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ABSTRACT

Currently, brands are trying to win consumer’s heart but not all brands are able to make consumer repurchase their products or services, or to charge consumer a higher price. This issue has led to calls for the mechanism of supportive-brand behaviours. In this paper, I aim to understand the mechanism is what consumer construct to develop the supportive-brand behaviours. To understand this mechanism, I believe that the belief about the brands is the drivers for the brand-supportive behaviours and it stem from the hedonic and utilitarian belief about a brand.

Psychological impact of hedonic and utilitarian is well established in the marketing and behavioural literature. Following the literature on both constructs, the variation of hedonic and utilitarian measurement is found. To examine hedonic and utilitarian motivation, scholars can use attribute-based approach. The diverse research focus of hedonic and utilitarian consumption can be found. For examples hedonic motivation is related to aesthetic of products (services), value expression, entertainment, fun, enjoyment, exploration, exciting, interest and so on. Utilitarian motivation is related to need, value, effective, helpful, functional, saving, quality, convenience and so on. To account for these measurement and its results, scholars and practitioners have to be aware of this distinction. To develop the thesis I elaborated the literature on hedonic and utilitarian motivation, consumer attitudes and consumer behaviours. This thesis aims to focus on discrete dimension of hedonic and utilitarian motivation. I use the attribute-based approach to identify dimension of hedonic and utilitarian motivation. Some of dimensions in the literature are presented, selected, renamed and used to develop two thesis frameworks. The thesis addresses two pieces of research.
First, I explore the relationship between three brand benefits (brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic) and brand attitude strength, as well as the relationship between brand attitude strength and three behavioural intentions (WOM, repeat-purchase loyalty and willingness to pay price premium). The research also includes the mediating effects of brand attitude strength on three behavioural intentions. The research are conducted in two counties; UK, and Thailand. The results indicate that brand functional benefit and brand aesthetic have a positive impact on brand attitude strength in both countries. However, brand self-identification has no impact on brand attitude strength in the U.K. but it has a positive impact in Thailand. The mediating effects of brand attitude strength can be found in both countries.

Second, I examine the transferability of attitude, which is based on a region to regions’ products. This research includes the mediating effects of perceptions of value for money of the products and product top-of-mind on independent variable (quality benefit and pleasure benefit) and supportive-brand behaviours. The results indicate that the quality benefit and pleasure benefit of a region have a positive impact on perceived value for money of region’s product. However, only pleasure benefit of region has a positive impact on top of mid. The perceived value for money of region’s product also has a positive impact on top-of-mind choice. Lastly, the mediating effects of perceived value for money of region’s product and top-of-mind choice are presented in this research except the indirect effect of quality benefit on supportive-brand behaviour though top of mind. Lastly, I discuss the research finding and provide managerial and theoretical contributions in the last section of this thesis.

Keyword: hedonism, utilitarianism, brand attitude strength, behavioural intention, consumer behaviour
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1. DEVELOPING SCOPE OF INTERESTS

For decades, marketing practitioners and scholars have long been interested in understanding consumers’ decision making processes and consumer behaviour. Many pieces of research have been conducted in order to try and answer questions such as why consumers buy what they buy, what factors influence their decision making process, what factors drive them in their decision making and influence their behaviour. The thesis framework was built on prior research which was based on the regulatory orientation and hedonic and utilitarian motivations.

Avnet and Higgins (2006) argue that regulatory orientation is based on an individual’s concerns or interests which shape his or her behaviour. They also suggest that regulatory orientation can be influenced by psychological needs, moods epistemic needs, social roles and so on. Thus, it is argued that a person’s motivation operates differently as and when he or she has different background. To be more specific, consider an example where two women have a diet plan for losing weight. One woman has a promotion orientation toward losing weight, meaning that her goal will be achieved when she reaches her ideal-self, aspiration or hope. However, the other woman has a security orientation toward losing her weight, meaning that she feels that she ought to lose weight because of the impact of her excess weight on her health. Regardless of the orientation held, both women can achieve their goal, which is losing weight.

According to the literature, several reasons why consumers buy products (here, the term products also refer to services) have been identified. Utilitarian and hedonic motivations are possible explanations for this phenomenon. These two dimensions have generated considerable research
interest (Mano and Oliver, 1993). Scholars in various fields including sociologists, psychologists and even economists have paid attention to utilitarian and hedonic motivation (Voss et al., 2003). Marketing scholars and practitioners have also adopted this theory so as to gain a better understanding of customers’ insights.

To define hedonic or utilitarian motivations, many approaches have been used. One such approach is a goal-based approach, which suggests that consumers primarily consume products or services for either hedonic or utilitarian reasons. Several pieces of research have shown that both hedonic and utilitarian attitudes can be processed simultaneously, indicating that in many cases a combination of hedonic and utilitarian attitude influence consumers’ actions. For example, in the case of mobile phones, a consumer may value the aesthetic appeal such as a mobile phone’s design or colour while also valuing the phone’s functional benefits such as calling, text messages and other related functions. Previous marketing research suggested that the term “utilitarian” meant the instrumental, functional and practical reasons which consumers considered when making product decisions, and the term “hedonic” referred to the aesthetic experimental and enjoyment (Batra and Ahtola, 1991, Chitturi et al., 2007, Chitturi et al., 2008, Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, Eagly and Chaiken, 1998)

To elaborate, a coffee shop can be used as an example. Utilitarian consumers would be motivated by the functional or instrumental benefits of the product, such as the taste, freshness, variety, or service offered by the coffee shop. A hedonic consumer, however, would be motivated by the aesthetics of or enjoyment provided by the coffee shop.
Since hedonic motivation is related to many dimensions. Due to the multi-faceted nature of hedonic motivation, using the term “hedonic” can refer to several dimensions. Three dimensions of hedonic are selected to study; aesthetic-based dimension, pleasure-based dimension, and self-expressive-based dimension. In addition, utilitarian motivation can be perceived as multi-dimensional in the same way as hedonic consumption. For example the work of Chandon et al. (2000) examines the hedonic and utilitarian factors in higher-order structures, looking in particular at a sales promotions strategy related to monetary and non-monetary benefit. The results showed that there were three utilitarian benefits, namely savings, quality and convenience benefits, and three hedonic benefits, namely value expression, entertainment, and exploration. Obviously, hedonic and utilitarian motivations have multi-dimensional perspective. In order to avoid any ambiguity towards the
definition and concepts of hedonic and utilitarian motivations, I narrowed the scope of interest and selected some points to focus on this thesis.

The previous research on hedonic and utilitarian consumption has focused on the extent to which consumers weigh these two dimensions when making decisions (Chitturi et al., 2008). However, I believe that both dimensions can impact on consumer decision making simultaneously. For Chitturi et al. (2008) also suggest that the research on the interplay between the hedonic and utilitarian approaches should be highlighted. However, this thesis has a different scope of interest from hedonic and utilitarian consumption. According to the information presented above, hedonic and utilitarian consumption have been categorised as either uni-dimensional or multi-dimensional. To be more specific, I would like to narrow down the scope of interest from hedonic consumption to functional benefit. I will focus only aesthetic and self-expression attributes from hedonic consumption. The selected attributes were then renamed into brand functional benefit, brand self-identification and brand aesthetic. Brand functional benefit is based on utilitarian theory whilst brand self-identification and brand aesthetic originate from hedonic theory.

This thesis was also influenced by the function of attitude theory, wherein there are two theories which can help explain the determinant of attitude strength. The value-expressive function of attitudes allows consumers to present his or her values and self-identities to others (Grewal et al., 2004) and also to presented as an aspect of hedonic motivation (Chandon et al., 2000). There is evidence showing that consumers express their self-identity, or ideal self-identity, and that their decisions are based on the others’ reaction toward their choice of consumption (DeBono, 1987, Shavitt, 1989a, Shavitt, 1989b). When consumers are motivated by self-identity, they feel that they need to justify their choice of consumption to others. All in all, these concepts and theories are integrated and presented in this thesis.
2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The major research objectives are as follows:

1) To crystallise understanding concerning brand attitude strength from different perspectives. This includes the drivers of brand attitude strength and the mediation effects of brand attitude strength on brand functional benefit, brand self-identification and brand aesthetic. I expected that two countries (the UK and Thailand) will present no differences in the determinant of brand attitude strength and the mediation effect of brand attitude strength on three supportive-brand behaviours.

2) To move towards a better understanding of the transferability of attitudes from a region to its product. This accounts for the mediation analysis of top of mind choice and perception of value for money. I estimate that there will be evidence which proves the process of attitudes transfer based on a region to region’s product and mediation effects of mentioned mediators.

3. CONTRIBUTIONS

This thesis is a vital, pioneering piece of research in the area of consumer behaviours and service brands. The results of this thesis can be used and applied not only to the academic world but to real life situations as well.

First of all, the thesis move a brand attitude strength theory forward. In existing literature, scholars examine drivers of brand attitude strength in the context where products are a centre of interest. However, the research setting in this thesis is a service context (Starbucks). Results show the difference between two countries. Results from Thailand confirm the existing literature. On the
other hand, results from the U.K. respondents goes against the existing literature. To elaborate, results show an insignificant relationship between brand self-identification and self-identification. Moreover, the thesis affirms the existing literature that brand attitude strength helps brand to stimulate consumers to have brand-supportive behaviours. All in all, marketing scholars and practitioners will have a better understanding of brand benefit, brand attitude strength, and behavioural intentions.

Secondly, this research contributes to the attitude theory. None of the research has taken a region and region’s products into account. Most of the research paper focus on the transferability of attitude based on products to products or people to people. Thus, there remains a need for an alternative method that scholars can study the transferability of attitude from a region to a region’s product. To the best of my best knowledge, this research is a piece of pioneering research that will examine the transfer process of attitude based on a region to region’s products. Research in this area was not found in the literature and it appears that this topic has, until recently, been neglected. As such, there is an urgent need to discuss this relatively unstudied topic. The scope of the study starts from when consumers experience a particular region (a tourist destination). The study will examine whether or not quality and pleasure benefits of region can be transferred to region’s products. For example, if one takes a trip in Tokyo, will his or her attitude towards benefits from visiting Tokyo be transferred from Tokyo’s products. The finding provide the new knowledge attitude theory which results confirm the transferability of attitude based on a region to region’s products. I would like to encourage other scholars to study this topic in various contexts to confirm the standardisation of the model.
4. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this thesis is a combination of qualitative and quantitative research. Whilst qualitative research provides both general ideas and the potential variables by using face-to-face interviews, this thesis mainly uses quantitative methods. In addition, quantitative method helps us to explain the relationship between the variables involved. The further discussion will be completely explained in the methodology section in chapter 2 and 3. Surveys were collected and coded and incomplete data were removed from the analysis. After cleaning the data, the usable data were analysed by two key statistic tools, namely Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and SPSS Amos. Specific details of the methodology used in this thesis are presented in Chapters 2 and 3.

5. OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

This thesis focuses mainly on two research themes. First, I identified three drivers of brand attitude strength, namely brand functional benefit, brand self-identification and brand aesthetic. Then, the impact of brand attitude strength on behavioural intentions and the mediation effect of brand attitude strength was explored. Second, the process of attitude transfer based on a region to its products was examined. This also included the mediating effects of the product’s value for money and the product’s top of mind on products’ commitment. The outline of this thesis is as follows.

Chapter 1 provides general information about this thesis, including a general overview of the service sector, research objectives, justification of the research, a brief overview of the methodology, and an outline of thesis.
Chapter 2 focuses on developing a construct which explains the relationship between brand benefits and brand attitude strength, and between brand attitude strength and behavioural intentions, as well as the mediating effect of brand attitude strength. The first part of this chapter focuses on reviewing the relevant literature, followed by methodology, results from study 1 and 2, and a general discussion.

Chapter 3 examines the transfer process of attitude based on a place to products dimension. In addition, the thesis also includes the mediation effects of a product’s value for money and a product’s top of mind on independent variables, the quality benefit and pleasure benefit, and supportive-brand behaviours. This chapter begins with a literature review, followed by methodology, results, and a general discussion.

Chapter 4 provides the overview of thesis, main findings and implications.

6. CONCLUSION

This chapter provides the backgrounds for the thesis. The chapter introduces research problems, research objectives, research questions. The research was justified, the methodology given, and the outline presented.
CHAPTER 2: BRAND ATTITUDE STRENGTH

1. ABSTRACT

Developing and managing global brands have generated considerable interest for marketing scholars and practitioners since firms can obtain very significant benefits from being global brands. However, this also comes with risk. This chapter investigates the relationships between brand benefits – brand functional benefit, brand self-identification and brand aesthetic – on the three behavioural intentions – word-of-mouth (WOM), repeat-purchase loyalty and willingness to pay price premium. This chapter also examines the mediation effect of brand attitude strength on the relationship mentioned earlier. This research is conducted in two countries, the UK and Thailand, in order to test the generalisability of the model. According to the research in brand attitude strength, much research has been done on product brands but little research has focused on the service brands, which has created a research gap for this researcher to investigate.

Results from 300 British and 416 Thai consumers show that brand functional benefit and brand aesthetic have significant impact on brand attitude strength for both countries. However, brand self-identification has a positive impact on brand attitude strength only in Thailand. Brand attitude strength has a positive impact three behavioural intentions. Lastly, the results show that brand attitude strength has a mediating effect on direct effect of brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic on three behavioural intentions.

2. INTRODUCTION

A considerable number of U.S. based brands, for instance, such as Apple inc., Coca-cola, McDonald’s and others are employing a globalisation strategy. Due to global market penetration,
they face the challenge of developing effective globalisation brand strategies. Most brand strategies developed by global brand managers based at headquarters. The extent to which consumers in different cultures share the similarities of home-based consumers has not been clearly identified. Therefore, brands will have a higher risk when they try to use the same strategy across counties. This research is conducted in two ways, which will help marketing scholars and practitioners to better understand how brand benefits impact on brand attitude strength, how brand attitude strength impacts on behavioural intentions, as well as the mediating effect of brand attitude strength.

This chapter aims to bridge the research on consumer psychology, consumer brand behaviours, and international marketing. Even though previous research has suggested the relative impact of brand attitude strength on consumer brand behaviours, little research has been done in the service context. There remains a need to better understand brand attitude strength in the service context.

Based on the discussion above, I draw on a new conceptual framework as presented in Figure 3-1 to address two questions: (1) How does the national factor influences the relationship between the brand benefits and three behavioural intentions, and (2) How does the brand attitude strength mediate if at all the direct effect of (1) brand functional benefit, (2) brand self-identification, and (3) brand aesthetic on three behavioural intentions.

This research chapter is organised as follows. First, the conceptual background used in this chapter is provided, including three brand benefits, brand attitude strength, and three behavioural intentions along with the hypotheses. Next, the methodology used in this chapter is described, and results by countries are presented (Study 1: the United Kingdom and Study 2: Thailand). Lastly, theoretical contributions and managerial contributions are introduced.
3. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

3.1 A PROPOSED MODEL

Figure 3-1 is a proposed model that depicts the brand attitude strength as a mediating variable. Beginning on the left, the proposed model starts with the consumer’s evaluation of three brand benefits. Brand benefits constructs are adopted from the work of Park et al. (1986), a work which suggests that benefits are what the consumer values with regards to the products/services. The benefits can be divided into three types, namely (1) brand functional benefit, (2) brand self-identification, and (3) brand aesthetic. I posit that when consumers evaluate the higher level of brand benefits, the result is a higher in-brand attitude strength. When consumers evaluate that a brand cannot deliver brand benefits to them, then negative brand attitude strength occurs.

![Figure 2-1: A Proposed Model](image)

On the right-hand-side, there are three behavioural intentions as the dependent variables. I propose that higher in-brand attitude strength will have a positive impact on three behavioural intentions, namely (1) WOM, (2) repeat-purchase loyalty, and (3) willingness to pay price premium. If
consumers have negative brand attitude strength, they are likely to behave with negative behavioural intentions. In this sense negative behavioural intentions provide negative WOM, repeat-purchase loyalty for brand’s competitors, and willingness to pay price premium for brand’s competitors. As presented in Figure 3-1, the model presents the mediating effect of brand attitude strength between the relationship of brand benefits and behavioural intentions.

3.2 BRAND BENEFITS

Here, the three brand benefit are adopted from the work of Park et al. (1986), who suggest that brand benefits are related to consumer perceived value towards a product/service attribute. In this sense, what brands can do for consumers can be described as brand benefits. These brand benefits can divided into three, and are then renamed for the purposes of this research, namely (1) brand functional benefit, (2) brand self-identification, and (3) brand aesthetic.

3.2.1 Brand Functional Benefit

Brand functional benefit refers to the benefit provided by products/services via consumer consumption. It is a value that consumers associate with the products / services attribute and concerns the rational motives of consumer resources, such as time or place (Chandon et al., 2000) rather than the arbitrary motives of consumers. Keller (1993) suggests that brand functional benefit helps consumers get rid of their basic motivations rather than the higher level of motivation. For example, the brand functional benefit of Starbucks is to provide food and coffee, which decreases physiological motivation.

Little research has been done on brand functional benefit and brand attitude strength. The relationship of these two variables can be explained as follows. The consumer believes that brands can provide them functional benefit, making improving their lives, the result of positive brand
functional benefit. The benefit which brands provide to consumers is likely to be associated with the valence of brand attitude strength. The higher the brand functional benefit the stronger the implication that consumers have brand performance-related thoughts triggered in in their memory, which reflects the extent to which consumers evaluate their performance. The stronger the brand functional benefit which a consumer has, the greater their judgement of how good the brand is. All in all, it is expected that the higher functional benefit a brand provides, the stronger the brand attitude.

3.2.2 Brand Self-Identification

As noted above, brand functional benefit is related to a brand’s intrinsic benefit. However, brand self-identification is related to the extrinsic advantage of a brand - its symbolic meaning (Keller, 1993), a meaning which is suggested as involving the non-product related attributes. This means that it is not involved in brand functional performance, although it is related to the social approval, or self-esteem in motivation theory.

It is widely believed that self-identity plays an important role in consumer behaviours (Epstein, 1973, Sirgy, 1982). In this sense, consumers purchase products or services not only for their functional benefits but also for their self-identification (Park et al., 1986), and for the association between the brand and the symbolic meaning a brand provides to consumers.

Therefore, the possession of a product by a consumer can be used as a means of satisfying their psychological needs, such as being accepted and loved by friends and fulfilling self-esteem. Consumers have their self-identification or ideal-self, and then express this self to others in order to differentiate their self from others (Dwayne Ball and Tasaki, 1992, Belk, 1988, Sirgy, 1982). Muniz Jr and O’Guinn (2001) suggests that consumers express the social status, cultures, sub-
culture that they belong to through product possession. Such possessions can be associated with brands (Fournier, 1998). This argument is consistent with the work of Levy, (1959) which indicates that consumers not only buy products or services for their functional benefit, but rather they are looking for the symbolic meaning of a brand. It can be said that the meaning and value of a brand can be translated into consumers’ self-meaning and help them to construct their self-meaning (McCracken, 1989).

Extending identity theory to the dimension of consumer brand behaviours, brand self-identification is defined here as the extent to which the brand is used to reflect the consumer’s self or ideal-self. Symbolic meanings occur when consumers use a brand to develop their self-identity and express their identity to others thorough their brand choice (Escalas and Bettman, 2003). They suggests that consumers associate reference groups and their brand choices, and choose a brand which is relevant to portray their self or their ideal-self. Though the product or service consumption, consumers create an attitude with certain characteristics. For example, McDonalds represents a fast-paced lifestyle while Hermès represent a luxurious lifestyle. Through brand choice, consumers can select a brand to create the own unique self (Kleine et al., 1995, Dwayne Ball and Tasaki, 1992). In addition, Aaker (1997) suggests that characteristics associated with a particular brand are likely to be relatively permanent. Finally a brand connected to the self or ideal- self.

Through consumer brand choice, where consumers perceive that a brand and its self-concept are congruent, the brand self-identification will be positive. However, where consumers think that a brand and their self-concept are contradictory, consumers will resist the brand, which results in negative brand self-identification. The most important thing is the extent to which consumers feel that a brand can represent their self-identity.
3.2.3 Brand Aesthetic

Aesthetics can be found everywhere, including products and services. Consumers have an aesthetic experience though their consumption (Bloch, 1995). In the products context, brands can provide the aesthetic benefit to consumer though logos, fonts, package design, product design, and so on. However, in the context of services, consumers can evaluative aesthetics though the setting, such as interior design, uniform, layout, and atmosphere. Patrick (2010) argues that in the consumer decision process, consumers rely on aesthetic rather than functional benefit. However, if price and functional benefits are equal, consumers are likely to consider more attractive products (Kotler, 1973). Later research also supports the work of Kotler and Rath (1984) which claims that at the time consumers had difficulty in identifying the functional benefits, and so visual cues would be used to make inferences about the quality and price (Dawar and Parker, 1994, Dodds, 1995). In the intense competition between brands, functional benefits seem to be common and standard. Providing aesthetic value to consumers is a promising strategy for a brand. For example, one of the world’s most successful companies, Apple Inc. is commonly recognised as being a brand that provides aesthetic value (good product design) and functional benefit (ease of use).

The word aesthetics derived from the Greek verb *aisthanesthai*, and *aisthētikos* which mean ‘to perceive’ and ‘of sensory perception’ respectively. The Psychology Dictionary described the word aesthetics as “the study of the feelings, concepts, and judgement arising from our appreciation of the arts or of the wider class of objects considered moving or beautiful or sublime”. Generally speaking, the term ‘aesthetics’ refers to the association between visual forms of objects and sensory experiences with texture, harmony, order and beauty (Venkatesh, 2008). However, there is confusion concerning product design and product aesthetic. People might think that these two concepts are the same whereas the truth is that they are not. Kumar (2010) suggests that differences
between a product’s design and the aesthetic attributes of the product should be noted. Noble (2010) explains that product design is a general term including utilitarianism, aesthetics, and product kinaesthetics. In addition, Bloch (1995) also describes product design as a general term that refers to engineering-related attributes such as ergonomics, production efficiency, strength, recyclability, ease of distribution and aesthetics.

Some products last longer before being discarded since aesthetically-pleasing products can become a part of the sensory environment. For example, a beautiful tin box may be kept for longer than might be expected because the consumer may want it for decorative use or for another purpose. Townsend (2010) notes that the influence of aesthetics on choice is well established, particularly for tangible goods and the significance of aesthetics in product design has long been established (Veryzer and Hutchinson, 1998, Bloch, 1995). Patrick (2010) argues that in the consumer decision process, consumers rely on aesthetic versus functional benefit. However, if the price and functional benefits are equal, consumers are likely to consider more attractive products (Kotler and Rath, 1984).

In the retail industry, there is increasing competition between brands (Baker, 1994). In order to survive in this intense market, in-store stimulus plays an important role for brands. Kotler (1973) argues that the specific atmosphere or the environment may influence the consumer’s patronage. The in-store stimulus such as colours, lighting, style or music may also impact on decision making, as opposed to other marketing efforts which are not present at the point of purchase, such as TV commercials or printed advertisements (Baker et al., 1994).

The literature shows that the service-setting design affected consumer perceptions and attitudes about the service (McElroy et al., 1990). According to the literature, the extant evidence concerns the relationship between the servicescape and the consumer. The literature reveals that the
servicescape has been found to regulate consumer behaviour and satisfaction (Bitner, 1992; Eisingerich et al., 2014; Wirtz and Bateson, 1999).

All in all, when a consumer feels that a brand has aesthetic appeal, they are likely to present higher in-brand aesthetics. Aesthetically appeal creates the positive valence of brand attitude strength. As a result, a higher in-brand aesthetic will have a greater impact on brand attitude strength. However, if a consumer believes that the brand is aesthetically unappealing, the brand aesthetic will be negative and cause the negative brand attitude strength.

3.3 BRAND ATTITUDE STRENGTH

Consumer attitudes have been examined for decades to help scholars and practitioners gain a better understanding as to how consumer attitudes are formed and impact on a brand. Previous research on attitudes has claimed that attitudes influence behaviours (Allport, 1935). However, much research in the last few decades has shown that only strong attitudes are thought to cause behaviours. With increasingly intense competition, a brand needs to maintain a good relationship with consumers in order to foster their brand. Research increasingly shows that attitude strength is a reliable indicator of purchase behaviour, with the direction of the behaviour (being inclined or declined toward purchase) varying as a function of whether attitude valence is strongly positive or negative (Fazio et al., 1989).

3.3.1 Conceptual properties

Park et al. (2010) suggests that brand attitude strength is a psychological construct that consumers employ to refer to a brand. It was defined as ‘the positivity or negativity (valence) of an attitude weighted by the confidence or certainty with which it is held (Park et al., 2010). It was assumed that a high level of brand attitude strength was based on substantial processing regarding the brand.
A considerable proportion of the research suggests that brand attitude strength predicts consumer brand behaviours, including purchase behaviours, brand avoidance (brand switching), willingness to pay a price premium and positive word-of-mouth (Park et al., 2010, Priester et al., 2004). Two important indicators of brand attitude strength were (1) valence, and (2) attitude strength.

Brand attitude has been recognised as comprising constituent elements of cognitive input. In this sense, cognitive input can be a mixture of products/services attributes or product/service benefits. This means that consumers can view a product/service based on a basis of features and beliefs. When consumers view a particular product/service brand, their views on the degree of positivity or negativity to it varies. This degree of positivity or negativity which a brand (an attitude object) is measured by is called attitude valence (Park et al., 2010). When consumers have a strong brand attitude, they have strong views about the goodness and badness of a brand.

Park et al. (2010) notes that when a consumer has a strong attitude, his or her strength varies according to the confidence with which the feeling is held. Specifically, when a consumer has a strong attitude toward a brand, his or her strength relates to the brand (an attitude object) and the degree of confidence with which his or her judgment is made. The attitudes that consumers have for particular brands are expected to differ in strength (Ahluwalia, 2000). This strength is conceptualised on a bipolar continuum, meaning that it varies from strong-positive to weak-positive and weak-negative to strong negative.

Both strong valence and attitude strength are crucial indicators of brand attitude strength. There are two reasons for this. First, a stronger attitude is likely to be a better predictor of behaviours (Tesser et al., 1995). In addition, it endures over time resists attempts to influence it in the opposite direction (Petty and Krosnick, 1995) and has a higher behavioural consistency (Fazio and Zanna, 1978, Petersen and Dutton, 1975). Petty and Krosnick (1995) suggests that the attitude valence has
been used to reflect the valence judgment (where it is assumed that attitudes contribute to determining judgments). Specifically, consumers can exhibit a bias evaluation based on their degree of valence. The supporting information is seen as being more interesting than the counterattacking one (Lord et al., 1979). Previous pieces of research have suggested that consumers perceive some attitude objects (in this context, a brand) to be intimately tied with them (Park et al., 2010).

Little research has been done regarding the relationship between brand functional benefit, brand self-identification and brand aesthetic and brand attitude strength. However, the logic underlying this relationship is that when the consumer is favourable towards the three brand benefits. They involve the judgement about product-related attributes as well as non-product related attributes about a brand. An overall judgement about the brand takes place. The information processing in their thinking is associated with the valence of brand attitude strength and attitude strength. Very elaborate attitudes develop, resulting in a salience which a consumer has confidence in. When a consumer has confidence in brand benefits, they are likely to become brand-supportive with the brand they like. The association between attitude and behaviour is increased by weighing the valence of brand attitude strength (Priester et al., 2004). Based on this reasoning, it can be said that brand benefits, brand attitude strength, and behavioural intentions can be integrated into the model.

3.4 BEHAVIOURAL INTENTIONS

According to the literature, consumer attitudes consist of consumer belief and consumer feeling about and their behavioural intentions towards an object. Consumer belief refers to the extent to which a consumer has a positive, neutral, or negative toward an object (here, a brand). It is not necessary that all consumers have the same belief about a brand, but this belief may vary from one
person to another. Consumer belief is also associated with consumer feeling. In the literature, several findings show the logical causality between consumer feelings and consumer behavioural intentions. Behavioural intentions are the way that consumers respond to the attitude object (here, a brand). Behavioural intentions can be positive or negative toward a brand. This paper will focus on supportive-brand behaviours.

3.4.1 Word-of-mouth

Word of mouth (WOM) is the communication process which transmits information from one person to another (Eisingerich et al., 2015). Both satisfied and dissatisfied consumers will spread their message, with the content being positive or negative depending on the satisfaction level of consumers (Anderson, 1998). Scholars, industry market research, and previous evidence confirm that WOM is very influential (Eisingerich et al., 2015). Particularly with regards to a consumer attitude, consumer effect, and consumer behaviours, which affect a company’s sales performance (Richins and Root-Shaffer, 1988, Krider and Weinberg, 1998, Buttle, 1998).

The importance of WOM communication is well documented in the field of marketing. WOM provides key information about products or services. The content involves the consumer’s brand experience, reviews, recommendations, or warnings. Much research has focused on the valence of WOM, which can be positive or negative, and its impact on consumer behaviours. Negative WOM has a greater impact on consumers than positive WOM (Chevalier and Mayzlin, 2006). Brown et al. (2005) also suggests that negative WOM also impacts on the frequency of WOM.

In recent decades, the majority of research has focused on the product context. Bansal and Voyer (2000) suggests that little research has been done regarding WOM in the service context. Not only are product brands influenced by WOM, but service brands as well. Theorists suggest that service
brands have a higher risk than service brands because of their distinctive characteristic, such as intangibility (Bansal and Voyer, 2000). Due to the intangible attribute of services, therefore, information referrals are important to consumers. WOM helps consumers forget their concerns regarding service (Bristor, 1990).

### 3.4.2 Repeat-purchase Loyalty

Repeat-purchase loyalty is one of the preferred brand behaviours within supportive brand-behaviours because it is one of the main components of brand loyalty (Dick and Basu, 1994). Aside from this point, repeat-purchase loyalty is a healthy behaviour in terms of marketing. In order to get new customers, marketing communication activities are required, and the message has to be strong enough to convince consumers to buy products or services. The marketing practitioners argue that the returned consumer is cost-saving and makes more profit than new consumers. It is worth to be noted that there is a difference between habitual purchase and repeat-purchase loyalty. It should be noted that there is a difference between habitual purchase and repeat-purchase loyalty. Jacoby and Kyner (1973) suggests that a strong brand evaluation is not necessary for a habitual purchase. On the other hand, repeat-purchase loyalty requires a strong brand evaluation (Dick and Basu, 1994). The attitude strength towards brand evaluation is an important driver for scholars to differentiate these two constructs. In this sense, the habitual purchaser engages in tactical buying or convenient buying rather than repeat-purchase loyalty.

On the other hand, repeat-purchase loyalty involves with a strong preference towards a brand (Bell and Eisingerich, 2007). I proposed that the strong brand attitude resulting from brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic. In summary, habitual purchase and repeat-purchase loyalty have different processes. As such, it can be confirmed that they have different
constructs. It is noted that marketing departments should be aware of the similarity and difference of these two constructs. Undoubtedly, habitual purchase stimulates a brand’s sales performance and can be categorised as a type of supportive-brand behaviour. If marketing practitioners are seduced by the volume of sales performances and do not closely look at the two constructs then the company is at risk of its performance being overrated, and it may not be successful in the long run.

### 3.4.3 Willingness to Pay Price Premium

Price is one of the most important elements of marketing. Price indicates the maximum amount of money that consumers are willing to trade for products and services they are interested in (Cameron and James, 1987, Krishna, 1991). Not all consumers are willing to pay at the same price for a product or service, with some willing to pay less and some who would be happy to pay more depending on the benefits they receive from a brand (Park et al., 2013). Lind and Tyler (1988) suggests that two parties (sellers and buyers) mutually agree that an exchange of price and products/services is fair. At this point, an exchange between the two parties is likely to occur. Homburg et al. (2005) argues that an exchange can be unequal (with either positive or negative inequity) from the perspective of one party. When this is so, this inequity causes a change in consumer satisfaction and leads to a willingness to pay. According to Homburg et al. (2005), the results suggest that the customer satisfaction on products/services can lead to consumers having a higher willingness to pay. A consumer’s willingness to pay a price premium is very important to brands since it means they can charge a higher price and consumers will still want the brand’s products or services.
3.4.4 Brand Attitude Strength and Behavioural Intentions

As mentioned in the section above, when consumers make an effort to process information to evaluate brand benefits, a strong attitude results (Petty et al., 1983). The valence and the strength of a brand guide consumer behaviours (Park et al., 2010; Park et al., 2013). Previous research has indicated that brand attitude strength has an impact on brand-supportive behaviours such as brand choice, willingness to purchase (Park et al., 2010).

3.5 SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION

The study presented here examines three key points. First, the study investigates the relationship between three brand benefits (1) brand functional benefit, (2) brand self-identification, and (3) brand aesthetic and brand attitude strength.

H1 : (a) in the United Kingdom, as the brand functional benefit increases, the brand attitude strength increases (b) in Thailand, as the brand functional benefit increases, the brand attitude strength increases

H2 : (a) in the United Kingdom, as the brand self-identification increases, the brand attitude strength increases (b) in Thailand, as the brand self-identification increases, the brand attitude strength increases

H3 : (a) in the United Kingdom, as the brand aesthetic increases, the brand attitude strength increases (b) in Thailand, as the brand aesthetic increases, the brand attitude strength increases

Secondly, the research tests the impact of brand attitude strength on three behavioural intentions (1) WOM, (2) repeat-purchase loyalty, and (3) willingness to pay price premium.

H4 : (a) in the United Kingdom, as the brand attitude strength increases, consumers are more likely to provide WOM (b) in Thailand, as the brand attitude strength increases, consumers are more likely to provide WOM
H5: (a) in the United Kingdom, as the brand attitude strength increases, consumers are more likely to show repeat-purchase loyalty about a brand. (b) As the brand attitude strength increases, consumers are more likely to show repeat-purchase loyalty about a brand.

H6: (a) in the United Kingdom, as the brand attitude strength increases, consumers are more willing to pay a price premium. (b) In Thailand, as the brand attitude strength increases, consumers are more willing to pay a price premium.

Third, the mediating of brand attitude strength on the direct effect of brand benefit and behavioural intentions are tested. Three hypotheses associated with the scope of investigation are presented here.

H7: (a) In the United Kingdom, there is evidence showing mediating effects of brand attitude strength on the direct effects of brand benefits and behavioural intentions. (b) In Thailand, there is evidence showing mediating effects of brand attitude strength on the direct effects of brand benefits and behavioural intentions.

4. STUDY 1

I designed Study1 to investigate three things in the United Kingdom. First, I wanted to test the assumption that in the United Kingdom, there is a positive relationship between brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic on brand attitude strength. Second, I wanted to investigate the relationship between brand attitude strength and three behavioural intentions. Third, I wanted to study the mediation effects of brand attitude strength on the direct effect of brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic on three behavioural intentions.
4.1 PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

To test our conceptual model, I used a quantitative study. A voluntary questionnaire was circulated to students at a large research-focused university in the United Kingdom, regardless of which department they were in. The respondents received basic information concerning the research project, including the purpose of study, completion time, number of pages and necessary information. We clearly stated that “all answers will be treated with strict confidentially and no individual responses will be disclose to Starbucks (our research’s subject) or any other entity outside the research group involved this study”. They were then asked to complete the booklet which consisted of 44 items. The booklet asked participants to report their brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, brand aesthetic, brand attitude strength, three behavioural intentions, brand familiarity, and gender. The questionnaires were circulated to 317 students in total. We terminated 17 responses due to inadequate question completion. The 300 usable responses for Study 1 meant a 94.64% effective rate.

4.2 RESEARCH SETTING

I conducted a pre-test to investigate the appropriacy of brand used in this research. The questionnaires were distributed to 150 respondents who participated. The usability of all 150 responses meant a 100% effective rate. Virgin Atlantic airlines and Sony were used in this pre-test. Respondents indicated the extent to which they were familiar with “brand name”?(Sony, Virgin Atlantic Airline, and Starbucks). The items were placed on 9 point scales anchored with “unfamiliar” (-4) and “familiar” (+4). Descriptive results show the problematic gap between two brands M_{Virgin Atlantic Airlines} = 1.4 and M_{Sony} =5.38, M_{Starbucks} =5.54, respectively). According to these descriptive results, Starbucks was thus chosen for this research.
4.3 BRAND BENEFITS

Respondents assessed three independent variables, namely (1) brand functional benefit (2) brand self-identification, and (3) brand aesthetic, based on 9 point scales. We adapted all the items to measure independent variables from the work of (Escalas and Bettman, 2005, Voss et al., 2003, Park et al., 2010, Park et al., 1986). For brand functional benefit, respondents answered two questions regarding the extent to which they thought Starbucks’ service offering was “unessential” (-4) versus “essential” (+4) for managing their daily life, and the extent to which they though Starbucks’ service offerings “hinder” (-4) versus “help” (+4) them manage their daily life. For brand self-identification, we adapted items from the work of Escalas and Bettman (2003). Participants indicated the extent to which they viewed Starbucks’ service offerings as “misrepresent” (-4) versus “represent” (+4) who they wanted to be as person, and the extent to which they thought Starbucks’s service offerings “misspeak” (-4) versus “express” (+4) who they are as a person. For the last independent variable, we adopted the items and also built on the work of Mathwick et al. (2001). Respondents expressed their views on Starbucks settings as being “displeasing” (-4) versus “pleasing” (+4), and the extent to which they thought Starbucks’ settings are “unappealing” (-4) versus “appealing” (+4), and the extent to which they viewed Starbucks’ settings as being “unattractive” (-4) versus “attractive” (+4).

Three independent variables are analysed by using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). To obtain a data reduction, we employed principal component analysis (PCA) with three fixed factors. To refine the variable measures, we dropped items with minimally loaded .70 on their constructed or with significant cross loadings on two or more factors. The remaining seven items yield three distinct factors. Table 2-1 illustrates the items categorised in groups according to the distinction
for both studies. The percentage of variance explained by the three factors are 52.69 %, 15.91%, and 11.90% respectively, with a total variance explained of 73.63%. It can be said that the constructs presented a unidimensional scale and obtained convergent validity. Furthermore, the Pearson’s correlation between items for brand functional benefit and brand self-identification were significant ($r=.60$, $r=.56$, $p<.01$, respectively). In addition, Cronbach’s alpha of brand aesthetic was .89, indicating a high level of unity of brand aesthetic constructs with samples in Study 1. This means that the three constructs demonstrated internal consistency.
1. To what extent [Brand name]’s settings “unappealing” or “appealing” to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent are [Brand name]’s settings “unattractive” or “attractive” to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent are [Brand name]’s settings “displeasing” or “pleasing” to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what extent are [Brand name]’s services offerings “hinder” or “help” how you manage thing in your daily living?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. To what extent are [Brand name]’s service offerings “unessential” or “essential” for your daily living?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. To what extent do [Brand name]’s service offerings functionally “misspeak” or “express” who you are as a person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. To what extent do [Brand name]’s service offerings “misrepresenting” or “representing” who you want to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-1: Factor Analysis for Study 1 and Study 2
As indicated in Table 2-2, the average variance extracted (AVE) of brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic were .62, .57, and .72, respectively. The composite reliabilities (CR) of brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic were .76, .72 and .89, respectively. These results exceeded the recommended score by Bagozzi and Yi (1988). To confirm the discriminant validity, the squared correlation between any pair of our three constructs was less than the respective average variance extracted (AVE) for the specific constructed in the pair as recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981). Drolet and Morrison (2001) suggests that the model contains the single-item factor, reporting AVE as acceptable.

Furthermore, we conducted two CFAs. In the first one we allowed brand functional benefit and brand self-identification, brand functional benefit and brand aesthetic, wherein brand self-identification and brand aesthetic were correlated \( (\chi^2(1) = 13.92, \text{ d.f.} = 11) \). In the second model we created a perfectly correlated among three variables \( (\chi^2(2) = 29.14, \text{ d.f.} = 14) \). The results
indicated that the three variables significantly differ at the model level ($\Delta \chi^2 = 15.23$, d.f. = 3, $p < .01$). Change in the chi-square results reveals that the first analysis fits the data better than the second one.

4.4 BRAND ATTITUDE STRENGTH

Following some alterations of Park et al. (2010), we measured a mediating variable, brand attitude strength, based on two important indicators. At first we measure (1) valence and (2) certainty. According to the work of Park et al. (2010), brand attitude strength is analysed based on the single-factor method. The value of brand attitude strength is the multiplicative product of valence and attitude strength. The valence is comprised of the following questions: To what extent do you view Starbucks as “bad” (-4) versus “good” (4); “negative” (-4) versus “positive” (4); and “dislike” (-4) versus “like” (4). Then we measure confidence or certainty by asking the additional five questions to evaluate the extent to which (1) Starbucks is important to you (2) Starbucks is relevant to you (3) you have thought about Starbucks (4) you are confident with your evaluation of Starbucks and (5) you are certain regarding your evaluation of Starbucks. Participants were asked to evaluate the items based on 9 point scales anchored by “not at all” (1) and “completely” (9).

4.5 BEHAVIOURAL INTENTIONS

According to the semantic differential used in this research, questions regarding the intention to perform behaviours were anchored by two behaviours. There were three behavioural intentions used in this research. The first behaviour was an intention to provide word-of-mouth about the brand; “providing negative word-of-mouth about Starbucks to others and providing positive word-of-mouth about Starbucks to others”. The second behaviour was a repeat-purchase loyalty; “always
buying Starbuck competitors’ products and “always buying Starbucks’s products”. The last intention is willingness to pay more; “paying 20% more to buy Starbucks competitors’ products and paying 20% more to buy Starbucks’s products.

4.6 RESULTS: STUDY 1

4.6.1 Measurement of Model

We examined the measurements and structural model through a structural equation model by using AMOS 22.0. We tested the model with 300 students in the United Kingdom. As shown in Figure
the results of model fit are as follows: \( \chi^2 / \text{d.f.} = 5.12 \), goodness of fit index = .89, normed fit index = .89, comparative fit index = .90, root mean square error of approximation = .11

4.6.2 Hypotheses Testing

The hypothesised relations were assessed by using the structural equation model method (SEM). We employed nonparametric bootstrapping with 1,000 resample as suggested by Hayes (2012) to examine standard errors of parameter estimates in the proposed model. As shown in Figure 2-2, the results showed a positive relationship between brand functional benefit and brand attitude strength (\( \beta = .44, p < .001 \)), and brand aesthetic and brand attitude strength (\( \beta = .35, p < .001 \)), in line with Hypothesis 1a and 3a respectively. However, we found an insignificant relationship between brand self-identification and brand attitude strength (\( \beta = .13, p > .05 \)) that contradicts with Hypothesis 2a. Consistent with Hypothesis 4a, 5a and 6a the results showed that brand attitude strength significantly impacts on three behavioural intentions: providing word-of-mouth, having repeat-purchase loyalty and willingness to pay price premium (\( \beta = .64, .57, .48, p < .001 \), respectively).

Due to the simplicity of the method, the Barron and Kenny approach has become famous and well-known amongst scholars. However, recent research has shifted interest to other methods, namely bootstrapping. There are many reasons for this shift. The first reason is that the Barron and Kenny approach claims that the mediation effect will have the strongest impact when there is no direct effect (Baron and Kenny, 1986). However, Zhao et al. (2010) argues that the strength of mediation should not be estimated by the insignificance of direct effect. They recommended the size of indirect effects. Second, when comparing the bootstrap and the Barron and Kenny methods, scholars found that the yield of the Barron and Kenny method is low in power (Zhao et al., 2010).
Hayes (2008) highlighted the problems regards the types of mediation. To test full or partial mediating effects, the total effect is not equal to zero in the Barron and Kenny method. However, Hayes (2008) found that there is the evidence refutes the Barron and Kenny approach. He also added that Barron and Kenny’s findings are not associated with the methods as defined. Third, the contemporary approach about evaluating mediation analysis does not focus on the significant impact of total effect prior to the evaluation of direct and indirect effects (Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 2009; Hayes, 2012; Rucker et al., 2011). The recent research recommends us to use the inference from indirect effect rather than the significant results from the paths which define the indirect effect (path $a$ and $b$)

As a next step, I investigated the indirect effects of brand attitude strength by adopting the steps recommended Hayes (2012) meaning that 10,000 bootstrap samples were used to explain the mediating effects presented in the model. According to Figure 3-1, our model includes three independent variables which are (1) brand functional benefit, (2) brand self-identification, and (3)
brand aesthetic, one mediator which is brand attitude strength, and behavioural intentions which are (1) Word-of-mouth (2) Repeat-purchase loyalty and (3) willingness to pay price premium. Hayes (2012) suggests that in the model containing multiple independent variables, scholars should regress one independent variable and correlate it with the remaining independent variables. He did not suggest regressing all the independents at the same time. If a model has \( k \) independent variables, the researcher should prepare a regression \( k \) times. In addition, he also suggests steps to analyse the mediating effects when a model has multiple dependent variables. If a model has \( k \) dependent variables, the researcher should run a regression \( k \) times. According to the model presented in Figure 2-1, nine regressions will be required to find the mediating effects.

The direct and indirect effects of Brand Functional Benefit, Brand Self-Identification and Brand Aesthetic, on behavioural intentions, were analysed. The mediator, Brand Attitude Strength, was regressed on independent variables in order to produce path \( a \), and dependent variables were regressed on both dependent variables and a mediators, which presented \( b \) and \( c \) respectively. Later section, I will use acronyms to represent factors; BFB= brand functional benefit; BSI= brand self-identification; BA= brand aesthetic; BAS= brand attitude strength; WOM = intention to provide word-of-mouth about the brands; REP = repeat purchase loyalty; PAY= willingness to pay price premium on the brand’s products or services.

As shown in Figure 2-4, \( a_I = 1.79, b_I = .09 \). The \( a_I \) shows that change in one unit of BFB is estimated to increase by 1.79 units on BAS (because \( a_I \) is positive). The regression coefficient for BAS on WOM, \( b_I = .09 \), means that if there are two groups of respondents assigned in the same condition (i.e. equal on BFB) but they differ by one unit of BAS (Mediating variable), they are evaluated to differ by .09 unit in WOM (Dependent variable). The indirect effect of BFB on WOM is estimated as the product of path \( a_I \) and \( b_I \). Multiplying two coefficients together (\( a_I \) and \( b_I \)), the results show
that \( a_1b_1=1.79 \times 0.09 = 0.16 \) with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval of 0.10 to 0.23. When the bootstrap confidence interval does not contain zero, we can conclude that the indirect effect of BFB on WOM through BAS was significant. In addition, the Sobel test also confirmed the significance of the indirect effect of BFB on WOM (\( Z = 6.19 \) and \( p < 0.001 \)).

The direct effect of BFB on WOM was estimated as \( c_1' = 0.03 \). If BAS is held as a constant, when BFB changes by one unit, WOM will increase by 0.03 units. The direct effect of BFB on WOM was not significant \( t(295) = 0.60, p > 0.05 \) with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from -0.07 to 0.13.

The total effect of BFB on WOM was estimated by the sum of direct and indirect effects, or regressing WOM on BFB: \( c_1 = a_1b_1 + c_1' = 0.16 + 0.03 = 0.19 \). This reflects that if two respondents who differ by one unit of BFB, they should increase by 0.19 units in WOM. The total effect was statistically significant \( t(296) = 3.80, p < 0.001 \). A 95% bootstrap confidence interval from 0.09 to 0.28 also affirmed that the total effect was statistically significant. The positive effect means the brand that had the greater BFB has a higher WOM.

---

**Figure 2-4:** Simple Mediation Model with BFB and WOM through BAS

---
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As can be seen from Figure 2-5, $a_1 = 1.79$, and $b_2 = .09$. The change by one unit of BFB resulted in a change of 1.79 units on BAS, and the change by one unit of BAS resulted in a difference of .04 units of BUY. I used two coefficients ($a_1$ and $b_2$) to calculate the indirect effect. The indirect effect of BFB on though BAS was estimated as $c_2' = a_1 \times b_2 = 1.79 \times .09 = .15$. The result was statistically significant with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .10 to .23. Later, a Sobel test was conducted and presented $z = 6.19$, $p < .001$. The result from the Sobel test also affirms that the direct effect of BFB on REP thorough BAS was statistically significant. The direct effect of BFB on BUY though BAS failed to obtain the significance $c_2 = .06$, $t(295) = 1.15$, $p > .05$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from -.04 to .16. The bootstrap confidence interval included zero, meaning that the direct effect was not significant.

The total effect of BFB on REP is computed by $c_2 = a_1 \times b_2 + c_2' = .15 + .06 = .21$ The total effect was statistically significant $t(296) = 4.27$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .11 to .31. The positive result of the total effect means that when BFB is higher, so too is REP.

![Diagram](image-url)
As shown in Figure 2-6, \( a_1 = 1.79 \), and \( b_3 = .07 \), where the regression of BAS on BFB was presented as \( a_1 \), and regression of PAY on BAS was shown as \( b_3 \). To estimate the mediating effect of BAS on BFB and PAY, I multiplied \( a_1 \) and \( b_3 = 1.79 \times .07 = .13 \) to get the indirect effect of BFB on PAY. The result was statistically significant with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .08 to .21. The interval did not include zero, thereby representing the significance of the indirect effect. A Sobel Test was then estimated in order to check the significance of the effect, \( z = 5.41, p < .001 \). The result from the Sobel test supports the fact that the indirect effect of BAS on BFB though PAY was significant.

The direct effect of BFB on PAY was presented as \( c_3' = -.02 \), \( t(295) = -.41, p > .05 \) with a 95 bootstrapping confidence interval from -.13 to .09. From the p-value and bootstrap confidence interval, the results imply that the direct effect of BFB on PAY was not significant.

The total effect was estimated by the sum of direct and indirect effects \( c_2 = a_1 \times b_3 + c_3' = .13 + .02 = .11, t(296) = 2.12, p > .05 \) with a 95% bootstrapping confidence interval from .01 to .21. According to the results, it can be concluded that the total effect of BFB on PAY was significant.

![Simple Mediation Model with BFB and MOST through BAS](image)

**Figure 2-6:** Simple Mediation Model with BFB and MOST through BAS
According to the SEM results (see Figure 2-2), the path from BSI to BAS was not significant. Therefore, the mediating effect of BAS on BSI and three varying intention to perform brand behaviours were excluded in the analysis. Then, I tested the next independent variable, Brand Aesthetic (BA).

As can be seen from Figure 3-7, \(a_3 = 2.32\) and \(b_1 = .09\). I used these two coefficients to find the indirect effect of BA on WOM through BAS. The result from multiplying \(a_1b_1\) was \(2.32 \times .09 = .20\) with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .14 to .29. Then, I used another approach to find the significance of the indirect effect by using a Sobel test. The result was \(z = 5.98\) \(p < .001\) and supported by the bootstrap results.

The direct effect of BA on WOM by holding BAS constant has a statistically important effect. The result was \(c_7' = .14, t(296) = 2.02, p < .05\), with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .00 to .27. It can be seen that there is statistical evidence to prove that the direct effect of BA on WOM was significant.

The total effect of BA on WOM can be calculated by the sum of indirect and indirect effects \(c_7 = a_1b_3, c_7' = .20 + .14 = .34, t(296) = 5.11, p < .001\) with a 95% bootstrapping confidence interval from .21 to .47.
As can be seen from Figure 2-8, $a_3 = 2.32$ and $b_2 = .09$. I multiplied two coefficient $a_1$ and $b_1$ in order to estimate the indirect effect of BA on REP through BAS, $2.32 \times .09 = .20$ with 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .13 to .29. The interval indicated that the indirect effect was statically significant because the confidence interval did not contain zero. In addition, the result from the Sobel test was consistent with the Bootstrap method, $z = 5.98$, $p < .001$.

The direct effect of BA on REP controlled by BAS was estimated as $c_8' = -.04$. The direct effect failed to present the statistically significant effect, $t(295) = -51$, $p > .05$, with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from -.17 to .10.

The total effect was presented as $c_8 = a_3 \times b_2 + c_8' = .20 - .04 = .16$, $t(296) = 2.41$, $p < .05$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .03 to .30. According to the statistical value, it can be confirmed that the total effect was not significant.
As can be seen in Figure 2-9, $a_3 = 2.32$ and $b_3 = .07$. The indirect effect of BA on PAY through BAS can be calculated by multiplying $a_3$ and $b_3$, $2.32 \times .07 = .17$ with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from .11 to .26. Then, a Sobel test was used, resulting in $z = 5.27$, $p < .001$. As can be seen from these results, it can be concluded that the indirect effect was significant.

Then, the direct effect of BA on PAY was estimated. The result was $c_9' = .00$, $t(295) = -.06$, $p > .05$ with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from -.15 to .14. The Bootstrap confidence interval contained zero, meaning that the direct effect was not significant.

The total effect of BA on PAY can be calculated by the sum of direct and indirect effect of BA on PAY, $c_9' + a_3 \times b_3 = .00 + .17 = .17$ with a Bootstrap confidence interval from .03 to .30, $t(296) = 2.38$, $p > .05$. From the results, it can be concluded that the total effect was not significant.
All in all, all results indicate that there is a mediating effect of brand attitude strength on two independent variables (brand functional benefit, and brand aesthetic) and dependent variables (word-of-mouth, repeat purchase loyalty, and willingness to pay price premium). From the results, it can be concluded that there is a mediating effect of brand attitude strength on the direct effect of brand benefits, and behavioural intentions leading to the support of H5a.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient (SE)</td>
<td>t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1: BFB → WOM</td>
<td>.19 (.05)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2: BFB → BUY</td>
<td>.21 (.05)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3: BFB → PAY</td>
<td>.11 (.05)</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4: BSI → WOM</td>
<td>Due to the significant effect of brand self-identification on brand attitude strength (as presented in Figure 2-2), the mediating effects of BSI were excluded from the analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5: BSI → BUY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 6: BSI → PAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7: BA → WOM</td>
<td>.34 (.07)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 8: BA → BUY</td>
<td>.16 (.07)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 9: BA → PAY</td>
<td>.17 (.07)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold.

Abbreviation: SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; BFB = Brand functional benefit; BSI = Brand self-identification; BA = Brand aesthetic; BAS = Brand attitude strength; WOM = word-of-mouth; REP = repeat purchase loyalty; and PAY = willingness to pay price premium

Table 2-3: Bootstrap Results for Total Effects

| Route | Direct Effect | | |
|-------|---------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
|       | Coefficient (SE) | t-value | p-value | Bias Corrected Method 95% CI | Lower | Upper |
| Route 1: BFB → WOM | .03 (.05) | .60 | NS | .07 | .13 |
| Route 2: BFB → BUY | .06 (.05) | .115 | NS | .04 | .16 |
| Route 3: BFB → PAY | -.02 (.05) | -.41 | NS | -.13 | .09 |
| Route 4: BSI → WOM | Due to the significant effect of brand self-identification on brand attitude strength (as presented in Figure 2-2), the mediating effects of BSI were excluded from the analysis. | |
| Route 5: BSI → BUY | |
| Route 6: BSI → PAY | |
| Route 7: BA → WOM | .14 (.07) | 2.05 | p < .05 | .00 | .27 |
| Route 8: BA → BUY | -.04 (.07) | -.51 | NS | -.17 | .10 |
| Route 9: BA → PAY | .00 (.07) | -.06 | NS | -.15 | .14 |

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold.

Abbreviation: SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; BFB = Brand functional benefit; BSI = Brand self-identification; BA = Brand aesthetic; BAS = Brand attitude strength; WOM = word-of-mouth; REP = repeat purchase loyalty; and PAY = willingness to pay price premium

Table 2-4: Bootstrap Results for Direct Effects
4.6.3 Discussion

Study 1 provides the evidence that items used to measure brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic are significant different. In addition, the results show that brand functional benefit and brand aesthetic have a positive impact on brand attitude strength in the United Kingdom, thereby supporting H1a and H3a. However, brand self-identification fails to prove its effect in the United Kingdom, causing a rejection of H2a. Brand attitude strength impacts on three behavioural intentions in support of Hypothesis 4a, 5a, and 6a. Lastly, the results show the significant mediating effects of brand functional benefit, and brand aesthetic on three behavioural intentions in support of H6a.
5. STUDY 2

5.1 PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

We designed Study 2 to replicate the results from Study 1. A total of 416 students participated in research focused university answered questionnaires in exchange for being listed in a lucky draw for 10 x £10 Starbucks gift vouchers. Before circulating the questionnaires for Study 2, we conducted five face-to-face interviews with randomly selected students. The purpose of the interviews was to reduce the ambiguity of the items. The respondents identified any ambiguity individually. The revised version was circulated to 76 graduate students and it was analysed with the primary purpose of testing the questionnaire.

5.2 TRANSLATION AND BACK-TRANSLATION

The questionnaire was translated into Thai by a PhD student and then back translated into English by another PhD student majoring in English language. The back-translated version was given to five professors teaching in the English Literature of Humanities Department (one American, one British, one Australian and two Thais) to prove the translation equivalence. Translated questionnaire were distributed to 20 Thai students, following which a few problematic questions were adjusted and redefined. The completed version was again given to the same professors as before, and pre-tested with 15 Thai students. Questions or concerns were not found in the pre-test stage.
5.3 BRAND BENEFITS

Measures of brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, brand aesthetic, brand attitude strength and behavioural intentions were identical to those in Study 1.

5.4 BEHAVIOURAL INTENTIONS

Measures of word-of-mouth, repeat-purchase loyalty and willingness to pay price premium were identical to those in Study 1.
5.5 RESULTS : STUDY 2

5.5.1 Measurement of Model

![Diagram of the model with standardized path coefficients and significance levels.]

**Notes:** N=416, these values are based on the standardised path coefficients. BFF = Brand functional benefit, BSI = Brand self-identification, BA = Brand Aesthetic, BAS = Brand attitude strength, WOM = intention to provide word-of-mouth, REP = repeat-purchase loyalty, and PAY = willingness to pay 20% more on the brand’s products. $\chi^2 = 156.62$, d.f. = 39, $\chi^2$/d.f. = 4.01, GFI = .90, NFI = .90, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .08. Solid lines represent statically significant effects based on probability values for two-tailed significant on path coefficient. A dashed line indicates statistically insignificant effects based on probability values for two-tailed significant on path coefficient.

*Figure 2-10: Estimates of Standardised Regression Weight, R-Square Values and Probability Levels for Paths in Structural Model*

5.5.2 Hypotheses Testing

The method used in this study is identical to that in Study 1. As can be seen in Figure 2-10, there is a positive relationship between brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic and brand attitude strength ($\beta = .24^{***}$, $.18^*$, $.45^{***}$, respectively). Our results strongly confirm Hypotheses 1b, 2b and 3b.
Using the method described earlier, our results are in line with Hypothesis 4b, 5b, and 6b. The results obtained in Study 2 are in good agreement with Study 1, showing that brand attitude strength has an appositive relationship with three behavioural intentions (β = .74, .66, .30, p < .001, respectively).

The method used in the mediation analysis was identical to Study 1. As presented in Figure 2-11, \( a_1 = .91, b_1 = .04 \). The indirect effect of BFB on WOM through BAS is the product of \( a_1 \) and \( b_1 \), which is \(.91 \times .04 = .04\) with a 95% bootstrap confident interval from .02 to .09. Following this, a Sobel Test was conducted in order to find the z-score, with the results showing that \( z = 3.01, p < .01 \). According to the result arising from the Bootstrap confidence interval and the Sobel test, it can be concluded that the indirect effect of BFB on WOM through BAS was significant because the confidence interval did not contain zero and \( p \)-value was less than .01.

The direct effect of BF on WOM was estimated as \( c_1' = .01, t(411) = .14, p > .05 \), with a 95% confidence interval from -.08 to .10. According to the \( p \)-value and Bootstrap confidence interval, the direct effect was not significant because the \( p \)-value was more than .05 and its confidence interval contained zero.

The total effect of BFB on WOM was calculated by the sum of direct and indirect effects, \( c_1 = a_1b_1 + c_1' = .04 + .01 = .05 \) with a Bootstrap confidence interval from -.04 to .14, \( t(412) = 1.05, p > .05 \). According to the results, it can be concluded that the total effect was not significant.
The indirect effect of BFB on REP through BAS was calculated by multiplying two coefficients, which are \( a_1 \) and \( b_2 \). The result was \(.91 \times .07 = .07\) with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .03 to .12. The result from a Sobel test indicated that \( z = 4.10 \), and \( p < .05 \). According to the results, the indirect effect was statistically significant.

The direct effect of BFB on REP was \( c_2' = .12 \), \( t(411) = 2.80 \), \( p < .05 \) with a Bootstrap confidence interval from .04 to .20. According to these results, it can be concluded that the direct effect was significant.

The total effect of BFB on REP was estimated by the sum of direct and indirect effect, \( c_2 = .07 + .12 = .19\), with a Bootstrap confidence interval from .10 to .27, \( t(412) = 4.28\), \( p < .001 \). According to these results, it could be inferred that the total effect of BFB on REP was statistically significant.
As can be seen in Figure 2-13, the indirect effect of BFB on PAY through BAS was estimated by multiplying $a_1$ and $b_3$, $0.91 \times 0.05 = 0.04$ with a Bootstrap confidence interval from 0.02 to 0.09. I further examined using a Sobel test, and the results yielded were $z = 3.56$, $p < 0.01$. It can be concluded that the indirect effect was significant.

Next, the direct effect of BFB on PAY was estimated. The results were 0.13, $t(411) = 2.69$, $p < 0.01$. The Bootstrap confidence interval of the direct effect was from 0.03 to 0.22. According to these results, it can be concluded that the direct effect was statistically significant.

The total effect of BFB on PAY was then estimated. The total effect is the sum of direct and indirect effect, $c_3 = a_1 \times b_3 + c_3' = 0.04 + 0.13 = 0.17$, with a Bootstrap confidence interval from 0.08 to 0.27, $t(412) = 3.64$, $p < 0.001$. According to the Bootstrap confidence interval and $p$-value, it can be concluded that the total effect was significant.
The next independent variable is BSI. First, the indirect effect of BSI on WOM through BAS was estimated by multiplying two coefficients, $a_2 b_1 = .95 \times .04 = .04$ with a Bootstrap confidence interval from .02 to .08. Then, I estimate the Sobel score of the indirect effect, the details of which were $z = 3.0$ and $p - value < .01$. According to these results, it can be concluded that the indirect effect was statistically significant.

Then, the direct effect of BSI on WOM was examined. The coefficient of the direct effect was $c_2' = - .05$ with a Bootstrap confidence interval from -.15 to .05, $t(411) = - 1.04$, $p > .05$. According to the results mentioned above, it can be concluded that the direct effect was not significant.

The total effect of BSI on WOM was calculated by the sum of the direct and indirect effect of BSI on LEAST, $c_4 = a_2 b_1 + c_4' = .04 - .05 = -.01$ with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from -.11 to .09, $t(412) = -.22$, $p > .05$. It can be concluded that the total effect was not significant.
The indirect effect of BSI on REP through BAS was examined. The indirect effect was determined by multiplying two coefficients, \( a_2 \times b_2 = .95 \times .07 = .07 \) with a Bootstrap confidence interval from .03 to .11. The Sobel test of this indirect effect was \( z = 3.80, p \text{–value} < .001 \). According to the two analyses, it can be concluded that the indirect effect was significant.

Next, the direct effect was determined. The results were \( c_4' = -.02, t(411) = -.46, p > .05 \) with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from -.11 to .07. It can be seen that the \( p \text{–value} \) was more than .05 and the Bootstrap confidence interval contained zero in the interval, meaning that the direct effect was not significant.

The total effect of BSI on REP was then examined by adding direct and indirect effect of BSI on MODE, \( c_5 = a_2 \times b_2 + c_4' = .07-.02 = .05, t(412) = .97, p > .05 \) with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from -.05 to .14. It can be seen from the results that the total effect was not significant.
The indirect effect of BSI on PAY though BAS was estimated by multiplying two coefficients $a_2*b_3 = .95*.05 = .04$ with a Bootstrap confidence interval from .02 to .09. Then, the Sobel value was calculated and the results indicated that $z = 3.35, p < .01$. From the results it can be concluded that the indirect effect was significant.

Then, the direct effect of BSI on PAY was estimated, the results showed that $c_6' = -.03, t(411) = -.53$ with a Bootstrap confidence interval from -.13 to .08. Since the Bootstrap confident interval contained zero, it can be concluded that the direct effect was not significant.

Next, the total effect of BSI on PAY was calculated by the sum of indirect and direct effect of BSI on MOST, $a_2*b_3 + c_6'$. The results was $.04-.03=.01, t(412) = .31, p > .05$ with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from -.09 to .12. It can be inferred that the total effect was statistically significant.
The last independent variable in this study is BA. The indirect effect of BA on WOM through BAS was the product of $a_3$ and $b_1$, $2.62 \times 0.04 = 0.11$ with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from 0.05 to 0.20. Then, a Sobel test was used in order to confirm the significance of the direct effect. The results of this test indicated that $z = 3.77$, $p < .01$. According to these results, it can be concluded that the indirect effect was significant.

Then, the direct effect of BA on WOM was estimated, the result was $c'_7 = .31$, $t(411) = 4.87$, $p < .001$ with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from .18 to .43. According to the $p$-value, it can be concluded that the direct effect was significant.

Next, the total effect of BA on WOM was a sum of direct effect and indirect effect of BA on LEAST, $a_3 b_1 + c_7$. The results was $c_7 = .11 + .31 = .42$, $t(412) = 7.62$, $p < .001$ with a 95% Bootstrap confidence interval from .32 to .53. According to the results mentioned previously, it can be concluded that the total effect was significant.
As can be seen from Figure 3-18, $a_3 = 2.62$ and $b_1 = .07$. The indirect effect of BA on REP through BAS can be calculated by multiplying two coefficients, $a_3 \times b_1 = .19$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .12 to .27. Then, a Sobel test was executed, with the result being $z = 5.96$, $p < .001$. In summary, the indirect effect of BA on REP through BAS was significant because the bootstrap confidence interval did not contain zero and the $p$-value did not exceed .05.

Next, the direct effect of BA on REP was estimated and the result which was presented was $c_8' = -.02$ with a bootstrap confidence interval from -.13 to .09, $t(411) = -.35$, $p > .05$. According to the results, the direct effect was not significant.

Then, the total effect of BA on BUY was estimated by adding the direct effect and indirect effect, $a_3 \times b_1 + c_8' = .19 -.02 = .17$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from .06 to .27. It can be concluded that the total effect was significant.
As can be seen in Figure 3-19, the indirect effect of BA on PAY though BAS was calculated by multiplying $a_3$ and $b_3$. The result was $2.62 \times .05 = .12$ with a bootstrap confidence interval from .06 to .20. Then, a Sobel test was executed, with the result showing that $z = 4.58, p < .001$. According to the results, it can be seen that the indirect effect was significant.

Next, the direct effect of BA on PAY was examined. The result was $c_3' = .05, t(411) = .75, p > .05$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from -.08 to .18. The confident interval contained zero, thereby showing that the direct effect was not significant.

Lastly, the total effect of BA on PAY was estimated. The total effect was calculated by the adding the direct and indirect effect of BA on PAY, $a_3 \times b_3 + c_3' = .12 + .05 = .17, t(412) = 2.98, p < .01$, with a 95% bootstrapping confidence interval from .06 to .29. These results show that the total effect was significant.
According to Table 2-7, it indicates that there is a mediating effect of independent variables (brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, brand aesthetic, and brand aesthetic) on dependent variable (behavioural intentions) through brand attitude strength. It can be concluded that the results support H7b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
<th>Coefficient (SE)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Bias Corrected Method</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1: BFB → WOM</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05 (.05)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2: BFB → BUY</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18 (.04)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3: BFB → PAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.05)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4: BSI → WOM</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01 (.05)</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5: BSI → BUY</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05 (.05)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 6: BSI → PAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01 (.05)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7: BA → WOM</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42 (.06)</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 8: BA → BUY</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.05)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 9: BA → PAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.06)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold.

**Abbreviation:** SE= standard error; CI= confidence interval; BFB=Brand functional benefit; BSI=Brand self-identification; BA= Brand aesthetic; BAS= Brand attitude strength; WOM= word-of-mouth; REP= repeat purchase loyalty; and PAY= willingness to pay price premium

Table 2-6: Bootstrap Results for Total Effects
### Table 2-7: Bootstrap Results for Direct Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 1: BFB → WOM</th>
<th>Route 2: BFB → BUY</th>
<th>Route 3: BFB → PAY</th>
<th>Route 4: BSI → WOM</th>
<th>Route 5: BSI → BUY</th>
<th>Route 6: BSI → PAY</th>
<th>Route 7: BA → WOM</th>
<th>Route 8: BA → BUY</th>
<th>Route 9: BA → PAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.01(.05)</td>
<td>.12(.04)</td>
<td>.13(.05)</td>
<td>-.05(.05)</td>
<td>-.02(.05)</td>
<td>-.03(.05)</td>
<td>.31(.06)</td>
<td>-.02(.06)</td>
<td>.05(.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>-3.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p&gt;.05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
<td>p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold.

**Abbreviation:** SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; BFB = Brand functional benefit; BSI = Brand self-identification; BA = Brand aesthetic; BAS = Brand attitude strength; WOM = word-of-mouth; REP = repeat purchase loyalty; and PAY = willingness to pay price premium.

### Table 2-8: Bootstrap Results for Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 1: BFB → BAS → WOM</th>
<th>Route 2: BFB → BAS → BUY</th>
<th>Route 3: BFB → BAS → PAY</th>
<th>Route 4: BSI → BAS → WOM</th>
<th>Route 5: BSI → BAS → BUY</th>
<th>Route 6: BSI → BAS → PAY</th>
<th>Route 7: BA → BAS → WOM</th>
<th>Route 8: BA → BAS → BUY</th>
<th>Route 9: BA → BAS → PAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.04(.02)</td>
<td>.07(.02)</td>
<td>.04(.02)</td>
<td>.04(.01)</td>
<td>.07(.02)</td>
<td>.04(.02)</td>
<td>.11(.04)</td>
<td>.19(.04)</td>
<td>.12(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold.

**Abbreviation:** SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval; BFB = Brand functional benefit; BSI = Brand self-identification; BA = Brand aesthetic; BAS = Brand attitude strength; WOM = word-of-mouth; REP = repeat purchase loyalty; and PAY = willingness to pay price premium.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BFB</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BSI</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BA</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BAS</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WOM</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. REP</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PAY</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation; AVE = Average Variance Extracted; CR = Composite Reliability; BFB = Brand functional benefit; BSI = Brand self-identification; BA = Brand aesthetic; BAS = Brand attitude strength; WOM = Word-of-mouth; REP = Repeat-purchase loyalty; PAY = Willingness to Pay Price Premium * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05

Table 2-9: Correlations

5.5.3 Discussion

In study 2, we found that brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic have a positive impact on brand attitude strength Thailand, in supportive Hypothesis 1b, 2b, and 3b. In addition, brand attitude strength shows the positive relationship between intention to perform behavioural intention and presents the mediating effect of direct effect of brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic on intention to perform three behavioural intentions in support Hypothesis 4b, 5b, 6b, and 7b respectively.
6. GENERAL DISCUSSION

6.1 SUMMARY

The purpose of this research is to investigate the generalisability of brand attitude strength formation and its impact on behavioural intentions. We conducted two studies which were tested in two counties, the United Kingdom and Thailand. The results show that there is a positive relationship between brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic and brand attitude strength. The higher the three brand benefit, the higher the brand attitude strength. After this, the research investigates the relationship between brand attitude strength and behavioural intentions. The results support the literature, that brand attitude strength has a positive impact on behavioural intentions, specifically word-of-mouth, repeat-purchase loyalty, and willingness to pay price premium.

6.2 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

The purpose of this chapter is to help both scholars and practitioners gain a better understanding the determinants of brand attitude strength and their impact on intention to perform consumer brand behaviours across different counties. In addition, this research is pioneering work which analyses brand attitude strength in a service context. First, we found that brand functional benefit, and brand aesthetic have a significant impact on brand attitude strength in both countries. However, brand self-identification shows a positive relationship with brand attitude strength in Thailand. Secondly, proved that brand attitude strength is a predictors of behavioural intentions and it statistically mediates the impact of direct effect of brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic on word-of-mouth, repeat-purchase loyalty and willingness to
pay price premium. Thirdly, the research provides evidence of the mediating effect of brand attitude strength on the direct effect of brand benefits and behavioural intentions.

### 6.3 MANAGERIAL CONTRIBUTION

The findings suggest that global brand managers should use different strategies in different counties. In the United Kingdom, global brand managers should communicate more about brand functional benefit to consumers. Since individuals have a significant interest in the functional benefit received from products or services, global brand managers should communicate this benefit to customers. To take Starbucks as an example, the key message in their marketing communications be on the functional benefit of their coffee – for example that coffee can improve energy or physical performance, that it can help consumers burn fat and so on. Brand aesthetic is one of the factors that company should pay attention to. This may include the service’s setting, decoration, smell, layout, the packaging of the product, employees’ uniform, the company’s letterhead and other factors which were noted earlier in the brand aesthetic section. However, the brand should not communicate brand-self-identification. The reason underlying this argument is that respondents in the United Kingdom focus on the benefits which a brand provides rather than using Starbucks as a tool to express themselves. In addition, Starbucks’ products and services are presented as a general product or service to the consumer. On the other hand, in Thailand Starbucks is positioned as a premium coffee shop. Therefore, Thai respondents use the act of consuming Starbucks as a tool to express themselves and to differentiate themselves from others.

In Thailand, global brand managers should focus on three factors. The results show that brand functional benefit, brand self-identification and brand aesthetic are important to consumers in a collectivistic society. In addition to the recommendation concerning communication noted above,
global managers should also communicate to consumers how brand image is related to consumers’ self-concept. Managers should focus more on the brand personality or brand image. In addition, managers should research more on the consumers’ self-concept, their reference group, their culture, and the social class of brand’s target consumers. After brands have this information they can incorporate all the information and use the strategy to match their brand image to consumers.

6.4 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Admittedly, this chapter can be improved in many ways. Due to resource limitations, it has been impossible to conduct research using all possible factors. Although many interesting topics were covered, there were only certain factors which could be studied. First, I recommended that other scholars should investigate this model across other countries to see the similarities and differences between them. According to the results, I found similarities and differences between the United Kingdom and Thailand. In order to gain a better understanding about the similarities and differences in both cultures, I suggest that scholars use a conceptual framework as a basis, and add more factors to make the research more interesting. To explain why brands help consumer identify themselves as who they are and who they want to be, realistic factors should be added in the model. For instance, scholars should study how consumers perceive a brand in terms of brand image and brand personality. Another factor which could be looked at is the level of product involvement. It is possible that the level of product involvement plays an important role in the model. One of the concerns of this chapter is the research subject, Starbucks. In the UK, the price of coffee sold at Starbucks ranges approximately from £2 to £4 (medium size). When compared to an existing coffee shop in the UK, the price of their products is about average. However, in Thailand the price ranges from 150 to 250 Baht (medium size), which is higher than other competitors in the market,
whereas the price ranges from 15 to 300 Baht. In addition, the price relative to the minimum wage has to take into consideration. The minimum wage in UK is £6.31 per hour. Suppose the workers work for 6 hours per day, the wage received should be around £38. However, in Thailand, the minimum wage starts at 300 Baht per day (the hourly-based wage is not commonly used in Thailand, with a day-based wage being preferred). It can be seen that the price of a Starbucks coffee is as expensive as the minimum wage. This suggests that some Thai consumers may have a different level of product involvement, which may be the cause of the difference in the results. Due to the limitations noted earlier, I would recommend that scholars use different research subjects such as low and high involvement products, durable and non-durable goods, services and products, and public or private products as promising factors to study further.

Another important factor that should be added in this thesis is gender. Gender is one of the basic but important factors of this research. The literature suggests that sometimes men and women exhibit differences in terms of their attitude and behaviour. However, this factor was not included in this research. Personally, I think that the gender is one of the most promising moderators which could be applied to this chapter.
CHAPTER 3: REGION-TO-PRODUCT MODEL

1. ABSTRACT

The main focus of this paper is the investigation into the transferability of attitude based on a region to the product of a region. The model consists of two parts, namely (1) attitudes toward a region, (2) attitudes toward products from a region, and (3) supportive behavioural intentions towards these products. By investigating the three mechanisms in the model, the results show that there is evidence of transferability of attitude from a region to its products. Specifically, all the relationships mentioned in the model can be explained as follows. Quality benefit and pleasure benefit have a positive impact on perceived value for money. Pleasure benefit and value for money have a positive impact on top of mind preference. Finally, we found that top of mind preference has a strong impact on supportive behavioural intentions, while value for money has no impact on supportive behavioural intentions. In addition, these findings have important implications for customer relationship management, especially service marketing, because they show how customer attitudes are related to the region’s attributes and are affected by value for money and top of mind preference, and can generate supportive behavioural intentions. This study represents one of the first investigations into the transferability of attitude from places to products.

2. INTRODUCTION

There are many reasons for tourists to take such trips, including business, medical and leisure purpose. However, the main focus of this thesis is leisure tourism. Currently, destination marketing organisations (DMOs) offer a number of activities to attract visitors. Wine tourism is one of the
activities. In the past, the business model for wine making has constituted the production and sale of wine to consumers. Some wine makers have identified an opportunity to attract customers by arranging activities in the winery. There are numbers of activities, including grapes picking, wines tasting, factory visiting, that could help destinations develop a relationship with visitors.

Nowadays customers have a large number of choices of tourist destinations, and these choices are growing continuously. A key question for any tourist destination is how to build and sustain a strong and committed relationships with visitors, especially when the latter have an ever increasing number of choices and exhibit variety-seeking behaviour. What is the best way to communicate to customers how to build a bond? The current study considers customers’ attitudes regarding a region’s attributes in terms of offering an experience that is high in perceived quality vs. high in pleasure elements, and how this translates into visitors’ relationships with products from that region and perform brand-supportive behaviours.

This chapter aims to cooperate the knowledge regards the consumer psychology, tourism marketing, and relationship marketing. To the best of my best knowledge, no previous research has been done concerning the transferability of attitude based on a region to its products. There is a need to better understand the process of transferability of attitude based on a region and its products.

This research investigates how quality benefit and pleasure benefit impact on perceived value for money and top-of mind choice. It then examines how perceived value for money and top-of-mind choice impact on supportive behavioural intentions. Lastly, the research considers the mediating effect of perceived value for money and top-of-mind on the direct effect of independent variables, that is, (1) quality benefit, and (2) pleasure benefit and supportive behavioural intentions.
3. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

3.1 A PROPOSED MODEL

The relationships in the proposed model are exhibited in Figure 3-1, and is named as a ‘region-to-product model. The model consists of two parts. The left-hand side of the model is called region-based attitudes, and it displays attitudes that consumers process with regards to a region’s attributes, and then evaluate based on a region’s performance. Generally, customers primarily consume products or services for these two reasons, namely quality and pleasure benefits. Based on this reasoning, tourists choose their destination based on the quality and pleasure attributes of a region as well. Here, “quality benefit” refers to the extent to which customers perceive a destination to be high on rational quality dimensions, while “pleasure benefit” refers to the emotional, aesthetic, experiential and enjoyment benefits arising from visiting the destination (Batra and Ahtola, 1991; Chitturi et al., 2008; Chitturi et al., 2007; Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Eagly and Chaiken, 1998).
The right-hand side of the model consists of perceived value for money, top-of-mind and brand-supportive behavioural intentions. This part of the model contains the region’s product-based attitudes. Three factors reflect consumer judgement on a region’s products and supportive behavioural intentions. Clearly, two variables (value for money and top-of-mind) represent the attitude towards a region’s products. The mechanism in this model shows the shift of attitude towards a region and towards a product. When consumers evaluate a quality benefit and pleasure benefit based on their direct experience towards a region, they assess attitudes towards a region’s products by requesting the perceived value for money and top-of-mind if there is significance between these four variables. This is substantial evidence to prove the transferability of attitude. The model provides more value as it links the attitude to the behavioural intentions. As depicted in the model, the relationship between value-for-money and top-of mind and supportive behavioural intention is shown.

The model is based on the assumption that consumers (visitors) visit the destination. The direct experience that consumers (visitors) have will shape their attitudes and activates their memory. Such strong thoughts about their experience of a region remain in the mind of a consumer. This presents a region-based attitude and an evaluation of a destination’s quality and pleasure dimensions. To test the transferability of attitude based on a region and the region’s products, the movement of attitudes must be investigated. Perceived value for money, and top-of-mind of a region’s products are examined. If there is one significant relationship from a region-side impact on a product-side, this can prove the transferability of attitude based on a region to a region’s products.

I predict that when the perceived quality of the region is high, value for money perceptions of the product from that region are high. This is because when visitors evaluate value for money, they
are likely to use rational quality benefits as criteria in their evaluation. In addition, when the quality and pleasure benefits of the region are high, we expect top of mind preference for products from that region to also be high. Perceptions of high value for money are associated with heightened top of mind preference, and top of mind preference in turn promotes supportive behavioural intention toward the products of the region. Furthermore, we also propose a mediating role of top of mind preference and perceived value on favourable brand behaviours.

It should be noted that when a product’s qualities are assessed, if consumers have not had any experience with the product, it should called perceived quality rather than quality of service. However, if consumers do have an experience with the product, this assessment should be called “product’s quality” because it is a true measure of the quality of the product rather than the perception of the product (Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

It should further be noted that the region-to-product model shares some similarities with attitude change theory and country-of-origin-effect. However, the proposed model contains some distinctive processes that differentiate the model from other theories. The section which follows explains the unique nature of the proposed model.

### 3.2 DIFFERENTIATING TRANSFER OF ATTITUDE AND ATTITUDE CHANGE

One of the most important contributions of this research is the transferability of attitude from a region to its product. Extant research suggests that attitudes can be transferred from one attitude object to another attitude object. The proof of existing of transferability of attitude can be found in
the literature related to brand extension theory, country of origin theory, emotional contagion theory, and sponsorship and congruity theory.

It is interesting to note that a transfer of attitudes and attitudes change are different. Attitudinal change refers to an individual altering their evaluative perception of an attitude object (Cacioppo et al., 1994). There are many reasons accounting for attitude change, such as new information received, new direct/indirect experience about an attitude object, or time change. However, transfer of attitudes differs from attitude change in that attitude change has one attitude object while a transfer of attitudes has more than one attitude object. An individual has an initial attitude toward one attitude object. Later, after an individual receives additional information or has either a direct or indirect experience, this individual would have a new evaluative judgement towards an attitude object. Wilson et al. (2000) suggests that when attitude change occurs, a new attitude overrides an existing attitude. However, it may not take the place of an initial attitude. It can be noticed that an individual has different perceptions toward an identical attitude object in different situational constraints. On the contrary, a transfer of attitudes has more than one attitude object. Initially, an individual makes an evaluation on the first attitude object. Later, an individual made an association between the first and another attitude object. As a result, an individual develops a new attitude toward the second attitude object. It can be seen that there is the difference in terms of an attitude object. In the attitude change process, an individual evaluates the identical attitude object whilst in an attitude transfer an individual processes more than one attitude object.

One prominent example of the transferability of attitude is brand extension. Both direct and indirect experiences with a brand (the attitude object) can determine a customer’s attitude toward it. Dove, for example, positions itself as “Dove is not soap” because 25% of it is moisturising cream. As a result, Dove’s image is that of a nourishing soap bar. This message impacts the whole
soap bar industry because Dove is a dominant first mover with regards to adding new attributes to a soap bar. Also, the Dove brand was successfully extended into other categories, such as hair care and skin care, where this attitude was successfully transferred. In a similar fashion, we posit that attitudes toward a region’s attributes (Quality and Pleasure) can also be transferred to the region’s products.

Much research has focused on attitude transferability from products to products, or brands to brands. The size of effect on a region-to-product model is greater than that which comes from product-to-product. When a consumer (visitor) has a positive or negative attitude towards the region’s performance, if they are impressed by their visit then a favourable quality benefit and pleasure benefit are likely to be realised. If there is a transfer of attitude from a region to its products, it is likely that few products can be influenced. However, the products from that region can be beneficial for this process. This means that not only does one brand in a region benefit from the transfer of attitude, but so do brands related to that region. In comparison to brand extension theory, which reflects the product-to-product effect, the parties who receive such a benefit from a transfer of attitude are the parent brand and extension brand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory Involved</th>
<th>Attitude Transfer Process</th>
<th>Selected Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Brand Extension</strong></td>
<td>A parent brand</td>
<td>Cohen,(1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Völckner and Sattler (2006)</td>
<td>A new brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined brand extension as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the use of established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brand names to launch new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products”. An attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer process occurs in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a stage that consumers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate brand extensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boushand Loken (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggested that attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated with the parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brand is referred to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension brand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. **Country of Origin</td>
<td>A country</td>
<td>Maheswaran, (1994),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect**</td>
<td>Product from that country</td>
<td>Bilkey and Nes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher agreed that</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1982), Li and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country of origin effect</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyers, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takes place when consumers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use the information related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to country-of-origin to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate products (Min Han,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989; Hong and Wyer, 1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Emotional Contagion</strong></td>
<td>Person A</td>
<td>Stock and Hoyer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional contagion is a</td>
<td>Person B</td>
<td>(2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept explaining that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when Person A and Person B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have minimal contact, an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude can transfer from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person A to Person B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Brand Alliance</strong></td>
<td>Brand A</td>
<td>Simonin and Ruth,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand alliance is a</td>
<td>Brand B</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wherein two or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual brands agree to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work together. It can be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>found in a physical form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as Oreo Dairy Queen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or in a symbol form such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the combination of two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-1: Selected Reviews of Transferability of Attitude
3.3 DIFFERENTIATING REGION-TO-PRODUCT MODEL AND COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN-EFFECT

A region-to-product model differs from the country-of-origin-effect in many perspectives. First, the country-of-origin effects are focused on the extent to which consumers are driven by the product’s country of origin or made-in label. It focused on the influence of country of origin on consumers’ attitude toward a product and is based on a broad perspective towards a specific region. When consumers have little information when evaluating a product, they will use the country image as a heuristics cue. For example, customers may respond more favourably to a Swiss-made watch compared to others because they associate Switzerland with delicacy and punctuality. As such, a Swiss-made watch has a favourable country-of-origin-effect on consumers’ attitude. The impact of the country-of-origin effect strongly impacts on consumers when they have information constraints regarding products; when this occurs, they will use their broad perception of the country in order to judge the product. In most studies, the independent variables for the country-of-origin-effect are the perceived quality of products (Kotler, 2002). However, the country-of-origin effect can create negative images as well. For instance, China-made consumer food products have an unfavourable image because of perceived poor standards, food contamination, or poor hygiene, which may create negative associations. Therefore, the country-of-origin effect frequently involves biased attitudes and a heuristic response. As suggested by Vargo and Lusch (2004), the attitude related to non-experience should be categorised as perceived attitudes. On the other hand, in the region-to-product model, a consumer (visitor) must have a direct experience of a destination to represent the real experience and strong feelings about a region. According to the proposed model, an evaluation based on a region’s attributes is not biased. Rather, it is an overall
judgment made after consumers have had a direct experience with a destination. Following this reasoning, it can be said that the model differs from the country-of-origin effects.

3.4 REGION-BASED-ATTITUDES

In developing effective tourism marketing strategies, DMOs have to take consumers’ motivation into consideration (Fodness, 1994). The model helps DMOs understand the factors that drive their attitude and behaviour. The model is based on hedonic and utilitarian theory (Hirschman, 1982). Based on this theory, customers perform their consumption behaviours for two main reasons, which are quality and pleasure driven. Several studies have presented the impact of service quality on supportive-brand intentions and behaviours, such as willingness to recommend the company (Parasuraman et al., 2004), customer commitment (Eisingerich and Rubera 2010), consumer trust (Eisingerich and Bell, 2008), and (Dean, 2007; Eisingerich and Bell, 2007). However, the extant literature has failed to capture one important factor in attitude processing, which is pleasure benefits. Service providers are not only providing functional benefits to customers. Pleasure elements are also embedded in the service. For instance, when customers evaluate a hotel, they do not only consider the facilities provided, their cleanliness and so on; they also consider factors such as the hotel’s aesthetics, decoration, and overall service climate. Therefore, our model includes service quality and pleasure elements, in order to have a better understanding of how visitors (customers) process quality and pleasure benefits, and how these may be associated with brand-supportive behaviours.

Quality benefit is cognitively engaged in the consumer’s attitude. It is associated with consumer evaluation towards an attitude object (here a tourist destination / region). When consumer processes cognitive attitudes towards a destination, the quality dimension can be included in their
decision. For example, in the tourist destination context, consumers (tourists) are likely to engage in cognitive thinking which involves them making their evaluation based on the service quality of the destination they visit. In contrast, when a consumer engages in the pleasure benefit, they are likely to include their affection in their judgement. These two constructs impact differently on consumers because the quality benefit triggers consumer cognition while the pleasure benefit arouses consumer affection.

3.4.1 Quality Benefit

The concept and measurement of service quality have been debated amongst scholars (Brady and Cronin, 2001), and the arguments have not been conclusive. The literature contains many different concepts and ways of measuring. There are two major perspectives of service quality, namely the holistic perspective and the attribute-based perspective. In the holistic view, service quality is judged and evaluated in the same ways as the overall perspective, i.e. overall quality or functions. The attribute-based, service quality, meanwhile, is judged and evaluated based on the attributes. In order to measure quality benefit, the model fits with the holistic approach of service quality. This is because the model tests attitudes related to regions. The unique nature of each region can obstruct the generalisability of a model since all destinations differ in term of their attributes. Problems can occur if two destinations have different attributes. However, if the model tests the overall judgement about the quality of a region then consumers can use their direct experience to evaluate items. All in all, the approach to study the quality benefit of a region is a holistic approach of service quality.
3.4.2 Pleasure Benefit

According to the literature, consumer research has recognised the importance of hedonic benefits. The best known research was conducted by Hirschman and Holbrook (1982), which argues that hedonic consumption comprises of many dimension of consumer behaviours including multisensory, fantasy, and the emotion of one’s experience with products or services.

Kwortnik and Ross (2007) argues that tourist seek the pleasurable benefit that a destination will provide for them. Therefore, if a region provides a pleasant environment and superb experience to consumers (tourists), and if it meets their expectations, then they are likely to have a more favourable attitude towards a region. In a nutshell, emotional and experiential motivations are very relevant to the tourism industry.

3.5 REGION’S PRODUCT-BASED-ATTITUDES

As can be seen in Figure 3-1, the right-hand-side of the model involves consumer’s evaluation based on products. There are two variable measure the attitude toward a region’s products and one variable measures the supportive behavioural intention toward a region’s products. All details are as follows.

3.5.1 Top-of-mind

Most of consumer’s decisions are related to products/ services attributes, social influencers, economic and past experience (Khan and Dhar, 2006; McFadden, 1986). To make a decision, consumers are bombarded with abundant number of choices. Only recalled choices are included in consumer evoke set and yielding the final choice. Here, I refer the product top-of-mind as the state that consumers have a preference to the particular brands in comparison to other brands. The
top-of-mind choice reflects the extent to which a consumer is impressed with regards to a tourist destination. When consumers are bombarded with choices, only the top-of-mind choice in the consumer consideration set is likely to be selected. However, if consumers are not impressed with a tourist destination, they are less likely to choose it. This variable reflects positive affection towards a tourist destination.

3.5.2 Value for money

Perceived value has a robust literature in the marketing field. However, the concept of perceived value has not been well defined (Sánchez-Fernández and Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007). The concept of perceived value has become a scholarly area of interest, and indeed scholars including Zeithaml, (1988), Woodruff (1997) and Holbrook (1999) have provided various definitions of perceived value. The definition by Zeithaml, (1988) wherein the perceived value as “consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product (or services) based on perceptions of what is received and what is given” has become the most well-known. She pointed out that consumers will make an assessment of what is got and what is given from the product (or services). Normally, the comparison is made in the form of ration or trade-off between price and quality (Monroe, 2003). In the evaluation process, consumers compare two factors, namely price and quality. The problem is that consumers have a different weighting system in their evaluation process (Zeithaml, 1988). For some consumers quality is inferior to price, while others have a different weighting system.

Despite the import of Zeithaml’s definition, Sheth, (1991) proposed five dimensions of perceived value: functional value, conditional value, social value, emotional value and epistemic value. The results indicated that five dimensions of perceived value impact on consumers’ intention to buy durable goods.
This is a subjective construct because perceived value varies between consumers (Parasuraman, 1997) and also differs from one culture to another culture (Sanchez, 2006). Therefore, in this research I would like to focus on only one dimension of perceived value which is the most basic dimension, a monetary dimension.

According to the literature, value for money is generally conceived as a trade-off between quality and what the customer gives up or pays (Dodds et al., 1991; Bolton and Lemon, 1999). According to Bolton and Lemon, (1991) value for money is defined as a customer’s overall judgement of what he or she gives up in order to acquire goods or services. Although value for money and satisfaction share some similarities (Bolton and Lemon, 1999; Woodruff, 1997), they are not the same construct. Marketing scholars tend to agree that satisfaction stems from post-purchase or post-use evaluation (Hunt, 1977; Oliver, 1981), whilst value for money can occur at various stages of the purchasing process (Woodruff, 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Dimension of Perceived value</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheth et al. (1991)</td>
<td>- Functional value</td>
<td>The research indicated that there was five dimensions of value that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conditional value</td>
<td>stimulated intention to buy products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emotional value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Epistemic value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney and Soutar, 2001</td>
<td>- Emotional Value</td>
<td>The research proposed four factors to measure customers’ perceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social Value</td>
<td>The results show that all four factors have a significant impact on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhancement of social</td>
<td>consumer behaviours including wiliness to buy a products, wiliness to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>functional concept</td>
<td>recommend, and product expectation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Functional Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Price/ Value for money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Functional value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Performance/ quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2: Selected Reviews of Value for Money
3.6 SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOURAL INTENTIONS

In recent years, considerable research has looked at behavioural intentions which support relationships in a service context (Bansal et al., 2004; Fullerton, 2003; Garbarino and Johnson, 1999). In this study, we refer supportive behavioural intentions as “the intention to behave in a manner supportive of relationship longevity with the brand” (Fournier, 1998). Therefore, brand-supportive behaviours can be viewed as a psychological premise to engage in supportive behaviours with another party. A committed visitor to a region tends to have a desire to sustain a relationship with that destination (Moorman et al, 1993; Morgan and Hunt, 1994). In order to maintain the relationship, they are likely to make some sacrifices for the continuity of this relationship (Anderson and Weitz, 1992).

There was a theory that can help use to explain supportive behaviours. According to the literature, there are two main types of relationship commitment, namely affective commitment and calculative commitment (Fullerton, 2003; Hansen, 2003). Affective commitment is perceived as more emotional and develops over time (Garbarino and Johnson, 1999; Morgan, 1994), while calculative commitment is based on the rational economic returns on the product benefits (Anderson and Weitz, 1992; Eisingerich, et al., 2009; Heide and John, 1992). The outcome variable in our model reflects affective commitment because this type of commitment addresses the idea that visitors want to stay in the relationship. Visitors have to make an effort, for example in terms of time or money, in order to keep the bond. Therefore, customers’ willingness to support products from a particular region suggests that visitors want to build a relationship with that region. They do not feel an obligation to stay in the relationship. It captures an emotional state of mind of the visitor rather than a mere economic return.
In this research the supportive brand behaviours employed are purchase loyalty, willingness to go to the extra miles and willingness to recommend. These three behaviours are important with regards to the tourist destination. Due to the intense competition in the tourism marketplace, purchase loyalty helps a destination minimise their costs for acquiring new consumers. In addition, a willingness to go the extra mile is crucial for a tourist destination because the consumer’s current location and their proposed destination is one of the criteria which consumers might consider in their decision making process. Lastly, the willingness to recommend a destination to others is important, as the other behaviours noted before. The current literature indicates that referral information plays an important role in the consumer decision making process, and can persuade others through the positive recommendations received from others.

3.7 SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

The research presented here examines the transfer of attitude from a region (as a source) to a region’s products (as a receiver), then tests the relationship between the attitude towards a region’s product to supportive behavioural intentions. Lastly, the model investigates the mediating effects of value for money and top-of-mind on the direct effects of quality benefit, and pleasure benefit and supportive behavioural intention.

Firstly, the model examines the relationship between quality and pleasure benefit and top-of-mind. The mechanism underlying this relationship is that when consumers visit a destination, their direct experience will indicate how and the extent to which they perceive quality and pleasure.

Even though there is a positive relationship between quality and pleasure benefit, it is not necessary that one destination will be a preferred destination over others. This is because the past direct experience from other regions will diminish the level of top of mind.
H1a: the greater the quality benefit given to consumers, the greater the top-of-mind which is likely to occur
H2a: the greater the pleasure benefit given to consumers, the greater the top-of-mind which is likely to occur

Secondly, the model tests the relationship between a region and a region’s products. The first relationship is a quality benefit and pleasure benefit representing the attitude towards a region and the perceived value for money of a product. Value for money is the process whereby consumers make an overall judgement about the product or service functions and what they have to sacrifice to obtain them (Zeithaml, 2008). If consumers have a positive value-for-money, this means that when consumers compare the cost and the benefits (quality and pleasure benefits) they received, the benefits of a region is more than its cost. It is expected that higher quality and the more pleasure that consumers receive, the higher the degree of perceived value for money will be.

H1b: the greater the quality benefit given to consumers, the greater the value-for-money which is likely to occur
H2b: the greater the pleasure benefit given to consumers, the greater the value-for-money which is likely to occur

Thirdly, the model posits that there is a relationship between value for money and top-of-mind. The reason behind this relationship is that value of money is an attitude that derives from the way in which a consumer feels about a price and the benefit. If consumers believe that a region provides a reasonable price, top-of-mind is likely to be strengthened.

H3: the more positive the value-of-money of a region, the greater the top-of-mind which is likely to occur

In order to make the model more applicable to the real context, measuring behavioural intention is very useful and provides more managerial contribution. The model examines how attitude toward a region’s product leads to consumer behavioural intention by measuring the relationship
between the top-of-mind and value for money and supportive behavioural intentions. It is believed that top-of-mind and value for money stimulate consumers to act with supportive behavioural intentions.

H4a: the more positive the top-of-mind, the greater the chance that the consumer will present supportive brand behaviours
H4b: the more positive the value for money, the greater the chance that the consumer will present supportive brand behaviours

Lastly, the mediating effects of value for money and top-of-mind on the direct effects of quality and pleasure benefit and supportive behavioural intentions are investigated. Obviously, the quality and pleasure benefit impact on supportive behavioural intention. However, a study of mediating effects is added to this research so as to gain a better understanding of the process. I posit that top-of-mind and value for money play a role between quality and pleasure benefit and supportive brand behavioural intention.

H5: value for money mediates the direct effects of quality and pleasure benefit and supportive behavioural intentions
H6: top-of-mind mediates the direct effects of quality and pleasure benefit and supportive behavioural intentions

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 PROCEDURE

Tourists were asked participate in a study by completing a questionnaire survey about their attitude toward a region’s attributes, their attitude towards a product from that region and their demographic profile. Before completing the survey, the respondents were given information about it. They were told that this research was part of an academic research project and that their response
would help us address several important issues which we are currently investigating. They were informed that their answers would be treated with strict confidentiality and no individual response would be disclosed to any other entity outside the research group involved in this study. Respondents were also told they could stop completing the questionnaire at any point. Potential survey participants were fully informed about the survey to ensure that all answers were given by individuals who were sure they wanted to participate in this research.

4.2 RESEARCH SETTINGS

The research team member went to 14 regions in eight countries to collect the data. The 14 regions are the Western Hills (Australia), Wachau (Austria), Burgenland (Austria), Napa and Sierra Foothills (USA), Sonoma (USA), Toskana (Italy), Burgundy (France), Geneva (Switzerland), Rioja (Spain), Ribera del Duero (Spain), Bordeaux (France), Eger (Hungary), Tokaj (Hungary) and Marche (Italy).

4.3 PREPARING THE DATA FOR ANALYSIS

Before the data was analysed, it had to be prepared for analysis by the researchers. This preparation enabled the researchers to scrutinise the data before conducting analysis. I applied a screening data process in order to screen incomplete and problematic data out of the entire data set.

The screening process involved first running the descriptive statistic using SPSS 21 to find missing values. Respondents who left any missing values were eliminated from the data set. Only complete sets of data were used for the analysis. The data was then examined by each questions. Suspicious false responses were dropped from the original data set. Since I was concerned that false responses might impact the accuracy of the entire results, I eliminated respondents who answered the
question stating that they were below the age of six, because at the age of six there would be little possibility of possessing the capabilities to read the questionnaire. Moreover, this answer showed a respondent error.

In addition, under the laws and regulations regarding the selling and consuming of alcohol in seven of the countries in our study, a person under the age of 18 is not allowed to buy or drink alcohol in public. The exception in our study was the USA, were the legal age for alcohol consumption and purchase is 21. Since one part of the questionnaire asks about wine consumption buying behaviours, I therefore, treated US respondents aged below 21 and respondents from the other countries who were below 18 as ineligible respondents. Ineligible respondents were excluded from the analysis.

The questionnaires consisted of seven pages with 115 questions. The sheer length may have exhausted or bored some respondents As a result, evidence of a lack of attention to the questions can be found in the results. Some of the respondents repeated the same answer for all questions with semantic differential scales. Respondents who did not answer all of the questions, or who showed a lack of interest, were deemed ineligible, and their data was excluded from the analysis. After screening, the complete, usable data was 1,109 questionnaires, which were then used for later analysis.

4.4 RESPONDENT PROFILE

Data was collected using a questionnaire survey across 14 regions. The total number of respondents was 3,323, while the completed and usable surveys totalled 1,109. As can be seen in Table 3-1, the number of respondents was broken down into regions and presented in percentages. From Western Hills (Australia), 29.97% of the data was collected, followed by Burgenland
Austria) with 15.39%; Ribera del Duero (Spain) with 9.54%; Bordeaux (France) with 6.84%; Rioja (Spain) with 6.30%; Wachau (Austria) with 5.49%; Geneva (Switzerland) with 5.49%; Marche (Italy) with 4.68%; Toskana (Italy) with 4.41%; Burgunf (France) with 4.32%; Napa and Sierra Foothills (USA) with 2.16%; Tokaj (Hungary) with 2.07%; Eger (Hungary) with 1.98% and Sonoma (USA) with 1.35%.

As can be seen in Table 3-2, the majority of data was collected in Australia, which accounted for 29.97%, followed by Austria 20.88%, Spain 15.84%, France 11.16%, Italy 9.09%, Switzerland 5.49%, Hungary 4.05% and the USA with 3.51%.

Forty-eight percent of respondents were male, with an average age of 42 (s.d. = 14.90; range: 18-87). Fifty-two percent were female, with an average age of 39 (s.d. = 14.35; range: 18-86). Each respondent answered questions pertaining to one specific region (the region they had visited as a tourist, which represents the tourist’s direct experience). Before completing the survey, the respondents were asked how well they knew the region they had visited. We wanted to ascertain the associations made between the destinations and the products of the region by comparing attitudes toward a region’s attributes and attitudes regarding the value for money from the regions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (Country)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Hills (Australia)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>30.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland (Austria)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>15.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribera del Duero (Spain)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordeaux (France)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rioja (Spain)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wachau (Austria)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva (Switzerland)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marche (Italy)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toskana (Italy)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgund (France)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa and Sierra Foothills (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokaj (Hungary)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eger (Hungary)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3: Percentage of Respondents by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region (Country)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>30.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>20.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-4: Percentage of Respondents by Country
5. RESULTS

5.1 QUALITY AND PLEASURE BENEFIT

I originally developed an extensive preliminary list of 34 items to measure a consumer’s attitude toward a region. The items tapped into several aspects pertaining to a region’s attributes. Through discussions with an expert, I decided to reduce the preliminary items to four in order to focus predominantly on the hedonic and utilitarian constructs which are our main interests in this thesis. Tourists were asked to answer whether they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding the wine regions they had visited. All respondents evaluated the items based on 7-point Likert-scales anchored by “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7).

Though exploratory factor analysis using the Varimax Rotation Method with two fixed factors, we reduced the initial pool of 34 items to two factors and four items (two items each for quality benefit and pleasure benefit). We examined the quality benefit from regions by asking about the following three items: (1) “In [Name of wine region], the quality of services and tourism facilities is consistent and (2) “In [Name of wine region], products offered are of high quality. These items represent the region’s quality benefit. The two items describing the pleasing benefit are as follows: (1) “[Name of wine region] is exactly the place to drink superb wines, (2) “[Name of wine region] is as beautiful and pleasing as I expected.

In order to confirm the robustness of the scale, we selected the items that displayed little cross loadings on other factors, or one which loaded higher than .50 on their constructs, which is higher than the cut-off point recommended by Hair et al. (1998). Hair et al. (1998) suggests using the cut-off thresholds ±.30 (poor), ±0.4 (more important) and ±0.5 (practically significant). Our cut-off
threshold was consistent with Hair et al. (1998), which suggests adopting a .70 cut-off point for justifying the factor analysis when performing a factor analysis with small sample sizes. However, our sample size of 1,109 would be considered a large sample size. Therefore, using the .70 cut-off point is practically significant for conducting the analysis. As can be seen from the Table 3-5, each factor has a high loading value and a low loading value across another factor. The percentage of variance explained by the two factors are 31.319%, and 32.277%, respectively, with a total variance explained of 63.596%. We also tested the reliability of the two factors separately. The Conbrach’s alpha among the three items of quality and pleasure benefits suggest that both factors have good reliability (r_{quality} = .687, r_{pleasure} = .678, respectively), as suggested by Nunnally et al. (1978). I conducted two confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) on all six items, to confirm the two-factor model of the region-to-product model. The first model allowed the two factors (Quality and Pleasure benefits) to correlate (r = .74 and \chi^2(1) = 9.379) whilst the second model forced the two factors to be perfectly correlated (\chi^2(2) = 54.947). The change in Chi-square \Delta\chi^2(1) = 45.568; p<.000) reveals that the first analysis fits the data better, confirming the two-factor region-to-product model. The model fits the data fairly well using AMOS 22: \chi^2= 807.605, df= 110, \chi^2/ df= 7.364, CFI= .884, IFI= .885, NFI = .869, and RMSEA = .076.

As indicated in Table 3-6, the average variance extract (AVE) of quality benefit and pleasure benefit were .53 and .52, respectively. The composite reliabilities (CR) of quality benefit and pleasure benefit were .69 and .69, respectively. To confirm the discriminant validity, the squared correlation between any pair of constructs was less than the respective average variance extracted (AVE) for the specific constructed in the pair (Please see Table 3-6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>The quality of services and tourist facilities is consistent</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Products offered are of high quality</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>15.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pleasure</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>As beautiful and pleasing as I expected</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exactly the place to drink superb wines</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>16.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Top of mind</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>I prefer to all others</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will always be desirable for me</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>15.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Value for Money</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>[name of regions]'s products are fair in price</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[name of regions]'s products are in general overpriced</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[name of regions]'s products offer good value for money</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brand-supportive behaviour</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>I will certainly purchase wines from [name of regions] in the future</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am willing to go to the extra mile to get wines from [name of regions]</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I can highly recommended wines from [name of regions] to relatives and friends</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>19.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-5: Factor Loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pleasure</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Top of mind</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Value for Money</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commit</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation; AVE = Average Variance Extracted; CR= Composite Reliability

Table 3-6: Correlations
5.2 TEST OF H1, H2, H3 AND H4

To test the region-to-product model, we used structural equation modelling (SEM) with AMOS 22. Tourists were asked to evaluate whether they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements regarding top of mind, and perceived value for money of region’s products. I examined top of mind by asking the following two items: (1) I prefer [Name of a region]’s product to all others, and (2) [Name of a region]’s product will always be desirable for me. I also measured value for money by asking the following three items: (1) [Name of region]’s products are fair in price, (2) [Name of region]’s products are in general overpriced (Reversed coding), and (3) [Name of regions]’s products offer good value for money. All participants evaluated items based on 7-point Likert-scales anchored by “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7).

The results confirmed Hypotheses 1b and 2b: quality and pleasure benefit have a positive impact on the perceptions of a region’s value for money ($\gamma^2 = .28$, $p<.001$; $\gamma^2 = .24$, $p<.01$, respectively). Hypotheses 1a and 2a were then tested, and the results revealed that only pleasure benefit positively impacts top of mind awareness ($\gamma^2 = .49$, $p<.001$). Hypothesis 1a was not supported. Hypothesis 3 was then tested, and the results showed a positive impact of value for money on top of mind ($\gamma^2 = .50$, $p<.001$). Lastly, we tested Hypotheses 4a and 4b, with the findings suggesting that only Hypothesis 4a was supported, indicating that top of mind has an impact on supportive behavioural intentions toward the products from the region ($\gamma^2 = .80$, $p<.001$), however, value for money has no impact on brand-supportive behaviours.
5.3 TEST OF H5 AND H6

Measures for supportive behavioural intentions were adopted from the work of Dean (2007). All items used a 7-points Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly disagree” (7). The items were presented, here, (1) I will certainly purchase wines from [name of region] in the future, (2) I am willing to go to the extra mile to get wines from [name of region], and (3) I can highly recommended wines from [name of regions] to relatives and friends.

Next, I investigated the indirect effects of quality and pleasure benefits by using the bootstrap technique recommended by Preacher and Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 2012). As recommended by Hayes (2012), 10,000 bootstrap samples were used to explain the mediating effects. Figure 3-1 describes a serial multiple mediators model, and the ordering of the paths in the model. Our model includes two independent variables which are (1) quality benefit and (2) pleasure benefit, two mediators which are (1) top of mind and (2) perceived value for money, and one dependent variable which is the supportive behavioural intentions.
The results show that the total effect of quality benefit on supportive behavioural intentions was not significant $c_1 = .06$, $t(1106) = 1.66$, $p > .05$, with a 95% bootstrap confident interval from -.01 to .14 and the direct effect of quality benefit on supportive behavioural intentions was not statistically significant $c_{1'} = -.01$, $t(1104) = -24$, $p > .05$ with a 95% bootstrap confident interval from -.08 to .06.

The indirect effect of quality benefit on supportive behavioural intentions through top-of-mind is a product of $a_1 = .05$ and $b_1 = .34 = .05 \times .34 = .02$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval from -.01 to .04. the result from bootstrap confident interval referred that the indirect effect was not significant, and there was no mediation. This was consistent with the evidence presented in Figure 3-7 the results presented that the quality benefit has no impact on the top-of-mind choice.

![Figure 3-3: Simple Mediation Model with Quality Benefit and Supportive Behavioural Intentions through Top-of Mind](image-url)
The indirect effect of quality benefit on supportive behavioural intentions passed through perceived value for money and is defined as the product of $a_2 = .20$ and $b_2 = .15$ or $=.03$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval of .04 to .11. We can summarise that this path is statistically significant since the confidence interval (CI) does not contain zero.
The indirect effect of quality benefit on the consumer’s supportive behavioural intentions passed through two mediators, which are perceived value for money and top of mind choice respectively. The indirect effect is a product of $a_2 = .20$, $a_5 = .33$, and $b_1 = .34$ or .02 with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval of .01 to .03. According to evidence from the bootstrap confidence interval, we can conclude that this route is statistically significant. In conclusion, the sum of three indirect effect is $0.20+0.03+0.02 = .07$.

In conclusion, the evidence shows that the quality benefit provided by tourist destinations influences supportive behavioural intentions toward a region indirectly through two routes. The first route is when the assessment of the tourist destination’s perceived quality benefit is positive: the perceived value for money of the product from that region is greater, resulting from the stronger supportive behavioural intentions towards products from that region. The next route occurs when the tourist destination’s quality benefit is higher: when the perceived value for money from that destination is greater, then the perceived value for money of that destination is higher in the tourist’s top of mind choice; as a result, it causes consumers to have higher regional supportive-behavioural intentions.

The next mediation effect to be discussed is the mediation effect of pleasure benefit from the tourist destination on supportive behavioural intentions. The results revealed that the total effect of pleasure benefit from the tourist destination on the consumer’s supportive behavioural intentions were positively significant $c_2 = .15$, $t(1106) = 8.67$, $p < .001$ with a 95% bootstrap confident interval from .24 to .38. The direct effect of pleasure benefit on consumer’s supportive-brand behaviours was statistically significant $c_2' = .15$, $t(1104) = 4.32$, $p < .001$, with a bootstrap confident interval from .08 to .21.
The indirect effect of pleasure benefit on supportive-brand behaviour though top-of-mind was defined by a product of $a_3 = .35$, and $b_1= .34$ or .12, with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval of .09 to .016. Results from the confidence interval confirmed that the indirect effect was significant.
Next, the indirect effect of pleasure benefit on supportive brand behaviour through value for money, is estimated by the product of $a_4 = .14$, and $b_2=.15$ or $.02$, with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval of $.01$ to $.04$. The results mentioned earlier confirm the significance of the indirect effect.

Lastly, the indirect effect of pleasure benefit on the consumer’s supportive behavioural intentions from that region passed through value for money and top of mind, respectively, gave the product of $a_4 = .14$, $a_5 = .33$, and $b_1=.34$ with a 95% bootstrap confidence interval of $.01$ to $.03$. Results confirmed that the indirect effect was significant. The sum of three direct effects is $.12+.02+.02=.16$.

In conclusion, the evidence shows that the pleasure benefit provided by tourist destinations influences the consumer’s supportive behavioural intentions towards the region indirectly through three routes. The first route is when the assessment of a tourist destination’s pleasure quality benefits is positive: the perceived value for money of the product from that region is greater, resulting from the higher supportive behavioural intentions toward products from that region. The
next route occurs when the tourist destination’s pleasure benefit is higher: the perceived value for money from that destination is greater; thus, the perceived value for money for that destination is higher in the top of mind choice and, a result, causes consumers to have higher regional supportive behavioural intentions. The last route showed how when tourists evaluate tourist destinations as high in pleasure benefit, it results in high perceived value for money and being a top of mind destination. In this last route, consumers are likely to commit to the product from the tourist destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient (SE) t-value p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality benefit  Supportive- brand Behaviour</td>
<td>.06(.04) 1.66 p &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure benefit  Supportive- brand Behaviour</td>
<td>.31 (.04) 8.67 p &lt; .001 .24 .38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold; Abbreviation: SE stands for standard error; CI stands for confidence interval

Table 3- 7: Bootstrap Results for Total Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient (SE) t-value p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality benefit  Supportive- brand Behaviour</td>
<td>-.01(.03) -.24 p &gt; .05 -.08 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure benefit  Supportive- brand Behaviour</td>
<td>.15(.03) 4.32 p &lt; .001 .08 .21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold; Abbreviation: SE stands for standard error; CI stands for confidence interval

Table 3- 8: Bootstrap Results for Direct Effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Coefficient (SE)</th>
<th>Bias Corrected Method</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality benefit $\rightarrow$ Supportive- brand Behaviour (Through top-of mind)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02(.01)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality benefit $\rightarrow$ Supportive- brand Behaviour (Through Value for money)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03(.01)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality benefit $\rightarrow$ Supportive- brand Behaviour (Through Value for money, and top-of mind, respectively)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02(.01)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure benefit $\rightarrow$ Supportive- brand Behaviour (Through top-of mind)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12(.02)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure benefit $\rightarrow$ Supportive- brand Behaviour (Through Value for money)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02(.01)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure benefit $\rightarrow$ Supportive- brand Behaviour (Through Value for money, and top-of mind, respectively)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02(.00)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001, NS p > .05; if CI does not contain zero, indirect effect is treated as statistically significant and presented here in bold; 
**Abbreviation:** SE stands for standard error; CI stands for confidence interval

---

**Table 3-9: Bootstrap Results for Indirect Effects**

### 5.4 CONTROL VARIABLE

To ensure that changes in willingness to support a region’s brand were not driven by consumer inertia, we used the region in the data collection process as a predictor. The specific region had a positive impact on willingness to support a brand ($\Upsilon=.13$, p<.001)
6. GENERAL DISCUSSION

6.1 SUMMARY

Results from this study provide support for the idea that quality benefit has a positive impact on the perceived value for money of its regional products, and that pleasure benefit has a positive impact on the perceived value for money and top of mind of its regional products. This confirms our region-to-product model and shows that visitors’ associations with a region translate into associations about products from that region. The association between regions (place) and its products is thus supported. In addition, attitudes toward a region’s attributes strengthen a customer’s supportive behavioural intentions.

6.2 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

This research makes three important theoretical contributions. Firstly, the results support the region-to-product model. This means that the attitudes towards a region or place can transfer to products. Nevertheless, a limitation of this study is that the samples were collected purely from wine regions. We would encourage future research to focus on different types of regions and products. Secondly, there are 6 possible routes which can used to find the mediation effects in the region-to-product model. However, the results show that one out of six routes is not significant, which is the direct effect of quality benefit on supportive-behavioural intentions though top-of mind. The rest of indirect effects show significant results. Surprisingly, we found that there was no relationship between value for money and supportive-behavioural intentions but top of mind has a positive impact on supportive-behavioural intentions.
6.3 MANAGERIAL CONTRIBUTION

Marketing practitioners, including destination marketing organisations, must understand the consumer decision process. This includes questions such as: What are the factors that impact consumer attitude? How do consumers translate their experiences to attitude toward products? What are the motivations behind consumer’s choice intention? What factors make consumers behave as they do? These questions do not fully cover what marketing practitioners need to know about their consumers. However, this research will help them explain certain patterns of consumer behaviour.

I strongly believe that this research will help destination marketing organisations, especially wine marketers. The tourism literature shows that pleasure motivation is strongly tied to the tourism industry. A particularly interesting implication is that tourist destinations should consider position themselves to visitors in areas such as quality benefits, pleasure benefits and value for money in order to strengthen visitors’ top of mind. As a result, high levels of top of mind are associated with a high level of supportive-brand behaviours. A committed visitor is likely to perform supportive behaviours towards the tourist destination, for example by showing a willingness to pay a price premium, willingness to provide positive word of mouth, and higher purchase intentions.

6.4 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Several constraints of the preceding analysis are noted here, and scholars can use this information to develop better research on wine tourism and wine consumption. First, this research focuses on the relationship between place (winery) and products (winery’s wine). The need for generalisability is noted here. A model is needed to re-examine other product categories in order
to increase the generalisability of the model. Future research may apply the model in others contexts such as the relationship between place (tourist destinations) and its local products such as jewellery, foods, textiles, beverages, or handcrafts.

Second, collecting data from the real environment provides several benefits to the research. However, there are disadvantages as well. Since data was collected in 14 regions (eight countries), this brought about a large variance in term of research objects. In the consumer decision making process, visitors (consumers) were not only influenced by motivation factors, but were embraced by numerous marketing stimuli as well as other factors; as a result, consumer behaviour might change. Future research can control the external environment by conducting research in experimental environments.

Third, there is another approach to improve this research model. It can be seen that tourist destinations and wines were used as research objects, both of which are inherently pleasurable. Alba and Williams (2013) suggests that some products or services are inherently highly pleasurable while some products and services are inherently the opposite. For instance, medical operation services from hospitals are low in pleasure. In contrast, spa services are highly pleasurable. Tourist destinations are also highly pleasurable in nature. This is because when travellers visit the tourist destination they can experience the scenic view of the winery, enjoy walking on the farm, and also be able to conduct activities in the winery while visiting. We can speculate that the wine related tourist attractions are strongly associated with the pleasure benefit. At this point, the results from this chapter may or may not reliable. I would like to encourage scholars to test this model with other possible research objects. In addition, wine products are strongly associated with pleasure benefits as well. Therefore, the model should be tested with other research objects.
Fourth, this research has also given opportunity to consumer behaviour researchers to build on their work based on the region-to-product model. I also acknowledge that the personality traits of consumers might play a vital role when experiencing the tourist destinations and wines. I believe that the consumers’ personality traits moderate the model’s results. It is possible that consumers who are open to new experiences are more likely to appreciate art and adventure. The notion that personality traits influences consumer behaviour can be categorised as a moderating effect.

Fifth, results from Tinsley and Eldredge (1995), which studies the psychological needs associated with tourism leisure, indicate many types of leisure purposes for the travellers, including, novelty, sensual enjoyment, cognitive simulation and self-expression. At this point, I would like to recommend other scholars to add other factors in the region-product model; in particular, I strongly believe that self-expression is one of the most interesting factors. It can be seen from our daily life that when people travel to destinations, they tweet, check-in, upload photos or post their status on their social network. I predict that there will be a relationship between these social network activities and social-expression.
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSIONS

1. OVERVIEW

Understanding the way in which hedonic and utilitarian consumption drive consumer attitude and behaviours is very important to both scholars and practitioners. Since both constructs have evolved over time, their specific meaning is ambiguous. It should be noted that scholars have used different approaches to study these constructs and different measurements to evaluate them. As a result, there are questions regarding the validity of their implications. This is because whilst scholars use the same term, they use different dimensions to look at the construct.

The research starts with identifying the different dimensions of hedonic and utilitarian consumption. Some dimensions are chosen to be used to develop a conceptual framework. For utilitarian consumption, functional benefit and quality benefit are selected in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, respectively. For hedonic consumption, self-identification and aesthetic benefits are chosen in Chapter 2 and the pleasure benefit is selected in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2 aims to identify the determinants of brand attitude strength, namely brand benefits. Following the literature, three items which capture brand attitude strength are proposed. These three items are brand functional benefit, originating from the utilitarian construct, and brand self-identification and brand aesthetic, which derive from the hedonic construct. Following this, the impact and mediating effect of brand attitude strength on three difficulty levels of consumer-brand behaviours are studied. The conceptual model is tested in two different cultures. At first, data is collected in the UK (see Study 1 in Chapter 2) and then in Thailand (see Study 2 in Chapter 3).
Chapter 3 attempts to show the transferability of attitude based on a region and the products of a region. This chapter also focuses on hedonic and utilitarian consumption. The quality benefit of utilitarian consumption and the pleasure benefit of hedonic consumption are selected, and later developed as part of the region-to-product model. The model has two main focal points. First, the quality benefit and pleasure benefit which consumers received from their visit are examined. These two factors arise from visitors’ evaluation based on a region they have visited. The rest of the model shows consumers’ evaluation based on the region’s products. It should be noted that the first part of the model is evaluated evaluation based on the region, whilst the rest of the model is estimated based on the product perspective. The model is then used to test how attitude is transferred based on a region to region’s products. Chapter 3 tests the impact of the quality and pleasure benefit of a region on the perceptions of value for money and products’ top-of-mind with the impact made on supportive behavioural intentions. This chapter also studies the mediating effect of perception of value for money and products’ top-of-mind.

2. MAIN RESEARCH FINDINGS

The main research findings provide a better understanding of how hedonic and utilitarian constructs can drive consumer attitude and behaviours. This thesis identifies and empirically testes two conceptual models, as can be seen in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3.

The key finding in Chapter 2 indicates that brand functional benefit and brand aesthetic have a positive impact on brand attitude strength for consumers in two countries, namely the UK and Thailand. In contrast, brand self-identification has a positive relationship with brand attitude strength in Thailand.
Study 1 in Chapter 2 shows that consumers in the UK do not present their self-identity through brand usage whilst consumers in Thailand do show a significant effect with regards to brand self-identification and brand attitude strength. There are three possibilities that could explain these results. First, as mentioned above, ethnic background is also influential in developing the self. The second reason is that the nature of the research object conveys difference symbolic meaning in both countries. It should be noted that Starbucks coffee is a publicly-consuming product. Bearden and Etzel (1982) suggest that publicly consumed products are used to convey symbolic meaning, and can do this more effectively than privately-consuming products. Clearly, Starbucks coffee is a publicly consumed product which consumers can easily use to identify their self through consumption, and it is widely available throughout the UK. In the United Kingdom, consumers are likely to differentiate themselves from others. As a result, publicly-consuming products like Starbucks coffee may not present consumer identity because the ubiquity of its products cannot create a distinctive symbolic meaning for its consumers.

The results from Chapter 2 confirm that brand attitude strength can be used on three behavioural intentions which are WOM, repeat-purchase loyalty and willingness to pay price premium. The results are consistent with the work of Park et al (2010). Both the pieces of research confirm that brand attitude strength is a predictor which can be used to study consumer engagement in behaviours. The results also suggest that there is a mediating effect of brand attitude strength on independent variables (brand functional benefit, brand self-identification, and brand aesthetic) and dependent variables (WOM, repeat-purchase loyalty and willingness to pay price premium).

The results from Chapter 3 suggest that both the quality benefit and pleasure benefit of a region are important for predicting the value for money of products from a region. However, only the pleasure benefit of a region impacts on the top-of-mind of the region’s product whilst the quality
benefit is not a significant predictor. Value for money of the region’s products is shown to be positively related to the product’s top-of-mind. A further examination of whether the product’s top-of-mind or product’s value for money better predicts supportive-behavioural intentions is also conducted. Surprisingly, only the product’s top-of mind can predict the supportive-behavioural intentions. The results also suggest that there are mediating effects of perception of top of mind and value for money. The transferability of attitude from a destination to a region’s products can be found in Chapter 3.

3. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Consumers vary in terms of their motivations and attitude. The difference in their motivations or attitude has a considerable impact on their intentions and behaviours. The literature thus suggests that it is important to take these motivations into consideration. The two basic motivations are hedonic and utilitarian. As noted above, scholars use different dimensions to measure hedonic and utilitarian motivation. It should be noted that marketing practitioners should pay close attention to the items used to measure hedonic and utilitarian motivations. This thesis presents hedonic and utilitarian ideas to practitioners. However, the two constructs are broken down into dimensions, which are then selected to be studied and developed in the conceptual model.

According to the results suggested in Chapter 2 that providing a benefit of efficacy and capable for consumers to manage their daily is incredible important in countries. For example, the level of comfort in a Croc shoe helps consumers master things in their personal lives. The more brand function benefit a brand has, the better the level of brand attitude strength. Stronger brand attitude strength means that consumers will be more confident in their brand evaluation. Therefore,
providing usefulness is important to brands. Similarly, the results from Study 3 also confirm that providing the quality benefit fosters the consumer perception of a product’s value for money.

Though consumer consumption, hedonic motivation is extremely important to brands. The results from Chapter 2 show that the aesthetics of a brand makes consumers more confident in their evaluation. For example, the Ritz Carlton hotel can deliver aesthetic benefits to visitors though elegant interior and exterior design, which appeals to consumers. The atmosphere in the hotel stimulates the visitors’ senses. As a result, the aesthetically pleasing quality of the hotel boosts brand attitude strength. The aesthetically pleasing quality works well in both countries. Chapter 3 notes that the pleasure quality of a region fosters product’s top of mind and value for money.

Some brands have a strong brand personality, inferring special characteristics and a symbolic meaning. Consumers may use these meanings to identify their own self or their ideal self to others. For instance, the Body Shop has a strong brand personality in terms of the sincerity dimension. The brand runs their business, and their well-known code of conduct, including being against animal testing, using fair trade prices and protecting the planet, provides symbolic meaning to consumers. The results present the different effects of brand self-identification in both countries. It should be noted that the same brand may have different symbolic meaning across cultures, subcultures or countries. The deeper insight of brand self-identification is noted here.

4. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The present thesis sheds light on hedonic and utilitarian motivations. However, the current thesis could be further developed. Due to time and budget constraints, it was not possible to test all possible factors. However, only a few dimensions are chosen to be studied in this thesis. I would recommend others scholars to study other motivations aside from hedonic and utilitarian. In
Chapter 2, gender as a moderator is tested across the two cultures, but no difference between male and female respondents across the two countries was found. I believe that there are plenty of potential moderators that could be used in this model including lifestyle, product involvement and privately / publicly consumed products. Two conceptual models are presented in this thesis. However, the model is at a preliminary stage. More work is required to increase the robustness of the conceptual models, especially in Chapter 2. This is because the respondents are students, meaning that it is difficult to generalise the results. It should be noted that the research cannot fully address the results. Future research should not limit the respondents to students but should focus on consumers in all groups in order to represent the entire population. Much of the research shows that intentions cannot fully predict behaviours. Therefore, future work may involve factors related to brand behaviours or comparisons between intentions and behaviours.
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