

When Failures Can Be Good:

A quantitative study of how planned failures influence consumers' behaviour

Abstract

In a world of information overload it is becoming increasingly important for marketers to resort to creative and engaging marketing tools to get their communication message to stand out. It has therefore become more and more popular to use experiential event marketing due to its high consumer involvement and interaction. This research has focused on the creative method of using fake failures in experiential event marketing to attract consumers' attention. A quantitative experiment was conducted to examine what effect a "planned failure" in experiential event marketing could have on consumers' brand interest, future loyalty intention, word of mouth intention, purchase intention as well as perceived brand personality. It was also studied how the results differed if the consumers found out that the failure was pre-planned. The primary findings from the research indicate that planned failures increase brand interest as well as influence perceived brand personality. It was also found that word of mouth intention can increase as a result of the planned failure. When the consumers found out about the planned failure the positive effects were reduced.

Key words: experiential marketing, event marketing, planned failure, consumer behaviour

Authors: Matilda Stoltz 21598 and Maria Selting 21532

Tutor: Karina Töndevold

Examiner: Deo Dharam Sharma

THANKS TO...

Karina Töndevold for her priceless support
Erik Modig for inspiration and continuous help
Anne-Marie Flynn for valuable expertise knowledge
Frida Ottosson, Elin Svanberg, Lena Lundström
Stoltz and **David Stoltz** for helpful input...

...and to all participants in our survey who made this
thesis possible.

Contents

Introduction	5
Background	5
Research Question and Purpose	6
Delimitations	6
Expected Contributions	6
Disposition.....	6
Terminology and Definitions	7
Planned Failure.....	7
Planned Failure with Disclosure	7
Theoretical Framework	7
Event Marketing.....	7
Experiential Marketing	8
Experiential Event Marketing	9
Brand Interest	10
Future Loyalty Intention	10
Word of Mouth Intention.....	11
Purchase Intention	11
Brand Personality	12
Method.....	12
Choice of Scientific Approach.....	12
Research and Survey Design.....	13
Scenario Design and Measuring Methods.....	13
Feasibility Study.....	15
Sample Selection	15
Quality of Research	16
Reliability	16
Validity.....	16
Result and Analysis	17
Demography of Respondents and Manipulation Test.....	18
Brand Interest	20
Future Loyalty Intention	20

Word of Mouth Intention.....	20
Purchase Intention	20
Brand Personality	21
Summary of Results.....	22
Discussion and Implications	23
Discussion.....	23
Limitations and Critique against the Research	26
Recommendations for Practitioners.....	27
Recommendations for Future Research.....	28
References.....	29
Appendix	33

Introduction

Background

In today's modern world of information overload it is becoming harder for marketers to break through the wall of disrupting noises and get their own message to reach their targeted customer. It is therefore becoming increasingly important to come up with new creative and innovative ways of communicating to make the message stand out from all other stimulus consumers are exposed to every day. Some marketers resort to shocks whilst others invest in interactive marketing activities involving all of the consumers' five senses. The latter has become increasingly popular during the last decade in the form of event marketing, where the consumers actively participate in an event. When the consumer gets to experience the product/brand within the form of a marketing event is also known as experiential event marketing. Experiential event marketing could be used for different purposes and goals such as increasing word of mouth, boost sales, increase brand awareness and influence brand image. The goal with the event is to provide the consumer with a unique and memorable experience. To achieve this, the marketer needs to be creative and innovative when designing the event, which differentiates an experiential marketing event from a marketing event. One example case that particularly caught our interest is an anonymous Swedish clothing brand which experienced themselves having a problem with being perceived as too old-fashioned and boring. In an attempt to change this perception they staged an outdoor event for consumers and opinion leaders without applying for permission to serve alcohol. During the event the police showed up, confiscated the alcohol and the CEO of the company was charged with violating the Public Order Act. The story was later published in national newspapers and became a buzz around the country. What many people do not know is the fact the whole scenario was prearranged and the staff of the company called the police and the journalists themselves. The company chose to deliberately "fail" in an attempt to be perceived as more youthful and rebellious. This type of PR-trick is what we choose to call a "planned failure". Since little research exists within this topic, we find it interesting to examine the effects of a planned failure. Additionally, we find it interesting to investigate whether the effect would be different if the information that the failure was planned would be disclosed.

Research Question and Purpose

The purpose of the research is to examine how planned failures in experiential event marketing influence consumers' behaviour and their perceptions of a brand. We have found five areas of particular interest to examine its effect on; brand interest, future loyalty intention, word of mouth intention, purchase intention and perceived brand personality. Since little research exists within the experiential event marketing area our goal is to quantify a planned failure's effect on consumers' behaviour, primarily for evaluation purposes. Furthermore, the research seeks to examine what happens when the consumers are disclosed to the information that the failure was planned and consequently the risk of staging a planned failure.

Delimitations

In order to make the research executable within the given time period some delimitations were necessary. The study was therefore delimited to examining the effect of a planned failure based on a lifestyle product. In this particular case a clothing brand was chosen. Furthermore the study was delimited to studying the effect of one type of planned failure. Finally, the sample of research was delimited to respondents living in Sweden.

Expected Contributions

The aim of the research is to provide an indication of what effects planned failures in experiential event marketing might have as well as serve as a foundation for future research. Our goal is also that the research will serve as an inspiration for practitioners as well as contribute to spreading the knowledge of the concept experiential event marketing.

Disposition

The following chapter provides the reader with a theoretical overview of the area as well as the parameters of research. This chapter outlines how the hypotheses of the research have been deduced from existing theory. The second chapter describes the methodology (scientific approach, experiment and statistical analysis) used. The third chapter includes the findings from the analysis of the experiment. In the fourth chapter the results are discussed, their implications as well as how the research conform to existing theory.

Terminology and Definitions

To avoid confusion among the topic concepts of research we have chosen to outline our own definitions used for this particular research.

Planned Failure

A section of a live event which has been prearranged but designed to make the participants believe it was a failure. The concept includes both the “failure” itself as well as the manner of which it has been managed by the company host.

Planned Failure with Disclosure

The concept involves a planned failure, as defined above, with the addition of the participants finding out that the failure was planned.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is divided into two main parts. The first part provides the reader with a contextual overview of which the research has been conducted. The second part outlines the theory of each chosen dependent variable that has generated our hypotheses.

Event Marketing

Still considered a relatively novel marketing tool, the influence and use of event marketing has become increasingly popular. This is due to changes in the marketing environment as less attention is paid to conventional advertising and the move towards experiential consumption (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2006a). As a consequence of the existing information overflow, consumers increasingly practice a number of avoidance strategies, such as zapping (Lee and Tse 2001, Rumbo 2002).

A marketing event is an event where the targeted consumers are involved in an activity, e.g. doing sports or being creative, offering the opportunity for social interaction between the participants and the hosting company (Sneath, Close, Finney and Lacey 2006, Drengner, Gaus, Jahn 2008). Marketing events must be clearly distinguished from event sponsorship, since marketing events are self-staged while event sponsorship involves the right to be associated with an event staged by a third independent party in exchange of a sponsorship fee. (Drengner, Gaus, Jahn 2008). Although consumers are aware events are designed to communicate the same advertising messages they typically try to avoid using previously listed avoidance-strategies, as they are often highly motivated

to voluntarily participate in marketing events. (Wohlfeil and Whelan 2006b). This explains the increased popularity of using events as a marketing tool.

Experiential Marketing

Companies have increasingly moved away from the traditional view of the consumer rationally evaluating features and benefits of a brand's products/services. Instead there has been a shift towards enhancement of transformational features such as fantasies, feelings and fun (Holbrook and Hirschman 1982). This, called experiential marketing, is becoming increasingly important due to three factors. Firstly, communication today is mostly driven by information technology with higher speed and availability. A transformation in media has taken place as a result from new technology development and changes in society. Secondly, information about brands is now instant and everywhere. Additionally, organizations previously not considered as brands, for example schools and TV channels, are now treated and advertised as such. The third factor to the increased importance of experiential marketing is that companies have become better at communicating with their customers and the communication is no longer just one-way (Schmitt 1999). Survey results indicate that experiential marketing is one of the most effective methods for increasing purchase probability (Latham 2008). Carù and Cova (2003) suggest that experiential marketing lies within extraordinary consumer experiences, rather than within the consumption experience. A consumption experience can occur with or without a market relation. An example of the latter could be consumption of a product over a dinner at a friend's place. A consumer experience can also occur without it being a consumption experience, for example when purchasing a product for another party. For a consumer experience to be extraordinary, practitioners strive towards creating a so-called flow-state. This highly enjoyable psychological state, first described by Csikszentmihalyi (1997, p. 36), enters when people feel that they act with total involvement in an activity. Only a small fraction of consumer experiences can be classified as flow activities, nonetheless are they of crucial importance since they represent peak consumer experiences (Arnould, Price and Zinkhan 2002, p. 427). McCole (2004) emphasizes that marketing during the 21st century is more challenging than ever due to fragmented media and at the same time consumers have become increasingly clever, articulated as well as they have developed their ability to think freely. NZ Marketing Magazine (2003) writes that a commercial in the peak-period of television had the potential of reaching over 40% of the population, whilst the same number was 15% during 2003. In order to overcome the

marketing challenges of the 21st century, McCole (2004) suggests that the marketer should focus on making the consumer emotionally attached to the product/brand by using creative means.

Experiential Event Marketing

In this study, experiential event marketing is defined as a marketing event created to immerse the participants with the experience to the extent that a flow state is reached. According to Wood (2009), the growth of experiential event marketing is mainly due to four factors. Firstly, the overuse of traditional media has led to the increased need of trying new things differentiating them from the competitors. Secondly, consumers are becoming increasingly individualistic and desire holistic lifestyle experiences that add value. Thirdly, the need for building emotional attachment to products that by nature are largely undifferentiated. The final factor is the expansion within related marketing areas, increasing the belief in the effectiveness of event marketing and their ability to produce even more creative, unique and highly tailored events.

Large organizations have consequently switched their marketing expenditure towards experiential event marketing instead of the traditional marketing methods (Wood 2009). Yet, there is lack of evidence proving the effectiveness of the method, which has led to companies relying on speculations from practitioners when conducting these experiential marketing events. Nevertheless, Wood and Masterman (2007), as listed in Wood (2009), suggests seven attributes of experiential event marketing that enhances the event experience, helps creating a flow-state experience and hence the effectiveness of the event. These attributes are called the “7 I: s”:

- *Involvement* - an emotional involvement with the brand, the event and the experience
- *Interaction* - with brand ambassadors, other attendees, exhibits and the brand
- *Immersion* – of all senses in isolation from other external messages
- *Intensity* – a memorable experience with high impact
- *Individuality* – the creation of an individual experience, each participant’s experience is unique
- *Innovation* – creativity of content and design
- *Integrity* - seen as genuine and authentic, providing real benefits and value added to the consumer

Nevertheless, experiential event marketing is an area of which very little existing research exists.

Brand Interest

According to Machleit, Madden and Allen (1990) brand interest is defined as “the level of interest or intrigue the consumer has in the brand and the level of curiosity s/he has to inquire or learn more about the brand”. Dahlén, Rosengren and Törn (2008) showed that more versus less creative advertising lead to consumers getting more interested in the brand which was perceived to be of higher quality, since it signalled more effort on the advertiser’s behalf and was perceived as proof of the brand’s smartness and ability to solve problems. This research provides incentives to assume that an innovative planned failure, with or without disclosure, can increase brand interest:

H1a: A planned failure will increase brand interest

H1b: A planned failure with disclosure will increase brand interest

Future Loyalty Intention

Retailer loyalty is defined as “the tendency to be loyal to a retailer, as demonstrated by the intention to purchase from the retailer as a primary choice” (Pappu and Quester 2006, Yoo and Donthu 2001). According to McAlexander, Kim, Roberts (2003), loyalty is an evolutionary process driven by experience. It is with experience customers have the occasion to develop additional and meaningful contents of brand community that can create a strong bind that affects satisfaction and loyalty. Further, they point out that it is important to pay attention to the holistic consumption experience. Söderlund (2010a) argues that the impact satisfaction has on loyalty long has been exaggerated by marketers. He emphasizes that it is indeed a factor that to some extent affects loyalty, but that emotions and switching barriers are more important for building loyalty. Authors before that study have argued that delight (Rust and Oliver 2000) and joy (Söderlund 2008) also may have strong effect on loyalty, which is also an emotional factor. Since the planned failure was designed to enhance the flow-state experience and hence the emotions of the participants, we hypothesize that a planned failure will increase future loyalty intention. On the other hand, Bagozzi (1975) states that retailers will not obtain repeat purchases if the consumer is taken advantage of and thereby is feeling deceived. If the participants are informed that the failure indeed was staged by the company, there is a risk of them feeling deceived and taken advantage of. This leads us to the following hypotheses:

H2a: A planned failure will increase future loyalty intention

H2b: A planned failure with disclosure does not increase future loyalty intention.

Word of Mouth Intention

Word of mouth intention refers to the interpersonal communication spreading knowledge and thoughts of a brand (Dichter 1966, Vázquez-Casielles, Suárez-Álvarez, del Río-Lanza 2013, Brooks, R. C., Jr 1957). An intrapersonal relationship will almost always outweigh the passivity of a one-sided and purely formal relationship. When the customer feels that the advertiser speaks to him as a friend or as an unbiased authority, creating the atmosphere of word of mouth, the consumer will relax and tend to accept the recommendation (Dichter 1966). Recent research shows that positive word of mouth can positively influence the receiver's brand-purchase probability and negative word of mouth can negatively influence the receiver's brand-purchase probability. However, the positive word of mouth effects have a stronger impact on brand purchase probability than the negative effects caused by negative word of mouth (Vázquez-Casielles, Suárez-Álvarez, del Río-Lanza 2013). Keller (2007) states that most word of mouth in fact is positive towards the brand, with a margin of more than six to one. He states that this means that we should consider consumers as being mostly supportive of brands and companies in the sense that they want to connect good brands with good friends. However, which effect that has greatest impact on an experiential marketing event is an object that we will examine further. A planned failure in experiential event marketing is, by its very nature, creative and avant-garde, which should mean that word of mouth is likely to increase both with and without disclosure. However, if the participants of the event with disclosure are left with negative feelings of deception (Bagozzi 1975), they may not communicate the event further. Although it is unclear which effect that will be strongest, it is our hypothesis that the two effects will outweigh each other and no significant change in word of mouth intentions on a planned failure with disclosure will take place.

H3a: A planned failure will increase word of mouth intention.

H3b: A planned failure with disclosure will not increase word of mouth intention.

Purchase Intention

Imran, Ghauri and Majeed (2012) defines purchase intention according to Laroche and Zhou (1996), Laroche and Sadokierski (1994), MacKenzie, Lutz and Belch (1986), as individual's intention to buy a specific brand which they have chosen for themselves after certain evaluation. Recent research by Nasermodeli, Choon Ling and Maghnati (2013), shows that only emotional experience and social experience are positively related to purchase intention. This leads us to hypothesize that a planned failure in experiential event marketing can increase future loyalty intention. On the other hand, as

previously stated, when the participants gain knowledge about the disclosure there is a risk of them feeling deceived. Since loyalty and purchase intention are interrelated this leads us to formulate our hypotheses in line with future loyalty intention:

H4a: A planned failure will increase purchase intention.

H4b: A planned failure with disclosure does not increase purchase intention.

Brand Personality

Brand personality is defined as a set of human characteristics associated with a brand (Aaker 1997). Brand personality tends to serve a symbolic or self-expressive function (Keller 1993). In her work, Aaker (1997) defines five dimensions of brand personality: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness. Different brands may focus on different parts of brand personality (for example Marlborough focuses on ruggedness and Mercedes on sophistication) and thereby match their marketing approaches to enhance the desired brand personality. This has led our research to focus on the part of brand personality that belongs to excitement, since this dimension best match the characteristics of an experiential marketing event. By conducting an innovative planned failure matching the nature of the excitement dimension it is our hypothesis that brand personality can be influenced by the planned failure, regardless of including the disclosure or not.

H5a: A planned failure will change brand personality.

H5b: A planned failure with disclosure will change brand personality.

Method

Choice of Scientific Approach

The hypotheses of the research have been deduced from existing theory. The paper is therefore of a deductive scientific approach. Deductive scientific approaches are typically associated with quantitative research methods (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 13). Therefore a quantitative web-survey was chosen as a research method for this paper. Since the purpose of the research is to study how a planned failure (independent variable) in experiential event marketing influence the chosen dependent variables (brand interest, future loyalty intention, word of mouth intention, purchase intention and brand personality) the study is of a causal/descriptive nature (Wahlund 2013, p. 2). One common method for causal studies is survey based experiments, which is why we chose the same research design for our experiment (Wahlund 2013, p. 3). Experimental researches are

associated with generating robust and reliable causal results and thereby the research method serves as a good basis for the analysis (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 45). A potential issue with the experimental approach is the generalizability to other settings than the particular conditions of the specific experiment (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 47).

Research and Survey Design

Scenario Design and Measuring Methods

The quantitative experiment was executed by sending out scenario-based questions to three different groups of respondents. To test the hypotheses three versions of the same base scenario were designed. One was distributed to the control group and the two others to two different experimental groups. The structure that served the basis for the design of the scenarios was as follows:

- Scenario 1: a neutral marketing event (control group), distributed to respondent group 1
- Scenario 2: scenario 1 with the addition of a planned failure aiming to enhance the flow-state experience, and thereby create an experiential marketing event (experimental group 1), distributed to respondent group 2
- Scenario 3: scenario 2 with the addition of a disclosure to the planned failure (experimental group 2), distributed to respondent group 3

The scenarios were consequently designed in layers revealing an increasing amount of information. This modelling structure was chosen in order to isolate the effect of the planned failure (with or without disclosure) as much as possible from other influencing parameters. This reasoning was further developed by inventing a fictional brand in order to eliminate consumers' preconceptions of existing brands that possibly could influence the results. Since the case that inspired us to conduct the research was a clothing brand, we designed a fictional brand that we chose to name "Urban Style".

When designing scenario 2 (based on the outlined structure) the aim was to produce a story including as many of the suggested "7 I: s" characterizing experiential event marketing as possible. Since every person's experience is different it is impossible to know whether every respondent perceived the scenario as we wished, although our view is that the designed scenario fulfilled the purpose. An additional criteria when designing the planned failure was that it could not cause any harm/waste resources of society whilst at the same time be turned into something "cool" by the way

it was managed. Based on these criteria and structure the scenarios were designed and the full versions are available in appendix.

The scenarios were distributed to the three different respondent groups based on their birth date of each month (1st-10th, 11th-20th and 21st-31st). This was done to resemble a random selection process. The respondents were asked to read their distributed scenario carefully and afterwards answer some questions related to brand interest, future loyalty intention, word of mouth intention, purchase intention and brand personality. Brand interest was measured using the questions “I find the (Urban Style) brand interesting” and “I want to buy products from this brand” (taken from Dahlén, Rosengren, and Törn 2008). Future loyalty intention was measured using the questions “In the future, my loyalty towards this brand would be high” and “In the future, I would prefer to buy products from this brand” (taken from Fuchs, Prandelli and Schreier 2010). Word of mouth intention was measured using the questions “I would recommend this brand to my friends”, “I would ‘talk this brand up’ to my friends” and “I would try to spread the word about this brand” (also taken from Fuchs, Prandelli and Schreier 2010). All questions related to brand interest, future loyalty intention and word of mouth intention were measured on a Likert scale (1-7) from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Purchase intention was measured using the question “Assuming this brand sells the type of clothes you normally wear, how likely is it that you would buy a product from this brand?” with the anchors “unlikely/likely”, “improbable/probable” and “do not want to buy/want to buy” (taken from Rosengren and Dahlén 2013) measured on a Likert scale (1-7). To test the credibility of the scenarios a manipulation test was also performed measuring the perceived realism in the scenarios. The level of realism was examined using the base question “How realistic do you think this scenario is?” with the anchors “unreal/real”, “low credibility/high credibility” and “false/true” (taken from Söderlund and Rosengren 2007) measured on a Likert scale (1-7). Mean variables were created from the groups of related questions which formed the variables “brand interest”, “future loyalty intention”, “word of mouth intention”, “purchase intention” and finally “level of realism” which served as measurements for the dependent variables. To establish reliability of the measures, Cronbachs alpha tests (for variables including three questions) and correlation tests (for variables including two questions) were performed (for more information see the Reliability section on p. 16).

Brand personality was measured using a list of ten adjectives of which the respondents were asked to rank how strongly they agreed that the adjectives described the brand. The goal of the event was to enhance the “excitement” dimension of Aaker’s brand personality model and therefore a list of words directly chosen from, or related, to the excitement part were selected. The adjectives chosen for the test were tailored to suit the designed event but at the same time relate to the excitement dimension. The adjectives chosen were “Trendy”, “Cool”, “Rebellious”, “Inspiring”, “Up-to-date”, “Fashionable”, “Youthful” and “Innovative”. In addition two antonyms, “Boring” and “Old-fashioned” were chosen to test the discriminant validity of the experiment. The responses were measured on a Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree (1-7). Finally, the respondents were asked to answer some demographic questions. To see the complete survey distributed see appendix.

Feasibility Study

Before the web-survey was distributed it was pre-tested on a number of ten respondents. This was done to ensure that the respondents understood the questions, check if there existed any uncertainties and thereby increase validity of the research. After having received feedback from the feasibility study a few adjustments and clarifications were made. To avoid missing data we changed the settings in Qualtrics so that the respondents were forced to answer all questions. Furthermore we added the text “please read the text below carefully” before the scenario.

Sample Selection

In order to efficiently obtain a large number of respondents within a short period of time the decision was made to use a convenience sample method. The survey was conducted in Qualtrics and it was distributed via email and Facebook during the 26th of February to the 2nd of March 2013. It was distributed mainly to people in the age of 20-30 years old from the Stockholm School of Economics and the Royal Institute of Technology. A total number of 225 responses were collected during the period. The convenience sample was consequently biased towards the target group of which the survey was distributed to. Since the aim of the research was to measure reactions to different modifications, and not measure specific opinions, it is arguable that the biased sample should have a limited effect on the results. Additionally, the respondents in the survey represent the same target consumer group as the target audience of the designed event, which can be seen as a justification of the convenience sample method.

Quality of Research

Two common concepts when evaluating the quality of a research are reliability and validity. Reliability refers to the extent that a measure provides the same result in repeated experiments whilst validity refers to the extent that the measure in fact measures what it is supposed to (Söderlund 2010b, p. 161). Although the concepts are normally evaluated separately it is important to keep in mind that they are not mutually exclusive since, without measurement reliability, it is naturally impossible to have measurement validity.

Reliability

If a measure of a study produces consistent results the measure is associated with high reliability. (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 41). In a lecture, 629 Degree Project in Marketing, presented at Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm, on 19 February, Dr. M. Söderlund suggested that ideally the same study should be repeated identically at different points in time. However since, in reality, that involves some practical difficulties researches can resort to other methods to create high reliability. The most common way to circumvent this problem is to ask multiple related questions aiming to measure the same issue. If the respondents answer in the same way on all the related questions then the measure is associated with high reliability. The standard way to test this is to do a Cronbachs alpha test which measures to what degree the respondents have answered consistently on all questions relating to the same issue (Söderlund 2010b, p. 162). Cronbachs alpha ranges from 0-1 and a value over 0,6 is typically desired (Malhotra 2010, p. 319). The limitation of the Cronbachs alpha test is that it requires a minimum of three questions. For measures including only two questions a correlation test is usually done instead where a correlation over 0,6 is desired (Stockholm School of Economics (SSE) 2012, p. 10). All mean variables of the research scored either a Cronbachs alpha over 0,91 or a correlation over 0,84. The measures of this paper are therefore associated with high internal consistency and reliability (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 10).

Validity

Once reliability has been established the validity of the research can be evaluated. In order to be fairly certain that the measures in fact measure what they are supposed to standardized and previously scientifically tested questions were used. Two common concepts of evaluation are external and internal validity, which are explained and discussed below (Söderlund 2010b, p. 197).

Internal Validity

Internal validity refers to the issue of causality and thereby the extent that independent variable has caused the variation in the dependent variable (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 42). In order to isolate the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable the survey was designed in a fashion to eliminate as many external influences as possible. As previously stated a fictional brand was designed to avoid any preconceptions influencing the responses. Therefore, we can be fairly sure that the independent variables were at least partially responsible for the variations in the dependent variables. However, it is not certain what part of the modification in scenario 2 (was it the nature of the planned failure, the fact that it was a failure or the way it was managed) that actually caused the variation in the dependent variables. The research therefore reflects how the modification as a whole influenced the dependent variables.

External Validity

External validity refers to the extent that the results of the study can be generalized to other situations (Söderlund 2010b, p. 199). Just as reliability is a precondition to validity, internal validity is a precondition to external validity (Söderlund 2010b, p. 199). Since only one experiment has been conducted limited to one type of product and brand the generalizability of the results are rather low. In order to produce more generalizable results a series of experiments using different types of scenarios, brands and products needs to be conducted. Moreover, the sample did not represent a random sample of the Swedish population. This is somewhat limiting the generalizability of the results to the selected sample target group. In defence of this possible critique the delimitations of the research were made purposely and the intention was not to produce highly generalizable conclusions. The aim is rather to provide an indication of how planned failures may affect the areas of research and serve as a springboard for further research.

Result and Analysis

The total number of 225 respondents was evenly distributed between the three respondent groups (75 respondents in each group). A precondition for performing the ANOVA test is a normal distribution assumption (Stockholm School of Economics (SSE) 2011, p. 5). Therefore normal distribution tests were conducted in SPSS. According to the tests all variables were normally distributed at a 0,000 significance level (both for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk

measures). The assumption for performing the ANOVA test therefore held. Furthermore, since the responses were measured on an interval scale, in combination with the fact that the groups of comparison were of equal size, an ANOVA Tukey test was performed (Stockholm School of Economics (SSE) 2012, p. 6). The hypotheses were tested by comparing the control group to experiment group 1 (HXa-hypotheses) and the control group to experiment group 2 (HXb-hypotheses). In order to add depth to the analysis the two experiment groups were also compared which served as a basis for evaluating the potential risks involved when conducting a planned failure. At first a significance level of 5% was set as a standard for the analysis. However, in order to add depth to the analysis the results have been analysed at both 5% and 10% significance levels. It is however important to keep in mind that the conclusions derived at a 10% significance level should be viewed as less strong as the conclusions derived at a 5% significant level.

Demography of Respondents and Manipulation Test

90% of our respondents were in the age of 18-30 years old, 60% were students and 57% were female. The main influence the biased sample might have is the overwhelming majority of students, which possibly could have influenced purchase intention negatively. Apart from that our view is that the demography of the respondents, to a high degree, resembles the same target group as the participants of an event of this kind. The mean age for the three different respondent groups ranged between 25,1-26,4 years old, 53,3-62,7% were women, 58,7-65,3% were students and finally 28-41,3% were full time employed. See table 1 for the full overview of the demography of the respondents. In order to analyse whether any significant differences existed in terms of demography between the groups a Chi-Square test was performed. Pearson Chi-Square scored 0,492 on age, 0,353 on gender and 0,173 on occupation. Therefore no significant heterogeneity existed (at 10% significance level) between the groups that may have influenced the reliability of the results. The perceived level of realism in the scenarios were 4,91 for the control group; 3,56 for experiment group 1 and 4,33 for the experiment group 2 (see table 2). This entails that the respondents were rather neutral in terms of how realistic they perceived the scenario to be. Therefore the level of realism in the scenarios should not significantly have influenced the results of the analysis.

Table 1. Demography of the respondents in the different groups

		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Gender	Male	37%	44%	47%
	Female	63%	56%	53%
Age	Mean age (years)	26,42	25,05	25,48
Occupation	Student	65%	59%	61%
	Employed	28%	41%	32%
	Retired	0%	0%	0%
	Unemployed	0%	0%	1%
	Self-employed	7%	0%	5%
	Other	0%	0%	0%

Table 2. Result of variables tested, mean values and standard deviation

Dependent variable	Mean values			Standard deviation		
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
purchase intention	5,04	5,13	4,80	1,48	1,44	1,53
future loyalty intention	4,09	4,48	3,92	1,62	1,49	1,49
word of mouth intention	4,08	4,65	4,37	1,70	1,64	1,53
brand interest	4,09	4,79	4,59	1,65	1,46	1,46
level of realism	4,91	3,56	4,33	1,43	1,45	1,50

Table 3. Hypothesis testing, significance and mean differences between the groups of comparison

Dependent variable	Hypothesis	Groups compared (x; y)	Mean diff. (x - y)	Significance p=
brand interest	H1a	1; 2	-0,69	0,02
	H1b	1; 3	-0,50	0,11
		2; 3	0,19	0,72
future loyalty intention	H2a	1;2	-0,39	0,27
	H2b	1;3	0,17	0,77
		2;3	0,56	0,07
word of mouth intention	H3a	1; 2	-0,58	0,08
	H3b	1; 3	-0,29	0,51
		2; 3	0,28	0,53
purchase intention	H4a	1; 2	-0,09	0,93
	H4b	1; 3	0,24	0,57
		2; 3	0,33	0,36

Sign. at 5% sign. level

Sign. at 10% sign. level

Brand Interest

Brand interest was significantly higher, at a 5% significance level, in experiment group 1 than the control group. The mean difference was 0,69 (see table 3) higher in the experiment group 1 than the control group. No other significant differences existed between any of the groups. The test thereby rejected the null-hypothesis for H1a and failed to reject the null-hypothesis for H1b. H1a was therefore empirically supported (5% significance level) whilst H1b was rejected (10% significance level): a planned failure can increase brand interest whilst a planned failure with disclosure does not increase brand interest.

Future Loyalty Intention

At a significance level of 5% no significant differences existed between any of the groups. At a 10% significance level experiment group 1 scored significantly higher than experiment group 2 with a mean difference of 0,56. The test failed to reject the null-hypotheses (at a 10% significance level) for both H2a and H2b whereby H2a was rejected whilst H2b was supported: a planned failure, with or without disclosure, does not increase future loyalty intention.

Word of Mouth Intention

At a 5% significance level no significant differences existed between any groups in terms of word of mouth. However at a 10% significance level word of mouth intention scored significantly higher in experiment group 1 than the control group with a mean difference of 0,58. No other significant differences existed between any of the groups. The test thereby succeeded to reject the null-hypothesis for H3a and failed to reject the null-hypothesis for H3b. The results therefore provide us with empirical support for both H3a (10% significance level) and H3b (10% significance level): a planned failure can increase word of mouth intention whilst a planned failure with disclosure does not increase word of mouth intention.

Purchase Intention

No significant differences existed between any of the groups in terms of purchase intention at neither 5% nor 10% significance level. The test thereby failed to reject the null-hypotheses for both H4a and H4b whereby H4a was rejected (10% significance level) and H4b was supported (10% significance level): a planned failure, with or without disclosure, does not increase purchase intention.

Brand Personality

Many significant differences exist between the groups in terms of brand personality. The mean differences of the adjectives tested ranged from 0,51 up to 2,27. This entails that there did not only exist significant differences but the differences were also relatively large. The most significant differences existed between the control group and experiment group 1 and the least significant differences existed between the two experiment groups. The largest significant difference existed between the control group and the experiment group 2 for the variable “rebellious”, with a mean difference of 2,27 higher for the experiment group 2. “Rebellious” was also significantly higher in the experiment group 2 than experiment group 1, which was the only significant difference that existed between those two groups. The experiment group 1 scored significantly higher mean values than the control group on the adjectives rebellious, inspiring, youthful and innovative. The two opposite adjectives (boring and old-fashioned) used to test the discriminant validity, scored significantly higher for the control group than the experiment group 1. This adds credibility to the results of the other adjectives. The results above are significant at a 5% significance level.

Table 4. Perceived brand personality testing, group comparisons

Adjective	Mean values			Group comparisons x - y (x; y)		
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	1; 2	1; 3	2; 3
Trendy	5,04	4,84	4,88	0,20	0,16	-0,04
Cool	4,75	5,25	5,00	-0,51	-0,25	0,25
Rebellious	3,04	4,68	5,31	-1,64	-2,27	-0,63
Inspiring	4,13	5,03	4,71	-0,89	-0,57	0,32
Up-to-date	4,43	4,68	4,76	-0,25	-0,33	-0,08
Fashionable	4,96	4,44	4,43	0,52	0,53	0,01
Youthful	4,43	5,20	5,29	-0,77	-0,87	-0,09
Innovative	3,57	5,49	5,65	-1,92	-2,08	-0,16
Boring	3,00	2,01	2,33	0,99	0,67	-0,32
Old-fashioned	3,07	1,85	1,97	1,21	1,09	-0,12
Sign. at 5% sign. level						
Sign. at 10% sign. level						

Whilst there existed many significant differences between the groups at a 5% significance level there also existed a few significant differences at a 10% significance level. To see the full list of the differences and on what significant level they are have empirically supported see table 4. It is however clear from the results that significant differences exists between the control group and both of the experiment groups in terms of perceived brand personality. Our hypotheses H5a (5%

significance level) and H5b (5% significance level) are therefore empirically supported: a planned failure, with or without disclosure, influence perceived brand personality.

Summary of Results

The result showed significant differences in terms of brand interest (5% significance level) between the control group and the experiment group 1. No significant differences between the control group and the experiment group 2 (10% significance level) existed whereby H1a had empirical support whilst H1b was rejected. In terms of future loyalty intention no significant differences existed (at 10% significance level) between the two experiment groups and the control group whereby H2a was rejected and H2b supported. Word of mouth intention was significantly higher (at 10% significance level) in experiment group 1 than the control group while no significant difference existed between the control group and experiment group 2 (10% significance level). Thereby both H3a and H3b were supported. No significant differences existed between any of the groups at either 5% or 10% significance level in terms of purchase intention. Thereby H4a was rejected whilst H4b was supported. The strongest and largest significant differences in the research were found in perceived brand personality. Significant differences (5% significance level) existed between the control group and both of the two experiment groups. Consequently, both H5a and H5b had empirical support.

Table 5. Summary of results from hypothesis testing

Hypothesis	No	Result	Significance level p<
A planned failure will increase brand interest	H1a	Supported	5%
A planned failure with disclosure will increase brand interest	H1b	Rejected	10%
A planned failure will increase future loyalty intention	H2a	Rejected	10%
A planned failure with disclosure does not increase future loyalty intention.	H2b	Supported	10%
A planned failure will increase word of mouth intention.	H3a	Supported	10%
A planned failure with disclosure will not increase word of mouth intention.	H3b	Supported	10%
A planned failure will increase purchase intention.	H4a	Rejected	10%
A planned failure with disclosure does not increase purchase intention.	H4b	Supported	10%
A planned failure will change brand personality.	H5a	Supported	5%
A planned failure with disclosure will change brand personality.	H5b	Supported	5%

Discussion and Implications

Discussion

The experiment shows that (at a 5% significance level) a planned failure can positively increase brand interest. However, since the survey was limited to examining the effect of one type of event it is hard to separate the effect of the failure from how it was in fact managed. This makes it hard to distinguish what part of the modification that contributed the most to the positive increase in brand interest for the experiment group 1 compared to the control group. Since theory implies that brand interest increases with a brand's ability to solve problems (Dahlén, Rosengren and Törn 2008) and the modification in experiment group 1 involve an element of problem solving activity the empirical support for H1a is in line with theory. It is therefore probable that the fashion in which the failure was managed was at least partially responsible for the increase in brand interest. Regardless of what part of the modification caused the largest variation in brand interest in experiment group 1, it is clear that the modification as a whole positively increased brand interest and the opportunity to showcase its problem solving ability rested upon having a failure to solve. Therefore the different parts of the modification are not mutually exclusive but co-dependent to create the full experience, as our definition of the planned failure entails. For experiment group 2, which did not experience an increase in brand interest, it is arguable that the modification in the experiment groups also contained an element of problem solving ability, due to the innovativeness of the scenario. Therefore the rejection of hypothesis H1b was not anticipated according to theory. Perhaps the respondents did not perceive the effect to be as strong by the fact that it was pre-planned and thereby the ability to quickly solve problems was not showcased as was the case in experiment group 1. The reason why only H1a and not H1b had empirical support is subject to much speculation and should be further researched. This entails, however, that the planned failure only significantly increases brand interest if the audience is kept believing that the planned failure was in fact a failure.

In terms of future loyalty intention no significant difference existed between the control group and experiment group 2. However, at a 10% significance level, future loyalty intention was significantly lower in experiment group 2 than in experiment group 1. This means that the only significant difference that existed was when finding out that the failure was planned in scenario 3 compared to scenario 2. Since theory states that if the consumers feel deceived loyalty decreases (Bagozzi 1975), this result is in line with theory, if the case is that the respondents did feel deceived in experiment

group 2 compared to experiment group 1. The hypothesis was that the respondents in experiment group 1 would gain a positive experience and thereby develop a strong bond with the brand resulting in increased future loyalty intention. The result entails that the experience was obviously not strong enough to cause an increase in future loyalty intention and one can say that in terms of future loyalty intention, only potential negative effects were found from the planned failure with disclosure. However, one needs to keep in mind that the respondents were only asked to imagine themselves participating in the event. This might have had a negative effect on the result. It is possible that the results would have been different if the experiment would have taken place in reality and the respondents would have gotten the opportunity to fully experience the event. That would have increased the effect of the “7 I: s” which would have enhanced their overall experience. If that would have caused a strong enough effect to influence future loyalty intention is subject to further research.

Word of mouth intention, in comparison to future loyalty intention, was affected in the opposite way. Experiment group 1 scored significantly higher than the control group (at a 10% significance level) whilst no significant difference existed between experiment group 1 and 2. This means that, compared to future loyalty intention, it seems as if mostly positive effects exist from the planned failure. Since the goal with experiment group 1 was to create an experience including a creative, interactive and noise-breaking marketing message, the increase in word of mouth intention is in line with theory. Regarding experiment group 2, word of mouth intention was not significantly influenced compared to the control group. It is likely that the two effects of the planned failure and the disclosure outweighed each other. The disclosure “punished” word of mouth intention, which could be a result of the respondents not feeling the brand deserved their word of mouth to the same extent. At the same time, Keller (2007) stated that most word of mouth is positive, with a margin of more than six to one, and people tend to choose to talk up what they like, connect good brands with good friends and let other bad opinions be left unsaid. Also, if word of mouth is in fact negative, the effects coming from the generation of positive word of mouth is greater (Vázquez-Casielles, Suárez-Álvarez, del Río-Lanza 2013). The two counteracting influences may be a plausible explanation for why no significant difference existed between the control group and experiment group 2.

Whilst all other parameters were, in some way, influenced at either 5% or 10% significance level, purchase intention was the only variable that remained unchanged at both significance levels. It is

interesting that purchase intention remained unaffected since, ultimately, increased sales are what profit-seeking companies are aiming for. Why word of mouth intention and brand interest were positively affected in the experiment group 1 compared to the control group while purchase intention remained unchanged might be a result of a few reasons. First of all the product chosen for the experiment is a product that, by its nature, customers want to see and try before evaluating whether they want to buy it or not. Therefore the respondents might have remained neutral in their response of whether they wanted to buy the product or not. Although the respondents were asked to imagine that the clothing company sold clothes they normally wear the lack of visual pictures might have affected their purchase intention. Moreover, no price was stated in the scenarios which is a parameter influencing purchase intention as well. Additionally the brand was a fictional brand and the information the respondents based their responses on was very limited. Therefore purchase intention may have been less influenced than it would have been for a well-known brand or another type of product. Since theory entail that positive word of mouth has a positive effect on brand-purchase (Vázquez-Casielles, Suárez-Álvarez, del Río-Lanza 2013) then it is likely that, over time, purchase intention and actual purchases would have been significantly increased anyway. Furthermore, an increase in brand interest should consequently lead to an increase in consumers exploring the brand and its products. Naturally, the more people exploring the brand/product, the likelihood of someone purchasing the product should increase. Therefore it arguable that, the planned failure might over time, have a positive effect on purchase intention despite the non-existence of a direct effect. Furthermore, as was the case with all other parameters, the event was fictional and the respondents did not get to fully experience the brand/product which directly lowers the impact of the “7 I: s”. This might consequently also had a negative effect on purchase intention. Finally, 60% of the respondents were students which possibly could have impacted purchase intention negatively.

It is interesting that many of the describing brand attributes were not only significant but also influenced with such large mean differences as up to 1,92 between the control group and experiment group 1 and even more between the control group and experiment group 2 (up to 2,27 in mean difference). Although the difference was relatively large one need to keep in mind that the experiment was based on a fictional brand and therefore the respondents did not have any preconceptions regarding the brand. Instead they were forced to base their answers on the small amount of information given. The small modifications might therefore have influenced to responses

to a higher degree than if an existing brand would have been used. Regardless of what, it is clear that, given the circumstances, the modifications of the scenarios influenced brand personality significantly. It is also interesting that the adjective with the second largest difference between the control group and experiment group 1 was “rebellious”, which was also the objective of our inspiration case to be perceived as more rebellious. Furthermore, the largest significant mean difference that existed between any of the groups was also “rebellious”, between the control group and experiment group 2 with a mean difference of 2,27 higher for experiment group 2. This means that the disclosure only enhanced the rebellious attribute of the brand which is also a logical effect since the disclosure is rather controversial. Consequently, if the one single goal with the event would have been to be perceived as more rebellious the planned failure regardless of including the disclosure or not would have achieved the purpose.

Limitations and Critique against the Research

The fact that the research was limited to one type of scenario, brand and product implies some natural limitations. This limits the generalizability of the results from the study. Furthermore, a fictional brand was used and therefore the study can be criticized for being subject to low ecological validity (too much manipulation creating unnatural settings) (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 43). Moreover, the sample selection was rather homogenous (compared to a randomized sample from the Swedish population) and some might argue that the biased sample could impact the results of the analysis. Additionally, no feasibility study was made when choosing what scenario to use in the study. Instead, the scenarios were designed from a list of criteria that was desirable. A feasibility study may have provided insight what parts of the modification (the nature of the failure, the fact that it was a failure or the way it was managed) that caused the variances in the independent variables. The study has thereby rather focused on what effect the modifications of the scenarios as a whole had on the independent variables. Finally, it might have added depth to the analysis investigating whether the respondents perceived the scenarios as positive or negative. This could have added creditability to the findings, especially in terms of word of mouth and future loyalty intention, two areas of which are influenced by consumers’ positive or negative attitude towards a brand.

Recommendations for Practitioners

The most obvious result of our experiment was the significant change in brand personality. If the brand wants to change or enhance its perceived brand personality then it can be worthwhile to consider this type of planned failure, especially if the goal is to be perceived as more rebellious. Many adjectives were not only significantly influenced but also with a large mean difference. Depending on how the marketer wants the brand to be perceived the event should be designed to mirror the personality. However, although the changes were significant one need to keep in mind that the brand was fictional and it is not known how large the effect would be on an existing brand. It is clear though that at an initial launch of a new brand one can significantly influence brand personality perception with a planned failure.

Positive effects exist also in terms of word of mouth and brand interest from the planned failure. However, since future loyalty intention was negatively affected with disclosure then no positive effects at all exists from the planned failure in terms of future loyalty intention – only risks were related to it. Since there did exist positive effects in terms of word of mouth and brand interest it is important to weigh the potential gains against the potential losses. In order to not risk a punishment against future loyalty intention it is important to make sure that the fact that it was planned remains non-disclosed. It is also important to consider what the goal of the event is. If the goal is increased purchase intention then it might be more worthwhile to use the resources for other marketing campaigns but if the goal is to change brand personality, increase brand interest or word of mouth it might be worthwhile to consider this type of PR-trick. Furthermore it is important to consider what type of brand it is. All brands might not benefit from this type of marketing trick. Our hypothesis is that mainly lifestyle products and aspirational products would benefit from these kinds of planned failures. Informational brands, such as banks and insurance companies, would probably be hurt by these kinds of events since security and safety are most likely valued much higher by the consumers for these types of services. Furthermore, the study was rather limited and the conclusions should be read selectively and critically. The findings are mainly indicative and serve as inspiration. It is therefore important that the marketer knows its target audience and its brand to be able to make educated choices if, and how, a planned failure should be used.

Recommendations for Future Research

Since the research was limited to one type of product, one event and one brand, it would be interesting to repeat the experiment using other types of products, scenarios and brands to see if the results would differ. Furthermore, it would be of interest to repeat the test using various existing brands (instead of a fictional) to see if that would change the results of the experiment. Additionally, it could be of interest to subdivide the modifications of the scenarios further to be able to analyse what parts of the modification (the fact that it was a failure, how it was managed or the nature of the failure) in experiment group 1 that caused the main difference in the results. Furthermore, since the experiment was conducted in a web-survey it would be interesting to conduct the experiments for real to see how the results differ when the respondents get to experience the event for real. Finally, it could be interesting to distribute the survey to different target groups to see if the responses would differ between different demographic groups of people.

References

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). 'Dimensions of brand personality'. *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 34 no. 3, pp. 347-356.
- Arnould, E., Price, L., & Zinkhan, G. (2004). *Consumers*, 2nd ed. Boston: McGraw- Hill/Irwin.
- Bagozzi, R. P. (1975). 'Marketing as exchange'. *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 39 no. 4, pp. 32-39.
- Brooks, R. C. (1957). "'Word-of-mouth" advertising in finding new products'. *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 22 no. 2, pp. 154-161.
- Bryman, B. & Bell, E. (2011). *Business Research Methods*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carù, A. & Cova, B. (2003) 'Revisiting consumption experience: A more humble but complete view of the concept'. *Marketing Theory*, vol. 3 no. 2, pp. 267–286.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Flow: The psychology of engagement with every-day life*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Dahlén, M., Rosengren, S. & Törn, F. (2008). 'Advertising creativity matters'. *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 48 no. 3, pp. 392-403.
- Dichter, E., (1966). 'How word-of-mouth advertising works'. *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 44 no. 6, pp. 147-166.
- Drenger, J., Gaus, H. & Jahn, S. (2008). 'Does flow influence the brand image in event marketing?' *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 48 no. 1, pp. 138-147.
- Funchs, C., Prandelli, E. & Schreier, M. (2010). 'The psychological effects of empowerment strategies on consumers' product demand.' *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 74 no. 1, pp. 65-79.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). 'The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasy, feelings and fun.' *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 9 no. 2, pp. 132–140.
- Imran, K., Ghauri, T. A. & Majeed, S. (2012). 'Impact of brand related attributes on purchase intention of customers. A study about the customers of Punjab, Pakistan'. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, vol. 4 no. 3, pp. 194-200.
- Keller, K. L. (1993). 'Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity'. *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 57 no. 1, pp. 1-22.
- Keller, E. (2007). 'Unleashing the Power of Word of Mouth: Creating Brand Advocacy to Drive Growth'. *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 47 no. 4, pp. 448-452.

Laroche, M. & Sadokierski, R.W. (1994). 'Role of confidence in a multi-brand model of intentions for a high involvement service'. *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 29 no. 1, pp. 1-12.

Laroche, N., Kim, C. & Zhou, L. (1996). 'Brand familiarity and confidence as determinants of purchase intention: an empirical test in a multiple brand context'. *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 37 no. 10, pp. 115-120.

Latham, J. (2008). Study proves live events have major impact. *Events Review*. Retrieved March 20, 2013, from <http://www.internationalmeetingsreview.com/uk-ireland/study-proves-live-events-have-major-impact-31295>

Lee, R. P. W. & Tse, A. C. B. (2001). 'Zapping behaviour during commercial breaks', *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 41 no. 3, pp. 25- 29.

Machleit, K. A., Madden, T. J. & Allen, C. T. (1990). 'Measuring and modeling brand interest as alternative Aad effect with familiar brands'. *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 17 no. 1, pp. 223-230.

MacKenzie, S.B., Lutz, R.J. & Belch, G.E. (1986). 'The role of attitude toward the ad as a mediator of advertising effectiveness: a test of competing explanations'. *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 23 no. 2, pp. 130-143.

McAlexander, J. H., Kim, S. K. & Roberts, S. D. (2003). 'Loyalty: the influence of satisfaction and brand community integration'. *Journal of marketing Theory & Practice*, vol. 11 no. 4, pp. 1-11.

McCole, P. (2004). 'Refocusing marketing to reflect practice. The changing role of marketing for business'. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, vol. 22 no. 5, pp. 531-539.

Nasermoadeli, A., Choon, K. L. & Maghnati, F. (2013). 'Evaluating the impacts of customer experience on purchase intention'. *International Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 8 no. 6, pp. 128-138.

NZ Marketing Magazine (2003), 'Think again: why experiential marketing is the next big thing', *NZ Marketing Magazine* September, pp. 8-15. Retrieved March, 2013, from : www.marketingmag.co.nz

Pappu, R. & Quester, R. (2006). 'Does customer satisfaction lead to improved brand equity? An empirical examination of two categories of retail brands'. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, vol. 15 no. 1, pp. 4-14.

Rosengren, S. & Dahlén, M. (2013). 'Judging a magazine by its advertising: exploring the effects of advertising content on perceptions of a media vehicle.' *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 53 no. 1, pp. 61-70.

Rumbo D.R. (2002) 'Consumer Resistance in a World of Advertising Clutter: The Case of Adbusters'. *Psychology & Marketing*, vol. 19 no. 2, pp. 127-148.

- Rust R. T. & Oliver R. L. (2000). 'Should we delight the customer?' *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 28 no.1, pp. 86-94.
- Schmitt, B. (1999), *Experiential Marketing: How to get Customers to Sense, Feel, Think, Act, and Relate to your Company and Brands*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Sneath, J. Z., Close A. G., Finney, R. Z., & Lacey, R. Z. (2006), 'Engaging the consumer through event marketing: linking attendees with the sponsor, community and brand.' *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 46 no. 4, pp. 420-433.
- Stockholm School of Economics (SSE) 2012, *The Quick Guide to SPSS*, Author, Stockholm.
- Söderlund, M. & Rosengren, S. (2007). 'Receiving word-of-mouth from the service customer: an emotion-based effectiveness assessment'. *Journal of Retailing & Consumer Services*, vol. 14 no. 2, pp. 123-136.
- Söderlund, M. (2008). 'Det räcker inte längre med att kunderna är nöjda'. In: Mattson, L. G. (ed). *Marknadsorientering, Myter och Möjligheter*, Liber.
- Söderlund, M. (2010a). 'Customer satisfaction and loyalty'. In: Ekström, K. M. (ed) *Consumer Behaviour. A Nordic Perspective*, Studentlitteratur.
- Söderlund, M. (2010b). *Experiment med människor*, Liber: Malmö. Vázquez-Casielles, R., Suárez-Álvarez, L. & del Río-Lanza, A. B. (2013), 'The word of mouth dynamics: how positive (and negative) WOM drives purchase probability: an analysis of interpersonal and non-Interpersonal factors.' *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 53 no. 1, pp. 43-60.
- Wahlund, R. (2013). Lecture notes distributed in the unit, 629 Degree Project in Marketing, Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm on 17 January, 2013.
- Wohlfeil, M. & Whelan, S. (2006a). 'Consumers motivations to participate in event-marketing strategies'. *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 22 no. 5-6, pp. 643-669.
- Wohlfeil, M. & Whelan, S. (2006b). 'Consumer motivations to participate in marketing-events: the role of predispositional involvement'. *Advances in Consumer Research- European Conference Proceedings*, vol 7, pp. 125-131.
- Wood, E. H., & Masterman, G. (2007). 'Event marketing: Experience and exploitation'. *Paper presented at the Extraordinary Experiences Conference: Managing the Consumer Experience in Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, Tourism, Retail and Events*, Bournemouth University, September 3-4 2007.
- Wood, E. H., (2009). 'Evaluating Event Marketing: Experience or outcome?' *Journal of Promotion Management*, vol. 15 no. 1-2, pp. 247-268.

Yoo, B. & Donthu N., (2001). 'Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale'. *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 52 no. 1, pp. 1-14.

Appendix

Conditional Question

Which date of the month is your birthday?

- 1st-10th -> **scenario1**
- 11th-20th -> **scenario2:**
- 20st-31st -> **scenario3**

Scenarios displayed to respondent conditioned on question 1:

Scenario 1

Please read the text below carefully.

Imagine yourself invited to a launch of a collection from the new brand "Urban Style".

The event is located in a large venue in the old parts of town. When you arrive, you are greeted with champagne and you mingle with the other guests.

After a couple of minutes, a DJ starts playing and the fashion show begins. Models start showing the new collection on a catwalk in the middle of the room.

After the show, waiters arrive with drinks and a buffet is served for all the guests.

Scenario 2

Please read the text below carefully.

Imagine yourself invited to a launch of a collection from the new brand "Urban Style".

The event is located in a large venue in the old parts of town. When you arrive, you are greeted with champagne and you mingle with the other guests.

After a couple of minutes, a DJ starts playing and the fashion show begins. When the first model enters the catwalk, she accidentally trips and falls over the DJ-booth knocking out a drink over the DJ's computer and the music stops.

The crowd holds their breath. All of a sudden, the CEO of the company enters the stage and starts to beat box. The DJ joins in and so does the crowd. The models walk out on the catwalk and the show continues to the sound of the beat box.

After the show, waiters arrive with drinks and a buffet is served for all the guests.

Scenario 3

Please read the text below carefully.

Imagine yourself invited to a launch of a collection from the new brand "Urban Style".

The event is located in a large venue in the old parts of town. When you arrive, you are greeted with champagne and you mingle with the other guests.

After a couple of minutes, a DJ starts playing and the show begins. When the first model enters the catwalk, she accidentally trips and falls into the DJ-booth knocking out a drink over the DJ's computer and the music stops.

The crowd holds their breath. All of a sudden, the CEO of the company enters the stage and starts to beat box. The DJ joins in and so does the crowd. The models walk out on the catwalk and the show continues to the sound of the beat box.

After the show, waiters arrive with drinks and a buffet is served for all the guests.

Later, you found out that the accident was all part of a plan. The model intentionally fell and spilled the drink over the DJ booth.

Displayed to all respondents:

Brand Personality

How strongly do you agree that the following adjectives describe the brand?

	1 - Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly agree
Trendy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cool	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rebellious	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inspiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Up-to-date	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fashionable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Youthful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Innovative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Old-fashioned	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Purchase Intention

Assuming this brand sells the type of clothes you normally wear, how likely is it that you would buy a product from this brand?

Unlikely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Likely
Improbable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Probable
Do not want to buy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Want to buy

Future Loyalty Intention

How strongly do you agree with the following statements?

	1 - Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly agree
In the future, my loyalty towards this brand would be high.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the future, I would prefer to buy products from this brand.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Word of Mouth Intention

How strongly do you agree with the following statements?

	1 - Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly agree
I would recommend this brand to my friends.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would "talk this brand up" to my friends.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would try to spread the word about this brand.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Brand Interest

How strongly do you agree with the following statements?

	1 - Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 - Strongly agree
I find the Urban Style brand interesting.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I want to buy products from this brand.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Level of Realism

How realistic do you think this scenario is?

Unreal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Real
Low credibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	High credibility
False	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	True

Demographics

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

What is your age?

What is your occupation?

- Student
- Employed
- Retired
- Unemployed
- Self-employed
- Other

Thank you

Thank you very much for your participation!

Maria and Matilda