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Abstract

The aim of the study was to analyse and evaluate what brand attributes are most important for bank customers. Questionnaire for a new survey instrument was made from aspects theorised to be important to bank customers in prior research. Additionally, two models were used to frame the questions, they are CBBE model and EBBI model, finally economic, social, and governance factors of known frameworks were analysed to measure ESG factors and their importance to customers. The questionnaire was designed to measure four main brand attributes: differentiation, segmentation, perception and additionally the ESG attribute. It was theorised that the dependent variables trust, loyalty and likelihood to recommend the bank to others would give an indication of what customers value. The survey was conducted in Iceland. A survey was sent to a random sample of the customers of one of the countries three largest banks. Findings show that differentiation and segmentation have a positive effect on trust, segmentation has a positive effect on whether customers would recommend the brand to others and perception has a positive effect on loyalty. The ESG attribute was found to have no effect on trust and no effect on to what extent customers would recommend the brand. ESG however had negative effect on loyalty. The findings suggest that segmentation and perception are attributes that are most important for bank customers.
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Introduction

Brand assessment has two sides, one focuses on the consumers behaviour towards the brand and the other focuses on the financial value of the brand (Nguyen, et al., 2019). Brand equity can likewise be viewed from two perspectives, consumer-based brand equity and financial based brand equity (Nguyen et al., 2019; Simon & Sullivan, 1993). For managers to successfully create brand equity by optimizing their brands through strategic planning they need to understand their customers thoroughly and know what matters to them (Keller, 1993). When managers understand what attributes matter most to their customers they will get the most value out of their brand (Barwise et al., 1989; Keller, 1993).

The focus of this thesis is on the consumer and what attributes of bank brands matter most to him, the results should help bank managers to focus their strategic planning on the right marketing activities that result in strengthening their brand and increase brand equity.

Companies exist and operate in a competitive world where they need to market their products and services to both retain current customers and gain new ones. Marketing is a way for companies to keep a competitive edge in the market where they operate (Kotler, 1986). Businesses must focus on their customers’ needs and wants, keeping in mind that they are in business of fulfilling those needs and wants, not making specific products or services and so their marketing must be customer orientated (Levitt, 1960). Marketing is an evolving concept that corresponds to changes in the environment and makes the job of the marketing manager challenging (Achrol & Kotler, 2011; Kotler, 1986; Kotler & Zaltman, 1971). Marketing activities affect consumers differently depending on the brand involved (Keller, 2001b).

Banks operate in a competitive environment that is constantly changing. Regulations, technology, and the globalization of goods and financial markets are constantly changing, this highly dynamic environment has impacted bank’s efficiency, operations, productivity, profitability and margins (Berger, 2007; Carbo & Fernandez, 2007; Claessens et al., 1998; Clarke et al., 2003; Demirguc-Kunt & Huizinga, 1998; Goddard et al., 2011; Lambkin and
Brand building and product innovation are key components for firms to gain market share and create competitive advantage (Brexendorf et al., 2015). A strong brand provides firms with financial rewards (Keller, 2001a; Keller & Lehmann, 2009). Research on the link between branding and financial performance in banks suggests that there is correlation between branding and financial results, banks with carefully managed branding activities can expect higher return on assets which helps them gain a competitive advantage in the fierce competition in the banking industry (Ohnemus, 2009).

Despite the long history of branding and brand management it only became apparent in the 1980s mergers and acquisitions boom how valuable the brands of companies were, which resulted in more focus on brand equity (Leone et al., 2006). Brands are now seen as one of the most valuable intangible assets of a firm (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004; Chatzipanagiotou et al., 2016; Keller, 1993; Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Keller & Lehmann, 2009).

The banking industry has been declining since 1984, that is banks are fewer today than they were in 1984 and this has happened more so in the US than Europe. This has happened because the banking sector has experienced a long-lasting wave of consolidation that continues to this day (Lambkin & Muzellec, 2008). For the last decade the banking sector has seen additional transformation, following changing technology, through the rise of the shadow banking system and the growth of fintech companies, both competing directly against traditional banks (Vives, 2019).

There is lack of research on what attributes of a bank or their brands matter to customers. Current theories suggest that banks need to transform people’s life to become a relevant brand (Wentz, 2014), that bank customers want more financial advice (Edmund, 2018; Mutsonziwa, 2015), that customers want helpfulness, innovativeness, resolution of problems, they care about language usage and friendliness of service consultants (Mutsonziwa, 2015) and convenience, although different customers have different definitions of convenience (Lee & Marlowe, 2003). There is evidence that suggests that social responsibility has become a key attribute in customer’s minds and
that banks need to make corporate social responsibility a part of their strategy (Bayer et al., 2019; Kotler, 2011; Weber & Feltmate, 2016).

This research will add to prior research on what matters to bank customers regarding the bank they do their business with and, since prior research is limited, the thesis will also build upon the body of research of what matters to customers regarding brands in general. The goal of this research is to add to empirical research within this field and help bank managers measure and strengthen their brand by identifying what attributes their customers value the highest.

The aim of this research is to answer the following question:

*Which brand attributes of banks are most valuable for consumers?*

Following this introduction are four main chapters. The first chapter is the literature review, which defines the concept of a brand and explores the different components of brand equity, then traces the history of banks and explains their challenges and difficult competitive environments. Prior research on what attributes are important to bank customers will be reviewed as well as a discussion on what existing brand equity tools could be used to evaluate the matter. There is ample evidence that ESG factors are becoming increasingly important to banks and in marketing, that topic will be elaborated on. Finally, the first chapter ends on a thorough explanation of the aspects of the tools chosen to form the survey instrument for the research conducted. Chapter two features a description of participants, detailed explanation of the process of making the survey instrument and the procedure of the research. Chapter three details the findings of the research where SPSS is used to crunch the survey results. Finally, in the fourth chapter the findings and implications of the research are discussed as well as what further research could be conducted.

1 Literature review

1.1 What is a brand

The American Marketing Association defines brand as a “name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods and services of one
seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competition” (AMA, n.d.), while Kotler (1972) similarly defines brand as a name, symbol, photo, design or a mix of those aspects that are meant to identify products and services of one producer from the competition. The reason why companies invest in their brands and marketers specialize in building them is because a brand that has strong connections in the mind of the consumer can deliver a competitive advantage to the company (McEnally & de Chernatony, 1999). A successful brand is recognized by its distinctiveness, meaning its identity is well defined and consumers feel that the brand adds value to the product or service that carries it (Doyle, 1994). In fact, the feelings that customers have towards products, based on the brands associated with them, is a deciding factor when it comes to purchase decisions (Gardner & Levy, 1955). Strong brands also build a strong company image in the mind of the consumer (Keller, 1993). The purpose of brands is to make it easier for customers to choose where they want to take their business and reinforce their decision to do so (Abratt & Bick, 2003). A strong brand is thought to be one of the most valuable intangible assets of a company (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004; Chatzipanagiotou et al., 2016: Keller, 1993; Keller & Lehmann, 2006; Keller & Lehmann, 2009). Therefore, it is important for companies to assess their brand equity, either from a marketing perspective (Keller, 1993) or from a financial perspective (i.e. the monetary value of the brand) so it can be used in financial disclosures or taken into consideration when companies are being sold, merged or acquired (Abratt & Bick, 2003). Brand equity is defined as the outcome of marketing a product or service that can be attributed only to the brand and would not occur if the product or service was offered by a different brand (Aaker, 1992; Farquhar, 1989; Keller, 1993; Kohli & Leuthesser, 2001).

1.2 Brand equity and its components

Brands are said to have equity because they are long term assets that drive both business strategy and business performance. (Aaker, 2014). Businesses can gain a competitive advantage that delivers better financial performance if they take care of their brand equity (Hunt, 2019; Hunt, 2018). Brand equity is the value of the brand as it is in the mind of the consumer (Aaker, 1992; Aaker, 2014; Farquhar, 1989; Keller, 1993; Hunt, 2019; Park et al., 1986; Yoo et al., 2000). Brand equity has been studied by many scholars who have found several approaches to brand equity (Herr, 1994), following is a look into
the development of the concept that is brand equity by a few of the most prominent scholars that have studied it, Peter H. Farquhar, David A. Aaker, and Kevin L. Keller.

Peter H. Farquhar published his findings regarding how brand equity is managed in 1989, according to him a strong brand is necessary to achieve brand equity and it is built with a positive brand evaluation, an accessible brand attitude, and a consistent brand image (Farquhar, 1989). Although a positive brand evaluation is necessary it is not enough to build a strong brand on its own (Herr & Fazio, 1993). Consumer’s attitude is also important when building a strong brand, attitude is defined as the relationship between an object and its brand (Fazio, 1986). For a strong brand, it is important to build a consistent brand image and take care of the brand consistency (Ogilvy, 1983). A part of the brand equity is the relationship between the brand and the customer, that relationship develops with each purchase (Berry, 1988). Farquhar (1989) found that brand equity can be achieved in three ways: it can be built, borrowed or bought.

David A. Aaker has concluded through his studies that brand equity consists of four dimensions, 1. Awareness, 2. Associations, 3. Perceived quality, and 4. Brand loyalty (Aaker, 1992). According to Aaker (1992) all companies must develop a measure for their brand equity by assessing how its brand stands in each of these four dimensions. To achieve brand equity the brand first needs to be strong (Aaker, 1992) and a strong brand is built by using these five elements: 1. Clear identity, 2. Corporate brand (i.e. the brand name of the corporation not its specific products or services), 3. Integrated, consistent communications, 4. Customer relationships, and 5. Symbols and slogans (Aaker, 1992). There are two main reasons for building a strong brand and achieving brand equity, first most managers are too occupied by quarterly earnings which leads to lack of focus on building lasting assets that will pay off in the long term, such as brand equity. The second reason is price competition, strong brands don’t need to compete on prices the same way as weaker brands do as their value is created in the customer mind and weighs heavier than the low prices of lesser brands (Aaker, 1992).

Kevin L. Keller has done extensive research on brand equity, he has outlined the Customer-Based Brand Equity (CBBE) model to help build strong brands (Keller, 2001a). A strong brand is built in four steps:
(1) establishing the proper brand identity, that is, establishing breadth and depth of brand awareness, (2) creating the appropriate brand meaning through strong, favourable, and unique brand associations, (3) eliciting positive, accessible brand responses, and (4) forging brand relationships with customers that are characterized by intense, active loyalty. (Keller, 2001a, p. 4).

The CBBE model can be said to measure the same things as the three leading industry models, Young and Rubicam’s BrandAsset Valuator model, Millward Brown’s BrandDynamics model, and Research International’s comprehensive brand equity model, as well as adding additional substance (Keller, 2001a). The process of creating brand equity is complex and difficult. The CBBE pyramid can be a useful tool in managing the process if used correctly (Keller, 2001a). The CBBE model approaches brand equity from the customer’s perspective because it is necessary to understand the customer to market services and products successfully to them (Keller, 2001c). The brand can only be as powerful as it is in the mind of the consumer so brand strength is vital and CBBE allows us to measure the strength of the brand in the mind of the customer (Keller, 2001c). Figure 1 shows CBBE pyramid.

![Figure 1. Customer-Based Brand Equity Pyramid](image)

Figure 1 CBBE model (Keller, 2001a. p. 7)

Figure 2 shows the subdimensions of the brand building blocks.
1.3 Banks

Banks accept deposits from customers and are credit institutions, meaning they grant loans to customers. Some credit institutions are not banks, such as credit unions, friendly societies or building societies (Bank of England, n.d.).

Historically banks and banking activity can be tracked back to merchants who made grain loans to farmers around 2000 BC but the development of banking practices similar to modern banking began in medieval and Renaissance Italy (Hoggson, 1926). During medieval fairs, there was record keeping of transactions, debit and credit, that occurred during these fairs (Verlinden, 1965). There is also information available about debit and credit transactions that took place in banks in Medieval and Early Modern Europe (DeRoover, 1948). Historians have found these fair-banks to be the beginning of development of banking in Europe (Van der Wee, 1977). When business increased at the fair-banks it became difficult to track all transactions (DeRoover, 1965). This increased difficulty of tracking transactions can help explain why banks emerged in Medieval and Early Modern Europe, the need for records and information expanded faster than the fair-banks could keep up with which resulted in demand for immediate payment, such as notes (Araujo & Minetty, 2011). Although the origin of banking can be tracked back
thousands of years it can be said that modern banking started in the 17th century when the Bank of England began to issue bank notes (Hoggson, 1926).

Throughout history banks have regularly faced financial crisis’s (Grinder et al., 2015). After each crisis, new regulations are usually implemented to prevent them from happening again (Grinder et al., 2015). For the last forty years governments around the world have tried to regulate banking further in their attempts at ensuring bank safety (Kobrak & Troege, 2015). Increased regulations in banks environment is one of the reasons that banks today operate in a different environment than they did before. The globalization of goods and financial markets, changes in regulations and changes in technology have resulted in an ongoing wave of consolidation within the banking industry. These changes have impacted bank efficiency, operations, productivity, profitability, and margins. (Berger, 2007; Carbo & Fernandez, 2007; Claessens et al., 1998; Clarke et al., 2003; Demirguc-Kunt & Huizinga, 1998; Goddard et al., 2011; Kobrak & Troege, 2015; Lambkin & Muzellec, 2008; Levine, 2003; Maudos & Fernandez de Guevara, 2004; Maudos & Fernandes de Guevara, 2007; Nam Jeon et al., 2011). One of the largest changes in recent decades was the financial crisis of 2008, the result of which has been that banks have had to help their customers cope with financial distress and rebuild trust in their brands again (Ohnemus, 2009; S. Johnson & Peterson, 2014). While old banks need to help their customers cope and rebuild their trust (S. Johnson & Peterson, 2014) new banking groups that come out of mergers and acquisitions need to be rebranded (Lambkin & Muzellec, 2008). Older banking brands also need to take care of their brand equity to be a feasible option and get premium price for their brand in the event of a merger or acquisition (Lambkin & Muzellec, 2008). It soon became apparent that the financial crisis would result in higher expectations from customers towards their banks brands and that would lead to more brand switching as a result (Ohnemus, 2009). Ohnemus (2009) has also found that branding is one of banks last stronghold where they can build up and maintain competitive advantage over other banks.

1.4 Image attributes of banks

Here is a closer look at the Icelandic banks and what is known of their brand status, this is important because the survey is conducted in Iceland. The Icelandic banks are probably best known for the economic collapse in 2008, the first case of such drastic
banking failure in Western Europe since the Great Depression and the largest banking collapse in economic history relative to the size of the economy (Méndez-Pinedo, 2011). After the collapse of 2008 trust in the banking system evaporated. It wasn’t until the year 2012 when trust started increasing again (Guðlaugsson & Larsen, 2014). There are three banks operating in Iceland that are systematically important for the Icelandic economy (Fjármálaeftirlitið, 2019) they are Landsbankinn, Arion banki and Íslandsbanki. They have similar market shares in Icelandic market and are very similar in size, with Landsbankinn being the largest by a slight margin (Fjármálaeftirlitið, 2019). Guðlaugsson has done extensive research on the image of the Icelandic banks between 2006 and 2018, with a survey conducted 13 times within that time frame (Guðlaugsson, 2019). The eight image attributes that were used for the survey were identified in another study conducted in 2004, they are the following: Support for good causes, progressive, modern, corruption, old-fashioned, personal service, social responsibility, and trust (Guðlaugsson, 2019).

Image is a part of the brand (Keller, 1993) so it helps this research to know what image attributes are important to bank customers in Iceland. Barich and Kotler (1991) define image as a three-category concept: Corporate image, product image, and brand image, additionally Barich and Kotler (1991) identified a forth concept that they call marketing image and is a part of corporate image, it refers to how customers experience the value offered to them through products of the company in comparison to their competitors (Barich & Kotler, 1991), this makes the concept of corporate image multi-dimensional (Bravo et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2005; O’Loughlin & Szigin, 2005). For banks the dimensions of a corporate image are location, service offered, corporate social responsibility, global impression and personnel (Bravo et al., 2010). Customer loyalty and a bank’s image is affected by perceptions of service quality by the customers, if they perceive the service quality to be high it has positive effects on the banks brand and they become more loyal than if they experience the service quality negatively (Chen et al., 2005). Separate researches conducted by Mutsonziwa (2015) and Lee and Marlowe (2003) also establish that customers perception of service quality in banks are among the attributes that matters most to them when doing business with a bank (Lee & Marlowe, 2003; Mutsonziwa, 2015). The banks image can also influence its revenue and a positive image increases value attributable to the bank’s shareholders (Ohnemus, 2009).
Guðlaugsson (2019) establishes that Landsbankinn, who had the strongest image in 2006, has not restored its former image and is today perceived as old fashioned. Íslandsbanki has a positive association with the attributes: modern, trust, and personal service, it has been able to restore its image to a more positive one than it had in 2006 (Guðlaugsson, 2019). Arion bank has the strongest connection to the attribute corruption but it used to have strong connections with the attributes: corruption and support for good causes in 2006, so Arion bank’s image is weaker than it was before (Guðlaugsson, 2019).

1.5 Bank attributes related to brand

The research on what matters to bank customers regarding their brand is lacking. There are a few studies that have been conducted in various parts of the world which try to answer the question what matters most to customers. The results of these studies are discussed here below.

Life transforming

Laurel Wentz studied how Itau, Latin America’s biggest bank became Brazil’s most valuable brand (Wentz, 2014). Wentz’s research did not focus on the customers as such but on Itau’s CMO, Fernando Chacon, and he explained how Itau became Brazil’s most valuable brand. Chacon believes that to succeed the brand must be relevant and transform both the lives of the people it touches and the world around them (Wentz, 2014). Itau has done so by investing heavily in education, culture, sports, and urban mobility, for example in one year the bank donated more than 32 million children books and gave away close to 8,000 bikes in seven different cities (Wentz, 2014). Itau also has a 272-person marketing department and spends about $400 million a year on media advertising, which has been crucial in making the bank Brazil’s most valuable brand (Wentz, 2014).

Financial advice

Mark Edmund conducted a survey that concluded that bank customers want more financial advice (Edmund, 2018). The study was conducted in the US and its findings were that 78% of bank customers want guidance from their bank, customers feel that they benefit when their bank gives them advice and more than 89% of customers said that they have benefited from information given to them by their bank (Edmund, 2018).
According to the survey there is ample opportunity to connect with customers but only 28% of customers said they could remember receiving financial advice. One possible reason could be that banks struggle to deliver advice to their customers digitally, which could be a problem since millennial customers the most receptive customer group for any bank advice (Edmund, 2018).

Among the findings of a survey conducted in South Africa was that customers of the country’s four largest banks longed for more financial and investment advice (Mutsonziwa, 2015).

Helpfulness, innovativeness, problem solving, friendliness of service consultants and language usage

The same survey, which was conducted by Mutsonziwa in 2015, also studied customer satisfaction. Mutsonziwa’s findings establish that the bank customers in South Africa value helpfulness of bank employees, innovativeness of the banks, problem solving of bank employees, friendliness of bank employees, innovativeness of the bank, how the banks conducted their language usage and what kind of investment advice they gave (Mutsonziwa, 2015).

Convenience

Lee and Marlowe did a study on how customers choose a bank for their checking accounts, their findings are that convenience is the deciding factor, although different customers define convenience differently (Lee & Marlowe, 2003). The differences in what customers defined to be convenient for them split the participants into two groups, young consumers and older consumers (Lee & Marlowe, 2003). Young consumers found convenience to be a bank located conveniently at a grocery store or similar, with long hours of operation, an ATM available and online banking available, they also found low monthly fee, low minimum balance and first year free to be important aspects (Lee & Marlowe, 2003). Older participants found convenience to be a bank located close to their home with long hours of operation, other important aspects to them are no monthly fee, higher interest rates, good service, no teller fee, free structure, positive relationship with the bank employees, a local bank with a range of services (Lee & Marlowe, 2003).
1.6 Similarities between the energy and finance sectors

Both the energy sector and the finance sector are commodity markets (Ji, et al., 2019). Commodity products are interchangeable for most consumers so the sellers of them usually compete on price. Because they are interchangeable the only way for companies in such markets to charge a price premium is to build a strong brand (Larsen, 2014). A survey instrument has been developed by Larsen out of the findings of his academic research as well as practice in the real world to measure what attributes of energy companies’ customers find most important. That instrument, the Energy Branding Benchmarking Index, could be modified to measure the same components within the customers of finance companies (EBBI, n.d.).

1.7 Social responsibility

The marketing world in general and especially brand managers and researchers, need to be aware of social responsibility. Marketing is a part of how society defines itself and how we, the members of society, treat each other (Brenkert, 2008). Marketers cannot continue marketing like they have done in the past, without regard for overconsumption and an unhealthy environment (Achrol & Kotler, 2012, Kotler, 2011). In the past marketers have acted as if the supply of resources were infinite and the environmental impact of their actions were non-existent (Kotler, 2011). Now as the world grows aware of its finite resources and the environmental impact of consumption, marketers need to act by reevaluating how they work (Kotler, 2011). Corporate societal marketing (CSM) is on the rise (Drumwright, 1996; File & Prince, 1998; Hoeffler & Keller, 2002; Varadarajan & Menon, 1988). CSM is defined to “encompass marketing initiatives that have at least one non-economic objective related to social welfare and use the resources of the company and/or one of its partners” (Drumwright & Murphy 2001, p. 164). When CSM is implemented successfully it creates a differential advantage by enhancing the image of the company and the brand (Lichtenstein et al., 2004) and differentiates the brand from competitors by enforcing an emotional and even spiritual bond between the brand and the consumer (Meyer, 1999). Even more importantly for financial institutions such as banks, at least if the economic collapse of 2008 is kept in mind, CSM programs can help provide an abundance of goodwill that helps companies and brands in the event of
negative publicity (Dawar and Pillutla, 2000). CSM benefits the building and maintenance of brand equity (Hoeffler & Keller, 2002).

Branding has been called out for being unethical since the turn of the century, starting with Naomi Klein, a Canadian journalist and social activist and the author of the book No Logo (Hunt, 2019, Klein, 1999). Branding has been called unethical because it preys on third world occupants by having them work for low wages in an unsafe environment and because their children often forgo education because of exploitation child labour in sweatshops (Hunt, 2019, Klein, 1999). This has impacted brand equity strategies and companies today must consider their ethical behaviour when they are crafting brand strategies (Hunt, 2019).

After the financial crisis of 2008 it was believed that not only would the finance industry start working on their economic, social, and governance (ESG) responsibilities and not only reporting their work but really intergrading it into their core strategy and core competence (Weber & Feltmate, 2016). Although there seems to be movement towards sustainable banking and the banking industry is increasingly focused on ESG issues the market share that ethical banks hold remains small (Bayer et al., 2019). The main reasons customers seem to choose conventional banks instead of ethical ones is lack of information, little pressure from society, weak morals when put in action, and the feeling that ethical banks are not as advantageous economically (Bayer et al., 2019). At the same time, there is evidence that strengthening ethical banking would increase the demand (Bayer et al., 2019).

1.8 Loyalty, trust and recommendations

The three factors this research will measure with its survey instrument, with the aim of assessing the most important factors to bank customers, are the following: brand loyalty, trust and Net Promoter Score. The rationale for these three factors being the best options to determine what’s important for bank customers is explained below.

Brand loyalty represents the core of the brands value and is therefore a core of brand equity while also being an important factor in sustaining a competitive advantage (Moisescu & Vu, 2011; Saeednia & Masoumi, 2014). Brand loyalty can be assessed by observing purchase behaviour over a time period or by measuring customers’ attitude
based on preferences, commitment to a particular brand or purchase intentions (Moisescu & Vu, 2011).

Trust in a finance company has been positively correlated to brand equity, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, brand and perception image (Saeednia & Masoumi, 2014). Trust is defined as the will to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of another one’s intentions (Loureiro, 2013; Rousseau, et al. 1998).

Word of mouth is powerful in gathering new customers (Buttle, 1998), we live in an era of overproduction and companies need to focus on the most profitable customers, the ones that have the highest return of investment and are happy enough with the services to bring in new customers (Florea, et al., 2018).

1.9 Development of survey instrument
The development of the survey instrument is built upon the foundation of the CBBE, which has been established as a tried and tested survey instrument for evaluating brand equity, and the Energy Branding Benchmarking Index, EBBI which is built upon academic knowledge and has been tried and tested in the real world to measure what consumers think of energy brands. Finally, several ESG metrics were used for the measurement of ESG attributes, they are Nasdaq ESG metrics, Global Reporting Initiative, UNEP FI Principles for Responsible Banking, UN Sustainable Development Goals, The Paris Agreement and UN Global Compact.

1.10 CBBE
This research will use Keller’s pyramid to measure what matters to bank customers when it comes to their bank’s brand. First it is necessary to understand the six blocks of the CBBE pyramid: Salience, performance, imagery, judgements, feelings, and resonance (Keller, 2001c).

Salience is the foundation of the pyramid that the other blocks are built upon, salience determines who the brand is and is achieved by creating a brand identity with customers that satisfies the need of the category that the brand exists within (Keller, 2001c). When salience is achieved the customer can recall the brand and recognize the brand at the right time. Therefore, it is vital that the brand awareness of the customer is both deep
and wide so that the customer not only remembers the brand but recalls it when he is choosing between brands at purchase points (Keller, 2001c).

Salience is measured by determining what brands within the researched category the consumer can recall, recognizes, might be likely to use in different scenarios, and thinks of frequently (Keller et al., 2012).

There are two blocks that make up the second layer of the pyramid, performance and imagery. (Keller, 2001c). Performance of the brand is influenced by the product itself and how it performs in the eye of the customer. The product is what primarily controls how customers think of the brand (Keller, 2001c). To create customer loyalty towards a brand the product must meet or exceed the customer expectations (Keller, 2001c). There are different attributes for products within different categories but in general there are five important attributes that are vital to achieve optimal brand performance:

1. Primary characteristics and supplementary features.
2. Product reliability, durability, and serviceability.
4. Style and design.
5. Price.

(Keller, 2001c, p.16-17).

The attributes of the product help to differentiate the brand, if the product has severe deficiencies in any of these attributes it is unlikely that the brand will be able to overcome them (Keller, 2001c).

To measure the performance of a brand consumers are asked to determine how it compares with other brands in the category in term of functions, aspects, price, and consistency. They are then asked what is special about the assessed brand, if it is reliable, durable, easily serviced, if the service is efficient, effective with courteous service providers, how stylish the brand is, and how the previous aspects are evaluated (Keller et al., 2012).

Imagery of the brand deals with what the consumer thinks about the brand instead of what he thinks the brand does and through imagery the brand tries to meet the consumer's psychological or social needs (Keller, 2001c). Imagery can be divided into four categories:
1. User profiles.
2. Purchase and usage situations.
3. Personality and values.
4. History, heritage, and experiences.

(Keller, 2001c, p. 17).

The imagery of the brand is measured by asking brand consumers about their attitude towards other people that use their brand, how they would describe other users of the brand, where the brand is usually purchased, when it is appropriate to use the brand, if the brand is widely available, if the brand can be used in many situations, and to what extent the consumers feel they can associate the brand with pleasant memories and childhood (Keller et al., 2012).

When consumer’s beliefs about the brand are studied through the dimensions of performance and imagery, it is preferable that the results are positive with intense and active brand loyalty (Keller, 2001c). To create brand equity, the associations of the brand must be strong, favourable, and unique in the mind of the consumer, in that order (Keller, 2001c).

The third layer of the CBBE pyramid measures how customers respond to the brand, it asks them the question: “What about you?” through two blocks: judgments, and feelings (Keller, 2001c). Judgments of a brand are made by the consumer through his perceptions of performance and imagery in the layer below (Keller, 2001c). There are four types of judgements that are vital in creating a strong brand, here they are in the ascending order of importance:

1. Quality.
2. Credibility.
3. Consideration.
4. Superiority.

(Keller, 2001c, p. 18).

These four judgments of a brand are measured separately, quality is measured by asking consumers of a brand what their overall opinion of the brand is, how they assess the product quality of the brand, to what extent the brand satisfies their needs, and how they evaluate the value of the brand to them (Keller et al., 2012). Credibility is measured by asking consumers of a brand how knowledgeable they are about the makers of the
brand, how innovative they think the makers are, how much they trust them, to what extent the makers understand the needs of the consumers, care about their opinions, have their interests in mind, how much the consumer likes the brand, admires it, and respects it (Keller et al., 2012). Consideration is measured by asking the consumer how likely he would be to recommend the brand to others, which his favourite products are within the brand category, and how personally relevant the brand is to him (Keller et al., 2012). Superiority is measured by asking the consumer to determine how unique this brand is to him, to what extent the brand offer advantages over other brands, and how superior the brand is to others in the same category (Keller et al. 2012).

Feelings toward a brand are based upon the consumer’s emotional reactions to the marketing actions of a brand (Keller, 2001c). There are six types of feelings that are important to brand building (Keller, 2001c, Kahle et al., 1988):

1. Warmth.
2. Fun.
3. Excitement.
5. Social approval.

(Keller, 2001c, p.18).

Feelings towards the brand are measured by asking consumers of the brand to determine if the brand gives them a feeling of warmth, fun, excitement, security, social approval, and self-respect (Keller et al., 2012).

All types of responses are possible when it comes to assessing how consumers respond to a brand, what matters most here is to get a positive reaction through judgement and feelings, and that these positive reactions come through when consumers think of the brand (Keller, 2001c).

Finally, at the top of the CBBE pyramid the last block focuses on the relationship between the customer and the brand by asking the question: “What about you and me?” the answer to which determines the brand resonance (Keller, 2001c). Brand resonance determines how deep and intensive the relationship is between the brand and the customer, it can be broken into four categories:

1. Behavioural loyalty.
2. Attitudinal attachment.
3. Sense of community.
4. Active engagement.

(Keller, 2001c, p. 19).

Brand relationships consist of intensity and activity, intensity being the strength of attitudinal attachment and sense of community while activity says how often a customer purchases the brand (behavioural loyalty) and how often he seeks other interactions with the brand (active engagement). To achieve consumer-brand resonance the brand must first excel at the five foundational blocks of the CBBE pyramid (Keller, 2001c).

The four categories of resonance are measured separately, loyalty is measured by asking consumers of a brand if they consider themselves loyal to the brand, if they buy it whenever they can, if they buy as much of it as they can, if they think this is the only brand of this product they need, if they prefer this brand over others, if it would make a difference to them if they needed to use another brand if this one was not available, and if they would go out of their way to purchase this brand (Keller et al., 2012). Attachment is measured by asking customers of the brand if they really love this brand, would miss it if it went away, if it is special to them, and if the brand is more than a product to them (Keller et al., 2012). Community is measured by asking customers of the brand if they identify with others who use the brand, if they feel like they are members of a special club with other users of the brand, if they feel like this is a brand used by people like them, and whether they feel a connection with other users of the brand (Keller et al., 2012). Engagement is measured by asking consumers of the brand whether they like to talk about the brand with others, if they are interested in learning more about the brand, if they are interested in merchandise with the brand on it, if they are proud of others they know who use the brand, if they like to visit websites just for this brand, and whether they, compared with others, follow news of the brand closely (Keller et al., 2012).

1.11 EBBI

The EBBI is built upon academic knowledge and from practice in the real world and measures what consumers think of energy brands. The EBBI is an energy branding benchmarking index, based on academic research of brands in the energy sector and created by Friðrik Larsen, professor at the University of Iceland and founder of the
consulting firm LarsEn, of. The EBBI gives its users information about how consumers perceive their brand and how their brand compares to competitors’ brands (EBBI, n.d.).

The EBBI measures brands in relation to three dimensions:

1. Differentiation
2. Segmentation
3. Perception

(EBBI, n.d.).

The EBBI score is calculated with a weighted mean formula that incorporates all the data from the questionnaire and calculates a score that shows how strong the brand being tested is (EBBI, n.d.).

1.12 The difference between CSR and ESG

There are many terms used to describe social responsibility and in the business world the most important concept is corporate social responsibility or CSR. Within the finance industry the concept is also referred to by the acronym ESG which stands for Economic, Social, and Governance and refers to the factors by which social responsibility can be measured. ESG and CSR are different names for the same concept (Fatemi et al., 2018), a concept that is determined as a crucial issue with strategic implications for businesses in all industries (Esmaeilpour & Barjoei, 2016).

1.13 The meaning of ESG for finance companies

Research has not reached unanimous conclusion whether ESG activities affect financial performances of a firm positively or negatively (Clark & Viehs, 2014; Margolis et al., 2009). It has been demonstrated that any ESG activities that exceed the legally binding minimum affect a firm’s performance negatively since it adds to the cost of investment and subsequently reduces the value of the firm (Friedman, 1970). However, recent studies show that ESG activities contribute to the firm overall value (Fatemi et al., 2015; Malik, 2015; Porter, 1991; Porter & Kramer, 2019; Porter and van der Linde, 1995; Roberts, 2004). The added value of ESG activities includes the potential to attract more qualified employees, enhance its reputation, strengthen the relationship with the firm’s stakeholders (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006) and that it “can be much more than a cost, a constraint, or a charitable deed – it can be a source of opportunity, innovation, and
competitive advantage” (Porter & Kramer, 2006, p. 2). Because of the positive attributes of ESG there is always a danger of greenwashing (Fatemi et al., 2018), which is when companies use ESG disclosures to paint a pretty picture for stakeholders that is not in correlation with their true actions (Cho et al., 2015). Opposite of greenwashing is brownwashing, when companies try to understate their ESG activities because of fear that their investors would frown upon their ESG activities and see them as too costly (Kym & Lyon, 2015).

1.14 ESG metrics

There are different frameworks for reporting on ESG matters, many firms use the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), and recently the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) (Esmaeilpour & Barjoei, 2016, Fatemi et al., 2018). Recently Nasdaq published its own guidelines on ESG reporting (Nasdaq, 2019), and one of the reporting guidelines that have been around for the longest time is the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) framework. ESG reporting frameworks that are exclusive to banks and the finance industry are Principles for Responsible Investments (PRI) and Principles for Responsible Banking (PRB), both a part of the UNEP Finance Initiative. However, it should be noted that ESG reporting is not regulated and the frameworks vary even though they come from the same ideology (Ioannou & Serafeim, 2016). An overview of the frameworks and if they attend to all ESG factors can be seen in table 1 at the end of this chapter.

Nasdaq launched an ESG reporting guide in May 2019 for all public and private companies after having initially been introduced in 2017 for the Nordic and Baltic markets (Nasdaq, n.d.). The ESG reporting guide states that although ESG factors are often perceived as non-financial they are in fact financial factors because how a company manages them affects its financial outcome (Nasdaq, 2019). The ESG reporting guide consists of 30 ESG metrics, ten for Environment (E), ten for Social (S), and ten for Corporate Governance (G) (Nasdaq, 2019). Before reporting, the company must conduct a materiality assessment to determine what aspects are most important to them and how their actions affect them, then report on the ESG factors yearly (Nasdaq, 2019).

Global Reporting Initiative is an independent organization that has been a pioneer of sustainability reporting since 1997 and issued the first global standards for sustainability
reporting (GRI, 2019). The GRI Standards support protection of the environment, improved society, economic wellbeing by improving governance and stakeholder relations, enhancing reputations and building trust (GRI, 2019).

Global Compact is the United Nations call to companies to align strategies and operations with universal principles that are divided into ten commandments that focus on four categories: human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption (United Nations Global Compact, 2019a).

In 2015 all members of the United Nations adopted a plan for a better future called the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), they are set to be reached by 2030, the SDGs are 17 goals that aim to end extreme poverty, fight inequality and injustice, and protect the planet (United Nations Global Compact, 2019b).

The Paris Agreement was signed in 2015 between all nations to undertake ambitious efforts to fight a common cause, the climate change. The goal of the Paris Agreement is to limit the temperature increase this century to 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursue to limit the increase even further or to 1.5°C (United Nations Climate Change, 2019).

UNEP FI is the abbreviation for the United Nations Environment Programme – Finance Initiative, it is a partnership between the UN Environment and the global financial sector established in 1992 to promote sustainable finance (UNEP Finance Initiative, 2019). Principles for Responsible Banking also known as PRB are a commitment between UNEP FI and signatory banks. PRB consists of six principles that signatories promise to assess, implement and report on in their operations: Alignment, impact & target setting, clients & customers, stakeholders, governance & culture and transparency & accountability (UNEP Financial Initiative Principles for Responsible Banking, 2019). The main goal of PRB is to help signatories adapt to and implement the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement (UNEP Financial Initiative Principles for Responsible Banking, 2019).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environment factors</th>
<th>Social factors</th>
<th>Governance factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasdaq ESG guidelines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Reporting Initiative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP FI Principles for Responsible Banking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Global Compact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Paris Agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Method

This chapter will outline the methodology of the research conducted. To find out what attributes of banks are most valuable for customers a questionnaire was formed featuring attributes found in existing literature; the empirically tested CBBE model (Keller, 2001c), the EBBI questionnaire that was deemed relevant for financial institutions as well as energy companies (Ji, et al., 2019, Larsen, 2014, EBBI, n.d.) and important ESG attributes that are becoming increasingly important for banks (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006, Porter & Kramer, 2006). The result of this was a questionnaire that is supposed to measure four dimensions, Differentiation, Perception, Segmentation, and ESG, which reliabilities were confirmed with Cronbach’s alpha. To evaluate if these attributes were valuable to customers and added to the brand equity a linear regression analyses were conducted using three different dependent variables; trust, WOM and loyalty.

2.1 Participants

The research was conducted in Iceland where there are three commercial banks that are deemed systemically important by the Financial Services and hold almost all the market share in the country between them (Fjármálaeftirlitið, 2019). In this study one of the three major banks collaborated with this study and sent out an e-mail to its customers and invited them to take part in the survey and the questionnaire reflected that it was made for the clients of that major bank.

The total population is everyone in Iceland that is 18 years old or older, that would be 276,283 people (Hagstofa Íslands, 2019). The sample collected consists of 227 participants.

The survey was initially sent out via e-mail to a random sample of 1200 customers from the banks customer list. After one week of data collection only 84 answers had been retrieved. The survey was then sent out to additional 3000 customers. The e-mails included a link to the survey, the survey can be seen in the appendix.

Participants ended up being 227, out of the 4200 that got an e-mail only 453 or 10.8% opened the questionnaire. Out of those that opened the questionnaire 227 or 50.1% finished answering the survey, yielding a total response rate of 5.4%.
The distribution between males and females that answered was even or 50.2% females and 49.8% male as table 2 shows.

**Table 2 Participants divided by sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common age of the participants was between 51-60 years of age, very few young participants participated or only 12 under 30 years of age. The distribution can be observed in table 3 here below.

**Table 3 Participants divided by age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years or younger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest level of education achieved among the study's participants was a university degree, either an undergraduate or a graduate degree. The distribution between participants education can be seen in table 4 here below.

**Table 4 Participants’ education levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School (10th grade in Iceland)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education, journeyman</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education, Masters certificate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University undergraduate degree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University graduate degree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most common amount of net income for participants is between 201,000-450,000 ISK. The distribution between participants income level can be seen in table 5 here below.
Table 5 Participants net income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income ISK</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000 or less</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201,000-450,000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451,000-600,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601,000-850,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851,000-999,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Measures

This study was being conducted for the first time and the questionnaire used is made from existing questionnaires that have been developed to measure brands, the models that were used were Keller’s CBBE model (Keller, 2001c), the EBBI Index (EBBI, n.d.), and additional questions were added to gauge whether corporate social responsibility or ESG factors matter to bank customers, those questions are mainly based upon the ESG reporting guidelines from Nasdaq, although other ESG (or CSR) reporting indexes were also included (Nasdaq, 2019, GRI, 2019, United Nations Global Compact, 2019, United Nations Climate Change, 2019, UNEP Finance Initiative, 2019, UNEP Financial Initiative Principles for Responsible Banking, 2019).

The CBBE model and the EBBI Index questionnaires unveil the attributes that prior literature has found to be important to bank customers (Edmund, 2018, Lee & Marlowe, 2003, Mutsonziwa, 2015, Wentz, 2014).

The CBBE model has six dimensions while EBBI has three dimensions, in this questionnaire there will be three dimensions because the CBBE dimensions have been allocated within EBBI’s three dimensions. What dimensions were combined can be seen in table 6 here below.

Table 6 Allocation of dimensions between models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBBE</th>
<th>EBBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery</td>
<td>Segmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgements</td>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For clarifications the research aims to measure what are the most important attributes for customers, the dimensions are made with different attributes and each could be called an attribute but that would be an oversimplification because the concept behind each dimension is more complicated than so that it can be explained as one attribute.

Differentiation is defined the extent to which the brand differentiates itself from its competitors regarding uniqueness, brand promise, product offer and the brand’s name and logo (EBBI, n.d.). Salience is the foundation of the CBBE pyramid and determines what the brand is, performance measures if the brand compares with other brands in the category and imagery measures what the customer thinks of the brand itself (Keller, 1993; Keller et al., 2012). These dimensions are comparable with each other and will now be within the same dimension that will be referred to as Differentiation.

Segmentation is defined as measuring the extent to which the brand divides its customers into segments and how well it appeals to each segment, trends identified include age, and price sensitivity (EBBI, n.d.). Judgement and feelings measure how customers respond to the brand (Keller, 1993; Keller et al., 2012) and the results can be used to segment customers so the dimensions are comparable with each other and were therefore combined into the same dimension in this study and be referred to as Segmentation.

Perception is defined as the extent to which customers experience the brand as trustworthy, experienced, reliable and responsible (EBBI, n.d.). Resonance defines the relationship between the customer and the brand (Keller, 1993; Keller et al. 2012) this includes how the customer experiences the brand so these dimensions are comparable with each other and will in this research be combined into one dimension and be referred to as Perception.

Finally, a fourth dimension was added to measure if customers perceive ESG factors to be of an importance.

The process of deciding which questions from CBBE and EBBI should be used in the questionnaire consisted of a discussion between the researcher and Friðrik Larsen, the author of EBBI and a Ph.D. in marketing. The discussion first determined which attributes that prior research has found (Edmund, 2018; Lee & Marlowe, 2003; Mutsonziwa, 2015;
Wentz, 2014) could be determined by which questions from CBBE and EBBI. The results of the comparison between CBBE and prior attributes can be seen in table 7 here below.

Table 7 The relationship between CBBE questionnaire and known brand attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBBE</th>
<th>Brand attributes that have been found to be important to bank customers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How effective is this brand’s service? Does it completely satisfy your requirements? | Give customers financial advice  
Bank location  
Hours of operation  
ATM availability  
Online banking availability |
| How efficient is this brand’s service in terms of speed, responsiveness and so forth? | Good service  
Local bank with a range of services |
| How courteous and helpful are the providers of this brand’s service? | Helpfulness  
Problem solving  
Friendliness of service consultants  
Language use of service consultants  
Positive relationship with bank employees |
| Compared with other brands in the category with which it competes, are this brand’s prices generally higher, lower or about the same. | Low or none monthly fees  
Low minimum balance  
High interest rates  
No teller fee |
| Judgements                                                           |                                                                                                         |
| How innovative are the makers of this brand?                        | Give customers financial advice  
Innovativeness |

When EBBI and attributes were compared, all questions that were directly related to the energy sector were removed, that is shown with a strikethrough in table 8. The results of the comparison between EBBI and prior attributes can be seen in table 8 here below.
Table 8 The relationship between the EBBI questionnaire and known brand attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EBBI</th>
<th>Brand attributes that have been found to be important to bank customers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How well or badly do Brand X service offerings appeal to you? | Financial advice  
Bank location  
Hours of operation  
ATM availability  
Online banking availability  
Low or none monthly fees  
Low minimum balance  
High interest rates  
No teller fee  
Local bank with a range of services |
| Please rate the following statements about Brand X: Brand X delivers quality service, Brand X engages in corporate social responsibility, Brand X offers green energy, Brand X has a wide range of products, Brand X understands the needs of young people, Brand X offers different services at different prices, Brand X offers you the chance to buy products from local sources, Brand X tailors services to its customers | Invest in education  
Invest in culture  
Invest in sports  
Invest in urban mobility  
Financial advice  
Low or none monthly fees  
Low minimum balance  
High interest rates  
No teller fee  
Local bank with a range of services  
Helpfulness  
Innovativeness |
| How important do you consider the following factors to be for energy providers-banks in general? Product variety, Customer service, Reliability, Environmental policy | Helpfulness  
Problem solving  
Friendliness of service consultants  
Language use of service consultants  
Good service  
Positive relationship with bank employees |

Continuing the design of the questionnaire, CBBE and EBBI were compared, table 9 shows what questions were deemed to be asking about the same thing. In the questionnaire only one version is used to make the questionnaire shorter.
Because the CBBE questionnaire includes many questions that measure the same attributes, some questions were removed as well as questions that ask about attributes that are specific to consumer goods and do not apply to banks or other financial companies. Questions that were removed and belonged in the original CBBE question list can be seen in the appendix. The final questionnaire is displayed in table 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Differentiation | 1. What is the first thing that comes to your mind when you think of Brand X  
2. What bank brands can you think of?  
3. How frequently do you think of this brand?  
4. Compared with other brands in the category, how well does this brand provide the basic functions of the product or service category?  
5. How well or badly do you know what Brand X stands for?  
6. What do you think of the following factors for Brand X from Not at all to Very much:  
   - This brand’s service is very effective  
   - This brand’s service completely satisfies my requirements  
   - This brand’s service is very fast  
   - This brand’s service is very responsive  
   - The providers of this brand’s service are courteous  
   - The providers of this brand’s service are helpful  
7. How much do you like the look, feel and other design aspects of this brand?  
8. Compared with other brands in the category in which it competes, are this brand’s prices generally higher, lower or about the same?  
9. How much do you like people who use this brand?  
10. How well do the following words describe this brand?  
   - Down to earth  
   - Honest  
   - Daring  
   - Up-to-date  
   - Reliable  
   - Successful  
   - Upper-class  
   - Charming  
   - Outdoorsy  
11. To what extent does thinking of the brand bring back pleasant memories?  
12. What is your overall opinion of this brand?  
13. How important do you consider the following factors to be for banks in general? |
| Segmentation   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
- Product variety
- Customer service
- Reliability
- Environmental policy
- Quality

14. Have you ever switched banks (for other reasons than moving)?
15. How innovative are the makers of this brand?
16. How much do you trust the makers of this brand?
17. How much do you like this brand?
18. How likely would you be to recommend this brand to others?
19. How unique is this brand?
20. To what extent does this brand offer advantage that other brands cannot?

21. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
   - This brand gives me a feeling of warmth
   - This brand gives me a feeling of fun
   - This brand gives me a feeling of excitement
   - This brand gives me a feeling of security
   - This brand gives me a feeling of social-approval
   - This brand gives me a feeling of self-respect

22. What is your gender
23. How old are you?

24. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest degree received.

25. What is your monthly net income? (adjusted by country)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. I consider myself loyal to this brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I would go out of my way to use this brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I really love this brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I really identify with people who use this brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am proud to have others know I use this brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. How well or badly do Brand X service offerings appeal to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Please rate the following statements about Brand X:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand X is modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand X is fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand X is progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand X is trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand X is old fashioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand X is reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand X is environmentally friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. Please rate the following statements about Brand X

- Brand X is an experienced bank
- Brand X delivers quality service
- Brand X has a wide range of products
- Brand X understands the needs of young people
- Brand X offers different services at different prices
- Brand X offers you the chance to buy products from local sources
- Brand X tailors’ services to its customers

34. How well do the following statements describe Brand X

- Brand X cares about the environment
- Brand X invests in the society
- Brand X honours equal opportunities
- Brand X is well directed
- Brand X is socially responsible
- Brand X governance is honest

### 2.3 Procedure

This study was conducted in Iceland so the final questionnaire was back-translated, that is translated from English to Icelandic by the researcher, and then translated back to English by another person that had not been involved with making the questionnaire. The translation was compared with the original questionnaire and it was found that two questions had lost its correct meaning in the translation. The Icelandic version of those two questions was rephrased so that the meaning would be the same in both languages, or as close as possible, it should be kept in mind that functionality difference between the questionnaire in English and Icelandic is possible although the likelihood has been reduced by back-translating (Price & Oshima, 1998; Werner & Campell, 1970. In this Icelandic version one question was added because it was interesting for this market because of how small it is with only three banks that divide almost equally between them the banking of all individuals in the country. The extra question was: What is your primary bank of business? Other alterations of the questionnaire were to combine a few questions into a matrix question were every option is evaluated with a 5-point Likert scale

Before the survey was sent out a test drive was conducted on a convenience sample that consisted of friends, colleagues, and family members. A few comments were made regarding instructions and the surveys instructions were adjusted accordingly.

The final version of a questionnaire was set up in the Questionpro format and the first e-mail from Landsbankinn to the random sample was sent out on August 20th, 2019 to
1200 recipients. The second e-mail from Landsbankinn to a random sample was sent out on August 26th, 2019 to 3000 recipients. The survey was closed on September 3rd, 2019 when data was exported from Questionpro into SPSS which was used for statistical analysis.

3 Findings

In this chapter results of the study will be discussed. First a descriptive analysis of all questions will be presented. Then inner reliability of each attribute is verified using Cronbach’s Alpha. Finally using regression analysis, it will be determined if the attributes statistically affect the dependent variables.

3.1 Descriptive analysis

All attributes of the questionnaire that are measured with a 5-point Likert scale are shown in table 11 from the highest mean score to the lowest. Questions that measure reliability, customer service and quality have the highest score, environmental policy also ranks highly on customers list. Questions that measure feelings toward the brand and the brands personal attributes have the lowest ranking. The four dimensions are represented as numbers 1 through 4 in the following order:

1. Differentiation
2. Segmentation
3. Perception
4. ESG

Table 11 Descriptive statistics of attributes’ scores in descending order
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of reliability</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of customer service</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of quality</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous employees</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful employers</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is an experienced bank</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective service</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service completely satisfies requirements</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of environmental policy</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand offers you the chance to do banking locally</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you like the brand</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is reliable</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service is very fast</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service is very responsive</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability of look, feel and other design aspects</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand has a wide range of products</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust the brand</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well or badly do the brands service offerings appeal to you</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is reliable</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand delivers quality service</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is trustworthy</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is up-to-date</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is successful</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely would you be to recommend the brand to others</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is honest</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability of people who use this brand</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is down to earth</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is modern</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself loyal to this brand</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is socially responsible</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand tailor's services to its customers</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of product variety</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand cares about the environment</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is progressive</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is environmentally friendly</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How innovative is the brand</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is well directed</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand honours equal opportunities</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand understands the needs of young people</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand invests in society</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand offers different services at different prices</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand governance is honest</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the brand offer advantage that other brands cannot</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is daring</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand gives me a feeling of security</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would go out of my way to use this brand</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is upper-class</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is charming</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking of the brand brings back pleasant memories</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is fun</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is old fashioned</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How unique is the brand</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really identify with people that use this brand</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to have others know I use this brand</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand is trustworthy</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand gives me a feeling of warmth</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand gives me a feeling of fun</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand gives me a feeling of social-approval</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand gives me a feeling of self respect</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand gives me a feeling of excitement</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really love this brand</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Component analysis

Cronbach’s Alpha was used to verify inner reliability of dimensions. For the dimension Differentiation the Cronbach’s Alpha was at first 0.881 but after removing the question: How many times per week do you think about Landsbankinn? Cronbach’s Alpha increased to 0.908 as is shown in table 12.

Table 12 Differentiation reliability statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the dimension Perception Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.915 as can be seen in table 13.

Table 13 Perception reliability statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the dimension Segmentation Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.93 as is shown in table 14.

Table 14 Segmentation reliability statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the dimension ESG Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.874 and would not be higher if any part of the question was removed from the dimension. Table 15 shows the Cronbach’s Alpha for this dimension.
After validating the inner reliability of the four dimensions, four new variables were made from the questions that each dimension consists of, equalling the mean of all questions belonging the concerning attribute.

### 3.3 Regression analysis

The effect of the four dimensions on the dependent variables trust, WOM and loyalty was assessed using regression analysis. The independent variables of differentiation, perception, segmentation and ESG explained 65.5% of the dependent variable trust:

\[(F(4, 210) = 99.587, p < .001)\]

Durbin Watson is 1.954 so there was no autocorrelation, the highest Cook’s is 0.103 so there are no outliers and VIF < 10 so there was no serious multicollinearity either (Field, 2013). Table 16 below shows the results from the regression analysis.

### Table 16 Coefficients for dependent variable trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients¹</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.979</td>
<td>-0.979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segmentation</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Dependent Variable: Q19 - Trust

The histogram in figure 3 showed no serious deviations from normal distribution.
The scatterplot in figure 4 with predicted values on x-axis and values on y-axis indicated homogeneity of residuals.
The beta coefficient for the dependent variable trust was 0.324 for Differentiation, 0.369 for Segmentation, 0.207 for Perception and -0.057 for ESG. Segmentation affects trust more than any other dimension and ESG is not relevant in regard to trust. This can be seen in figure 5.

![Diagram showing the relationship between different dimensions and trust](image)

**Figure 5 How different dimensions affect trust**

The independent variables of differentiation, perception, segmentation and ESG explained 62.8% of the dependent variable How likely are you to recommend the bank to others.

\[(F(4, 211) = 88.989, p < .001)\]

Durbin Watson was 1.817 so there was no autocorrelation, the highest Cook’s was 0.006 so there are no outliers and VIF < 10 so there was no serious multicollinearity either (Field, 2013). Table 17 shows the results from the regression analysis.
Table 17 Coefficients for dependent variable WOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.436</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>-4.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Q22 - recommendation

The histogram in figure 6 shows no serious deviations from normal distribution.

Figure 6 Histogram for dependent variable WOM
The scatterplot in figure 7 looks like a diamond with predicted values on x-axis and values on y-axis.

Figure 7 Scatterplot for dependent variable WOM

The beta coefficient for the dependent variable WOM was 0.174 for Differentiation, 0.427 for Segmentation, 0.262 for Perception and -0.041 for ESG. Segmentation affects WOM more than any other dimension and ESG is not relevant in regard to WOM.
For the dependent variable loyalty, two dependent variables were analysed, I consider myself loyal to the brand which will be defined as loyalty¹ and I would go out of my way to do business with the brand which will be defined as loyalty².

The independent variables of differentiation, perception, segmentation and ESG explained 51.9% of the dependent variable loyalty¹:

\[ F(4, 207) = 55,877, p < .001 \]

Durbin Watson was 1.975 so there was no autocorrelation, the highest Cook’s was 0.005 so there are no outliers and VIF < 10 so there was no serious multicollinearity either (Field, 2013). Table 18 shows the results from the regression analysis.

The explanatory value of the independent variables was just a little above 50% which is lower than for the previous two dependent variables. In the Coefficients table below, it can be seen that the ESG dimension was weakening the explanation value of the independent variables. That can be correct because if a bank is perceived as very ESG conscious it can affect customers loyalty since they think that ESG conscious banks care more about ESG factors than about yielding a high return on their customers’ investments (Kym & Lyon, 2015).

Figure 8 How different dimensions affect WOM
Table 18 Coefficients for dependent variable loyalty¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.529</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>-1.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>1.817</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>-0.649</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>-0.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: P - Ég er trú(r) banka X

The histogram in figure 9 shows no serious deviations from normal distribution.

Figure 9 Histogram for dependent variable loyalty¹
The scatterplot in figure 10 looks like a diamond with predicted values on x-axis and values on y-axis.

**Figure 10 Scatterplot for dependent variable loyalty¹**

The beta coefficient for the dependent variable loyalty¹ was -0.094 for Differentiation, 0.119 for Segmentation, 0.970 for Perception and -0.373 for ESG. Perception affects loyalty¹ more than any other dimension and Differentiation and Segmentation are not relevant in regard to loyalty¹ and ESG seems to be harmful to loyalty¹.
The independent variables of differentiation, perception, segmentation and ESG explained 60.8% of the dependent variable loyalty²:

\[(F(4, 207) = 80.248, p < .001)\]

Durbin Watson was 1.722 so there was no autocorrelation, the highest Cook’s was 0.005 so there are no outliers and VIF < 10 so there was no serious multicollinearity either (Field, 2013). Table 19 shows the results from the regression analysis.

Like with loyalty¹ the ESG dimension is having a negative effect on the dependent variable, and for the same reasons as well. People tend to be distrustful of banks that are perceived to be ESG responsible in regards of yielding a high return on their investments.
Table 19 Coefficients for dependent variable loyalty²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-1.631</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>-4.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmentation</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>1.799</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>-0.598</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The histogram in figure 12 shows no serious deviations from normal distribution.

Histogram

Figure 12 Histogram for dependable variable loyalty²
The scatterplot in figure 13 looks like a diamond with predicted values on x-axis and values on y-axis.

**Figure 13 Scatterplot for dependable variable loyalty²**

The beta coefficient for the dependent variable loyalty² was -0.135 for Differentiation, 0.271 for Segmentation, 0.881 for Perception and -0.316 for ESG. Perception affects loyalty² the most out of the dimensions, Segmentation has some effect, Differentiation seems to be harmful and ESG is harmful to loyalty².
4 Discussion

4.1 Conclusion

The study’s objective was to answer the question: Which brand attributes of banks are most valuable for consumers?

The findings of prior research suggested that:

- Banks need to transform people’s life to be a relevant brand (Wentz, 2014).
- Bank customers want more financial advice (Edmund, 2018; Mutsonziwa, 2015).
- Customers want helpfulness, innovativeness, friendly employees and their problems solved (Mutsonziwa, 2015).
- Convenience (Lee & Marlowe, 2003).
- Social responsibility (Bayer et al., 2019; Kotler, 2011; Weber & Feltmate, 2016).
According to the descriptive analysis the following attributes all score 75% or higher on a Likert scale of 1-5 where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest. They are the deemed important in the following order, with 1 being the most important:

1. Reliability
2. Customer service
3. Quality
4. Experience of brand
5. Environmental policy
6. Convenience
7. Likeability
8. Product range
9. Trust

The study confirms prior research for the most part. Financial advice, helpfulness, innovativeness, problem solving and friendly employees are all a part of reliability, customer service, quality, brand experience and likeability. Convenience is also represented in the findings and a part of social responsibility is to have an environmental policy so that aspect is also supported by the descriptive analysis. The findings did not support the theory of banks needing to transform people’s life to be a relevant brand, it is possible that the survey instrument did not measure that theory correctly, future research might add insight into that theory.

The survey instrument measured these four dimensions:

1. Differentiation measures how well the brand differentiates itself from its competitors regarding uniqueness, brand promise, product offer and the brand’s name and logo (EBBI, n.d.). The CBBE dimensions salience, performance and imagery belong within the differentiation dimension since they determine what the brand is, performance measures, imagery measures and what the customer thinks of the brand (Keller, 1993; Keller et al., 2012).
2. Segmentation measures how well the brand divides its customers into segments and how well it appeals to each segment (EBBI, n.d.). The CBBE dimensions judgements and feelings belong within this dimension since they measure how the customer responds to the brand (Keller, 1993; Keller et al., 2012).
3. Perception measures customer experience regarding trust, perceived experience, perceived reliability and perceived brand responsibility (EBBI, n.d.). The CBBE dimension resonance belongs within this dimension as it defines the relationship between the customer and the brand (Keller, 1993; Keller et al., 2012).
4. ESG measures if customers perceive environment, social and governance factors to be of importance.

Component analysis verified the inner reliability of all four dimensions, therefore the dependent variables could be analysed with regression analysis.

Trust has been shown to relate to brand equity, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, brand and perception image (Saeednia & Masoumi, 2014). Findings revealed that 65.5% of trust can be explained using these four dimensions, at a closer look reveals that the dimension Segmentation most prominently affects trust while ESG has no effect. This suggests that one of the most important brand aspects for customers is to be approached with the correct service offerings based on the target group it belongs within, therefore a bank that wants to increase trust should focus on a thorough and meticulous segmentation of their target group.

Whether customer is likely to recommend brands to others by word of mouth is important to determine customer’s value, it is important for companies to know its customer’s true value to invest in the correct group (Florea, et. Al., 2018). Findings revealed that 62.8% of NPS can be explained using these four dimensions. At a closer look it is revealed that the dimension Segmentation has the most prominent effect on NPS while ESG has no effect. This suggests that one of the most important brand aspects for customers to be a valuable customer is to be approached with the service offerings that mean the most to him, therefore a bank that wants to increase NPS should focus on their targeting and segmentation of their target group.

Brand loyalty represents the core of the brands value and is an important factor in sustaining a competitive advantage (Moisescu & Vu, 2011; Saeednia & Masoumi, 2014). Brand loyalty can be assessed by tracking and measuring customer behaviour and by measuring customers preferences, commitment and purchase intentions (Loureiro, 2013; Rousseau, et al., 1998). Brand loyalty was evaluated through two dependent variables, the first one measured if the customer considered himself loyal and the second one measured if the customer would go out of his way to do business with the bank, a behaviour which would indicate brand loyalty. Findings were similar for both variables; the four dimensions could explain the first loyalty variable by 51.9% but the second loyalty variable got a better score of 60.8% explanation rate of the four dimensions. Both
variables were very highly affected by the dimension Perception and the dimension ESG negatively affected both variables. This suggests that one of the most important brand aspects for customers to keep their loyalty is to deliver brand experience, brand reliability and brand responsibility to their customers. At the same time, it has a negative affect towards customer’s loyalty if the brand is perceived as being invested in social responsibility which resonates with prior research that has suggested socially responsible firms are believed to deliver worse financial performance (Friedman, 1970). This has led to brownwashing where companies try to understate their ESG activities because investors see them as too costly (Kym & Lyon, 2015).

At the same time other studies show that ESG activities add to the firm overall value (Fatemi et al., 2015; Malik, 2015; Porter, 1991; Porter & Kramer, 2019; Porter and van der Linde, 1995; Roberts, 2004) and marketers are being called out and asked to become socially responsible in their marketing activities (Fatemi et al., 2015; Malik, 2015; Porter, 1991, Porter & Kramer, 2019; Porter and van der Linde, 1995; Roberts, 2004).

Brand assessment is twofold and divides into the consumer behaviour towards the brand and the financial value of the brand (Nguyen, et al., 2019). The findings of this research can be a valuable tool for managers to assess their consumers’ behaviour towards their brand and they can use the result to build their brand equity. Managers that understand what attributes matter most to their customers will get the most value out of their brand (Barwise et al., 1989; Keller, 1993).

4.2 Limitations

The survey got fewer responses than were expected because the response ratio was only around 5%. The sample size was fairly small with 227 participants and below the initial goal of 300 responses. Although the sample is not of an optimum size it should provide enough information to decide whether the questionnaire measures the most important attributes to bank customers and if the research would be worth repeating on a larger scale.

The survey instrument was made especially for this research, it would be helpful to test the questionnaire again to test its reliability.
4.3 Future research

This research tested a random sample of customers from one of the three largest banks in Iceland, it would be advisable to follow up by testing the other two as well, preferably with a larger sample, and see if the results would confirm the results of this research.

It would also be advisable to test banks in other countries and see if the findings would confirm the results of this research.
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Appendix 1

CBBE candidate measures (Keller et al., 2012)

1. Salience
   - What brands of product or service category can you think of? (Using increasingly specific product category cues).
   - Have you ever heard of these brands?
   - Which brands might you be likely to use under the following situations?
   - How frequently do you think of this brand?

2. Performance
   - Compared with other brands in the category, how well does this brand provide the basic functions of the product or service category?
   - Compared with other brands in the category, how well does this brand satisfy the basic needs of the product or service category?
   - To what extent does this brand have special features?
   - How reliable is this brand?
   - How durable is this brand?
   - How easily serviced is this brand?
   - How effective is this brand’s service? Does it completely satisfy your requirements?
   - How efficient is this brand’s service in terms of speed, responsiveness and so forth?
   - How courteous and helpful are the providers of this brand’s service?
   - How stylish do you find this brand?
   - How much do you like the look, feel and other design aspects of this brand?
   - Compared with other brands in the category with which it competes, are this brand’s prices generally higher, lower or about the same?
   - Compared with other brands in the category with which it competes, do this brand’s prices change more frequently, less frequently or about the same amount?

3. Imagery
   - To what extent do people you admire and respect use this brand?
   - How much do you like people who use this brand?
   - How well do the following words describe this brand: down-to-earth, honest, daring, up-to-date, reliable, successful, upper-class, charming, outdoorsy?
   - What places are appropriate to buy this brand?
   - How appropriate are the following situations to using this brand?
   - Can you buy this brand in a lot of places?
- Is this a brand that you can use in a lot of different situations?
- To what extent does thinking of the brand bring back pleasant memories?
- To what extent do you feel you grew up with the brand?

4. Judgments

Quality
- What is your overall opinion of this brand?
- What is your assessment of the product quality of this brand?
- To what extent does this brand fully satisfy your product needs?
- How good value is this brand?

Credibility
- How knowledgeable are the makers of this brand?
- How innovative are the makers of this brand?
- How much do you trust the makers of this brand?
- To what extent do the makers of this brand understand your needs?
- To what extent do the makers of this brand care about your opinions?
- To what extent do the makers of this brand have your interests in mind?
- How much do you like this brand?
- How much do you admire this brand?
- How much do you respect this brand?

Consideration
- How likely would you be to recommend this brand to others?
- Which are your favourite products in this brand category?
- How personally relevant is this brand to you?

Superiority
- How unique is this brand?
- To what extent does this brand offer advantages that other brands cannot?
- How superior is this brand to others in the category?

5. Feelings
- Does this brand give you a feeling of warmth?
- Does this brand give you a feeling of fun?
- Does this brand give you a feeling of excitement?
- Does this brand give you a feeling of security?
- Does this brand give you a feeling of social-approval?
- Does this brand give you a feeling of self-respect?

6. Resonance

Loyalty
- I consider myself loyal to this brand.
- I buy this brand whenever I can.
- I buy as much of this brand as I can.
- I feel this is the only brand of this product I need.
- This is the one brand I would prefer to buy/use.
- If this brand were not available, it would make a difference to me if I had to use another brand.
- I would go out of my way to use this brand.

Attachment

- I really love this brand.
- I would really miss this brand if it went away.
- This brand is special to me.
- This brand is more than a product to me.

Community

- I really identify with people who use this brand.
- I feel like I almost belong to a club with other users of this brand.
- This is a brand used by people like me.
- I feel a deep connection with others who use this brand.

Engagement

- I really like to talk about this brand to others.
- I am always interested in learning more about this brand.
- I would be interested in merchandise with this brand’s name on it.
- I am proud to have others know I use this brand.
- I like to visit the website for this brand.
- Compared with other people, I follow news about this brand closely.

Appendix 2

EBBI questionnaire

Dear customer, this is a customer survey for BRANDXXX conducted for CHARGE - Energy Branding Awards. In this survey, customers will be asked to complete a survey that asks questions about BRANDXXX. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can skip them or withdraw from the survey at any point. It is very important for us to learn your opinions. It takes approximately 4 minutes to complete the survey. Your survey responses will be
strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the whole. Your information will be coded and will remain confidential. If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, you may contact CHARGE at conference@branding.energy. Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start with the survey now by clicking on the NEXT button below.

What is the first thing that comes in to your mind when you think of Brand_X?

How well or badly does Brand_X appeal to you?
1. 1. Very badly
2. 2. Badly
3. 3. Neither well nor badly
4. 4. Well
5. 5. Very well

How unique or ordinary do you think Brand_X is compared to other energy providers?
1. 1. Very ordinary
2. 2. Ordinary
3. 3. Neither unique nor ordinary
4. 4. Unique
5. 5. Very unique

How well or badly do you know what Brand_X stands for?
1. 1. Very badly
2. 2. Badly
3. 3. Neither well nor badly
4. 4. Well
5. 5. Very well

How well or badly do Brand_X service offerings appeal to you?
1. 1. Very badly
How well or badly do you like the name Brand_X?
1. 1. Very badly
2. 2. Badly
3. 3. Neither well nor badly
4. 4. Well
5. 5. Very well

How do you like Brand_X’s logo?
1. 1. I dislike it a lot
2. 2. I dislike it
3. 3. Neither like it nor dislike it
4. 4. I like it
5. 5. I like it a lot

Please rate the following statements about Brand_X:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is modern</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is fun</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is progressive</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is trustworthy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is old fashioned</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is reliable</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is environmentally friendly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X is an experienced</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate the following statements about Brand_X:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X delivers quality service</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X engages in corporate social responsibility</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X offers green energy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X has a wide range of products</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X understands the needs of young people</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X offers different services at different prices</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X offers you the chance to buy products from local sources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand_X tailors services to its customers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely are you to recommend Brand_X to a friend, colleague or relative?

1.  1.  0
2.  2.  1
3.  3.  2
4.  4.  3
5.  5.  4
6.  6.  5
7.  7.  6
8.  8.  7
9.  9.  8
10. 10. 9
11. 11. 10

How important do you consider the following factors to be for energy providers in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product variety</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental policy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever switched energy suppliers? (For other reasons than moving)
1. 1. No
2. 2. Yes, once
3. 3. Yes, more than once

What is your gender?
1. 1. Male
2. 2. Female
3. 3. Other

How old are you?
1. 1. Under 18 years
2. 2. 18-25 years
3. 3. 26-35 years
4. 4. 36-45 years
5. 5. 46-55 years
6. 6. 56-65 years
7. 7. 66-75 years
8. 8.
9.
10. Over 75 years
11.
12.

What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest degree received.

1. 1. Elementary school
2. 2. Some high school, no diploma
3. 3. High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED)
4. 4. Some college credit, no degree
5. 5. Trade/technical/vocational training
6. 6. Associate degree
7. 7. Bachelor’s degree
8. 8. Master’s degree
9. 9. Professional degree
10. 10. Doctorate degree

What is your monthly net income? (adjusted by country)

1. 1. Less than $1500
2. 2. $1500-2500
3. 3. $2500 - 3500
4. 4. More than $3500

Appendix 3

Nasdaq ESG Reporting Guide

Environmental (E)

E1. GHG Emissions
E2. Emissions Intensity
E3. Energy Usage
E4. Energy Intensity
E5. Energy Mix
E6. Water Usage
E7. Environmental Operations
E8. Climate Oversight/Board
E9. Climate Oversight/Management
E10. Climate Risk Mitigation

Social (S)
S1. CEO Pay Ratio
S2. Gender Pay Ratio
S3. Employee Turnover
S4. Gender Diversity
S5. Temporary Worker Ratio
S6. Non-Discrimination
S7. Injury Rate
S8. Global Health & Safety
S9. Child & Forced Labour
S10. Human Rights

Corporate Governance (G)
G1. Board Diversity
G2. Board Independence
G3. Incentivized Pay
G5. Supplier Code of Conduct
G6. Ethics & Anti-Corruption
G7. Data Privacy
G8. ESG Reporting
G10. External Assurance

Appendix 4
Questions removed from the CBBE questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CBBE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever heard of these brands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which brands might you be likely to use under the following situations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How stylish do you find this brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared with other brands in the category with which it competes, do this brand's prices change more frequently, less frequently or about the same amount?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imagery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do people you admire and respect use this brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What places are appropriate to buy this brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How appropriate are the following situations to using this brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you buy this brand in a lot of places?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a brand that you can use in a lot of different situations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you grew up with the brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judgements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does this brand fully satisfy your product needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How knowledgeable are the makers of this brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the makers of this brand understand your needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the makers of this brand care about your opinions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the makers of this brand have your interests in mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you admire this brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you respect this brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which are your favourite products in this brand category?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How personally relevant is this brand to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How superior is this brand to others in the category?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resonance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I buy this brand whenever I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I buy as much of this brand as I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel this is the only brand of this product I need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the one brand I would prefer to buy/use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If this brand were not available, it would make a difference to me if I had to use another brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would really miss this brand if it went away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand is special to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This brand is more than a product to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I almost belong to a club with other users of this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a brand used by people like me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a deep connection with others who use this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really like to talk about this brand to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always interested in learning more about this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be interested in merchandise with this brand’s name on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to visit the website for this brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared with other people, I follow news about this brand closely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

Final questionnaire in Icelandic

Hvaða bönkum manstu eftir?

Hver er þinn aðal viðskiptabanki?
- Arion banki
- Íslandsbanki
- Landsbankinn
- Annar

Hvað er það fyrsta sem þér dettur í hug þegar þú hugsat um banka X?

Hversu oft í viku hugsar þú um banka X?
0-10 sinnum

Hvernig er banki X í samanburði við aðra íslenska banka?

Hversu vel eða illa þekkir þú banka X?

Hversu viðeigandi eða óviðeigandi finnst þér eftirfarandi fullyrðingar um banka X?
- Banki X býður upp á mjög skilvirka þjónustu
- Banki X uppfyllir allar mínar þarfir
- Þjónusta banka X er mjög hraðvirk
- Banki X bregst hratt við
- Starfsfólk banka X er kurteist
- Starfsfólk banka X er hjálplegt

Hversu vel eða illa líkar þér við útlit, tilfinningu og aðra þætti vörumerkis banka X?

Hvernig er verðskrá banka X í samanburði við aðra íslenska banka?

Hversu vel eða illa líkar þér við viðskiptavini banka X?

Hversu vel eða illa lýsa eftirfarandi lýsingarorð banka X?
- Jarðbundinn
- Heiðarlegur
- Hugrakkur
- Nútímalegur
- Áreiðanlegur
- Árangursríkur
- Yfirstéttarlegur
- Heillandi
- Útvistarlegur

Að hversu miklu eða litlu leyti rifjar það upp góðar minningar að hugsa um banka X?
Hvað finnst þér almennt um banka X?
Hversu mikilvægir eða lítilvægir þykja þér eftirfarandi þættir vera fyrir banka almennt?
  - Vöruframboð
  - Þjónusta við viðskiptavini
  - Áreiðanleiki
  - Umhverfisstefna
  - Gæði

Hefur þú skipt um banka af annarri ástæðu en vegna flutninga?
Hversu framsækinn eða afturhalðssamur er banki X?
Hversu vel eða illa treystir þú banka X?
Hversu vel eða illa líkar þér við banka X?
Hversu líkleg(ur) eða ólíkleg(ur) eftirfarandi fullyrðingum um banka X?
Hversu einstakur eða hefðbundinn er banki X?
Að hversu miklu eða litlu leyti hefur banki X yfirburði yfir aðr um íslenska banka?

Ertu sammála eða ósammála eftirfarandi fullyrðingum?
  - Banki X fyllir mig hýrri tilfinningu
  - Banki X er skemmtilegur
  - Banki X gerir mig spennta(n)
  - Banki X fyllir mig öryggis tilfinningu
  - Banki X lærur mér líða eins og ég sé samþykktur af samfélaginu
  - Banki X eykur sjálfsvirðingu mína
  - Ég er trú(r) banka X
  - Ég myndi leggja lykkju á leið mína til að stunda viðskipti við banka X
  - Ég elska banka X
  - Mér finnst ég eiga mikið sameinginlegt með örðum viðskiptavinum banka X
  - Ég er stolt(ur) af því að aðrir viti að ég sé viðskiptavinur banka X

Hversu vel eða illa höfðar þjónusta banka X til þín?
Hversu søannar eða ósøannar eru eftirfarandi fullyrðingar um banka X?
  - Banki X er nútímalegur
- Banki X er skemmtilegur
- Banki X er framsækinn
- Banki X er traustur
- Banki X er gamaldags
- Banki X er áreiðanlegur
- Banki X er umhverfisvænn
- Banki X er reynslumikill

Hversu sannar eða ósannar eru eftirfarandi fullyrðingar um banka X?

- Banki X skilar af sér gæðabjónustu
- Banki X býður upp á fjölbreytta þjónustu
- Banki X skilur þarfir unga fólksins
- Banki X býður upp á þjónustu á breiðu verðbili
- Banki X gerir þér kleift að fá bankabjónustu í nágrenni þínu
- Banki X sérsniður þjónustu að þórfum viðskiptavína

Hversu sannar eða ósannar eru eftirfarandi fullyrðingar um banka X?

- Banki X hugsar vel um umhverfið
- Banki X fjárfestir í nærsamfélaginu
- Það ríkir jafnrétti hjá Banka X
- Banka X er vel stýrt
- Banki X er samfélagslega ábyrgur
- Stjórnendur banka X eru heiðarlegir

Hvert er kyn þitt?

- Karl
- Kona
- Annað

Hver er aldur þinn?

Hver er hæsta menntunargráða sem þú hefur lokið? Ef þú ert í námi merktu þá við hæstu gráðu sem þú hefur lokið.

- Grunnskóli
- Sveinspróf
- Stúdentspróf
- Meistarabréf iðnnám
- Grunnnám úr háskóla (BS eða BA)
- Framhaldsnám úr háskóla (Master eða PhD)

Hver er heildarinnkoma þín á mánuði eftir skatt?
- 200.000 eða minna
- 201.000-400.000
- 401.000-600.000
- 601.000-850.000
- 851.000-999.999
- 1 milljón eða meira