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Research questions: How can event marketing be studied as a part of relationship marketing? How can event marketing be used to strengthen customer-brand relationships?

Purpose: The purpose of this thesis is to study event marketing as a part of relationship marketing, by analysing the elements of trust, commitment, brand involvement, brand emotions, brand attitudes and customer value.

Method: This research was conducted using a quantitative research method, where the primary data was collected via an online-survey distributed to visitors at Chokladgästabudet at Waxholms Hotel and GastroNord, two food-related events. In total, the study received 102 respondents.

Conclusion: The study found support for previous studies regarding events having an effect on the customer-brand relationships. However, this study also found that events have a particular effect on the emotional aspects of the theories used in the study, which are believed to lead to stronger relationships.
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1. Introduction

It is a warm day and the sun is shining over the Roman Empire. People from all social classes have gathered at Foro Romano – the site of so many elections and processions, criminal trials and public speeches. And gladiator games. The roar of the crowd makes it difficult to make out any other sounds, and the tension and excitement is so thick, it could be cut with a knife. They are anxiously awaiting the bloody battle that will soon commence on the oval arena below them.

Even if event marketing is considered a relatively new marketing tool (Drengner, Gaus & Jahn, 2008) events are by no means a new phenomenon (Cristache, Micu, Basalic & Rusu, 2013; Grönkvist, 2000). They have been used to placate, inspire or help the population for at least 2,000 years, and have therefore had a fundamental part in human life and behaviour. While they have thus often been used with the population, or the consumers, in mind, it has not been a part of marketing studies for very long – the term was considered to be introduced as late as the Olympic Games in Los Angeles in 1984 (Behrer & Larsson, 1998). This means that more studies are required to be conducted on the topic, and that relationship marketing is a useful paradigm through which event marketing can be interpreted (Crowther, 2011).

1.1 Problem Background

A customer focus has always been prevalent in business practice, and several of the key concepts associated with relationship marketing today were present in the marketing literature already before the turn of the twentieth century (Tadajewski & Saren, 2009). Despite this previous understanding of the customer as central for business, for a long period of time it was not a top priority for most companies (Berry, 2002) and marketing still had a transactional perspective (Sheth, 2017). In the 1970s however, competition became more intense on a global basis, which lead to several bankruptcies among many US industries (Sheth, 2002). Before this, many companies devoted their resources to acquire new customers, while spending minimum effort to retain them (Berry, 2002), but it instead became necessary to minimize marketing expenditures and activities and focus on retaining the already existing customers (Sheth, 2002). In the 1980s, Berry (2002) introduced the term “relationship
marketing” for the first time, and a new marketing paradigm with a relational perspective emerged (Sheth, 2017).

Relationship marketing means different things to different scholars and practitioners, from customer relationship management to managing loyalty programs (Sheth, 2017). The basis of the concept tends to be establishing, maintaining and enhancing customer relationships (Grönroos, 2004; Berry, 2002) or successful relational exchanges (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Trust has been considered a cornerstone in the establishment of relationships, with everything else revolving around it (Berry, 2002; Morgan & Hunt, 1994), but commitment is also a frequently used and examined term (e.g. Berry, 2002; Beatty, Homer & Kahle, 1988). Other benefits that can arise from a relational perspective are a positive emotional attachment (Bairrada, Coelho & Coelho, 2018) and attitudes (Hess & Story, 2005) greater involvement and engagement with the brand (Beatty et al., 1988) and higher perceived value for all parties involved (Vivek, Beatty & Morgan, 2012; Grönroos, 2004).

One way to establish relationships is through communication, however, the marketing communication landscape has changed significantly in modern marketing due to the increasing global competition and saturation of brand messages (Wohlfeil & Whelan, 2006; Belch & Belch, 2015). This has led to advertising activities being less effective (Cristache et al., 2013) as mass media are losing their viewers, listeners and readers to more engaging communication methods (Belch & Belch, 2015). The advancement of newer communication tools are thus both timely and appealing (Crowther, 2011) and new marketing communication strategies that offer interaction are emerging to take the place of the former passive monologues (Wohlfeil & Whelan, 2006). Communication between brands and consumers today needs to be exciting (Cristache et al., 2013) and to get their attention, companies need to facilitate intense experiences (Grönkvist, 2000) to even gain the possibility of differentiation (Iglesias, Singh & Batista-Foguet, 2011). Experience is the result of interactions (Varey, 2008; Srivastava & Kaul, 2014), which are therefore at the heart of relationship marketing (Grönroos, 2004; Srivastava & Kaul, 2014). Interaction is usually defined as acting reciprocally, or action done together, and is invariably required for relationships to emerge (Varey, 2008). However, experience with the brand will only lead to customer relationships if affective, or emotional, commitment has been developed (Iglesias et
al., 2011), which Sheth (2017) called *share of heart*. Share of heart regards bonding with the customers on an emotional level, where the relationship becomes a friendship governed by purpose and mutual respect (Sheth, 2017). Affective bonds are needed to deepen customer relationships (Iglesias et al., 2011) and to create customer involvement and engagement in the value creation process (Chen & Chen, 2017). While customer relationships usually refer to the relationship between customer and company, the interaction between customers also needs to be recognized as potentially value enhancing, as having a social network surrounding the company is suggested to affect consumer loyalty as they form bonds with each other (Moore, Moore & Capella, 2005). Simply put, marketing communication today needs to focus more on activities that can help the brand build sustainable, long-term relationships (Belch & Belch, 2015) and to achieve that, the facilitation of interaction between people is becoming increasingly important (Grönkvist, 2000).

### 1.2 Problem Discussion

One form of communication that has received more attention recently is event marketing (Zarantonello & Schmitt, 2013) and the awareness of event marketing’s important role in an effective communication strategy (Close, Finney, Lacey & Sneath, 2006) is increasing, due to its resilience towards challenges traditional media is facing and the face-to-face contact it facilitates (Sneath, Finney & Close, 2005). Events, at their core, provide exactly the solution marketing communication today needs – they are experiential, interactive, targeted and relational (Crowther, 2011) and consumers tend to be more receptive to marketing messages since their participation in an event is voluntary (Belch & Belch, 2015). There is therefore a growing imperative for organizations to adopt event marketing alongside their traditional communication strategies (Crowther, 2011).

One of the key aspects of event marketing that makes it dissimilar to other marketing methods, is the facilitation of interaction events can provide a company. They create an interactive atmosphere in which face-to-face contact is enabled (Cristache et al., 2013) and encounters that allows the consumers to experience the brand in a more direct, immediate and memorable way (Zarantonello & Schmitt, 2013). Event marketing is even defined by some as an active and creative environment where
interaction between people can occur (Grönkvist, 2000). The promise of interaction is one of the key strengths of events and can be seen as a physical accelerator, which creates intensity and interest upon which meaningful relationships can be formed (Crowther & Donlan, 2011). Compared to other forms of communication, events provide an apt opportunity to establish, maintain and enhance relationships (Crowther, 2011) that have the possibility to last for a long time (Grönkvist, 2000). Using events as a tool for relationship marketing is also useful from a competitive perspective, as relationships cannot be copied by other competing brands (Behrer & Larsson, 1998).

It is already established that event marketing is a valuable tool within the larger scope of relationship marketing, however, there is currently a lack of research connecting the two (Crowther, 2011) and while the interest in events as a marketing tool has increased, it is only really true with regard to the evaluation of the effects of events (Drengner et al., 2008). Many companies are still therefore unsure of the actual effects and how events can influence marketing outcomes effectively (Wood, 2009). The risk connected to unsuccessful application of event marketing is high as it could be damaging to the organization’s brand and relationships (Crowther, 2011). There is thus more research to be done in order to understand the effects events have on consumers before practical methods are developed (Wood, 2009) and there is consequently a need for further research within the topic of relationships and event marketing.

1.3 Purpose and Research Questions

The area of event marketing needs more research, particularly as a part of relationship marketing due to their fundamental similarities. The research questions are thus:

- How can event marketing be studied as a part of relationship marketing?
- How can event marketing be used to strengthen customer-brand relationships?

The purpose of this thesis is therefore to study event marketing as a part of relationship marketing, by analysing the elements of trust, commitment, brand involvement, brand emotions, brand attitudes and customer value, which are all significant factors in customer-brand relationships.
2. Literature Study and Theoretical Framework

In the following chapter, the theoretical framework will be presented, which will be used as the foundation and framing for the entire study. The chapter starts with an account of relationship marketing and the very connected theories of trust and commitment. Afterwards, the section moves on to brand involvement, brand emotions and brand attitudes. The chapter ends with the creation of value.

2.1 Relationship Marketing

Relationship marketing regards marketing activities that attract, develop, maintain and enhance relationships between customers and brands (Grönroos, 1994) with the aim to make them both intimate and long-lasting (Chiu, Hsieh, Li & Lee, 2005). A relationship focus has become important in order to create a sense of loyalty among the company’s customers (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2004), as well as to improve customer retention in order to increase the overall profit (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990) by bonding with the customers and generating consumer gratitude (Berry, 1995).

Berry (1995) outlined three levels of relationship marketing necessary to achieve these stronger bonds that lead to strong relationships and a lower defection rate. The first level is to keep the customers loyal by providing tangible benefits (Berry, 1995), often through social, structural and financial relationship marketing programs, such as individual treatment, tailored order processing or discounts (Palmatier, Gopalakrishna & Houston, 2006). This level is also considered to constitute the weakest relationship, as the tangible benefits offered generally are easy to replicate by competitors (Berry, 1995). The second level regards regular interaction with the customers, while the third level regards solving customer problems through preferential treatment (ibid), thus increasing the strength of the relationships exponentially.

Investments in these three levels have been found to have an influence on brand loyalty (Huang, 2015), which is one of the key concepts of relationship marketing (Fournier, 1998; Fullerton, 2005). Loyalty is usually defined as same-brand buying behaviour caused by a commitment to the brand, which negates the influence of other brands’ marketing activities and lowers the customer’s inclination to switch to a different brand (Oliver, 1999). It therefore enables the company to retain their
customers without having to worry about the intense competitive market in which they are operating (Nam, Ekinci & Whyatt, 2011). However, the level of loyalty might also differ, as loyalty can be either behavioural or attitudinal (Bandyopadhyay & Martell, 2007). Attitudinal loyalty can be considered to cause slightly stronger loyalty, as it regards the psychological commitment to the brand, while behavioural loyalty only focuses on the repetition of purchase (Nam et al., 2011). Dick and Basu (1994) argue that loyalty should not be seen as consumers’ repurchase behaviour alone, since attitudinal loyalty can lead to the consumer keeping their intention to purchase and to recommend the brand to others, even if they are not actively making purchases from it (Nam et al., 2011).

2.1.1 Trust

While several authors and researchers have offered different definitions of trust in the past, there tend to be certain similarities between them. For example, Morgan and Hunt’s (1994) definition of trust is that one party has confidence in the reliability and integrity of the other party, while Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) define the concept as the willingness of one party to be vulnerable to the actions of the other party. Reliability, or confidence, of the trustee’s word or promise is also a part of Rotter’s (1971) definition of trust. Confidence and vulnerability are further expressed in the definition offered by Gambetta (2000), who believes that trust is the assessment one party makes of the probability that the other party will perform a particular action in a context where it affects the trustor, which can be either positive or negative. Trust therefore also includes a willingness to take a risk (Mayer et al., 1995), which is something some regard as a prerequisite of trust (e.g. Rempel, Holmes & Zanna, 1985; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). If there is no risk of being negatively affected, there is also no need for trust to exist. Because of the existence of a myriad of definitions, Hernandez and Santos (2010) believed that it might not even be possible to develop a single definition that could serve all disciplines that use the concept, as the concept then might lose its wealth. Halliday (2003) instead proposed that trust is perhaps best conceived of as a theme and a rich and complex concept rather than a construct with a clear or even complex definition, while Hernandez and Santos’ (2010) own solution was for trust to be seen as a multidimensional concept, which figure 1 will illustrate further.
Lewis and Weigert (1985) mean that we choose whom to trust based on what they call “good reasons”, or evidence of trustworthiness. The evidence arises from the accumulated knowledge the trustor has about the trustee through observations of behaviour within the relationship or from the reputation the trustor gains through other relationships (Johnson & Grayson, 2005; Hernandez & Santos, 2010). The knowledge accumulated is in turn developed in a cognitive process, in which the good reasons, or the evidence, are processed in order for the trustor to make a judgment about the trustee’s trustworthiness (Hansen & Morrow, 2003). In the model, cognitive trust is made up of predictability and ability. Ability refers to the skills, competencies and characteristics of the trustee (Mayer et al., 1995) or to the dependability and the quality that is attributed to them (Rempel et al., 1985). When the trustor is accumulating knowledge about the trustee and their abilities, they are also developing their own ability to predict the future actions of the trustee (Hernandez & Santos, 2010). Predictability is thus dependent on past experiences that have been consistent and stable, in order for the trustor to be able to rely on the consistency of recurrent behaviour that this factor implies (Rempel et al., 1985).
If cognitive trust is evidence based on knowledge gained through direct experience and word of mouth, the affective trust is based on the trustor’s feelings towards the trustee. Lewis and Weigert (1985) mean that while cognitive trust is a necessary condition, it cannot constitute trust on its own – knowledge is not enough to cause trust. It is affective trust that consists of the emotional bond or investments usually made in trusting relationships (ibid) and can make trust deepen in a way that available knowledge cannot (Johnson & Grayson, 2005). While it is most intense in close interpersonal relationships (Lewis & Weigert, 1985), it is also what first makes someone trust another party, before a relationship has been established, and is what signals the presence and quality of trust in a relationship (Jones & George, 1998). In the model, the affective trust consists of benevolence and integrity. Benevolence has been considered the most important aspect of trust and refers to the belief that the trustee will be responsive and caring (Rempel et al., 1985) or that, aside from the egocentric motive of profit, they want to do good (Mayer et al., 1995). Integrity, on the other hand, refers to the trustor’s own accepted set of principles and whether or not the trustee adheres to them (ibid).

### 2.1.2 Commitment

Consumer commitment is fundamental in the creation and continuation of marketing relationships, as it is the key factor that connects the customers to the brand psychologically (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Commitment is an attachment between parties, which results in a desire to have a long-term relationship (ibid) and is therefore very important in terms of repurchase as well as brand satisfaction (Fullerton, 2005).

Allen and Meyer (1990) originally developed a three-component model of commitment within the field of organizational behaviour, consisting of affective, continuance and normative commitment, however, this model has since then been adopted by marketing scholars as well (Fullerton, 2005). Especially affective and continuance commitment have been studied widely, while only a few researchers have mentioned normative commitment (Fullerton, 2003; Bansal, Irving & Taylor, 2004), with resulting disagreement as to its actual effect (see e.g. Bansal et al., 2004; Gruen, Summer & Acito, 2000). This is why only affective and continuance commitment will be considered in this study.
Affective commitment is maintained when the customer has shared values, identification and attachment with and to the brand, as well as when they feel trust and enjoy being connected to the brand (Bansal et al., 2004; Fullerton, 2003; Gruen et al., 2000). Affective commitment combines behavioural and attitudinal loyalty – when a customer feels affective commitment, they have formed an approving attitude towards the brand and are more inclined to purchase from it recurrently (Fullerton, 2005). This combination of loyalty due to affective commitment is the key foundation in brand communities, where consumers share the identification with the brands they consume as both individuals and as part of a larger community (McAlexander, Schouten & Koenig, 2002).

Continuance commitment, on the other hand, is more concerned with the commitment that arises when customers feel that there is a limited set of alternatives available other than the focal brand, or when they have difficulties to end a relationship with a specific brand (Fullerton, 2005). When a customer initiates a relationship with a brand, they usually do so due to a perceived personality fit between the customer’s own personality and that of the brand or due to a cultural fit through the rich cultural meaning that brands can provide (Fullerton, 2003). Continuance commitment is thus concerned with continuing the relationship based on a limited set of alternatives, a difficulty to end a relationship or the loss of the perceived personality and/or cultural fit.

### 2.2 Brand Involvement

Brand involvement is a quite well researched topic in the marketing and consumer literature, and has from the 1980s received rigorous attention from researchers in various different contexts – from product and purchase decisions to advertising and events (Michaelidou & Dibb, 2008). Involvement is the significance of an object a person ascribes to it based on their innate interests, values and needs as well as their own devotion to an activity or product (Zaichkowsky, 1985). Even though involvement has generally been considered a characteristic intrinsic to products, brands can also be characterised by it (Aaker, 1997) as individuals who owns a specific brand can care more deeply about maintaining the core values associated with that brand (Kirmani, Sood & Bridges, 1999). People can even get attached to brands
in a similar way to how they get attached to other people (Bolkan, Goodboy & Bachman, 2012), as they want to feel related to a brand and not just to a consumption process (Zaichkowsky, 1985). By becoming more involved with the focal brand and more engrossed in extensive external searches for information (Beatty & Smith, 1987), this attachment can increase the customers’ patronage intentions even if they are dissatisfied with the brand (Shiue & Li, 2013).

Laaksonen (1994) proposed three different kinds of involvement – cognitive based, individual state and response based involvement. This classification is in turn based on the first distinction of involvement made by Houston and Rothschild in 1978, who also developed three types of involvement – enduring, situational and response involvement. Enduring involvement focuses on the consumer’s affection toward a brand, product or advertisement, while situational involvement concentrates on consumer’s concern with the purchase of the product and response involvement regards the behavioural orientation, including information attainment and the decision-making process (Michaelidou & Dibb, 2008).

A concept that is connected to involvement is brand engagement. The concept of engagement has acquired considerable attention in other research fields in the past; however, it was only recently that it was adapted to the area of marketing (Hollebeek, 2011a; Hollebeek, 2011b). Keller (2013, p. 320) defined brand engagement as “the extent to which consumers are willing to invest their own personal resources- time, energy, money- on the brand, beyond those resources expended during purchase or consumption of the brand”. Previous research has shown that consumers who have a higher level of brand involvement also show an increased level of brand engagement (Vivek, Beatty & Morgan, 2012), as consumers want to preserve relationships with the brands they have greater bonding with and that offer more rewarding experiences (Lambe, Wittmann & Spekman, 2001).
2.3 Brand Emotions

Consumers get exposed to thousands of brands and products in their everyday lives; however, they only form a passionate, emotional attachment to a small number of these (Shouten & McAlexander, 1995). Consumer research has therefore shifted from a central focus on cognitive decision formation to identifying the significance of the emotional element (Zambardino & Goodfellow, 2007) by addressing the five senses (Gobe, 2001), which have been argued to have a fundamental role in consumers’ behaviours and decisions (Franzak, Makarem & Jae, 2014). Emotional attachment might also lead to greater commitment and loyalty (Thomson, MacInnis & Park, 2005) as well as enhancement of the strength of brand perception and beliefs (Ruth, 2001).

Travis (2000) argues that rationality has a very little part in convincing the consumers’ thinking and that emphasis should be placed on how the consumers feel about a brand, as relationships are only created when the consumer has strong emotional feelings towards it. It is also emotional values rather than functional that can provide a source of sustainable competitive advantage for the companies (de Chernatony, 2003), as well as consumers’ recall of a brand (Elliot & Percy, 2007). Koshkaki (2014) divided emotional branding into product-related or brand-related emotions, where product-related emotions generate real differences as consumers physically interact with products, but only brand-related emotions can create the deeper psychological and mental differences that are difficult to copy by competitors.

2.4 Brand Attitude

While several authors and researchers have offered their own definitions of brand attitude in the past, most of them tend to include more or less the same concepts. The three most important ones to describe are however attitude objects, consistency or endurance, and the bipolar continuum of evaluations.

- **Attitude objects.** First of all, most of the definitions include attitude objects (see e.g. Katz, 1960; Schiffman, Kanuk & Hansen, 2012). An attitude object should be interpreted in a wider sense than just tangible products (Schiffman et al., 2012) to include anything one might have an attitude towards, whether that is concrete or abstract, inanimate or alive (Bohner & Wänke, 2002). This
means that the attitude object can also be causes or people (Schiffman et al., 2012), places, issues or ideas (Priester, Nayakankuppam, Fleming & Godek, 2004) or institutions or events (Ajzen, 1989).

- **Consistency or endurance.** Attitudes tend to be relatively consistent with their reflected behaviour (Schiffman et al., 2012), a view held by, for example, Priester et al. (2004) and Spears and Singh (2004). Certain circumstances such as affordability can prevent consistency (Schiffman et al., 2012) – someone might love sports cars but cannot afford one. There is also a certain ambivalence towards some attitude objects – someone might know that working out is healthy and good for them, but they find it boring (Bohner & Wänke, 2002).

- **An evaluative continuum of favourable versus unfavourable.** For many authors, evaluation is key to attitudes (see e.g. Spears & Singh, 2004; Solomon, Bamossy, Askegaard & Hogg, 2010) and refers to the extent to which that attitude object is evaluated positively or negatively (Priester et al., 2004). This evaluation is usually conducted on a bipolar continuum (see e.g. Priester et al., 2004; Ajzen, 1989; Schiffman et al., 2012), which generally ranges from favourable to unfavourable, but could include any other polar opposite adjectives considered useful.

Thus, the definition of attitudes used here is that *attitudes are relatively consistent evaluations of an attitude object, where opinions fall on a bipolar continuum of either favourable or unfavourable.*

The general consensus of the formation of attitudes – from having no attitude towards an attitude object towards having at least some attitude towards it (Schiffman et al., 2012) – is that they are learned through direct experience or through acquired information from other people or mass media (Erwin, 2001; Schiffman et al., 2012). While this explains why someone holds the attitudes they do, it does not explain what attitudes are. The tricomponent model of attitudes (also called the tripartite model or the ABC-model) does just that by seeing attitudes as having three interconnected components (Erwin, 2001) – a cognitive, an affective and a conative component. The cognitive component consists of the knowledge and perceptions used to form beliefs about an attitude object (Schiffman et al., 2012; Ajzen, 1989), while the affective component is the emotional one (Erwin, 2001; Ajzen, 1989), consisting of values or
moral beliefs (Jansson-Boyd, 2010). The affective component tends to be more accessible in memory than the cognitive one, and is thus faster elicited and held with greater confidence (Verplanken, Hofstee & Janssen, 1998; Giner-Sorolla, 2004). The conative component is the behavioural or action component, and consists of the behavioural intentions of the individual in regards to the attitude object (Ajzen, 1989; Schiffman et al., 2012; Katz, 1960).

2.5 The Creation of Value

Throughout the years, researchers and practitioners have offered several different definitions of the concept of customer value. The term “customer value” is in itself confusing, as it can refer to both the perceived value of a certain item from the customer’s point of view, as well as the value of the customers for the company in regards to, for example, loyalty or satisfaction (Stępień, 2017). It is perhaps then understandable why so many definitions have been proposed in the past. One of the most traditional points of view regards value as the trade-off between costs and benefits – the perceived benefits received in exchange for what is given, or the cost of obtaining those benefits (Zeithaml, 1988; Chen & Dubinsky, 2003). In an attempt to combine the earlier definitions of customer value, Woodruff (1997) proposed a different definition – customer value arises from the product attributes and consequences that can facilitate the achievement of the customer’s goals and purposes. Butz and Goodstein (1996) provides a different view that expands the concept of customer value, yet is still connected to the previous definitions. They argue that customer value is the emotional bond between a customer and a company that arises after the customer has decided that the product adds value and which gets developed when the product provides more benefits than the costs incurred (Butz & Goodstein, 1996). This definition adds a relationship-aspect to the concept of customer value and thus broadens the understanding of it, but can perhaps not be understood as the complete view as it still considers value to be embedded within the product. This is why Vargo and Lusch (2004) proposed that companies cannot produce value, only offer value propositions, and that value is defined by and co-created with the consumer to meet their specific needs. Sánchez-Fernández and Iniesta-Bonillo (2006) also offered a relationship-focused definition of value and argue that customer value is a cognitive-affective evaluation of the tangible and
intangible elements of the relationship, which is carried out at any stage during the consumption process.

Due to the many different definitions of value, Khalifa (2004) argued that there was a need to create an integrated understanding of the concept of value, and he consequently proposed a model he called the value buildup model (see figure 2). The value buildup model assumes that value builds up when the benefits exceed the costs due to four intangible factors – customer needs and benefits, and the view of the relationship and the customer – that will create stronger customer value as they build up (Khalifa, 2004). For this thesis, only customer needs and customer benefits will be investigated, as we argue that interactions and the view of consumers as persons are already inherent within event marketing.

![Figure 2 - The value buildup model as proposed by Khalifa (2004)](image)

Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) have outlined five consumption values that they consider explain why consumers choose to buy or not to buy – functional, emotional, social, epistemic and conditional value – which we argue adequately describe both customers’ needs and the benefits they receive. Functional value refers to the product’s functional, utilitarian or physical advantages or attributes (Sheth et al., 1991), such as whether or not the product has the desired characteristics or performs...
desired functions, or whether or not it is useful (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Emotional value is acquired when the product is associated with or can arouse specific feelings (Sheth et al., 1991) such as enjoyment or trust (Smith & Colgate, 2007), while social value is acquired when the product is associated with a specific, desired social group (Sheth et al., 1991) or interactions, image and status (Groth, 1994). When the product is able to arouse curiosity, novelty and/or a desire for knowledge, the value received will be epistemic (Sheth et al., 1991; Smith & Colgate, 2007). Conditional value is not applicable to this study and will thus not be described or further used.

2.6 Hypotheses and Framework

Events create an interactive atmosphere (Cristache et al., 2013) that allow the consumers to directly experience the brand in an immediate and memorable way (Zarantonello & Schmit, 2013). As marketing communication today needs to focus more on relationship building activities (Belch & Belch, 2015) that are based on interaction (Grönkvist, 2000), events should provide an apt opportunity to establish, maintain and enhance relationships (Crowther, 2011). Therefore, the first hypothesis is:

**H1. Event marketing strengthens the customer-brand relationship.**

Trust is an important aspect within customer-brand relationships, which Lewis and Weigert (1985) mean is divided into cognitive and affective trust. Cognitive trust is based on knowledge (Lewis & Weigert, 1985) and arises through observations of behaviour within the relationship (Johnson & Grayson, 2005). Events should be able to facilitate the direct observation that leads to cognitive trust. Affective trust is based on emotions (Lewis & Weigert, 1985) and can be based on the brand’s perceived benevolence, or the belief that the trustee will be responsive and caring (Rempel et al., 1985). Events should also be able to facilitate affective trust through the brand’s ability to demonstrate this trait during the event. Furthermore, affective trust can make trust deepen beyond available knowledge (Johnson & Grayson, 2005). If the trust in the brand increases after the event, the customer-brand relationship should deepen and the customer should become more loyal. Trust has also been connected to brand involvement and commitment, as affective commitment can only arise when the customer feels trust (Bansal et al., 2004). The second and third hypotheses are thus:
H2a. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s cognitive trust towards the brand.

H2b. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s affective trust towards the brand.

H3a. Increased trust after the event leads to a stronger customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.

H3b. Increased trust after the event leads to higher commitment and involvement with the brand.

Brand involvement and engagement are defined as the extent to which consumers are willing to invest personal resources (Keller, 2013), which is likely to occur when the customer is visiting an event, even if it is merely time that has been invested. Previous research has also demonstrated the consumers’ wish to preserve relationships with brands they have greater bonding with (Lambe et al., 2001), which means that brand involvement is likely to affect the customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty to the brand. The fourth and fifth hypotheses are therefore:

H4. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s involvement with the brand.

H5. Increased brand involvement after the event strengthens the customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.

Consumers get exposed to thousands of brands in their everyday lives (Shouten & McAlexander, 1995) however; relationships are only created when the consumer has strong emotional feelings towards the brand (Travis, 2000) and they only want to preserve the relationships where great bonds and more rewarding experiences exist (Lambe et al., 2001). If the brand can facilitate that experience through an event, it should have an effect on the customer-brand relationship, as well as the brand involvement and commitment. The event should therefore also overall affect the brand emotions, resulting in the hypotheses:

H6. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s emotions towards the brand.

H7a. Positive brand emotions after the event leads to a stronger customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.
H7b. Positive brand emotions after the event leads to higher commitment and involvement with the brand.

Brand attitudes are learned through direct experience with the brand (Erwin, 2001) and can be held in regards to knowledge (cognitive attitude), emotions (affective attitude) or behaviour (conative attitude). As events facilitate direct experiences with brands, they should be apt at affecting the customers’ attitudes. Furthermore, attitudinal loyalty is considered to be slightly stronger than behavioural loyalty alone (Nam et al., 2011) however, it is the combination of loyalty that leads to affective commitment (Fullerton, 2005). This leads to hypotheses eight and nine:

H8a. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s cognitive attitude towards the brand.

H8b. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s affective attitude towards the brand.

H8c. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s conative attitude towards the brand.

H9a. Positive brand attitudes after the event lead to a stronger customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.

H9b. Positive brand attitudes after the event lead to higher commitment and involvement with the brand.

There are four types of customer value investigated in this study – functional, emotional, social and epistemic value – which are all connected to either the utilitarian advantages, the customer’s feelings, certain social groups or curiosity (Sheth et al., 1991). As events should be apt grounds for learning more about the brand and to elicit certain emotions in the customer, as well as facilitate interaction, the hypotheses are that:

H10a. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s functional value for the customer.

H10b. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s emotional value for the customer.
H10c. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s social value for the customer.

H10d. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s epistemic value for the customer.

Furthermore, the value buildup model used in the study assumes that value becomes stronger when the customer needs and benefits are more psychic and intangible, and the relationship is viewed as an interaction and the consumer as a person (Khalifa, 2004). As value should be higher in a relationship that offers more rewarding experiences – a relationship consumers want to preserve (Lambe et al., 2001) – events should be able to affect the customer-brand relationship through customer value. They should also be able to affect brand involvement through customer value, as the customer wants to feel related to the brand and not just the consumption process (Zaichkowsky, 1985). It is therefore hypothesised that:

H11a. The customer value connected to the event leads to stronger customer-brand relationships in terms of loyalty.

H11b. The customer value connected to the event impacts the customer’s involvement with the brand after the event.

As both trust and attitudes are based on knowledge and emotions, and brand emotions are inherently affective, one or more of the different types of value should affect the three aspects due to their fundamental basis of knowledge and emotions themselves. Therefore:

H12a. The customer value connected with the event leads to increased trust.

H12b. The customer value connected with the event leads to more positive brand emotions.

H12c. The customer value connected with the event leads to more positive brand attitudes.
3. Methodology

In the following chapter, the methodology used in this study will be presented by discussing the selection of theories and the data collection, as well as the analytical method used in the next chapter.

3.1 Selection of Theories

The starting point of this thesis was Martensen, Grønholdt, Bendtsen and Jensen’s (2007) model of event evaluation, in which they acknowledge the importance of brand involvement, brand emotions and brand attitudes and their effect on customers’ perception of the brand. As consumers are able to form an emotional attachment to some brands despite being exposed to many other brands in their everyday lives (Schouten & McAlexander, 1995) and as consumers want to feel more involved with the brand and not just the consumption itself (Zaichkowsky, 2007), it was believed that these theories could enlighten and achieve deeper knowledge within the area of event marketing. Value creation was also a part in the initial stages of this thesis and stemmed from the knowledge that value is considered to be co-created with customers (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). As events are able to facilitate direct experience and interaction between the brands and the customers, value creation was an interesting aspect to consider in regards to the particular topic area investigated here. From the initial understanding of these theories and their connection to event marketing, the purpose of the thesis was developed – to study event marketing as a part of relationship marketing, by analysing these elements. Relationship marketing was therefore also used to frame the study, while trust and commitment were added to complement this theory. The final theoretical framework consisted of theories that were all important aspects of relationship marketing and were therefore relevant to include in a study on events and relationships.

Some specific mentions in regards to the theoretical framework will now be put forth. The model of trust used, created by Calefato et al. (2015) was a combination of three different sources. Mayer et al. (1995) were the first to conceptualize the so-called “tripod model” of ability, benevolence and integrity, while McKnight and Cummings (1998) also included predictability. The concept of cognitive and affective trust came from Lewis and Weigert (1985). Furthermore, normative commitment was removed
from the study due to disagreements among scholars as to its actual effect (Bansal et al., 2004), while brand engagement was included in the theory on brand involvement, as this is seen as involvement on a higher level (Vivek et al., 2012). Lastly, Khalifa (2004) created three models of customer value, which he argued worked together. However, for this study only one of these models has been used due to its stronger connection to relationships as well as the intangibility of the four factors included in it. Out of these four factors, only customer needs and benefits were included in the study, where four out of the five consumption values proposed by Sheth et al. (1991) were used. The one excluded here was conditional value, as this is purely situational and therefore difficult to define in terms of value creation within event marketing. The other two factors, the view of the relationship and the view of the customer, were not used in the study as we argue that events already achieve the higher level of value for these two factors, due to events’ inherent nature of interactions.

3.2 Data Collection

For this study, a quantitative method of collecting the data was chosen. Generally, there are two overarching methods to use when conducting research – qualitative studies, which are more concerned with generating a depth of subjective understanding and reporting rich narratives (Murshed & Zhang, 2016), and quantitative studies, which are more concerned with collecting numerical data (Duignan, 2016) and creating more exact estimations of the relationship between different variables (Bryman & Bell, 2011). While the nature of most studies determines which of the two methods is chosen, there are times when the research context will not dictate the most appropriate methodology (Murshed & Zhang, 2016), thus meaning that any of the two methods would be applicable. In the case of this study, both a qualitative and a quantitative study would have elucidated the chosen topic area. However, the world is more or less run by numbers, and there are few situations that does not depend on counting or measuring, or more importantly, on reasoning with the use of numbers (Payne & Williams, 2011). Quantitative research seeks to do just that – to use its numerical orientation to allow researchers to test their hypotheses and confirm a given conclusion (Murshed & Zhang, 2016). The first step in quantitative research should therefore be theory, which gives the study a clearer guideline and on which the hypotheses are deduced and later on tested (Bryman &
Bell, 2011). Consequently, a quantitative method is appropriate when several areas are to be covered in one single study (Eliasson, 2006). As the purpose was to investigate a number of different aspects of relationship marketing and their individual connections to events and a more general view of the area was considered appropriate before generating a deeper understanding of it, a quantitative method was deemed the most beneficial option.

3.2.1 Primary Data

The primary data in this thesis was collected using a survey regarding events and the relationship between the customer and the brand, created via the online program Netigate. Netigate was chosen due to its user-friendly layout with several different alternatives for questions and adaptability to different sized screens, as well as for the diagrams it generates and its compatibility to SPSS. Two surveys were created – one in Swedish and one in English – to accommodate both Swedish-speaking and foreign respondents more conveniently. It was noted afterwards, however, that one survey would have sufficed, as Netigate also offers multi language settings.

Surveys are an appropriate tool to use in a quantitative study as they are generally used to study people’s preferences or intentions (Duignan, 2016), both of which are parts of the study conducted here. It is also generally easier to distribute a survey to many potential respondents at once (Bryman & Bell, 2011) even if the process of obtaining the potential respondents might be difficult. The effects a present interviewer might have will also be completely circumvented, however, there is instead the issue of the interpretation of questions and ensuring that the respondent understands all of them (ibid). To minimize the risk of this, two actions were taken. First, to ensure that all the questions were easy to understand as well as to ensure that the interpretation from one language to the other was valid, the survey, both the English and the Swedish one, was scrutinized by others. Secondly, an email address was also provided in the email sent out to the respondents, and they were encouraged to use it if they had any questions regarding the survey or study at all. There is also a risk of higher loss of respondents when using a survey (ibid), however, this will be further discussed in a future section.
The survey consisted of twelve questions, with four having sub-questions, and one follow-up question if the appropriate answer was given. The total number of questions was thus twenty-nine. The respondents of the survey were visitors to one of two events – Chokladgästabudet at Waxholms Hotel or GastroNord –, which were chosen due to their availability during the given timeframe of the study. Their mutual theme of food was beneficial, but merely coincidental. None of the respondents were asked to take the survey at the event. Instead, the visitors were asked to give their email addresses, as a way to calculate the response rate as well as to ensure that everyone had had the time to visit and experience the event. The survey was then sent out the same evening, with a reminder around five days after the event. Every respondent were told the reasons of conducting the survey, and in case they seemed sceptical or wondered about the use of their addresses, they were also reassured that their emails would only be used for this purpose and would be deleted as soon as the survey was closed. The survey was open between the 21st of April and the 5th of May, but the actual number of days to respond to the survey varied depending on when the event occurred. The respondents from Chokladgästabudet therefore had more days to respond than the respondents from GastroNord.

In total, 206 email addresses were collected, however, as there were some technical issues after the second day of GastroNord, 25 addresses were lost. As the email was sent out, it was also noticed that six addresses were invalid for various reasons, so the actual total of possible respondents was 175. The survey received 102 complete responses that could be used for the analysis – a response rate of 58 per cent. The defection rate, or the rate of those who started the survey but did not complete it, was 16 per cent. It should be noted that the response rate might have been different if the survey would have been conducted at the events rather than having it sent out after the event, as some possible respondents might agree to participate on site, but neglect to do it when they are alone. On the other hand, using this method also comes with its downsides, as many respondents would then decline to participate altogether. The majority of the respondents came from GastroNord as this was a larger event, and most wanted the survey in Swedish.
3.2.1.1 Chokladgästabudet at Waxholms Hotel
Chokladgästabudet (approx. the chocolate feast) was hosted by Waxholms Hotel for the first time between the 21st and 22nd of April in 2018. The event offered a chocolate fair, chocolate inspired menus at the hotel’s restaurants, taste testing of rum, chocolate and coffee as well as workshops and lectures about chocolate (Alltomstockholm.se, n.d.). The collection of email addresses took place during both days of the event, and out of the original 206 possible respondents, 55 came from Chokladgästabudet.

3.2.1.2 GastroNord at Stockholmsmässan
GastroNord was hosted between the 24th and 27th of April in 2018 and is an industry expo hosted biannually since 1985. As Northern Europe’s most important gastronomic platform, it attracts interested and committed visitors from the hotel-, restaurant- and catering-industry, allowing them to receive inspiration and knowledge about the industry as a whole as well as about the exhibitors’ offerings. (GastroNord, n.d.) As most of the visitors at the event were representing their respective companies, they were not necessarily there as private individuals, or consumers. However, we argue that as they were still there as customers, the same elements of the customer-brand relationship put forth in the theoretical framework are still applicable, and their answers were thus still valid. The collection of email addresses took place during the first three days of the event, and out of the original 206 possible respondents, 151 came from GastroNord. With the loss of 25 email addresses however, the number of possible respondents were 126.

3.2.2 Survey Design
The survey consisted of twelve questions, with sub-questions for four of them as well as a follow-up question if the respondent answered in a certain way. Two of the questions were of a demographic nature to investigate whether or not the age and gender groups were evenly distributed for a more generalizable study, while the remaining ten questions were related to the theoretical framework. All of the questions were closed, with two being answered by a simple yes or no, and eight with a scale of one to seven.

The actual questions asked in the survey can be found in appendix 1, table 1.1, as only a summary will be provided here. Four of the questions were related to customer-
brand relationships and asked in order to establish if there was an existing relationship between the respondent and the brand prior to the event or if the event could establish potential relationships in the future. As with the three questions asked about brand involvement, the questions were based on what was found in the literature overall, rather than pertaining to specific measurements developed by other authors. One question was asked regarding the impact an event might have on the respondent’s trust in the brand, with five measurements inspired by Calefato et al. (2015). These were friendly, approachable, competent or skilful, reliable and honest. As there are plenty of emotions that could be investigated in a study such as this, five of the emotions listed in Martensen, Grønholdt, Bendtsen and Jensen (2007) were used to establish which emotions an event can elicit towards a brand. However, this might not give a complete view of brand emotions and events, but might nonetheless give some insights into it that can further future studies. Two questions were asked regarding brand attitude and events – one to measure the behavioural intent, or the conative attitude component in the tripartite model, and one to measure the cognitive and affective attitude components. This second question was based on four of the five measures Spears and Singh (2004) developed: appealing, pleasant, favourable and likeable. The measurement that was not used was good, as this was considered unrelated to the study as well as its close resemblance to measures such as favourable or likeable, which were asked instead. To measure the value events can create for the customer, a question based on the different kinds of value formulated by Sheth et al. (1991) was created, but the actual questions were inspired by a study made by Sweeney and Soutar (2001) as well as the general nature of the different kinds of value outlined in the theoretical framework. Commitment is notably absent from this summary; however, this is because the various theories used in the theoretical framework to measure the effects of events on customer-brand relationships are all seen as parts of the commitment customers have. Therefore, every question asked can more or less be connected to commitment through their connection to other theories.

3.2.3 Sample

The sampling method used in this study was a convenience sample. This sample consists of respondents who just happened to be available to the researcher at the given time (Bryman & Bell, 2011) and are therefore easy to access, however, the characteristics of the respondents within the sample still broadly match the population
of interest (Duignan, 2016). While this sampling method is one of the most common in business and management studies, the problem is that it is more or less impossible to generalize the results as it is unknown which population it is representative of (Bryman & Bell, 2011). For example, if a study is made trying to understand the behaviours of consumers in a store, it is possible that the day on which the study takes place is not representative of the ordinary patterns of consumer behaviour (Duignan, 2016) and thus the study becomes biased.

An attempt to avoid these negative effects was made as both events were visited during several days, ensuring a wider population. Visiting two different events was also done to ensure a wider spread in population, as they attracted different kinds of visitors, and potential respondents were approached regardless of their age or gender. It should be said though that the majority of the respondents were female (67 per cent) and born between 1970 and 1979 (32 per cent) (see full diagrams in appendix 2, figure 2.1 and 2.2). It was noticed that the visitors most inclined to agree to participate in the survey were women. To try and remedy this, more men were approached during the last two days of GastroNord, however, men were also more inclined to disagree. The dominating age group was also not a big surprise, as the average visitor to both events was middle-aged. In the case of GastroNord, this might have to do with it being more likely that the older employees have senior positions and authority to make decisions, as they might have worked at the company longer. Both younger and older respondents were therefore also approached to a larger extent; however, they were also more likely to decline.

3.3 Analytical Method

The analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics, which is a comprehensive set of statistical tools with an easy-to-use interface (IBM, n.d.) commonly used within quantitative studies (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This program was used in every part of the analysis, from the mean values used in the initial analysis to the correlations and regressions in the deeper one. The study’s findings, analysis and discussion were included in the same chapter for the readability of these sections.
The initial analysis was a univariate analysis, which means that it focused on one variable at a time by investigating the result in terms of frequency or mean values (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This was done to receive an overview of the result of the study and a way to ground the analysis in theory already from the beginning. It was also the basis for the correlation and regression analysis conducted later. The mean values were calculated for all sets of theories except customer-brand relationships, in which both frequency and mean values were used as three of the questions – brand knowledge, previous purchase and number of times purchased – were answered by using yes or no, as well as the frequency of purchasing in the past. Commitment was not included in this initial analysis due to its connection to every single theory mentioned which meant that all variables could give insight to this aspect.

Before the correlation and regression analysis were conducted, five of the variables had to be recoded and reversed to fit the answers for the other variables and to enable correct results. These variables were *Brand Knowledge, Previous Purchase, Interest in Other Brands, Boring* and *Annoyed*. For example, if the respondent answered 1, disagree, to the question regarding whether or not they were annoyed with the brand after the event, it meant that the respondent was not annoyed at all. As this is a positive outcome on a negative variable, this has to be reversed so as to mean the same thing as the scale for a question about a positive emotion, such as joy. For these variables, the scale was reversed so a 1 became a 7, and vice versa, in order to mirror the scales for the more positive variables and enable a correct analysis. The different variables were also renamed so as to avoid having to write out the entire question in the analysis – these new variable names are available in appendix 1, table 1.1.

The correlation analysis was then conducted in order to establish whether or not there were any correlations between the variables and to get some insight into which variables should be included in the regression analysis later on. What correlation analysis can illuminate is the strength and direction of the relationship between the entered variables (Pallant, 2013), which means that it searches for relationships in which a change in one variable will yield a change in the other (Einspruch, 2005). The size of the value – between -1 and +1 – indicates the strength of the relationship, in which a value between .10 and .29 indicates a low strength and a value above .50 a very strong relationship (Pallant, 2013). The closer the value is to 1, the stronger the
relationship is. The direction of the relationship is indicated by whether the value is positive or negative (ibid). If the value is positive, an increase or decrease in one variable will yield the same result in the other, and if it is negative, an increase or decrease in one variable will yield the opposite result in the other (Einspruch, 2005). The level of significance indicates how likely this correlation is – a significance level of .01 means that this correlation will be found in 99 per cent of the cases. The correlations were then used to create three different areas of discussion – customer-brand relationships and brand involvement; customer value, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement; and brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust.

As correlations can only provide an indication of whether or not a relationship exists, a regression analysis was conducted to investigate if certain variables were able to predict other variables as well, and how strong this prediction would be (Einspruch, 2005). For this purpose, a standard linear multiple regression analysis was used, in which several independent variables were entered into the equation at the same time (Pallant, 2013) in order to see which independent variable had the strongest impact on the dependent one. There were some exceptions to this method as only the correlations that were found to be significant were interesting for the regression analysis. Some variables only had one correlation with another variable within its given area. Only the significant results were presented in the analysis, as these were the only ones that had a statistically significant contribution to predicting the dependent variable. They were usually the variables with the highest Beta-value as well, which meant that they also had the largest contribution to explaining the dependent variable.
4. Findings and Analysis

This chapter consists of the study’s findings, analysis and discussion, in order to make the chapter easier to follow for the reader. It starts out with an initial analysis of mean values for each theory, before it continues to the three areas found in the correlation and regression analyses. The chapter aims to answer the thesis’ research questions: “How can event marketing be studied as a part of relationship marketing?” and “How can event marketing be used to strengthen customer-brand relationships?”

4.1 Initial Analysis

The initial analysis was conducted by calculating the mean values for every variable, and where this was not possible, the percentages of each given answer. These were then related to each corresponding theory in order to give an overview of the findings of the study. Commitment is notably absent from this section – this is due to its connection to every single theory mentioned. There were thus no questions regarding commitment specifically, as all of the variables could give insight into this aspect.

4.1.1 Customer-Brand Relationships

The goal of relationship marketing is to create long-lasting and intimate relationships (Chiu et al., 2005) by creating activities which attract, develop, maintain and enhance the customer-brand relationship (Grönroos, 1994). As this was the main focus of this study – to increase the knowledge and to deeper understand the effects events can have on the customer-brand relationship – this area was of course interesting to investigate. As it is only possible to calculate mean values for two of the variables asked regarding the relationship, the other three will be presented in percentages for each answer (see table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage / Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Knowledge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Purchase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Times Purchased</th>
<th>Once or less</th>
<th>27.1 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-5 times</td>
<td>24.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-9 times</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 times or more</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interest in Other Brands | 4.75 |
| Future Purchase          | 4.89 |

Table 1 - Mean values for customer-brand relationships

Overall, most respondents had knowledge of the brand prior to the event, and most had also purchased from the brand beforehand – the majority more than ten times. This means that in most cases, there was some sort of a relationship already established prior to the event. As the respondents chose themselves which brand to consider that had been present at the event, they might have chosen one which they already had knowledge about instead of choosing one they were not as familiar with. It is therefore also interesting to look at the strength of that relationship and the potential continuation of it after the event. As can be seen from the mean values, there is a positive inclination towards making a purchase from the brand again in the future, suggesting some sort of loyalty to the brand, which is usually defined as same-brand buying behaviour (Oliver, 1999). However, the mean value for Interest in Other Brands also suggests that this loyalty might be fragile, as it indicates an interest for other brands within the same product category and thus potential switching behaviour (ibid). This result is interesting as events generally mean at least a second level relationship as they provide grounds for interaction (Berry, 1995). Perhaps events can only develop and enhance the relationship to a certain extent, while the relationship needs further efforts by the brand in order to achieve complete loyalty. However, it is still considered to confirm H1 (later analysis also confirms this hypothesis).
Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. Event marketing strengthens the customer-brand relationship.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 - Hypothesis regarding customer-brand relationships*

### 4.1.2 Trust

Trust is defined as the willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another party (Mayer et al., 1995) in a context where the actions might affect the trustor negatively (Gambetta, 2000). For this study, trust was divided into cognitive and affective trust, or knowledge-based (Johnson & Grayson, 2005) and emotion-based trust (Lewis & Weigert, 1985), which were interesting to investigate due to their duality—trust cannot exist without both components (Johnson & Grayson, 2005)—as well as trust’s general importance in customer-brand relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Trust</th>
<th>Components of Trust</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Trust</td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Trust</td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3 - Mean values for trust*

Cognitive trust was in turn divided into ability and predictability, while affective trust was divided into benevolence and integrity. As can be seen in table 3, all of these components scored over 4 in mean value, which means that they are all above the neutral answer in the statements. All of them can therefore be considered to be positive, however, as none of the scores are over a 5, the result is not the strongest. For cognitive trust, the event seemingly affects the perception of competency more than the reliability. This might be because the evidence of trustworthiness cognitive trust is based on arises through observations of the behaviour within the relationship (Hernandez & Santos, 2010) and events facilitate more direct displays of competency.
than of reliability. The perception of reliability is most likely derived from other sources over a longer period of time and is thus harder to affect through one event alone. Affective trust is according to the mean values mostly affected by integrity, with the friendly component of benevolence close behind. While an event should be considered an apt platform to create these emotional bonds affective trust constitutes (Lewis & Weigert, 1985), it is perhaps understandable that the brands appear friendly and honest, as they are there in the capacity of salesmen and -women. This means that both H2a and H2b are confirmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2a. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s cognitive trust</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards the brand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s affective trust</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards the brand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Hypotheses regarding trust*

### 4.1.3 Brand Involvement

Brand involvement is the perceived importance of an object to an individual, as well as their devotion to it and is especially important since consumers want to feel attached to a brand and not just a consumption process (Zaichkowsky, 1985). By becoming more involved with the brand, the customers’ patronage intentions can increase (Shiue & Li, 2013), which in turn can lead to stronger loyalty in the customer-brand relationship. It was therefore interesting to investigate how events affect the brand involvement and in turn affect the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Interest</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5 - Mean values for brand involvement*
All the variables within brand involvement received mean values above 4 (see table 5), the neutral answer. They are thus considered to be more positive than negative, even if the result is not the strongest. The variable *Satisfaction* received the highest mean value, which indicates that most visitors were satisfied with the event they attended. A closely connected concept to brand involvement is brand engagement, and according to Keller (2013), this concept is defined as the extent to which someone is willing to invest their own personal resources, such as time, money or energy. This means that if someone is visiting the event, they have most likely invested some personal resources in it, especially their time, voluntarily. If brand engagement, or involvement, is already a part of the customer-brand relationship, the visitor might feel satisfied with the event because of this prior connection. Brand involvement might also arise from the customers’ wish to preserve relationships that offer more rewarding experiences (Lambe et al., 2001) – which an event with the brand should be able to do. If they feel satisfied with the event, it should thus lead to greater brand involvement. The only thing that somewhat diminishes this argument is the mean value for attachment to the brand after the event was slightly lower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s involvement with the brand.</td>
<td>Partially confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6 - Hypothesis regarding brand involvement*

### 4.1.4 Brand Emotions

Rationality has a very little part in convincing consumers’ thinking, and emphasis should instead be placed on the consumers’ feelings, as strong emotional feelings can create customer-brand relationships (Travis, 2000). However, only brand-related emotions can create deep psychological differences (Koshkaki, 2014), and thus it is interesting to investigate events’ connection to brand emotions.
Table 7 - Mean values for brand emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 7 demonstrates, the positive variables Joy and Expectation scored over 4 in mean value, while the two negative variables Boring and Annoyed both scored less than 3. This means that events can help achieve positive brand emotions while negative brand emotions will be avoided, assuming the event is to the visitor’s satisfaction. The “middle emotion” Fine is the closest to the neutral answer out of all variables for brand emotions, which means that events most likely will achieve stronger emotions, either positive or negative, depending on how the event is perceived. Visitors thus will not feel “just fine” about the brand after the event. It therefore seems as if events do have an effect on the customers’ brand emotions, and can help facilitate a deeper emotional attachment, which in turn might have an effect on brand commitment and loyalty (Thomson et al., 2005) as well as brand attitudes (Ruth, 2001). H6 can thus be confirmed.

Table 8 - Hypothesis regarding brand emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H6. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s emotions towards the brand.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.5 Brand Attitude

The definition of attitudes used in this thesis is that attitudes are relatively consistent evaluations of an attitude object, where opinions fall on a bipolar continuum of either favourable or unfavourable, and they are believed to be learned through, among other ways, direct experience with a brand (Erwin, 2001). This was interesting to investigate in regards to events, as they facilitate the direct experience which attitudes
might arise from. For this purpose, the tripartite model of attitudes was used, with questions regarding the cognitive, affective and conative attitude components.

As can be seen in table 9, all of the mean values are above 4, the neutral answer, which means that it is more likely that events affect the attitudes towards being more positive than being more negative. However, only the factor *Favourable* within the cognitive attitude component can be said to be more strongly affected by the event, as this is the only factor that scores above a 5. Cognitive attitude consists of the knowledge used to form beliefs about an attitude object (Ajzen, 1989) and as an event facilitates a more direct experience with the brand the visitor also receives more direct knowledge about it on which to base their beliefs. The affective component might be more difficult to facilitate as this consists of values and moral beliefs (Jansson-Boyd, 2010) – two aspects that can be difficult to portray to a visitor in a confined space and time period. However, the factor *Pleasant* scores the highest after the cognitive component, so events’ effect on affective attitude should not be completely discarded. Somewhat surprisingly is the relatively low result on the behavioural intentions of the conative component, as events were believed to be able to induce the visitor to make future purchases. This means H8a-c are all confirmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tripartite Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Attitude Component</td>
<td><em>Favourable</em></td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Likeable</em></td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Attitude Component</td>
<td><em>Appealing</em></td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pleasant</em></td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conative Attitude Component</td>
<td><em>Potential Future Purchase</em></td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9 - Mean values for brand attitudes*

As can be seen in table 9, all of the mean values are above 4, the neutral answer, which means that it is more likely that events affect the attitudes towards being more positive than being more negative. However, only the factor *Favourable* within the cognitive attitude component can be said to be more strongly affected by the event, as this is the only factor that scores above a 5. Cognitive attitude consists of the knowledge used to form beliefs about an attitude object (Ajzen, 1989) and as an event facilitates a more direct experience with the brand the visitor also receives more direct knowledge about it on which to base their beliefs. The affective component might be more difficult to facilitate as this consists of values and moral beliefs (Jansson-Boyd, 2010) – two aspects that can be difficult to portray to a visitor in a confined space and time period. However, the factor *Pleasant* scores the highest after the cognitive component, so events’ effect on affective attitude should not be completely discarded. Somewhat surprisingly is the relatively low result on the behavioural intentions of the conative component, as events were believed to be able to induce the visitor to make future purchases. This means H8a-c are all confirmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H8a. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s cognitive attitude towards the brand.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H8b. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s affective attitude towards the brand.  
Confirmed

H8c. Event marketing positively affects the customer’s conative attitude towards the brand.  
Confirmed

| Table 10 - Hypotheses regarding brand attitudes |

4.1.6 Value Creation in Events

Customer value is a complex concept with many definitions. In this thesis, a special focus was placed on the relationship-aspect within value, and was studied using two parts of the value buildup model – customer needs and customer benefits (Khalifa, 2004). This was studied by using four kinds of consumption values – functional, emotional, social and epistemic value (Sheth et al., 1991) – to connect the reason behind the visit to a specific type of value. If the reason behind the visit was related to any of these values, the event was believed to be able to facilitate that value too.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Value</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Value</td>
<td>The brand’s physical attributes or offering</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Value</td>
<td>Like the brand</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Social Value | Interaction with others who have the same interests  
Friends were going | 4.09  
4.02 |
| Epistemic Value | Out of curiosity | 4.26 |

| Table 11 - Mean values for customer value |

The initial analysis shows that the event was not really connected to any of these four types of value, with the exception of emotional value and potentially also epistemic value. However, the scoring is still on the lower side, and while the event will most likely have a positive effect on them, it is not a particularly strong effect. But this result does not mean that events cannot be great facilitators of customer value. According to the value buildup model, the value becomes stronger if the customer
needs are mostly psychic and the benefits are mainly intangible (Khalifa, 2004). Emotional value is obtained when the product (or in this case brand) can arouse specific feelings such as enjoyment, while epistemic value will be obtained when the product (or brand) is able to arouse curiosity (Smith & Colgate, 2007). As these are primarily connected to psychic needs and intangible benefits, the value during an event should still be able to become strong, even if none of the other values are obtained, at least for the events visited in this study. This means that only H10b is fully confirmed, while H10d is partially confirmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H10a. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s functional value for the customer.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10b. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s emotional value for the customer.</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10c. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s social value for the customer.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10d. Event marketing is positively connected to the brand’s epistemic value for the customer.</td>
<td>Partially confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12 - Hypotheses regarding customer value*

4.2 Correlation and Regression Analysis

The correlation analysis showed several significant correlations between various variables. These were then grouped into three primary areas – customer-brand relationships and brand involvement; customer value, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement; and brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust. For this last area, several correlations were also found between the three mentioned categories and customer-brand relationships and customer value. The regression analysis was then
conducted on the significant correlations to establish causality, or which of the variables affect the other.

4.2.1 Customer-Brand Relationships and Brand Involvement

Statistically significant correlations have been found between several of the variables for customer-brand relationships and brand involvement. The majority of them are significant at $p < .01$, which means that the correlation is found in 99 per cent of the cases. Most of the correlations found here are between low and medium strength, with the exception of the correlations between Brand Knowledge and Previous Purchase and between Future Purchase and Interest in Other Brands. Most of the correlations are also positive, except for the variable Interest in Other Brands, which has negative correlations with all other variables in this first set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brand Knowledge</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Previous Purchase</td>
<td>.718**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Times Purchased</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.411**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interest in Other Brands</td>
<td>-.332**</td>
<td>-.210*</td>
<td>-.363**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Future Purchase</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>-.504**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.200*</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.302**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.426**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 - Correlations between customer-brand relationships and brand involvement

*Future Purchase* is the variable with the most correlations to the other variables and is thus connected to both the other aspects of customer-brand relationships as well as brand involvement. These correlations are understandable, as someone who intends to purchase from a brand in the future, might also have an already established
relationship with the brand prior to the event. Someone who is satisfied with the event and feels more attached to the brand after the event is probably also more likely to make a purchase from the brand in the future, regardless of the existence of a prior relationship.

*Interest in Other Brands* is the only variable that scores negative correlations with the other variables. This might be explained as the more established the relationship is prior to the event and the more brand involvement the event leads to, the less interest the person will have in other brands within the same category, as they are pleased with the brand in question. While this relationship might be contradicting the initial analysis of mean values, it can also be the reverse, where a larger interest in other brands leads to weaker relationships and brand involvement. For further confirmation of these relationships, a regression analysis was conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Other</td>
<td>Future Purchase</td>
<td>-.495</td>
<td>-4.193</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Purchase</td>
<td>Interest in Other Brands</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>-4.521</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>4.107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Future Purchase</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14 - Regression between customer-brand relationships and brand involvement*

The causal relationships displayed in table 14 are all statistically significant at the highest level while also having the highest Beta- and t-values in their individual sets. The largest contributor to *Attachment* was *Satisfaction* – a logical relationship as both variables pertain to brand involvement. This means that the more satisfied the visitor was with the event, the more attached they felt to the brand afterwards. However, it was also found that *Future Purchase* was a large and significant contributor to *Attachment*, which might indicate that the more likely someone is to make a purchase from the brand after the event, the more attached to the brand they feel. The most interesting regression was found between the two variables *Interest in Other Brands* and *Future Purchase*, in which both was found to affect each other. Exactly what this
indicates is difficult to know, however, it might be interpreted as the more likely someone is to make a purchase from the brand in the future, the lesser interest they have in other brands, but the more interest they have in other brands, the smaller the likelihood of a future purchase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H5. Increased brand involvement after the event strengthens the customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.</td>
<td>Partially confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 15 - Hypothesis regarding customer-brand relationships and brand involvement*

Brand involvement and customer-brand relationships have also been linked in the past, as consumers only want to preserve the relationships they have with brands they have a strong bond with (Lambe et al., 2001). This bond stems from brand involvement and engagement (Vivek et al., 2012), as well as the customer’s commitment to the brand (Morgan & Hunt, 1994), due to the devotion they feel towards it (Zaichkowsky, 1985), the psychological attachment it provides (Morgan & Hunt, 1994) and brand satisfaction (Fullerton, 2005). This study confirms these connections while also giving at least some confirmation regarding the influence the event has on these aspects. This means that H5 is partially confirmed.

4.2.2 Customer Value, Customer-Brand Relationships and Brand Involvement

Statistically significant correlations were found primarily between customer value and brand involvement, however, some interesting correlations were also found between customer value and customer-brand relationships (see table 16). The majority of these are significant at the highest level (p < .01); however, most of the correlations are of low to medium strength, with the exception of one correlation (*Like the Brand* and *Future Purchase*). All the correlations are also positive, with the exception of two variables – *Number of Times Purchased* and *Interest in Other Brands.*
Customer Value | Customer-Brand Relationships | Brand Involvement
--- | --- | ---
Brand Knowledge | Previous Purchase | Number of Times Purchased | Interest in Other Brands | Future Purchase | Satisfaction | Attachment

| Physical Attributes | - | - | -.237* | -.240* | -.257** | - | .415**
| Like the Brand | .282** | .332** | - | -.422** | .549** | .370** | .389**
| Social Reason | .239* | - | - | -.348** | .278** | - | .331**
| Curiosity | - | - | - | -.262** | .315** | .259** | .493**
| Personal Interest | - | - | - | -.295** | .282** | - | -

Table 16 - Correlations between customer value, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement

Emotional value (Like the Brand) was the variable with the most correlations with customer-brand relationships, as it was correlated with three out of the four variables. The weakest of these, albeit a statistically significant one, is the correlation between emotional value and Brand Knowledge – a logical correlation, as the respondent who visited the event due to them liking the brand beforehand should have some knowledge regarding the brand. This is also applicable to the correlation between emotional value and Previous Purchase, as the visitor might have also bought something from the brand in order to determine whether or not they liked the brand. The correlation between emotional value and Interest in Other Brands is a negative one, which means that one variable increases when the other decreases (Einspruch, 2005). When someone has an affinity for a particular brand and visits an event because they like the brand, it is reasonable to believe that they are also less interested in other brands within the same product category. The strongest of these correlations is found between emotional value and Future Purchase – another logical correlation as most people are probably more inclined to purchase from the brand in the future as well, if they liked it prior to the event.

The most correlations were found between customer value and brand involvement, and especially so between emotional and epistemic value (Curiosity), which were correlated with all three variables for it. The correlation between the two variables, Satisfaction and Attachment, are reasonable, as a visitor who likes the brand is most likely inclined to be satisfied with an event with it, as well as feel even more attached
to the brand afterwards. While epistemic value has weaker correlations with brand involvement than emotional value, they are still statistically significant. The correlations here are consistent with the arguments for emotional value; however, it might only be induced under certain circumstances. For example, if the visitor is curious about the brand and finds that it did not live up to their expectations, it is unlikely that a purchase will take place in the future or that they will feel particularly attached to the brand, or vice versa. This is still the characteristic of positive correlations though – as one increase or decrease, the other variable reacts the same way (Einspruch, 2005). To investigate if these fairly logical relationships are correct, a regression analysis was conducted. In table 17 below, only those causal relationships that were found to be significant are included – two variables each for both customer-brand relationships and brand involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Purchase</td>
<td>Like the Brand</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>3.342</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Purchase</td>
<td>Like the Brand</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>4.095</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Like the Brand</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>2.656</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 17 - Regression between customer value, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement*

All of the causal relationships found in table 17 are statistically significant at the highest level (p<.01) and in their individual sets, they were also the highest scoring in both Beta- and t-value. This means that these independent variables had the largest as well as the most statistically significant contribution to explaining the dependent variable. To put it simply – these independent variables can be considered to affect the dependent ones. Once again, emotional value is seemingly the largest contributor for customer-brand relationships, while it shares the spot with epistemic value for brand involvement. The most interesting causal relationship here is that between previous purchase and emotional value. Emotional value was investigated by asking if the visit was due to the respondent liking the brand before the event, and the logical relationship between the two variables should thus be reversed – the emotional value should be affected by the customer-brand relationship and not the other way around.
Hypothesis | Result
---|---
H11a. The customer value connected to the event leads to stronger customer-brand relationships in terms of loyalty. | Confirmed
H11b. The customer value connected to the event impacts the customer’s involvement with the brand after the event. | Confirmed

Table 18 - Hypotheses regarding customer value, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement

As is clear through both the correlation and regression analysis, emotional value through events has a particular relationship with both customer-brand relationships and brand involvement. According to Berry (1995) regular interaction with the customers lead to stronger relationships, something events alone can facilitate. However, not only interaction is required to create the deeper bonds that lead to loyalty beyond repurchasing behaviour – a strong psychological commitment to the brand is also necessary to create deeper, attitudinal loyalty (Nam et al., 2011). Emotional value, which is obtained when the brand is able to arouse specific feelings such as enjoyment (Smith & Colgate, 2007), could be one way to create this stronger bond between the customer and the brand. This relationship receives some confirmation with this study. Emotional value also constitutes what Michaelidou and Dibb (2008) call enduring involvement, which focuses on consumers’ affection toward the brand. As consumers want to preserve relationships with the brands they have greater bonding with (Lambe et al., 2001), emotional value can therefore also be an important predecessor as well as a result of brand involvement. H11a thus receives confirmation with this study.

Furthermore, brand involvement is also influenced by epistemic value. This type of value can be connected to response involvement, which regards the behavioural orientation through, for example, information attainment (Michaelidou & Dibb, 2008), as epistemic value refers to the need of curiosity and desire for knowledge (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Events should be able to facilitate this need and thus lead to higher brand involvement too. This means that H11b is also confirmed.
4.2.3 Brand Emotions, Brand Attitudes and Trust

Statistically significant, positive correlations were found among all positive variables for brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust – ranging from medium to high strength (see appendix 3, table 3.1). This means that when, for example, positive brand emotions increase, positive brand attitudes and trust increase too, and that this relationship is fairly strong and is statistically bound to occur 99 per cent of the time. The only positive variable where fewer correlations were found was Fine. This only correlated with four other variables – brand attitudes Appealing and Pleasant and Approachable and Honest within trust – and both the strength and significance with these were lower than the rest. However, this correlation is logical when considering the connotation Fine implies, as it is usually a feeling expressed when things are just okay – neither good, nor bad. It therefore should not correlate strongly with the more positive feelings, or the more negative ones, as it is a midrange emotion.

Several factors confirm this analysis. First of all, knowledge, or cognitive trust, is a necessary condition for trust to be generated, however, knowledge alone is not enough to cause this condition (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Affective trust is what creates the emotional bond necessary to make trust deepen in a way that knowledge cannot (Johnson & Grayson, 2005), which elucidates brand emotions’ as well as positive brand attitudes’ effect on trust. Secondly, emotional attachment to a brand can enhance the strength of brand perception and beliefs (Ruth, 2011) as rationality has a very small effect on the consumer’s thinking (Travis, 2000). This means that while brand attitudes consists of both cognitive and affective components, the affective component is more readily accessible and held with greater confidence (Verplanken et al., 1998) due to its connection to brand emotions. Lastly, only brand-related emotions can create deep psychological differences (Koshkaki, 2014), and is thus one way for trust to be generated. Due to these factors, as well as the non-surprising correlations among these three aspects and the mutual effect they have on each other, a regression analysis was not conducted.

4.2.3.1 Customer-Brand Relationships and Brand Involvement

Several significant correlations were also found between brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust and the aspects of the customer-brand relationships and brand involvement investigated in the study (see table 19). Once again, the majority of them
are significant at the highest level (p<.01), varies from low to high strength and are positive relationships, with the exception of the variable *Interest in Other Brands*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Attitudes</th>
<th>Interest in Other Brands</th>
<th>Future Purchase</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>-.337**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>-.315**</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>-.271**</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.550**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>-.307**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>-.247*</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>-.203*</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.373**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>-.296**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>-.331**</td>
<td>.468**</td>
<td>.557**</td>
<td>.457**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>-.328**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.420**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.249*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>-.274**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.495**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 - Correlations between brand emotions, brand attitudes, trust, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement

The variables found in the three aspects of brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust all correlate positively with the variable *Future Purchase, Satisfaction* and *Attachment*. This can logically be interpreted as when the brand is connected to positive brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust after the event, the more likely it is that a purchase from it will occur in the future, as well as to achieve higher satisfaction with the event and greater attachment to the brand. The variable *Interest in Other Brands* is negatively correlated with the variables found in the other three aspects. The logical interpretation here is that when positive brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust is achieved through the event, the lower is the interest in other brands within the same product category. To find out if these relationships were correct, a regression analysis, as well as a reverse regression analysis, was conducted (see table 20).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>3.612</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>3.712</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>4.183</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>5.179</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>3.968</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Future Purchase</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>2.956</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Purchase</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>3.112</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>2.920</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 - Regression between brand emotions, brand attitudes, trust, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement

All of the causal relationships found in table 20 are statistically significant at the highest level, and most of them also had the highest scores in both beta- and t-value in their individual sets, with the exception of Joy, where Satisfaction scored lower in Beta than Like the Brand but scored the highest in both t-value and significance, and Future Purchase, where Expectation scored lower than Pleasant in Beta-value, but scored higher in t-value. Brand involvement seems to be the largest contributor to both brand attitudes and trust, while brand emotions can be explained by both customer-brand relationships and brand involvement. The only casual relationships that were found in the reverse regression analysis were between the brand emotion Expectation and a potential future purchase and between the competent-component of trust and attachment to the brand. This means that emotions towards the brand felt after the event can lead to future relationships between the customer and the brand, and that the change in trust felt after the event can lead to higher brand involvement. It should also be mentioned that the relationship between Future Purchase and Expectation shows significance in both the regression analysis and the reversed one, which might indicate a duality in effect where they both affect each other equally.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3a. Increased trust after the event leads to a stronger customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b. Increased trust after the event leads to higher commitment and involvement with the brand.</td>
<td>Partially confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a. Positive brand emotions after the event leads to a stronger customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.</td>
<td>Partially confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b. Positive brand emotions after the event leads to higher commitment and involvement with the brand.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a. Positive brand attitudes after the event lead to a stronger customer-brand relationship in terms of loyalty.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9b. Positive brand attitudes after the event lead to higher commitment and involvement with the brand.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 - Hypotheses regarding brand emotions, brand attitudes, trust, customer-brand relationships and brand involvement

As can be seen through the correlation and regression analysis, there is some confirmation as to brand emotions’, brand attitudes’ and trust’s effect on both customer-brand relationships as well as brand involvement, which is also confirmed by the importance of emotional value for these two aspects. As with emotional value, positive brand emotions and attitudes constitute enduring involvement, or the affection towards the brand (Michaelidou & Dibb, 2008) while greater trust can make up affective commitment, which is maintained when the customer feels trust and enjoy being connected to the brand (Bansal et al., 2004). A greater bond with a brand through brand involvement and commitment might thus also lead to stronger
relationships, as consumers want to preserve the relationships with the brands they have those bonds with (Lambe et al., 2001). While the regression suggests that brand emotions primarily will lead to behavioural loyalty based on purchasing behaviour, there are strong correlations that connect them to attitudinal loyalty as well. The affective commitment mentioned is also believed to be able to connect these two types of loyalty with brand emotions and attitudes, as a customer who is positive towards the brand, should be more inclined to purchase from it (Fullerton, 2005). None of the hypotheses received full support, and only H3b and H7a were even partially confirmed.

4.2.3.2 Customer Value
Lastly, correlations between brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust and the different customer values were also found (see table 22). All of them are positive, low to medium strength correlations, with the exception of some correlations with emotional value (Like the Brand). The majority are also significant at the highest level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical Attributes</th>
<th>Like the Brand</th>
<th>Social Reason</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Curiosity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Attitudes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appealing</strong></td>
<td>.319**</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pleasant</strong></td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Favourable</strong></td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.213*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Likeable</strong></td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td><strong>Friendly</strong></td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Approachable</strong></td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.267**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Competent</strong></td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reliable</strong></td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>.241*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Honest</strong></td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the variables between these aspects have correlations, however, part of the social value (Friends) is not correlated with brand emotions or trust at all, and only one weak correlation can be found with brand attitudes. However, the other variable for social value (Social Reason) is correlated, albeit weakly. The strongest correlations can be found between brand emotions, brand attitudes, trust and emotional value, which is consistent with the other findings in this study. It is logical that the emotional value will be correlated with the variables that are measuring emotions, and the result can be interpreted as when emotional value during the event is obtained, more positive brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust will also be obtained. This relationship is also found between epistemic value (Curiosity) and functional value (Physical Attributes) and the three other aspects investigated here. A regression analysis was then conducted to investigate the causal relationships between these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Emotions</th>
<th>Joy</th>
<th>.260**</th>
<th>.605**</th>
<th>.291**</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>.447**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.212*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 22 - Correlations between brand emotions, brand attitudes, trust and customer value*

As can be seen in table 23, only three variables, one from each aspect, had a significant causal relationship with any of the customer values. In all three cases, emotional value was the largest contributor, however, for Joy the most significant contributor was Satisfaction. This causal relationship means that if someone visited the event to obtain emotional value, or because they liked the brand, they feel more.
positive brand emotions, brand attitudes and stronger trust when it comes to pleasantness, friendliness and joyfulfulness regarding the brand after the event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H12a. The customer value connected with the event leads to increased trust.</td>
<td>Confirmed for emotional value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12b. The customer value connected with the event leads to more positive brand emotions.</td>
<td>Confirmed for emotional value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12c. The customer value connected with the event leads to more positive brand attitudes.</td>
<td>Confirmed for emotional value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 24 - Hypotheses regarding brand emotions, brand attitudes, trust and customer value*

A reverse regression analysis was also conducted, however, this did not reveal any interesting causal relationships between any of the variables. This was somewhat surprising, as it is clear that emotional value affected the other variables – something that is only acquired when the brand can arouse feelings such as enjoyment or trust (Smith & Colgate, 2007). This means that there should be some evidence of brand emotions and trust affecting emotional value the same way emotional value apparently affects them. However, this might be due to the way the question was phrased, as it is stated as a reason for visiting the event in the first place. Otherwise, the result is, as mentioned, consistent with the other findings in this study, where emotional value has been found to have the most and strongest correlations with almost any variable, as well as it having been the largest and most significant contributor to them. This means that H12a-c were all confirmed for emotional value, while support could not be found for the other types of value.
5. Conclusion

Since the 1980s, relationship marketing has evolved as a new marketing paradigm (Sheth, 2017) in which establishing, maintaining and enhancing customer-brand relationships (Grönroos, 2004) takes precedence. However, as global competition increases and causes a saturation of brand messages (Wohlfeil & Whelan, 2006), the less effective the previous marketing efforts are (Cristache et al., 2013) and the more important the advancement of new marketing communication strategies that offer interaction is (Wohlfeil & Whelan, 2006). One such form of communication strategy is event marketing, which in the past has been connected to both interaction (Cristache et al., 2013) as well as relationships (Crowther, 2011). Despite this apparently perfect tool for new communication, there is currently a lack of research connecting the two (ibid), especially with regard to the effects events can have on consumers (Wood, 2009). The purpose of this thesis was therefore to study event marketing as a part of relationship marketing, as relationship marketing was considered the umbrella under which event marketing should be placed. The aim was to contribute to both areas by adopting a relationship approach to events.

The study highlighted the usefulness of studying events under the relationship umbrella, as they were proven to be a potentially valuable tool to strengthen the customer-brand relationship through two of the most important aspects – emotions and knowledge. The initial analysis revealed that events’ effect on the parameters chosen for this study – trust, commitment, brand involvement, brand emotions, brand attitudes and customer value – tend to be more positive, thus confirming that events do have an effect on customer-brand relationships. The following correlation and regression analysis deepened that knowledge and helped to illuminate the actual effects. The results received were somewhat surprising, as the initial belief was that events would provide a good base of knowledge for the customer, with the effects therefore being primarily cognitive. This lead to the emotional aspects events might facilitate to be somewhat overlooked, by disregarding the many emotions that are inherent within interactions. However, upon analysing the results of the study this relationship was clarified, and looking back at the theoretical framework, the study receives further support of events’ effect on the customer-brand relationship. Emotional and affective aspects have in the past been proven to deepen trust (Johnson
& Grayson, 2005) and confidence in one’s attitudes (Verplanken et al., 1998) beyond what cognitive aspects can (Lewis & Weigert, 1985), which is also believed to have little to do with convincing customers’ thinking (Travis, 2000). Instead, consumers only form passionate, emotional attachments to a few brands (Shouten & McAlexander, 1995) that they have a great bonding with (Lambe et al., 2001) – psychological and mental differences that are difficult for the competitors to copy (Koshkaki, 2014). While customer-brand relationships most likely need more than just event marketing in order to be established, maintained or enhanced, events can facilitate that deeper emotional connection that is seen as not only important to relationships, but vital.

This does not mean, however, that the cognitive aspects in relationships should be disregarded where events are concerned, as the initial analysis showed stronger support for cognitive brand attitudes due to the direct experience the event can facilitate, than affective attitudes. It also revealed some support for events’ ability to provide epistemic value, or the need for knowledge (Smith & Colgate, 2007) – a primarily cognitive value. While relationships would not be strong without an emotional attachment, knowledge is still a necessary condition for trust to be generated (Lewis & Weigert, 1985) and for attitudes to arise (Verplanken et al., 1998). This study therefore illuminates events’ ability to facilitate both cognitive and affective aspects of customer-brand relationships, as well as their potentially strong effect on them.

5.1 Managerial Implications

Many companies have in the past organised and participated in brand events without necessarily understanding the actual benefits of event marketing on their relationships with their customers – it has very often been seen as merely a tool that can help generate more brand knowledge and increased sales, despite the knowledge that it does affect the relationships. However, companies need to start realizing the potential event marketing has beyond revenue, and start to include them as a tool in their relationship marketing-toolbox. This study found that while events do have a cognitive effect, which increases customers’ knowledge, the emotional effects are demonstrated more often due to the interactions that events can help generate between
the customer and the brand. This means that events play a necessary, perhaps even vital, role in developing, maintaining and enhancing the relationships with customers, and that it is something that companies should keep in mind while making strategic decisions about the management of their customer-brand relationships. It also means that the events the companies are involved in today need to be more carefully planned to maximize the emotional effect and enable that deeper emotional connection, which is at the heart of a true relationship and that constitutes a competitive advantage for the company.

5.2 Suggestions for Future Studies

In this study, several of the hypotheses developed were confirmed. Based on these, a model was created (see figure 3) that shows the individual relationships between each theory, event marketing and the customer-brand relationship. A solid line in the figure indicates a confirmed relationship, while a dashed line indicates a partially confirmed one. It is suggested that this is tested by structural equation modelling in order for the model and the results of this study to be further verified.

![Figure 3 - Proposed model of relationships between the different theories](image)

Furthermore, each of the aspects studied in this thesis can be used for individual studies on event and relationship marketing in the future in order to give a more complete picture of the effects pertaining to that particular aspect, both with quantitative and qualitative studies. For example, individual studies on event marketing and trust alone would enlighten and deepen the knowledge even more than what this study has been able to do, and would generate more knowledge as to the
effects of event marketing. These studies should also aim at receiving a larger sample and a broader variety of events, as this study had fewer respondents and only food-related events. A larger sample would increase the generalizability of the study, while different events might elicit different insights.
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## Appendix 1 - Operationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Between which years are you born?</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Asked to investigate the spread and, therefore, generalizability of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Asked to investigate the spread and, therefore, the generalizability of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did you know the brand before the event?</td>
<td>Brand Knowledge</td>
<td>Customer-Brand Relationships</td>
<td>Asked to determine whether or not there was a relationship already established between the customer and the brand prior to the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Did you ever purchase anything from this brand before the event?</td>
<td>Previous Purchase</td>
<td>Customer-Brand Relationships</td>
<td>Asked to determine whether or not there was a deeper relationship already established between the customer and the brand prior to the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. If yes, how many times have you purchased from this brand?</td>
<td>Number of Times Purchased</td>
<td>Customer-Brand Relationships</td>
<td>Asked to investigate the potential strength of the relationship between the customer and the brand, if there was one prior to the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How interested are you of other brands within the same product category?</td>
<td>Interest in Other Brands</td>
<td>Customer-Brand Relationships</td>
<td>Asked to investigate the strength of the relationship. If the respondent is interested in other brands within the same product category, they are believed to have a weaker relationship with the particular brand in question, and vice versa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. After the event, are you planning to buy products from the brand in the future?</td>
<td>Future Purchase</td>
<td>Customer-Brand Relationships</td>
<td>Asked to investigate whether or not the event can help initiate relationships if no relationship has been developed prior to the event, or if it can help deepen already established relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How satisfied are you with the event?

Satisfaction | Brand Involvement | Asked to investigate the customers’ satisfaction with the event, which is believed to be able to lead to higher brand involvement.

8. After the event, I feel more attached to the brand.

Attachment | Brand Involvement | Asked to investigate how the event affects brand involvement by affecting the perceived attachment.

9. I attended this event because…

- Physical Attributes
  - I wanted to find out more about the brand’s physical attributes or offering.
- Like the Brand
  - I like this brand.
- Social Reason
  - I wanted to interact with others who are interested in the same things as me.
- Friends
  - My friends were going.
- Curiosity
  - I was curious about the brand.
- Personal Interest
  - It was relevant to my own personal interests.

The measurements used in this question were inspired by Sheth et al. (1991), but the actual questions were inspired by a study made by Sweeney and Soutar (2001) as well as the general nature of the concept. If the respondent attended the event due to one of these reasons, it is believed that a higher value will be gained from it.

10. After attending the event, I think the brand is…

Appealing | Brand Attitudes – Cognitive and Affective Components | Asked to investigate the impact events might have on the emotional and knowledge-based components of attitude. The four measurements used here are adapted from Spears and Singh’s (2004) study, however, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Less pleasant&lt;br&gt;More pleasant</td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Less favourable&lt;br&gt;More favourable</td>
<td>Favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Less likeable&lt;br&gt;More likeable</td>
<td>Likeable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurement “good” was excluded from this particular study.

11. After attending the event, I think the brand seems…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Friendly</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Approachable</td>
<td>Approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Competent/Skilful</td>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Reliable</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Honest</td>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurements used in this question are inspired by Calefato et al. (2015), and are used to investigate how events can impact the perceived benevolence, integrity, predictability and ability of the brand, and therefore impact the overall trust.

12. After the event, which of the following emotions do you have towards the brand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Joy</td>
<td>Joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Annoyed</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Boring</td>
<td>Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Fine</td>
<td>Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Expectation</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The measurements used in this question were adapted from Martensen et al. (2007) to investigate the impact events can have on brand emotions – whether positive or negative.

| Table 1.1 Operationalization |
Appendix 2 - Age and Gender Divisions

Figure 2.1 Age division in the study

- 1949 or earlier: 5%
- 1950-1959: 19%
- 1960-1969: 15%
- 1970-1979: 32%
- 1980-1989: 21%
- 1990-2000: 8%

Figure 2.2 Gender division in the study

- Women: 67%
- Men: 29%
- Don't want to disclose: 4%
Appendix 3 - Brand Emotions, Brand Attitudes and Trust Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pleasant</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Favourable</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Likeable</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Friendly</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Approachable</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Competent</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Honest</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fine</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Expectation</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Correlations between brand emotions, brand attitudes and trust