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RESEARCH ON FAILURE AND SATISFACTION MISSES THE POINT!

- Defection must be triggered by clearly identifiable negative incidents... really?
- Clearly identifiable service failures are relatively rare occurrences (only up to 20%; e.g., 1.43 customer complaints per 100,000 customers in the airline industry in 2012)
- Even after serious failure, complaint rates are well-below 35% (TARP 1979; 1986)
- Defection rates even among satisfied and very satisfied consumers across different industries range from 65% to 85% (Reichheld 1996).
- In the automobile industry, in which 85% to 95% of consumers report that they are satisfied with their current brand, only 30% to 40% repurchase the same brand (Oliver 1999)
- A case in point: A US company spends $2 million annually in customer loyalty but about half of the most profitable customers disappear completely after buying large numbers of high margin products in a short time (Reinartz and Kumar 2002).

100% retention is a **myth** and regardless of the initiatives taken for customer retention, customers disengage.
KEY QUESTIONS

Why do consumer relationships gradually and almost “naturally” fade over time?

How do consumer relationships gradually fade over time?

What are the key drivers of relationship fading?

What is a (typical?) relationship trajectory?

Can we predict “movement” between fading stages and – as a consequence – do something about it?
AGENDA
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There's nothing more practical than a good theory...

Process of Marital Disaffection

- **Disillusion**
  - Negative disconfirmation of expectations.
  - Partners often experience feeling of surprise and hurt.
  - Partners do not intend to leave the relationship.

- **Disaffection**
  - Anger and hurt escalate as conflicts have not been resolved.
  - Attempts to solve the problems are still frequent.
  - Partners are not ready to leave the marriage due to substantive barriers.

- **Indifference**
  - Apathy and indifference are the main feelings partners have.
  - Spouses re-interpret their partners' quality and the relationship that they had.

(Kersten 1990)
MARITAL DISAFFECTION

Our Metaphor: Process of Marital Disaffection: Outcomes

- Indifference
  - Outcome will be moderated by:
    - level of investments
    - commitment
    - quality of alternatives
    - other external barriers
  - (Kersten 1990)

- Divorce
- Unhappily remaining married with dissatisfaction
- Recovery from disaffection
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METHODOLOGY

• Qualitative approach

• Semi-structured interviews (18 + 14) conducted in Australia and the UK

• Unit of analysis: “fading story” (n=49)

• 100 hours of recording

• More females (23); average age of 31.56 years (24-57 years)
FINDINGS: THE PHENOMENON

Consumer Relationship Fading - Phenomenon and Definition

- Similar to marital relationships, fading consumers have had an affective relationship with a brand but are experiencing a series of rather minor disappointments, which affects their cognitive-emotive process negatively and ultimately lead to a general attitude change.

- The perception of fading consumers involves feelings of negative emotions towards the brand or the provider company due to multiple unfavorable events which induce them to diminish their patronage level and look for alternatives.
FINDINGS: THE DEFINITION

Consumer Relationship Fading - Phenomenon and Definition

A process of **gradual decline** in consumers’ intention to continue the relationship with a brand (company) manifested in **negative feeling** towards the brand (company), **diminishing** frequency and/or volume of transactions with it and growing **initiation** of switching intention.
FINDINGS: FADING STAGES

(...) for the last 12 or so months, they stopped sending me those rewards. (...) I feel like I no longer belong to the company.

(...) the quality of service is getting worse. The automated service is really poor – it never understood my request at all. Waiting time is over one hour sometimes. (...) they couldn’t solve my problem. (...) lots of small stuff (...) it’s just completely frustrating for me.

(...) My girl friend was also experiencing network problem but her roommate using different company is not facing any network problems. (...) so we are looking for alternatives. (...) they upset me enough that I am willing to forget about my emotional attachment and I started looking around.
SUMMARY 1

Drivers, Feeling, and Thoughts during in Fading Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disillusion</th>
<th>Disaffection</th>
<th>Crossroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong></td>
<td>Changing price/value perception (15)</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory encounters (22)</td>
<td>Competitor (marketing) activities (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Pressure (5)</td>
<td>Unreliability (14)</td>
<td>Lack of perceived trustworthiness (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habitation (3)</td>
<td>Lack of personalization (3)</td>
<td>Accusing Consumers (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incompatible match (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal changes (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over-promising (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feelings</strong></td>
<td>Dissatisfaction (8)</td>
<td>Frustration (15)</td>
<td>Indifference (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Negative) surprise (4)</td>
<td>Anger (8)</td>
<td>Emotional Separation (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thoughts</strong></td>
<td>Giving a second chance (5)</td>
<td>Searching for alternatives (10)</td>
<td>Giving one last chance (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patiently Waiting (2)</td>
<td>Negatively evaluate the brand (6)</td>
<td>Threatening to leave (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of costs and benefits (2)</td>
<td>Perceived risks of switching (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complaining (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS: BOUNDARY CONDITIONS 1/3

Individual level

“I’m one of those people who like to get along with everyone and not having any confrontations or not try to make arguments anything like that.”

“I just hate being treated like that. If you mess with me, forget it!”
Dyadic/relational level:

„I feel like it’s lost that thing we initially clicked on, it’s kind of just faded now, it’s just disappeared. (...) It’s a bit painful for me because the pricing is still the same, they’re still marked as slightly above the average but there’s nothing distinctive about it any more.”

“I just realized it doesn’t fit me any more and I don’t really know what has changed; it’s just that feeling…”
Contextual level (environment):

„I just really had to buy a phone, as soon as possible. So I didn’t have much choice and didn’t do any research properly to check the prices so I just bought the phone (...) and started using it.”

“Also, all my friends were using other providers and some providers have this option – if you call the same network provider, calls are for free. So I was the only one among the people with whom I speak often with this network. So it affected me as well.”

“…now it’s just not cool any more; you know, technology and style has moved on…”
## SUMMARY 2

### Boundary Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Characteristics</th>
<th>Relational Characteristics</th>
<th>Contextual Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Neuroticism (4)</td>
<td>- Differences in values,</td>
<td>- External pressures (e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attitudes and beliefs (9)</td>
<td>career circumstances, pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incompatibility relating</td>
<td>of potential “partners,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to role preferences (8)</td>
<td>political and economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicting interests (4)</td>
<td>circumstances) (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor conflict resolution (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict avoidance (2)</td>
<td>Peer pressure – when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impulsiveness (3)</td>
<td>Boredom (1)</td>
<td>choosing a brand/company (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short “dating” periods (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aggregated life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor familiarity with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences (e.g. low</td>
<td></td>
<td>other “partner” (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income, previous bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience, dysfunctional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beliefs about a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Anxiety (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aston Business School
PROPOSED MODEL
STUDY 1

Relationship Fading Process

Affective Relationship

Disillusion
Surprise
Giving a second chance
Patiently waiting

Disaffection
Frustration
Searching for alternatives
Negatively evaluate the brand
Assessment of costs and benefits

Crossroads
Indifference
Giving one last chance
Threatening to leave
Emotional separation
Calculating risks of switching

Boundary Conditions: personal / relational / environmental

Receptiveness for competitor activities

Series of unsatisfactory (minor) encounters
Unreliability
Lack of personalization

Changing price-value perception
Habituation
Over-promising

Relationship End/Change
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METHODOLOGY

- Diary study (longitudinal)
- 706 UK student participants (50% female; average age 20.40 years)
- Initial duration: 4 month; ongoing for 10+ more month
- 10 entries, 3 “main” entries (so far)
- Self-report of the fading stage
- Attitudes, believes, feelings
- “Incidents”
METHODOLOGY

ENTRIES: E1-E10

E1
“big” survey

E5
“big” survey incidents

E10
“big” survey incidents

1 5 10
### Preliminary Findings

#### Fading Stage in Entry 1 ("E1")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Honeymoon</td>
<td>Fascination</td>
<td>55.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good Relationship</td>
<td>Slight Disappointment</td>
<td>32.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disaffection</td>
<td>Negativity</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disillusion</td>
<td>Re-evaluation</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crossroads</td>
<td>Lack of Attachment</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRILIMINARY FINDINGS

### “Relationship Dynamics”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trajectory</th>
<th>Entry 1 - Entry 5</th>
<th>Entry 1 - Entry 10</th>
<th>Entry 5 - Entry 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>57.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Preliminary Findings

## Point of No Return?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement E1-E5</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PRILIMINARY FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complaint intention</th>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
<th>Annoyed</th>
<th>Disturbed</th>
<th>Sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honeymoon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascination</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationship</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disillusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight disappointment</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative change</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaffection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluating relationship</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crossroads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of attachment</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-value (MANOVA)</strong></td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>41.95</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRILIMINARY FINDINGS

Who ‘moves’, who ‘stays’?

- Estimated Marginal Means of Agreeableness
  - p < .05

- Estimated Marginal Means of Neuroticism
  - p < .05

- Estimated Marginal Means of Extraversion
  - p = .11

Openness, Conscientiousness: n.s.
DISCUSSION

- Substantial movement even in a relative short observation period
- Movement in both directions: larger percentage moves in a negative direction (about 25%) than in a positive one (about 15%); early stages seem to be “stickier”
- Negative feelings increase / positive decrease along the fading trajectory
  BUT: highest negative feelings in the disaffection stage
- Indifference in the last stage
- Traits influence trajectory
AGENDA

• Background
• Theoretical background and empirical findings: “marital disaffection”
• Study 1 (qualitative interviews)
• Study 2 (diary study)
• Study 3 (quantitative study with behavior)
• Discussion & Future Research
METHODOLOGY

• Quantitative survey among 1,208 customers of an online retailer
• Predominantly male (>80%) and older (>55 years)
• Survey: self-reported fading stage, emotions
• Behavioral data
### Preliminary Findings

#### Fading stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honeymoon 1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disillusion 3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaffection 5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroads 6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRILIMINARY FINDINGS

Negative emotions

$p < .05$
PRIMINARY FINDINGS: BEHAVIORS

Recency

Estimated Marginal Means

Fading Stage
Preliminary Findings: Behaviors

Frequency

Estimated Marginal Means

Fading Stage

1 2 3 4 5 6
PRIMALINARY FINDINGS: BEHAVIORS

Moneytary Value

Estimated Marginal Means

Fading Stage
DISCUSSION

• Generally confirms previous (qual./quant.) findings
• Behavioral antecedents of fading: early indicators
• High profitability of fading consumers
• Background
• Theoretical background and empirical findings: “marital disaffection”
• Study 1 (qualitative interviews)
• Study 2 (diary study)
• Study 3 (quantitative study with behavior)
• New Insights
NEW INSIGHTS

Our findings show that similar to what happens in the process of marital disaffection, fading consumers pass through three stages: disillusion, disaffection, and crossroads.

Stage of disillusion: **over-promising** is the key driver that is likely to transform a committed consumer into a disillusioned.

Stage of disaffection: consumers develop feelings of frustration, mainly triggered by the brand’s inability to adequately deal with a series of **minor negative events**.

Stage of crossroads: Consumers increasingly **loose interest** in the brand.

Boundary conditions: personal, dyadic, and environmental factors make fading more (less) likely.
NEW INSIGHTS

Substantial *movement* which can go in both direction (more positive / more negative) = not a one-directional trajectory

There does not seem to be a “point of no return,” therefore, relationship can be *restored* and moved to a higher level

Consumers in “later” fading stages seem to be *most profitable*
Any Questions?
THANK YOU

Dr Heiner Evanschitzky
Professor of Marketing
Programme Director MSc Market Research & Consultancy
h.evanschitzky@aston.ac.uk
http://astonmsc.com
MSC MARKET RESEARCH & CONSULTANCY: CORE

Making sense of turbulent markets
• Foundations of Market Research

Gaining theoretical insights
• Consumer Behaviour Theory
• Marketing Management Theory
Working with (“big”) data
• Quantitative market research
• Qualitative market research

Testing marketing activities
• Experimental market research
MSC MARKET RESEARCH & CONSULTANCY: APPLICATION

Solving real problems

- Marketing Consultancy
- Dissertation research project
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<tr>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 12.00</td>
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