

Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context

In this research, the authors propose that the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior is moderated by customer, relational, and marketplace characteristics. They further hypothesize that the moderating effects emerge if repurchase is measured as objective behavior but not if it is measured as repurchase intentions. To test for systematic differences in effects, the authors estimate identical models using both longitudinal repurchase measures and survey measures as the dependent variable. The results suggest that the relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase behavior is contingent on the moderating effects of convenience, competitive intensity, customer involvement, and household income. As the authors predicted, the results are significantly different for self-reported repurchase intentions and objective repurchase behavior. The conceptual framework and empirical findings reinforce the importance of moderating influences and offer new insights that enhance the understanding of what drives repurchase behavior.

Marketing literature consistently identifies customer satisfaction as a key antecedent to loyalty and repurchase, but current knowledge fails to explain fully the prevalence of satisfied customers who defect and dissatisfied customers who do not (Bendapudi and Berry 1997; Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds 2000; Jones and Sasser 1995; Keaveney 1995). Although prior research points to several variables that may moderate the satisfaction–repurchase relationship, empirical results are equivocal and difficult to reconcile.

Many empirical studies examining direct and moderated satisfaction–repurchase effects measure repurchase intentions rather than objective repurchase behavior. Studies can produce erroneous inferences if there are significant differences between intentions and subsequent behavior (Bolton 1998; Kamakura et al. 2002; Mittal and Kamakura 2001; Morwitz, Steckel, and Gupta 1997) or if common method variance inflates estimates of the association between self-reported satisfaction and intentions (Bolton 1998; Gruen, Summers, and Acito 2000; Morwitz and Schmittlein 1992). Satisfaction levels at which customers report a positive intent can differ considerably from those at which customers engage in the corresponding behavior (Mittal and Kamakura 2001). Therefore, additional research is neces-

sary that explicitly examines the extent to which results converge when using repurchase intentions versus objective repurchase behavior as the dependent measure.

In response to calls for deeper insight into factors that may moderate the satisfaction–repurchase relationship (e.g., Bolton, Lemon, and Verhoef 2004), we propose a conceptual framework that explains why two customers with the same (different) levels of satisfaction engage in different (the same) patterns of repurchase behavior. We use consumer resource allocation theory to support our prediction that, after we control for main effects established in prior research (Anderson and Sullivan 1993; Bolton 1998; Boulding et al. 1993; Rust, Zahorik, and Keiningham 1995), customer, relational, and marketplace characteristics moderate the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior but do not moderate the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase intentions. For example, convenience (a marketplace characteristic) conserves customers' time and effort and thereby facilitates a satisfied customer's ability to fulfill his or her intent.

We test the conceptual framework in an understudied retail context that is characterized by low switching costs and comparison shopping behavior. This context is noteworthy because no known research has examined differences in intentions and objective repatronage behavior in a retail shopping category marked by moderate repurchase frequency. Research suggests that the predictive validity of repurchase intentions varies widely from frequently purchased convenience goods to infrequently purchased durables (e.g., Chandon, Morwitz, and Reinartz 2005). In addition, the satisfaction–repurchase relationship can differ significantly between contractual services and discrete, recurring purchases (Lemon, White, and Winer 2002; Reinartz and Kumar 2003), for which switching costs are lower and customers typically are not obligated to give all their business to any one firm (e.g., Rust, Lemon, and Zeit-

Kathleen Seiders is Associate Professor of Marketing, Carroll School of Management, Boston College (e-mail: seiders@bc.edu). Glenn B. Voss is Associate Professor of Marketing, Department of Business Management, North Carolina State University (e-mail: gvoss@ncsu.edu). Dhruv Grewal is Toyota Chair of e-Commerce and Electronic Business and Professor of Marketing, Babson College (e-mail: dgrewal@babson.edu). Andrea L. Godfrey is a doctoral student, University of Texas, Austin (e-mail: Andrea.Godfrey@phd.mcombs.utexas.edu). The authors thank the anonymous *JM* reviewers, the Marketing Science Institute for supporting this research, and Katherine Lemon for helpful comments on this article.

haml 2004). Thus, our research extends current knowledge by capturing the complexity of the satisfaction–repurchase relationship in a context marked by discrete recurring transactions.

Conceptualizing a Moderated Satisfaction–Repurchase Behavior Relationship


In Figure 1, we present a conceptual framework that proposes satisfaction and customer, relational, and marketplace characteristics as antecedents to repurchase intentions and behavior. We conceptualize customer satisfaction as a cumulative, global evaluation based on experience with a firm over time (Homburg, Koschate, and Hoyer 2005). Repurchase intentions represent the customer's self-reported likelihood of engaging in future repurchase behavior, whereas repurchase behavior is the objectively observed level of repurchase activity. The default expectation is that satisfaction positively influences both repurchase intentions and behavior, and we offer no formal hypothesis for this well-established relationship.

The dotted lines in Figure 1 capture direct relationships that have been previously established in the literature (e.g., Beatty and Smith 1987; Bolton, Kannan, and Bramlett 2000; Rust, Lemon, and Zeithaml 2004; Soberon-Ferrer and Dardis 1991). In the sections that follow, we provide brief reviews of the relevant literature for these direct effects, but we do not offer formal hypotheses for them. Instead, we focus on the moderating effects depicted by the solid lines

in Figure 1. Specifically, we predict that customer, relational, and marketplace characteristics moderate the relationship between satisfaction and objective repurchase behavior after we explicitly control for their direct (i.e., main) effects. Moreover, we believe that these variables do not moderate the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase intentions after we control for direct effects.

For conceptual, methodological, and empirical reasons, we believe that customer, relational, and marketplace characteristics moderate the effect of satisfaction on objective repurchase behavior but not on repurchase intentions. First, consumer resource allocation theory suggests that repurchase behavior reflects intervening contingencies that measures of repurchase intentions do not. Consumers allocate a variety of resources to purchase decisions (Batshell 1980; Roberts and Dant 1991; Zeithaml 1988), including money (Marmorstein, Grewal, and Fishe 1992), time and effort (Becker 1965; Feldman and Hornik 1981; Jacoby, Szybillo, and Berning 1976), motivation, opportunity, and cognitive ability (e.g., MacInnis and Jaworski 1989; MacInnis, Moorman, and Jaworski 1991; Peracchio and Meyers-Levy 1997). One stream of research depicts consumers as cognitive misers (e.g., Shugan 1980) who lack the motivation and cognitive ability to incorporate intervening contingencies into their predicted repurchase probabilities. Because consumers are not motivated to consider simple intervening characteristics (e.g., how different levels of income might facilitate or constrain future repurchase activity) or capable of foreseeing complex intervening factors (e.g., competitive interactions among firms), they routinely provide inaccurate

FIGURE 1
A Framework for Examining Moderators of the Relationship Between Customer Satisfaction and Repurchase



predictions of their future behavior (Kahneman and Snell 1992; Morwitz 1997; Morwitz, Steckel, and Gupta 1997). Thus, consumer resource allocation theory explains why people fail to consider intervening contingency effects in predicting their future behavior and predicts subsequent differences in their motivation and capability to engage in repurchase behavior.

Second, from a methodological perspective, we expect systematic differences in the measurement properties of repurchase intentions and behavior. Because intentions measures typically use five- or seven-point scales, information lost as a result of range restrictions and coarseness can attenuate researchers' ability to detect significant interaction effects that truly exist in the population (Russell and Bobko 1992). Range restriction occurs when information is lost because the highest or lowest point on the scale does not accurately capture extreme variations in the construct of interest. Similarly, coarseness refers to information that is lost when one-point scale variations do not accurately capture within-range variation in the construct of interest. Range-restricted and coarse scales may capture direct linear relationships with other constructs, especially if the two measures share common method variance and response bias (Bolton 1998; Morwitz and Schmittlein 1992). Measurement theory suggests that intentions measures do not capture the nuanced, complex variations that are provided by

objective repurchase behavior measures, even if respondents could make accurate predictions.

Finally, prior empirical research demonstrates that the conversion of intent into repurchase is moderated by various factors, including the type of product (Jamieson and Bass 1989; Kalwani and Silk 1982; Young, DeSarbo, and Morwitz 1998), demographics (Morwitz and Schmittlein 1992), experience (Bentler and Speckart 1979; Morwitz and Schmittlein 1992), and time lapse (Chandon, Morwitz, and Reinartz 2005; Mittal and Kamakura 2001; Young, DeSarbo, and Morwitz 1998). Studies that Chandon, Morwitz, and Reinartz (2005) conducted suggest that consumers provide relatively more accurate predictions of frequent, routine purchase decisions, such as those involving grocery items, than of infrequent, complex purchase decisions, such as those involving computers or automobiles. We attribute this lower accuracy in the prediction of infrequent, complex purchase decisions to unforeseen contingency effects that emerge between intentions measurement and subsequent repurchase (Kalwani and Silk 1982).

In the following section, we rely on this conceptual, methodological, and empirical evidence to develop specific hypotheses that build on prior research that has examined moderators of the satisfaction–repurchase relationship. In Table 1, we summarize the studies that support moderating effects of various customer, relational, and marketplace

TABLE 1
Moderators of the Association Between Satisfaction and Repurchase

Study	Dependent Variable(s) Context and Design	Customer Characteristics	Relational Characteristics	Marketplace Characteristics
Bolton (1998)	Relationship Duration (OM) Telecommunications Longitudinal Contractual service		Length of experience (+)	
Bowman and Narayandas (2001)	Share of Category Requirements (SR) Consumer package goods Cross-sectional Noncontractual goods	Heavy user (+)	Loyalty (+)	
Bowman and Narayandas (2004)	Share of Customer Wallet (SR) Processed metal Longitudinal Noncontractual industrial goods	Size (–)	Account management tenure (+)	Satisfaction with competitor (+)
Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan (2003)	Intention to Stay with Provider (SR) Credit card and telephone service Cross-sectional Contractual service		Relational switching costs (n.s.)	Procedural switching costs (n.s.) Financial switching costs (n.s.)
Capraro, Broniarczyk, and Srivastava (2003)	Defection/Repurchase (SR) Health insurance Longitudinal Contractual service	Objective knowledge (n.s.) Subjective knowledge (n.s.)		
Garbarino and Johnson (1999)	Future Intentions (SR) Professional theater Cross-sectional Contractual and noncontractual service		Relational orientation (–)	

TABLE 1
Continued

Study	Dependent Variable(s) Context and Design	Customer Characteristics	Relational Characteristics	Marketplace Characteristics
Homburg and Giering (2001)	a. Recommendation Intentions (SR) b. Brand Repurchase Intentions (SR) c. Dealer Repurchase Intentions (SR) Auto manufacturer/dealer Cross-sectional Contractual goods and services	Income SP (–: a, b, c) SSP (+: a, b) Involvement: SSP (–: b) Gender: SP (+m: c) SSP (+f: b) Age SP (+: a, b, c) SSP (–: b)	Variety seeking SP (–: a, b, c)	
Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty (2000)	Repurchase Intentions (SR) Banking and hair salon Cross-sectional Contractual and noncontractual services		Interpersonal relationships (–)	Switching costs (–) Attractiveness of alternatives (+)
Magi (2003)	a. Share of Purchase (SR) b. Share of Visits (SR) Grocery stores Longitudinal Noncontractual consumption goods	Economic orientation (–: a; n.s.: b) Personalizing orientation (–: a, b) Apathetic shopping orientation (n.s.: a, b) Age (n.s.: a, b) Purchase volume (+: a; n.s.: b)		
Mittal and Kamakura (2001)	Repurchase Behavior (OM) Automobile manufacturer Longitudinal Contractual durable goods	Sex (+) Education (+) Marital status (n.s.) Age (+) Children (+)		Urban versus suburban (n.s.)
Verhoef (2003)	a. Customer Retention (OM) b. Customer Share Development (OM) Insurance Longitudinal Contractual service		Relationship age (+: a; n.s.: b.)	
Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra (2002)	a. Customer Referrals (SR) b. Number of Services Purchased (OM) Insurance Cross-sectional and longitudinal Contractual service		Relationship age (n.s.: a; +: b)	
Current Study	Repurchase Intentions (SR), Repurchase Visits (OM), and Spending (OM) Apparel and home furnishings Cross-sectional and longitudinal Noncontractual fashion goods	Involvement Household income	Relationship age Relationship program participation	Competitive intensity Convenience of offering

Notes: +/– indicates that the effect of satisfaction on the dependent variable increases/decreases as the moderating variable increases/decreases; n.s. = not significant; SR = self-reported measure provided by respondent; OM = objective measure taken from secondary source; SP = satisfaction with the product; and SSP = satisfaction with the sales process.

characteristics. We report the results only for moderating effects; that is, we do not include results for main effects. A review of Table 1 shows that our study makes unique contributions by testing formerly unexamined moderating variables; linking survey data to self-reported intentions and objective, longitudinal repurchase behavior; and investigating a previously understudied context marked by low exit barriers.

Development of Hypotheses

The conceptual framework we present in Figure 1 proposes three categories of moderators that operate at different levels. Customer characteristics explain variations in the satisfaction–repurchase relationship due to individual differences, relational characteristics capture customers' investments in building or formalizing relationships with a specific firm, and marketplace characteristics account for variations related to market-level competition. For each category of moderator, we propose and subsequently test two specific moderating variables. In each case, we predict an interaction effect after we control for main effects.

Customer Characteristics

Customer characteristics explain variations in peoples' purchase levels for an entire purchase category. We expect that customer-level variables have a direct influence on repurchase intentions and behavior and moderate the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior. We examine involvement, a motivational resource, and household income, a monetary resource. Because both moderators are closely linked to key resources, they are likely to be among the most significant customer-level influences.

Involvement. Involvement is the importance of the purchase category to the consumer and is based on the consumer's inherent needs, values, and interests (Mittal 1995). From a resource perspective, highly involved customers allocate more time and effort to search (Beatty and Smith 1987; Bloch, Sherrell, and Ridgway 1986; Maheswaran and Meyers-Levy 1990) and report higher levels of repatronage intentions (Wakefield and Baker 1998), which suggests a positive direct link between involvement and repurchase intentions and behavior. We acknowledge an alternative view that involvement could negatively affect repurchase intentions. More involved consumers may be more likely to search and potentially identify more preferred alternatives in the market, regardless of their level of satisfaction.

We also expect that involvement enhances the positive effect of satisfaction on actual repurchase behavior but not on repurchase intentions. Involved shoppers should allocate more time, effort, and money to retailers that provide exceptional satisfaction. They should also be more discriminating among offerings and more responsive and committed to superior offerings (Beatty, Kahle, and Homer 1988). This positive moderating effect would extend to repurchase intentions if involved customers accurately incorporated these complex effects into their predictions, but because we do not expect such incorporation to occur, we formally hypothesize the following:

H₁: Involvement (a) moderates (enhances) the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and objective repurchase behavior but (b) does not moderate the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

Household income. Household income is positively related to consumers' routine expenditures for multiple types of services (Nichols and Fox 1983; Soberon-Ferrer and Dardis 1991), loyalty among online shoppers (Keaveney and Parthasarathy 2001), and profitable lifetime customer duration (Reinartz and Kumar 2000). On the basis of these findings, we expect that household income has a positive influence on repurchase intentions and behavior.

Household income should also intensify the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior. The conversion of intent into purchase varies across groups that differ in their ability to fulfill that intent (Morwitz and Schmittlein 1992), and lower-income customers may be constrained in their purchases. Because higher-income customers place a higher value on time and are more discriminating in how they allocate their time (Marmorstein, Grewal, and Fishe 1992), they should visit and spend less at retailers that offer low satisfaction and more at retailers that offer high satisfaction. This positive moderating effect would extend to intentions only if higher- and lower-income customers accurately incorporated the enabling and constraining effect of income. Because we do not expect such incorporation to occur, we formally hypothesize the following:

H₂: Household income (a) moderates (enhances) the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and objective repurchase behavior but (b) does not moderate the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

Relational Characteristics

Relational characteristics represent formal and informal bonds between the firm and its customers; relational bonds can create social and financial switching barriers that provide firms with an advantage insulated from competitor actions. Although relational moderators have been examined primarily in the context of contractual services, relational strategies designed to encourage discrete, ongoing repurchase are widespread. Proposed relational moderators include relationship age with the focal firm and participation in the firm's relationship program.

Relationship age. Prior experience influences intent, repurchase behavior (Anderson, Fornell, and Lehmann 1994; Morwitz and Schmittlein 1992), and loyalty (Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds 2000). Relationship age is positively related to customer profitability (Reinartz and Kumar 2000, 2003), retention (Bolton 1998), number of services purchased (Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra 2002), continued museum membership (Bhattacharya 1998; Bhattacharya, Rao, and Glynn 1995), and (we expect) repurchase intentions and behavior.

Empirical results indicate that length of prior experience enhances the positive association between satisfaction and subsequent relationship duration (Bolton 1998) and that

relationship age enhances the link between satisfaction and retention and the number of services purchased (Verhoef 2003; Verhoef, Franses, and Hoekstra 2002). This effect would extend to intentions only if relational customers accurately incorporated the moderating effect of prior relational investments, but because we do not expect such incorporation to occur, we hypothesize the following:

- H₃: Relationship age (a) moderates (enhances) the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and objective repurchase behavior but (b) does not moderate the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

Relationship program participation. Relationship programs represent company initiatives that target individual customers who agree to exchanges that may be complementary or ancillary to their purchase transactions. These programs promote retention by enhancing customers' perceptions of the relationship investment and increasing their trust and commitment (De Wulf, Odekerken-Schroder, and Iacobucci 2001; Rust, Lemon, and Zeithaml 2004). Participants may receive personalized communications that keep them informed of new offerings or preferential treatment and rewards for past loyalty. Empirical findings indicate that relationship program participation has positive direct effects on intentions, usage levels, retention, and customer share development (Bolton, Kannan, and Bramlett 2000; Garbarino and Johnson 1999; Verhoef 2003).

We also expect that relationship program participation enhances the positive effect of satisfaction on repurchase behavior. Customers enter relationships in part to reduce the time and effort required for purchase decisions (Bhattacharya and Bolton 2000; Sheth and Parvatiyar 1995), which suggests that relationship program participants should be less inclined to shop around and more inclined to allocate purchases to relational providers that offer superior satisfaction. This positive moderating effect would extend to intentions only if customers accurately incorporated the moderating effect of relational program participation. Because we do not expect such incorporation to occur, we hypothesize the following:

- H₄: Relationship program participation (a) moderates (enhances) the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and objective repurchase behavior but (b) does not moderate the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

Marketplace Characteristics

Marketplace moderators feature interactions among customers, the focal firm, and competing firms. For example, intense competition that spurs price promotions may increase switching behavior and overall purchase volume, or new firms entering the marketplace may steal customers and market share from entrenched competitors. We examine the convenience of the focal firm's offering and its interaction with competitive intensity in the marketplace.

Convenience. Overall convenience is a second-order construct that consists of five types of time and effort costs involved in service experiences (Berry, Seiders, and Grewal

2002). Empirical findings indicate that convenience is significantly related to customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions (Andaleeb and Basu 1994), consumer switching behavior (Keaveney 1995), and customer perceptions and retention (Rust, Lemon, and Zeithaml 2004).

In addition to its direct effects, we propose that convenience enhances the positive effect of satisfaction on repurchase behavior but not on intentions. From a resource allocation perspective, a convenient offering conserves customers' time and effort and thereby facilitates a satisfied customer's ability to fulfill his or her intent. In this capacity, convenience functions less as an input to evaluation and more as an ongoing barrier that encourages or discourages repurchase behavior. This is likely to be particularly relevant for repatronage behavior, for which access to geographically based retailers or other service firms is a major decision factor, and can produce both planned and unplanned trade-offs between degree of convenience and level of satisfaction. Thus:

- H₅: Convenience (a) moderates (enhances) the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and objective repurchase behavior but (b) does not moderate the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

Competitive intensity. We define competitive intensity as the level of direct competition that the focal firm faces within its immediate business domain. Competitive intensity can attenuate competitive advantage and influence repurchase behavior over time because competition erodes customers' perceptions of differential advantage along unsustainable dimensions. For example, convenience represents a characteristic that can be readily replicated in many marketplaces; thus, the relative advantage it offers when competition is low is eroded as competition intensifies.

We illustrate the expected interaction using an anecdote about gas station competition and repurchase. A consumer routinely travels three distinct routes along which he or she makes repurchase decisions. On the first route, there is only one gas station; the convenience of the offering may be paramount, so the traveler repurchases at this gas station, especially if he or she is satisfied with the service station but, when necessary, even if he or she is not. On the second route, there are two gas stations on opposite sides of the road, both of which are open with no waiting line; convenience may lead the traveler to repurchase at whichever station is on the side of the road in the direction he or she is traveling. Alternatively, one of the competitors may deliver higher satisfaction on another dimension, which would lead the traveler to cross the road if necessary to repurchase from the same gas station. On the third route, there are four gas stations located on the four corners of an intersection; each is open without a waiting line. Convenience may continue to play a key role (e.g., stop at the first one on the same side of the road that does not have a line), but an alternative decision rule could lead to convenience becoming irrelevant.

This anecdote suggests a three-way interaction among satisfaction, convenience, and competitive intensity. When competitive intensity is low, convenience prevents defection

and facilitates repurchase behavior, thus exerting both a direct and a moderating influence on repurchase. However, as competitive intensity increases, convenience plays a less important role in the repurchase decision. It is not clear whether competitive intensity will have a significant direct effect, which would depend on whether customers perceive shopping synergies associated with a large number of competitors in a single destination, such as at a regional shopping mall. We do not expect that customers will incorporate these complex interactions into repurchase intentions, which suggests the following hypothesis:

H₆: Competitive intensity (a) moderates the relationships among customer satisfaction, convenience, and repurchase behavior such that convenience enhances the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior when competitive intensity is low but not when competitive intensity is high but (b) does not moderate the relationship among customer satisfaction, convenience, and repurchase intentions.

Research Design and Empirical Results

To examine our hypotheses, we worked with a national specialty retail chain that sells its own brand of upscale women's apparel and home furnishings in approximately 100 North American locations. The company provided contact information for 3117 customers and offered a \$20 coupon to customers who responded to the four-page questionnaire. The customer list included randomly selected names of customers who had purchased merchandise from any store during the 12 weeks before the generation of the list. Thus, the sampling frame represents current customers.

Contact information included names and addresses for all 3117 customers and e-mail addresses for 1150 customers who had joined the relationship program, which featured frequent e-mails announcing newly arrived merchandise and promotions. We sent e-mail messages to all 1150 e-mail addresses, inviting potential respondents to click through to an online survey. Of these 1150 addresses, 264 e-mails were returned as undeliverable, leaving an effective sampling frame of 886. After two weeks, we sent an additional e-mail to nonrespondents, offering them another chance to participate. We ultimately received 285 surveys, for an effective response rate of 32%. We eliminated 12 respondents who provided incomplete information from subsequent analyses, leaving a total of 276 usable responses.

We sent postal mail to the other 1967 names on the customer list. Of these, 28 were returned as undeliverable, leaving an effective sampling frame of 1939. After four weeks, we sent a follow-up letter and survey to the nonrespondents, offering them another chance to participate. A total of 721 people responded, for an effective response rate of 37%. Of these, 52 incomplete surveys were unusable, leaving a total of 669 usable responses. The 945 respondents to both surveys were primarily women (99%) between the ages of 35 and 54 years (66%) with at least some college education (96%) and an average household income exceeding \$58,000.

Construct Measurement

We operationalized repurchase behavior using two measures from the company's records: the number of repurchase visits and the amount of repurchase spending during the 52 weeks after completion of the survey. The use of objective repurchase data for the year following the survey eliminates concerns of common method variance, simultaneity, or endogeneity. We log transformed the repurchase behavior measures to improve distribution normality.

Several independent measures were objective secondary data or single-item, self-reported measures. We measured household income as the median household income reported in the 2000 census for the respondent's zip code. Relationship age was a single-item measure (i.e., "How long have you been a ... customer?"). Relationship program participation was a dichotomous variable indicating whether the customer had opted in to the company's e-mail program. To operationalize competitive intensity, we used Census Bureau Zip Code Business Patterns data that report the number of establishments competing in each North American Industry Classification System (NAIC; <http://censtats.census.gov/cbpnaic/cbpnaic.shtml>); using the respondent's zip code, we included the total number of competitors in women's clothing (NAIC code 448120) and other home furnishings (NAIC code 442299).

We adapted multi-item scales to measure repurchase intentions (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry 1994), satisfaction (Voss, Parasuraman, and Grewal 1998), and involvement (Beatty and Talpade 1994). Because no comprehensive convenience scale existed, we followed standard procedures to develop scale items for each of the five convenience types (Berry, Seiders, and Grewal 2002). The multigroup confirmatory factor analysis that we report in the Appendix supports the reliability and consistency of the scales (Voss and Parasuraman 2003). We used mean scores for the latent constructs in subsequent regression analyses.

In Table 2, we present descriptive statistics and construct correlations for the variables of interest. Comparison of the means for the postal mail and e-mail samples indicates that relationship program participants are more involved, have lower relationship ages, and engage in more repurchase visits and spending. These mean differences raise questions as to whether there are differences in the structural relationships of interest across the two samples. We conducted an exploratory analysis to address this. Of the 15 possible structural differences across the three models (five for each model: repurchase visits, spending, and intentions), only one was significant at the $p < .05$ level; moreover, there was no increase in the adjusted R^2 for any of the models. These results reinforce the generalizability of the findings across the two samples.

Hypothesis Testing

To test the hypotheses, we ran a series of regression analyses to estimate identical models for repurchase intentions, visits, and spending. Preliminary analyses indicated that the hypotheses were supported by 12 of the 18 tests and that the interaction effects of relationship age (H₃) and relationship program participation (H₄) were not significant in any model. For reasons of parsimony, we reestimated the three

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix for the Constructs of Interest

	Overall Mean (Standard Deviation): N = 945	Postal Mail Mean (Standard Deviation): N = 669	E-Mail Mean (Standard Deviation): N = 276	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Satisfaction	4.34 (.72)	4.36 (.71)	4.29 (.74)	1.0								
2. Involvement	4.03 (.73)	3.99* (.74)	4.14* (.70)	.27	1.0							
3. Household income	58,776 (20,254)	59,941* (20,500)	55,952* (19,394)	-.06	-.05	1.0						
4. Relationship age	3.13 (2.44)	3.39* (2.68)	2.50* (1.56)	.01	.10	.06	1.0					
5. Relationship program participation	.29 (.45)	0 (0)	1 (0)	-.04	.10	-.09	-.17	1.0				
6. Convenience	3.89 (.54)	3.88 (.53)	3.92 (.55)	.66	.28	.02	.09	.03	1.0			
7. Competitive intensity	7.45 (10.39)	7.59 (10.55)	7.12 (10.03)	-.01	-.03	.03	.01	-.02	.00	1.0		
8. Repurchase intentions	4.31 (.70)	4.29 (.71)	4.36 (.68)	.53	.48	-.06	.03	.04	.47	.00	1.0	
9. Repurchase visits	4.13 (9.62)	3.27* (9.03)	6.22* (10.65)	.07	.10	.01	.03	.14	.11	-.01	.11	1.0
10. Repurchase spending	326.68 (1083.00)	237.97* (644.33)	541.72* (1718.80)	.07	.11	.00	.00	.13	.10	-.03	.10	.74

*Means are significantly different across groups ($p < .01$); correlations $\geq |.07|$ are significant at $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).

models without these variables. We present the nonstandardized coefficients and t-values for the reduced models in Table 3, in which we group the hypothesized interaction terms in the lower half to facilitate inferences about hypothesized effects. Each model is significant ($p < .01$), but the explanatory power of the model with repurchase intentions as the dependent variable is much higher than those with repurchase visits or spending as the dependent variable. This finding suggests that some of the explanatory power of the repurchase intentions model is due to shared method variance.

The relatively low explanatory power of the equations with objective dependent measures raises some concern about omitted variable bias. To address this concern, we reran the analyses and included lagged dependent measures (i.e., purchase visits and spending for the previous year), which capture unobserved, systematic variation across respondents. This lagged analysis produced no changes in the results for customer or market characteristics and a minor attenuation of the direct effects of relational characteristics, thus indicating that the lagged dependent variables partially mediate the effects of relationship age and relationship program participation. These results suggest that omitted variable bias is not a significant concern.

Repurchase behavior. In the repurchase visits model, three of the four hypothesized interactions (income \times satisfaction, convenience \times satisfaction, and convenience \times competition \times satisfaction) are significant and in the expected direction. These three results are replicated in the repurchase spending model, in which the fourth interaction term (involvement \times satisfaction) is also significant and in the expected direction. Thus, H_{1a} receives partial support, and H_{2a} , H_{5a} , and H_{6a} are fully supported in both analyses. The graphs in Figure 2 facilitate interpretations of these results.

With regard to H_{1a} , involvement moderates the satisfaction–repurchase spending link ($t = 2.22$, $p < .05$, effect size [ES] = .07) but not the satisfaction–repurchase visits link (Cohen 1988). As we show in Figure 2, Panel A, the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase spending is positive only when involvement is high; it is flat when involvement is low. For H_{2a} , household income moderates the link between satisfaction and repurchase visits ($t = 3.12$, $p < .01$, ES = .10) and between satisfaction and repurchase spending ($t = 2.53$, $p < .01$, ES = .08). As we show in Figure 2, Panel B, the relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase spending is not significant when household income is low, but it is significantly positive when household income is high. Consistent with resource allocation theory, this result shows that highly satisfied, lower-income customers are constrained in their repurchase spending.

In support of H_{5a} , the convenience \times satisfaction term is significantly positive in both the repurchase visits ($t = 1.85$, $p < .05$, ES = .06) and the repurchase spending ($t = 1.73$, $p < .05$, ES = .06) models. In support of H_{6a} , the three-way convenience \times competition \times satisfaction term is significantly negative in the two objective repurchase behavior analyses (repurchase visits: $t = -2.17$, $p < .05$, ES = .07; repurchase spending: $t = -2.44$, $p < .05$, ES = .08). To

examine the nature of the interaction effect, we divided the overall sample into three (low, medium, and high) subgroups based on competitive intensity and reran the analysis. The results indicate that the convenience \times satisfaction term is significant only in the low-competition subgroup. As we show in Figure 2, Panel C, the relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase spending is not significant when convenience is low, but it is significantly positive when convenience is high.

Repurchase intentions. The significant, negative coefficient for the involvement \times satisfaction interaction term is the only unexpected result for the repurchase intentions model. As we show in Figure 2, Panel D, the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase intentions is more positive when involvement is low than when involvement is high, and repurchase intentions are nearly as strong for highly satisfied, low-involvement customers as for highly satisfied, high-involvement customers. Combining the results from Figure 2, Panels A and D, offers additional insight: Low-involvement customers overestimate the impact of increasing satisfaction on their subsequent repurchase behavior.

Examining the Baseline Direct Effects

Although we did not hypothesize the baseline direct effects captured by the dotted lines in Figure 1, the results offer some inferences worth noting. For the repurchase visits model, five of the six antecedents—involvement, relationship age, relationship program participation, convenience, and competition—have significant main effects. Although the main effects of satisfaction and income are not significant, significant higher-order terms indicate that the direct effects are contingent. The results for the repurchase spending model are largely similar to the repurchase visits model; although the main effects of convenience and competition are not significant, significant higher-order terms indicate that the direct effects are contingent. These results offer general support for the baseline model depicted in Figure 1, in that all antecedents have a significant effect on repurchase visits and spending. All main effect sizes are small ($ES \leq .11$), with the exception of relationship program participation, which has the strongest effect size ($ES = .29$) with repurchase visits as the dependent variable.

Only three antecedents have significant effects on repurchase intentions. The main effect sizes are moderately large for involvement ($ES = .40$) and satisfaction ($ES = .26$) and are smaller for convenience ($ES = .14$). Household income, relationship age, relationship program participation, and competitive intensity have no significant effects. Common method variance offers a plausible explanation for this pattern of results; all the independent variables that are self-reported measures using Likert scales are positively related to repurchase intentions, but the other measures are not. In general, our findings, with some interesting exceptions, confirm the results of prior studies that report significant direct effects of the model's antecedents on both repurchase intentions and behavior.

TABLE 3
Regression Analysis Results

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables					
	Repurchase Visits		Repurchase Spending		Repurchase Intentions	
	Coefficient	t-Value	Coefficient	t-Value	Coefficient	t-Value
Intercept	1.11**	(29.80)	5.88**	(202.99)	4.34**	(202.98)
Satisfaction	.04	(.57)	.06	(1.11)	.30**	(8.24)
Involvement	.17**	(3.80)	.12**	(3.55)	.33**	(13.19)
Household Income	.01	(.83)	-.00	(-.18)	-.01	(-1.02)
Relationship age	.04**	(3.22)	.02*	(1.91)	-.00	(-.64)
Relationship program participation	.31**	(9.13)	.21**	(7.79)	.01	(.63)
Convenience	.14*	(1.76)	.08	(1.40)	.20**	(4.42)
Competition	.01*	(1.79)	.00	(1.23)	.00	(.64)
Competition × satisfaction	-.00	(-.71)	-.00	(-.75)	-.00	(-.77)
Competition × convenience	.01	(1.06)	.00	(.57)	-.00	(-.56)
Involvement × satisfaction	.06	(1.17)	.09*	(2.22)	-.07**	(-2.40)
Income × satisfaction	.07**	(3.12)	.04**	(2.53)	.01	(.73)
Convenience × satisfaction	.12*	(1.85)	.09*	(1.73)	-.06	(-1.59)
Convenience × competition × satisfaction	-.01*	(-2.17)	-.01**	(-2.44)	-.00	(-.85)
Model F value (degrees of freedom = 13/931)	11.53**		9.14**		53.92**	
Adjusted R ²	.13**		.10**		.42**	


* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.


Notes: We report nonstandardized regression coefficients with t-values in parentheses for each effect. Significant hypothesized interaction effects are bolded for visual clarity.

FIGURE 2
Significant Interaction Plots


A: Plotting the Effect of Involvement and Satisfaction on Repurchase Spending^a




B: Plotting the Effect of Income and Satisfaction on Repurchase Spending^a



C: Plotting the Effect of Convenience and Satisfaction on Repurchase Spending when Competition Is Low^a



D: Plotting the Effect of Involvement and Satisfaction on Repurchase Intentions



^aThe graphs understate the effect sizes in the repurchase spending panels because figures on the vertical axis are log natural transformations, so that 5 ≈ \$148.41, 6 ≈ \$403.43, and 7 ≈ \$1,096.63.

Discussion

The marketing concept, which proposes that customer satisfaction should be the focal point of business activities, is based on the explicit assumption that satisfied customers repurchase more and therefore are more profitable. In questioning this fundamental assumption, we predicted that customer, relational, and marketplace characteristics would moderate the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior but not repurchase intentions. In a specialty retailing context, we find that satisfaction has a strong positive effect on repurchase intentions but no direct effect on

repurchase behavior; customer and marketplace characteristics play significant moderating roles; and relational factors have a positive direct influence on repurchase behavior but not intentions.

Consistent with our prediction, we find that inferences related to moderating effects vary dramatically across self-reported repurchase intentions and objective measures of repurchase behavior. Our results show the absence of significant moderating effects on the satisfaction–repurchase intentions relationship for five of the six interactions, but they show the presence of significant moderating effects on the satisfaction–repurchase behavior (visits and spending)

relationship for 7 of the 12 interactions. This pattern of results supports our argument—drawn from consumer resource allocation theory—that customers often fail to consider intervening contingency effects when they predict their own future behavior.

These divergent findings, consistent with the modest correlations between intentions and objective visits and spending (see Table 2), again raise questions about the reliability of customers' self-reported repurchase intentions for testing conceptual models of repurchase behavior, including those that examine the role of moderating variables. We summarize the hypotheses test results in Table 4.

Moderating Effects on Repurchase Behavior and Intentions

Customer characteristics. Our results add to a growing body of research that offers strong support for the moderating role of customer characteristics on repurchase behavior across a variety of contexts (see Table 1). As we expected, involved customers shop and spend more than do less involved customers. The significant moderating effect on repurchase spending indicates that involved customers spend even more when their satisfaction is high (Figure 2, Panel A). The interaction effect is not significant for repurchase visits, which suggests that satisfaction has no linear effect on involved customers' repurchase frequency. These active shoppers likely patronize a variety of competing stores within their evoked set, and delivering satisfaction to this customer group simply establishes a presence in that set. Delivering superior satisfaction does not lead to increased repurchase frequency (i.e., customers continue to shop around), but it does lead to significantly higher spending. Unexpectedly, involvement has a negative moderating effect on repurchase intentions. Figure 2, Panel D, suggests that when low-involvement customers perceive superior satisfaction, they register significantly higher repurchase intentions; however, Panel A indicates that low-involvement customers fail to follow through on those intentions.

Consistent with Becker's (1965) theory of time allocation, household income enhances the effect of satisfaction on repurchase visits and spending (Figure 2, Panel B). This result confirms the role of household income as a constraint that attenuates the influence of satisfaction on repurchase behavior for lower-income customers. As we expected, household income does not moderate the link between satisfaction and repurchase intentions. In contrast, household income has no significant direct effects, a finding we did not anticipate. This result may reflect the highly focused merchandising strategy and lifestyle orientation of the specialty retailer we studied.

Relational characteristics. Our results add to equivocal findings with respect to relational characteristics, which seem to play a moderating role in contractual or industrial purchase contexts or when specific types of repurchase behavior are examined (see Table 1). Relational variables may have weaker moderating effects in contexts marked by discrete purchase events and low exit barriers than in contractual relationships (e.g., Bolton 1998; Reinartz and Kumar 2000; Verhoef 2003). The predicted nonsignificant

moderating effects of relationship age and relationship program participation on repurchase intentions and the positive direct effects on repurchase visits and spending but not on intentions are consistent with our belief that it is difficult for customers to incorporate background factors such as relationship age and program participation into future purchase predictions.

The results indicate that habit plays a major role in determining behavior in this context, and we speculate that relationship programs that feature direct communications may act as a personal shopper by providing updates on merchandise, sales, and promotions that simplify the shopping process. These programs conserve participants' resources and provide them with more frequent incentives to visit the retailer's stores. Participants may also perceive a greater relationship investment by the retailer and respond with higher behavioral commitment, even if their intentions are unaffected.

Marketplace characteristics. Our results add to the small number of studies that have demonstrated moderating effects of marketplace characteristics, and the results highlight the importance of considering firm \times competitor interactions that distinguish retail competition across geographic marketplaces. The significant results for convenience as a positive moderator of satisfaction's effects on repurchase visits and spending highlight the importance of this relatively unexamined construct. Collectively, the findings suggest that convenience directly encourages repurchase visits but that repurchase spending occurs only if satisfaction also is high.

Convenience has been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that has particular importance for retail patronage behavior (Seiders, Berry, and Gresham 2000). We contribute to the emerging literature in this area by developing and testing a scale that captures the multiple dimensions of shopping convenience. As a threshold variable, convenience assumes a different role from switching costs, which have been examined in other studies (e.g., Burnham, Frels, and Mahajan 2003; Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty 2000). Whereas switching costs represent a one-time penalty for customers that is directly associated with moving from one firm to another, convenience is a strategically used marketing variable and a relatively stable attribute of the offering. The lack of convenience can be a motive to defect, whereas the presence of convenience can motivate trial or discourage defection.

Our study is one of the first to examine the moderating effect of competitive intensity on the satisfaction–repurchase relationship directly. The results support our expectation that increasing competition attenuates the positive effect of convenience, which is a relatively easy-to-copy source of advantage. It would also be instructive to explore the extent to which competitive intensity erodes other sources of competitive advantage. Furthermore, competition exerts a positive main effect on repurchase visits, which suggests that competitors in this category benefit from locating next to one another to create a shopping destination.

TABLE 4
Summary of Hypothesized Results

Hypothesized Moderators of the Effect of Satisfaction on:	Repurchase Behavior					
	Repurchase Visits		Repurchase Spending		Repurchase Intentions	
	Hypothesis	Supported	Hypothesis	Supported	Hypothesis	Supported
H ₁ : Involvement \times satisfaction	+	No	+	Yes	0	No
H ₂ : Income \times satisfaction	+	Yes	+	Yes	0	Yes
H ₃ : Relationship age \times satisfaction	+	No	+	No	0	Yes
H ₄ : Relationship program participation \times satisfaction	+	No	+	No	0	Yes
H ₅ : Convenience \times satisfaction	+	Yes	+	Yes	0	Yes
H ₆ : Convenience \times competition \times satisfaction	-	Yes	-	Yes	0	Yes

Notes: + = variable moderates (enhances) the positive relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase behavior, - = convenience moderates (enhances) the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior when competitive intensity is low but not when competitive intensity is high, and 0 = variable does not moderate the relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

Implications for Managers

Satisfaction scores by themselves may not predict repurchase behavior accurately and may create false security if managers assume that higher satisfaction scores necessarily lead to stronger repurchase behavior. That someone is an ongoing customer suggests that he or she is at least somewhat or very satisfied (if not delighted). However, greater value may be gleaned by tracking defecting customers to determine the cause of their defection or by developing customer relationship management systems that track actual repurchase decisions. Such behavioral data are more accurate in evaluating the effectiveness of firms' marketing strategies and therefore represent an important complement to customer self-reported data.

Managers also would benefit from a better understanding of moderating variables, such as involvement and household income, that can be used to segment customers into lower or higher repurchase groups. Firms can identify customers with higher levels of involvement and then attempt to foster long-term relationships with members of that group. Managers can invest resources in offering programs (e.g., by using initiatives such as in-store events, experiential classes, and charitable campaigns) to increase customer involvement. For example, Whole Foods Market regularly promotes a program in which it matches customers' contributions to featured national environmental organizations through the highly visible sale of coupons offered for purchase at the stores' checkout terminals. Our results support the assumption that these carefully focused initiatives can lead to more repurchase visits and spending by increasing involvement among customers.

Our results also suggest that managers should encourage repurchase behavior through deliberately multifaceted strategies that conserve customers' time and effort. For example, innovative and comprehensive approaches to site location analysis should be a priority for retailers. Retail firms can develop strategies that promote convenience and reduce uncertainty by communicating specific and detailed information about merchandise online and by focusing on coordination to ensure consistency across channels. Related to this is the importance of encouraging customers to opt in to permission-based communications and then delivering tangible value to those who participate in relationship programs. In our study, respondents from the e-mail sample visited and spent approximately twice as much in the store as did the postal mail respondents (see Table 2). Managers should consider offering incentives to motivate customers to join these programs. Moreover, firms should not only allocate resources to attract and retain customers who elect to join permission-based communications programs but also use this channel as a means for creative differentiation. These types of initiatives construct effective exit barriers and contribute to competitive strength and viability.

Limitations and Further Research

As with all research, our study is constrained by limitations that suggest areas for further research. Although prior research suggests that satisfaction is a partial mediator of the effect of convenience on repurchase, we do not explic-

itly examine the direct effect of convenience on satisfaction. In terms of our sample, 99% was female; because prior research has demonstrated shopping differences between men and women, caution should be exercised when extending our findings to a general population. The sample also included only current customers; thus, our findings may not extend to noncustomers who have no experience with the firm or to customers who have defected. We encourage additional research that examines defection to illuminate the differences between customers who defect and those who do not.

We especially encourage additional studies that investigate direct and moderating effects of relational characteristics. We collected objective repurchase measures one year after we measured the relationship program participation, but endogeneity cannot be completely ruled out as an alternative explanation for the robust direct effects, because customers who elect to participate in relationship programs may be particularly enthusiastic or loyal. If this is true, the causal ordering between relationship program participation and repurchase behavior is ambiguous. We believe that the involvement construct included as an independent measure effectively controls for purchase category enthusiasm, but we did not control for store loyalty. Further research could attempt to disentangle relationship program participation effects from the effects of other, related constructs.

The dynamism of fashion, which encourages variety-seeking shopping behavior, might explain the lack of significant moderating effects of relational characteristics in the current study. Significant moderating effects of relational characteristics might be found in discrete repurchase contexts that are less dynamic and less hedonic. The type of relationship program that the retailer implements might also affect whether moderating effects manifest. For example, relationship programs that are multilevel (e.g., with different levels of benefits) rather than dichotomous (as was the case with the retailer in our study) might elicit significant moderating effects.

Our results indicate key moderating roles of customer characteristics, such as involvement and income, and marketplace characteristics, such as perceived convenience and competitive intensity. Further research could provide a deeper understanding of how these variables and relational characteristics influence repurchase behavior across a variety of conditions. We suspect that convenience is important in explaining behavior for discrete, recurring purchase decisions and likely becomes even more important as the frequency of repurchase increases (e.g., supermarket shopping). The multidimensional convenience scale that we present in the Appendix may be useful in exploring the role of convenience in other purchase contexts.

The study of additional customer and marketplace characteristics that may moderate the satisfaction–repurchase relationship is an important next step. Customer characteristics that warrant examination for moderating effects (see Table 1) include the propensity to engage in relationships and variety seeking. Additional marketplace characteristics, such as switching barriers and the attractiveness of alternatives for customers, should also be investigated further (Jones, Mothersbaugh, and Beatty 2000). For example, if

attractive alternatives exist, less-satisfied customers would be more likely to register regret (in passing up the alternative); thus, they should be less likely to repurchase from the focal retailer (Inman, Dyer, and Jia 1997; Inman and Zeelenberg 2002; Lemon, White, and Winer 2002). This suggests that the link between satisfaction and repurchase would be more positive when attractive alternatives exist.

We examine the impact of customer, relational, and marketplace factors in a specialty retailing context in which repurchase behavior equals repatronage. We propose that these three categories of moderators likely generalize across repurchase situations; thus, the conceptual framework in Figure 1 can be applied, for example, to brand repurchase and to retail repatronage behavior. More specifically, we expect that the categories of moderators are generalizable and that the specific variables in each category that are salient may vary across purchase situations. Therefore, the conceptual framework should be tested in additional repurchase contexts to confirm that it can generalize across products and services.

Finally, to our knowledge, no research has examined the role of situational factors in moderating the satisfaction–

repurchase association. Decisions influenced by transitory needs, such as those driven by emergency, point-of-purchase, or time pressure factors, often lead customers to engage in isolated unsought, impulse, or suboptimal purchase behavior. Such situational moderating influences warrant better understanding in terms of how they affect specific, stand-alone transactions and ongoing customer–firm relationships.

Despite these limitations and opportunities for additional research, the current study introduces new insights into the moderated relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behavior in a context marked by discrete, recurring purchases. The conceptual framework and empirical results improve the understanding of the complex and contingent relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase behavior and suggest that habit, convenience, task simplification, and individual differences in involvement and household income play important roles. The findings also serve to identify new directions for further research that ultimately will enhance the understanding of what drives repurchase behavior.

APPENDIX

Item Descriptions and Measurement Model Results for Latent Constructs

Item Descriptions	Lambda Loading	Construct Reliability	Average Variance Extracted
Decision Convenience		.75	.52
I can easily determine prior to shopping whether SR will offer what I need.	.82		
Deciding to shop at SR is quick and easy.	.50		
I can quickly find information before I shop to decide if SR has what I'm looking for.	.79		
Access Convenience		.82	.54
I am able to get to SR quickly and easily.	.79		
SR offers convenient parking.	.59		
SR offers convenient locations.	.87		
SR offers convenient store hours.	.67		
Transaction Convenience		.89	.73
I am able to complete my purchase quickly at SR.	.84		
SR makes it easy for me to conclude my transaction.	.93		
It takes little time to pay for my purchase at SR.	.78		
Benefit Convenience		.84	.57
It is easy to find the products I am looking for at SR.	.80		
I can easily get product advice at SR.	.59		
The merchandise I want at SR can be located quickly.	.85		
It is easy to evaluate the merchandise at SR.	.75		
Postbenefit Convenience		.80	.61
SR takes care of product exchanges and returns promptly.	.74		
Any after-purchase problems I experience are quickly resolved at SR.	.73		
It is easy to take care of returns and exchanges at SR.	.76		
Satisfaction		.90	.74
I am pleased with the overall service at SR.	.82		
Shopping at SR is a delightful experience.	.87		
I am completely satisfied with the SR shopping experience.	.88		

APPENDIX Continued

Item Descriptions	Lambda Loading	Construct Reliability	Average Variance Extracted
Involvement		.89	.73
I have a strong personal interest in stores like SR.	.81		
Stores like SR are very important to me.	.92		
The kinds of products SR sells are important to me.	.84		
Repurchase Intentions		.81	.68
How likely are you to shop more often at SR in the future?	.80		
How likely are you to continue shopping at SR?	.84		
Fit Statistics			
Chi-square (degrees of freedom = 1363)	2351.60		
Nonnormed fit index	.93		
Comparative fit index	.94		

Notes: SR = the specialty retailer brand name.

REFERENCES

- Andaleeb, Syed Saad and Amiya K. Basu (1994), "Technical Complexity and Consumer Knowledge as Moderators of Service Quality Evaluation in the Automobile Service Industry," *Journal of Retailing*, 70 (Winter), 367–81.
- Anderson, Eugene W., Claes Fornell, and Donald R. Lehmann (1994), "Customer Satisfaction, Market Share, and Profitability," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (July), 53–66.
- and Mary W. Sullivan (1993), "The Antecedents and Consequences of Customer Satisfaction for Firms," *Marketing Science*, 12 (Spring), 125–43.
- Batshell, Richard R. (1980), "Consumer Resource Allocation Models at the Individual Level," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (June), 78–90.
- Beatty, Sharon E., Lynn R. Kahle, and Pamela M. Homer (1988), "Alternative Hierarchies of the Attitude-Behavior Relationship: The Impact of Brand Commitment and Habit," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16 (Summer), 1–10.
- and Scott M. Smith (1987), "External Search Effort: An Investigation Across Several Product Categories," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (June), 183–95.
- and Salil Talpade (1994), "Adolescent Influence in Family Decision Making: A Replication with Extension," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (September), 332–41.
- Becker, Gary S. (1965), "A Theory of the Allocation of Time," *The Economic Journal*, 75 (September), 493–517.
- Bendapudi, Neeli and Leonard L. Berry (1997), "Customers' Motivations for Maintaining Relationships with Service Providers," *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (Spring), 15–23.
- Bentler, Peter M. and George Speckart (1979), "Models of Attitude-Behavior Relations," *Psychological Review*, 86 (5), 452–64.
- Berry, Leonard L., Kathleen Seiders, and Dhruv Grewal (2002), "Understanding Service Convenience," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (July), 1–17.
- Bhattacharya, C.B. (1998), "When Customers Are Members: Customer Retention in Paid Membership Contexts," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 26 (1), 31–44.
- and Ruth N. Bolton (2000), "Relationship Marketing in Mass Markets," in *Handbook of Relationship Marketing*, Jagdish N. Sheth and Atul Parvatiyar, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 327–54.
- , Hayagreeva Rao, and Mary Ann Glynn (1995), "Understanding the Bond of Identification: An Investigation of Its Correlates Among Art Museum Members," *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (October), 46–57.
- Bloch, Peter H., Daniel L. Sherrell, and Nancy M. Ridgway (1986), "Consumer Search: An Extended Framework," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (June), 119–26.
- Bolton, Ruth N. (1998), "A Dynamic Model of the Customer's Relationship with a Continuous Service Provider: The Role of Satisfaction," *Marketing Science*, 17 (1), 45–65.
- , P.K. Kannan, and Matthew D. Bramlett (2000), "Implications of Loyalty Program Membership and Service Experiences for Customer Retention and Value," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28 (January), 95–108.
- , Katherine N. Lemon, and Peter C. Verhoef (2004), "The Theoretical Underpinnings of Customer Asset Management: A Framework and Propositions for Future Research," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32 (Summer), 271–93.
- Boulding, William, Ajay Kalra, Richard Staelin, and Valarie A. Zeithaml (1993), "A Dynamic Process Model of Service Quality: From Expectations to Behavioral Intentions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (February), 7–27.
- Bowman, Douglas and Das Narayandas (2001), "Managing Customer-Initiated Contacts with Manufacturers: The Impact on Share of Category Requirements and Word-of-Mouth Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (August), 281–97.
- and ——— (2004), "Linking Customer Management Effort to Customer Profitability in Business Markets," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41 (November), 433–47.
- Burnham, Thomas A., Judy K. Frels, and Vijay Mahajan (2003), "Consumer Switching Costs: A Typology, Antecedents, and Consequences," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31 (2), 109–126.
- Capraro, Anthony J., Susan Broniarczyk, and Rajendra K. Srivastava (2003), "Factors Influencing the Likelihood of Customer Defection: The Role of Consumer Knowledge," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31 (2), 164–75.
- Chandon, Pierre, Vicki G. Morwitz, and Werner J. Reinartz (2005), "Do Intentions Really Predict Behavior? Self-

- Generated Validity Effects in Survey Research," *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (April), 1–14.
- Cohen, Jacob (1988), *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2d ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- De Wulf, Kristof, Gaby Odekerken-Schroder, and Dawn Iacobucci (2001), "Investments in Consumer Relationships: A Cross-Country and Cross-Industry Exploration," *Journal of Marketing*, 65 (October), 33–50.
- Feldman, Laurence P. and Jacob Hornik (1981), "The Use of Time: An Integrated Conceptual Model," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (March), 407–419.
- Ganesh, Jaishankar, Mark J. Arnold, and Kristy E. Reynolds (2000), "Understanding the Customer Base of Service Providers: An Examination of the Differences Between Switchers and Stayers," *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (July), 65–87.
- Garbarino, Ellen and Mark S. Johnson (1999), "The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and Commitment in Customer Relationships," *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (April), 70–87.
- Gruen, Thomas W., John O. Summers, and Frank Acito (2000), "Relationship Marketing Activities, Commitment, and Membership Behaviors in Professional Associations," *Journal of Marketing*, 64 (July), 34–49.
- Homburg, Christian and Annette Giering (2001), "Personal Characteristics as Moderators of the Relationship Between Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty—An Empirical Analysis," *Psychology and Marketing*, 18 (1), 43–66.
- , Nicole Koschate, and Wayne D. Hoyer (2005), "Do Satisfied Customers Really Pay More? A Study of the Relationship Between Customer Satisfaction and Willingness to Pay," *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (April), 84–96.
- Inman, J. Jeffrey, James S. Dyer, and Jianmin Jia (1997), "A Generalized Utility Model of Disappointment and Regret Effects on Choice Valuation," *Marketing Science*, 16 (2), 97–111.
- and Marcel Zeelenberg (2002), "Regret in Repeat Purchase Versus Switching Decisions: The Attenuating Role of Decision Justifiability," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (June), 116–28.
- Jacoby, Jacob, George J. Szybillo, and Carol K. Berning (1976), "Time and Consumer Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Overview," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2 (March), 320–39.
- Jamieson, Linda F. and Frank M. Bass (1989), "Adjusting Stated Intention Measures to Predict Trial Purchase of New Products: A Comparison of Models and Methods," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26 (August), 336–35.
- Jones, Michael A., David L. Mothersbaugh, and Sharon E. Beatty (2000), "Switching Barriers and Repurchase Intentions in Services," *Journal of Retailing*, 76 (Summer), 259–74.
- Jones, Thomas O. and W. Earl Sasser Jr. (1995), "Why Satisfied Customers Defect," *Harvard Business Review*, 73 (November–December), 89–99.
- Kahneman, Daniel and Jackie S. Snell (1992), "Predicting a Taste Change: Do People Know What They Will Like?" *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 5 (3), 187–200.
- Kalwani, Manohar and Alvin J. Silk (1982), "On the Reliability and Predictive Validity of Purchase Intention Measures," *Marketing Science*, 1 (Summer), 243–86.
- Kamakura, Wagner A., Vikas Mittal, Fernando de Rosa, and Jose Afonso Mazzon (2002), "Assessing the Service-Profit Chain," *Marketing Science*, 21 (Summer), 294–317.
- Keaveney, Susan M. (1995), "Customer Switching Behavior in Service Industries: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (April), 71–82.
- and Madhavan Parthasarathy (2001), "Customer Switching Behavior in Online Services: An Exploratory Study of the Role of Selected Attitudinal, Behavioral, and Demographic Factors," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29 (October), 374–90.
- Lemon, Katherine N., Tiffany Barnett White, and Russell S. Winer (2002), "Dynamic Customer Relationship Management: Incorporating Future Considerations into the Service Retention Decision," *Journal of Marketing*, 66 (January), 1–14.
- MacInnis, Deborah J. and Bernard J. Jaworski (1989), "Information Processing from Advertisements: Towards an Integrative Framework," *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (October), 1–23.
- , Christine Moorman, and Bernard J. Jaworski (1991), "Enhancing Consumers' Motivation, Ability, and Opportunity to Process Brand Information from Ads: Conceptual Framework and Managerial Implications," *Journal of Marketing*, 55 (October), 32–53.
- Magi, Anne W. (2003), "Share of Wallet in Retailing: The Effects of Customer Satisfaction, Loyalty Cards and Shopper Characteristics," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (Summer), 97–106.
- Maheswaran, Durairaj and Joan Meyers-Levy (1990), "The Influence of Message Framing and Issue Involvement," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27 (August), 361–67.
- Marmorstein, Howard, Dhruv Grewal, and Raymond P.H. Fiske (1992), "The Value of Time Spent in Price-Comparison Shopping: Survey and Experimental Evidence," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (June), 52–61.
- Mittal, Banwari (1995), "A Comparative Analysis of Four Scales of Consumer Involvement," *Psychology and Marketing*, 12 (November–December), 363–380.
- Mittal, Vikas and Wagner A. Kamakura (2001), "Satisfaction, Repurchase Intent, and Repurchase Behavior: Investigating the Moderating Effect of Customer Characteristics," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (February), 131–42.
- Morwitz, Vicki (1997), "Why Consumers Don't Always Accurately Predict Their Own Future Behavior," *Marketing Letters*, 8 (1), 57–70.
- and David Schmittlein (1992), "Using Segmentation to Improve Sales Forecasts Based on Purchase Intent: Which 'Intenders' Actually Buy?" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (November), 391–405.
- , Joel H. Steckel, and Alok Gupta (1997), "When Do Purchase Intentions Predict Sales?" MSI Report No. 97-112. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Nichols, Sharon Y. and Karen D. Fox (1983), "Buying Time and Saving Time: Strategies for Managing Household Production," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10 (September), 197–208.
- Parasuraman, A., Valarie A. Zeithaml, and Leonard L. Berry (1994), "Alternative Scales for Measuring Service Quality," *Journal of Retailing*, 70 (Fall), 201–30.
- Peracchio, Laura A. and Joan Meyers-Levy (1997), "Evaluating Persuasion-Enhancing Techniques from a Resource-Matching Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (September), 178–191.
- Reinartz, Werner J. and V. Kumar (2000), "On the Profitability of Long-Life Customers in a Noncontractual Setting: An Empirical Investigation and Implications for Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (January), 77–99.
- and ——— (2003), "The Impact of Customer Relationship Characteristics on Profitable Lifetime Duration," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (January), 77–99.
- Roberts, Scott D. and Rajiv P. Dant (1991), "Rethinking Resource Allocation in Modern Society: A Meanings-Based Approach," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 12 (September), 411–30.
- Russell, Craig J. and Philip Bobko (1992), "Moderated Regression Analysis and Likert Scales: Too Coarse for Comfort," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (3), 336–42.
- Rust, Roland T., Katherine N. Lemon, and Valarie A. Zeithaml (2004), "Return on Marketing: Using Customer Equity to Focus Marketing Strategy," *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (January), 109–127.

- , Anthony J. Zahorik, and Timothy L. Keiningham (1995), "Return on Quality (ROQ): Making Service Quality Financially Accountable," *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (April), 58–70.
- Seiders, Kathleen, Leonard L. Berry, and Larry Gresham (2000), "Attention Retailers: How Convenient Is Your Convenience Strategy?" *Sloan Management Review*, 49 (3), 79–90.
- Sheth, Jagdish N. and Atul Parvatiyar (1995), "Relationship Marketing in Consumer Markets," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23 (4), 255–71.
- Shugan, Steven M. (1980), "The Cost of Thinking," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7 (September), 99–111.
- Soberon-Ferrer, Horacio and Rachel Dardis (1991), "Determinants of Household Expenditures for Services," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (March), 385–97.
- Verhoef, Peter C. (2003), "Understanding the Effect of Customer Relationship Management Efforts on Customer Retention and Customer Share Development," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (October), 30–45.
- , Philip H. Franses, and Janny C. Hoekstra (2002), "The Effect of Relational Constructs on Customer Referrals and Number of Services Purchased From a Multiservice Provider: Does Age of Relationship Matter?" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 30 (3), 202–216.
- Voss, Glenn B. and A. Parasuraman (2003), "Conducting Measurement Validation with Experimental Data: Cautions and Recommendations," *Marketing Letters*, 14 (1), 59–73.
- , ———, and Dhruv Grewal (1998), "The Role of Price and Quality Perceptions in Prepurchase and Postpurchase Evaluation of Services," *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (October), 46–61.
- Wakefield, Kirk L. and Julie Baker (1998), "Excitement at the Mall: Determinants and Effects on Shopping Response," *Journal of Retailing*, 74 (Fall), 515–39.
- Young, Martin R., Wayne S. DeSarbo, and Vicki G. Morwitz (1998), "The Stochastic Modeling of Purchase Intentions and Behavior," *Marketing Science*, 44 (2), 188–202.
- Zeithaml, Valarie A. (1988), "Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality, and Value: A Means–End Model and Synthesis of Evidence," *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (3), 2–22.