

ABSTRACT

It was hypothesized and empirically confirmed that brand attribute information is salient in predicting immediate satisfaction and that these factors strongly influence intentions formed immediately after product trial. However, it was shown that in delayed measurement, past knowledge factors increasingly become salient while the relative explanatory power of performance evaluation and satisfaction decays in forming future purchase decisions. The impact of the timing factor and the strategic implications of the findings are discussed.

Temporal Decay in Satisfaction – Purchase Intention Relationship

David Mazursky and Aviva Geva

The Hebrew University

Many previous studies have attempted to predict future purchase decisions following the exposure and experience with new brands. There are two major sources of information that consumers may utilize when forming intentions to buy these brands. One source derives from knowledge that has been presented and/or projected from the tried brand (i.e. the focal brand). The second source consists of knowledge that had been accumulated and learned in the past, not in the context of the focal brand, but could potentially become salient when future evaluations and choice decisions are formed. This source of information may consist of knowledge about competing brands, social approval by reference groups and individuals, standards regarding what the focal brand ought to achieve, past experience, etc. To distinguish the latter factors from those associated with the first (focal brand) type of predictors, they will be termed in this context social and product "norms" (see also in Woodruff, Cadotte, & Jenkins, 1983). While the consequences of brand trial have traditionally been studied within the consumer satisfaction/

dissatisfaction literature scant attention had been devoted in these studies to the impact of general product class beliefs and social norms on purchase decisions. The present study was designed to embed these factors within current frameworks and test their impact empirically.

To elaborate, early research in this domain attempted to predict brand quality and satisfaction (e.g. Cardozo, 1965; Anderson, 1973; Olshavsky & Miller, 1972) from the discrepancy between performance and prior brand expectations. Hence, in many of the empirical tests, satisfaction was postulated to emanate from focal brand information. Swan (1982, p. 126) noted that "Satisfaction is a . . . specific affective/cognitive postpurchase orientation that has as its focus the evaluation of the product in terms of its performance in use".

More recent studies extended this paradigm to predict intention to purchase and choice decisions (Oliver, 1980; Bearden & Teel, 1983; LaBarbera & Mazursky, 1983). Except for a few studies (e.g. Churchill & Surprenant, 1982), a strong focal brand information on intentions was observed in the consumer satisfaction studies in the form of a substantial statistical link between performance evaluation (including satisfaction) and intentions to purchase the focal brand.

However, a careful assessment of the methods used in these studies reveals that the post trial measures were typically collected by the same instrument very briefly after the trial or without controlling for the time that had elapsed between trial and measurement. Aside from the possibility that coefficients are higher due to method variance (Oliver, 1980), it is plausible that focal brand information is highly available (and effective) immediately after trial but that this impact is weakened over time. The strong influence of focal brand information stem primarily from a simultaneous operation of several sensory channels that are involved in brand experience (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982; Smith & Swinyard, 1983). The enhanced processing of brand information makes this information highly effective in satisfaction measurement. In addition, in immediate measures, brand-specific information in more recent (Hannah & Sternthal, 1984).

While in some purchase occasions satisfaction and intention to purchase are formed in a very brief delay after brand information acquisition (e.g. telemarketing, foot-in-the-door), there are many other instances in which purchase decisions are withheld and formed only after a longer period of time (days, weeks) elapsed since the brand had been tried (e.g. cars, electronic appliances, housing). Recently, it has been suggested that the difference in advertising effectiveness between the exposure occasion and brand response may be mediated by the length of delay intervals (Baker, & Lutz, 1988).

Thus, if intentions to buy are developed only a certain period of time after the brand was tried, the conclusion about the strong link between focal brand judgments (i.e. performance evaluation and satisfaction) and intention may represent an overestimation of focal brand impact and a corresponding underestimation of norms information. Measuring intentions in a controlled delay after product trial may be extremely important given that in many contexts the decision to buy is formed only some time after trial.

Indeed, other studies have suggested that purchase intentions may be strongly affected directly by social and product norms. When intentions to purchase are assessed, the consumers' focal reference shifts toward the anticipated purchase occasion and usage of the brand (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). The information that will be evoked is likely to include a much broader set of thoughts and associations to past experiences (e.g. Bugelski, 1982; Gardner, 1985). Affective responses from experiences other than those with the focal brand may be activated in view of the anticipated brand usage, thus limiting the impact of the focal brand satisfaction on intentions. Accordingly, brand judgments generate but one of many emotional links to the specific future brand use situation (Zajonc & Markus, 1982). It has also been shown that focusing on contextually specific measures and directing consumers' attention toward the evoked set of brands and purchase location (thus inducing the retrieval of knowledge from previous experiences) may improve predictions of future buying intentions (e.g., Warshaw, 1980).

Most importantly, the impact that social and product norms exert on intentions may strengthen over time, while that of focal brand information is likely to weaken. Specifically schemata of accumulated past experiential and norms knowledge are represented in memory as highly coherent and unitized structures (Fiske & Dyer, 1985) and are associatively linked to the self (Markus, 1985). In contrast, the effect of brand information (which directly influences satisfaction) decays as this information tends to be forgotten over time. Accordingly, the suppression of general product information by focal brand information and satisfaction, as manifested in immediate judgments, may be temporary and decay over time (Wyer & Unverzagt, 1985).

To summarize, in consumer satisfaction studies a strong focal brand influence on intentions was generally observed. It is asserted that due to methodological limitations, the generalizability of this empirical finding is constrained mainly to situations involving intentions as they prevail very soon after trial. However, this finding may not be generalizable to many purchase occasions because the relative

impact of past experiences may increase over time. Indeed, this latter possibility is worth pursuing as purchase decisions are frequently formed in reality at a later stage, not immediately after trial.

Two major hypotheses were tested in the study. The first hypothesis pertained to the prediction of product (dis)satisfaction. It was hypothesized that norms affect satisfaction, yet satisfaction is primarily originating from focal brand experience (i.e., performance evaluation). The second hypothesis, which derives from the discussion as provided earlier, posited that the relative explanatory power of norms and past experiential information would be relatively strong and that of focal brand information (including satisfaction) would be relatively weak, if intentions to buy the product are assessed in delayed measurement.

STUDY 1

Method

Subjects

The analyzed sample consisted of 103 adults who completed the two questionnaires. No significant differences were observed on key usage rate measures between these and the remainder of 120 consumers initially interviewed. The consumers were approached in their homes. Because the study entailed a two week interval between visits, an attempt was made to minimize the opportunity for word of mouth communication among participants. Accordingly, only one person per household was interviewed.

Stimulus

The product selected for the study was a new portable electronic anti-theft alarm. For several reasons this product was chosen for the study. First, the device is portable and could be carried to the respondents' homes. This was important as the delayed measurement was conducted in the same environment as that of the product trial and immediate measurement. Thus, the potential intervention of environmental factors was minimized. Second, the performance of such a product is not subjected to as many performance aspects as are many other products (e.g., cars). The relatively simplistic task which did not entail a sequential learning process enabled making the assumption that the interpretation (though not necessarily the evaluation) of the performance by respondents was uniform. Third, the

potential markets for this product are not limited to unique segments within the population at large. In fact, except for a few cases, all respondents showed an interest in the demonstration and trial task and were willing to cooperate in the delayed measurements. Finally, the researchers were able to obtain a brand which was unknown and not previously introduced in the tested region. The study was conducted several weeks before the brand was launched in that region for commercial purposes. This eliminated possible confoundings attributable to brand familiarity. Furthermore, it made the implications particularly relevant for new brands since in this situation general product norms are readily available while specific brand judgments are virtually nonexistent.

Procedure

Respondents were handed a questionnaire in which they were first asked to indicate their agreement (or disagreement) to ten statements all of which pertained to normative and past experiences with alarms in general (e.g., "Alarm devices help me feel safer"). They were then handed the package of the new product on which the brand name, a picture of the product, and a description of the product's characteristics were presented. A second questionnaire containing nine questions relating to expectations from product performance (e.g., "Very Useful" to "Not Useful at All", "Very Reliable" to "Not Reliable at All") was then handed to the participants.

In the third stage, the participants were handed the device and asked to try it. The device which was relatively small in size (roughly two by three inches) was turned on and put in a briefcase. The moment the briefcase was moved, the device would let off a 98 decibel noise. Following product trial, the last section of the questionnaire (in that session) was administered. This consisted of performance evaluation (nine questions pertaining to similar dimensions as those assessed in the expectation questions), and a question pertaining to global product satisfaction (with scale varying from "Completely Satisfied" to "Completely Dissatisfied", see Churchill & Surprenant, 1982). All the questions were rated on seven point scales. Upon completion of the questionnaire the respondents were debriefed. They were not forewarned about a possible revisit in the future.

Two weeks later the respondents were revisited. In this visit, a short questionnaire containing three measures of intention to purchase the product and several filler questions was administered. The first question (pertaining to purchase intentions) asked: "If this

device were offered for sale, would you buy it?”. The next question pertained to inclination to recommend the product to friends. The final question was anchored by the product’s price (which, in fact, was the true retail price). It stated that the company was contemplating the price of \$25, and asked whether the respondent would buy it for that price. All three questions ranked from “Certainly Yes” to “Certainly Not” on seven point scales.

Analysis and Results

Two factors pertaining to experiential and normative information were identified.¹ One factor pertained primarily to social and family normative standards (“An alarm device should be installed in every house/apartment”, “Almost all the people I know advocate the use of alarm devices”, “Members of my family advocate the use of an alarm system in our home”) and was therefore labeled “social norms”. The second factor consisted of three measures (“Alarm devices are sufficient to deter thieves”, “Automobile alarm devices do not prevent burglary”, “Alarm devices make me feel safer”) and was labeled “Product Class Beliefs”. The measures were averaged to form the two factors for the subsequent analyses (both Alpha coefficients exceeded the .60 level). Regarding the remaining constructs (i.e., expectations and performance evaluation), each one of them produced a single factor with reliability levels (Alpha = .73 and .81, respectively) that enabled averaging the relevant measures.

A regression analysis with the two factors of norms, focal brand expectations, performance evaluation, and satisfaction as explanatory factors was performed four times. In each of the first three analyses one of the three measures of future behavioral intentions was utilized as a dependent variable and in the fourth run, an aggregate measure of intentions was used as a dependent measure. An additional regression analysis was performed with the global satisfaction measure as the dependent variable. The results of the regression analyses are shown in Table 1. For each regression shown in Table 1, the upper row lists the beta coefficients obtained when all the explanatory variables were entered simultaneously. The bottom row shows the R^2 obtained when a hierarchical regression was applied and the variables were entered sequentially.

Two major findings emerged from this analysis. First, in the regressions predicting future behavioral intentions, the impact of

¹ The data were first factor analyzed to enable the detection of key factors for subsequent analysis. A varimax rotation revealed that the dimensionality of normative standards could be best represented by two main factors (with eigenvalues exceeding 1.00).

TABLE 1
The Impact of Norms and Focal Brand Information on Immediate Satisfaction and Delayed Future Behavioral Intentions: Study 1

	"Product Class Beliefs"	"Social Norms"	Focal Brand Expectations	Performance Evaluation	Brand Satisfaction
Satisfaction					
Beta	.30 ^b	.06	.14	.40 ^b	—
R ² Ch.	.09			.30	—
Intention to Purchase					
Beta	.19 ^a	.45 ^b	.14	.17	.02
R ² Ch.	.04	.35		.06	
Recommendation					
Beta	.15 ^a	.38 ^b	.11	.30 ^b	.10
R ² Ch.	.03	.15		.34	
Intention Subject to Price					
Beta	.30 ^b	.37 ^b	.17	.21 ^b	.06
R ² Ch.	.09	.28		.05	
Aggregate Intention					
Beta	.22 ^b	.43 ^b	.15	.24 ^a	.02
R ² Ch.	.05	.36		.10	

^aSig. at $p < .05$ level.

^bSig. at $p < .01$ level.

the normative factors outweighed that of focal brand measures (i.e., expectations, performance evaluation, and product satisfaction). The only exception was recommendation to friends as a dependent measure where product performance was significantly related to the dependent measure. Overall, however, the past knowledge factors accounted for about 80% of the explained variance (which was $R^2 = .53$ in the aggregate equation).²

Interestingly, an opposite pattern of predictions was revealed when satisfaction was measured as the dependent variable. Although the "product class beliefs" factor was significant, the beta coefficient of the performance evaluation factor was larger and the latter factor itself accounted for about 77% of the explained variance. Note that in this analysis neither the "social norm" factor nor the expectations factor were significant.

Discussion

The measurement of immediate satisfaction provided support to recent conceptual advances, in that normative standards, in addition to focal brand expectations may be salient predictors of satisfaction. Nevertheless, similar to findings obtained in most studies to date, brand information (particularly post-trial information) outweighs all other predictors in accounting for satisfaction.

The important finding relates to the opposite pattern of explanatory power of that information when it is assessed as antecedent of delayed intentions. Namely, normative standards factors were relatively more salient predictors of intentions than were measures of brand (both pre- and post-exposure) information. The reversed pattern of satisfaction versus intention prediction, supports the hypothesis that the two outcome factors are distinguishable with respect to the sphere of their meaning. While satisfaction is mainly focal brand oriented, intention to purchase is determined by a much broader set of phenomena, many of which are not necessarily mediated by focal brand expectations.

A methodological shortcoming of Study 1 relates to the confounding of timing measurement when predictions of satisfaction

² An inspection of the correlation matrix of Study 2 (Table 2) suggests that the poor relationship between satisfaction and intention may be due to multicollinearity which is quite prevalent in such studies (see Oliver, 1980). However, to maintain consistency and comparability with immediate measurements in which satisfaction exerted some significant impact it was analyzed as a separate factor. Note also that no conceptual distinction is made in this study between performance evaluation and satisfaction since both bear on focal brand information. The analysis shown in the upper rows of Tables 1, 3, and 4 confirms it empirically.

and intentions to purchase are compared. Namely, while satisfaction was measured immediately after brand trial, intentions measures were assessed in delayed measurement. Although the purpose of Study 1 was to assess the long term impact of brand and experience based judgments on intention formation, a more direct test was needed to compare the salience of satisfaction and intentions predictors.

Study 2 was designed to overcome this methodological concern. It differed from Study 1 in the kinds of judgments that were obtained in immediate and delayed measurements. In Study 2 the set of measures (including norms, focal brand expectations, performance evaluation, satisfaction, and intention) were collected twice; once in immediate and, another time, in delayed measurements. It was predicted that the impact of focal brand judgments would override the effect of norms and experience based judgments only in immediate post-trial intention measurement. In delayed judgments, the relative impact of experience-based judgments in predicting future behavioral tendencies was expected to increase.

STUDY 2

Method

Procedure

One hundred responses were obtained out of 120 who were initially interviewed. Essentially, the procedure of Study 2 was similar to that of Study 1. The study was conducted in a different neighborhood with the same respondent socioeconomic characteristics as in Study 1. Immediate and delayed measurements were conducted in the participants' homes, with a two week interval between measurements. The same precautions against possible word of mouth communication among the respondents were taken as in Study 1. Likewise, given the appropriateness of the product utilized in the first study and for comparison purposes, the portable alarm device was used as the stimulus.

The three-stage immediate measurement procedure was similar to that of Study 1. Norms and indicants of past behavior were collected. Then, the original package was shown to the participants. Brand expectations were subsequently assessed. Finally, the brand was tried and post-exposure measures were collected. In addition to the post-exposure variables that were measured in Study 1, in Study 2 the intention measures were also collected in immediate post-trial

TABLE 2
Zero Order Correlations In Immediate and Delayed Measurement: Study 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1) "Social Norms" = (Imm.)	.98	.25	.35	.71	.61	.52	.52	.85	.86	
2) "Social Norms" = (Del.)		.46	.56	.63	.64	.57	.68	.85	.93	
3) "Product Class" = (Imm.)			.98	.30	.25	.38	.48	.35	.60	
4) "Product Class" = (Del.)				.45	.28	.45	.53	.41	.60	
5) Perfor. Eval. = (Imm.)					.88	.86	.79	.94	.74	
6) Perfor. Eval. = (Del.)						.90	.89	.89	.70	
7) Satisfaction = (Imm.)							.95	.82	.60	
8) Satisfaction = (Del.)								.81	.64	
9) Intention = (Imm.)									.92	
10) Intention = (Del.)										.92

measurements. The participants were not forewarned about a possible revisit in the future.

Two weeks later, the respondents were visited again, in delayed measurement, the same set of variables as that collected in the immediate measurement was obtained without, of course, repeating the exposure to the package and the trial task and without reassessing pre-trial expectations.

Results

Table 2 lists the zero-order correlations among the investigated variables for the two measurements. According to the discussion presented earlier, the explanatory power of the factors pertaining to norms were more likely to remain unchanged in delayed measurement than those related to focal brand information. The correlation matrix shows that for the two norms factors, the correlations between the two measurements was $r = .98$ ($p < .001$).

Tables 3 and 4 focus on the key proposition of this paper. Namely, they show the relative impact of focal brand and experience-based knowledge. Two sets of regressions were conducted; one performed on measures collected immediately after product trial (Table 3) and the other on the measures obtained in the delayed measurement (Table 4).³ Several findings pertaining to the immediate judgments, the delayed judgments, and the comparison between the two sets of regressions are noteworthy.

³ The factors obtained in a factor analysis performed on the measures in Study 2 contained the same sets of variables as in Study 1 except for a minor difference in the measures loading on the performance evaluation factor.

TABLE 3
 The Impact of Norms and Focal Brand Judgments On Immediate Measures of Satisfaction and Future Behavioral Intentions: Study 2—Immediate Measurement

	“Product Class Beliefs”	“Social Norms”	Performance Evaluation	Brand Satisfaction	Overall R^2
Satisfaction					
Beta	.12	-.16	.63b	—	.51
R^2 Ch.			.46	—	
Intention to Purchase					
Beta	.10	.29a	.48b	.01	.58
R^2 Ch.		.06	.51		
Recommendation					
Beta	-.04	.35b	.39b	.53b	.73
R^2 Ch.		.06	.61	.06	
Intention Subject to Price					
Beta	.01	.45b	.33a	.15	.65
R^2 Ch.		.13	.51		
Aggregate Intention					
Beta	.03	.39b	.43b	.18	.74
R^2 Ch.		.09	.62		

aSig. at $p < .05$ level.

bSig. at $p < .01$ level.

TABLE 4
The Impact of Norms and Focal Brand Judgments On Delayed Measures of Satisfaction and Future Behavioral Intentions: Study 2 = Delayed Measurement

	"Product Class Beliefs"	"Social Norms"	Performance Evaluation	Brand Satisfaction	Overall R ²
Satisfaction					
Beta	.28 ^a	.07	.59 ^b	—	.53
R ² Ch.	.09		.43	—	
Intention to Purchase					
Beta	.13	.64 ^b	.21	.11	.58
R ² Ch.		.55			
Recommendation					
Beta	.23 ^a	.48 ^b	.30 ^a	.05	.68
R ² Ch.	.05	.55	.08		
Intention Subject to Price					
Beta	.06	.67 ^b	.20	.04	.55
R ² Ch.		.54			
Aggregate Intention					
Beta	.15	.62 ^b	.20	.00	.74
R ² Ch.		.61			

^a Sig. at $p < .05$ level.

^b Sig. at $p < .01$ level.

First, as shown in Table 3, the immediate satisfaction measure is significantly influenced by brand evaluation.⁴ The measures of norms did not influence satisfaction. In contrast, in the regressions with intentions as the dependent measures, variables representing both brand and normative information were significant. Particularly, the "social norms" factor and the performance evaluation factor were significant in all the relevant regressions. Satisfaction was significant only in the regression predicting the disposition to recommend the brand. Nevertheless, the contribution of focal brand information to the overall R^2 is dominant in all the regressions.

Second, a reversed pattern of the influence of brand and experience based judgments is obtained in delayed measurements (see Table 4). The relative explanatory power of the normative factors is enhanced both in predicting satisfaction and future behavioral tendencies. In predicting the intention measures, the beta coefficients of the normative factors were significant while the significance of brand evaluation and satisfaction (which are the brand information factors) generally diminished. The relative explanatory power of the predictors is also manifested in the R^2 following the sequential entering of the factors into the regression equations. Unlike the immediate measurement regressions, the prediction of the intention measures in the delayed measurement regression was dominated by the normative factors. Note that the overall explained variance in the delayed measurement regressions does not differ markedly from that which was obtained in the immediate measurement regressions.

Note also that while the "product class beliefs" factor turned out to be significant in predicting the delayed satisfaction measure, brand information still contributed more to explaining satisfaction than did the normative factors. Thus, in delayed measurements, the difference in the role of normative versus brand information in predicting satisfaction and intentions is amplified. While satisfaction is predominated by focal brand judgments, intention to purchase the brand is more strongly influenced by norms and experience based judgments.

A test for the change in the impact of the explanatory factors was accomplished by applying repeated measures with a varying covariates analysis (Winter, 1971). This analysis provides the regression coefficients and a test for the within-subjects (i.e. immediate vs delayed) effect. Accordingly, the impact of the "product class beliefs" and "social norms" factors was shown to increase over time [$F(1,99) = 3.8, p < .05$ and $F(1,99) = 5.2, p < .05$ for the two

⁴ Note that the pre-trial expectation measure was excluded to make these results comparable with those obtained in the delayed measurement.

factors, respectively]. In contrast, the estimated influence of the performance evaluation factor decreased over time [$F(1,99) = 8.5$, $p < .01$]. The observed decrease in the global satisfaction measure did not reach statistical significance.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Several conclusions emerge from this study. First, in contrasting the satisfaction and intention to purchase constructs, satisfaction is more likely to reflect focal brand information while intentions are relatively more attached to general product norms and other experience based knowledge. Second, information bearing on norms and past experience is more likely to endure as compared to the focal brand information whose impact is more transient. Third, the distinction between the two outcome judgments (i.e. satisfaction and intentions) is magnified over time; immediate judgments reflect the stronger impact of focal brand information. In delayed judgments, however, the relative contribution of the two types of information is altered such that norms and past experiential information becomes more effective.

In the present setting, experience based variables formed two distinguishable dimensions. One dimension, "product class beliefs", represented the respondent's attitude and opinion regarding the product category in general and the other dimension, "social norms" focused on opinions and social approval by reference groups and individuals (i.e., friends and family members). It is interesting to note that a similar categorization of norms has been offered in previous research (e.g. Day, 1977; Woodruff et al., 1983) in accounting for the post-trial evaluation process. It appears that in the present context "social norms" exerted a stronger impact on the post-trial measures. Future research should test the generalizability of this conclusion to other product contexts and settings.

The distinction between immediate and delayed measurements has major implications for marketing decisions. It emphasizes the need for considering timing of measurement as a relevant factor in predicting purchase and choice behavior. Accordingly, purchase behavior predictions may be obscured owing to temporal changes in consumer judgments even if no external factors intervene between the trial and measurement timing. Unfortunately, this finding makes the comparison with previous studies untenable. In some previous applications, the variables were measured immediately after trial (e.g., Olson & Dover, 1979; Swan & Trawick, 1981; Churchill & Surprenant, 1982) while in others, there was an uncontrolled gap

between brand experience and measurement (e.g., Oliver, 1980; Bearden & Teel, 1983). Despite the contribution of these studies to the understanding of other aspects of the satisfaction and intention formation, they have not assessed the impact of the timing factor. The impact of this factor was found in this study to substantially affect behavioral intentions judgments.

In view of the current findings, the explanatory power of focal brand information in predicting choice behavior as previously conceptualized in the satisfaction/dissatisfaction paradigm should be reappraised. While it was reaffirmed (in *immediate* post-trial measurement) that the salience of the tried brand information (including performance evaluation and satisfaction) outweighs that of other factors in intention formation, the results of delayed measurements are quite different. In delayed measurement, the impact of performance evaluation and brand satisfaction decreased substantially and, in most cases, became statistically nonsignificant.

Thus, an analysis that identifies the conditions under which measures of satisfaction are salient predictors of the choice process as opposed to those in which competing measures are superior is called for. Such a contingency approach may vary, for example, with the type of the investigated product or the assessed marketing strategy. Regarding the type of product, for example, if the product under study is an adhesive which is often purchased under circumstances of impulse buying, satisfaction and focal brand information is indeed an important antecedent of a purchase decision. If, on the other hand, a marketing research project involves the prediction of major appliance purchases (whereby decisions are typically made a while after the exposure to the product), the influence of satisfaction may be relatively small.

Similarly, a manufacturer could assess which type of information would be most appropriate so as to enhance the likelihood of a purchase decision. If strategies that involve immediate purchase decisions are considered, such as foot in the door or in-store promotions, focal brand information may be most relevant. However, attempts to cause a temporary enthusiasm and satisfaction may not prove useful if the purpose is long term image development of the brand. In the latter case, the manufacturer might achieve this goal if normative factors will be highlighted.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. E. (1973). Consumer satisfaction: The effect of disconfirmed expectancy on perceived product performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10, 38-44.

- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitude and predicting social behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Baker, W. E. & Lutz, R. J. (1988). The relevance-accessibility model of advertising effectiveness. In S. Hecker & D. W. Stewart (Eds.), *Nonverbal communication in advertising*. Mass: Lexington Books.
- Bearden, O. W. & Teel, J. E. (1983). Selected determinants of consumer satisfaction and complaint behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 21-28.
- Bugelski, B. R. (1982). Learning and imagery. *Journal of Mental Imagery*, 6, 1-92.
- Cardozo, R. N. (1968). An Experimental study of consumer effort, expectation and satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2, 244-249.
- Churchill, G. A. & Surprenant, C. (1982). An investigation into the determinants of consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19, 491-504.
- Day, R. L. (1977). Extending the concept of consumer satisfaction. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 4, 149-154.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Beliefs, attitude, intention and behavior*. Reading, Mass: Addison - Wesley.
- Fiske, S. & Dyer, L. (1985). Structure and development of social schemata: Evidence from positive and negative transfer effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 839-52.
- Gardner, M. P. (1985). Mood states and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12, 281-300.
- Hannah, D. & Sternthal, B. (1984). Detecting and explaining the sleeper effect. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2, 632-42.
- Holbrook, M. B. & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). The experimental aspect of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings and fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 132-140.
- LaBarbera, P. A. & Mazursky, D. (1983). A longitudinal assessment of consumer satisfaction/ dissatisfaction: The dynamic aspect of the cognitive process. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 393-404.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 63-78.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 460-469.
- Olshavsky, R. W. & Miller, J. A. (1972). Consumer expectations, product performance and perceived product quality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9, 19-21.
- Olson, J. C. & Dover, P. A. (1979). Disconfirmation of consumer expectation through product trial. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 179-189.
- Smith, R. E. & Swinyard, W. R. (1983). Attitude-behavior consistency: The impact of product trial versus advertising. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 257-267.
- Swan, J. E. (1982). Consumer satisfaction research and theory: Current status and future directions. In Hunt, K. H. & Day, R. L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh annual conference on consumer satisfaction-dissatisfaction and complaining behavior* (pp. 124-129). Bloomington: School of Business, Indiana University.
- Swan, J. E. & Trawick, I. F. (1981). Satisfaction explained by desired vs. predictive expectations. In Bernhardt, K. et al., (eds.), *The changing marketing environments: New theories and applications* (pp. 170-173). Chicago American Marketing Association.

TEMPORAL DECAY

- Warshaw, P. R. (1980). Predicting purchase and other behaviors from general and contextually specific intentions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 26-33.
- Woodruff, R. B., Cadotte, E. R., & Jenkins, R. L. (1983). Modeling consumer satisfaction processes using experience-based norms. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 296-304.
- Wyer, R. S. & Unverzagt, W. (1985). Effects of instructions to disregard information on its subsequent recall and use on making judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 533-49.
- Zajonc, R. B. & Markus, H. (1982). Affective and cognitive factors in preferences. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 123-131.