumers’ opinions and preferences, consumer’s long-term commitment, and consumer’s enjoyment of interaction with a brand may foster positive emotions and perceptions towards the firm or its offerings (see Table 2.3). Researchers in psychology (Sternberg, 1986, 1997) and marketing (Fournier, 1998; Shimp & Madden, 1988) have indicated the importance of intimacy in evoking positive emotions and perceptions for a romantic partner or for a brand/firm, respectively.
Table 2.3. Elements of Roberts’ Intimacy Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub components</th>
<th>Concept descriptions and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm’s empathy</td>
<td>• Empathy is an understanding of and solid support for consumers by listening to their opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Empathy is an understanding of consumers’ aesthetic preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Empathy is connections with consumers, remembering personal events (e.g., birthday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer’s commitment</td>
<td>• Commitment is consumer’s preferable attitudes towards the brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumer’s long-term commitment maintains a relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer’s enjoyment</td>
<td>• Enjoyment of interaction is consumers’ strong positive feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoyment of interaction can transform the most insignificant product into a must-have item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoyment of interaction keeps the relationship going longer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summarized from Roberts (2004, pp.197-214)

2.3.2 Brand Love

Building mystery, sensuality, and intimacy into brand experiences shapes brand love. Brand love is defined as a strong affection or deep emotional attachment consumers have for a certain brand (Albert et al., 2008; Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Roberts, 2004). Roberts (2004) suggested that brand love is a primary component of a lovemark experience, describing the importance of appeal to consumers on a personal and emotional level. Roberts (2004) posited that mystery, sensuality, and intimacy experiences would contribute to creating a feeling of love towards a brand, which leads to consumer retention through brand loyalty. In Roberts’ lovemarks theory, the feeling of love towards a brand has similar constituents as interpersonal love in social psychology.

Liebowitz (1983, p.48) defined love as “the strongest positive feeling a person can have.” The concept of love has been discussed in terms of multi-dimensions in close interpersonal relationships (Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991; Rubin, 1970; Sternberg,
1986). These researchers viewed love is shaped by cognitive, emotional, and behavioral associations with another person.

Recently, marketing researchers have used existing psychological research on interpersonal love (Ahuvia, 2005; Albert et al., 2008; Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Fournier, 1998; Shimp & Madden, 1988; Whang, Allen, Sahoury, & Zhang, 2004) to examine the feeling of love consumers have towards objects/products/brands. For example, two main theories of love in psychology (Lee, 1977; Sternberg, 1986) were used in these marketing studies.

Whang et al.’s (2004) research indicated that the relationship between consumers and products resembles a romantic relationship, which supports Branden’s (1980) argument that feelings of impersonal love (e.g., love of swimming) can be interpreted using interpersonal love theory. A similar view is found in Richins’ (1997) work, which suggested that people can fall in love with material objects (e.g., products, brands, and stores) that they feel provide excitement and great value.

Similar to psychological researchers, marketing scholars have shown the multidimensionality of love. Shimp and Madden (1988) adopted Sternberg’s (1986) triangular theory of love to develop a conceptual framework of consumer-object love. Shimp and Madden (1988) suggested the three components of love (i.e., intimacy, passion, and decision/commitment) in Sternberg’s theory align with the three components of consumer-object love (i.e., liking, yearning, and decision/commitment), because each captures a cognition, emotion, or motivation experience of the relationship, respectively.

Shimp and Madden’s (1988) consumer-object love has been expanded by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006). These scholars (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006) defined brand love as an
emotional attachment that satisfied consumers have with a certain brand. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) argued that brand love includes five constructs of passion, attachment, positive evaluation, emotion, and declarations of love.


Albert et al.’s (2008) research examined dimensions of love consumers have for some brands in the general product category. Findings from Albert et al.’s (2008) study suggested eleven dimensions of love: passion, duration of the relationship (e.g., intimacy), self-congruity (e.g., self-image), dreams, memories, pleasure, attraction, uniqueness, beauty, trust, and declaration of affect.

*Mystery and Brand Love*

Psychological and marketing studies have explained that there are cognitive experiences associated with the deep emotional attachment of love. A significant interdependence between thoughts/beliefs and deep emotions has been supported by empirical studies in psychology (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000; Gold, Ryckman, & Mosley, 1984; Goodwin, Fiske, Rosen, & Rosenthal, 2002; Murray, Holmes, & Griffin, 1996). Albert et al.’s (2008) experimental study examined dimensions of brand love. The result of their study indicated that brand love is related to congruity between the self-image of a consumer and brand image, positive memories or personal history associated with a brand, and accomplishment of aspirations through consumption of a brand. These
dimensions of brand love reflect cognitive aspects of brand image, corresponding to the mystery concept introduced by Roberts (2004, 2006).

Albert et al. (2008) suggested that positive memories and dreams about owning/purchasing a brand (i.e., a sense of mystery) shape brand love. For instance, the Body Shop adds a variety of natural scent to its body care products, such as cotton, coconut, cherry, and mango, which may help consumers retrieve a romantic memory. Such delightful memories may inspire brand love. A consumer/reviewer of the Body Shop wrote (www.lovemarks.com):

The Body Shop is my favorite place, because it is a magical world that captivates my senses! The variety of smells makes me feel wonderful, as I travel with my imagination to far tropical islands. Furthermore, I love the products which are used during or after the shower, such as oxygen soaps and massage oils. The smell of them reminds me of romantic moments with my boyfriend! Cognitive experience capturing consumers’ past or present events, or reflecting congruity between consumers’ future aspirations and the brand image may lead to a sense of strong affection towards a brand. For instance, Adidas is associated with European heritage. Adidas may lead consumers to feel a deep emotional attachment because of the desire to be seen as having European interests and sensibilities. A consumer/reviewer of Adidas wrote (www.lovemarks.com):

I love Adidas. It brings back so many memories to me. It also conveys a very European Image which I really like, much more truly and deeply passionate about soccer than Nike. Adidas has a story, a real and strong personality and a great respect of its tradition in spite of its innovation. My Adidas is a part of me.

Sensuality and Brand Love

Sensory elements of the retail environment, used to create brand image, may please all five senses. There are empirical studies focusing on the effect of such sensory features on consumer emotions. Bellizzi, Crowley, and Hasty (1983) examined the effect
of color on emotions and found that it affects emotional experience associated with a retail environment. Similarly, Bellizzi and Hite (1992) found the positive effect of retail environment color on feelings and purchase intention. In addition, researchers (Valdez & Albert, 1994) have suggested that color positively influences both emotional pleasure and arousal, which defines the emotional experience of love. Several studies have revealed that music is also important to setting a specific mood and triggering pleasure and arousal states of emotions in consumer experiences (Alpert & Alpert, 1989; Anand & Holbrook, 1986; Bruner, 1990; Dube, Chebat, & Morin, 1995; Yalch & Spangenberg, 2000).

Olfaction research has indicated that pleasant ambient scent (Bone & Ellen, 1999; Chebat & Michon, 2003; Ellen & Bone, 1999; Mattila & Wirtz, 2001) and pleasingly scented product (Bone & Jantrania, 1992; Miller, 1991) have a positive effect on the affective response of the consumers as well.

Natural skincare brand, Origins, creates retail environments with neat displays, packaging, and a pleasurable scent, which may drive feelings of pleasure and arousal. The pleasing sensory experience may trigger a feeling of love towards Origins. A consumer/reviewer of Origins wrote (www.lovemarks.com):

I know that Origins shampoo or body cleanser isn't much better than others. Yet, I'm totally seduced by the store, the packaging, the smell, the feel of the product. Whenever I pass, I walk inside whether I need something or not. Sometimes I buy. Sometimes I don't. But for sure, I have more Origin products than I can use. And I don't care. Just looking at them makes me happy.

Moreover, an empirical study by Albert et al. (2008) showed that a brand’s music, scent, odor, and taste instilled a feeling of love within a consumer. Research participants used the word “sensuality” to describe their feeling of brand love (Albert et al., 2008), which supports a relationship between sensuality and brand love proposed by Roberts
(2004). Thus, it is reasonable to expect a positive relationship between sensory
experience and brand love.

**Intimacy and Brand Love**

Since the 20th century, research findings in psychology have indicated that
intimacy is an important general factor in shaping feelings of love (Spearman, 1927;
Similarly, research in marketing (Albert et al., 2008; Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Shimp &
Madden, 1988) has suggested that intimacy is a key component in building a relationship
between consumers and an object or a brand. Shimp and Madden (1988) argued that
consumers’ emotional support (i.e., intimacy) towards a product lead to strong positive
feeling (i.e., love). Roberts’ subcomponents of intimacy (i.e., consumer’s commitment
and enjoyment) have been associated with brand love by researchers. Albert et al.’s
(2008) research revealed that consumer’s commitment fosters brand love and extends
longevity of a relationship with a brand. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) included positive
emotions (e.g., enjoyment) as constructs of brand love. For instance, going to Starbucks
makes consumers feel good because of coffee taste, smell, freshness, and store
environments. That is, consumers felt joy in Starbucks. Such affective experiences may
lead consumers to feel closeness and connectedness to Starbucks. A consumer/reviewer
of Starbucks wrote (www.lovemarks.com):

> I love travelling and have travelled around the world. I always enjoy trying out
something local and new and seeing something different. However, there is a time
you get a bit tired of the unaccustomed and you just want to relax in familiar
surroundings. Then there is Starbucks. As soon as I go in a store, I almost feel at
home. Same smell, same atmosphere, and always good coffee. Wherever you are
you know the place has a good coffee and you can simply relax. I simply enjoy
good coffee at Starbucks when I'm in my home country and when I'm not, Starbucks turns into a gateway to home.

Based on a comprehensive literature review, the first series of hypotheses is posited (see Figure 2.2):

H1. Each of the three dimensions of brand image (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) will have a positive relationship with brand love.
   H1-a. Mystery will positively influence brand love.
   H1-b. Sensuality will positively influence brand love.
   H1-c. Intimacy will positively influence brand love.

2.3.3 Brand Respect

Brand respect refers to a positive perception consumers have towards a particular brand, based on their evaluation on brand performance (Roberts, 2004). Roberts (2004) stated that brand respect is a combination of the three elements of performance, trust, and reputation (Table 2.4). A brand creates respect through good performance, which creates a sense of trust and builds a positive reputation (Roberts, 2004). Roberts (2004) emphasized the importance of respect in building a strong positive relationship between the consumer and brand.
Table 2.4. Roberts’ Three Components of Brand Respect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Sub-components</th>
<th>Descriptions and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Innovation/Quality</td>
<td>Performs better than competitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Does the right thing by consumers/local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Possesses a heritage that consumers know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Offers the best possible value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Receives consistent feedback from consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease/Openness</td>
<td>Welcomes consumer input to enhance changes in the brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Consumer’s perception of the brand matches expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>A leader in its field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Puts forth the right plan when something goes wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Keeps promises, even if it hurts the bottom line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy/Usefulness</td>
<td>Provides user friendly brands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summarized from Roberts (2004, pp.74-75)

A number of researchers in psychology and sociology have indicated that respect is an important factor in building close interpersonal relationships (Frei & Shaver, 2002; Gottman, 1994, 1996; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006; Zacchilli, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2009). Respect is described as an attitude shaped by feelings and thoughts of quality of a person (Frei & Shaver, 2002; Jackson, Esses, & Burris, 2001).

**Mystery and Brand Respect**

Psychological literature has indicated an empirical connection between cognitive experiences and respect (Frei & Shaver, 2002; Kovecses, 1990). Brand communications creating unforgettable positive experiences with a brand or personally relevant messages may lead to brand respect. These messages delivered through telling great stories and the use of cultural myths and iconic characters may build respect through an emphasis on the brand’s performance, trust, and reputation. For instance, Benetton’s ads consistently incorporated multi-cultural models and addressed social issues, which reinforced the
brand’s socially responsible reputation, and may have increased respect for the brand. A blogger wrote (rozeanafonseca.wordpress.com):

Benetton’s advertising is without a doubt controversial, but at the same time it is original and successful. Many of its ad campaigns reflecting real social and political issues use beautiful images and pictures that cause a great impact on the viewer. My favorite campaigns were Toscani’s early ones portraying racial equality and world peace. I thought the pictures were very artistic and original, perfect to capture the public’s attention. I like Luciano Benetton’s unique idea of advertisement, and I think the whole idea of “communicating the company’s values” has really worked for Benetton.

**Sensuality and Brand Respect**

Academic and industry literature describes the importance of sensory experience to augmentation of brand performance, trust, and reputation. Postrel (2003) noted that brands have turned to aesthetic design to differentiate themselves, because quality and price are no longer effective differentiators; there are many brands within a price range that offer good quality. Good design is seen as an innovation and sign of quality, which may increase brand respect. For instance, when Apple came out with brightly colored computers instead of gray boxes, the brand was lauded for its innovation, and its reputation among many consumers increased. Apple’s reputation, today, is built on its continued technology innovation and attention to design (Gobé, 2001; Postrel, 2003). U.S. cosmetic retailer, Sephora, provides beauty product samples for consumers to touch and try on before making a purchase decision. This sensory experience may affect consumer perceptions of the product’s aesthetic value and efficacy/usefulness, which affects perceived quality (i.e., performance).

Sensory elements may be associated with a brand for a long period of time, thus build a sense of heritage and consequent respect. For example, the visual appearance and
tactile shape of Coca-Cola’s original bottle and taste of its cola product are part of its heritage, which contribute to the brand’s well-respected image. When the company changed the flavor of its cola, brand respect was tarnished (Hartley, 2006; Simon & Sullivan, 1993). Gobé (2001) described: “Through the original design of the glass Coca-Cola bottle, Coke translates the identity of the brand to handheld touch. So well designed is the Coke bottle that it embellishes the identity of the whole brand, touch, vision, and taste all come beautifully together” (2001, p.93).

**Intimacy and Brand Respect**

Empirical psychological studies have suggested that the concept of respect includes an emotional dimension (Gottman, 1994, 1996; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006). Gottman (1994, 1996) described respect as being attentive, empathic, sympathetic, kind, and supportive. For example, respect is manifested in asking for opinions, caring about feelings, taking good care, and considering the viewpoint of a partner. Therefore, intimacy and respect appear to have an overlapping element of empathy. Branding literature (Shimp & Madden, 1988) supports the influence of intimacy on perceptions of brand performance. Strong positive feelings lead consumers to perceive that the brand provides high quality and value (Shimp & Madden, 1988), which can result in perceptions of brand respect.

Openness of a brand to consumer wants may create satisfaction and a long-term relationship (i.e., intimacy). The consumer feels the brand listens to its customers and changing consumer wants are met, helping to foster satisfaction and a long-term relationship. As an example, Panera Bread develops new menu items, based on responsiveness to consumer preferences and lifestyle, which may help instill satisfaction
and a long-term relationship among its customers. Two consumers/reviewers of Panera Bread wrote (www.lovemarks.com):

Panera is remarkably responsive to their customers and sensitive to changing trends. First they added low crab salads, then whole grain baguettes as a bread choice, then opened the process up to allow the choice of 1 of 4 "sides" with any order. They understand who their customers are and what they are looking for - fresh healthy food, quick service, a warm inviting space and reasonable pricing. I am in Panera Bread every day to have a bagel or pastry and drink their iced tea. I don't exactly know why I am committed to the brand, but I know that I am. Their products are top notch, and the service is friendly. The emotional connection is because of the ambience of the place. It is like going to your family's house to hang out.

Thus, the second set of hypotheses is proposed as follows: (see Figure 2.2.):

H2. Each of the three dimensions of brand image (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) will have a positive relationship with brand respect.
   H2-a. Mystery will positively influence brand respect.
   H2-b. Sensuality will positively influence brand respect.
   H2-c. Intimacy will positively influence brand respect.

![Figure 2.2. A Conceptual Model of the Effect of the Three Dimensions of Brand Image on the Lovemark Experience](image)

Note: A lovemark is a combination of brand love and respect (Roberts, 2004)
2.4 Consumer-Based Brand Equity

Much of the research regarding consumer-based brand equity has been grounded in Aaker’s (1991) brand equity and Keller’s (1993) consumer-based brand equity theory. Both scholars suggested the strength of a brand (i.e., brand equity) can be measured by examining consumers’ associations with a brand, and their positive responses to the brand.

Aaker (1991) suggested three main cognitive factors determine brand loyalty: brand awareness, perceived quality, and brand associations. Similar to Aaker’s theory, Keller (1993) named brand awareness, brand image, and brand loyalty as important components that comprise brand loyalty. Keller (1993) viewed brand image as strong, unique, and favorable associations consumers have with a certain brand. Based on Keller’s theory, a high level of brand awareness and positive brand image could augment brand loyalty. Thus, five brand equity dimensions (i.e., brand awareness, perceived quality, brand association, brand image, and brand loyalty) have been widely operationalized as important measurements of consumer-based brand equity in the literature.

Although many scholars have examined brand awareness, brand association, and perceived quality as determinants of brand loyalty (Buil et al., 2008; Jung & Sung, 2008; Pappu et al., 2005; Pappu & Quester, 2006; Tong & Hawley, 2009a, 2009b; Yoo & Donthu, 2001, 2002; Yoo et al., 2000), few studies have empirically tested the effect of brand image on brand loyalty (Keller 1993, 2001; Kim et al., 2003) and purchase intention (Esch et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2009). Kim et al.’s (2003) results support Keller’s (1993, 2001) conceptual relationship between brand image and brand loyalty, showing
the statistically significant positive effect of favorable brand image on loyalty. Esch et al.’s (2006) research indicated that brand image more strongly predicted consumers’ current/future purchase than brand awareness. Kim et al. (2009) found indirect positive effects of brand image on purchase intention for apparel brands.

Researchers have included brand feelings as a brand equity dimension, which emphasizes the significance of the emotional relationship between consumers and brands (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Keller, 2001; Lassar et al., 1995; Taylor et al., 2004). Keller (2001) suggested the importance of brand feelings in consumer-based brand equity. Statistically, a significant positive effect of brand feelings (e.g., brand love and affect) on brand loyalty was confirmed in five studies (see Table 2.5).

Table 2.5. Dimensions of Brand Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Brand Awareness</th>
<th>Perceived Quality</th>
<th>Brand Association</th>
<th>Brand Image</th>
<th>Brand Loyalty</th>
<th>Brand Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buil et al. (2008)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll &amp; Ahuvia (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhuri &amp; Holbrook (2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb-Walgren et al. (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esch et al. (2006)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung &amp; Sung (2008)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller (1993)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller (2001)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al. (2003)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al. (2009)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassar et al. (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low &amp; Lamb (2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappu et al. (2005)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappu &amp; Quester (2006)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor et al. (2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tong &amp; Hawley (2009a, 2009b)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoo et al. (2000)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “V” stands for major dimensions the study explored.
2.4.1 Brand Awareness

Brand awareness refers to an ability to identify, recognize, or recall a brand in a certain category (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993). Tangible attributes of branding, such as a brand name, logo, symbol, icon, and metaphor, facilitate consumers’ awareness of a brand (Neumeier, 2006). Moreover, advertising and positive word-of-mouth regarding a brand may enhance brand awareness, which plays an important role in consumer decision-making (Aaker, 1996, 2007; Pitta & Katsanis, 1995). For instance, a consumer may easily and often think of Adidas or Nike athletic products because the consumer has frequently seen the brand names and logos promoted on TV/Internet, and has experienced wearing both brands. A positive reputation for Adidas or Nike may increase the level of awareness, fostering consumers’ interest in the brands. Brand recognition is important for a new brand; recall or top-of-mind is vital for a well-known brand (Aaker, 1991, 1996). Although the top-of-mind frequently leads to purchase decisions; disliked or hated brand could be the first recalled brand in consumers’ minds, due to pessimistic perceptions of the brand formed by negative past experiences with the brand (Kim et al., 2003).

2.4.2 Brand Loyalty

A favorable attitude shaped by a positive consumption experience leads to brand loyalty, defined in terms of attitudinal and behavioral perspectives (Dick & Basu, 1994). In terms of the **attitudinal** perspective, brand loyalty can evoke when consumers have favorable beliefs about and attitudes towards a brand (Keller, 1993). Attitudinal brand loyalty reflects a deep commitment to patronage of a preferred brand by continuing to like its products (Oliver, 1999). Similarly, Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) and Fournier (1998) supported that attitudinal brand loyalty taps into commitment, reflecting
willingness to keep or maintain a positive relationship with a brand. Dick and Basu (1994) suggested including both categories of loyalty in conceptualizing loyalty.

In terms of a behavioral perspective, Aaker (1991) explained that brand loyalty should be measured by the number of brands purchased, percent of purchases, and future purchase intention. When a consumer is loyal, he or she continuously purchases the brand, even though the brand makes changes, such as increasing price or altering product features (Aaker, 1991). Aaker (1991) identified five levels of brand loyalty as shown in the brand loyalty pyramid (Figure 2.3). The bottom loyalty level includes switchers, who are not loyal to the brand. These consumers may constantly look for variety, or are sensitive to price and buy the brand on sale. The second loyalty level is habitual buyers, who tend to continue to buy the brand not seeking alternative brands. The third level is satisfied buyers with switching costs. They are unwilling to change to a substitute brand, due to switching costs in time, money, and performance risk. The fourth level consists of buyers who like the brand, due to emotional attachment. These consumers shape a friendship with the brand, based on a positive long-term relationship. The top loyalty level is committed buyers. They will continue to purchase the brand regardless of price or change, because they are more closely tied to possessing or using the brand than buyers who only like the brand (Aaker, 1991).
2.4.3 Relationships between Brand Awareness, Image, Loyalty, and the Lovemark Experience

**Brand Awareness and Brand Image**

Brand awareness is comprised of recognition and recall, which contributes to a consumer creating a set of brands she/he considers for a certain product category (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993). A well-established brand name creates a sense of familiarity with the brand (Aaker, 1991). For instance, Gap is a well-known U.S. brand for casual clothing, Tiffany for jewelry, Starbucks for coffee, Apple for a computer and the I-pod, and Tide for detergent. Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) noted that brand awareness is needed to shape a brand image, which can be created when consumers recognize a brand name, product features, and tangible/intangible benefits. Prior studies (Esch et al., 2006; Kim et
al., 2009) have found brand awareness to be positively associated with brand image. Based on the findings of the aforementioned studies, the present study posits:

H3. Brand awareness will be positively associated with brand image.

Brand Awareness and Brand Loyalty

Aaker (1991) noted that brand awareness can affect perceptions and loyalty. Previous research empirically tested the relationship between brand awareness and brand loyalty (Jung & Sung, 2008; Kim et al., 2003; Yoo & Donthu, 2001, 2002; Yoo et al., 2000). By empirically testing Aaker’s (1991) theory, Yoo’s research (Yoo & Donthu, 2001, 2002; Yoo et al., 2000) demonstrated that brand awareness and positive associations influence brand loyalty. However, Yoo’s research combined brand awareness and associations into a unidimensional concept. Jung and Sung (2008) supported Yoo’s research findings by showing the effect of both brand awareness and associations on brand loyalty. Likewise, Pappu’s studies (Pappu & Quester, 2006; Pappu et al., 2005) demonstrated the positive effect of brand awareness on loyalty; however, this research distinguished between brand awareness and brand associations. In support of the findings from the existing research, the present study examines the relationship between brand awareness and brand loyalty. Thus, the present study proposes:

H4. Brand awareness will be positively associated with brand loyalty.

Brand Awareness and the Lovemark Experience (i.e., High Brand Love and Respect)

Mehrabian and Russell (1974) proposed that consumers tend to approach situations they like and avoid those that they don’t like. Based on Mehrabian and Russell’s (1974) approach/avoidance theory, consumers may spend more time exploring information of a brand that they like, which may strengthen their affect towards and
beliefs about a brand through selective perception. Consumers may selectively perceive information to reinforce their positive attitudes or beliefs (Blackwell, Miniard, & Engel, 2005). Consumers even search for information about the brand after they have made their purchase to confirm their decision (Blackwell et al., 2005). Thus, the level of brand awareness may be associated with positive affect (i.e., brand love) and cognitions (i.e., brand respect).

Thus, the present study hypothesizes the following:

H5. Brand awareness will be positively associated with the lovemark experience.
   H5-a. Brand awareness will be positively associated with high brand love.
   H5-b. Brand awareness will be positively associated with high brand respect.

*Brand Image and the Lovemark Experience (i.e., High Brand Love and Respect)*

Brand image captures cognitive, affective, and sensory associations (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) consumers have with a brand. Marketing research has shown that a positive brand image augments both cognitive and emotional brand experiences, such as brand trust, attachment, engagement, sense of community, and loyalty (Broyles et al., 2009; Esch et al., 2006). For instance, consumers may come to love the retailer Hot Topic (teen apparel brand), because they have a positive brand image due to experiencing its “goth” inspired store environment, exploring its alternative music bands promoted on its Website, and attended its sponsored musical events. Brand image may be also associated with cognitive evaluations on a brand. For example, a consumer may have respect for Patagonia (active sportswear), because of the positive perceptions of quality of its product, and knowledgeable and experienced brand representatives. Thus, the present study proposes:

H6. Brand image will be positively associated with the lovemark experience.
H6-a. Brand image will be positively associated with high brand love.
H6-b. Brand image will be positively associated with high brand respect.

**Brand Image and Brand Loyalty**

Keller’s (1993, 2001) conceptual research suggested a strong connection between a positive brand image and brand loyalty. Keller (1993) explained that consumers’ repeated buying behavior represents brand loyalty, which reflects a favorable attitude towards a brand. Esch et al.’s (2006) empirical research supported Keller’s proposition by showing a statistically significant effect of positive brand image on current/future purchases. Thus, the present research posits:

H7. Brand image will be positively associated with brand loyalty.

**The Lovemark Experience and Brand Loyalty**

Marketing research has empirically supported Dick and Basu’s (1994) conceptual model of antecedents/consequences of brand loyalty. According to Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) and Taylor et al. (2004), brand affect (i.e., positive emotional responses towards a brand) influences brand trust, which consisted of beliefs of reliability, quality, willingness to rely on, dependence, trustworthiness, security, and honesty. Based on these definitions of brand affect and trust in these studies, brand affect is comparable to brand love and brand trust reflects the concept of brand respect suggested by Roberts (2004). These studies and others have found that brand affect (e.g., love) influenced both attitudinal and behavioral brand loyalty (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Pawle & Cooper, 2006; Taylor et al., 2004; Whang et al., 2004). A significant effect of brand trust on brand loyalty found in previous research (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Pawle & Cooper, 2006; Taylor et al., 2004) supports that brand respect
may lead to brand loyalty. Considering the findings of previous studies, the present research included both attitudinal and behavioral measures of loyalty to capture overall brand loyalty. Therefore, the present research proposes:

H8. The lovemark experience (i.e., high brand love and respect) will be positively associated with brand loyalty.
   H8-a. High brand love will be positively associated with brand loyalty.
   H8-b. High brand respect will be positively associated with brand loyalty.

Brand Loyalty and Overall Brand Equity

Brand equity is strongly interrelated with brand awareness, image, and loyalty (Gil, Andres, & Salinas, 2007; Keller, 1993, 2001; Yoo et al., 2000). Previous studies found a strong effect of brand loyalty on overall brand equity (Gil et al., 2007; Taylor et al., 2004; Tong & Hawley, 2009b; Yoo et al., 2000). Yoo et al. (2000) demonstrated that the relationship of loyalty to overall brand equity was much stronger than that of other equity dimensions (i.e., perceived quality and a combination of awareness and associations). Based on this finding, Yoo et al. (2000) suggested that brand loyalty is the most important dimension that affects an increase in overall brand equity. Other studies supported this proposition (Gil et al., 2007; Taylor et al., 2004; Tong & Hawley, 2009b). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H9. Brand loyalty will positively influence overall brand equity.

The existing agreement among scholars on the positive effects of brand love and respect on brand loyalty as well as the direct relationship between brand loyalty and overall brand equity, it is viable to combine these dimensions into a single model. Based on the extensive review of literature, the present study proposed an expanded consumer-based brand equity model that incorporates the lovemark experience for fashion brands as
an antecedent of the brand loyalty and overall brand equity (Figure 2.4).

2.5 Fashion Innovativeness, Fashion Information Search, Gender, and Brand Awareness

Gender and Fashion Innovativeness

Fashion involves innovation (Evans, 1989). Consumers differ in their acceptance of fashion product newness or novelty. Some consumers (i.e., fashion innovators) prefer to wear a newly introduced fashion design for its uniqueness and differentiation; whereas, others (i.e., laggards) adopt the fashion product once it is accepted by a majority of the people in society (Phau & Lo, 2004).

According to Goldsmith and Flynn (1992) fashion innovativeness is defined as the willingness to try a new product when it appears in the market and earlier than other members of society. The findings of their research showed that consumers high in innovativeness (i.e., innovators and early adopters) are more fashion conscious; they frequently read fashion magazines and fashion articles in the newspaper, and watch television programs dealing with fashion products, because they are more interested in new fashion than those lower in innovativeness.

Some studies have revealed demographic differences between high and low fashion innovativeness. Behling (1992) stated that fashion innovative consumers tend to be female, higher in education, younger in age, very social, high in self-confidence, and financially stable. Other studies confirmed that typically female consumers more than male consumers are fashion innovative (Beaudoin et al., 2003; Goldsmith et al., 1987). Additionally, female consumers more than male consumers appear to be more interested in clothing and fashion (Beaudoin & Lachance, 2006; Haynes, Burts, Dukes, & Cloud,
Based on these findings, the present study posits:

**H10.** In general, female consumers will be more fashion innovative than male consumers.

**Fashion Innovativeness and Brand Awareness**

Recent empirical studies (Beaudoin et al., 2003; Beaudoin & Lachance, 2006) have examined the relationship between fashion innovativeness and brand sensitivity. Beaudoin et al., (2003) described brand sensitivity as the degree to which consumers consider information associated with a brand as an important component in their purchase decision making process. Consumers high in fashion innovativeness have higher interest in brands than those low in fashion innovativeness (Beaudoin et al., 2003; Beaudoin & Lachance, 2006). Consumers who adopt a new fashion may be aware of more fashion brands and product information of the brands, including design, color scheme, quality, and price range, due to their high interest in designer collections for the coming season. Since consumers high in fashion innovativeness tend to go shopping for fashion products more often (Goldsmith & Flynn, 1992), they may be exposed to new brands and products more frequently than others low in fashion innovativeness. Fashion interest and voluntary exposure to brands will likely lead to higher levels of brand awareness. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H11.** Higher levels of fashion innovativeness will result in higher levels of awareness for fashion brands.

**Gender and Fashion Information Search**

Consumers search for information to make better choice decisions. Empirical studies have indicated there are gender differences in information search behavior (Darley & Smith, 1995; Meyers-Levy, 1988, 1989; Meyers-Levy & Maheswaran, 1991).
In addition, a body of literature, focusing on involvement, has indicated that the degree of information search is positively related to a level of involvement (i.e., perceived relevance or interest) with a product (Bloch & Richins, 1983; Bloch, Sherrell, and Ridgway, 1986; Tigert, Ring, & King, 1976). Prior research found female consumers are more highly involved with fashion products than male consumers (Auty & Elliott, 1998; Browne & Kaldenberg, 1997; Dholakia, 1999; McCracken & Roth, 1989; O’Cass, 2000, 2004; Tigert et al., 1976). Females tend to be more knowledgeable of fashion products than males (Burton, Netemeyer, & Lichtenstein, 1995). Thus, the present research proposes:

H12. Female consumers will search for more information about fashion brands than will male consumers.

Fashion Information Search and Brand Awareness

Information search increases product awareness and knowledge (Bloch et al., 1986). Consumers have diverse ways of information search. For instance, they may look at product characteristics including design, color, and price or they may have an interaction with sales staff at a retail store. They may go to a number of brand Websites that offer similar product options to compare product features and price. They may read fan group sites for a fashion brand on Face book to gather opinions of brand experiences. They may subscribe to magazines talking about fashion or regularly check out fashion blogs to collect information. In the information search process, consumers will become more familiar with the brand. It is expected that information search may be directly linked to brand awareness. Thus, the present study posits:

H13. Information search will be positively associated with level of awareness of fashion brands.
Figure 2.4. A Conceptual Framework of Relationships between Brand Awareness, Brand Image, Lovemark Experience, Brand Loyalty, Overall Brand Equity, Fashion Innovativeness, Fashion Information Search, and Gender
CHAPTER 3. QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS FOR TESTING CONTENT VALIDITY

Chapter 3 describes the beginning step of the process for developing reliable and valid scale items for the three dimensions of brand image (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy). The first step is to ensure content validity, which includes a qualitative interview procedure and identification of major themes and sub-themes around cognitive, sensory, and emotional brand experiences (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy), used to generate scale items.

3.1 Content Validity of the Measures

Content validity focuses on development and testing of items of a construct to help ensure they capture the meaning of the original facets of the concept (DeVellis, 1991; Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995; Netemeyer et al., 2003). Vazquez, Del Rio, and Iglesias (2002) presented four basic steps of content validity assessment, based on the scale development procedure suggested by Churchill (1979) and Deng and Dart (1994). The present study followed Vazquez et al.’s (2002) four steps to create a valid measure of brand image. These steps were: specifying concepts through literature review, identification of critical facets capturing the concepts through qualitative interviews, initial scale item generation, and face validity assessment. Figure 3.1 depicts the four steps used for the present study to assess content validity.
3.2 Defining the Concepts and Critical Facets

The first step relates to building a solid conceptualization of the three dimensions of brand image (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy), based on a comprehensive literature review. Because these dimensions were conceptualized as antecedents of a lovemark, lovemark experience (i.e., high brand love and respect) literature was also reviewed. Roberts’ (2004, 2006) lovemarks theory was examined to understand the important facets of mystery, sensuality, intimacy, and two lovemark experience dimensions (i.e., brand love and respect). Marketing literature related to consumer-brand relationships and psychology literature on interpersonal love and respect were reviewed to understand better these five concepts. The marketing literature included brand
experiences (e.g., Ahuvia, 2005; Albert et al., 2008; Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Gobé, 2001; Lindstrom, 2005; Schmitt, 1999; Shimp & Madden, 1988; Thomson et al., 2005; Whang et al., 2004), and brand image (e.g., Bullmore, 1984; Dichter, 1985; Dobni & Zinkhan, 1990; Frazer, 1983; Gardner & Levy, 1955; Keller, 2001, 2008; Newman, 1957; Pohlman & Mudd, 1973). The psychology literature included feelings of love (e.g., Aron et al., 1991; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986, Hendrick et al., 1988; Lee, 1977; Rubin, 1970; Sternberg, 1986, 1997), and perceptions of respect (e.g., Frei & Shaver, 2002; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006). Moreover, consumers’ opinions on lovemarks from the www.lovemarks.com site were reviewed to identify critical facets associated with mystery, sensuality, and intimacy (see Appendix A for the descriptive comments). Existing brand love and respect scales were identified, which eliminated the need to create new measures.

Following the comprehensive literature review including review of consumers’ opinions from the lovemarks Website, the second step involved qualitative in-depth interviews to obtain a deeper understanding of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy from the consumer’s perspective. The in-depth interview is a primary research method to understand the nature of a phenomenon (McCracken, 1988; Wengraf, 2001). Qualitative interview data were content-analyzed to determine commonalities that described personal experiences with favorite brands across product categories.

Sample

A convenience sample of graduate college students over 18 years of age at a major Midwestern university was used for the individual interviews. Eleven interviewees, who reported having favorite brands in various product categories, were recruited from
diverse majors (e.g., Apparel, Merchandising, & Design; Engineering; Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management; Human Development Family Studies; and Psychology).

Each of these eleven interviewees was contacted by e-mail to schedule a one-time interview. All of the recruited interviewees, 8 female and 3 male students ranging in age from 21 to 54 years of age with a mean age of 33, volunteered to participate in the individual interviews. Nine of the 11 students were Caucasian and two students were Asian. The majority of the interviews lasted between 30 to 70 minutes. Redundancy of information suggested this sample size was sufficient to capture the range of responses.

Instrument

Drawing on the aforementioned literature, 17 questions (see Appendix B for the interview questions) were developed for use in the in-depth individual interviews. For example, interview questions included, “Could you tell me what it means to really like or love the brand?”, “Why do you like or love these brands?”, “How would you describe the relationship you have with the brand?”, “Please tell me if these brands build good sensual experiences (through the product, store environment, ads, etc.)”, and “Please describe your emotional feelings about these brands or how you feel when you think about or use the brand.” These open-ended questions captured respondents’ cognitive, sensory, and affective experiences with their favorite brands in various product categories (e.g., clothing, shoes, cosmetics, jewelry, cars, or electronics).

Data Analyses

All individual interviews were recorded and transcribed. The transcribed data were interpreted using the qualitative, analytical techniques suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994). Qualitative data analyses involved three analytic steps: data reduction,
data display, and conclusion drawing/verification (Miles & Huberman, 1994). First, data reduction is selecting, simplifying, and organizing the collection of data appeared in the transcriptions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I content-analyzed the transcriptions line-by-line to select similar phrases and to identify general themes and patterns. Second, data display refers to a presentation of thematic interpretations, leading to valid conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I grouped the identified themes around the three concepts (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) derived from the literature review, based on the commonalities of the content. Third, for the verification of conclusions, an expert confirmed the emerged themes and sub-themes around the three concepts. Any discrepancies in coding the data were negotiated between the researcher and the expert.

Interview Findings

The 11 interviews revealed that “loved brands” appear in a variety of categories, including fashion (Anthropologie, Banana Republic, Chanel, French Connection, J.Crew, Kenneth Cole, Louis Vuitton, Marc Jacobs, St. John, and Urban Outfitters), cosmetics (Bobbi Brown and Kiehl’s), active sportswear (Adidas, Champion, and Nike), cars (Honda and Toyota), retailers (Menard’s, Target, and Von Maur), electronics (Apple, Samsung, and Sony), service (State Farm), and food (Edy’s ice cream, Godiva Chocolate, Starbucks, and Teavana). Most of the interviewees really liked or loved a brand for a long time because the brand provided them with positive cognitive, sensory, and emotional experiences. Table 3.1 summarizes interview-generated themes and sub-themes around the three experiences (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy); details are discussed in subsequent sections.
### Table 3.1. Summary of Themes/Sub-Themes around Mystery, Sensuality, and Intimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>Positive present experiences</td>
<td>● Personal stories with a product/brand</td>
<td>Both Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Perceived high quality of a brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive memories from past</td>
<td>● Positive memories from personal experiences</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>● Positive memories from family members’ experiences</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future aspirations</td>
<td>● Reflection of personal aspirations</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-congruity</td>
<td>● Reflection of congruent self-image</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuality</td>
<td>Visual sensations</td>
<td>● Pleasant store environments</td>
<td>Both Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Pleasant Website design</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Beautiful product colors</td>
<td>Both Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Appealing packaging</td>
<td>Both Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Attractive advertisements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olfactory sensations</td>
<td>● Pleasantly scented products</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Pleasantly scented environments</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory sensations</td>
<td>● Pleasurable music in a store</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tactile sensations</td>
<td>● Soft textures</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>The firm’s empathy</td>
<td>● Understanding consumers’ preferences</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Remembering personal events</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer’s commitment</td>
<td>● Commitment from consumers</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer’s enjoyment</td>
<td>● Pleasure from owning a brand</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Pleasure from interacting with a brand</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mystery: Cognitive Experiences**

For the participants’ cognitive experiences associated with the brand they really
liked or loved, four primary themes emerged: 1) positive present experiences, 2) positive memories from past experiences, 3) future aspirations, and 4) self-congruity. Positive present experiences were more frequently discussed than the other three themes. The three themes (i.e., positive present experiences, positive memories from past experiences, and future aspirations) are consistent with mystery sub components proposed by Roberts, but self-congruity also emerged (see Table 2.1).

*Positive Present Experiences*

First, it appeared that positive present experiences with products and brands increased liking or loving of the brand. A majority of male and female participants shared personal stories of experiences with the brand. For instance, one male participant loved Apple because an iPod, a portable media player designed by Apple, helped him efficiently manage his time; he could multi-task. In addition, its public broadcasting service made him aware of national and global issues, politics, and other relevant information. The iPod and the Apple brand, in general, evoked love:

I love Apple because my iPod helps me use my times better and allows me to gain a lot of information. I listen to audio books and broadcasts when I am driving my car, washing dishes, or doing laundry. If I do not have my iPod, I would not read books, newspapers, or watch news on TV. My iPod [helps me] connect to the national/international news through iPod broadcast. [Because] I have these great experiences with my iPod that I really like, I really value Apple.

He also loved his Sony video camera because it helped him record family events. He stated that the video camera is strongly associated with his past memories with family, which evoked love towards the brand:

I love Sony because of my video camera. My video camera is very important, because I can preserve my family events. [Recording] memorable family events, such as holidays and birthdays is very important. My Sony camera is really valuable.
Perceived high quality of the brand was another aspect of positive present experiences. A majority of female participants mentioned this sub-theme regarding apparel brands. Comments included “appropriate size”, “comfortable fit”, and “durability of the garment” (e.g., last through washing). If females were satisfied with the brand’s functional value, they liked the brand and believed the brand performed better than the others.

Positive Memories from Past Experiences

Second, positive memories from past experiences influenced liking or loving of the brand. Both male and female participants had positive memories associated with brands that lead to a feeling of nostalgia, which created a deep emotional bond or attachment to the brand. For instance, one female participant had a 10-year relationship with Honda. She stated that the good memories associated with her first car, a Honda Accord, made her continue to purchase cars from Honda:

I love Honda because I had great experiences with my first car, Honda Accord. I loved it. So, I bought my second and third cars from Honda. I ordered the third one, a Honda Civic, no matter what the price was. I have a strong, positive, long term relationship with Honda. I love my car, my Honda. I feel very comfortable in my car like [I am] in heaven.

Similarly, one male participant summarized his childhood experiences with Adidas and Hasbro (a toy brand). His memories tied to these two brands fostered a deep attachment to the brands, which influenced his present intense positive emotions towards the brands:

I really liked Adidas. It was my first shoe choice when I was in 7th grade. I liked Adidas because Adidas had cartoon characters on the shoes, which I wanted to have. I like to have this childhood memory so it has some sentimental value [to me]. I still love the memory and still like Adidas. I remember the feelings that I had when I was young.
Hasbro offered toy transformers. I am a huge transformer fan. When I was young, I was really sick. My parents wanted me to go to the [pharmacy] and chose a toy, which was a transformer. I just fell in love with it. The first toy was very unique, which transformed [into] a robot, cars, and jets. They became [my] old friends. I liked Hasbro because my dad and I liked it together. We [collected] over 10,000 transformers. Each one of them is a memory. So, I have 10,000 memories.

An icon is a graphic character or symbol associated with a brand that reflects meaning, metaphors, and/or the culture (Roberts, 2004). For example, the Starbucks logo featuring a Mermaid Siren is a memorable iconic character that symbolizes fresh premium coffee. Nike’s swoosh conveys movement and excelling as an amateur athlete.

Personal stories of experiences with the brand that tap into memorable icons of specific products or brands create a deep emotional attachment towards the brand. For instance, one male participant loved T-shirts with the previous Iowa State logo because the logo had meanings for him. The meaning, shaped by past experiences, established a deep emotional connection to the old Iowa State logo T-shirts:

I really [do not] like the new logo T-shirts, but [like the] old items. I hate the new logo design. For example, I like the old Iowa State logo T-shirts, because our old logo has a lot of meaning. That [meaning] has gone from the new logo Iowa State T-shirts. I really think history or heritage is important. In fact, every Iowa State T-shirt I wear has some meaning. I go online to Websites to find vintage Iowa State merchandise.

He also stated that the Adidas logo (three parallel bars) became a memorable icon connoting “success”, shaped by the brand’s associations with a former world champion tennis player, Rod Laver. The iconic Adidas logo evoked positive feelings:

The Adidas logo is iconic. I was extremely good at tennis and had scholarship offers to play when I was in high school. My parents gave me a Rod Laver poster when we went to the U.S. Open. It was of him hitting an overhead shot, wearing Adidas shoes. I think it is our human nature to emulate success. So, I would wear wrist bands that matched Rod Laver and shoes that matched Rod Laver. Adidas shoes in particular become synonymous with this emulation. I have made this connection with the Adidas logo. Thus, I love Adidas brand and like its logo.
Along with positive memories from an individual’s own experiences with the brand, a family member’s experiences shaped positive brand perceptions. One male participant stated that the great brand experiences his family had with Honda influenced his perceptions of Honda. His trust of the brand, based on his own and his family’s experiences led to the belief that Honda produced high quality cars. Such sense of trust may increase respect for the brand:

If I think of buying a car, Honda would [come to] my mind [immediately due to] positive past experiences, not only my own, but my family members.’ We trust [this brand]. If I purchase another car from Honda, I believe that it would work as our previous cars, based on good experiences with this brand.

**Future Aspirations**

Third, aspirations for future experiences were associated with deep emotional attachment to the brand. This theme was reported by some of female participants, who are more likely than males to dream about owning the brand. A few female participants loved a brand because it reflected their ideal image and future desires. A few female participants believed that their personality, character, and/or social status were closely connected to the brand image. One female participant stated that owning Chanel products is her future aspiration, which evoked love:

Chanel is a part of my future style, which is my dream and my goal I hope to achieve. I definitely have affinity toward Chanel. I do love the brand.

In addition, two female participants reported that they work harder to earn more money so that they can buy their favorite brands. Their strong aspirations to own the brands, which reflect their goals and social class created love toward the brands. One participant stated:
My favorite brands are my dreams, my goals, and social class that I hope to reach sometime. I know that I should work hard to own them. I want to afford those brands not only for myself but also for my family and friends. I have definite affinity and attachment to my brands.

*Self-Congruity*

Fourth, congruent self-image reflection influenced a deep emotional connection to the brand. A majority of female participants mentioned this theme regarding apparel brands. They loved the brand because it connoted their characteristics or self-image. The congruent image between female consumers and a brand contributed to maintaining a positive long-term relationship and evoked love:

St. John reflects a prestigious image and I like that people recognize this brand as me. If this brand does not exist, it would be hard to present myself. I love this brand. I have been wearing this brand for 15 years. I will remain loyal to this brand.

These brands enhance my life, giving me opportunities to express myself. It represents who I am. It makes me feel comfortable and confident because I know I look good in wearing these brands. It makes me feel very happy and fun.

In summary, positive present experiences and positive memories from past brand experiences evoked a deep emotional attachment, led to trust, and built a positive reputation for a brand. Future aspirations and self-congruity enhanced the emotional connection to the brand. Thus, pleasant cognitive experiences may contribute to creating a Lovemark (i.e., high brand love and respect).

*Sensuality: Sensory Experiences*

A majority of participants responded that positive sensory experiences influenced liking or loving of the brand. Four major themes emerged from the interview data: 1) visual, 2) olfactory, 3) auditory, and 4) tactile sensations. Visual sensations were more frequently discussed than the other three sensations. These four sensations, along with
gustatory sensations were proposed by Roberts (2004, 2006) to contribute to the sensuality concept (see Table 2.2).

Visual Sensations

First, it appeared that favorite brands were strongly associated with pleasurable vision cues from branding elements, such as the store environment, Website design, product color, packaging, and advertisements. Visual sensations were the most frequently mentioned source of sensory experiences. Male participants noted the impact of visual cues of the store environments and product color, whereas female participants were influenced by all of the branding elements. For instance, one female participant stated that Kiehl’s (premium cosmetics) store environment, packaging color, and design appealed to her. Such pleasant visual sensations evoked positive feelings:

I love Kiehl’s store environment because I love the way the entire [display] looks together. I also love Kiehl’s packaging, which looks like a white pharmaceutical case. I keep purchasing a lot of products because I am very happy with their products and packaging. I feel so confident in Kiehl’s.

Another female participant found Anthropologie’s Website design and product colors appealing. The attractive visual merchandise and colors contributed to establishing an emotional connection to the brand.

I love to see Anthropologie’s Website because of their creative visual merchandise. I like Anthropologie more than Urban Outfitters because they have more mature colors than Urban Outfitters. I shop at Anthropologie more frequently than Urban Outfitters. I feel that I am closely connected with Anthropologie. It has been an integral part of my life. I feel confident.

These statements reinforce that pleasant visual sensations provide consumers with unforgettable brand experiences that contribute to building an emotional connection and trust between consumers and the brand (Gobé, 2001).
Olfactory Sensations

Second, the sense of smell evoked sensory pleasure, which positively affected liking and trust in the brand. Both male and female participants loved pleasantly scented products and environments. For instance, one female participant stated that she loves to go to Teavana (premium leaf tea and tea accessory retailer) because pleasant tea smells in the store pleased her. Pleasant sensory experiences evoked by a pleasant scent, increased liking and trust in the brand:

I love to go to Teavana because of the tea smell in the store. I love the [sensory] experiences in there and I think their tea is great. I am so happy with Teavana and I feel confident. I still keep purchasing it, feeling happy.

Environmental fragrancing that adds fragrance in retail settings triggered sensual pleasure, which increased shopping in the environment. One female participant stated that she loves Anthropologie because the fragranced scent in the store pleased her:

I like Anthropologie’s perfumed smell going through different sections, which have seasonally different scents. Sometimes, I just go there and do not buy anything. Shopping for me is a kind of experience.

Auditory Sensations

Third, females more than males mentioned the appeal of the sound offered by the brands they really liked. Female participants enjoyed music in retail environments, which evoked sensory pleasure. For instance, one female participant stated that music of the store setting pleased her. Sensory pleasure evoked through auditory sensations increased liking of the brands:

I am very inspired by music. Anthropologie keeps their music almost exactly what I love to listen to. It is the same with Von Maur. I go there to enjoy listening to the piano playing. I tend to go to Anthropologie and Von Maur more often just because of the music they play in the stores.
Another female participant stated that in-store music appealed to her. The auditory sensations affected her perception of the brand:

Music really appeals to me, because music is a big part of my life. Music in Express store catches my ears, which makes me [think] it as a modern brand.

_Tactile Sensations_

Fourth, a majority of participants liked to touch the merchandise before they purchase. They stated that texture information is particularly important to apparel brands. They liked to feel the products against their skin. Most of them stated that the soft texture evoked sensual pleasure. For instance, one male participant stated that he liked Champion because of the soft texture. The soft touch pleased him, which increased his overall liking of the brand:

I really like Champion [because] their T-shirts are soft. What I like about Champion is their T-shirts do not change to hard after washing many times. I like the soft texture. I feel the soft texture for a long time.

A few female participants stated that they loved a cosmetic brand because of its soft texture. One female participant received sensory pleasure through touching Bobbi Brown cosmetics, which influenced love of the brand:

I love Bobbi Brown due to the sense of touch. I appreciate that Bobbi Brown cosmetics are credibly luxurious. The face creams are dense and thick on the fingers as they glide effortlessly over the skin. The skin cleansers are similarly rich and creamy, which feels refreshing on the face. When rinsed, they don't leave any residue, just the feeling of clean, supple skin. The cream blush goes on creamy but slightly tacky, blending to a fresh finish. I am so happy with those products.

In summary, visual, olfactory, and tactile sensations positively influenced affective responses and positive perceptions of a brand. Auditory sensations created a
positive emotional state. Thus, pleasant sensory experiences may contribute to creating a lovemark (i.e., high brand love and respect).

**Intimacy: Emotional Experiences**

Most of participants noted that there was a deep emotional connection with the brand they really liked or loved. Three primary themes emerged from the interview data: 1) the firm’s empathy, 2) consumer’s commitment, and 3) consumer’s enjoyment. Female participants more than males mentioned commitment and enjoyment. These three themes were proposed by Roberts (2004, 2006) to contribute to the intimacy concept (see Table 2.3).

**The Firm’s Empathy**

First, it appeared that empathic brands evoked positive feelings and built a long-term relationship with consumers. A majority of participants responded that they felt emotionally tied to the brand when the brand showed an understanding of their preferences. For example, when the brand provided their preferred product design, color, shopping environment, and/or services, this created emotional pleasure for consumers. For instance, one female participant loved Chanel because it offered her favorite makeup colors. She felt love for Chanel because the brand understood her color preferences:

I love Chanel. Chanel is the only brand that provides the beautiful cosmetic colors I love. Chanel gives me pleasure and happy feelings.

She also felt intimacy when Chanel showed empathy to her by mailing coupons. The brand’s efforts contributed to maintaining a long-term relationship with the brand:

Chanel always sends me some coupons, special events, or new product promotions through the mail. Chanel shows me very constant communication efforts. Chanel makes an effort to build a good relationship with me. I love Chanel cosmetics. I have a long-term relationship with Chanel for over 20 years.
Another participant stated that she loved Starbucks because of its drive-through service, which instilled pleasure and contributed to maintaining a long-term relationship with the brand:

I really love Starbucks brand and the company. I have intense good feelings towards the brand and products. They have drive-through, which makes me go there every day! It is fast! I think this brand understands me and my lifestyle. I’ve maintained a good relationship with this brand for a long time.

Respondents also felt a sense of intimacy when the brand remembered personal events (e.g., customer’s birthday). For instance, one female participant mentioned that Menard’s and State Farm sent a birthday card and gift card every year, which contributed to maintaining a long-term relationship with the brands for over 30 years:

The brands built up positive long-term relationships and loyalty by rewarding me. Menard’s and State Farm sent me a birthday card and free gift card every year. Both brands have been offering great customer services for a long time. I have been with these brands for over 30 years.

Consumer’s Commitment

Second, consumer’s commitment triggered emotionally charged experiences. A majority of participants reported that they are committed to their favorite brand. In addition, the female participants described that their relationship with their favorite brand is similar to a friendship. For instance, one female participant felt a sense of intimacy through long-term commitment to Nike and Adidas since high school:

I have a long-term commitment to Nike and Adidas because their shoes are comfortable, stylish, and last long. I have been loyal to those brands since high school. I would say the relationships are like a friendship. I am loyal to them because I can rely or depend on them.

Consistently, the participants who were committed to their favorite brands stated that they would maintain the relationships:
I love Urban Outfitters. I am very committed to this brand and I would like to continue to keep supporting this brand.

**Consumer’s Enjoyment**

Third, participants received enjoyment when interacting with the brand. Females more than males felt enjoyment when they owned the brand and interacted with the brand. Female participants felt happiness and joy when they owned the brand they really liked or loved. The affective experiences led to a deep emotional attachment:

- I really love my Kenneth Cole bag, which is designed exactly as I wanted. I feel happy with this brand. I always find good design from this brand. I like to carry my Kenneth Cole bag anywhere. I have been with this brand for 10 years.

- I love Chanel cosmetics, which help me to create a feminine style. I really enjoy my Chanel collection in my house. I feel happy with my Chanel collection.

In summary, interviewees had emotionally charged experiences with their favorite brand. Firm’s empathy and consumer’s commitment may influence brand love and contributed to building positive long-term relationships with the brand. Consumers’ enjoyment from interaction with the brand and its products may influence positive feelings (i.e., brand love). Thus, pleasant emotional experiences may contribute to creating a lovemark (i.e., high brand love and respect).

### 3.3 Initial Scale Item Generation

The third step was to generate an initial pool of scale items for the three dimensions of brand image. The eleven themes and 21 sub-themes of the three dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) were identified, based on the literature review, descriptive comments from the lovemarks Website, and findings from the interviews. One hundred forty initial items, which reflect the identified 21 sub-themes of the three dimensions, were created. Two researchers determined the initial items.
clearly reflected all of the sub-themes of the three dimensions through a comparison between the 21 sub-themes and the initial items. The items were written as statements to be rated on a Likert-type scale, indicating degree of agreement with each statement. Through these processes, items measuring the three constructs (i.e., 80 mystery items, 25 sensuality items, and 35 intimacy items) were produced.

3.4 Testing Face Validity

The fourth step was to assess face validity and wording clarity of the initial scale items. Two experienced researchers and two graduate students knowledgeable about branding concepts were asked to determine if each item was representative of the appropriate construct domain. The two researchers and one graduate student were Caucasian females, while one graduate student was Asian female. The definitions of the three constructs were given to the four judges, and they were asked to indicate items that were not worded clearly or did not represent the construct well. They noted three mystery items were not good representations of the construct. Consequently, the three mystery items were removed from the 140 items (see Appendix C for the 137 generated items). With face validity confirmed, construct validity processes could begin.
CHAPTER 4. PRELIMINARY QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS FOR TESTING RELIABILITY, CONVERGENT, AND NOMOLOGICAL VALIDITY

Chapter 4 presents the results of reliability, and convergent and nomological validity assessments for the measures of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy discussed in Chapter 3. This chapter describes the three steps of reliability and validity assessment, based on the scale development process presented by Vazquez et al. (2002): 1) collect quantitative data using an online survey, 2) conduct exploratory factor analysis and compute the reliability of the measures that were derived from the exploratory factor analysis, and 3) evaluate convergent validity through confirmatory factor analysis and nomological validity by testing Roberts’ (2004) theory through Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (see Figure 4.1). This chapter provides definitions of three different types of construct validity (i.e., convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity) and a summary of the results from the tests of convergent and nomological validity. The discriminant validity assessment is reported in Chapter 5.

**Step1:** Quantitative data collection using an online survey (preliminary test)

**Step2:** Data reduction and reliability assessment by calculating Cronbach’s alpha values

**Step3:** Convergent and nomological validity assessment: CFA and SEM to test Roberts’ (2004) theory

Figure 4.1. Three Steps of Reliability, and Convergent and Nomological Validity Assessment
4.1 Reliability and Construct Validity of the Measures

Reliability

Reliability refers to the degree of internal consistency of a set of items (DeVellis, 1991; Netemeyer et al., 2003). Cronbach’s (1951) alpha coefficient (DeVellis, 1991; Huck, 2007; Netemeyer et al., 2003) was used to assess the internal consistency of the scales that measure the three dimensions of brand image (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) developed in the present study along with the measures of brand love and respect (one minus alpha is measurement error). The reliability analyses were conducted using SPSS 18.0. A high coefficient implies the scale items produce a reliable assessment of the construct being evaluated (DeVellis, 1991).

Construct Validity

Construct validity assesses whether the scale provides an assessment of the intended construct, based on the theoretical conceptualization of the construct (Netemeyer et al., 2003). The three types of construct validity are: convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity (DeVellis, 1991).

Convergent validity assesses the degree to which the items from the measure are similar to other measures of the same or similar constructs (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Convergent validity can be tested in several ways. First, convergent validity is confirmed by significant factor loadings (above .50) in the measurement model of SEM (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). Second, two scales that are hypothesized to measure similar concepts can be used to test convergent validity (DeVellis, 1991). A strong positive correlation between these measures provides evidence of convergent validity. This chapter presents
evidence of convergent validity of the measures (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) by factor loadings in the measurement model.

Discriminant validity is used to assess the degree to which a measure of a construct can be shown to be distinct from measures of other constructs that are theoretically related. The goal of discriminant validity is to demonstrate that the measure differs from other related measures (DeVellis, 2003; Netermeyer et al., 2003; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). For example, Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona (1980) demonstrated that the UCLA Loneliness Scale assesses a construct that is distinct from measures of depression. Their results indicated that the correlation between the loneliness and depression measures was less than the correlation between the loneliness measure and other indicators of loneliness. Discriminant validity of the brand image measures is presented in Chapter 5.

Nomological validity assesses whether the relationships among measures are consistent with theoretical predictions (Netermeyer et al., 2003). For example, a recent study assessed nomological validity of a newly developed measure for Pine and Gilmore’s (1999) experience economy concepts (i.e., educational, esthetic, entertainment, and escapist experiences) by examining if these four constructs predicted four consequence variables (i.e., arousal, memory, overall quality, and satisfaction) (Oh, Fiore, & Jeong, 2007). The present chapter presents evidence of nomological validity of the measures by testing Roberts’ (2004) theory.

4.2 Preliminary Quantitative Data Collection

To begin to finalize the scale items for the three dimensions of brand image, a preliminary online survey with 167 items was administered to undergraduate students.
The 167 items included 10 brand love items and 20 brand respect items. The resulting data were used to test reliability, and convergent and nomological validity through exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and SEM.

Sample

A convenience sample of undergraduate college students over 18 years of age at a major Midwestern university was used for the online survey. During March 2009, a total of 224 students, enrolled in four courses at the university, participated in the online survey that was linked to their courses’ Websites. These students majored in diverse disciplines, such as Apparel, Merchandising, and Design; Engineering; Journalism and Communication; Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management; and Human Development and Family Studies. The respondents were recruited through an announcement in class for voluntary participants. As an incentive for participation, students received extra credit points added to his or her course grade (i.e., 5 points or 10 points out of 1000). Of the 224 responses received from the online survey, 218 were usable, because six surveys had missing data.

The majority of the sample was female (91%). A predominate female sample was appropriate because women are more involved than men with fashion brands (Auty & Elliott, 1998; Browne & Kaldenberg, 1997). The respondents (198 females and 20 males) ranged in age from 18 to 54 years of age with a mean age of 21. Caucasian American students represented 87% of the sample. Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (N=218)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian American</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents indicated that they spent more than $500 annually for fashion products. Specifically, 37% of the respondents spent $501-1,000 and 35% spent more than $1,000. With regard to shopping frequency, 35% of the respondents reported they shop for fashion products more than once a week or every week, and 42% go shopping monthly. More than 50% of the respondents had previous experience checking out fashion blogs; however, only about a quarter of the respondents (22%) had experience with online fashion/brand communities. More than half of the respondents reported that they occasionally read fashion magazines (58%). Therefore, the sample appeared to have interest in and experience with fashion products. Detailed information regarding respondents’ shopping experiences for fashion products is shown in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2. Shopping Experiences for Fashion Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Experiences</th>
<th>Frequency (N=218)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money spent on fashion products annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101-500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501-1,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $1,000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping frequency (in-store or online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice or three times a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 2 or 3 months</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every month</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every week</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every day</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online fashion/brand community experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking out fashion blogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every once in a while</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of reading fashion magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never read or look at fashion magazines</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally, I read or look at fashion magazines.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to read or look at every issue.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An investigation of the participants’ favorite fashion brands revealed that Express was the favorite brand. The top five fashion brands were casual wear brands (i.e., Express, Forever 21, J. Crew, Gap, and Juicy Couture) that target young adult consumers. The favorite fashion brands and the number of respondents identifying each brand are shown in Table 4.3. The majority of respondents (95%) indicated that they liked or really loved their selected fashion brand.
Table 4.3. The Most Favorite Fashion Brands (N=120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorite fashion brand name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forever 21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Crew</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juicy Couture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Eagle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana Republic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abercrombie &amp; Fitch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Outfitters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guess</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropologie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCBG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Procedure

The present study obtained approval to use human subjects from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the university (see Appendix D). Students were fully informed of their rights by the researcher during a presentation to the class before participating in the online survey. Links to the survey were opened on the courses’ Websites after receiving IRB approval. Survey Gizmo software package was used to create the online survey. The first page of the survey included a consent form and description of procedures, risks, benefits, compensation, confidentiality, and participant rights. The participants were asked to click “Yes” if they voluntarily agreed to participate in the present study. They could move to the next pages by clicking the “Next” button located on the bottom of the web page. Participants had ten days to log onto the Website and complete the survey.

Instrument

A self-administered questionnaire was used for the online survey (see Appendix E for the questionnaire). At the beginning of the survey, respondents were asked to identify
their favorite fashion brands, including clothing, accessories, footwear, and cosmetics brands. In addition, they were asked how much they loved the brand, ranging from “I like this brand somewhat” (1) to “I really love this brand” (5). Brand experience questions were divided into two parts: (1) brand love and respect for their favorite fashion brands, and (2) mystery, sensuality, and intimacy experiences with their favorite fashion brands. A reliable measure of brand love was adopted from Carroll and Ahuvia (2006), and brand respect items came from the Frei and Shaver’s (2002) scale. The present study replaced one respect item: “I am a member of a respect-worthy social category (e.g., experts, authorities, prize-winners, and successful people)” with “This brand leads fashion trends season to season.” Frei and Shaver’s (2002) scale measured interpersonal respect, whereas the present study examined brand respect for fashion products. The reported reliability coefficient alpha of brand love was .91 and brand respect was .97 (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Frei & Shaver, 2002).

A 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), was used for the brand image (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy), brand love, and respect items. Demographic characteristics, which included age, gender, and ethnicity along with items related to shopping behaviors, concluded the questionnaire. The latter items measured consumers’ information search and shopping behaviors for fashion products (see Table 4.3 for these items and results).

4.3 Data Analyses: Data Reduction and Reliability Assessment

Data Analyses

Data collected through the online survey were analyzed in three ways, using SPSS 18.0 and Mplus 5.0 programs. First, descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution,
mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum scores, were used to summarize
data for the three brand image dimensions, the two lovemark experience dimensions,
demographic variables, and shopping behaviors. Second, exploratory and confirmatory
factor analyses were performed as data reduction techniques for the mystery, sensuality,
intimacy experiences, brand love, and respect measures. Third, a Cronbach’s alpha
coefficient for each of the five measures was calculated to assess reliability.

Exploratory factor analysis using principle axis factoring with promax rotation
was conducted to facilitate data reduction. Factor rotations allow transformation of initial
factor loadings of the items to present a clear and simple structure (Nunnally, 1978).
Promax rotation allows correlations among the factors, which maximize the loading on
one factor for each item (i.e., simple structure) (Nunnally, 1978). Social science research
commonly uses orthogonal rotation (i.e., varimax), assuming statistical independence
between the factors (Brown, 2006). However, oblique rotation (i.e., promax) is useful
when a theory suggests correlated factors (Brown, 2006; DeVellis, 1991). Specifically,
the orthogonal rotation is the best approach for uncorrelated factors (e.g., less than .15);
otherwise, the oblique rotation is the most appropriate approach (DeVellis, 1991;
McDonald, 1997). Therefore, the present analysis used the oblique rotation allowing the
factors to be correlated, because correlations between measures of these five constructs
would be expected. The number of factors for each construct was determined, based on
the eigenvalue greater than 1 criterion. Items were retained if they loaded above .50 on
the factor, but below .30 on the other factors (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Cross-
loading items on two or more factors were excluded (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).
Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability

Exploratory factor analysis with the oblique rotation (i.e., promax rotation) extracted factors for items assessing the three brand image dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) and the two lovemark experience dimensions (i.e., brand love and respect). As set in the EFA, one factor resulted in each dimension, based on the eigenvalue greater than 1.0 criterion. Each measure had satisfactory internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha value above .70. Results from the exploratory factor analysis and reliability tests are presented in Table 4.4.

Mystery: Cognitive Experiences

Nine of the original 77 items for the mystery factor were retained, based on the factor loadings. Retained items captured the cognitive experiences shaped by positive present interactions and positive memories from past interactions with a brand, but it did not capture aspirations for future interactions. The nine-item mystery factor had an eigenvalue of 5.98 and explained nearly 66% of the variance for the items. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .94.

Sensuality: Sensory Experiences

Ten of the original 25 items were retained for the sensuality factor. Retained items captured the sensory experiences from visual, olfactory, and tactile sensations, but it did not capture auditory sensations. This factor had an eigenvalue of 5.84 and explained 58% of variance for the items. The factor had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .92.

Intimacy: Emotional Experiences

Fourteen of the 35 original intimacy items were retained. The retained items
captured emotional experiences shaped by the intimacy sub components (i.e., the firm’s empathy, consumers’ commitment, and consumer’s enjoyment). Two items (“I like looking at the products of this brand” and “I see this brand as cool”) that were designed to measure sensuality loaded highly on the intimacy factor, which may reflect consumer’s enjoyment from interacting with a brand. This factor had an eigenvalue of 10.39 and explained 65% of the variance for these items. The 16 items had a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .96.

*Brand Love and Respect*

The brand love factor retained seven of the 10 original items, based on the factor loadings. The factor had an eigenvalue of 4.87 and explained 70% of the variance for these items. The Cronbach’s alpha was .93 for the seven items. The brand respect factor retained 11 out of the original 20 items. This factor had an eigenvalue of 6.37 and explained 53% of the variance. The Cronbach’s alpha for these 11 items was .91.

**Table 4.4. Results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability (N=218)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct and item</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mystery (α = .94)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>66.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. This brand adds to the experience of my life.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This brand adds to the quality of my life.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This brand always has what I’m looking for.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand awakens good memories for me.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand captures a sense of my life.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand captures the times.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This brand has changed my life for the better.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This brand is a part of my life.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensuality (α = .92)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>58.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The design of the brand’s packaging really appeals to me.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The design of this brand’s ads is really well done.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The smell of the store environment of this brand is pleasing.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The store environment of this brand appeals to me.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The textures of this brand are better than other brands.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct and item</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Eigen value</th>
<th>Percent of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensuality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Website design for this brand is really well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>58.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This brand has a beautiful color scheme.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This brand has incredible displays.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intimacy (α = .96)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am confident that my relationship with this brand will last a long time.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can rely on this brand.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel comfortable when I wear this brand.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel connected to this brand.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel fortunate that I can buy this brand.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel happy when I wear this brand.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel satisfied with this brand.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have fun with this brand.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have solid support for this brand.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I like looking at the products of this brand.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I really enjoy wearing this brand.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I see this brand as cool.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I will always trust this brand.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would be disappointed if this brand was no longer available.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would stay with this brand.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. This brand really excites me.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Love (α = .93)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>69.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am passionate about this brand.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I love this brand.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I’m very attached to this brand.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand is a pure delight.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand is totally awesome.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand makes me feel good.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This is a wonderful brand.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand respect (α = .91)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>53.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I approve of this brand’s performance.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I pay attention to what is going on with this brand.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I respect this brand.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I’m very committed to this brand.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand communicates well with me.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand has a good reputation.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This brand is honest to me.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This brand is responsible to me.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This brand is responsible to society.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This brand is very faithful.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. This brand leads fashion trend season to season.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. This brand is responsible to society.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. This brand is very faithful.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. This brand leads fashion trend season to season.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. This brand is responsible to society.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. This brand is very faithful.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis was used to finalize items for the three brand image dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) and the two lovemark experience dimensions (i.e., brand love and respect). A number of indices were employed to evaluate the goodness of model fit, because the $\chi^2$-square test of a model fit is affected by sample size (Netemeyer et al., 2003). The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) value should be greater than .90 to be acceptable (Hair et al., 2006). The cut off value for Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) was .08, used to indicate an acceptable range of model fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992).

The results from confirmatory factor analysis also provide modification indices, which identify aspects of the model that do not fit the data well (Brown, 2006). These values indicate the decrease in the overall model $\chi^2$ if a fixed or constrained parameter (i.e., factor loading) was freed (Brown, 2006). In the present study, the modification indices were examined to discover aspects of the model that does not fit the data well.

Mystery: Cognitive Experiences

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the nine mystery items extracted through exploratory factor analysis. Three items were removed from the underlying mystery factor on the basis of the modification indices for the residual matrix. If the random error terms for two measures were highly correlated with one another, then the item with the lowest factor loading on mystery was removed to improve model fit. For instance, the error term for “This brand has changed my life for the better” was highly
correlated with the error term for “This brand is a part of my life.” The modification indices indicated a 25.75 decrease in \( \chi^2 \)-square if these two error terms were allowed to correlate. Therefore, “This brand has changed my life for the better” was removed due to its lower factor loading (.73) than the other item (.82). The results from the confirmatory factor analysis revealed a better model fit when the three mystery items were removed using this data reduction process. Thus, the mystery scale was finalized with six items.

Table 4.5 presents the differences in degrees of freedom and \( \chi^2 \)-square, as well as the improved fit indices obtained by eliminating the three mystery items.

Table 4.5. Fit Indices for the Two Mystery Models (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two models</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model with 9 items</td>
<td>163.5***</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved model with 6 items</td>
<td>13.91***</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3 items removed:
1. This brand always has what I’m looking for.
2. This brand adds to the quality of my life.
3. This brand has changed my life for the better.

\( *** p \leq .001 \)

The finalized mystery factor with six indicators showed a good model fit to the data (\( \chi^2 = 13.91, df = 9, p < .001 \)); moreover, CFI was .99, the RMSEA estimate was .05, and SRMR was .02. The standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item for the mystery factor were statistically significant as shown in Table 4.6. The Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) for these six items was .92.
Table 4.6. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Mystery (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This brand adds to the experience of my life.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>27.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This brand awakens good memories for me.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>44.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This brand captures a sense of my life.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>50.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand captures the times.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>37.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>24.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand is a part of my life.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>23.46***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p ≤ .001

Sensuality: Sensory Experiences

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis using the 10 sensuality items, three items were removed from the scale on the basis of the modification indices for the residual matrix. For instance, the error term for “The smell of the store environment of this brand is pleasing” was highly correlated with the error term for “The store environment of this brand appeals to me.” “The smell of the store environment of this brand is pleasing” item was eliminated, because of its lower factor loading (.74) in comparison to the other item (.79). Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that removing the three sensuality items from the model resulted in an improvement in the fit indices (CFI, RMESA, and SRMR [see Table 4.7]).

Table 4.7. Fit Indices for the Two Sensuality Models (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model with 10 items</td>
<td>214.87***</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved model with 7 items</td>
<td>45.69***</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3 items removed:
1. The design of the brand’s packaging really appeals to me.
2. The smell of the store environment of this brand is pleasing.
3. The textures of this brand are better than other brands.

*** p ≤ .001
The chi-square test confirmed an acceptable model fit for the sensuality dimension, based on chi-square ($\chi^2 = 45.69$, $df = 14$, $p < .001$), CFI of .96, the RMSEA estimate of .10, and SRMR of .03. Although the RMSEA estimate indicated a mediocre fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992), exceeding the .08 cut off, the other two fit indices (i.e., CFI and SRMR) provided evidence of adequate model fit. The most important fit index is the CFI, because it has the most consistent record in accurately indicating model fit (Hair et al., 2006). A number of scholars have argued against the common cutoff value (.05) for the RMSEA (Chen, Curran, Bollen, Kirby, & Paxton, 2008). Chen et al. (2008) indicated that an appropriate cutoff value of the RMSEA should be based on the model specifications, sample size, and degrees of freedom. The results of their research revealed that numerous valid models in small sample sizes ($\leq 400$) that were rejected by a .05 cutoff value of the RMSEA performed better in larger sample sizes ($\geq 400$). Thus, the sensuality model with a larger sample size might perform better in terms of the RMSEA.

The standardized factor loadings and $t$-values for each item for the sensuality factor were statistically significant as shown in Table 4.8. Thus, the sensuality factor was finalized with seven items. The Cronbach’s alpha for these seven items was .90.

### Table 4.8. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Sensuality (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The design of this brand’s ads is really well done.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>23.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>19.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The store environment of this brand appeals to me.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>20.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Website design for this brand is really well done.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>15.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>27.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand has a beautiful color scheme.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>22.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This brand has incredible displays.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>24.71***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq .001$
Intimacy: Emotional Experiences

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the 16 intimacy items. Seven items were removed based on the modification indices for the residual matrix. For instance, the error term for “I feel comfortable when I wear this brand” was highly correlated with the error term for “I feel happy when I wear this brand.” “I feel comfortable when I wear this brand” was eliminated, because that item had a lower factor loading (.76) than the other item (.86). Removing the seven intimacy items improved model fit. Thus, the intimacy factor was finalized with nine items. The improved fit indices achieved by eliminating the seven intimacy indicators are shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9. Fit Indices for the Two Intimacy Models (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model with 16 items</td>
<td>391.50***</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved model with 9 items</td>
<td>85.04***</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items removed:
1. I am confident that my relationships with this brand will last a long time.
2. I feel comfortable when I wear this brand.
3. I feel fortunate that I can buy this brand.
4. I see this brand as cool.
5. I will always trust this brand.
6. I would be disappointed if this brand were no longer available.
7. This brand really excites me.

The goodness of model fit with nine indicators confirmed adequate model fit for intimacy ($\chi^2 = 85.04$, $df = 27$, $p < .001$); moreover, CFI was .97, the RMSEA estimate was .09, and SRMR was .03. Although the RMSEA estimate indicated a mediocre fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992), the overall model fit was acceptable, due to a greater than .90 for CFI and a lower than .08 for SRMR (Hair et al., 2006). Table 4.10 shows the
standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item for the intimacy factor. The Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) for these nine items was .95.

### Table 4.10. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Intimacy (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>( t )-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I can rely on this brand.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>28.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel connected to this brand.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>26.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel happy when I wear this brand.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>41.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel satisfied with this brand.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>37.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have fun with this brand.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>53.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have solid support for this brand.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>58.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like looking at the products of this brand.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>25.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I really enjoy wearing this brand.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>33.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would stay with this brand.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>33.14***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(* * * p \leq .001\)

**Brand Love: a Deep Emotional Attachment**

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis using the seven brand love items, two items were removed on the basis of the modification indices for the residual matrix. For instance, the error term for “I am passionate about this brand” was highly correlated with the error term for “I love this brand.” Based on the factor loadings of each item, “I am passionate about this brand” was eliminated, due to its lower factor loading (.73 compared to .77). Removing the two brand love items improved the three fit indices (See Table 4.11 for a comparison of the fit indices).

### Table 4.11. Fit Indices for the Two Brand Love Models (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two models</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model with 7 items</td>
<td>48.16***</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved model with 5 items</td>
<td>14.07***</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2 items removed:
1. I am passionate about this brand.
2. I am very attached to this brand.

\(* * * p \leq .001\)
The final model with five indicators showed a good model fit for brand love \(\chi^2 = 14.07, df = 5, p < .001\); moreover, CFI was .99 and SRMR was .02. The RMSEA estimate (.09) was slightly higher than the cutoff point .08 (Hair et al., 2006; Hu & Bentler, 1999), which could be caused by the small sample size (≤ 400) (Chen et al., 2008). The brand love model was acceptable in terms of CFI and SRMR (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Table 4.12 shows the standardized factor loadings and t-values for each item for the brand love factor. The Cronbach’s alpha for these five items was .91.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I love this brand.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>24.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This brand is a pure delight.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>30.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This brand is totally awesome.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>44.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand makes me feel good.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>29.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This is a wonderful brand.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>29.73***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** \(p \leq .001\)

**Brand Respect: Positive Perceptions**

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the 11 brand respect items extracted through exploratory factor analysis. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, three items were removed from the brand respect measure, based on the modification indices for the residual matrix. For instance, the error term for “This brand is responsible to society” was highly correlated with the error term for “This brand is very faithful.” Because “This brand is responsible to society” had a lower factor loading (.75) than the other item (.84), it was eliminated. The results from the confirmatory factor analysis revealed that removing the three brand respect items lead to an improved model fit. Thus, the brand respect was finalized with eight indicators. Table 4.13 presents the improved fit indices achieved by eliminating the three brand respect items.
Table 4.13. Fit Indices for the Two Brand Respect Models (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two models</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model with 11 items</td>
<td>169.58***</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecified model with 8 items</td>
<td>53.61***</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3 items removed:
1. I pay attention to what is going on with this brand.
2. This brand has a good reputation.
3. This brand is responsible to society.

The final model with eight indicators showed a good model fit for brand respect \((\chi^2 = 53.61, df = 20, p < .001)\); moreover, CFI was .96, the RMSEA estimate was .08, and SRMR was .04. These indices indicated an acceptable model fit, greater than .90 for CFI and smaller than .08 for RMSEA and SRMR (Hair et al., 2006). Table 4.14 shows the standardized factor loadings and t-values for each item for the brand respect factor. The Cronbach’s alpha for these eight items was .88.

Table 4.14. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Brand Respect (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I approve of this brand’s performance.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>15.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I respect this brand.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>23.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I’m very committed to this brand.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>13.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand communicates well with me.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>10.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand is honest to me.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>26.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand is responsible to me.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>22.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This brand is very faithful.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>31.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This brand leads fashion trend season to season</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>12.61***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001

4.4 Convergent and Nomological Validation, and Hypotheses Testing

To establish construct validity of the measures, convergent and nomological validity were examined. Convergent validity was assessed by examining the factor loadings in the measurement model for confirmatory factor analysis. Roberts’ (2004)
lovemarks theory, which posited that a lovemark (i.e., a combination of high brand love and respect) is determined by mystery, sensuality, and intimacy, was tested to assess nomological validity and to test hypothesis 1 and 2. The relationships among mystery, sensuality, intimacy, brand love, and respect are examined using SEM. SEM is useful to test a theory that involves multivariate relations between observed variables and unobserved latent variables (Byrne, 2001; Hair et al., 2006). In SEM, both measurement and structural models are tested simultaneously (Hair et al., 2006). To begin measurement and structural models testing, item parcels for the five constructs (i.e., mystery, sensuality, intimacy, brand love, and respect) were created.

Creating Item Parcels

Item parcels were created, based on sums of responses to groups of individual items, and scores of these parcels were used in the latent variable analysis (Russell, Kahn, Spoth, & Altmaier, 1998). To balance the average loadings of each parcel on the factor, the extracted items were assigned to parcels for each variable, based on their factor loadings from the confirmatory factor analysis (Russell et al., 1998). As an example, the mystery items, “This brand awakens good memories for me” and “This brand is a part of my life” were assigned to M1; “This brand captures a sense of my life” and “This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product” to M2; and “This brand captures the times” and “This brand adds to the experience of my life” to M3. These three mystery item parcels are designed to reflect the underlying construct of mystery at an equal level. Research using item parcels rather than individual items has resulted in a better fit of the measurement model, because the results are not influenced by characteristics of individual items (Russell et al., 1998). Three item parcels were
developed for mystery, sensuality, intimacy, brand love, and respect variables as shown in Table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.15. Item Parcels: Three Brand Image Dimensions, Brand Love, and Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item parcel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M1 | This brand awakens good memories for me. (.87)  
This brand is a part of my life. (.75) |
| M2 | This brand captures a sense of my life. (.89)  
This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product. (.76)  
This brand captures the times. (.85)  
This brand adds to the experience of my life. (.78) |
| M3 |  |
| Sensuality |  |
| S1 | This brand has incredible displays. (.78)  
The design of this brand’s ads is really well done. (.77)  
The well-ordered store environment appeals to me. (.81) |
| S2 | The store environment of this brand appeals to me. (.74)  
This brand has a beautiful color scheme. (.75)  
The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product. (.73) |
| S3 | The Website design for this brand is really well done. (.66) |
| Intimacy |  |
| I1 | I have solid support for this brand. (.90)  
I really enjoy wearing this brand. (.82)  
I can rely on this brand. (.79) |
| I2 | I feel happy when I wear this brand. (.85)  
I feel satisfied with this brand. (.84)  
I like looking at the products of this brand. (.77)  
I have fun with this brand. (.89) |
| I3 | I would stay with this brand. (.82)  
I feel connected to this brand. (.77) |
| Brand love |  |
| B1 | I love the brand. (.77)  
This brand is a pure delight. (.81) |
| B2 | This brand is totally awesome. (.88) |
| B3 | This is a wonderful brand. (.81)  
This brand makes me feel good. (.80) |
| Brand respect |  |
| R1 | I approve of this brand’s performance. (.66)  
This brand communicates well with me. (.54)  
I’m very committed to this brand. (.63) |
| R2 | I respect this brand. (.78)  
This brand is honest to me. (.79)  
This brand leads fashion trends season to season. (.60)  
This brand is responsible to me. (.76) |
| R3 | This brand is very faithful. (.83) |
Results

Measurement Model and Convergent Validity

The first step in SEM is testing the measurement model. Confirmatory factor analysis of the item parcels was performed to examine the fit of the measurement model. The convergent validity of measures for each brand image dimension (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) was also indicated, based on the factor loadings on each construct. The maximum-likelihood estimation procedure, which minimizes residuals between the observed and implied matrix, was used to test the measurement and structural models. The correlation among items was freed, but all error terms for the measured variables (i.e., item parcels) were not allowed to correlate. The overall goodness-of-fit of the measurement and structural models was determined by examining the chi-square value, CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR (cut off value for CFI .90, RMSEA .08, and SRMR .08) (Browne & Cudeck, 1992; Hair et al., 2006).

As Table 4.16 presents, all confirmatory factor loadings were higher than .79 with highly significant t-values ranging from 24.75 to 124.56, which confirmed convergent validity of the measures (Baggozzi & Yi, 1988). The results also indicated that the measurement model fits the data well, $\chi^2 = 167.02, df = 80, p < .001$, CFI was .97, the RMSEA value was .07, and SRMR was .03.
Table 4.16. Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (N=218)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item parcel</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>51.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>47.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>63.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>41.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>30.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>42.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>87.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>124.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>104.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>45.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>43.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>46.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>35.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>24.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>27.68***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001

The five constructs were significantly correlated with each other (≥. 50) (see Table 4.17). The three brand image dimensions were strongly correlated with each other. Furthermore, these three measures were correlated with brand love and respect, as Roberts’ (2004) theory proposed.

Table 4.17. Correlations between the Five Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mystery</th>
<th>Sensuality</th>
<th>Intimacy</th>
<th>Brand Love</th>
<th>Brand Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuality</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Love</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Respect</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001

The Structural Model, Nomological Validity, and Hypotheses Testing

A structural model testing relationships between the three brand image variables
and brand love and respect, using the maximum-likelihood estimation procedure, was employed to examine nomological validity of the brand image scale (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) as well as to test Hypotheses 1 and 2 of the conceptual model proposed in Chapter 2 (see Figure 2.2). The fit indices of the structural model showed good fit of the data, which supports nomological validity of the scale ($\chi^2 = 167.02, df = 80, p < .001$). CFI was .97, RMSEA was .07, and SRMR was .03, indicating a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). All proposed paths in the SEM model were statistically significant ($P \leq .001$), except one path from sensuality to brand love.

**Testing Hypotheses (H1 and H2)**

The structural model supported Hypotheses 1a, 1c, 2a, 2b, and 2c, but not Hypothesis 1b (see Figure 4.2). Hypothesis 1a posited that mystery positively influences brand love. The standardized path coefficient ($\gamma$) between mystery and brand love was .22 ($t = 2.94, p \leq .01$), supporting Hypothesis 1a. Hypothesis 1b, predicting a positive effect of sensuality on brand love, was not statistically supported ($\gamma = .09, t = 1.07$).

Hypothesis 1c, predicting a positive effect of intimacy on brand love, was statistically supported ($\gamma = .50, t = 5.19, p \leq .001$). Hypothesis 2a, predicting a positive effect of mystery on brand respect was statistically supported ($\gamma = .27, t = 3.02, p \leq .01$).

Hypothesis 2b, predicting a positive effect of sensuality on brand respect, was statistically supported ($\gamma = .38, t = 5.02, p \leq .001$). Hypothesis 2c, predicting a positive effect of intimacy on brand respect, was statistically supported ($\gamma = .29, t = 3.04, p \leq .01$). These significant results further support the nomological validity of the three brand image dimensions developed in the present study.
Figure 4.2. The Structural Model Showing Empirical Relationships between the Three Brand Image Dimensions and the Lovemark Experience

Note: Standardized path coefficients are reported in parentheses.

\[ \chi^2 (df = 80) = 167.02 \]

CFI = .97

RMSEA = .07

SRMR = .03

\[ **P \leq .01, ***P \leq .001 \]
CHAPTER 5. FINAL QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS FOR SCALE VALIDATION AND TESTING OF THE HYPOTHESES MODEL

Chapter 5 presents the results of factor structure assessments for each variable in the proposed model (see Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2) and final validation of the brand image scale developed in Chapter 4. The present chapter contains the results of convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity assessments for the measure of brand image using data from an online survey of a sample of U. S. consumers. Convergent and discriminant validity were assessed through confirmatory factor analysis. Testing the structure of the hypothesized model using SEM provided evidence of nomological validity.

5.1 Final Quantitative Data Collection

Sample

A random sample of two groups, undergraduate and graduate students and alumni, was recruited to complete the online survey between April 21st and 26th 2010. The inclusion of students and alumni provided a wide range of ages and geographic locations, which enhance the external validity of the analyses. The sample was drawn from a total of 88,017 alumni registered in the university alumni association and 26,283 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in spring 2010 at a major Midwestern university. The list of undergraduate and graduate student e-mail addresses was purchased from the university’s Office of the Registrar and Residency Classification Officer. The alumni e-mail address list was purchased from the University’s Foundation. An e-mail message was sent to explain the purpose of the survey and to invite students and alumni to participate. These individuals were informed their responses would remain
anonymous. A drawing to win one of four Visa Check cards valued at $25 each was the incentive to participate.

A total of 3,042 individuals participated in the online survey. Of the 3,042 responses, 2,492 were usable, because 550 responses had missing data. These usable responses indicated participants loved or really loved a fashion brand(s). Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (N=2,492)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-76</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian American or European</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,999 or none</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-19,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-39,999</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-59,999</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-79,999</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000-99,999</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100,000</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money spent on fashion products annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101-900</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$901-1,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,501-2,100</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,101-2,700</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,701-3,300</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,301-5,100</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants (1,006 males and 1,486 females) were between the ages of 18 to 76 with a median age of 46 years. The national median age was 36.8 years according to the U.S. Census Bureau in 2009. Almost sixty percent of the sample was female. The majority of the participants (75%) were middle-aged adults between 30 and 65; young adults between 18 and 29 years were almost 20% of the sample and individuals older than 65 were 4.7% of the sample. The largest group of the participants was Caucasian American (92.5%). Approximately half of the respondents (45.4%) indicated their annual income in the range of $40,000-$99,999. About one-third of the respondents (33%) were annually paid more than $100,000. Most of the participants were highly educated individuals who had obtained an undergraduate, graduate degree, or currently working on their college degree as students. The annual spending amount for fashion averaged $2,400-2,700. Specifically, 60% spent $1,501-3,300, about 22% of the participants spent $101-1,500, and 5.5% spent $3,301-5,100.

Data Collection Procedure

The present study collected data after obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the university for use of human subjects (see Appendix F). Both students and alumni were fully informed of their rights by the researcher’s e-mail message before participating in the online survey. A link to the survey was attached to the e-mail. Survey Gizmo software package was used to create the online survey. The first page of the survey included a consent form and description of procedures, risks, benefits, compensation, confidentiality, and participant rights. The participants were asked to click “Yes” if they voluntarily agreed to participate in the present study. They could proceed to the next pages by clicking the “Next” button, located at the bottom of the electronic
survey page. Participants could log onto the survey Website to complete the survey during a six-day period.

Instrument

A self-administered questionnaire was distributed online. At the beginning of the survey, respondents were asked to identify their favorite fashion brands. They were also asked to indicate the degree to which they liked or loved the brand, ranging from “I like this brand somewhat” (1) to “I really love this brand” (5). The remainder of the questionnaire consisted of ten parts: respondents’ level of brand awareness, their opinions about brand love, brand respect, brand image, brand experience, brand involvement, brand loyalty, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, fashion information search behaviors, and demographic characteristics (see Appendix G for the full version of the instrument).

Brand Awareness

Brand awareness captures brand recognition and brand recall. The items comprising the brand awareness scale were adopted from two brand awareness measures (Aaker, 1996; Keller, 2001). The brand awareness scale includes five items, such as “I know what this brand stands for”, “I have heard of this brand”, and “I am aware of this brand.”

Brand Love and Respect

Brand love and respect represent components of the lovemark experience. Brand love captures the strong affection or attachment consumers have for a certain brand. Brand love items were adopted from Carroll and Ahuvia’s (2006) brand love scale. The present study used six of the 10 original items, based on the results of exploratory and
confirmatory factor analyses in Chapter 4. Sample items are “I love this brand” and “This brand is totally awesome.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the extracted brand love items was .93.

Frei and Shaver’s (2002) respect for partner scale was used to measure brand respect, which captures positive performance or reputation of the brand. Nine of the 12 original items were retained for use in the present study, based on the results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses in Chapter 4. Sample items are “I respect this brand” and “This brand is very faithful.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the retained brand respect items was .89.

**Brand Image: Mystery, Sensuality, and Intimacy**

The three brand image dimensions of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy were measured using the newly developed scale items. The mystery dimension includes items reflecting positive present interactions and positive memories from past experiences with a brand. The scale includes six items, such as “This brand captures a sense of my life” and “This brand awakens good memories for me.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the mystery scale was .92.

The sensuality dimension includes items reflecting sensory pleasure through design of marketing elements (e.g., packaging and store design). The scale includes seven items, such as “The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product” and “The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the sensuality scale was .90.

The intimacy dimension includes items reflecting consumer’s commitment and a consumer’s enjoyment. The scale includes nine items, such as “I feel connected to this
brand”, “I have solid support for this brand”, and “I really enjoy wearing this brand.” The Cronbach’s alpha for the intimacy scale was .95.

**Brand Experience**

Brakus, Schmitt, & Zarantonello’s (2009) brand experience scale was used to test convergent validity for the three brand image dimensions. Similar to the brand image scale developed in the present study, Brakus et al.’s brand experience measure reflects consumers’ subjective (i.e., cognitions, sensations, and feelings) and behavioral responses shaped by brand-related stimuli, such as the name, logo, packaging, advertisements, store, and events (Brakus et al., 2009). Brakus et al.’s cognition, sensation, and feeling elements are similar to the three brand image dimensions of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy, respectively, however Brakus et al.’s brand experience items measured more general brand experiences. Sample items are “This brand does not appeal to my senses” and “This brand is an emotional brand.” Thus, Brakus et al.’s brand experience scale is distinct from the brand image scale, which measures specific brand experiences (e.g., “The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product” and “This brand awakens good memories for me.) The Cronbach’s alphas for Brakus et al.’s brand experience measures were .79 for cognitive experience, .83 for sensory experience, and .81 for affective experience (Brakus et al., 2009).

**Brand Involvement**

Zaichkowsky’s (1985) Personal Involvement Inventory (PII) scale was used to test discriminant validity for the brand image measure. Zaichkowsky (1985, p. 342) defined brand involvement as “a person's perceived relevance of the object, based on inherent needs, values, and interests.” Brand involvement reflects a state of motivation,
arousal, or interest towards the brand triggered by a person, stimulus (a product or brand), and situation (Zaichkowsky, 1985). The construct of brand involvement taps into the significance of a brand to the consumer, based on subjective associations consumers have with the brand. As I have explained in Chapter 2, brand image is the combination of personal brand associations. Both brand involvement and brand image relate to brand associations, but represent distinct constructs. Similarly, Brakus et al. (2009) assessed discriminant validity for the brand experience scale using Zaichkowsky's PII scale. Brand involvement items assembled into a semantic differential scale include measures of brand importance, interest, benefit, and other dimensions of worth (e.g., unimportant to me/important to me, uninterested/interested, unexciting/exciting, useless to me/useful to me, and unappealing/appealing). The Cronbach’s alpha for the PII scale was .95 (Zaichkowsky, 1985).

**Brand Loyalty**

Brand loyalty captures whether consumers have favorable attitudes toward the brand and how often consumers purchase the brand. Seven items assessing the attitudinal and behavioral loyalty constructs were adopted from Keller’s (2001) brand loyalty scale, such as “I consider myself loyal to this brand” and “This is the one brand I would prefer to buy or use.”

**Overall Brand Equity**

Brand equity is defined as brand strength, which reflects the level of brand awareness, positive image, and loyalty consumers have for a certain brand (Aaker, 1991, 1996; Keller, 1993). Four items were adopted from Yoo et al.’s (2001) overall brand equity scale, which includes: “It makes sense to buy this brand instead of any other
brand, even if they are the same” and “Even if another brand has the same features as this brand, I would prefer to buy this brand.” Yoo et al. (2000) reported a reliability coefficient of .90 for an American sample and .89 for a Korean American and Korean sample of college students in the U.S.

**Fashion Innovativeness**

Fashion innovativeness is described as a willingness to try a new brand or product earlier than other members of society (Goldsmith & Flynn, 1992). The present study adopted Goldsmith and Hofacker’s (1991) Domain Specific Innovativeness Scale (DSI) used in identification of early adopters for fashion products. The six items that measure fashion innovativeness include “Compared to my friends, I own few new fashion items” (reverse scored) and “I will buy a new fashion item, even if I have not heard of it yet.” The reliability for these six items was .73, based on two different samples (Goldsmith & Flynn, 1992; Goldsmith & Hofacker, 1992).

**Fashion Information Search**

Fashion information search items were adopted from Bloch et al.’s (1986) information search scale. Bloch et al. (1986) suggested six items to measure consumers’ information search activities for clothing and computers, which included “How often on average do you go shopping for fashion products just to look around or get fashion information?” and “How many clothing catalogs do you look through?” The reliability for these six items was .70 (Bloch et al., 1986).

A 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), was used for brand awareness, brand love, brand respect, brand image, brand loyalty, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, brand experience, and brand involvement
items. Demographic characteristics, which included age, gender, ethnicity, and annual income items, were combined with information search and shopping behavior items in the last part of the questionnaire (see Appendix H for the questionnaire).

5.2 Data Analyses: Factor Structure and Reliability Assessment

Data Analyses

Data collected through the final online survey were analyzed in four ways, using SPSS 18.0 and Mplus 5.0 programs. First, frequency distribution, mean, and standard deviation for the measures were determined to summarize the demographic variables and shopping behaviors of the respondents. Second, confirmatory factor analysis was performed for all variables in the hypothesized model. Third, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were determined for each of the measures. Fourth, the hierarchical structure of brand image proposed in the present study was tested through confirmatory factor analysis.

Results: Factor Structure Testing and Reliability

A number of indices were employed to evaluate the goodness of model fit through confirmatory factor analysis (Netemeyer et al., 2003). The cut off values determining an acceptable model fit were .90 for CFI, and .08 for RMSEA and SRMR (Browne & Cudeck, 1992; Hair et al., 2006). Modification indices of the results from confirmatory factor analysis were used to discover aspects of the model that do not fit the data well (Brown, 2006). These values indicate the decrease in the overall model $\chi^2$ if a fixed or constrained parameter (i.e., factor loading) were freed (Brown, 2006). Internal consistency for each dimension with retained items from confirmatory factor analysis
was assessed using a Cronbach’s alpha value greater than or equal to .70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

**Brand Awareness**

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the five brand awareness items. Two items were removed due to low factor loadings below .50 (i.e., “I know what this brand stands for” and “I frequently think of this brand). The brand awareness factor with three items showed a perfect model fit to the data \( \chi^2 = 0.0 \) \((df = 0), p < .001\]. Moreover, CFI was 1.0, and the RMSEA and SRMR were .00. The standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item of the brand awareness factor were statistically significant as shown in Table 5.2. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .70.

**Table 5.2. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Brand Awareness \((N=2,492)\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>( t )-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have an opinion about this brand.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>23.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have heard of this brand.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>35.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am well aware of this brand.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>39.72***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ *** p \leq .001 \]

**Mystery**

All six items were retained for the mystery factor, based on factor loadings and model fit indices from confirmatory factor analysis. Results confirmed a good model fit for the mystery factor, based on chi-square of 326.49 \((df = 9), p < .001\], CFI of .95, the RMSEA estimate of .12, and SRMR of .04. The RMSEA estimate was higher than .08, but the overall model fit was acceptable, due to a value greater than .90 for CFI and a value lower than .08 for SRMR (Hair et al., 2006; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item
of the mystery factor are shown in Table 5.3. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .86.

Table 5.3. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Mystery (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This brand adds to the experience of my life.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>79.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This brand awakens good memories for me.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>81.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This brand captures a sense of my life.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>101.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand captures the times.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>52.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>29.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand is a part of my life.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>57.38***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p ≤ .001

Sensuality

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis using the seven sensuality items, one sensuality item was removed from the scale on the basis of the modification indices for the residual matrix. Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that removing the sensuality item resulted in an improvement in the fit indices (CFI, RMESA, and SRMR [see Table 5.4]).

Table 5.4. Fit Indices for the Two Sensuality Models (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model with 7 items</td>
<td>901.51***</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved model with 6 items</td>
<td>373.86***</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1 item removed:
1. The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.

*** p ≤ .001

The finalized sensuality factor with six items showed an acceptable model fit to the data. Although the RMSEA estimate was higher than .08, the overall model fit was acceptable, due to a CFI value greater than .90 and a SRMR value lower than .08 (Hair et al., 2006). The standardized factor loadings and t-values
for each item of the sensuality factor were statistically significant as shown in

Table 5.5. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .85.

Table 5.5. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Sensuality (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The design of this brand’s ads is really well done.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>59.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>61.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The store environment of this brand appeals to me.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>51.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Website design for this brand is really well done.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>47.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand has a beautiful color scheme.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>46.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand has incredible displays.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>73.06***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intimacy**

All nine items were retained for the intimacy factor, based on factor loadings and acceptable model fit indices: \( \chi^2 = 1192.91 \) (df = 27), \( p < .001 \), CFI = .90, RMSEA estimate = .13, and SRMR = .05. Similar to the other factors, the RMSEA estimate was higher than .08, but CFI and SRMR had acceptable values (Hair et al., 2006; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Table 5.6 presents the standardized factor loadings and t-values for each item of the intimacy factor. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .90.

Table 5.6. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Intimacy (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I can rely on this brand.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>44.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel connected to this brand.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>74.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel happy when I wear this brand.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>77.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel satisfied with this brand.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>67.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have fun with this brand.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>61.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have solid support for this brand.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>77.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like looking at the products of this brand.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>50.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I really enjoy wearing this brand.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>76.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would stay with this brand.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>56.46***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** *** \( p \leq .001 \)
Brand Love

All five items were retained on the brand love factor, based on factor loadings (above .50) and model fit indices from confirmatory factor analysis. The majority of fit indices confirmed a good model fit for the brand love factor: \( \chi^2 = 150.46 \) (df = 5), p < .001, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .10, and SRMR = .02. Although the RMSEA exceed .08, the other two fit indices, CFI and SRMR, provided an adequate model fit. Table 5.7 presents the standardized factor loadings and t-values for each item of the brand love factor. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .90.

Table 5.7. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Brand Love (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I love this brand.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>75.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This brand is a pure delight.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>138.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This brand is totally awesome.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>144.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand makes me feel good.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>72.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This is a wonderful brand.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>85.62***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p ≤ .001

Brand Respect

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis using the eight brand respect items, two items were removed on the basis of the modification indices for the residual matrix. If the random error terms for two measures were highly correlated with one another, then the item with the lowest factor loading on brand respect was removed to improve model fit, as explained in the previous chapter. The results from the confirmatory factor analysis showed a better model fit when two brand respect items were removed using this data reduction process. Thus, the brand respect scale was finalized with six items. Table 5.8
presents the differences in degrees of freedom and chi-square, as well as the improved fit indices obtained by eliminating the two brand respect items.

Table 5.8. Fit Indices for the Two Brand Respect Models (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two models</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full model with 8 items</td>
<td>1228.74***</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved model with 6 items</td>
<td>578.76***</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2 items removed:
1. I approve of this brand’s performance.
2. This brand leads fashion trends season to season.

*** \( p \leq .001 \)

The finalized brand respect factor with six items showed an acceptable model fit to the data. Although the RMSEA estimate exceeded .08, the overall model fit was acceptable, due to a CFI value of .90 and a value lower than .08 for SRMR (Hair et al., 2006). The standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item of the brand respect factor were statistically significant as shown in Table 5.9.

The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .85.

Table 5.9. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Brand Respect (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>( t )-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I respect this brand.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>36.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I’m very committed to this brand.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>45.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This brand communicates well with me.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>65.80***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This brand is honest to me.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>104.81***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This brand is responsible to me.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>103.91***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This brand is very faithful.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>107.74***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** \( p \leq .001 \)

**Brand Loyalty**

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, one of the seven brand loyalty item (i.e., If this brand was not available, it would make little difference to me) was removed from the scale because its’ loading was below .50. The model
fit indices for the six brand loyalty items confirmed a good model fit: \( \chi^2 = 350.24 \) 
\((df = 14), p < .001\], CFI = .95, RMSEA estimate = .10, and SRMR = .03.  
Although the RMSEA estimate indicated a mediocre fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1992), the overall model fit was acceptable, due to CFI and SRMR values (Hair et al., 2006; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Table 5.10 presents the standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item of the brand loyalty factor. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .86.

Table 5.10. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Brand Loyalty (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>( t )-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I consider myself loyal to this brand.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>54.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I consider this is the only brand of this product I need.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>42.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I buy this brand whenever I can.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>68.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I buy as much of this brand as I can.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>58.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This is the one brand I would prefer to buy or use.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>56.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would go out of my way to use this brand</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>79.37***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** \( p \leq .001 \)

**Overall Brand Equity**

All four items were retained on the overall brand equity factor, based on factor loadings and model fit indices. The chi-square of 87.27 \((df = 2), p < .001\], CFI (.98), and SRMR (.02) values confirmed a good model fit. Although the RMSEA estimate of .13 was higher than the recommended cut off, the overall model fit was deemed acceptable (Hair et al., 2006; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Table 5.11 presents the standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item of the overall brand equity factor. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .82.
Table 5.11. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Overall Brand Equity (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It makes sense to buy this brand instead of any other brand, even if they are the same.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>74.91***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Even if another brand has the same features as this brand, I would prefer to buy this brand.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>129.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If there is another brand as good as this brand, I prefer to buy this brand.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>100.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If another brand is not different from this brand any way, it seems smarter to purchase this brand.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>71.09***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001

Fashion Innovativeness

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the six fashion innovativeness items. One fashion innovativeness item, “I will buy a new fashion item, even if I have not heard of it yet” was removed from the scale because of its factor loading below .50. The chi-square test with the remaining five fashion innovativeness items confirmed a good model fit, based on chi-square of 312.59 [(df = 9), p < .001], CFI of .94, the RMSEA estimate of .12, and SRMR of .04. Although the RMSEA estimate was higher than the cut off, the overall model fit was acceptable, due to CFI and SRMR values (Hair et al., 2006). Table 5.12 presents the standardized factor loadings and t-values for each item of the fashion innovativeness factor. The Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .83.
Table 5.12. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Fashion Innovativeness
(N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to buy a new fashion item when it appears.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>72.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I heard that a new fashion style was available in the store, I would be interested enough to buy it.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>37.71***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compared to my friends, I own few new fashion items.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>52.03***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In general, I am the last in my circle of friends to know the names of the latest fashions and styles.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>86.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I know the names of new fashion designers before other people.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>48.41***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001

Fashion Information Search

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, two of the fashion information search items, “How many clothing catalogs do you look through?” and “Are you a part of any online communities that talks about fashion brands?” were removed because its loading was below .50. The chi-square of 204.56 [(df = 2), \( p < .001 \)], CFI (.92), and SRMR (.06) values confirmed a good model fit. The RMSEA estimate (.19) was higher than the cut off, but the overall model fit was acceptable (Hair et al., 2006). The standardized factor loadings and \( t \)-values for each item of the fashion information search factor were statistically significant as shown in Table 5.13. The Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) for this factor was .71.
Table 5.13. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Fashion Information Search (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often on average do you go shopping for fashion products in stores or online, to purchase fashion products?</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>56.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How often on average do you visit stores or online retail sites, just to look around or get fashion information?</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>63.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many fashion-related magazines do you subscribe to or read regularly?</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>27.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How often do you check out fashion blogs or Websites (style.com, elle.com, wwd.com) on average?</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>26.94***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p ≤ .001

Hierarchical Structure of Brand Image

The current research posited that the three brand image dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) would reflect the construct of brand image as specified in Roberts’ (2004) lovmarks theory. In a second-order factor structure, the first-order latent factors represent indicators of the second-order construct (Hair et al., 2006). Strong correlations above .50 among the three dimensions support the hierarchical structure of brand image (see Table 5.18). Thus, the three dimensions were considered as indicators of the brand image factor.

To begin to examine the hierarchical structure of brand image, three item parcels were created for mystery, sensuality, and intimacy as shown in Table 5.14. The use of item parcels rather than individual items results in a better fit of the measurement model, because characteristics of individual items do not influence the results (Russell et al., 1998), as I have explained in Chapter 4. The three item parcels for each construct created by balancing the average loadings of each parcel on the factor, based on their standardized factor loadings from the confirmatory factor analysis.
### Table 5.14. Item Parcels: Mystery, Sensuality, and Intimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item parcel</th>
<th>Item and standardized factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mystery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M1          | This brand awakens good memories for me. (.78)  
             | This brand is a part of my life. (.69)        |
| M2          | This brand captures a sense of my life. (.84)  
             | This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product. (.50) |
| M3          | This brand captures the times. (.67)         
             | This brand adds to the experience of my life. (.78) |
| **Sensuality** |                                    |
| S1          | The design of this brand’s ads is really well done. (.72)  
             | The store environment of this brand appeals to me. (.67) |
| S2          | This brand has a beautiful color scheme. (.64)  
             | This brand has incredible displays. (.78)     |
| S3          | The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product. (.73)  
             | The Website design for this brand is really well done. (.65) |
| **Intimacy** |                                     |
| I1          | I can rely on this brand. (.61)             
             | I feel satisfied with this brand. (.73)      
             | I really enjoy wearing this brand. (.76)     |
| I2          | I feel connected to this brand. (.75)       
             | I have solid support for this brand. (.76)   
             | I like looking at the products of this brand. (.65) |
| I3          | I feel happy when I wear this brand. (.76)  
             | I have fun with this brand. (.70)            
             | I would stay with this brand. (.68)         |

The fit of the hierarchical model of brand image was examined through the confirmatory factor analysis (see Figure 5.1). Based on the approximation fit indices, the hierarchical model resulted in a good fit to the data: \[ \chi^2 = 266.07 \text{ (df = 20), } p < .001; \text{ CFI = .98; RMSEA = .07; and SRMR = .03.} \] All factor loadings were statistically significant, which supported the hypothesized hierarchical structure of brand image.
Figure 5.1. Model Fit Indices and Factor Loadings for the Hierarchical Structure Model

5.3 Convergent, Discriminant, and Nomological Validation, and Hypotheses Testing

Now that the factor structures for all the variables in the model have been assessed, the convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the brand image can
be measured.

Brand Image Scale Validation

The present study assessed convergent validity of the brand image scale by examining the factor loadings in the measurement model and correlations between two measures (i.e., brand experience and brand image). Discriminant validity of the brand image scale was assessed by examining the correlation between brand image and brand involvement. A structural model testing relationships among the variables in the proposed model (see Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2), using the maximum-likelihood estimation procedure, was conducted to assess nomological validity of the brand image scale and to test Hypotheses 3 to 13. To begin measurement and structural models testing, item parcels for the seven constructs (i.e., brand awareness, love, respect, loyalty, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, and fashion information search) were created. The item parcels for brand image are shown above (see Table 5.14).

Creating Item Parcels

The finalized items were assigned to parcels for each variable, based on their standardized factor loadings from the confirmatory factor analysis (Russell et al., 1998). The three item parcels for each variable were designed to reflect the underlying construct of each variable at an equal level. Table 5.15 presents the three item parcels for the brand awareness, brand love, brand respect, brand loyalty, overall brand equity, fashion innovativeness, and fashion information search measures.
Table 5.15. Item Parcels: Brand Awareness, Love, Respect, Loyalty, Overall Brand Equity, Fashion Innovativeness, and Fashion Information Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item parcel</th>
<th>Item and standardized factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW1</td>
<td>I have an opinion of this brand. (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW2</td>
<td>I have heard of this brand. (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW3</td>
<td>I am well aware of this brand. (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Love</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>I love this brand. (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This brand is a pure delight. (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>This brand is totally awesome. (.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>This brand makes me feel good. (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a wonderful brand. (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Respect</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR1</td>
<td>I respect this brand. (.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This brand is honest to me. (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR2</td>
<td>This brand communicates well with me. (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This brand is responsible to me. (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR3</td>
<td>I’m very committed to this brand. (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This brand is very faithful. (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Loyalty</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>I consider this is the only brand of this product I need. (.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would go out of my way to use this brand. (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>I consider myself loyal to this brand. (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I buy this brand whenever I can. (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>I buy as much of this brand as I can. (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is the one brand I would prefer to buy or use. (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Brand Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE1</td>
<td>Even if another brand has the same features as this brand, I would prefer to buy this brand. (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE2</td>
<td>If there is another brand as good as this brand, I prefer to buy this brand. (.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE3</td>
<td>It makes sense to buy this brand instead of any other brand, even if they are the same. (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If another brand is not different from this brand in any way, it seems smarter to purchase this brand. (.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.15. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item parcel</th>
<th>Item and standardized factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fashion Innovativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI1</td>
<td>In general, I am the last in my circle of friends to know the names of the latest fashions and styles. (.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FI2         | In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to buy a new fashion item when it appears. (.78)  
If I heard that a new fashion style was available in the store, I would be interested enough to buy it. (.58) |
| FI3         | I know the names of new fashion designers before other people. (.66)  
Compared to my friends, I own few new fashion items. (.68) |
| **Information Search** |                                       |
| IS1         | How often on average do you visit stores or online retail sites, just to look around or get fashion information? (.83) |
| IS2         | How often on average do you go shopping for fashion products in stores or online, to purchase fashion products? (.76) |
| IS3         | How many fashion-related magazines do you subscribe to or read regularly? (.50)  
How often do you check out fashion blogs or Websites (style.com, elle.com, wwd.com) on average? (.50) |

Results: Hypothesized Model

*Correlations between the Variables*

The correlations between the variables were examined (see Table 5.16). Brand awareness was moderately correlated (below .50) with all other variables. Brand love was highly correlated (above .50) with both brand respect and brand image. Brand image was highly correlated with brand respect (.71) and brand loyalty (.56). Brand loyalty was highly correlated with brand respect (.55) and overall brand equity (.57). Fashion innovativeness was highly correlated with fashion information search behaviors (.62).
Table 5.16. Correlations between the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brand Love</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brand Respect</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Brand Image</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Brand Equity</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fashion Innovativeness</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Information Search</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 4.60 | 3.77 | 3.67 | 3.68 | 3.25 | 3.42 | 2.61 | 2.44 |
SD   | .46  | .75  | .74  | .60  | .82  | .87  | .91  | .77  |

Note: significant; * p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01

The Measurement Model and Convergent Validity

In SEM, a test of the measurement and structural models were performed simultaneously. The fit of the measurement model was examined using confirmatory factor analysis and the maximum-likelihood estimation procedure. The correlation between the second-order factor of brand image structure and the other variables was unconstrained, and all error terms for the measured variables (i.e., item parcels) were not allowed to correlate. Goodness-of-fit of the measurement model was evaluated using the chi-square test and the same fit indices (CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR). The cut-off values as used for factor structure analysis above (Browne & Cudeck, 1992; Hair et al., 2006).

As presented in Table 5.17, all standardized factor loadings were higher than .50 with highly significant t-values ranging from 25.90 to 153.80. The significant standardized factor loadings (above .50) of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy on brand image supported the convergent validity of the measures (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). In addition, convergent validity for the brand image scale was supported by the significant correlation between brand image and brand experience (r = .81).
The results also indicated that the complete measurement model including all variables fit the data well: \( \chi^2 = 2558.35 (df = 246), p < .001 \), CFI = .94, RMSEA = .06, and SRMR = .06.

Table 5.17. Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (N=2,492)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Item parcel</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Awareness</td>
<td>AW1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>25.90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AW2</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>47.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AW3</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>54.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Love</td>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>153.80***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>127.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>125.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Respect</td>
<td>BR1</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>114.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BR2</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>122.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BR3</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>146.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Image</td>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>113.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensuality</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>48.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>136.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>112.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>96.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>69.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>BE1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>131.91***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Equity</td>
<td>BE2</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>103.85***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BE3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>117.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>FI1</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>94.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>FI2</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>76.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI3</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>53.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Information</td>
<td>SI1</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>57.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>SI2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>34.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI3</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>30.03***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** \( p \leq .001 \)

**Discriminant Validity**

To establish discriminant validity of the brand image scale, the chi-square difference test between two models of the brand image scale and brand involvement scale
[constrained model (one-factor) and unconstrained model (two-factor)] was employed. Identification of a statistically significant chi-square difference ($p \leq .001$) between the two models confirms two distinct constructs (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In Model 1 (unconstrained model), all measures were considered as the same construct by fixing the correlation between the brand image and brand involvement scale to be equal. In Model 2 (constrained model), the correlation between the two measures was freely estimated. The chi-square test indicated that Model 2 showed a significantly better fit compared to Model 1, which supported discriminant validity. The chi-square of Model 2 was $143.4$ ($df = 8$), whereas that of Model 1 was $1,645.1$ ($df = 10$). These results indicated that the fit of Model 2 is significantly better than that of Model 1 ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1,501.7$, $\Delta df = 2$) at $p \leq .001$. Therefore, discriminant validity for the brand image scale was confirmed.

The Structural Model, Nomological Validity, and Hypotheses Testing

Figure 5.2 contains the variables used in testing the structural model. This procedure used maximum-likelihood estimation to establish nomological validity of the brand image scale and to test Hypotheses 3 to 13 of the proposed model (see Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2). The goodness-of-fit measures provided evidence of nomological validity of the brand image scale (see Figure 5.2). Ten structural paths out of 14 paths in the SEM model were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$).
Figure 5.2. The Final Empirical Model Showing the Hypothesized Relationships between the Variables

\[ \chi^2 (df = 260) = 2880.92 \]
CFI = .93
RMSEA = .06
SRMR = .08
Testing Hypotheses (H3 to H13)

The structural model supported 10 of the 14 Hypotheses (3, 6a, 6b, 7, 8a, 8b, 9, 10, 12, and 13). The results showed that brand awareness predicted brand image, but not brand loyalty, brand love, and brand respect. Hypothesis 3 posited that brand awareness positively influences brand image. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between brand awareness and brand image was .45 (t = 20.14, p ≤ .001), providing support for Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 4 posited that brand awareness positively influences brand loyalty. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between brand awareness and brand loyalty was -.04 (t = -1.61), leading to the rejection of Hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 5a posited that brand awareness positively influences brand love. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between brand awareness and brand love was .04 (t = 1.82), leading to rejection of Hypothesis 5a. Hypothesis 5b posited that brand awareness positively influences brand respect. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between brand awareness and brand respect was .05 (t = 2.24), leading to rejection of Hypothesis 5b.

As expected, brand image strongly predicted brand love, respect, and loyalty. Hypothesis 6a posited that brand image positively influences brand love. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between brand image and brand love was .80 (t = 55.12, p ≤ .001), providing support for Hypothesis 6a. Hypothesis 6b posited that brand image positively influences brand respect. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between brand image and brand respect was .80 (t = 56.95, p ≤ .001), lending support for Hypothesis 6b. Hypothesis 7 posited that brand image positively influences brand loyalty. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between brand image and brand loyalty was .68 (t = 13.55, p ≤ .001), providing support for Hypothesis 7.
Hypothesis 8a posited that brand love positively influences brand loyalty, but the results were opposite from the hypothesis. Although the correlation between brand love and brand loyalty was positive (.48), the standardized path coefficient ($\gamma$) from brand love to brand loyalty indicated a significant negative path ($\gamma=-.12$, $t = -3.17, p \leq .001$). The reason could be collinearity between the model’s variables, affecting the calculated path coefficient of brand love (Hair et al., 2006). Hypothesis 8b posited that brand respect positively influences brand loyalty. The standardized path coefficient ($\gamma$) between brand respect and brand loyalty was .18 ($t = 4.66, p \leq .001$), lending support for Hypothesis 8b. Brand loyalty strongly predicted overall brand equity, providing support for Hypothesis 9. The standardized path coefficient ($\gamma$) between brand loyalty and overall brand equity was .64 ($t = 43.23, p \leq .001$).

As posited, female consumers were more innovative toward fashion and searched for more information about fashion brands than did male consumers. Hypothesis 10 posited that female consumers more than male consumers are innovative toward fashion. The standardized path coefficient ($\gamma$) between gender and fashion innovativeness was .20 ($t = 9.63, p \leq .001$), providing support for Hypothesis 10. Hypothesis 11 posited that fashion innovativeness is positively associated with brand awareness. The standardized path coefficient ($\gamma$) between fashion innovativeness and brand awareness was .02 ($t = .41$), leading to rejection of Hypothesis 11. Hypothesis 12 posited that female consumers search for more information about fashion brands than do male consumers. The standardized path coefficient ($\gamma$) between gender and fashion information search was .45 ($t = 22.09, p \leq .001$), providing support for Hypothesis 12. Hypothesis 13 posited that information search about fashion brands would be positively associated with level of
awareness of fashion brands. The standardized path coefficient (γ) between fashion information search and brand awareness was .18 (t = 3.35, p ≤ .001), providing support for Hypothesis 13. Table 5.18 presents a summary of the results from hypotheses testing.

Table 5.18. Summary of Casual Relationship Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Direction of effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3. Brand awareness → Brand Image</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Brand awareness → Brand loyalty</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a. Brand awareness → Brand love</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b. Brand awareness → Brand respect</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a. Brand image → Brand love</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b. Brand image → Brand respect</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7. Brand image → Brand loyalty</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a. Brand love → Brand loyalty</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8b. Brand respect → Brand loyalty</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9. Brand loyalty → Overall brand equity</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10. Gender → Fashion innovativeness</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11. Fashion innovativeness → Brand awareness</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12. Gender → Fashion information search</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13. Fashion information search → Brand awareness</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: +: Significant positive effect  
- : Significant negative effect  
n.s: Non-significant effect
CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 6 summarizes the research findings of the present study. In this chapter, the findings are also interpreted and managerial implications are provided. Finally, limitations and recommendations for future research are suggested.

6.1 Summary and Discussion

In spite of the literature’s emphasis on the growing importance of providing cognitive, sensory, and emotional experiences to achieve competitiveness for a firm (Gobé, 2001; Lindstrom, 2005; Roberts, 2004, 2006; Schmitt, 1999), no academic research has been found that has included all three experiences in a brand image measure. Past marketing research measured brand image by capturing either cognitive or emotional experiences; none have included sensory experiences (e.g., Esch et al., 2006; Keller, 2001, 2008; Kim et al., 2003; Kim et al., 2009). Therefore, the need to create a new holistic measure of brand image, reflecting all three dimensions (i.e., cognitive, sensory, and emotional experiences), was identified. These three dimensions relate to Roberts’ (2004) dimensions of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy, respectively. Roberts (2004, 2006) proposed that these three dimensions lead to a lovemark (i.e., high brand love and respect), which increases brand loyalty.

To create a reliable and valid brand image measure, the present study consisted of three phases. First, eleven themes and 21 sub-themes (see Table 3.1 in Chapter 3) of the three dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) were identified, based on a literature review, descriptive comments from the lovemarks Website, and findings from interviews. Then, 137 items were created reflecting the 21 sub-themes. Face validity and wording clarity of the initial scale items were assessed by two researchers and two
graduate students who have knowledge of branding concepts. Second, quantitative data were collected from college students using an online survey. Based on the factor loadings from exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses of these data, 22 items (i.e., six mystery, seven sensuality, and nine intimacy items) were retained in the brand image scale. Reliability and construct validity of the brand image scale were also assessed. The present study assessed convergent validity through confirmatory factor analysis and nomological validity by testing Roberts’ (2004) theory using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Third, the final validation of the brand image scale and hypotheses testing (see Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2) were conducted using quantitative data collected from a sample of U.S. consumers gathered through an online survey. Finally, convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the brand image scale were confirmed using SEM of these data.

6.1.1 Qualitative Interview Data Analysis for Testing Content Validity

The respondents were asked to share cognitive, sensory, and affective experiences related to their favorite brands in various product categories (e.g., clothing, shoes, cosmetics, jewelry, cars, or electronics). At the beginning of the individual interviews, the respondents were given a few minutes to think about their favorite brands and then they were asked 17 open-ended questions, such as “Please describe your emotional feelings about these brands or how you feel when you think about or use the brand” (see Appendix B for the interview questions).

The results of 11 interviews indicated that the three brand experiences (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) were connected with liking or loving the brand. The content analysis revealed that four themes emerged for mystery and sensuality, and three
themes emerged for intimacy. Most of the major themes were consistent with mystery, sensuality, and intimacy sub-themes proposed by Roberts (2004, 2006). One of the mystery themes (i.e., self-congruity) was not found in Roberts’ conceptualization.

*Mystery: Cognitive Experiences*

The four themes identified for mystery were: 1) positive present experiences, 2) positive memories from past experiences, 3) future aspirations, and 4) self-congruity. “Positive present experiences” was the most frequently mentioned theme among the four. This theme reflected personal stories related to experiences with a product/brand and perceived high quality of a brand (e.g., appropriate size and comfortable fit). Positive memories from past experiences referred to positive memories from either personal or family members’ experiences. Future aspirations represented dreams about owning a brand, which reflected an ideal image and future desires. Self-congruity referred to the brand’s ability to reflect one’s self-image.

These findings reinforce past research in marketing and psychology. A number of marketing studies have confirmed that consumers’ cognitive experiences affect favorable beliefs and attitudes towards a brand (Aaker, 1991; Esch et al., 2006; Feldwick, 1996; Keller 1993, 2001). Psychological studies have shown that positive cognitive experiences significantly contribute to maintaining a close interpersonal relationship (Frei & Shaver, 2002; Rusbult et al., 2000).

*Sensuality: Sensory Experiences*

The four themes identified for sensuality were: 1) visual, 2) olfactory, 3) auditory, and 4) tactile sensations. “Visual sensation” was the most frequently mentioned theme among the four. This theme represented sensual pleasure evoked by visual cues from
branding elements, such as the store environment, Website design, product color, packaging, and advertisements. Olfactory sensation reflected sensual pleasure evoked by pleasantly scented products and environments. Auditory sensation reflected pleasurable music in a store. Lastly, tactile sensations referred to sensual pleasure evoked by soft textures.

These findings reinforce environmental psychology research. Literature has revealed that the physical store environment influences consumers’ cognitive responses and emotional states (Bitner, 1992). For instance, pleasant colors enhance consumers’ positive evaluations (Babin, Hardesty, & Suter, 2003) and positive feelings (Bellizzi et al., 1983; Bellizzi & Hite, 1992). Pleasantness of an ambient scent evokes affective response for the consumer (Bone & Ellen, 1999; Chebat & Michon, 2003), and pleasingly scented products affect positive product evaluations (Bone & Jantrania, 1992; Miller, 1991). In-store music affects shoppers’ product evaluations and emotional responses (Yalch & Spangenberg, 2000). Pleasant tactile experiences increase positive perceptions of a product (Peck & Childers, 2003a).

**Intimacy: Emotional Experiences**

The three themes identified for intimacy were: 1) the firm’s empathy, 2) consumer’s commitment, and 3) consumer’s enjoyment. The firm’s empathy reflected its understanding of consumer preferences (e.g., design, color, and package) and remembering personal events (e.g., a customer’s birthday). Consumer’s commitment is similar to a long-term friendship. Lastly, consumer’s enjoyment refers to pleasure from owning a brand and from interacting with the brand.
These findings support previous research. Marketing studies have suggested that a firm’s continuous support of its customers increase intense feelings towards a brand and positive perceptions of the brand (Albert et al., 2008; Shimp & Madden, 1988). Relationship marketing studies have indicated that consumer commitment is a key feature in maintenance of a relationship between consumers and a brand (Albert et al., 2008; Fournier, 1998; Fullerton, 2005). The committed consumer trusts the brand and enjoys the relationship with the brand (Fullerton, 2005), as well as believes that maintaining the relationship is worthwhile (Morgan & Hunt, 1994).

6.1.2 Preliminary Quantitative Data Analysis for Testing Reliability, Convergent, and Nomological Validity of the Brand Image Scale

Using data drawn from the literature, the lovemark Website, and the individual interviews, 137 items measuring the three brand image dimensions (i.e., 77 mystery items, 25 sensuality items, and 35 intimacy items) were created. Reliability, along with convergent and nomological validity, was established for the measures of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy.

Using the data gathered from a sample of 218 undergraduate college students over 18 years of age at a major Midwestern university, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses extracted items assessing the five variables: mystery, sensuality, intimacy, brand love, and brand respect. To test Roberts’ (2004, 2006) lovemarks theory, brand love and brand respect were included as consequence variables in the conceptual framework. Carroll and Ahuvia’s (2006) brand love scale and Frei and Shaver’s (2002) respect scale were adopted in the present study.
The mystery factor with six items reflected positive present interactions with a brand (e.g., “This brand adds to the experience of my life”) and positive memories from past interactions with a brand (e.g., “This brand awakens good memories for me”), but it did not capture personal aspirations for future experiences. Sample items of future aspirations were: “This brand will likely be a part of my future”, “This brand reflects the social status that I hope to have”, and “This brand symbolizes my dreams.” These items did not load on the mystery factor. Because the survey participants’ favorite fashion brands (Express, Forever 21, J.Crew, Gap, and Juicy Couture) reflect their current life stage, they may not be future-oriented when thinking about these brands. However, consistent with the lovemarks theory, the respondents in the interviews who mentioned luxury brands (e.g., Chanel, Louis Vuitton, and Tiffany) indicated that their favorite brand reflected their future dreams and aspirations. After all, luxury brands are associated with enhanced social status and wealth more than the brands frequently mentioned by the survey respondents. Perhaps, future aspiration experiences may be restricted to luxury (fashion) brands.

The sensuality factor had six items associated with sensory experiences from visual sensations (e.g., “This brand has a beautiful color scheme”), but it did not capture olfactory, auditory, and tactile sensations. The current culture has become more visually oriented in what attracts attention; consumers depend more on visual information in recognition and discrimination of a brand or product (Fiore, 2010; Gobé, 2001; Lindstrom, 2005).

This finding is consistent with interview results showing visual sensations to be those most frequently mentioned. Previous empirical research (Baker, Parasuraman,
Grewal, & Voss, 2002) has revealed that consumer perceptions are more strongly influenced by visual than by olfactory cues. Moreover, branding consulting literature (Lindstrom, 2005; Schmitt, Simonson, 1997) has illustrated the importance of visual sensations over the other sensual experiences because it creates a clear brand identity through branding elements (i.e., design, color, shape, light, packaging, advertisement, store design, and Website features). For instance, Abercrombie & Fitch (A&F), known as a successful casual wear retailer in the U.S., uses photography with semi-nude males and females for store displays and promotions. The A&F models are placed on large framed in-store posters, the Web site, gift cards, and shopping bags. The use of sexual images visually appeals to the target audience of teens and young adults, creating its clear identity: a sexy and fashion-savvy lifestyle of luxury.

The intimacy factor, with nine items, reflected a consumer’s commitment (e.g., “I have solid support for this brand”), and a consumer’s enjoyment (e.g., “I have fun with this brand”), but it did not capture the firm’s empathy. Sample items of the firm’s empathy were: “This brand knows a lot about me”, “This brand knows what I want to wear”, and “This brand does not forget my birthday.” This did not align with the interview findings, which indicated some respondents felt a caring and personalized relationship with their favorite brands. This finding may be due to the online survey participants not experiencing a customized relationship with their favorite brands in their life. Perhaps, consumer demand for the firm’s empathy may depend on the personal relationship with a brand.

Each of these three brand image dimensions had satisfactory internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha values above .90. Therefore, positive present experiences, positive
memories from past experiences with a brand, pleasing visual sensations, and consumers’ commitment and enjoyment may all play important roles in building a favorable brand image.

Convergent validity of the brand image measure was confirmed, based on the factor loadings on each construct (above .80) in a measurement model. Nomological validity of the brand image measure was confirmed by testing Roberts’ (2004, 2006) lovemarks theory. The present study found that mystery and intimacy positively influenced brand love, and all three of the brand image dimensions significantly influenced brand respect. Of the three dimensions, the effect of intimacy on brand love, and sensuality on brand respect were the strongest. Conversely, sensuality did not have a significant effect on brand love. Results of the present study showed that cognitive and emotional experiences with a brand may lead to both brand love and respect, but sensory experiences may only influence brand respect.

Consequently, the findings provided partial support for Roberts’ (2004, 2006) lovemarks theory. According to Postrel (2003), aesthetic experience (good design) influenced by a product and the store environment is an expectation for everything from cell phone casings to restaurants. Therefore, the presence of sensuality may not be a way to differentiate among brands; many brands may offer equally appealing sensory experiences.

6.1.3 Final Quantitative Data Analysis for Scale Validation and Hypotheses Testing

Based on data from a sample of 2,492 U.S. consumers, the factor structure for each variable in the proposed model (see Figure 2.4 in Chapter 2), and convergent,
discriminant, and nomological validity of the brand image scale were assessed through measurement and structural model testing using a SEM technique.

As a result of CFA, factor structures for brand awareness (CFI = 1.0, SRMR = .00), mystery (CFI = .95, SRMR = .04), sensuality (CFI = .94, SRMR = .04), intimacy (CFI = .90, SRMR = .05), brand love (CFI = .98, SRMR = .02), respect (CFI = .93, SRMR = .04), loyalty (CFI = .95, SRMR = .03), overall brand equity (CFI = .98, SRMR = .02), fashion innovativeness (CFI = .94, SRMR = .04), and fashion information search (CFI = .92, SRMR = .06) were established. Fit indices were at acceptable levels: CFI value ranged between .90 and 1.0 and the SRMR was between .00 and .06. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis also confirmed the hierarchical structure of brand image (i.e., the second-order factors of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy).

The results of the measurement model confirmed the convergent validity of the brand image scale. The present findings showed that all standardized factor loadings of item parcels for mystery, sensuality, and intimacy on brand image were above .50. In addition, the results of the present study indicated a significant correlation between brand image and brand experience ($r = .81$), which supported the convergent validity of the brand image measure. The results of the chi-square difference test ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1,501.7$, $\Delta df = 2$, $p \leq .001$) between the brand image scale and brand involvement scale provided support for the discriminant validity of the brand image scale.

The results of the structural model indicated that brand awareness was positively associated with brand image (H3); this was found to be significant in previous research (Esch et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2009). However, brand awareness did not influence brand loyalty (H4), love (H5a), or respect (H5b). Perhaps, brand awareness can just as likely be
linked to positive assessments as it could to negative assessments of a brand. For instance, consumers may have a higher level of awareness of BP (British Petroleum) after the 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, but it does not necessitate a positive assessment of BP. Therefore, knowing a brand may not contribute to creating brand loyalty, love, or respect. As hypothesized, the present study found that brand image did have a significant, positive influence on brand love, respect, and loyalty. These results suggest that a favorable brand image may enhance emotional attachment and perceptions of a brand, which lead to brand loyalty.

A significant, negative path coefficient between brand love and brand loyalty (H8a) was found in the present study, although we proposed a significant, positive path between these variables. One possible explanation may be collinearity, affecting the calculated path coefficient between brand love and loyalty. As hypothesized, brand respect did have a significant, positive influence on brand loyalty (H8b). This finding aligns with those of previous branding studies (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Pawle & Cooper, 2006; Taylor et al., 2004). Consistent with past empirical research findings (Gil et al., 2007; Taylor et al., 2004; Tong & Hawley, 2009b; Yoo et al., 2000), brand loyalty significantly influenced overall brand equity (H9).

Results showed that female consumers were higher on fashion innovativeness than were male consumers (H10), and female consumers searched more for information about fashion brands than did male consumers (H12), which aligns with past trends related to demographic differences in fashion involvement (Auty & Elliott, 1998; O’Cass, 2000, 2004; Tigert et al., 1976). Lastly, the present results do not support the proposed positive relationship between brand awareness and fashion innovativeness (H11), but the
level of fashion information search significantly influenced brand awareness (H13). These findings suggest that whereas consumers may watch what goes on in fashion, they do not adopt it for their own use, as fashion innovators do.

Additionally, an indirect relationship between fashion information search and brand image through brand awareness was found, as was a moderate correlation between fashion information search and brand image (.32). Thus, it was advisable to test for a direct relationship between the two variables, using SEM. To do so, a path was added from fashion information search to brand image in the original model. Results showed that fashion information search was significantly associated with brand image. According to SEM, the standardized path coefficient (γ) between fashion information search and brand image was .32 ($t = 15.26, p \leq .001$), providing empirical support for the relationship. The fit indices (CFI = .93, RMSEA = .06, and SRMR = .06) between the two models were almost the same, but the chi-square test ($\Delta \chi^2 = 205.39, \Delta df = 1$) showed that adding this path resulted in a significant improvement. Perhaps, consumers engaging in a greater search for fashion brands may be interested in advertisements, catalogs, emails, the Websites, and online communities to recognize product features and tangible/intangible benefits. Therefore, information collectors have a sense of familiarity with fashion brands, leading to a certain brand image for a particular fashion brand.

### 6.2 Conclusions and Implications

The primary contribution of the present study is the development of a solid conceptualization of the three brand image dimensions (i.e., mystery, sensuality, and intimacy). The present study also pulls together scholarly literature and Roberts’ industry-based literature, as well as offers a holistic, reliable, and valid scale of brand
image capturing the three dimensions, consisting of 21 items (i.e., six mystery, six sensuality, and nine intimacy items). Results of the present study confirmed that the new brand image scale is reliable and has content, convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity.

In line with previous studies, this new brand image measure captured cognitive and emotional experiences. Furthermore, sensory experience was included in the new brand image measure, which is absent in other brand image scales. For example, Esch et al. (2006) captured cognitive and emotional aspects of brand image, measuring “Overall attitude towards the brand”, “The perceived quality of the brand”, and “The brand’s overall affect.” Lassar et al.’s (1995) scale reflected only cognitive brand experience, measuring “The brand’s social reputation” and “Congruity with personality.” Similar to Lassar et al. (1995), Kim et al. (2009) focused on cognitive brand experiences, measuring “The brand’s prestigious image” and “The brand’s reputation.” Kim et al.’s (2003) brand image scale focused on cognitive experience, measuring a “Brand’s prestigious image” and “Perceived quality.”

The present study expanded Keller’s (1993) consumer-based brand equity model by including the loyemark experience (i.e., high brand love and respect), overall brand equity, psychographic characteristics (i.e., fashion innovativeness and fashion information search), and gender in the model. Keller (1993) proposed that brand awareness, brand image, and brand loyalty shape consumer-based brand equity. A consumer’s emotional connection with a brand and psychographic characteristics should be included in building consumer-based brand equity, based on the empirical findings of the present study.
Moreover, from what I could find, the present study appears to be the first empirical study that has combined Roberts’ (2004, 2006) lovemarks theory with consumer-based brand equity theory to develop a conceptual model that explains the relationships among brand awareness, image, love, respect, and loyalty. Roberts has been the CEO of the global branding/advertising agency, Worldwide Saatchi & Saatchi, since 1997. The company earned more than US$430 million in profit by applying the lovemarks theory to JCPenney’s advertising in 2006 (Creamer & Parekh, 2009; McArthur, 2008). The empirical evidence provided here gives credence to their lovemark approach.

Consistent with Roberts’ (2004, 2006) lovemarks theory, a positive relationship between brand image and brand love and respect, was empirically supported. That is, positive cognitive, sensory, and emotional experiences contribute to the lovemark experience, which is a combination of high brand love and respect. In addition, the significant contribution of brand image, love, and respect on brand loyalty supported the importance of lovemark experience in increasing brand loyalty, which significantly enhances overall brand equity. Moving branding research forward, the present study empirically supports the addition of new contributors (i.e., lovemark experience) to consumer-based brand equity.

Based on these findings, it is apparent that marketing practitioners should build mystery, sensuality, and intimacy into a brand experience to ensure a favorable brand image, leading to brand loyalty. Brand development should not only emphasize product-use associations to foster cognitive experiences, and sensory experiences such as attractive Website and store designs but also emotional experiences through customer
relationship management (e.g., mass customization and loyalty programs). These findings support present marketing trends that emphasize the role of sensory and emotional experiences in affecting consumer perceptions, preferences, attitudes, choices, and consumption behavior. For instance, Anthropologie, owned by Urban Outfitters, Inc. sells a variety of merchandise from women’s apparel to home furniture through their retail stores, catalogs, and online. Shopping at Anthropologie provides consumers a multi-sensory experience. Their merchandise design showing craftsmanship and elegant interior/exterior store design, as well as a signature scent and soft in-store music affect consumer perceptions of Anthropologie. As an example of an emotional brand, Nike has established an emotional relationship with consumers through mass customization, which allows consumers to select preferred designs and colors. Nike allows customers to input their own preferences on the NIKEiD Website, which contributes to building a personalized relationship with Nike brand (Keller, 2008).

Female consumers were more likely than male consumers to search for information about fashion brands, and they tended to be more aware of a variety of fashion brands. These findings emphasize that women, more than men, have interest in fashion. Previous research has supported that females are likely to be more knowledgeable about fashion products than males (Burton et al., 1995). JCPenney launched a “FindMore” fixture at 750 stores in 2010 (Steel, 2010). The FindMore kiosks, with a 52-inch touch screen, allow consumers to search the retailer's full range of merchandise. Consumers can email the information obtained from the fixture to friends, so that friends can assist in product selection. In addition, consumers can scan a bar code to receive recommendations regarding coordinating items. This innovative retailing
technology may appeal to female consumers because females are more engaged in gathering fashion product information.

As expected, female consumers had a higher level of fashion innovativeness on average than did male consumers. However, contrary to expectations, fashion innovativeness did not significantly affect brand awareness. Fashion innovativeness scale items measured an interest in or owning new fashion styles (e.g., “If I heard that a new fashion style was available in the store, I would be interested enough to buy it”), whereas brand awareness scale items measured knowing a brand or brand name (e.g., “I am aware of this brand” and “I have heard of this brand”). Perhaps, fashion innovators look for product novelty rather than messages from and long-term relations with brands, lowering attention to brand communications, resulting in less awareness of brands. Thus, the fashion innovator may recognize the newest fashion styles, but pay relatively little attention to their brand names.

The present study contributes to the growing body of brand equity research (Aaker, 1996; Jung & Sung, 2006; Keller, 1993; Kim et al., 2009; Pappu et al., 2005; Yoo & Donthu, 2001, 2003). Both academic literature (Carroll & Ahuvia, 2006; Keller, 2001, 2008; Taylor et al., 2004) and brand consulting and advertising industry literature (Gobé, 2001; Lindstrom, 2005; Neumeier, 2006; Riesenbeck & Perrey, 2007; Roberts, 2004, 2006) have advocated the importance of building a strong emotional connection between consumers and brands, but these studies did not empirically test such relationships. Present findings provide evidence of the importance of this relationship; the emotional relationship between consumers and a brand contributes to create the lovemark
experience (i.e., high brand love and respect), which augments brand loyalty in building consumer-based brand equity.

6.3 Limitations

In spite of the significant contribution of the present study to branding research, several limitations should be considered. First, a convenience sample of college students was used in the interviews and preliminary online survey of the present study, which may have limited the conceptualization of the brand image dimensions. For the final online survey, a random sample of college students and alumni from a Midwestern university was used. Although this sample represented a wide range of ages and geographic regions, it may not have included all geographic locations in the U.S. and may not proportionally reflect the demographic makeup of the country. Therefore, the findings may not be generalized to all U.S. consumers.

Second, the present study focused on an investigation of Western consumers’ cognitive, sensory, and emotional experiences for fashion brands, which lead to favorable brand image. Thus, generalization of these findings to non-U.S. consumers is cautioned against. Successful brand image can differ cross-nationally, based on cultural (e.g., individualism and collectivism), social, and economic characteristics in a society (Roth, 1995). For instance, Asian consumers in cultures reflecting high collectivism tend to rely on social approval and acceptance because of their high level of uncertainty avoidance (Jung & Sung, 2008; Roth, 1995). Perhaps, group conformity (e.g., positive comments on a brand) may play an important role in building a favorable brand image for Asian consumers.

Third, the present study focused on fashion brands. Thus, caution is needed in
generalization of these findings to non-fashion brands because the product category (i.e., fashion product) may affect the results. For instance, the present study revealed that visual sensations are the most important among the five senses in building a favorable brand image for a fashion product. However, for gourmet food or restaurant brands, olfactory and taste sensations may be as important as visual sensations.

Fourth, one of seven common method biases may be present due to the nature of self-report measures (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Lee, 2003). Past research has explained that respondents try to maintain consistency in their responses to similar questions (Johns, 1994; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986; Schmitt, 1994).

6.4 Future Research Suggestions

The mystery, sensuality, and intimacy concepts proposed by Roberts (2004, 2006) were partially captured by the results the present study. Researchers may try to create additional scale items that reflect aspects of brand image eliminated by exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses in the present study (i.e., future aspirations for mystery, olfactory, auditory, tactile, and gustatory sensations for sensuality, and the firm’s empathy for intimacy). Looking at the correlations between the three constructs (i.e., brand image, brand love, and brand respect) suggests that these constructs might reflect a combined higher order variable.

Future research should examine applicability of this new brand image scale across brands, product categories, and markets because the present study focused on Western consumers’ fashion brand experiences. The items that load on the three dimensions may vary by culture. For instance, Kim et al.’s (2009) research examined young Korean consumers’ brand perceptions of U.S. apparel brands. Kim et al.’s (2009) research found
that these consumers tend to perceive prestigious image and high quality to be more important than emotional value for these brands. Similarly, Yoo and Donthu’s (2002) research found that Korean consumers consider perceived quality to be more important in their purchase decisions than do U.S. consumers. Therefore, future research may include prestigious image in the brand image dimensions for an investigation of the Korean market.

Moreover, testing the scale in various cultures will increase validity of the scale. Such cross-cultural research may reveal differences in contributors to brand love and respect and their impact on brand loyalty, which would be helpful in developing effective brand strategies for global brands sold in various markets. For instance, Koçak et al. (2007) replicated Vazquez et al.’s (2002) four brand utility dimensions with a Turkish sample. The four brand utility dimensions are: product functional utility (comfort, safety, and duration), product symbolic utility (aesthetics), brand name functional utility (guarantee), and brand name symbolic utility (social identification, status, and personal identification). Vazquez et al.’s (2002) research indicated the importance of these four brand utility dimensions for Spanish consumers. However, Koçak et al.’s (2007) study found that for Turkish consumers’ only three of the four dimensions were important for the same product choice (sport shoes).

Further research should also examine other consequences of brand image using the new scale. Brand image may directly influence perceived value, satisfaction, willingness to pay a premium price, recommendation of the brand, or patronage intentions. Brand image may indirectly influence brand loyalty because of these
consequence variables. Therefore, these relationships should be empirically tested in the future research.

Lastly, future research could focus on the relative performance of the various brand image and brand experience scales in predicting loyalty and brand equity. For instance, Brakus et al.’s (2009) brand experience scale measures general brand experiences, capturing consumers’ intellectual, sensory, affective, and behavioral responses, whereas the brand image scale in the present study measures more specific brand experiences in terms of cognitive, sensory, and emotional experiences. Future research may compare the effect of brand experience with the effect of brand image on brand loyalty. These types of research may identify relative usefulness of brand image or brand experience scale in predicting brand loyalty.
APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTIVE COMMENTS FROM THE LOVEMARKS WEBSITE (www.lovemarks.com)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Descriptive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mystery: Positive present</td>
<td>present experiences</td>
<td>● I love Adidas. This brand represents a certain lifestyle: people who love sports, people who feel young and healthy, and people who feel fashionable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Nike is not just a sports brand, but Nike is a lifestyle. To me, Nike means personal achievement and self-improvement. I use Nike products because it helps me run better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Tiffany’s is about service and respect. Tiffany is, to me, the place where my little love token from college is treated by professionals with the same care and reverence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● In every advertisement they make, Benetton always shows the spirit of togetherness and fun with a variety of ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Converse is way more than a shoe, they are the American shoe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Teavana elevates tea from a beverage to an experience through an excellent customer service. Each time I go in, the staff helps me find an aromatic, unique tea that fits whatever need I have (something to wake me up in the morning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive memories from past</td>
<td>● Adidas brings many memories to my mind! My father had the 3 lines on his shoes and I loved it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>● I love Adidas, because they are using the &quot;retro&quot; logo, which reminds me of my childhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● They have to bring Anne Klein perfume back. If I have paid attention, I would have bought every bottle I found. I have one full bottle left and I am afraid to use it [because I would] lose the scent from my memory, memories of my youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future aspirations</td>
<td>● Louis Vuitton is a symbol of social status. The ability to purchase their products is a sign of success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Chanel is a dream for me; it's classic and elegant. Although Chanel products are expensive, I believe they are worth buying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I always thought that one day I would be able to afford Lancôme products to take care of myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuality: Sensory</td>
<td>Visual sensations</td>
<td>● I love Bobbi Brown so much! The packaging of each product is elegant and nothing can be compared to this brand, especially a shape of the small brush is perfect and unique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>● I am totally seduced by the store and the packaging. Whenever I pass, I walk inside whether I need something or not. I have more Origin products than I can use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Descriptive Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensual</td>
<td>Olfactory sensations</td>
<td>• I go into the Body Shop because I love the smell. I am always a great fan of the sensual smells of their products, particularly the papaya body butter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory experiences</td>
<td><em>Bath &amp; Body Works knows how to appeal to people driven by their sense of smell. They are great at producing divine scents, natural ones, such as cotton blossom. Their product smells always lift my spirits.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory sensations</td>
<td>• Have you ever been in a store, because you loved the music and wanted to know who the artist was, so you could buy the CD? I have the experience in Barnes &amp; Noble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tactile sensations</td>
<td>• I love all the products! The texture of the bronzers, eye shadows, lipsticks, and everything, is perfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I have so surpassed the age of using Johnson baby soap. The softness of the soap is so beautiful that I can't explain it in words. My skin thanks to Johnson's, which is the best. Johnsons baby soap rocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• iPhone is not just a mobile phone, it’s my friend with a special sense of touch! Sensible touch that makes me excited!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>The firm’s empathy</td>
<td>• The Loft always has everything I want in one place. Not too trendy or old. It is a brand that I can depend on, recommend, and consider as a friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>• American Apparel is intimate towards their clients. They use beautiful photography and friendly language to flatter those they love. They have a sharp wit, and a sense of humor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer’s commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• I have loved Puma for years. I collect them and some of them are my most prized treasures. What I love about Puma is their great athletic casual shoes in great colors. When in the office, I rarely wear dress shoes. Instead, I wear my Pumas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I have had 3 Nokia phones within 6 years. In that time I have not been faced with a technical problem. Thus, I trust Nokia. The menus are very user friendly. Nokia follows the latest technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There is no equal to Heinz ketchup. No other ketchup matches the richness of flavor, the wonderfully thick consistency. When I go to a barbecue at a friend's house, I purchase a bottle and bring it along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I've been an avid fan for Hello Kitty since 1998. I have a huge collection of Hello Kitty, everything from a CD walkman to wallpaper borders and duvet sets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I've got 35 pairs of Adidas sneakers and I wear a different one every day of the week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Descriptive Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intimacy: Emotional experiences | Consumer’s enjoyment | - I love BCBG Max Azria and all of its sub-brands because I always feel good in their clothing. The cuts are flattering, the colors and details are beautiful, and they are always trendy, yet offer classic options as well. I love the way I feel when I try on BCBG clothing.  
- This is truly the most amazing retail chain ever! This company has made all of its stores more than a shopping experience. I am recreated into a magnificent bliss of pure fantasy, adventure, culture, and love.  
- I go to IKEA not mainly because of their products but the shopping experience. To get inspiration and physically experience possible ways how to live. IKEA is a living experience.  
- Apple makes my days easier. The unique system is different from the others and it makes me feel different too and proud of myself. The use of Apple was totally fun and nice. I won't switch to another brand.  
- Starbucks is amazing. There is a new branch opening on my street in Paris. I frequently go into there to enjoy good coffee at Starbucks. It absolutely made my day! |
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
I am interested in understanding experiences consumers have with their favorite brands for any product, such as clothing, shoes, cars, cosmetics, electronics, restaurants, or retailers. I want you to think about your favorite brands for a few minutes. Tell me if you are ready to answer questions.

1. What are some of your favorite brands?
2. Would you say you really like or love the brand?
3. Why do you like or love these brands?
4. Could you tell me what it means to really like or love the brand? (Such as your behaviors, thoughts, or feelings towards the brand)
5. How would you describe the relationship you have with the brand?
6. Does the brand enhance your life in anyway?
7. Has the brand become an integral part of your life?
8. Would you have a hard time living without or feel your lifestyle would be negatively affected if you could not buy the brand?
9. Have you had a positive long-term relationship with the brand?
   If so, tell me about what the brand has done to help build this relationship.
10. Do you feel that the brand understands you or your lifestyle?
11. How does the brand show it understands you?
   a. Messages in the ads?
   b. The features of the product?
   c. The design of the store?
   d. The brand representatives in the store or corporate
12. Please describe your emotional feelings about these brands or how you feel when you think about or use the brand?
13. How do these brands communicate with you?
14. In which ways do these brands communicate well (e.g., commercials/ads, e-mailing, or a website)?
15. Sensuality is appealing to your five senses (e.g., sound, sight, smell, touch, and taste). Based on this definition, please tell me if these brands build good sensual experiences through the product, store environment, ads, etc.
16. Have these brands changed with you and your lifestyle? (How—messages in ads, product features, look of the brand, price?)
17. Do you think you will remain loyal to the brand? Why or Why not?

*Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in my research survey.
APPENDIX C: INITIAL SCALE ITEMS FOR THE THREE BRAND IMAGE DIMENSIONS
Table 6.2. Initial Scale Items (77 Mystery, 25 Sensuality, and 35 Intimacy Items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Scale items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mystery | Positive present experiences | • I can count on the products of this brand always working well.  
• Products of this brand fit me much better than other brands.  
• Products of this brand fit me really well.  
• Products of this brand last long.  
• The products of this brand are reliable.  
• The products of this brand look fresh.  
• The look of this brand coordinates from season to season.  
• Designers of this brand understand my body size and shape.  
• The designers of this brand know what I like.  
• I feel like the style of this brand does not match my body shape. (r)  
• I can’t find such good quality in any other brand.  
• I feel like I’m getting what I pay for.  
• I think this brand is right for my age.  
• The staff of this brand helps me find what I’m looking for.  
• The staff of this brand is friendly.  
• The staff of this brand is knowledgeable.  
• The staff of this brand is willing to help me.  
• There is richness to the stories that this brand tells about itself.  
• This brand makes purchase decisions easier due to fewer brands to research.  
• This brand helps me reduce the chance of making a wrong purchase decision.  
• I can’t go wrong when I buy this brand.  
• This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product.  
• This brand is really dependable.  
• This brand offers what I like.  
• This brand provides excellent value.  
• This brand reflects a certain life style.  
• This brand adds to the quality of my life.  
• This brand has changed my life for the better.  
• This brand is a part of my life.  
• This brand adds to the experience of my life.  
• This brand captures a sense of my life.  
• This brand captures the times.  
• This brand understands my life style.  
• This brand understands what I like.  
• This brand always has what I’m looking for.  
• This brand doesn’t have any meaning to me. (r)  
• This brand enriches my life.  
• This brand gives me really good customer service.  
• This brand has a long tradition.  
• This brand has a strong heritage. |

Note: (r) indicates negatively worded items.
Table 6.2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Scale items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>Positive present experiences</td>
<td>● This brand never lets me down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand has an affordable price range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand is consistently high quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand accentuates my good points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I get compliments when I wear this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● People give positive comments when I wear this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● People will think less of me, if I wear this brand. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I look good wearing this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand is targeted specifically towards me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand makes me more appealing to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand is very user friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand is well worth the money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand makes me feel more confident than other brands do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I have had a good long-term relationship with this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand tells a great story about itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand transforms my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I follow what this brand is doing each season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive memories from past experiences</td>
<td>● I have good memories of this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I have positive memories about experiences with this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand awakens good memories for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future aspirations</td>
<td>● I work more so that I can purchase this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● My wish list includes products of this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand always shows new designs that I desire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand reflects the social status that I hope to have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand reflects who I aspire to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand symbolizes my dreams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand will likely be a part of my future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Owning more of this brand is one of my aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-congruity</td>
<td>● I can create my own style with the products of this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Wearing this brand helps me create the image I want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand doesn’t define who I am. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand makes me different from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I communicate who I am through this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I do not feel like myself when I wear this brand. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I think this brand stands by me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel unique when I wear this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The image of this brand has changed with my image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuality</td>
<td>Visual sensations</td>
<td>● This brand looks awesome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I like looking at the products of this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I like to go shopping to experience this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel frustrated when I shop the store of this brand. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel pleasure when I shop in the store of this brand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (r) indicates negatively worded items.
Table 6.2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Scale items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensuality</td>
<td>Visual sensations</td>
<td>● The brand chooses really good looking models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand has a beautiful color scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand has incredible displays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The celebrities (e.g., movie star or sports player) who wear this brand add to its physical appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The brand’s print advertisements appeal to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The clean environment of the store of this brand appeals to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The store environment of this brand appeals to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The Website design for this brand is really well done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The colors of the brand really appeal to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The design of the brand really appeals to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The design of the brand’s packaging really appeals to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The design of this brand’s ads is really well done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I see this brand as cool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olfactory sensations</td>
<td>● The smell of the store environment of this brand is pleasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditory sensations</td>
<td>● I am inspired by the music in the brand’s store environment or ads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I’d like to listen at home to the music in the store environment or ads of this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The store environment of this brand plays music that I like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tactile sensations</td>
<td>● The textures of this brand are better than other brands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>The firm’s empathy</td>
<td>● This brand knows a lot about me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand knows what I want to wear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand offers deals that I really can relate to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand does not forget my birthday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The advertisements make me feel closer to this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I like getting e-mails from this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer’s commitment</td>
<td>● I feel connected to this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel like I have a personal connection with this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I am committed to this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I have solid support for this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I am confident that my relationship with this brand will last a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I can rely on this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I have a close relationship with this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I would stay with this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I will stay with this brand for years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I would be disappointed if this brand was no longer available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Scale items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Consumer’s commitment</td>
<td>● I will always trust this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel comfortable when I wear this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel satisfied with this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I like to talk about this brand even if I’m not wearing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I like this brand because I don’t need to think of alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I look for alternatives to this brand. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel emotionally close to this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer’s enjoyment</td>
<td>● I really enjoy wearing this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I like to go shopping to feel closer to this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel fortunate that I can buy this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I feel happy when I wear this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I have fun with this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand really excites me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The customer service of this brand makes me happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● I sometimes get upset with this brand. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand is disgusting. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● This brand makes me angry at time. (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● People are jealous of me because I wear this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Sometimes I feel a certain level of anxiety using this brand. (r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (r) indicates negatively worded items.
APPENDIX D: IRB HUMAN SUBJECT REVIEW FOR PRELIMINARY STUDY
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The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair has reviewed this project and has declared the study exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b). The IRB determination of exemption means that:

- You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.

- You must carry out the research as proposed in the IRB application, including obtaining and documenting (signed) informed consent if you have stated in your application that you will do so or if required by the IRB.

- Any modification of this research should be submitted to the IRB on a Continuing Review and/or Modification form, prior to making any changes, to determine if the project still meets the Federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB proposal will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

Please be sure to use the documents with the IRB approval stamp in your research.

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review by the IRB. Only the IRB may make the determination of exemption, even if you conduct a study in the future that is exactly like this study.
APPENDIX E: ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRELIMINARY STUDY
Consumer Experience with Favorite Brands

We are interested in understanding the kinds of experiences consumers have with their favorite fashion brands for products such as clothing, accessories, footwear, and cosmetics. The questionnaire will take about 20-25 minutes to complete. Your answers will be confidential and used only for the purpose of this research.

If you have any questions about this research, please contact Eunjoo Cho at (515) 451-8776: echo@iastate.edu or Dr. Ann Marie Fiore at (515) 294-9303: amfiore@iastate.edu.

Please think of your favorite fashion brands for a few seconds before looking at the questionnaire. What would you say is your most favorite fashion brand? (Please identify)__________________________________

How much do you like this brand?

I like this brand somewhat 1 2 3 4 5 I really love this brand

Part I. The questions below ask your general ideas about your favorite fashion brand. Please indicate your response by circling the number that best describes your opinions for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am passionate about this brand.
2. I have neutral feelings about this brand.
3. I have no particular feelings about this brand.
4. I love the brand.
5. I’m very attached to this brand.
6. This brand is a pure delight.
7. This brand is totally awesome.
8. This brand makes me feel good.
9. This is a wonderful brand.
10. I am interested in this brand.
11. I approve of this brand’s performance.
12. I pay attention to what is going on with this brand.
13. I respect this brand.
14. I’m very committed to this brand.
15. People are aware of this brand.
16. The store of this brand is easy to go through.
17. This brand cheats me sometimes.
18. This brand communicates well with me.
19. This brand has a good reputation.
20. This brand has stable financial status.  
21. This brand is an innovator.  
22. This brand is honest to me.  
23. This brand is recognizable.  
24. This brand is responsible to me.  
25. This brand is responsible to society.  
26. This brand is trustworthy.  
27. This brand is very faithful.  
28. This brand leads fashion trend season to season.  

**Part II.** The questions below ask about your experiences with your favorite fashion brand.  
Please indicate your response by circling the number that best describes your opinions for each question.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Designers of this brand understand my body size and shape.  
2. I can count on the products of this brand always working well.  
3. I can create my own style with the products of this brand.  
4. I can’t find such good quality in any other brand.  
5. I can’t go wrong when I buy this brand.  
6. I communicate who I am through this brand.  
7. I do not feel like myself when I wear this brand.  
8. I feel like I’m getting what I pay for.  
9. I feel like the style of this brand does not match my body shape.  
10. I feel unique when I wear this brand.  
11. I follow what this brand is doing each season.  
12. I get compliments when I wear this brand.  
13. I have good memories of this brand.  
14. I have had a good long-term relationship with this brand.  
15. I have positive memories about experiences with this brand.  
16. I look good wearing this brand.  
17. I think this brand is right for my age.  
18. I think this brand stands by me.  
19. I work more so that I can purchase this brand.  
20. My wish list includes products of this brand.  
21. People give positive comments when I wear this brand.  
22. Products of this brand fit me much better than other brands.  
23. Products of this brand fit me really well.  
24. Products of this brand last long.  
25. The designers of this brand know what I like.  
26. The image of this brand has changed with my image.  
27. The look of this brand coordinates from season to season.  
28. The products of this brand are reliable.  
29. The products of this brand look fresh.
30. The staff of this brand helps me find what I’m looking for.
31. The staff of this brand is friendly.
32. The staff of this brand is knowledgeable.
33. The staff of this brand is willing to help me.
34. There is richness to the stories that this brand tells about itself.
35. This brand accentuates my good points.
36. This brand adds to the experience of my life.
37. This brand adds to the quality of my life.
38. This brand always has what I’m looking for.
39. This brand always shows new designs that I desire.
40. This brand awakens good memories for me.
41. This brand captures a sense of my life.
42. This brand captures the times.
43. This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product.
44. This brand creates its own world.
45. This brand doesn’t define who I am.
46. This brand doesn’t have any meaning to me.
47. This brand enriches my life.
48. This brand gives me really good customer service.
49. This brand has a long tradition.
50. This brand has a strong heritage.
51. This brand has an affordable price range.
52. This brand has changed my life for the better.
53. This brand helps me reduce the chance of making a wrong purchase decision.
54. This brand is a part of my life.
55. This brand is consistently high quality.
56. This brand is really dependable.
57. This brand is targeted specifically towards me.
58. This brand is very user friendly.
59. This brand is well worth the money.
60. This brand makes me different from others.
61. This brand makes me feel more confident than other brands do.
62. This brand makes me more appealing to others.
63. This brand makes purchase decisions easier due to fewer brands to research.
64. This brand never lets me down.
65. This brand offers what I like.
66. This brand provides excellent value.
67. This brand reflects a certain life style.
68. This brand reflects the social status that I hope to have.
69. This brand reflects who I aspire to be.
70. This brand symbolizes my dreams.
71. This brand tells a great story about itself.
72. This brand transforms my life.
73. This brand understands my life style.
74. This brand understands what I like.
75. This brand will likely be a part of my future.
76. Wearing this brand helps me create the image I want.
77. I am inspired by the music in the brand’s store environment or ads.
78. I feel frustrated when I shop the store of this brand.
79. I feel pleasure when I shop in the store of this brand.
80. I like to go shopping to experience this brand.
81. I’d like to listen at home to the music in the store environment or ads of this brand.
82. The brand chooses really good looking models.
83. The brand’s print advertisements appeal to me.
84. The celebrities (e.g., movie star or sports player) who wear this brand add to its physical appeal.
85. The clean environment of the store of this brand appeals to me.
86. The colors of the brand really appeal to me.
87. The design of the brand really appeals to me.
88. The design of the brand’s packaging really appeals to me.
89. The design of this brand’s ads is really well done.
90. The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product.
91. The smell of the store environment of this brand is pleasing.
92. The store environment of this brand appeals to me.
93. The store environment of this brand plays music that I like.
94. The textures of this brand are better than other brands.
95. The Website design for this brand is really well done.
96. The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.
97. This brand has a beautiful color scheme.
98. This brand has incredible displays.
99. This brand looks awesome.
100. I am confident that my relationship with this brand will last a long time.
101. I can rely on this brand.
102. I feel comfortable when I wear this brand.
103. I feel connected to this brand.
104. I feel emotionally close to this brand.
105. I feel fortunate that I can buy this brand.
106. I feel happy when I wear this brand.
107. I feel like I have a personal connection with this brand.
108. I feel satisfied with this brand.
109. I have a close relationship with this brand.
110. I have fun with this brand.
111. I have solid support for this brand.
112. I like getting e-mails from this brand.
113. I like looking at the products of this brand.
114. I like this brand because I don’t need to think of alternatives.
115. I like to go shopping to feel closer to this brand.
116. I like to talk about this brand even if I’m not wearing it.
117. I look for alternatives to this brand.
118. I really enjoy wearing this brand.
119. I see this brand as cool.
120. I sometimes get upset with this brand.
121. I will always trust this brand.
122. I will stay with this brand for years.
123. I would be disappointed if this brand was no longer available.
124. I would stay with this brand.
125. Owning more of this brand is one of my aspirations.
126. People are jealous of me because I wear this brand.
127. People will think less of me, if I wear this brand.
128. Sometimes I feel a certain level of anxiety using this brand.
129. The advertisements make me feel closer to this brand.
130. The customer service of this brand makes me happy.
131. This brand does not forget my birthday.
132. This brand is disgusting.
133. This brand knows a lot about me.
134. This brand knows what I want to wear.
135. This brand makes me angry at time.
136. This brand offers deals that I really can relate to.
137. This brand really excites me.

Part III. The questions below ask about your general background information. Please check or fill in the appropriate information.

1. What is your age? ______ years

2. What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female

3. For which course do you want us to apply your extra credit for this activity? (Please select ONE).
   AESHM342_____ TC165_____ TC210_____ TC245_____ TC275_____ TC475_____

4. What is your name? (This information is used for giving extra credit)
   ______________________

5. What is your ethnicity? Please check one.
   Native American_____ Black or African-American _____Asian American____
   Hispanic or Latino ____ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ____ White or European _____
   Two or more races ____ Other (Please specify ________________)

6. How much do you spend on fashion products per year?
   Less than $100 _____ $101-250 _____ $251-500 _____
   $501-$750 _____ $751-1,000 _____ Over 1,000_____ Do not know _____

7. How often do you go shopping for fashion products? (in store or online)
   Almost every day ______ More than once a week_____ Every week ______ Every month ______
   Every two or three months ______ Twice or three times a year ______
Once a year _______ Others __________

8. Are you a part of any online communities that talks about fashion brands? Yes / No

9. How often do you check out fashion blogs?
   Not at all _______ Every once in a while _______ Frequently _______

10. How often do you read fashion magazines?
    _____ I try to read or look at every issue.
    _____ Occasionally, I read or look at fashion magazines.
    _____ I never read or look at fashion magazines.
APPENDIX F: IRB HUMAN SUBJECT REVIEW FOR FINAL STUDY
Date: 4/16/2010

To: Eunjoo Cho  
2627 Kent Ave #22  
Ames, IA 50010

CC: Dr. Ann Marie Fiore  
1062 LeBaron

From: Office for Responsible Research

Title: Consumer Experience with Favorite Brands

IRB Num: 09-135

Submission Type: Modification  
Exemption Date: 4/15/2010

The project referenced above has undergone review by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and has been declared exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b). The IRB determination of exemption means that:

- You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.

- You must carry out the research as proposed in the IRB application, including obtaining and documenting informed consent if you have stated in your application that you will do so or if required by the IRB.

- Any modification of this research should be submitted to the IRB on a Continuing Review and/or Modification form, prior to making any changes, to determine if the project still meets the federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB proposal will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

Please be sure to use only the approved study materials in your research, including the recruitment materials and informed consent documents that have the IRB approval stamp.

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review by the IRB. Only the IRB may make the determination of exemption, even if you conduct a study in the future that is exactly like this study.
Informed Consent Document

Title of Study: Consumer Fashion Brand Experiences

Investigators: Eunjoo Cho and Dr. Ann Marie Fiore

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding, if you would like to participate. Your answers are very important to this research, focusing on consumer experiences with favorite fashion brand. We appreciate your willingness to participate in this survey. Please feel free to ask any question at any time.

The purpose of the research is to understand the kinds of experiences consumers have with their favorite fashion brands, including clothing, accessories, footwear, and cosmetics brands. You are being invited to participate in this study, because you are either a student at ISU or ISU alumni.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey. You will also be asked to provide general background information, such as age, gender, and ethnicity. All the questionnaires will use numeric codes for analytical purpose. You will indicate your response by clicking the number from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) that best describes your opinions for each question. The questionnaire will take 10 minutes or less to complete. Given the non-sensitive nature of the survey questions, there are no foreseeable risks from participating in this study.

You will not have any cost from participating in this study. As compensation for participating in this study, participants have a chance to win one of four $25 Visa Check Card in a random drawing. To be included in the drawing, interested parties need to provide an e-mail address in order for us to obtain an address to distribute the Visa Check cards. Your e-mail address will not be used for any other purpose, and confidentiality will be maintained. The e-mail address will be removed from all files after the Visa Check Cards are awarded.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you have the right to refuse to participate or leave the study at any time without penalty. If you decide to not participate in the study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering.

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy records for quality assurance and data analysis.

Confidentiality of your responses will be maintained. All survey responses will be stored on password protected computers with access limited to the researchers. Participants who choose to
be included in the drawing for the Visa Check Card will need to provide their e-mail addresses. Yet, their responses will remain confidential, because there will be no direct association of completed surveys with specific e-mail addresses. The e-mail address will be deleted from all files after the four Visa Check Card are distributed.

The information will be completely destroyed by the researcher after publication of the findings. If results are published, only summary data rather than individual responses will be reported.

For further information about the study, please contact Eunjoo Cho, echo@iastate.edu, 515-451-8776, Department of AESHM or Dr. Ann Marie Fiore, amfiore@iastate.edu, 515-294-9303, 1062 LeBaron Hall, Ames, IA 50011. If you have any question about the rights of research subjects, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, 1138 Pearson Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

Clicking ‘yes’ on the bottom of this page indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. Thank you for your participation.

Yes _____
No _____

Eunjoo Cho
Ph.D. Candidate
Dept. of Apparel, Educational Studies, & Hospitality Management (AESHM)
31 MacKay Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1121
Transcript to invite participants in an online survey through an e-mail

Dear ISU alumni:

You are invited to participate in a research study of about 1,000 ISU alumni to better understand consumer responses towards branding, with a focus on fashion brands including clothing, accessories, footwear, and cosmetics brands. The findings of this research could help companies create better consumer experiences. This study was approved by the ISU Institutional Review Board.

You will indicate your responses by clicking numbers from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) that best describes your opinions for each question. It will take approximately 10 minutes or less to complete the questionnaire. Your individual responses will be kept in strict confidence. Responses will be published in summary form only. You will have an option to enter into a drawing receive one of four $25 Visa Check Card prizes. We will randomly draw four participants from those who enter after the survey to identify the winners of the Visa Check Cards. Given the non-sensitive nature of the survey questions, we do not anticipate any risks to you from participation.

Confidentiality of your responses will be maintained. Participants who choose to be included in the drawing for the Visa Check Card will need to provide their e-mail addresses. Yet, their responses will remain confidential, because there will be no direct association of completed surveys with specific e-mail addresses. The e-mail address will be deleted from all files after the four Visa Check Card are distributed.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. By participating, you give the researchers your consent. Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your present or future relations with the university. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without any penalty or negative consequences. You can skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering.

Please feel free to ask questions at any time by emailing Eunjoo Cho at echo@iastate.edu or calling (cell) 515-451-8776. If there is no response when you call, please leave a message. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, 1138 Pearson Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

Thank you for your willingness to help.

Sincerely,

Eunjoo Cho
Ph.D. candidate
Dept. of Apparel, Educational Studies, & Hospitality Management (AESHM)
31 MacKay Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1121
APPENDIX G: INSTRUMENTS FOR FINAL STUDY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Brand awareness** (5 items) | ● I know what this brand stands for.  
   ● I have an opinion about this brand.  
   ● I have heard of this brand.  
   ● I am aware of this brand.  
   ● I frequently think of this brand. | Aaker (1996)             |
|                             |                                                                                           | Keller (2001)            |
| **Brand love** (5 items)     | ● I love this brand.  
   ● This brand is a pure delight.  
   ● This brand is totally awesome.  
   ● This brand makes me feel good.  
   ● This is a wonderful brand. | Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) |
| **Brand respect** (8 items)  | ● I approve of this brand’s performance.  
   ● I respect this brand.  
   ● I’m very committed to this brand.  
   ● This brand communicates well with me.  
   ● This brand is honest to me.  
   ● This brand is responsible to me.  
   ● This brand is very faithful.  
   ● This brand leads fashion trends season to season. | Frei and Shaver (2002)   |
| **Mystery** (6 items)        | ● This brand adds to the experience of my life.  
   ● This brand awakens good memories for me.  
   ● This brand captures a sense of my life.  
   ● This brand captures the times.  
   ● This brand comes to mind immediately.  
   when I want to purchase a fashion product.  
   ● This brand is a part of my life. | Developed in the present study    |
| **Sensuality** (7 items)     | ● The design of this brand’s ads is really well done.  
   ● The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product.  
   ● The store environment of this brand appeals to me.  
   ● The website design for this brand is really well done.  
   ● The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.  
   ● This brand has a beautiful color scheme.  
   ● This brand has incredible displays. |                          |
| **Intimacy** (9 items)       | ● I can rely on this brand.  
   ● I feel connected to this brand.  
   ● I feel happy when I wear this brand.  
   ● I feel satisfied with this brand.  
   ● I have fun with this brand.  
   ● I have solid support for this brand.  
   ● I like looking at the products of this brand.  
   ● I really enjoy wearing this brand.  
   ● I would stay with this brand. |                          |
| **Brand experience** (9 items) | ● I engage in a lot of thinking when I encounter this brand.  
   ● This brand does not make me think.  
   ● This brand stimulates my curiosity and problem solving. | Brakus et al. (2009)      |
Table 6.3. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brand experience (9 items)        | ● This brand makes a strong impression on my visual sense or other senses.  
                                  ● I find this brand interesting in a sensory way.  
                                  ● This brand does not appeal to my senses.  
                                  ● This brand includes feelings and sentiments.  
                                  ● I do not have strong emotions for this brand.  
                                  ● This brand is an emotional brand.            | Brakus et al. (2009)       |
| Brand involvement (11 items)      | ● Unimportant to me/important to me.  
                                  ● Irrelevant to me/relevant to me.  
                                  ● Means nothing to me/means a lot to me.  
                                  ● Useless to me/useful to me.  
                                  ● Fundamental/trivial.  
                                  ● Not beneficial/beneficial.  
                                  ● Worthless/valuable.  
                                  ● Uninterested/interested.  
                                  ● Unexciting/exciting.  
                                  ● Undesirable/desirable.  
                                  ● Unappealing/appealing | Zaichkowsky (1985)          |
| Brand loyalty (7 items)           | ● I consider myself loyal to this brand.  
                                  ● I consider this is the only brand of this product I need.  
                                  ● I buy this brand whenever I can.  
                                  ● I buy as much of this brand as I can.  
                                  ● This is the one brand I would prefer to buy or use.  
                                  ● I would go out of my way to use this brand.  
                                  ● If this brand was not available, it would make little difference to me. | Keller (2001)              |
| Overall brand equity (4 items)    | ● It makes sense to buy this brand instead of any other brand, even if they are the same.  
                                  ● Even if another brand has the same features as this brand, I would prefer to buy this brand.  
                                  ● If there is another brand as good as this brand, I prefer to buy this brand.  
                                  ● If another brand is not different from this brand any way, it seems smarter to purchase this brand. | Yoo et al. (2001)          |
| Fashion innovativeness (6 items)  | ● In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to buy a new fashion item when it appears.  
                                  ● If I heard that a new fashion style was available in the store, I would be interested enough to buy it.  
                                  ● Compared to my friends, I own few new fashion items.  
                                  ● I will buy a new fashion item, even if I have not heard of it yet.  
                                  ● In general, I am the last in my circle of friends to know the names of the latest fashions and styles.  
                                  ● I know the names of new fashion designers before other people. | Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fashion Information Search (6 items) | ● How often on average do you go shopping for fashion products in stores or online, to purchase fashion products?  
● How often on average do you visit stores or online retail sites, just to look around or get fashion information?  
● How many clothing catalogs do you look through?  
● How many fashion-related magazines do you subscribe to or read regularly?  
● How often do you check out fashion blogs or Websites (style.com, elle.com, wwd.com) on average?  
● Are you a part of any online communities that talks about fashion brands? | Bloch et al. (1986) |
APPENDIX H: FINAL ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
Consumer Fashion Brand Experiences

We are interested in understanding the kinds of experiences consumers have with their favorite fashion brands (e.g., clothing, accessories, footwear, and cosmetics). The questionnaire will take about 10 minutes or less to complete. If you have any question about the research, please contact Eunjoo Cho at (515) 451-8776: echo@iastate.edu or Dr. Ann Marie Fiore at (515) 294-9303: amfiore@iastate.edu.

Please think of your favorite fashion brand in clothing, accessories, footwear, or cosmetics categories for a few seconds before looking at the questionnaire. What would you say is your most favorite fashion brand? (Please identify)________________

How much do you like this brand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like this brand somewhat</th>
<th>I really love this brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I. The questions below ask your general ideas about your favorite fashion brand. Please indicate your response by clicking the number that best describes your opinions for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I know what this brand stands for.
2. I have an opinion about this brand.
3. I have heard of this brand.
4. I am well aware of this brand.
5. I frequently think of this brand.
6. I love this brand.
7. This brand is a pure delight.
8. This brand is totally awesome.
9. This brand makes me feel good.
10. This is a wonderful brand.
11. I approve of this brand’s performance.
12. I respect this brand.
13. I’m very committed to this brand.
14. This brand communicates well with me.
15. This brand is honest to me.
16. This brand is responsible to me.
17. This brand is very faithful.
18. This brand leads fashion trends season to season.

Part II. The questions below ask about your experiences with your favorite fashion brand. Please indicate your response by clicking the number that best describes your opinions for each question.
1. This brand adds to the experience of my life.
2. This brand awakens good memories for me.
3. This brand captures a sense of my life.
4. This brand captures the times.
5. This brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase a fashion product.
6. This brand is a part of my life.
7. The design of this brand’s ads is really well done.
8. The packaging of this brand is as pleasing as the product.
9. The store environment of this brand appeals to me.
10. The Website design for this brand is really well done.
11. The well-ordered store environment appeals to me.
12. This brand has a beautiful color scheme.
13. This brand has incredible displays.
14. I can rely on this brand.
15. I feel connected to this brand.
16. I feel happy when I wear this brand.
17. I feel satisfied with this brand.
18. I have fun with this brand.
19. I have solid support for this brand.
20. I like looking at the products of this brand.
21. I really enjoy wearing this brand.
22. I would stay with this brand.
23. I engage in a lot of thinking when I encounter this brand.
24. This brand does not make me think.
25. This brand stimulates my curiosity and problem solving.
26. This brand makes a strong impression on my visual sense or other senses.
27. I find this brand interesting in a sensory way.
28. This brand does not appeal to my senses.
29. This brand includes feelings and sentiments.
30. I do not have strong emotions for this brand.
31. This brand is an emotional brand.

Part III. The questions below ask about your general considerations of your favorite fashion brand. Please indicate your response by clicking the number that best describes your opinions for each question.
2. I consider myself loyal to this brand.
3. I consider this is the only brand of this product I need.
4. I buy this brand whenever I can.
5. I buy as much of this brand as I can.
6. This is the one brand I would prefer to buy or use.
7. I would go out of my way to use this brand.
8. If this brand was not available, it would make little difference to me.
9. It makes sense to buy this brand instead of any other brand, even if they are the same.
10. Even if another brand has the same features as this brand, I would prefer to buy this brand.
11. If there is another brand as good as this brand, I prefer to buy this brand.
12. If another brand is not different from this brand in any way, it seems smarter to purchase this brand.

Part IV. The questions below ask about your willingness to try new fashion products. Please indicate your response by clicking the number that best describes your opinions for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In general, I am among the last in my circle of friends to buy a new fashion item when it appears.
2. If I heard that a new fashion style was available in the store, I would be interested enough to buy it.
3. Compared to my friends, I own few new fashion items.
4. I will buy a new fashion item, even if I have not heard of it yet.
5. In general, I am the last in my circle of friends to know the names of the latest fashions and styles.
6. I know the names of new fashion designers before other people.

Part V. The questions below ask about your general background information. Please check or fill in the appropriate information.

1. What is your age? ______ years
2. What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female
3. What is your ethnicity? Please check one.
   Asian _____ Black or African-American _____ Caucasian or European _____
   Hispanic or Latino _____ Native American _____ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander _____
   Two or more races _____ Other (Please specify ______________________)
4. What is your annual income? Please check one. (If you are a dependent student, please list your parent’s income)

- $0-$9,999
- $10,000-$19,999
- $20,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$99,999
- Over $100,000
- Do not know

5. How often on average do you go shopping for fashion products in stores or online, to purchase fashion products?

- Almost every day
- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every two or three months
- Twice or three times a year
- Once a year
- Other, describe

6. How much do you spend on fashion products per year?

- Less than $100
- $101-$300
- $301-$600
- $601-$900
- $901-$1,200
- $1,201-$1,500
- $1,501-$1,800
- $1,801-$2,100
- $2,101-$2,400
- $2,401-$2,700
- $2,701-$3,000
- $3,001-$3,300
- $3,301-$3,600
- $3,601-$3,900
- $3,901-$4,200
- $4,201-$4,500
- $4,501-$4,800
- $4,801-$5,100
- Over $5,100
- Do not know

7. How often on average do you visit stores or online retail sites, just to look around or get fashion information?

- Almost every day
- More than once a week
- Every week
- Every two or three months
- Twice or three times a year
- Once a year
- Other, describe

8. How many clothing catalogs do you look through?

- Not at all
- One catalog
- Two to three catalogs
- Four to five catalogs
- More than five catalogs

9. How many fashion-related magazines do you subscribe to or read regularly?

- None
- One magazine
- Two to three magazines
- Four to five magazines
- More than five magazines

10. How often do you check out fashion blogs or Websites (style.com, elle.com, wwd.com) on average?

- Not at all
- Occasionally
- Frequently

11. Are you a part of any online communities that talks about fashion brands? Yes / No

12. If you would like to be in the drawing for one of four $25 Visa Check Card, please provide your e-mail address: 
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