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Abstract

In the field of marketing, there is anecdotal evidence that “respect” is an important determinant of marketing relationship success (e.g., Berry 1996; Bitran and Hoech 1990; Costley, Friend, and Babis 2005). The current relational paradigm that guides much of marketing research, thinking, and practice implies that marketing involves not only exchange between organizations and customers, but also relationships between people. Given this context, individual-level relationship variables such as respect become important to our understanding of relationship marketing as a whole. Yet, in marketing and in other relevant fields (e.g., social and organizational psychology, ethics, education), there is no agreement as to how respect should be defined, and there is no measure that captures the complexity of this construct. In order to gain a more complete understanding of the reasons why certain marketing relationships succeed or fail, it is important to investigate the role of respect.

The purpose of this research is to gain an understanding of (1) what respect means in the context of business-to-business marketing relationships, and (2) how respect impacts on the outcomes of those relationships. Following an extensive review of literature from a number of fields, the empirical research took place over four studies. In the first study, seventeen elite (in-depth) interviews were conducted with marketing practitioners. The goal of the interviews was to come to a more complete understanding of the importance of respect, its definition and dimensionality, its key features, and its role in the success of marketing relationships. As a result of these seventeen interviews, a preliminary model of respect was developed. In the second study, five additional marketing practitioners were interviewed in order to gain feedback on the proposed model of respect. Study 3 was aimed at developing a measure of respect to be included in later model testing; a key activity in this phase was an expert analysis of respect items. This research
culminated in study 4, where the model of respect was tested via an experiment involving 114 business and marketing practitioners.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Why Study Respect?

Respect is important for the simple reason that we often talk about respect, in both our personal and our business lives. Companies and organizations use the term respect in corporate mission statements. Schwartz (2005) analyzed moral values contained in corporate codes of conduct and found six key moral values that emerged as nearly universal – respect was one of them. Respect is included in the American Marketing Association’s Statement of Ethics: “Respect – to acknowledge the basic human dignity of all stakeholders” (American Marketing Association 2009). The Woodstock Theological Center at Georgetown University has engaged in an extensive study of creating and maintaining an ethical climate in business. This group has defined eight critical values for business in society, one of which is respect for individuals.

In an era where relationship marketing has come to the forefront, respect is especially important. End consumers care about the respect they receive from service personnel. Business-to-business customers care about the respect that companies demonstrate towards them. A study of small- and medium-sized business owners by Kadence Business Research and the City Business Journals Network found that approximately 87% of small businesses and 89% of mid-market companies say that they want to do business with brands they respect (Anonymous 2004). The importance of respect towards customers is further evidenced by The Customer Respect Group, a United Kingdom-based organization that calculates a respect index, similar to a satisfaction index, for prominent online companies.
The current relational paradigm that guides much of marketing research, thinking, and practice implies that marketing is not only on-going exchange between organizations and customers, but is also relationships between people. Given this context, individual-level relationship variables, such as respect, become important to our understanding of relationship marketing as a whole. In fact, Ulaga and Eggert (2006) found that personal interactions (as compared to products or prices) are a core differentiator in today’s business relationships. Despite the intuitive and anecdotal evidence that respect is important in a marketing context (Berry 1996; Butcher, Sparks, and O’Callaghan 2003; Murphy 1999; Murphy et al. 2007), it has not been a topic of rigorous research.

This thesis focuses on respect in the context of business-to-business (B2B) relationships. This context was chosen for a number of reasons. First, respect is inherently a relational phenomenon (Frei and Shaver 2002; García-Marzà 2005; Hill 2000; Lind 1989), therefore it makes sense to study respect in an interpersonal context. Second, marketers are typically engaged in person-to-person relationships with their buyer(s), supplier(s), or agency(ies), because each buyer/supplier/agency often represents a large-scale account. Therefore, the B2B context provides an opportunity to study marketing relationships where the interaction is frequent, occurs with the same or similar people over time, and may be intense. To compare, in the business-to-consumer (B2C) setting, the interaction need not be human, it may not be with the same person over time, and it may not be frequent. The B2B context is thus a rich environment for studying relationship variables such as respect. Because research about respect in marketing is just emerging, it is important to study respect in a context where the potential for understanding is deep.
In order to further establish the importance of studying respect from a marketing perspective, I conducted in-depth interviews with twenty-two marketing professionals. These interviews provide additional insight into why respect is so critical in marketing. The interviews focused specifically on respect in the context of (primarily B2B) marketing relationships. One of the interviews was with Samantha (a pseudonym), who, as a marketer, is engaged in a multitude of business relationships with suppliers, distributors, and other partners. I began the interview by asking Samantha to describe one successful relationship and to explain why that relationship was so successful. Without being prompted in any way to talk about respect (and without knowing the research topic), Samantha answered:

It [a relationship with a particular supplier] was really positive because it was built on mutual respect and trust.

In other words, respect is at the forefront of Samantha’s thoughts about what makes marketing relationships successful.

Samantha identified the outcomes of this respect-filled relationship. First, the two organizations maintain an ongoing relationship. Second, the end product was “stellar” and exceeded everyone’s expectations. Third, Samantha and her colleagues find that they frequently recommend this specific supplier to others in the industry. Samantha believes that respectful relationships are productive relationships:

I think that relationships that have deep personal and professional respect are going to be the most productive relationships, so if you are respecting each other quite personally and professionally, then you are going to be enthusiastic about working together, and so your end product is going to be much more positive.

Of course, not all relationships that marketers have are positive or are laden with respect. Samantha also described an unsuccessful relationship that lacked respect. For Samantha, the lack
of respect led to emotional reactions and hurt feelings on both sides. The relationship process was very challenging, because dealing with the lack of respect was draining. As a result, not enough energy could be devoted to the end product and the final outcomes suffered. Ultimately, the relationship was severed.

Samantha’s real-life narrative about her relationship experiences as a marketer sheds insight into why respect is important to marketing practice and research. From this narrative, it is evident that respect is a defining characteristic of marketing relationships and that it leads to important consequences, such as relationship commitment and word-of-mouth. In other fields of research, respect has similarly been linked to important relationship outcome variables (e.g., commitment, satisfaction) (Bitran and Hoech 1990; Fojt 1995; Frei and Shaver 2002; Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Gilder 2006). Given the potential for respect to impact on key relationship variables, it is worth more fully understanding what respect means and its precise impact on relationship marketing outcomes.

Other marketers have acknowledged the importance of respect through calls for research on the topic. In a conceptual paper, Berry (1996) concluded that there is a customer respect deficit in the United States, and through in-person conversations, he highlighted the need for rigorous academic treatment of respect. There are other calls for research on respect. Costley, Friend, and Babis (2005) believe that respect is an important construct in marketing which requires research attention. Winstead (2000) suggests respect is an important but understudied construct.

While respect may be important to marketers and marketing researchers, one might wonder why investigations of respect in other fields cannot simply be borrowed and translated to a marketing context. A review of the literature related to respect across a number of disciplines suggests, however, that there are many gaps in our knowledge about respect. The literature review, which
is presented in Chapter 2, uncovers a range of definitions and conceptualizations of respect and reveals that researchers both within and across fields do not always agree on its meaning. The literature review also explores a number of possible outcomes of respect, but their application in a B2B marketing context cannot be certain. This is because the B2B setting is made up of actors that do not necessarily have common goals (i.e., both seek to maximize their own wealth), but who still hope to work together over the long-term. Other marketing researchers have similarly concluded that we do not have a thorough knowledge of the complexity of respect (Costley, Friend, and Babis 2005). In addition, we do not have an appropriate measure of respect. For example, single item measures (e.g., Butcher, Sparks, and O’Callaghan 2003; Winstead 2000) are common. As a result, there is a need for research that will allow for a fuller understanding of respect in the context of B2B marketing relationships.

1.2 Research Purpose

The purpose of this research is to come to a more complete understanding of the respect construct in the context of B2B marketing relationships and the impact that respect has on other variables known to determine marketing relationship success (e.g., commitment). Achieving this purpose involved a number of steps. First, it was important to arrive at a definition of respect as a foundation for moving forward with this research. The literature review and in-depth interviews were critical in arriving at this definition.

Second, it was important to arrive at a measure of respect in a B2B relationship marketing context. A measure of respect was necessary so that further empirical testing could take place. The literature review and the interviews served to generate a list of potential items that were used to measure respect. These were later assessed through an expert analysis and then tested in an experimental setting.
Third, this research needed to ascertain that respect is distinct from other important relationship
variables, in particular, trust (Morgan and Hunt 1994). If respect and trust share information,
then investigating the impact of respect on marketing relationships becomes less meaningful. The
literature review provided some evidence of the distinction between respect and trust. Building
on this evidence, the experiment with marketing practitioners helped to test the discriminant
validity of respect and trust.

Fourth, in order to fulfill its purpose, this research needed to investigate the ways in which respect
impacts on important relationship marketing outcomes. All phases of this research were geared at
understanding how and why respect impacts on marketing relationship outcomes.

To summarize, the specific research questions are as follows:

1. What is the meaning of respect?

2. How can we measure respect in a B2B relationship marketing context?

3. How does the meaning and domain of respect vary versus that of trust?

4. How does respect impact on important relationship marketing outcomes?

Following the preliminary interviews, emotion emerged as a theme and as an outcome of respect
(or lack of respect) in B2B marketing relationships. Andrew, for example, suggests that
respectful relationships lead to heartfelt bonds:

So in that sense, you have to have enough respect for each other to realize it’s bigger than the
contract. I guess that’s where I’m getting to. […] it made it so rewarding, and I was so, it
almost breaks your heart when you see you know some players change or go on to do things,
you know, how do you achieve this mutual respect again with new players? You know? I
certainly miss them. There’s a respect to this day, always will be.

Yvette, on the other hand, talks about the negative emotions that result from disrespect:
I think it [disrespect] can make you so indignant and it can make you so angry or frustrated that you don’t actually focus as much on the work that you have to do, but rather you focus on the fact that you’re indignant and you’re getting not the right type of attention, and it makes you mad, and you put your energies into that versus what you need to […]

Emotion was not the only emergent theme in the preliminary interviews; a number of other themes emerged that are also worthy of further exploration. Emotion was chosen as a focus for the current research because of its potential to expand the way in which we think about B2B marketing relationships. Previous research on B2C relationships has accounted for the emotional aspects of these relationships (e.g., Arnould and Price 1993). Research on B2B relationships, in comparison, has frequently viewed marketing relationships as much more cognitive. In reality, B2B marketing relationships are not purely cognitive; there are also emotions which play out (Bagozzi 2006). By investigating the role of emotions in B2B relationships and how they relate to respect, we can gain novel insights and perspectives.

Given that emotion emerged in the interviews and is deemed to be an important, yet understudied, area of B2B relationships, the following research question was added:

5. What is the role of emotion within B2B relationships; specifically what role does it play as an outcome of respect?

1.3 Intended Contributions

This work is relevant and meaningful to research, theory, and practice. The empirical contributions include defining respect in a B2B marketing relationship context, as well as developing a measure of respect. In addition, this research builds and empirically tests a model of the impact of respect.

This research makes a number of theoretical contributions. First, it integrates different conceptual streams of work (e.g., relationship theory, emotion) in marketing. Also, it integrates
and synthesizes research on respect from various fields of study. Second, it allows researchers to understand more fully the network of marketing relationship constructs that enhance or detract from B2B relationship success. Third, it examines relationships at the level of the individual managers responsible for maintaining relationships (versus the organizational level at which relationships have traditionally been studied), and it challenges assumptions about marketers and B2B relationships being primarily cognitive by highlighting the prominence of emotions. This research assumes that marketers do in fact care about respect and emotional experiences in their relationships, not just about material or rational outcomes.

This research is also valuable to marketing managers. It provides marketers with an understanding of the importance of respect as well as an understanding of its domain (e.g., what it means to have respect between marketers). By providing marketers with an enhanced understanding of respect, this research will assist them in developing and sustaining more successful – respectful – relationships.

1.4 Conclusion for this Chapter

To summarize, respect is an important aspect of marketing relationships, yet it is not well understood. Therefore, the aim of this research is to arrive at a more complete understanding of respect – its definition, conceptualization, measurement, and impact.

The remainder of my thesis achieves the stated purpose. In Chapter 2, I review relevant literature, which helps to arrive at a definition of respect and provides a foundation for exploring the research questions. In Chapter 3, I revisit the research questions and briefly explain the methodology that will be used to address these research questions. Chapter 4 summarizes the results of the first set of elite, in-depth interviews with seventeen marketing professionals.
Chapter 5 outlines the preliminary model that emerged from the literature review and from the first phase of interviews and then describes the outcomes of a second set of elite interviews with five additional marketing professionals, which helps to confirm and revise the proposed conceptual model. In Chapter 6, I describe the measure development. In Chapter 7, I revisit the conceptual model of respect in marketing relationships that emerged from the literature review and in-depth interviews, outline the experiment that was conducted to test the model, and summarize the findings from this experiment. Chapter 8 includes a discussion of the results of my thesis, a summary of its contribution, an explanation of research limitations, and future research opportunities.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

In this chapter I review the literature on respect. This literature review helps to answer the first research question by arriving at a definition of respect. The literature review also provides a firm foundation for answering research questions two, three, and four.

Respect research is concentrated primarily in the fields of ethics/philosophy and social/organizational psychology, though other fields have investigated this topic as well (e.g., education, aging, social work, sociology, nursing, ethnic studies, child development). While respect has been recognized by marketers as an important construct, evidence is anecdotal and little empirical work has been directed at understanding its meaning or role in relationships.

This literature review speaks to the first four research questions outlined in Chapter 1. Five key conclusions arise: (1) respect is a relational phenomenon, therefore it is meaningful to study respect in a marketing relationship context; (2) definitions and conceptualizations of respect as well as the dimensionality of respect vary within and across disciplines, therefore there is a need to further investigate what respect means in the context of marketing relationships; (3) there is no appropriate established measure of respect, therefore a respect measure is needed for this context; (4) respect is conceptually distinct from trust, therefore it is appropriate to confirm its discriminant validity through empirical testing; (5) respect is expected to lead to various outcomes (e.g., commitment) which are important to relationship marketing. Demonstrating the consequences of respect is a key step in establishing its importance.

The literature review is organized as follows. In the first section, the varied meanings of respect across different fields are summarized. In the second section, the way in which respect is
different from certain key variables is explained. In the third section, some expected consequences of respect are outlined.

2.1 What is Respect?

In this section, definitions and conceptualizations of respect, as well as its dimensions, are discussed. The meaning of respect is explored in four areas of literature – ethics and philosophy, social and organizational psychology, marketing, and other fields.

2.1.1 Respect in the Ethics and Philosophy Literature

According to Murphy et al. (2007), “RM [relationship marketing] is inherently an ethical activity, since enduring relationships cannot be built or sustained without a solid moral foundation” (p. 38). Murphy and his co-authors built a conceptual model of the ethical bases of relationship marketing, and in this model, respect was highlighted as a critical virtue. These marketing ethicists explain that while respect is not frequently addressed in a relationship marketing context, it is becoming increasingly important in our business context. Thus, it is meaningful to consider the literature on ethics, as well as philosophy, and what this literature has to say about respect.

The ethics and philosophy literature pertaining to respect is primarily conceptual in nature. In ethical and philosophical discussions of respect, there is a lack of agreement as to the definition of respect (Joh 2001). “There is considerable controversy, even among ethicists, as to what a respect for persons principle requires” (Bowie 1999, p. 41). Some of the various definitions of respect include:

when we see someone, not just as an object, but as a person such that, prima facie at least, there is reason to respect him: a reason not to interfere with him, a reason to consider him equally with others, a reason to grant him privacy, and so on (Pettit 1989, p. 122)
full recognition as a person, with the same basic moral worth as any other, co-membership in
the community whose members share the authority to determine how things ought to be and
the power to influence how they will be (Hill 2000, p. 59-60)

due process where a person’s projects are significantly affected […] an ordinary
understanding of respect for persons includes a disposition to accept and work through
differences in values […] an ordinary understanding of respect for persons includes a concern
about each person’s benefit from involvement at the corporation (Gilbert 1991, p. 115-116)

Definitions and conceptualizations of respect vary because the philosophical and moral
approaches behind them also vary. Some of these different approaches are summarized below.

Virtue ethics is based in part on Aristotle’s theory of virtues – the notion that there are certain
virtues that make up a good person (Aiken 2004). Respect is one such virtue. Respect is not
always conceptualized as a virtue, however. In some cases, it is seen a principle (e.g.,
Kantianism) or a norm (e.g., discourse ethics).

Kantianism is named after the prominent philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), who strongly
influenced definitions and conceptualizations of respect in this field. Kantianism is a form of
deontology, where (as compared to teleology) it is the intention behind the act rather than the
consequences that make an act good or bad (Bowie 2002). The famous ‘categorical imperative’
is essential to Kant’s version of a respect for persons principle. The categorical imperative states
that people should “(1) act only on maxims [principles] which you would will to be universal
laws of nature, (2) always treat the humanity in a person as an end, and never as a means merely,
(3) so act as if you were a member of an ideal kingdom of ends in which you were both subject
and sovereign at the same time” (Bowie 2002, p. 62).

The second part of this categorical imperative is especially relevant in terms of respecting others.
It suggests we all have a moral duty to treat other humans with respect by, for example, not
interfering in the lives of others. Our duty to treat others with respect stems from the fact that all
humans are autonomous and capable of self-governance, and in particular, all humans are moral agents who have the capacity to act in a responsible fashion (Bowie 1999).

Kant’s assumption that people are free and principle-governed rational agents has been a source of critique. Hill (2000) suggests that instead, humans are culturally-embedded, social beings. With this in mind, respect for humans means that we have to value their ability to know their own desires, their personal life goals, and the fact that they pursue these goals within a network of social relationships. Seidler (1986) has criticized Kant for encouraging people to ignore their own wants and desires, including our need for relationships with others, and has suggested that respect means we make an effort to see the world from the other’s point of view and recognize the validity of their experiences and emotions. In other words, respect is not about non-interference and autonomy, as Kant’s analysis might lead us to conclude, but instead respect is a relational, interactive, and social phenomenon.

Discourse ethics’ founding father was Habermas (French and Allbright 1998). Discourse ethics is also a form of deontology, but from a much different philosophical perspective. “Discourse ethics claims that norms of action are valid (‘right’) only if all concerned persons that participate in a practical discourse can (or could principally) agree on them” (Ott 2003, p. 17). The assumption behind discourse ethics is that humans are engaged and are made up of past experiences, expectations, and life goals (Herrera 1992). Given this assumption, respect, as an ethical or moral norm, is something that needs to be negotiated by a particular community of people. Respect is thus context dependent and socially constructed (García-Marzà 2005). Of course, to engage in effective discourse, there still needs to be universal moral respect (Hepburn 1997 citing Benhabib’s thinking) in terms of listening to the other person and truly taking them
into consideration (Herrera 1992). Again, following this perspective, respect is very much a relational phenomenon.

There is not only disagreement about the definition and conceptualization of respect, but there is also debate as to its dimensionality. Darwall (1977) argues that there are two kinds of respect: appraisal respect (respect for the merits and special qualities of the person) and recognition respect (respect for the person simply because they are human). Spelman (1978) supports this view by suggesting that two types of respect are treating someone as a person with rights, and treating someone as the person that he/she is. Hudson (1980), on the other hand, suggests that there are four types of respect: directive (i.e., respect for rules), evaluative (i.e., respect for merits), institutional (i.e., respect for rules of office), and obstacle (i.e., respect for those with power). Pope (2004) proposes three types of respect: esteem (e.g., for a talented person), civil (e.g., granted to everyone), and moral (e.g., for someone who is virtuous).

Other authors’ definitions of respect imply that respect is unidimensional (e.g., Hill 2000; Pettit 1989) or their conceptualizations suggest that respect is either ‘recognition respect’ or ‘appraisal respect’, but not both. For example, Kant’s version of respect is very much ‘recognition respect’. Recent work in philosophy focuses more on respect as regard for a person because of their particular character traits or abilities – in other words, it focuses on ‘appraisal respect’. To illustrate, Cranor (1975) describes his theory of respect for persons, in which he suggests that person A will respect person B in virtue of some characteristic, where the characteristic is a good and valuable thing. Dillon (1992) suggests that respect is regarding something as worthy, important, worth paying attention to, and worth taking seriously – and that there also needs to be a reason for regarding the target in this particular way.
2.1.2 Respect in the Social and Organizational Psychology Literature

The literature on respect in social and organizational psychology has adopted the assumption, like much of the recent work in ethics and philosophy, that respect is a relational phenomenon. Given that social and organizational psychologists are concerned about group and relationship dynamics, it is no surprise that they have taken an interest in the impact of respect on relationships. As compared to the conceptual nature of respect research in ethics and philosophy, however, much of this research is empirical. But, similar to the confusion about what respect means to ethicists and philosophers, what constitutes respect has also been a topic of debate for social and organizational psychologists (Frei and Shaver 2002; Montgomery, Kane, and Vance 2004). Those who address respect do not always explicitly define the construct, and when they do, definitions vary. Some example definitions include the following:

Respect within groups can be defined as social information about one’s relational value for the group as communicated by others via the way they treat the other. (DeCremer 2003, p. 370)

Intragroup respect is defined as the perceived value of the self for the group [...] which can be conveyed either by intragroup interactions or by evaluative judgments from other group members. (Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Gilder 2006, p. 244)

We use the term ‘respect’ to refer to a type of attitude characterized by feelings of esteem for another that manifest in both highly valuing the person’s feelings, thoughts, and behaviors and a willingness to be influenced by that person (Jackson, Esses, and Burris 2001, p. 48-49).

The group-value model, first described by E. Allan Lind and Tom R. Tyler in their 1988 book, *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*, has had a significant influence on the way social and organizational psychologists think about respect. The group-value model was developed to explain why procedural justice matters to people. Previous research on procedural justice suggested that people are most concerned about their control over processes and decisions. Lind and Tyler, on the other hand, felt that people are also concerned about their long-term
relationships with others and that procedural justice also matters to the extent that it enhances or
detracts from interpersonal relationships (Lind 1989).

Lind and Tyler’s group-value model (as described by Lind 1989) suggests that because people
care about their relationships, there are issues other than control that matter to group members.
People are expected to care about their relationships and status in a group, which they infer from
treatment by group authorities. Specifically, people will infer they have high status or value to
the group if they are treated politely and with respect. In some cases, this is labeled procedural
justice (Tyler, Degoey, and Smith 1996) and in other research it is labeled interactional justice
(Colquitt 2001).

The group-value model has permeated the way social and organizational psychologists think
about respect. Amongst these researchers, respect is often described in a rather cognitive fashion
as social information communicated by the group’s unbiased treatment or evaluative judgments
that are symbolic of one’s position, status, or relational value (DeCremer 2002, 2003; Simon and
Stürmer 2003, 2005; Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Gilder 2006; Smith and Tyler 1997; Tyler and
Blader 2002). However, not everyone in this field follows the lead of the group-value theorists.
Other studies in social and organizational psychology take a variety of approaches to the meaning
and conceptualization of respect. Some describe respect as an attitude (Frei and Shaver 2002;
Jackson, Esses, and Burris 2001; Segal 1979; Triandis, Vassiliou, and Thomanek 1966). Others
describe respect as an interpersonal resource (Gaines 1994). Respect may be conceived as a
behaviour such as appropriate conduct (Yelsma and Yelsma 1998), as admiration and/or
obedience (Pusateri and Latané 1982; Triandis, Vassiliou, and Thomanek 1966), or as valuing the
person and their ideas (Jehn and Mannix 2001).
Most studies in social and organizational psychology do not provide explicit clues as to the dimensionality of respect. Many do, however, reflect the two types of respect that Darwall (1977) identified – recognition respect and appraisal respect. Recognition respect is evidenced when respect is described as treating people with politeness and dignity (Simon and Stürmer 2003, 2005; Stürmer, Simon, and Loewy 2008) or as valuing input from organizational members in general (Thompson, Kray, and Lind 1998). Appraisal respect is apparent when respect is described as valuing a person’s unique contributions (Tyler and Blader 2002) or valuing their ideas and accomplishments (Pusateri and Latané 1982; Triandis, Vassiliou, and Thomanek 1966).

2.1.3 Respect in Other Literatures
There are a number of other fields that address the topic of respect: education, aging, social work/counseling, sociology, nursing, ethnic/cultural studies, and child development. Here, too, there is pervasive recognition that respect is complex and not well-understood. “What respect itself means is both socially and psychologically complex” (Sennett 2003, p. 59). Again, throughout these various literatures, definitions and conceptualizations of respect differ. In the nursing literature, respect is described as dignity, reverence, and regard (Milton 2005), or as the values of status equality, human dignity, inherent worthiness, and self-determination (Browne 1997). In counseling, respect can be defined as acceptance of the other (Wallston and Weitz 1975). In the aging literature, respect is a regard or admiration for someone who has good qualities or achievements, it is synonymous with courtesy (Mehta 1997), and it is deference to the old and wise (Ingersoll-Dayton and Saengtienchai 1999). In the field of education, respect may mean regard for skills (Greenberger and Sorenson 1971). In child development, it can be an evaluation of goodness or badness (Suls and Kalle 1978).
Definitions of respect across studies and authors differ, as do conceptualizations of respect. In psychology, respect may be thought of as an attitude (Arnold 1987). In negotiations, some see it as a psychological stance and a process (Cohen 2002). In the aging literature, within the context of elder respect, it has been described as a value (Ingersoll-Dayton and Saengtienchai 1999), or as treatment and behaviour (Sung 2004; Sung and Kim 2003). In nursing, respect may be conceived as a basic moral principle and human right (Browne 1997).

A number of articles across these fields have explored the dimensionality or the different types of respect, and all have had different findings depending on the context. For example, in the context of elder respect in Korea, one study found seven forms of respect – service, gift, linguistic, spatial, victual, presentational, and celebrative (Sung and Kim 2003). Feelings of respect amongst African American adolescents were divided into ‘societal respect’ and ‘family respect’ subscales (Leary, Brennan, and Briggs 2005). Darwall’s (1977) distinction between recognition and appraisal respect is not explicit in these diverse literatures, though these two types of respect still do emerge in the various definitions and conceptualizations. For example, respect as dignity (Milton 2005) reflects recognition respect, and respect as admiration for someone with good qualities (Mehta 1997) reflects appraisal respect.

2.1.4 Respect in the Marketing Literature

The term and concept respect has been used sporadically in the marketing literature. Most of this literature is conceptual rather than empirical in nature. Within marketing academics’ business relationships – in the peer review process – Nakata (2003) and Taylor (2003) highlight the need for reviews to be respectful. Discussions of respect have focused on the meaning and complexity of respect, manifestations of respect, and expected outcomes. In several cases, respect is
identified as important (Costley, Friend, and Babis 2005), but clear definitions of respect are lacking (e.g., Beatty et al. 1996; Winstead 2000).

In the marketing literature, it is rare to find a definition of respect that does not focus on behaviours or treatment. Murphy (1999), one of the exceptions, defines respect in a business ethics context as “giving regard to the views of others” (p. 113) and/or “to hold someone in high regard or to give them special attention” (p. 115). More often, respect is defined in terms of its manifestations – the behaviours and kinds of treatment that convey respect. For example, Brashear and colleagues (2003), in a paper on salesperson-sales manager relationships, define managerial respect as “the treatment accorded to people by group authorities … issues of politeness, respect for rights and treatment with dignity (Tyler 1994, p. 853)” (p. 191). Similarly, Butcher, Sparks, and O’Callaghan (2003) describe respect in a services context primarily in behavioural terms – treating the customer as any other person would like to be treated, treating the customer as important, not making ‘insulting offers’ (e.g., highballing), not taking the customer to be an idiot, and the like.

Other researchers discuss the numerous behaviours that convey respect or lack of respect. Respect for customers is communicated through special consideration for their needs and wishes, as well as concern for their satisfaction (Bitran and Hoech 1990). Respect for customers is conveyed when they are treated as houseguests, when they are trusted, when their time is valued, when they are thanked, and when companies and employees stand behind their products, keep promises, and communicate respectfully (Berry 1996). Disrespect for customers may be communicated by making them endure long waits for service (Baldasare 1995; Bitran and Hoech 1990), by assigning disrespectful labels (Adkins and Swan 1980; Stephens and Bergman 1995), and/or through cheating, dishonesty, unfairness, ignoring customers, and refusing to assist.
customers (Berry 1996). While respect is manifested in behaviours and actions, the core construct respect is a belief. Therefore, there is a need to uncover the kinds of thoughts or cognitions that comprise respect in a marketing context.

Respect in the marketing literature is clearly conceptualized as a dimension of relationships (Barnes 1997; Beatty et al. 1996). As evidenced by the previous two paragraphs, however, respect is typically discussed in terms of the company’s or the employee’s respect for the customer; the customer’s respect for the employee or company does not appear to be addressed, even though respect is dyadic in nature. Respect is also conceptualized in this literature as context-dependent (Bitran and Hoech 1990; Brashear et al. 2003) and culture-specific (Leung and Chan 2003). In some cases, and reflecting the ethics and social psychology literature, respect is described as a virtue (Murphy 1999) or in terms of interactional justice (e.g., Blodgett, Wakefield, and Barnes 1995).

### 2.2 How is Respect Operationalized?

In the previous section, we saw that while respect is commonly characterized as a relationship phenomenon, there is little agreement as to what it means, how it should be conceptualized, or what its dimensions are. Consistent with the fact that the meaning of respect is unclear, there are also various ways to measure respect across the areas of research.

Most of the empirical work on respect has been in social and organizational psychology. Here, following the assumptions of the group-value model, manipulations of respect often focus on the evaluations or treatment by a relevant group (DeCremer 2002; Simon and Stürmer 2003, 2005; Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Gilder 2006; Thompson, Kray, and Lind 1998). Measures of respect assess people’s perceptions that group members or group authorities value their accomplishments
and membership, view them as having a good reputation, appreciate their work, pay attention to their ideas (Smith and Tyler 1997; Tyler and Blader 2002), treat them with dignity and politeness, and respect their rights (Heuer et al. 1999). These measures and manipulations of respect represent a narrow view of what constitutes respect (e.g., behaviours only, recognition respect only), therefore more work needs to be done to develop appropriate measures and manipulations of respect.

Three studies in the area of social and organizational psychology were found that specifically developed a measure of respect. Frei and Shaver’s (2002) Respect for Partner Scale and Hendrick and Hendrick’s (2006) Respect Toward Partner Scale both focus on respect in the context of close relationship partners who are intimate and loving, and therefore do not transfer well to the non-intimate B2B relationship context. In addition, Frei and Shaver note that their scale is actually a measure of respect worthy features of a relationship partner rather than a measure of the construct of respect.

Cronin’s (2003) dissertation developed a unidimensional respect scale. Cronin’s research on respect in the context of organizational teams may not easily transfer to respect in the context of business relationships, because team members from the same organization have more similar goals than business partners from different organizations. Conflicting self-interests are expected to alter the motivation for and experience of respect. As a result, additional work in this area is necessary.

2.3 How is Respect Different?
In this section, the way in which respect is distinct from the constructs of trust and justice is explored. My review of the literature revealed that these distinctions have caused past confusion
in understanding the nature of respect; therefore, it is important that the meaning of these distinct constructs be clarified.

2.3.1 Trust

Trust is defined as the perceived credibility and benevolence of relationship partners (adapted from Doney and Cannon 1997, p. 36), whereas respect is conceived as relationship partners regarding each other to have value or worth. Trust implies that one party is willing to be vulnerable to the other party (Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande 1992), whereas respect does not imply a willingness to rely upon the other. Even though I trust another person, I may not respect him/her. For example, I may not respect Charlie’s skills as a marketing manager, even though I trust that s/he will stay true to his/her promises. At the same time, however, respect and trust may be mutually reinforcing. For example, the fact that I trust Charlie may cause me to respect him/her (i.e., respect him/her for the characteristic of being trustworthy), or the fact that I show respect to Charlie may cause him/her to behave in a more trustworthy fashion. The mutually reinforcing nature of trust and respect is a cause for potential confusion as to their differences.

Some researchers have provided conceptual and empirical arguments for how trust and respect differ. Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004) distinguish respect from trust by defining respect as “regard[ing] and treat[ing] employees with esteem and value; showing consideration and concern for others’, and trust as “being able to confidently depend on the character and truth of the organization and its representatives” (p. 131). Jehn and Mannix (2001) measured both trust and respect, and found that trust items did not cross-load onto respect in a confirmatory factor analysis. Cronin (2003), in a dissertation on respect in a team setting, demonstrated interaction effects between respect and trust, again showing two distinct constructs.
Other researchers have suggested that respect is an antecedent to trust. Cranor (1975) explains this relationship: “If I respect Smith for being a principled person, then I am disposed to entrust my well-being to his care by relying upon his continuing to be principled. If Smith makes a promise to me, then out of respect for his being principled, I am disposed to trust implicitly in Smith’s keeping the promise” (p. 314). In an experiment, Simon, Lücken, and Stürmer (2006) found that respected group members had more trust in fellow group members. Brashear et al. (2003) argued and empirically demonstrated that respect is a key trust-building element. Baldasare (1995) also suggested, in a conceptual paper, that perceptions of disrespect created lack of trust in a service provider.

This previous research suggests that respect and trust are distinct concepts and that the nature of the relationship between them is unclear. It remains important to distinguish between trust and respect in a marketing context, especially because trust has been so widely studied as a marketing relationship construct (Doney and Cannon 1997; Geyskens, Steenkamp, and Kumar 1998; Morgan and Hunt 1994; Nicholson, Compeau, and Sethi 2001).

2.3.2 Justice

From the perspective of a person working in the field of social and organizational psychology, there is likely a concern that respect and justice is the same thing. Organizational justice can be defined as “fairness in the workplace” (Donovan, Drasgow, and Munson 1998, p. 683) and is conceptualized as including four dimensions: distributive, procedural, interactional, and informational justice (Colquitt 2001). In some cases, respect is a measure or a component of interactional justice (Donovan et al. 1998; Skarlicki and Folger 1997), and other times respect plays a role in distributive and procedural justice (Miller 2001).
While the terms justice and respect are sometimes equated (Bond 1996), according to the group-value model (Lind 1989), justice is important because it conveys respect. The difference between respect and justice is implicit in the rationale behind this model. Heuer et al. (1999) empirically studied the moderating effects of deservingness on the relationship between respectful treatment and justice evaluations, and found that justice evaluations resulted when a person received the level of respectful treatment they thought they deserved. Again, in this model, respect and justice are assumed to be different.

From a theoretical perspective, justice and respect are different because justice is about the fairness of something, whereas respect is about the inherent value or worth of an individual. In the same way that respect and trust may be mutually reinforcing variables, it is also possible that the fairness of some procedure, outcome, or interaction could communicate respect, or that a respectful interaction could be perceived as fair. At their core, however, justice and respect are inherently different constructs.

My research proposes to explore the differences between respect and trust, but does not intend to engage in an empirical investigation of the differences between respect and justice. There are some key reasons for this. First, trust is a key variable in the B2B relationship marketing research (e.g., Morgan and Hunt 1994), whereas justice has not had the same prominence. Second, the conceptual distinction between justice and respect appears to be stronger than the distinction between trust and respect. The difference between justice and respect is implicit in the empirically validated group-value model – respect matters because it conveys justice. The difference between trust and respect, however, has not been significantly researched. Third, my research must remain focused and therefore cannot attempt to accomplish all goals. Empirically testing the differences between respect and justice remains a task for future research.
2.4 What are the Consequences of Respect?

In this section, consequences of respect are explored. Based on the literature review, relationship commitment, loyalty, and satisfaction are key anticipated outcomes. Other possible outcomes include identification, cooperation, and word-of-mouth behaviours.

2.4.1 Relationship Commitment

Commitment is defined as “an exchange partner believing that an ongoing relationship with another is so important as to warrant maximum efforts at maintaining it” (Morgan and Hunt 1994, p. 23). This is nearly identical to Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande’s (1992) definition of the same construct, “an enduring desire to maintain a valued relationship” (p. 316). Past research has established that there are a number of variables, such as trust (Gounaris 2005; Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande 1992; Morgan and Hunt 1994), that result in commitment.

There is reason to believe that respect is also an important antecedent to relationship commitment. Other researchers have suggested a link between respect and commitment. In a conceptual article, Fojt (1995) noted that a company that respects its employees should experience greater employee commitment. In an empirical study, Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Gilder (2006) found that higher levels of respect increased participants’ affective commitment to the group. Herrington, Scott, and Johnson (2005), through focus groups on firm-employee relationships, found that respect led to commitment, mediated by relationship strength.

There are also theoretical and practical arguments for the link between respect and relationship commitment. When other people respect us, it is easy for us to feel good about ourselves. Past empirical research has found that respect is significantly related to feelings of self-esteem (Smith and Tyler 1997). People are expected to have a ‘need for esteem’ (Maslow 1943). Therefore, it is not surprising that people are willing to exert maximum effort to maintain relationships in
which they are treated with respect, and to exert minimum effort at maintaining disrespectful relationships.

2.4.2 Behavioural Loyalty

Behavioural or ‘action loyalty’ is a “commitment to the action of rebuying” (Oliver 1999, p. 36). When there is more respect, parties in a relationship will want to continue working together over the long term – this is the behavioural manifestation of their felt commitment. Respect should result in customer loyalty, because it signals that the company is worthy of their customers’ loyalty (Berry 1996).

In an empirical study, Blodgett, Wakefield, and Barnes (1995) found that respectful treatment (in terms of interactional justice, or courteous and respectful treatment) led to a willingness to repatronize the firm following a service failure. Empirical studies of service switching have found that disrespectful behaviours (e.g., being impolite, not accommodating customer requests, being condescending, ignoring customer complaints (Keaveney 1995), inattentiveness, disinterest, and dishonesty (Mohr and Bitner 1995)) result in consumers choosing to switch services (i.e., not exhibiting behavioural or action loyalty).

2.4.3 Satisfaction

In the marketing literature, satisfaction is defined as an emotion (Bougie, Pieters, and Zeelenberg 2003); as “pleasurable fulfillment” (Oliver 1999, p. 34); and as “a post consumption evaluation that has both cognitive and affective elements” (Homburg, Hoyer, and Koschate 2005, p. 37). In other words, satisfaction is a positive evaluation and an affective experience. Previous research has noted a positive relationship between respect and relationship satisfaction. Frei and Shaver (2002) found that respect helps to predict relationship satisfaction. In an empirical study,
Winstead (2000) uncovered relatively high correlations (i.e., 0.61 and 0.58) between respect and satisfaction. Bitran and Hoech (1990) found that “a customer who had been treated respectfully seemed more inclined to express his or her satisfaction” (p. 95).

2.4.4 Other Outcomes
The literature review uncovered a number of other outcomes of respect. Respect for a person leads that person to stronger identification with the group (Barreto and Ellemers 2002; Jetten et al. 2004; Simon, Lücken, and Stürmer 2006; Simon and Stürmer 2005) or feelings of belongingness (DeCremer 2002). Respect results in more cooperative behaviours (Barreto and Ellemers 2002; DeCremer 2003), such as a willingness to engage in group-serving behaviours (Simon, Lücken, and Stürmer 2006; Simon and Stürmer 2005) or contribute to the team (Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Gilder 2006; Smith and Tyler 1997), and a greater likelihood of coming to an agreement (Cohen 2002). Respect is expected to enhance positive word-of-mouth (Costley, Friend, and Babis 2005). Blodgett, Wakefield, and Barnes (1995) found that respectful treatment (in terms of interactional justice, or courteous and respectful treatment) following a service failure led to positive word-of-mouth.

2.5 Synthesis
Based on the preceding review of literature, one can conclude that respect in the context of personal interactions and relationships is about the inherent (rather than instrumental) value or worth of the relationship partner; the value or worth of a relationship partner’s rights, dignity, and morality (i.e., their personhood); and the value or worth of a relationship partner’s characteristics, abilities, merit, or status. Respect is related to morality and values and is also a relational, interpersonal, and social phenomenon.
Respect is manifested in actions. “Respect is an expressive performance. That is, treating others with respect doesn’t just happen, even with the best in the world; to convey respect means finding the words and gestures which make it felt and convincing” (Sennett 2003, p. 207). Though respect is communicated through behaviours and discourse, it is rooted in people’s thoughts and beliefs. Some of the cognitions that comprise respect include the following: accepting the person, accepting the person as equal, acknowledging the person as an end (not as a means to an end), acknowledging the person’s embeddedness, acknowledging the person’s particularities, deferring to or revering the person, feelings of esteem for the person, not judging the person, being attentive to the person, recognizing the person, seeing the world from the person’s point of view, showing concern for the person, showing consideration for the person, and showing regard for the person.

The literature review indicates that in the past, respect has often been defined or measured in terms of behaviours. The behaviours alone, however, are not sufficient indicators of respect. This is due to the fact that respectful treatment may be disingenuous – a person may hold the door open for another not out of respect, but in order to impress onlookers. Therefore, to assess respect, it is necessary to get at what is ‘inside the head’ of the person who is treating another with/without respect in order to gauge the level of true, genuine, and authentic respect.

Across the literature, it is recognized that respect is a complex construct. The complexity of respect is due, in part, to the fact that respect is context-dependent and changes with the perspective of the evaluator/target of respect.

Based on this literature review, there are some areas of disagreement which lead to unanswered questions. Are there multiple dimensions of respect, and if so, what are they – affect/behaviour/cognition, merit/status, and/or others? Is respect a reciprocal phenomenon?
What are the core features of respect versus the peripheral features? What are the key antecedents and outcomes of respect? How does context impact on respect? Are authenticity and genuineness requirements for respect? Does everyone deserve respect?

2.6 Conclusion for this Chapter

Literature related to respect was reviewed from the following fields: ethics/philosophy, social and organizational psychology, marketing, and other fields. While there is no clear definition of respect in the literature, a literature review helped to identify areas where there is consensus about respect, which allowed a definition of respect to emerge. Also, the literature review identified areas where consensus is lacking and a set of ‘unanswered questions’ emerged. The elite, in-depth interviews, the results of which are presented in Chapter 4, were designed to confirm the areas of consensus and to resolve the areas where there was lack of consensus. The current chapter addressed not only relevant definitions and conceptualizations of respect, but also what respect is related to (e.g., commitment, behavioural loyalty) as well as what respect is distinct from (e.g., trust).
Chapter 3
Research Questions and Methods

3.1 Research Questions

As stated in Chapter 1, this thesis explores the following five research questions:

1. What is the meaning of respect?

2. How can we measure respect in a B2B relationship marketing context?

3. How does the meaning and domain of respect vary versus that of trust?

4. How does respect impact on important relationship marketing outcomes?

5. What is the role of emotion within B2B relationships; specifically what role does it play as an outcome of respect?

In order to fully investigate these five research questions, I conducted four consecutive studies.

3.2 Study 1: Elite Interviews (Phase 1)

Because research on respect, especially in a marketing context, is very new, it was important to begin this process with an exploratory approach. Therefore, I conducted in-depth, elite interviews with marketing practitioners and professionals in order to uncover whether respect is in fact important in B2B relationships and if so, what respect means in this context. In addition, I probed these respondents to tell me more about potential outcomes of respect in their relationships.

This first phase of interviews was very open and exploratory in nature. For example, I did not ask informants to immediately talk to me about respect. In fact, my informants were not aware that my research topic was respect. Instead, I asked informants to tell me about their good and bad
marketing relationships and respect was allowed to emerge based on its importance to the respondents.

Thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006) of the interview transcripts provided strong insights into the meaning of respect in this context. In addition, by synthesizing the results of these interviews with my findings from the literature review, I was able to build a preliminary conceptual model of the impact of respect in marketing relationships.

A more thorough description of these interviews, as well as a detailed summary of their results, are provided in Chapter 4.

3.3 Study 2: Elite Interviews (Phase 2)

Before launching into a formal test of the model that resulted from the literature review and from the first set of interviews, it was necessary to conduct additional exploratory research that would help to confirm the practical legitimacy of my conceptual model. Therefore, I interviewed five marketing professionals and after asking them a series of questions about relationships and respect, I presented them with my working model and asked for their comments and feedback.

While the first phase of interviews was very open, this set of interviews was somewhat more directed, as I was interested in gaining feedback to my own theory-building. In other words, this set of interviews was more confirmatory. As a result of these interviews, I was able to revise and refine my conceptual model of the impact of respect.

The results of these interviews are found in Chapter 5.

3.4 Study 3: Measure Development

The focus of my dissertation was not solely aimed at building a measure of respect, which is a substantial task on its own. At the same time, however, I did not find an adequate
conceptualization and measure of respect in the existing literature, so it was necessary that some form of measure development take place. First, I compiled a list of over one hundred respect items that had emerged from my literature review and from the interviews. Second, fifteen experts gauged the representativeness of these items. Finally, the most representative items became the critical elements in forming the conceptualization and measurement of respect used in the experiment for Study 4.

A description of these measure development activities are in Chapter 6.

3.5 Study 4: Experiment to Test Model of Respect

In the fourth and final stage of this thesis research, I tested the model of respect’s impact in B2B marketing relationships that had emerged through the previous stages. An experiment was chosen (vs. a survey) because internal validity (vs. external validity or generalizability) was a key priority at this early stage of research on respect in marketing. However, in order to ensure that the results are still meaningful to marketing practitioners, my sample was drawn from this group. To facilitate participation from the marketing and business community, the experiment was a scenario-based, online experiment. These respondents were recruited through a number of relevant organizations.

A detailed description of the method as well as the results of this experiment are found in Chapter 7.
Chapter 4
Study 1: Elite Interviews (Phase 1)

4.1 Overview
In this chapter, I present the findings from a study involving seventeen preliminary interviews. The purpose of these interviews was to investigate the meaning of respect in a B2B marketing relationship context, and to explore some of the unanswered questions following the literature review in Chapter 2. These elite interviews were conducted with marketing practitioners and professionals. First, I describe the method that was used to approach the interviews. Then, I discuss the themes – both primary and emergent – that resulted from an analysis of the interview transcripts.

4.2 Method
The first phase of this research project is based on elite (in-depth) interviews. Elite interviews are a necessary first step in coming to a more complete understanding of the meaning of respect in a marketing context. Elite or “long” (McCracken 1988) interviews with decision makers are different from highly structured interviews in that they are designed to ascertain decision makers’ understanding of a phenomenon, its meaning to them, and what they consider relevant. Elite interviews are especially useful when one cannot be sure what interpretation, code, norm, affect, or rule is guiding the actors (Berger, Cunningham, Drumwright 2006, citing Strauss 1990).

A total of seventeen informants participated in the interviews. These informants represented a variety of organizations, such as not-for-profits, packaged goods firms, transportation/logistics companies, and advertising/marketing agencies. All informants were employed in marketing positions and engaged in exchange relationships with people from other organizations. Six of the
informants were male, the other eleven were female. The informants were located across Canada. The informants were recruited through my networks and contacts, as well as those of my supervisor, using a snowballing technique. The recruitment materials are included in Appendix A.

The elite interviews were semi-structured. They followed an interview guide approach combined with an informal conversational approach. An interview guide approach is a type of interview where the researcher selects the topics that are to be covered ahead of time, but chooses the exact order and phrasing of the questions as the interview progresses. An informal conversational approach means that additional questions might emerge as a result of topics brought up by the informants. The two approaches were used in tandem because the goal of this study was to explore how marketing managers think about marketing relationships and respect rather than to confirm expected outcomes.

The Interview Protocol is in Appendix B. In the first five interviews, respondents were asked to elaborate on the meaning of respect in the context of B2B relationships. In the next twelve interviews, a slightly different approach was taken in order to allow the theme of respect to emerge if the informants deemed it inherently important. In these twelve interviews, I initially asked respondents to describe successful and unsuccessful relationship experiences. The purpose of these initial questions was to determine if respect would emerge on its own as an important factor for relationship success. When respect did emerge in respondents’ relationship examples, they were probed to delve more into the meaning, antecedents, and consequences of respect. If the word respect did not emerge in participants’ discussions about successful relationship experiences, then respondents were asked to talk specifically about respect – the meaning of respect, its causes, and its outcomes. All participants were asked whether or not respect is
reciprocal, who deserves respect, the contextual nature of respect, and the kinds/types of respect. These were all issues that were deemed ‘unanswered’ following the literature review.

The interviews were transcribed. The transcripts were analyzed for primary and emergent themes. The data were coded by hand according to the themes. The analysis was conducted in an iterative fashion, which involved re-reading transcripts several times, moving back and forth between parts of transcripts, whole transcripts, and the literature.

The interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006), which is “a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (p. 79). Thematic analysis is compatible with many theoretical frameworks. In this case, thematic analysis was applied as an essentialist or realist method (as compared to a social constructionist method), because the goal of the analysis was to contribute to a model of respect that would reflect participants’ reality in terms of the meaning of respect as well as their experiences of respect. The analysis can be described as theoretical thematic analysis (as compared to inductive thematic analysis), because it followed a lengthy and detailed literature review of respect and was therefore guided and informed by my existing knowledge of theory around respect. The themes that have been identified are primarily semantic or explicit (rather than latent or interpretive), because this level of thematic insight fits well with my goal of reflecting (rather than deeply interpreting) reality in the analysis.

“A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (Braun and Clarke 2006, p. 82). The primary themes were those that I expected based on a working definition and conceptualization of respect. The emergent themes were those that surfaced from the data. The primary and secondary themes helped to confirm my definition of respect. They also contributed
to a deeper understanding of the conceptualizations of respect and its relevant dimensions. As a result, the final definition and conceptualization became clearer, more concise, and grounded in marketing managers’ experiences.

The data helped to uncover antecedents and consequences of respect, as well as related concepts. The data also revealed individual items that could be used to measure respect. This information, together with existing literature, helped to create a model of how and why respect matters in marketing relationships. This model is presented at the end of the chapter.

4.3 Themes from the Interviews
A number of primary and emergent themes were identified through analysis of the transcripts. The findings from the interviews are summarized according to these themes. The primary themes are as follows: definition and meaning of respect; authenticity of respect; reciprocity of respect; contextuality of respect; types of respect; antecedents to respect; and consequences of respect.

The emergent themes include the following: emotion; identification; reputation, word-of-mouth, and contagion of respect; whole person; power; and efficiency. Each of these themes is summarized in the remainder of this section. First, the definition, meaning, and types of respect are presented. Next, the theme ‘whole person’ is explored, because this is an elaboration of one element of respect – understanding. Then, four potential moderators of respect are discussed – reciprocity, authenticity, contextuality, and power. Following that, the themes of identification and reputation/word-of-mouth/contagion of respect are explored – these thematic discussions encompass aspects of respect, as well as antecedents and consequences of respect. Subsequently, the specific outcome of emotion is presented. Finally, a more general discussion of additional antecedents and consequences takes place.
4.3.1 Meaning of Respect

In the first set of interviews, five participants were asked to talk about respect specifically. In the second set of interviews, twelve participants were asked to talk about successful and unsuccessful marketing relationships. In this second set of interviews, the term respect was used by some of the informants to describe their relationships and in other interviews, informants referred to elements of respect when talking about their relationships. In both cases, participants were asked to elaborate on what respect meant to them. Responses to these questions provide a rich description of respect from a marketer’s perspective.

The participants discussed a number of elements that are central to respect. First, respect is about understanding the other person. A number of the interview participants talked about spending time with their business partners in social activities, as this provides an opportunity to learn more about the individual at a personal level. They discussed the importance of talking to business partners about leisure activities, holidays, or children, as this conveys respect for the person. Jennifer suggested that respect is about understanding people’s individuality:

So it [respect] really has to do with being in tune to people and understanding how they want to be approached and how some people want to be listened to, some people just want to talk, some people want you to tell them what they need to do.

The informants also used the word ‘empathy’ to discuss this idea of understanding. Supporting the relationship between respect (i.e., acceptance of the other) and empathy, Wallston and Weitz (1975) found that measures of respect and empathy were correlated. In the marketing literature, the term empathy, and the related term sympathy, have been investigated. Escalas and Stern (2003) define “an empathy response” as “a person’s absorption in the feelings of another” and sympathy as being “conscious of another’s feelings” (p. 567). Empathy is one of the five
dimensions of service quality (Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml 1991). Gerald uses the word empathy in describing respect:

Another word for me would be sort of empathy, having the ability, not sympathy but empathy, having the ability to see the issue or the topic from the other person’s point of view, and to understand that you know a decision on your side has such and such an impact on the other side […]

Yvette, in the following quote, emphasizes the importance of both understanding and listening.

Respect to me is understanding that people might have different points of view, understanding that they may be coming from a different place, but making sure that you listen to where they’re coming from, that you try to understand where they’re coming from, that at the end of the day, a lot of the people that you work with will have a ton of experience that is probably divergent from your own, and you probably have a lot to gain from listening and understanding them.

As suggested by the above quote, respect is also about listening to the other person, hearing what they have to say, and engaging them in a meaningful way. Previous research in marketing has suggested listening to the customer is important. This is a fundamental assumption of the market orientation (i.e., intelligence generation dimension from Kohli and Jaworski 1993; customer orientation dimension from Narver and Slater 1990). The present research suggests it is also important for listening to occur between both parties in a B2B relationship. When there is respect, listening is not just hearing or soliciting ideas, but it is truly contemplating what the other has to say. When there is respect, ideas that a relationship partner brings forward must be deemed valuable and honestly considered, even if they are not adopted or implemented at the end of the day. Respect does not require that everyone agrees on solutions or ideas, but it does require genuine consideration of the other person’s thoughts.

Third, respect is about viewing the other as important – it’s about having an interest in the person, valuing them, and placing priority on the person. As Erin suggests, respect is about:
[...] acknowledging someone’s experience or someone’s thoughts or, what they bring to the table, what they offer, the value they bring, it’s knowing that everyone does have something to offer. I had worked with an agency [...] they had someone who was brand new, she had just graduated and she was writing the text for one of our pieces. And she was pretty new at it and probably needed a lot of hand holding or direction. But certainly acknowledging that she still you know added something to the work.

Samantha reinforces this perspective:

[...] it [respect] was about treating every person that we came in contact with at their agency importantly. So just because I was speaking to someone who might not hold a managerial title, still letting them know that they were an important and valuable member of the team.

Respect implies that other people are important, even if they are different. Wendy explains:

[...] respect really has to do with understanding that other people have talents other than the ones that we feel are important.

This aspect of respect – viewing the other as important – was already presented in Chapter 2 in the review of ethics literature. The deontological perspective (e.g., Kantianism) suggests that all humans have a duty to recognize the inherent worth of others. The idea that some marketers in business relationships have a genuine interest in the other person has been addressed to some extent in the services literatures on rapport and friendship. Gremler and Gwinner (2000) investigated the construct rapport, which they define as “a customer’s perception of having an enjoyable interaction with a service provider employee, characterized by a personal connection between the two interactants” (p. 92). Rapport is not the same thing as having a genuine interest in the other, however; rapport is an outcome. Friendships, specifically those between a service provider and his/her client, have been explored by Price and Arnould (1999). These researchers found that friendships involve, among other things, social support such as listening. As with rapport, it is likely that a commercial friendship would result from the fact that each party
respects the other. Intuitively, people are unlikely to choose who they respect from among their friends, but instead are more likely to choose their friends from among those they respect.

While these areas of the marketing literature suggest that even in an exchange context it’s important to show an interest in the other person, notions of valuing or placing priority on the other have not received as much attention. Valuing the person means placing worth on the person, their thoughts and opinions, their position, and their abilities. Putting priority on the other means not only having the interests of the other party at heart, but putting those interests before your own. Putting priority on the other is manifested in simple actions like returning phone calls promptly and providing thoughtful responses to inquiries. The popular marketing concept ‘the customer is king’ reflects this idea, but it implies that prioritizing the other is a one-way phenomenon. Respect, on the other hand, implies that the seller should put the customer or buyer first and the buyer should also put the seller first.

The informants discussed not only central elements of respect, but also what they saw as features of respect. Respect is fundamentally an aspect of relationships. Because it is something held for another person with whom there is some interaction, it follows that there must be some relationship in order for respect (or lack of respect) to be observed. The connection between respect and relationships was made clear in Chapters 1 and 2.

Respect is most commonly manifested in people’s behaviours and treatment of others. For example, does a person listen attentively to the suggestions of the other and write down what they are saying, or do they only listen as they answer emails and complete other tasks? Respectful treatment is often indicated through communication – through appropriate language, timely feedback, considerate gestures, and open dialogue, for example. Sandra explains how language is a manifestation of respect:
So it was really positive and we were, you know, I work in an organization where language is really important, in terms of language we choose to use when we’re operating in our business context, and so it was always really focusing on positive respectful language, sort of that conscious effort in our day-to-day relations with them really made a lot of difference. And they were really kind of blown away a bit, because they were used to their traditional clients who pay them money and sometimes would treat them poorly and would be bossy and all of that kind of stuff. And we could still get the same results with you know not being bossy and not being disrespectful.

Other features of respect are addressed below as primary or emergent themes: whole person, reciprocity of respect, authenticity of respect, contextuality of respect, power, identification, and reputation/word-of-mouth/contagion. In addition, the specific outcome of emotion is discussed, as well as more general antecedents and consequences. Before these other themes are explored, the different types of respect will be described.

4.3.2 Types of Respect

Through the interview process, it became evident that there may be several types of respect. Two types of respect emerged in the discussions that reflect Darwall’s (1977) recognition respect and merit-based or appraisal respect. One could also argue, however, that these are not necessarily types of respect, but instead are antecedents of respect – bases upon which we might respect another person.

Recognition respect. This type of respect is about valuing or placing worth on the person simply because they are a person. From an ethical perspective, deontologists suggest that one of our ethical obligations is to recognize the inherent worth of human beings (Hill 2000) and also to follow the Golden Rule (Burton and Goldsby 2005). The Golden Rule states that we should treat others as we expect to be treated. Recognition respect is about showing interest and understanding, treating each person as an individual, and acknowledging the other’s goals and
objectives. In this case, there need not be a specific ‘basis’ for respect (e.g., expertise is not required for this type of respect to exist). Sandra and Paul both explain:

Sandra: And then it went to another level in terms of there was an individual respect. So it was about you know treating every person that we came in contact with at their agency importantly. So just because I was speaking to someone who might not hold a managerial title, still letting them know that they were an important and valuable member of the team.

Paul: [...] some people deliver [respect] right up front, regardless of how important they see you, just because that’s the way they operate [...] Merit-based respect. This type of respect is about valuing or placing worth on a person as a result of their talents or capabilities in (a) certain area(s). People earn respect based on their expertise, tenure, credentials, abilities, or some other positive characteristics. The way in which someone might learn about a person’s merits vary – this may be through credentials, rank, or title; through direct experience with the target; or through third parties. As Lana explains, respect is an assessment of the other’s capabilities:

I think obviously for an initial project or for the first few meetings, you’re still assessing someone’s capabilities, which takes a little time to build a respect.

Within this category, respect is something that is built over time, it is earned. In some cases, building respect can take a long time, in other cases it can happen at a single meeting. When respect is viewed as something that is built over time, it is also fragile and easily broken. Once respect is broken, it may be hard to restore, evidenced in Nancy’s quote:

I think for me at least, I’ll give you my respect until you [...] break it. You, I will like you and I’ll talk to you, I mean and you fully earn it, but I won’t, if someone breaks it though, I think that’s really hard to replace and to fix. So for me that’s a key thing in any relationship whether it’s work or personal. It’s something that you have to watch.

The kinds of characteristics that deserve respect are varied. When asked who deserves respect, Joan answered:
I think people that are thoughtful, that are diligent, people that are creative, people that are caring.

Other informants suggested that respect may be given to those who are working for the good of others, seeing the bigger picture, curious, lifelong learners, good listeners, hard workers, not lazy, prompt, willing to go above and beyond, willing to do their ‘homework’, concerned about the environment, trying to do their best, strongly principled, capable of doing many things, and/or efficient in what they do.

Note that it is possible for a person to respect another in one area (e.g., respect their expertise) but not another (e.g., lack respect because they are an arrogant person).

### 4.3.3 Whole Person

The notion of the ‘whole person’ is a consideration for, as the name implies, all aspects of a person – it ignores a split between mind and body, and acknowledges that people’s lives are relational, spiritual, affective, physical, and intellectual (Ellerby 2006). The importance of respect for the ‘whole person’ is recognized in Lightfoot’s (2000) book on respect, in which she cites Piaget (1977/1995, p. 172): “Respect is a personal sentiment, that is it evaluates a person as such, well differentiated from other individuals and considered as a unique whole” (p. 178).

Sennett (2003), in his book on respect, describes a lack of respect as not being seen as or accounted for as full human beings (p. 13). Pettigrew, Mizerski, and Donovan (2003) studied the service preferences of older clients in a financial services context, and found that older clients’ desire for respect included a holistic view of the consumer. Ulaga and Eggert’s (2006) study of personal interactions in business relationships revealed that the whole person matters in this context too; according to one manager who was interviewed in this study, “When dealing with these people, I look at them as much more than just a tool. I look at them as a person” (p. 125).
This theme of respect as a ‘whole person’ concept is somewhat ironic, given the earlier suggestion that respect can be merit-based, and that it is possible for a person to value another’s characteristics in a certain area (e.g., as a hard worker) but not in another area (e.g., as a mother).

The theme of the whole person is also apparent in the interview discussions about respect. First, descriptions of respect in business relationships often include references to respecting differences between ‘individuals’ or to talking about the other party ‘as a person’. There are many ways in which a person can treat another ‘as a person’ – one way is by joking with the other person, because this acknowledges that the other person has not only a business sense but also a sense of humour.

Joan: I would start with respecting people, whatever position they’re in. And I think that’s the same way, most important, people treat the cleaning staff the same way they treat the chairs of the board, as people first. Sounds trite but it’s true.

Interviewer: And how do you treat people then as people first?

Joan: You ask their name [laughing]. You know? In terms of house cleaning staff how often does that happen? Not very. You know, in terms of how I treat my chair of the board, I joke with him, nobody, I mean, the first time I joked with him people were shocked because they don’t because he’s the chair of the board, but that’s you know, I think that’s fundamental to being a person, a full rounded person.

Second, discussions of respect include the notion that social relationships are important, because they allow for learning about the other person. This process of learning or understanding surrounds the whole person – not only his/her work life, but also family life, leisure, etc. By learning about and understanding the whole person, respect in business relationships can be fostered and/or enhanced. Lana was asked to expand on her own comments about the importance of understanding the person versus just the business relationship:

Lana: Let’s say with some suppliers I only meet them for brief meetings, or deal with them through email and phone calls that are relatively short. With this one particular supplier, I
had to travel relatively long distances, like a few hours in the car, to meetings with, I’ve had lunch a few times with them. There’s one in particular, the one contact I have […] ridden the subway with her, had a chance to talk to them about things above and beyond just work, so I understand more where they’re coming from, so we’ve made a connection at a personal level.

Interviewer: OK, and how does that change things?

Lana: I think you can, the person becomes more rounded, I guess. You understand, I’ve found connections with them, outside of the office that we have to talk about briefly, the, sort of the neighbourhood we live in, or things that are going on in the city. That sort of thing. And so it’s more than just working with a supplier, it’s like working with a friend, I guess.

Interviewer: How does that change the business relationship then?

Lana: I think it makes it, just, I think there’s more support going back and forth, it’s not just an email from another supplier, it’s somebody I want to get back to because I appreciate the person perhaps that little bit more as a person.

Interviewer: Does that change the outcomes of the relationship then?

Lana: Maybe at some level, and it’s not to say that I don’t make an effort and my other suppliers don’t make an effort, but me, I think it’s just in that situation, one I feel more comfortable calling up and asking for things that might be a little bit of a stretch in responsibility, but I know they have the capabilities, two I perhaps put more into it myself as well. So perhaps we give a little bit more in the, sort of the work aspect.

The notion of respect being related to the whole person is recognized in the ethics and philosophy literature on respect, but not as much in other literatures. For example, in the social and organizational psychology literature, Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Gilder (2006) manipulate respect as a positive/negative evaluation of a participant’s accomplishment. Specifically, a group member would describe one achievement and one cooperative act they were proud of, and one of each that they were not proud of. Then, they would receive (fake) feedback on their achievements and actions. A low evaluation was meant to signal lack of respect, and a high evaluation was to signal respect. In this case, these achievements and actions are only a small
part of the whole person – this manipulation assumes that respect is targeted at a fragmented person.

4.3.4 Reciprocity of Respect

It appears there are different views on whether respect is always reciprocal or whether it can also be one-sided. Some hold the view that respect is mutual. Simply put, if you get respect, you owe respect back – if you are treated well, you treat the other well in return. This is similar to the Golden Rule – treating others as one expects to be treated.

Yvette: I just think it would be very very difficult to respect another individual if they weren’t respectful of you.

Interviewer: And how come?

Yvette: Because if they’re not treating you with respect, or not treating others with respect, I’m using the word respect a lot, they’re probably not the type of person that you’re going to look up to or really have a lot of admiration for.

If someone doesn’t respect you, or if respect is unidirectional for too long, you may eventually start to lose respect for that person. Perhaps this is more so the case for recognition (versus merit-based) respect. Some informants suggested that if respect is true or authentic, then it should be mutual. Mutual respect is facilitated when parties have similar values. Of course, mutual respect does not necessarily mean that parties have to agree.

Others hold the view that respect does not always go both ways. Nancy, in describing a particular incident, suggests that it

[...] may have led to him respecting me, but I don’t know necessarily that that was the case for me.
The unidirectional nature of respect may be due to the type of respect. In the case of merit-based versus recognition respect, it is more likely that respect might be unidirectional because one party may have capabilities or talents that the other does not. It may also be due to the fact that one party needs to earn the respect of the other person. For example, in relationships where there is an imbalance of power, parties may be expected to earn the respect of others. If respect is unidirectional, it becomes harder to get along with the other person. The consequences that would normally be attributed to a respectful relationship may suffer. It may also ultimately impact on profits. If A respects B, but B does not respect A for reasons that are outside of A’s control, then A may see this as petty and unnecessary.

4.3.5 Authenticity of Respect

Previous researchers and philosophers have suggested respectful behaviour needs to be authentic in order to be considered true respect. Cohen (2002) wrote that it is possible for a person to act respectfully, but in order to know if a person is actually respectful you need to know their intention. Kantianism and other forms of deontology are based on the premise that it is the intention behind an act that makes the act ethical or respectful (Bowie 2002). Cranor (1975), in a philosophical article on respect, underscores the need for respect to be genuine and altruistic. In the context of psychotherapy, authentic and inauthentic respect are differentiated (Kanwal 1997, p. 143):

> Respect is not politeness. Politeness is a mask that at best indicates some willingness to acknowledge the needs of the other person, and at its worst is a deadly misleading from the real. Respect, on the other hand, is a more profound realization and acceptance of the nonself world, with its differences and limitations, that allows a therapist to be nonintrusive, patient, and forgiving.

The theme of authenticity and inauthenticity emerged in the interviews as well. It is possible to be inauthentic in terms of respect – there are people who maintain a semblance of respect, who
pay simple lip service, and who can fake the mechanics of respect. Even though the exchange may appear pleasant (e.g., polite, courteous, well-mannered), it may not be fundamentally respectful (e.g., seeing the other as a valued client with rights, understanding the interests and motivations of the other party). Samantha explains:

I think fundamentally, there was no respect. Like it was, there was like, you know they didn’t see us as a valued client with rights, and we didn’t see them as creatively competent. Sort of where I mean respect, when I say the exchange was respectful, we were always very conscious that even if we don’t agree with someone, we’re not going to sort of you know attack them personally, because we work for the [organization], but they also knew that and they understood sort of our ground rules and our politics […] and so while conversations, like if you read a transcript of the conversations would sound pleasant enough, it was sort of the underlying outcomes that was really, where the lack of respect exist[ed].

Paul reinforces this sentiment:

[…] if you’re showing somebody that you’re say on the phone with from a particular service provider, if you’re treating them outwardly with quote-unquote respect, really all that means is you’re treating them politely and well and like you know a decent human being, which maybe isn’t really respect, in fact it isn’t really respect. It’s just being polite and having good manners. […] So yeah, I guess the difference is that respect is a situation where you understand the interests and motivations of those that you’re working with and you try as best as you can you know understand those and you know work within that context.

The party that is treated politely but is not genuinely respected may be able to figure out what’s really going on through body language, hearsay, inconsistency in words and actions, and other little clues. A person might know that respect is not genuine if their ideas and opinions are sought out, but then these ideas and opinions are not incorporated or even considered. When A acts as if he/she respects B, but really does not, the consequences (provided B finds out) include the following: B’s confidence and trust are lost, B feels undermined, B does not put 100% into the project, B becomes frustrated, or B loses respect for A. Other more general consequences include the following: there is no shared sense of working together so the project cannot move forward, there is no open dialogue and issues are ‘danced around’ so the process becomes more
expensive, there is no honesty, the atmosphere of trust is changed, and the entire process is undermined. On the other hand, when respect is authentic, it is very rewarding for the parties involved.

In some cases, it seems a person could respect only some parts of another person, and this is not necessarily inauthentic. For example, A might respect B’s work but not respect B as a person. This does not imply that A’s respect for B’s work is inauthentic.

Interestingly, the notion of respecting people with certain titles or reputations may be considered inauthentic. Respecting someone based on their knowledge or background may be a false respect, because it’s based on a person’s history and not direct experience from working together.

It is possible that someone who is young in the field could be more talented than a seasoned professional, who may have only ‘risen up the ranks’ because of their social networks or their tenure. Thus, titles and ranks are not an appropriate basis for true respect.

### 4.3.6 Contextuality of Respect

Respect is context-dependent. The context-dependent or situation-specific nature of respect has been recognized by other researchers. In the marketing literature, Bitran and Hoech (1990) acknowledge that the attitudes and behaviours of respect will depend on the socioeconomic and cultural context. Brashear et al. (2003) also recognize that the meaning of respect (and its importance) may vary by context. Leung and Chan (2003) and Mann et al. (1994) have found that respect is subject to cultural differences. In non-marketing literatures, Dillon’s (1992) notion of ‘care respect’ suggests that we respect people by responding to their particularities, seeing the world from their point of view, and paying attention to the person as an individual. Joh (2001) suggests that the meaning of respect depends on the individual relationship at hand. Sennett (2003) describes respecting someone as treating them as different.
This theme of contextuality also appeared in the interviews. Specifically, respect is an individual-level phenomenon. Some people just don’t care about the ‘soft stuff’ such as respect in relationships, and other people do. Different people have different definitions of respect, because respect is connected to people’s individual values. It is not surprising that respect is connected to people’s values, since much of ethical behaviour depends on individual and social values.

“Ethical behavior is acting in ways consistent with one’s personal values and the commonly held values of the organization and society” (Sims 2003, p. 23). Previous research has suggested that the reasons why one person might respect a target stems from that person’s own values (Cronin 2003).

The bases upon which one person respects another result from their unique beliefs about what characteristics are desirable (e.g., hard work, punctuality, dedication, being a good person, good communication, thoughtfulness, diligence, creativity, care, doing their best, leadership abilities, consistency, influence). Blaine makes this point clear:

And it probably boils down to my own personal beliefs about why I respect someone. I respect hard work, I don’t respect laziness. I respect promptness and being on time. Maybe I’ve got a little bit of more military in my background than I need, and that’s probably where a lot of it comes from, I did have eight years of military training.

The reciprocity of respect may be driven in part by values. First, it is harder to achieve mutual respect if two people are very dissimilar in terms of their values. Second, people’s values may drive them to have unidirectional respect or unmerited respect – even if the other person has done something implausible, they may continue to follow the Golden Rule and treat others as they want to be treated.

The theme of ‘contextuality’ was also apparent in the informants’ ability to talk about times when respect matters more versus less. In some cases respect is always important, but in other cases,
respect matters more. First, when there is pressure, when the outcome is critical, or when there is more at stake, then respect is integral. Joan felt that respect matters most in a crisis situation:

Yeah well I know I do a lot of work in crisis communications and if we don’t respect the roles we have, you’re spending too much time defending, you’re spending too much time second guessing, and we don’t have time as a [organization]. You know your […] team has to kick in and every person on that team has to respect the other people because everyone has a role to do. So I think in life itself that it, that without that respect, you have to keep earning it or justifying it or second guessing it at the time, when it is most needed.

Second, when there is a power imbalance, respect matters more. If A has more power than B, then it is essential for A to also respect B in order to achieve a cooperative relationship. Third, when the parties are mutually dependent, then (mutual) respect is critical, because both parties must be concerned about the other’s success. Fourth, respect may be more important at the beginning phase, when one party is trying to get its ‘foot in the door’ and make a good impression, rather than later phases of a relationship. Finally, respect is probably more important in long-term versus short-term relationships.

4.3.7 Power

The theme of power emerged in a number of the interviews. The people that have ‘the hammer’ are typically buyers (versus sellers) or people from larger organizations. The organizational members that don’t have the power are those that don’t matter enough from a business perspective, or don’t necessarily provide a great deal of value to the other. The organizational member that has more power (person A) experiences a number of ‘luxuries’ in their relationship with the other person (person B). Specifically, it seems to be acceptable for A to treat B with low or no respect; and even if A treats B with low or no respect, B (though frustrated) may still continue to do business with A. Blaine was asked to talk about when respect matters more, and he drew the distinction between buyers versus sellers:
Yeah, I guess, you could probably say, to me, respect, if I had to say it was more important, with me being the buyer or the seller, I think with me being the buyer, respect plays a bigger role. If I feel that respect, then I almost have to feel that respect before I would go to the next step. Whereas if I am the seller or the provider of a service, I’ll still move forward even though I’m not feeling respect, because you’re not going to back out, right?

Blaine then elaborated on these power differences:

[…] and every [business] customer is very important, and they have to be treated with respect, they have to be treated so that they’re going to appreciate you and your product and whatever it is you’re taking forward. So you’ll punch it around as long as you can. Eventually you’ll back off if it’s going nowhere. And if I went there right away, and a guy’s, like, just rude off the bat, I’m probably not going to go back again. But it would take a much higher level of rudeness on his behalf than it would on the sellers, or, you know the person who’s trying to sell to me. Like if the guy selling’s even a slight bit rude, I might go a little bit further, but I’m going to be listening close, because that’s the type of relationship I’m going to end up with that guy. Now, depending on how big the customer is, obviously the bigger he is, the more crap he’ll take. […] Bottom line is, you know, benefit to the shareholders. So sometimes you have to take a kick in the teeth for the better of everybody else, right? But I don’t have to take it from my vendors and suppliers. The guy who’s only going to buy one unit from me, he’d probably gets the same as the supplier side, it would be like, it’s not worth it, you know, I don’t need your business that bad. It’s going to take, you’ve got to kind of weigh it out, you know, the cost-benefit like, how much effort am I going to have to put into this relationship, what am I going to get in return?

Note that not only organizations but also individuals can have power that impacts on respect – people who are higher up in a hierarchy have more power, and therefore can get away with treating people less respectfully. People who are lower on the organizational hierarchy will still be obliged to treat those above them with respect, because their managers have the power to affect their employment.

In contrast to these interview findings which suggest that power differences create a particular respect dynamic, previous literature has suggested that power differences erode respect. Richard Sennett’s (2003) book, *Respect in a World of Inequality*, explores the relationship between respect and power/inequality. Sennett’s exploration is grounded in his own childhood experiences growing up in poverty in the Cabrini Green housing project in Chicago. Sennett
explores the way in which “inequality eats into respect” (p. 117). Dutton’s (2003) book on creating high quality connections describes how respectful engagement can be hampered by power differences. Cranor (1975) suggests that one of the features of respect is that it is something that happens between equals, suggesting that there cannot be a power differential for respect to exist. Piaget argues that mutual respect can only emerge out of relationships where the two parties view themselves and each other as equals (Lightfoot 2000). When power imbalances exist, respect may not be reciprocated (Gaines 1994).

An alternate perspective in the literature is that in situations where there are power imbalances, respect matters more. Simon, Lücken, and Stürmer (2006) found that when there were structural inequalities in a group (i.e., restricted rights vs. full rights to vote and participate as a group member), then the positive effects of respect (in terms of resulting in greater collective identification and willingness to engage in group serving behaviour) were stronger. For example, if group members felt respected in such a way that their ideas and opinions were valued and seriously considered, then whether or not they had equal participation rights did not matter to the outcomes at hand. But, if there was no respect, then structural equality was necessary for preserving the positive group outcomes. Respect may buffer power differences; “Respect is useful because it helps to move the relationship forward without the struggles for power” (Arnold 1987).

4.3.8 Identification

There are many definitions of organizational identification (OI). Riketta suggests that the most comprehensive definition of OI is “a variety of separate, though related phenomena … (1) feelings of solidarity with the organization; (2) [attitudinal and behavioral] support for the
OI theory is useful, because it is one piece in the puzzle explaining how respect operates. Respect is facilitated when there is inter-organizational identification (defined in Berger, Cunningham, and Drumwright 2006). When one party already identifies with the other party (i.e., when there is similarity in values, goals, work styles, cultures, etc.) then mutual respect is easier and may even be automatic. Similarly, shared goals and other similar organizational features act as a basis for developing respect.

The theme of identification is not only apparent in terms of how people relate to organizations, but also how people relate to others. People sometimes respect other individuals based on their own beliefs about personal characteristics that are desirable. For example, a person who values hard work may respect another individual that works hard. This can be likened to identification – if a person is similar to the other, they identify with the other and as a result, they respect the other.

In the interviews, evidence that people respect similar others was found in descriptions of respect. Matthew raised the importance of ‘similar thinking’ in fostering respect. When asked to expand on this point, Matthew explained

[…] it’s difficult to have oil and water mix. And if you are too different for any long term relationship, whether it’s a you know a spousal thing or a business relationship, if you do think differently, are different people, operate differently, I don’t think you’re going to have a long term relationship, it just doesn’t work out. There’s, you’re both trying too hard. There’s not enough common ground, and I just don’t think you’ll end up having them as a long term client. […] There’s degrees, so we draw two circles. You can be different, that’s one circle, and the other group can be different, but you have to have enough common ground where the circles intersect, and as long as that’s the case, and the more they overlap, the probably best, you know longer the relationship will be.
Person A will gain the respect of person B when A portrays back what B wants to portray in him/herself (i.e., when A is B’s ‘ideal self’); is on the same wavelength as B; demonstrates characteristics valued by B; is like-minded when compared to B; has the same philosophies as B; and has the same work styles as B. Ultimately, people respect other people based on their own beliefs about why another should be respected. In talking about respect, Blaine expressed his view:

You know, what do I value as a person, myself, what do I want to portray myself as, if I see somebody portraying that back, regardless of what position they’re in, they’re going to gain respect.

The notion that ‘similarity breeds respect’ has been uncovered in previous research by Blau (1962) and by Montgomery, Kane, and Vance (2004). These researchers found that when judges’ identity matched that of the target of some offense, they were more likely to view the perpetrator’s behaviour as an incivility (i.e., disrespectful). In contrast, when judges’ identity matched that of the perpetrator, they were more likely to take the perpetrator’s side.

One component of respect is the notion of understanding. For example, when one party makes an effort to really understand the other party – where they are coming from, their pressures, their motives, everything about them – this is an element of respect. This intense form of understanding results in, or simultaneously leads to, closer identification with the other party. Remember that Riketta’s (2005) view of identification includes “feelings of solidarity with the organization” (p. 360). Following this view, respect in some cases can even be defined in terms of organizational identification – for example, respect is an understanding of where the other party is coming from, having a shared sense of being at the table together, becoming relevant to the other organization, finding what is common between two parties, becoming a member or a part of the other organization, and working for the better good of both parties.
According to Matthew in the earlier quote, organizations and organizational members that are too different are not expected to hold long-term relationships because they do not share enough common ground. One would therefore expect the opposite to hold true – similar organizations and people should be expected to have longer term relationships. If similar people have an easier time fostering and maintaining respect, then perhaps respectful relationships will be more successful as long-term relationships.

It is interesting that the theme of identification is addressed even in Kant’s thinking on respect for persons. Bowie (1999), in discussing Kant’s philosophy of respect, suggests that “the persons in a Kantian moral firm would share the goals of the firm and thus the firm would be organized as a cooperative enterprise” (p. 102). In other words, in an organization characterized by high respect, marketers and employees would strongly identify (e.g., share goals) with the organization.

4.3.9 Reputation, Word-of-Mouth (WOM), and Contagion of Respect

The following quote from Joan suggests that respect is related to reputation and word-of-mouth (e.g., third party endorsements), and also that respect is somewhat ‘contagious’ (e.g., depends on who a person is connected to or seen with):

There’s respect that’s built on reputation and what you’ve read and heard about a certain person or organization. There’s respect based on affiliates, who that person connects to or is seen with, and I don’t mean seen like at a party or anything, but related to the partners that they have or the company that they keep or things like that. So there’s ways of securing respect, there’s third party kind of endorsement that comes from someone else, you know expressing interest or giving a recommendation, there’s that kind of respect that comes from third party endorsement, so I think there’s a variety of ways.

The relationship between respect and reputation has been investigated in other literature. Hemmings (2003), in her study of respect at urban high schools, found that respectability and reputation are opposing discourses. Students sometimes cannot be respectful if they want to
maintain their reputation. In the high school context, disrespect ironically leads to positive reputations (e.g., being cool).

The word ‘reputation’ has more positive connections with respect in a marketing relationship setting. For some, reputation may be synonymous with respect – a person or party’s reputation is essentially the respect that others have for them and their work. In other cases, the reputation of a person or party (e.g., credentials, hearsay), if it is positive, may provide a basis for respect. Respect or disrespect may be used to describe the reputation of a person or party – for example, Company A’s reputation may be as a company that acts disrespectfully towards others. When an organization acts disrespectfully, its reputation may be harmed with the person it has treated in a disrespectful manner, and its reputation at a public level may be damaged if that person spreads negative word-of-mouth.

WOM is connected to respect in a couple of ways. First, ‘WOM respect’ may be thought of as one form or type of respect. For some, the respect that people or organizations have through affiliates, third party endorsements, and the like is a certain kind of respect. This ‘kind’ of respect is not based on direct experience with the target person or party, but rather it is based on what others say about the target.

Second, WOM may be an outcome of a relationship that is characterized as respectful or disrespectful. When a respectful relationship exists, a person may spread positive WOM about the other party. Sandra makes this connection in describing a respectful relationship:

"So although we don’t have as many huge active projects going, we still see each other as important supplier/partner relationships that you know we’ll go to them for small things, and they’ll support us at our [activities], and you know give, we give lots of recommendations and things to them in the community as a result."
Respect may be described as contagious in some instances. If person A respects organization B, then A may respect all of the members of B simply because he/she respects B as a whole. Lana describes a particular situation where this happened:

Lana: Well, I think because of the size of the, basic sort culture within the company, instills the sense that respect is sort of, is not necessarily given out to suppliers. But I think, I know from working in let’s say with one in particular […] he made a whole point of telling me how excited it was to be in [our] office, it just has that, power of it all, and all this. And he sort of realized that even without having worked with us, there was already a sort of a sense of awe to the relationship, so lump respect in with that I guess. Whereas for me, I didn’t know him from Adam, and so I had limited respect for him at the time. And so he had to build it. Whereas he came in sort of being, this is the big glass tower that has all these brilliant people in and all that.

Interviewer: OK. So it has something to do with the size of the company then?

Lana: The size, and just sort of the recruiting culture and the type of people they recruit are typically hard to get in, and it’s very well known how hard it is to get into the company. That a certain level of respect is given just for having a job with this company.

The contagious nature of respect is similar to the idea that brand extensions can leverage the brand equity of their parent brand – in this case, members of a team or organization can leverage the respect of their organization (which could also be described, like brand equity, as an asset).

4.3.10 Emotion

From the interviews, it was clear that strong feelings resulted from respect. Respectful relationships may result in positive emotions, such as feelings of reward/fulfillment, feeling good about the relationships, passion, lack of anxiety, and excitement. Andrew makes the connection:

In respect, it’s just good to have that relationship. And you always want it to feel better.

Disrespectful relationships may result in negative emotions. Samantha discusses the very personal, negative feelings that arose in a relationship where there was a lack of respect:
So when that would happen and then there would be requests for changes or you know to deliver more closely to what the expectation might have been, then there was a lot of resistance and a lot of taking it personally and feeling offended […]

Relationships where there is lack of respect or inauthentic respect are laden with feelings of frustration. If person A does not respect B in terms of B’s skills and abilities, then person A might worry or feel anxious about having to work with person B because B may not be deemed capable. Disrespectful relationships also make people angry and indignant. The problem with such negative emotions is that the person who feels the negative emotions puts energy into coping with those negative emotions rather than into managing and improving the relationship. Evidence of this was provided in an earlier quote from Yvette:

I think it can make you so indignant and it can make you so angry or frustrated that you actually don’t focus as much on the work that you have to do, but rather you focus on the fact that you’re indignant and you’re getting you know not the right type of attention, and it makes you mad, and you put your energies into that versus what you need to do.

In contrast, when there are positive emotions, more energy and effort is put into the relationship.

Yvette was asked to explain why she spends time getting to know and understand her relationship partners:

Yvette: I mean, obviously it was genuine [laughing], they were, for the most part, really nice people, and certainly that was part of it, like a genuine interest, I think also, I just found in relationships, even if we’re working with you know suppliers to us, positive relationships basically hold you in good status when it comes to the work that they’re doing for you, or the way that you’re able to influence people.

Interviewer: And how come, do you think?

Yvette: I mean from a marketing perspective, it does affect a little bit into my current role, I think if you can genuinely get someone excited about what you’re trying to do, about the goals that you have for your brand, and about what you’re trying to achieve, and you can engage people and make them excited about it, and make them really feel like they’re bought in, they’re going to give you not only more energy and effort at work, but I think you’re probably also going to get more of their energy and effort you know when they’re just
thinking about things taking the subway to work, or I don’t know, we call it shower time. Generally I think those positive relationships give you better results.

The connection between emotion and respect has been acknowledged in the philosophy literature. Seidler (1986), in extending Kant’s views on respect, suggests that “there is a sense in which respecting someone involves recognition of the validity of someone’s experience, their emotions and feelings as much as their moral actions. Sharing our emotions and feelings, desires and wants is an integral aspect of sharing our experience” (p. 42). In other literatures, emotion has not been widely addressed by respect researchers. Ellemers, Doosje, and Spears (2003) considered the emotions of pride and shame as outcomes of low versus high respect manipulations. From the interviews, however, we see that the range of emotions involved in respect/disrespect extend much broader than pride and shame. Simon and Stürmer (2003) assessed participants’ moods after being subjected to a respectful treatment manipulation – participants in the respect condition were in a better mood. The idea that emotions play a role in B2B relationships stands in contrast to the assumptions marketing researchers have traditionally made about these relationships as cognitive and rational interactions (Bagozzi 2006).

4.3.11 Consequences of Respect
In addition to emotion, the consequences of respect are plentiful. Some of these consequences have been touched on in the previous discussions of themes. Overall, a respectful relationship is much more rewarding for the people involved. There is a ‘wow’ factor for the party/ies that is/are treated with respect. When there is respect, the interaction itself becomes more trusting, honest, cooperative, and open. When one party is respected, it is often given the benefit of the doubt. The party that is respected will in turn provide more help and support, put more effort and energy into the exchange, and possibly even be willing to bend over backwards for the other. As a result
of respect, two parties are able to better work together – the process runs smoothly, miscommunications are squelched, things are less stressful, and time is saved. In turn, the quality of the outcomes improves (e.g., on time, on budget, creative, well done, nimble), and it is more likely that products or recommendations are actually implemented. Relationships characterized by respect tend to provide the most value, last the longest, and result in positive word-of-mouth.

Nancy describes the consequence of both respect and lack of respect:

 [...] it’s hard to work with someone and to feel like they have your best interests at heart if you don’t respect someone. And I think with respect some of those other ones come. Where if I do respect you and if my buyer respects me, he’s more likely to cooperate with me, and be more open with me, and help me help him. So I think that’s it, cause I’ve worked for some people where just I mean in terms of their actions and the way that they approach things, I don’t have respect for them and I, from there, I don’t trust them, I don’t want to work with them, I really have no interest in speaking with them.

As evidenced in the above quote, the consequences of lack of respect or disrespect are also numerous. For the person who is experiencing disrespect, the relationship is more stressful and more confusing. That person loses motivation, does not put in 100% effort, is less confident, and feels undermined, frustrated, resentful and discontentment/dissatisfaction. In addition, that person may be less willing to innovate or take risks, and may be more likely to make mistakes. The process itself becomes much more time consuming (i.e., resources are wasted, less effort is committed to the project). The quality of the outcome suffers and may not meet expectations. The reputation of the disrespectful party may be damaged.

A relationship where disrespect exists becomes draining and makes life difficult, because energy is put into dealing with the disrespect rather than improving outcomes. It is especially hard work for the party that has to earn the other’s respect. Erin describes her experiences:

 [...] if an agency doesn’t respect me, I think you end up in a situation of conflict. Because you know, I know I’m not respected by them, so I feel undermined or I feel my confidence
waning, therefore I may not put in 100% into the project, or provide 100% service that they need to get the job done. So therefore, it erodes on both ends. If I’m not providing what they need, they see that and then they provide less. Or, you get into a situation of, you know stubbornness or butting heads over issues because, you know if you don’t feel like you’re being respected, then you want probably to talk over them and make sure your opinion is being heard or you do emphatically try to move forward with what you want, regardless of how people perceive you or how you’re being perceived by them.

Finally, if respect is lacking, the outcomes may become irrelevant, no matter how excellent they are. Instead, in the case of disrespect, one party may withdraw, resign, sever a relationship, or simply choose not to work with other party in the first place.

4.3.12 Antecedents to Respect

There are a number of antecedents to respect. Two of the more common antecedents are (1) previous relationships, and (2) meeting or exceeding expectations. When the parties have a pre-existing relationship, it seems that respect comes easier. Lana suggests the following:

[…] and a part of me thinks, well most suppliers I work with are long term members of [our company’s] supply world, I guess you can say, so it’s not like, typically I know that they’ve done work for like 8 or 10 years with the company, so there’s a level of respect going in from my side with that.

One explanation is that respect involves an understanding of the whole person. When a previous relationship exists, each party knows something else about the other party beyond the business exchange. As a result, respect is enhanced.

When A meets or exceeds the expectations of B, then B’s respect for A is enhanced (this is similar to the literature on ‘service quality’; Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml 1991). One possible explanation is related to the fact that respect involves valuing the other’s abilities or accomplishments. A’s ability to garner respect stems in part from its ability to set realistic expectations about what it can or cannot achieve. Thus, the level of ability or accomplishment
required to achieve respect may not be standardized across all relationships, but instead may be
relative to what each party in the relationship claims it can or cannot do.

Other antecedents to (dis-)respect include the following: humility, background research,
dialogue/communication, history of performance, points of contact, common ground/similarities,
business results, competitive position/market share, potential for power shift, recruiting culture of
organization, size of organization, ego of organization, leadership within the organization,
organizational ownership/structure, and patronizing/condescending attitudes. In general, it seems
the antecedents have to do with the person (humility, other attitudes), the company (ego, size,
culture, marketing objectives, leadership, ownership), the present interaction
(dialogue/communication, points of contact), and the past (history, business results). The fact
that this context is a business situation where parties are engaged in exchange to make money and
to pursue self-interests means that respectful behaviours might suffer (e.g., don’t take the time to
pay attention to client’s real needs, etc.).

4.4 Definition of Respect

Synthesizing these findings from the interviews, together with the literature review, it is possible
to arrive at a definition of respect to guide the remainder of this research.

Respect, in the context of an inter-personal relationship, is defined as regarding a relationship
partner to be valuable or, in other words, to have worth. Respect is directed at a target. The
other person has various aspects (e.g., rights, dignity, characteristics, talents, achievements) that
can be respected. Respect is a belief. Respect is not, however, an action or behaviour –
respectful actions and behaviours are manifestations of respect.
4.5 Conclusion for this Chapter

In this chapter, I reviewed the findings from a series of exploratory, in-depth interviews with marketing professionals. These findings were organized around themes that were both expected and uncovered in the interview transcripts. The thematic analysis has helped to refine the meaning of respect and the types of respect. It has shed insight into the reciprocal and authentic nature of respect. It has also uncovered the importance of ‘whole person’. In addition, it has suggested that there are contextual factors that impact on respect, such as power, authenticity, and reciprocity. The thematic analysis assisted in understanding the linkages between respect, identification, reputation, word-of-mouth, and the potentially contagious nature of respect. Finally, this analysis uncovered various antecedents and consequences of respect, including emotion.
5.1 Overview

The results of the literature review and the first phase of in-depth interviews provided the insights necessary to develop a preliminary conceptual model of respect’s impact in B2B marketing relationships. This model acknowledges that my anticipated research sample – marketing and business practitioners – have limited time to participate in such research. Therefore, the model includes only the most important variables to limit the number of items and maximize potential for participation.

Before summarizing this preliminary model, however, I describe relationship marketing, which is a key theoretical foundation. Then, I summarize the results from a second phase of interviews, which were intended to confirm, in a preliminary fashion, whether my proposed model resonated with marketing practitioners. I conducted five in-depth interviews with marketers. The results of these interviews suggested that I was generally on the right track, but they also suggested that one’s orientation towards buy-sell relationships in general might be a significant moderator of the impact of respect on these relationships. The orientation described by the informants echoed elements of the service dominant logic described by Vargo and Lusch (2004). Therefore, I provide a summary of this logic and a discussion of the way in which my informants felt this logic impacted on their relationships.
5.2 Theoretical Foundation of Relationship Marketing

A key perspective guiding this research is relationship marketing. Though there is debate as to what exactly relationship marketing means, this area of study has a number of defining features—it involves one-to-one relationships between marketers and their customers, it is an interactive process rather than an exchange, and it is a value added activity that occurs through collaboration between buyers and sellers (Sheth and Parvatiyar 2002).

While my exploratory research into respect uncovered an important emotional dimension in B2B marketing relationships, previous research has often assumed that these relationships are more rational or cognitive in nature. A prime example of this assumption is found in the emphasis on calculating customer lifetime value for relationship marketing success, evidenced by recent research on the topic (e.g., Reinartz, Thomas, and Kumar 2005; Venkatesan and Kumar 2004) and on a special issue devoted to ‘customer lifetime value’ in the *Journal of Relationship Marketing* (2006, Issue 5, Volume 2/3). Other ‘rational’ theories such as transaction cost analysis (Rindfleisch and Heide 1997) and resource dependence theory (Pfeffer and Salancik 1978) have guided researchers in exploring a variety of B2B relationship topics, for example contract enforcement (Antia and Frazier 2001). This focus on rational theories of marketing relationships is not surprising, given that marketing’s history is firmly rooted in economics. As Granovetter (1985) explains, “Much of the utilitarian tradition, including classical and neoclassical economics, assumes rational, self-interested behaviour affected minimally by social relations…” (p. 481).

Within this utilitarian or rational tradition, trust has been assumed to play a primary role in the development of relationship success and commitment. This notion was first proposed by Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh (1987) and later empirically established by Morgan and Hunt (1994) in their trust-
commitment theory of relationship marketing. The critical importance of trust has been subsequently addressed in numerous other studies (e.g., Garbarino and Johnson 1999; Gounaris 2005; Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande 1992). Trust, like B2B marketing relationships in general, has been viewed as cognitive in nature. Specifically, it has been viewed as an alternative to monitoring the partner organization and thus as a way to reduce governance costs (Doney and Cannon 1997).

My dissertation extends the assumptions that guide marketing relationship research in a B2B context. Specifically, my research challenges the assumption that marketing relationships are solely cognitive or calculative in nature. Instead, it suggests that emotional elements also play an important role in determining marketing relationship outcomes. This is akin to Granovetter’s observation that, while neoclassical economics has assumed rational decision makers, “At the other extreme lies what I call the argument of ‘embeddedness’: the argument that the behaviour and institutions to be analyzed are so constrained by ongoing social relations that to construe them as independent is a grievous misunderstanding” (p. 481-2). Like Heide and Wathne (2006), I too believe that marketing relationship partners can adopt roles as both rational actors and embedded individuals and that these roles can co-exist – that there is room to begin investigating these assumptions about the nature of business relationships concurrently.

Specifically, my research suggests that in addition to trust, respect – a variable that speaks directly to the interpersonal interaction – is also important in predicting marketing relationship success. Perceptions of respect or lack of respect are expected to foster emotional reactions in individual relationship partners, as evidenced in my preliminary interviews.
5.3 Preliminary Model of Respect’s Impact in B2B Marketing Relationships

The preliminary conceptual model is depicted in Figure 5-1 and a brief descriptive summary follows. Because I will elaborate on the variables included in the final model in Chapter 7, and because the final model is somewhat different, I provide only a brief description here.

Figure 5-1 Preliminary Conceptual Model

To summarize Figure 5-1, when there is respect in a relationship, that relationship will feel good because people feel positive about themselves and each other. In comparison, when there is trust in a relationship, that relationship works well because there are reduced governance and monitoring costs. Both trust and respect are expected to impact on the important relationship marketing outcomes of commitment and cooperation. In addition, because respect makes people feel good about their relationship, they will be more likely to help or to do nice things for their relationship partners – they will be more likely to engage in citizenship behaviours. Trust and reduced transaction costs, because they are more rational in nature, do not emotionally drive citizenship behaviours.
The specific relationship between respect and trust remained unclear following the first interview phase, therefore this relationship is depicted as a dotted line without arrows.

As uncovered in the first phase of interviews, respect has emotional outcomes, which is quite different from trust’s impact as explored in other research. Therefore, emotions are included in the model as a key mediating variable, helping to explain why respect matters in B2B marketing relationships. This is in contrast to transaction costs, which other research has posited as a key mediating variable for why trust matters in B2B marketing relationships.

Three outcome variables are selected as part of this preliminary model. Citizenship behaviours – the notion that relationship partners provide each other with extra help and support as a result of respectful relationships – are included because these emerged as a unique outcome of respect in the interviews that have not been extensively addressed in other marketing relationship literature. Commitment to the relationship and cooperation between relationship partners are included as two additional outcome variables because these were noted as important outcomes to respect in both the respect literature and the interviews. Also, these outcomes have been heavily studied in the relationship marketing literature, and have already been demonstrated as outcomes of trust.

While some of the relationships in Figure 5-1 have been demonstrated in previous research, by incorporating respect, emotion, and citizenship behaviours, I am building on and enhancing existing models to better understand each variable’s impact. I engaged in a preliminary test of this model through five in-depth interviews, which I describe in the remainder of this chapter.

5.4 Method
A total of five male informants participated in the interviews. These informants represented a variety of industries and businesses from across Canada and the US. All were heavily involved in
buyer-seller relationships of parts or supplies from other organizations. These participants were recruited with the assistance of the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, which supported my research by providing contact information for several of its members. The recruitment information is included in Appendix C.

Again, this study involved elite interviews that followed an interview guide approach combined with an informal conversational approach. Like the first set of interviews, this phase was still semi-structured; however, the level of structure was somewhat greater than in the first phase, as my goal was to confirm and further explore some of the findings from the first phase. The informants were first asked relatively general, exploratory questions about their business-to-business relationships. A series of more specific (but still open-ended) questions about the role of respect in these relationships was then posed. The Interview Protocol is in Appendix D.

Again, the interviews were transcribed and were subject to an iterative, thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006). Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 82) state, “An alternative use of thematic analysis is to provide a more detailed and nuanced account of one particular theme, or group of themes, within the data. This might relate to a specific question or area of interest within the data …”. In the case of these interviews, my goal was to determine whether the model of respect that emerged from the previous stages of research continued to show potential in a practical setting. I found that in some cases, the participants generally agreed with my model. In other cases, however, participants did not feel that the model would hold because respect did not really matter to them. Therefore, in this phase of interviews, the thematic analysis centers around understanding why my model of respect might not hold in certain contexts, and what those contexts might be.
5.5 Theme from the Interviews: The Service Dominant Logic of Marketing

In the previous chapter, I summarized relationship marketing, which provides a key theoretical foundation for my work. These exploratory interviews brought a second key perspective to the fore – the emergent service-dominant logic (SDL) of marketing (Vargo and Lusch 2004), as it compares to the traditional goods-dominant logic (GDL) of marketing. Given the nature of the buyer-seller relationships (parts and supplies), it was particularly notable that this emerged.

While the SDL has been the subject of criticism and critique for its lack of offering a truly new perspective to the field (e.g., Brown 2007), in my view, the SDL has successfully captured dominant and important shifts in marketing thinking. The SDL builds on the relationship perspective by suggesting that in marketing, the fundamental unit of exchange is services (i.e., the application of skills and knowledge) rather than goods. Following the SDL, respect becomes even more important to marketing relationships. “Interactivity, integration, customization, and co-production are the hallmarks of a service-centered view and its inherent focus on the customer and the relationship” (Vargo and Lusch 2004, p. 11). I expect that respect should facilitate the interactivity, co-production, co-creation, and continuous learning that is central to the SDL, because respect is the mechanism by which parties genuinely value and therefore incorporate each other’s contributions when co-producing/co-creating value. In a similar vein, Abela and Murphy (2008) argue that the SDL provides a more ethical approach to marketing as compared to other logics.

Respect is not only expected to facilitate the implementation of a service-dominant perspective, but is also conceptually aligned with the language and tone used to describe the SDL. Vargo and Lusch (2004) suggest that the service-dominant view is about “being adaptive to [customers’] individual and dynamic needs” (p. 6), which echoes the notion that respect is about recognizing
people’s uniqueness and differences. The SDL focuses on the exchange of skills, service, and knowledge rather than the exchange of goods. In other words, a service-dominant view does not glorify superficial, material goods, but instead acknowledges, values, and therefore respects the human skills and talents that have been integral in goods production. Finally, the service-dominant perspective suggests that companies can only make value propositions, and that it is up to the customer to accept or reject those value propositions. This is inherently respectful because it acknowledges the autonomy and intelligence of the customer. To be sure, a company guided by an authentic service-dominant logic must also engage in relationships characterized by respect.

My second phase of preliminary interviews provided evidence that a person’s and a company’s service-dominant (versus goods-dominant) orientation impacts on the perceived importance of respect in relationships. Three of the five interviews were particularly illustrative of this phenomenon. Each of the three informants presents a somewhat different perspective on the importance of respect based on their orientations.

Roger is a Vice-President of Purchasing for a distribution company and he talks about relationships with his suppliers and customers from a goods-dominant perspective. When asked to comment on the importance of respect in his relationships, Roger responded:

You know sometimes we have to put aside certain things in a deal and that might be something that we would have to set aside for the time being or for the short term, maybe even long term based on the deal […] .

Roger’s connection between “good deals” and relationship success is prevalent throughout his interview:

I can respect somebody all day long for being a great guy but if I’m not getting a great deal I can’t do anything with that company […] .
For Roger, the economic or instrumental aspects of his relationships are a key priority, and this is tied to his beliefs about our materialistic culture in general:

I think that our culture […] it’s on a fast track, it’s on fifteen minutes of fame, you know what I mean, and it’s the way we’ve brought our children up […] it’s hard to put into words I guess […] it’s the material things mean more than they ever have before so money means more than it ever has before.

Roger even uses money as a symbol to demonstrate respect or lack of respect for others:

I’ll show my respect by doing business with somebody and my lack of respect by not doing business with them […] the only way I can is with my dollars.

For Roger, the product and the price – rather than skills, knowledge, interactivity, and participation – matter most to relationship success.

Roger’s instrumental, goods-oriented view of buyer-seller relationships may be facilitated by a fragmented view of his own life. Roger clearly separates his work from his personal life, which may enable him to work in relationships that lack respect because he does not “take this home” at the end of the day. He states,

At the end of the day I go home, I go to my family and I don’t care […] I think if it matters to somebody then they’re dwelling more on what people think about them […] they should be doing their business.

Even though respect is not critical to his relationships, trust is still very important:

… if I don’t respect him but I know he’s telling me the truth I can still feel good about that…

Roger’ experiences can be contrasted with those of Norman, who owns a distribution company and is engaged in many buyer-seller relationships. Norman clearly views respect as important:

[…] you can always sell something that somebody wants regardless of what type of relationships you have […] it can be sold on price or it can be the only product that can [do] the job […] I think that you cannot continue […] to have an ongoing business relationship with somebody unless you have a respectful relationship on some level.
It seems that Norman’s view of respect is influenced by the corporate culture he has worked to instill:

I’ve always felt that it’s really important to get to know the customers really well and to know a little bit about their family and be able to sort of talk a little bit on a personal relationship as well as on a business relationship.

Norman’s dialogue not only equates successful relationships with respect, but also with customized and individualized relationships, a premise of the SDL:

[...] that’s one component, obviously customer service and lead times and speed of delivery and attitude of our truck drivers and installation crew and a lot of other things come into play, but at the core of it is, you have to have a one-to-one relationship between us as a seller, salesman selling and the purchasing person buying for a particular organization.

Cameron is a Vice-President of Purchasing for a privately held independent distributor.

Cameron’s perspective on respect clearly connects the importance of respect to the company’s orientation. In comparing companies with and without service orientations, Cameron’s quote helps to clarify when respect matters and when it does not:

[...] most of our relationships are very strong and there is a lot of respect [...] our company has a tremendous reputation both with our customers and with our suppliers [...] our suppliers would say that we’re hard but fair and we want to do the right thing, and I would think that our customers would say that we care about providing them with the best service and providing them with value [...] value is much more than just the price of the part that we’re selling. There are some vendors and I can think of one, probably our second largest vendor [...] while they do a wonderful job in marketing and a great job at providing programs they don’t do a very good job at having consistent inventory fill [...] a lot of backorders [...] a lot of that has to do with the way their management runs the company [...] it’s driven by financial decisions more than customer focus decisions, it’s not a service. Many times you have their decisions about what they’ll invest in inventory and what they believe are adequate fill rates, all of that is driven by somebody that’s got a pencil trying to decide what’s the best return. And in our business [...] it might cost our customer hundreds of thousands of dollars an hour, millions of dollars a day because of a fairly inexpensive part. So we have to be able to provide the customer with what he needs when he needs it, and when you have a supplier that isn’t necessarily thinking about it that way, and we do have one like I said (our second largest), it becomes a problem sometimes.
For the most part, Cameron’s company culture is focused on providing service to individualized customers:

[…] we’re not the low price guy […] we truly service our customers twenty-four-seven, we do whatever it takes to service them because we understand that most of our customers have very special needs sometimes and that’s the way we go about our business.

He views his own job through a lens of respect:

[…] it’s my responsibility to understand him and it’s his responsibility to understand me, understand my personality, my needs, my company’s desires and that’s where you start to develop the respect for the person.

At the same time, however, instrumental, business-related goals can override service and respect:

I don’t think that [the supplier] always considers their customer first, which would be us, I think they’re much more focused on their own needs like financial budgets and targets […] it isn’t enough for us to want to buy from somebody else […] there’s still a lot more of the good than the bad […] but if you asked me, are they one of your best, easiest; or is it one of the suppliers that you have the most respect for […] I would say no.

Given the theoretical connections between relationship marketing, the service-dominant logic of marketing, and respect, combined with findings from this second set interviews, I propose that a service-dominant (vs. goods-dominant) orientation towards marketing relationships should moderate the importance and impact of respect in these relationships.

5.6 Conclusion for this Chapter

In this chapter, I first presented a preliminary model of the role of respect in business-to-business marketing relationships. This model emerged from the literature review and the initial exploratory interviews. The model anticipates that respect will result in the key outcome variables of citizenship behaviours, commitment, and cooperation, and that respect’s relationship with these outcome variables occurs as a result of the positive (negative) emotions that respect (lack of respect) incurs. In contrast, trust is anticipated to result in the key outcome variables of
commitment and cooperation because relationship partners that are reliable incur lower transaction costs.

Then, I summarized the key findings from a second set of exploratory interviews conducted with marketers and managers in wholesaler-distributor firms. A key finding that emerged from these interviews is that while respect matters in some marketing relationships, it is not as important to the relationship outcomes in others. One explanation for this difference is that some marketers and managers follow a more service-dominant orientation in their approach to marketing relationships, whereas others follow a more goods-dominant orientation to these same relationships. This variable – service-dominant orientation – is thus expected to moderate the role of respect in marketing relationships.
Chapter 6

Study 3: Measure Development

6.1 Overview
The purpose of Study 3 was to arrive at a succinct measure of respect to be used in an experimental context. In order to achieve this, fifteen experts engaged in a review of over one hundred respect items that had been generated from the literature and from the interview process.

6.2 Method
Following Churchill (1979), there are eight critical steps involved in measure development: (1) specifying the construct’s domain; (2) generating sample items; (3) collecting data; (4) purifying the measure; (5) collecting more data; (6) assessing reliability; (7) assessing validity; and (8) developing norms. My primary goal in this thesis was not to engage solely in construct development, because this is an enormous task on its own. Instead, I have worked towards uncovering respect’s meaning and demonstrating its importance. Therefore, the construct development activities that I engaged in were not as rigorous as they would have been had I focused solely on measure development; however, I have still followed Churchill’s (1979) general prescriptions.

6.3 Construct Development Activities
In this section, the construct development activities that I engaged in, following Churchill’s outline, are summarized.

6.3.1 Domain Specification
The definition of respect was stated clearly in Chapter 4. To review, respect is defined as follows:
Respect, in the context of an inter-personal relationship, is defined as regarding a relationship partner to be valuable or, in other words, to have worth. Respect is directed at a target. The other person has various aspects (e.g., rights, dignity, characteristics, talents, achievements) that can be respected. Respect is a belief. Respect is not, however, an action or behaviour – respectful actions and behaviours are manifestations of respect.

6.3.2 Sample Item Generation
As per Churchill’s suggestions, I used information from my literature review and from my interviews to generate a list of potential items that tapped various aspects of respect. I made certain to include items that had even small differences in wording to be sure that I captured different interpretations in meaning. A list of over one hundred sample items was generated, and can be reviewed in Appendix F.

6.3.3 Data Collection
Next, marketing experts were asked to assess the appropriateness of each item as part of the domain and definition of respect as well as the overall appropriateness and understandability of each item. Experts ‘judged’ items by completing a questionnaire (see Appendix F). Two parallel questionnaires were developed – one that asked participants to rate items reflecting their respect for another person (9 participants), and one that asked participants to rate items reflecting another person’s respect for them (6 participants). The questionnaires were completed via email.

There were a total of 15 participants, which included business school professors (4), graduate students in business (5), and marketing professionals from a variety of sectors (6). Participants were recruited through Queen’s School of Business, personal contacts at business organizations,
friend/family, and snowballing techniques (see Appendix E for recruitment materials). Diverse perspectives and a range of expertise were sought.

6.3.4 Measure Purification

Given my small sample size and the simplicity of my questionnaire, the most appropriate method to analyze this data was to determine those items deemed most representative of respect across a majority of the experts.

The items that were judged to be most appropriate (e.g., that received a rating of four or more on a seven-point scale for positively worded items) by at least twelve (80%) of respondents were retained for further consideration. Also, suggestions for wording changes were considered. The forty-one items retained are included below. The items in the far right column (relationship respect) were adapted from the original items for potential use as measures of respect in the relationship. See Table 6-1.

Table 6-1 Respect Item Expert Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect for Other</th>
<th>Other's Respect for Me</th>
<th>Relationship Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I value what this person brings to the table</td>
<td>This person values what I bring to the table</td>
<td>People value what relationship partners bring to the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate this person for who they are</td>
<td>This person appreciates me for who I am</td>
<td>People in this relationship are appreciated for who they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person has worth</td>
<td>This person thinks I have worth</td>
<td>People in this relationship believe that the other has worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value this person</td>
<td>This person values me</td>
<td>People in this relationship value each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value this person’s thoughts and opinions and ideas</td>
<td>This person values my thoughts and opinions and ideas</td>
<td>People in this relationship value each other's thoughts, opinions, and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value this person’s knowledge</td>
<td>This person values my knowledge</td>
<td>People in this relationship value each other's knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value this person’s experiences</td>
<td>This person values my experiences</td>
<td>People in this relationship value each other's experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is credible</td>
<td>This person treats me as though I’m credible</td>
<td>People in this relationship treat each other as though they are credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognize this person’s experiences</td>
<td>This person recognizes my experiences</td>
<td>People in this relationship recognize each other's experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate this person’s work</td>
<td>This person appreciates my work</td>
<td>People in this relationship appreciate each other's work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Other</td>
<td>Other's Respect for Me</td>
<td>Relationship Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hold this person in high regard</td>
<td>This person holds me in high regard</td>
<td>People in this relationship hold each other in high regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to understand this person’s vision</td>
<td>This person tries to understand my vision</td>
<td>People in this relationship try to understand each other's vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regard this person highly</td>
<td>This person regards me highly</td>
<td>People in this relationship regard each other highly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an honest relationship with this person</td>
<td>This person has an honest relationship with me</td>
<td>This is an honest relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is important</td>
<td>This person thinks I am important</td>
<td>People in this relationship think the other is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this person has a useful perspective</td>
<td>This person thinks I have a useful perspective</td>
<td>People in this relationship think the other has a useful perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person’s opinion is important</td>
<td>My opinion is important to this person</td>
<td>People's opinions are important in this relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person deserves my consideration</td>
<td>This person is considerate towards me</td>
<td>In this relationship, people are considerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in this person’s thoughts and opinions</td>
<td>This person is interested in my thoughts and opinions</td>
<td>People in this relationship are interested in each other's thoughts and opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person has a good reputation</td>
<td>This person treats me as though I have a good reputation</td>
<td>People treat each other as though they have good reputations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give regard to this person’s views</td>
<td>This person gives regard to my views</td>
<td>People in this relationship give regard to each other's views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider this person’s ideas and opinions</td>
<td>This person considers my ideas and opinions</td>
<td>People in this relationship consider each other's ideas and opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept this person</td>
<td>This person accepts me</td>
<td>In this relationship, people are accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value the ways in which this person might be different</td>
<td>This person values the ways in which I might be different</td>
<td>People in this relationship value the ways in which the other might be different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I admire this person’s achievements</td>
<td>This person admires my achievements</td>
<td>People in this relationship admire each other's achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hold regard for this person’s achievements</td>
<td>This person holds my achievements in high regard</td>
<td>People in this relationship hold each other's achievements in high regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person conducts him/herself with integrity</td>
<td>This person considers me to have integrity</td>
<td>People in this relationship consider the other to have integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think highly of this person</td>
<td>This person thinks highly of me</td>
<td>People in this relationship think highly of each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hold this person’s skills in high regard</td>
<td>This person holds my skills in high regard</td>
<td>People in this relationship hold each other's skills in high regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am equal to this person</td>
<td>This person treats me as their equal</td>
<td>People in this relationship treat each other as equals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognize this person’s 'personhood'</td>
<td>This person recognizes my 'personhood'</td>
<td>People in this relationship recognize each other's personhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident about this person</td>
<td>This person treats me as though they have confidence in me</td>
<td>People in this relationship treat each other as though they have confidence in them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept this person’s differences</td>
<td>This person accepts my differences</td>
<td>People in this relationship accept each other's differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept this person even what I don’t understand</td>
<td>This person accepts me even what they don’t understand</td>
<td>People in this relationship accept in the other even what they don't understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person usually has good reason for his/her beliefs</td>
<td>This person respects my beliefs</td>
<td>People in this relationship respect each other's beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not value this person’s participation</td>
<td>This person does not value my participation</td>
<td>People in this relationship don't value each other's participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not value this person’s judgment</td>
<td>This person does not value my judgment</td>
<td>People in this relationship don't value each other's judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Other</td>
<td>Other’s Respect for Me</td>
<td>Relationship Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not value this person’s</td>
<td>This person does not value my thoughts and opinions</td>
<td>People in this relationship don't value each other's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoughts and opinions and</td>
<td>and ideas</td>
<td>thoughts, opinions, and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not take this person’s</td>
<td>This person does not take my ideas and views</td>
<td>People in this relationship don't take each other's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas and views seriously</td>
<td>seriously</td>
<td>ideas and views seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not take this person’s</td>
<td>This person does not take my experiences seriously</td>
<td>People in this relationship don't take each other's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td>experiences seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not have</td>
<td>This person treats me as though I have nothing to</td>
<td>People in this relationship don’t have anything to offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anything to offer</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.5 Data Collection, Reliability and Validity Assessment, and Norm Development

In the experiment outlined in Chapter 7, additional data were collected, which were useful in assessing the reliability and validity of the respect measure, and in developing norms around this construct.

### 6.4 Conclusion for this Chapter

In this chapter, I summarized the measure development process. First, a list of over one hundred respect items was generated from the literature and from the exploratory interviews. Then, these items were subject to an expert item analysis by fifteen experts. Following this procedure, forty-one potential respect items remained. This list of items was later refined for inclusion in the experiment.
Chapter 7

Study 4: Experiment to Test Model of Respect

7.1 Overview

In this chapter, I present the theoretical rationale, hypotheses, method, and results pertaining to an experiment that tested a model of respect’s role in business-to-business marketing relationships. This study represents a culmination of the previous work – it helped to both refine and test a measure of respect, and to test proposed relationships between respect and various outcome variables that matter in marketing relationships.

7.2 Final Model of Respect in B2B Marketing Relationships

In this study, I investigate the relationship between respect, self-esteem, emotion, trust, transaction costs, citizenship behaviours, commitment, word-of-mouth, and a service-dominant orientation. I also incorporate specific components of respect and trust into the model as antecedent variables. The variables included in this study differ somewhat from those proposed in the preliminary model (Chapter 5). These changes were made in light of additional theoretical considerations and reflection. At the same time however, the final model continues to capture the fundamental premise of this research – that, as Grayson (2007) argues, instrumental and intrinsic orientations often co-exist in business relationships.

Here, I will briefly summarize the variables that are included in the final model and the changes that were made over the earlier version. Later, I will describe each of the variables and their proposed interrelationships in much more detail. Respect is the central variable in this research. Emotion is included in the model because it is expected to result from respect, and because it sheds new insights into marketing relationships. Self-esteem is included as an expected mediator
of the relationship between respect and emotion, because it helps to explain why respect has emotional consequences – in a nutshell, respectful relationships make people feel good about themselves, thus they feel good about the relationship. Trust is included because, as previously explained, it is an important variable in the relationship marketing literature and it is imperative to demonstrate that trust and respect can be discriminated. In the same way that respect is expected to have emotional consequences, trust has rational consequences – it reduces transaction (e.g., monitoring, governance) costs.

The variable citizenship behaviours is included as a unique consequence of respectful relationships. People are expected to engage in extra-role (e.g., helping) behaviours in relationships that they feel good about. Commitment is included as a widely studied relationship marketing outcome variable and is expected to result from both trust and respect. Commitment in this model includes not only affective or felt commitment, but also proxies for behavioural commitment (i.e., expectations of continuity and willingness to invest). Word-of-mouth is included because word-of-mouth is deemed to be an ultimate outcome variable in business relationships (Palmatier et al. 2006). I eliminated cooperation, which was an outcome variable in the earlier model, for two reasons: (1) because I had to limit the number of constructs to keep survey length reasonable, and (2) because conceptually, cooperation is more accurately assessed in a dyadic fashion whereas this study only explored one side of the relationship. For all of the final outcome variables, distinctions are made as to the target of the outcome variables – the individual or the company. A service-dominant orientation is expected to moderate the impact of respect on the relationship outcomes. Given the experimental nature of this research, individual-level components of respect and trust are included, as these also serve as manipulation checks for the scenario conditions of respect and trust.
See Figure 7-1 for a complete overview of the model. While some of these relationships have been demonstrated in previous research, by incorporating respect, self-esteem, emotion, citizenship behaviours, and a service-dominant orientation, I am building on and enhancing existing models to better understand each variable’s impact.
Figure 7-1  Final Model
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7.3 Variables in the Model

In this section, each of the model’s variables is described in detail. The rationale for the relationships between these variables is grounded in the interview findings, the literature, and theoretical insights – the hypotheses are provided in the next section.

7.3.1 Respect

The definition of respect evolved out of the literature review and the preliminary interviews. Respect, in the context of an interpersonal relationship, is defined as regarding a relationship partner to be valuable or, in other words, to have worth. Respect is directed at the other person who has various aspects (e.g., rights, dignity, characteristics, talents, achievements) that can be respected. Respect is a belief. It is not an action or behaviour – these are manifestations of respect.

For the purpose of this study, respect is conceptualized as a feature of an interpersonal relationship. In fact, both respect and trust are conceptualized as interpersonal, relationship variables – as phenomena that occur between individuals or boundary spanners from different organizations rather than between larger groups (such as departments or organizations). This level of analysis is warranted because, according to Palmatier et al. (2006), past research has demonstrated that individuals will be more confident in their judgments of other people versus organizations, and that these judgments will be more likely to result in actual behaviours. Therefore, it is meaningful to study respect at the level of the individual (versus organizational) interaction.

Respect is conceptualized as a unidimensional construct. This stands in contrast to Darwall’s (1977) conclusion that there are two types of respect – recognition- and appraisal-based – and the
interview findings which seemed to reflect these same two types. I conclude, however, that recognition of the person and appraisal of the person are two different antecedents to respect. As such, evaluations of the person as a moral agent or evaluations of the person’s merits result in respect for that person. Regardless of the source of respect, the core of respect remains the same – it is valuing that person and deeming them to be worthy.

7.3.2 Trust

Trust has been variously defined in the literature. For the purpose of this study, the definition is taken from Doney and Cannon (1997, p. 36), who define trust in another person as “the perceived credibility and benevolence of a target of trust”. In other words, it is a belief that another party is reliable. In contrast, respect is recognizing and valuing the other’s personhood, rights, merits, or talents. Trust exists independent of respect and vice-versa. For example, I may not value another person’s thoughts and opinions, even though I trust that she will stay true to her promises.

This definition of trust has been chosen from amongst the many that have been proposed, because it reflects the way in which trust has been defined across the literature. Geyskens, Steenkamp, and Kumar (1998), in a meta-analysis of trust in channel relationships, similarly found that trust was primarily viewed as honesty/reliability and benevolence. In my research, I interpret benevolence as not necessarily working in the best interests of the other party, but rather as non-malfeasance, which means not intentionally harming the other party (as per Cronin 2003).

Support for this interpretation is found in Jap’s (1999) study of B2B alliances, which includes a construct labeled ‘beliefs in interpersonal trustworthiness’, defined as “the ability to predict the actions of the other party in the relationship reliably and the belief that the other party will not act opportunistically if given the chance to do so” (p. 466). Some definitions of trust have highlighted integrity as an important component (Morgan and Hunt 1994; Nicholson, Compeau,
and Sethi 2001), however, Moorman, Deshpande, and Zaltman (1993) found integrity to be a predictor of trust, and therefore it is not included in the current definition.

Trust is conceptualized, like respect, as a feature of relationships. In other words, if a relationship is characterized by trust, each party will trust the other, and each party will perceive that the other party trusts them. Fang, Palmatier, Scheer, and Li (2008) have noted that trust can in fact be measured at three levels – between firms, within an organization (e.g., firm’s trust for employees), and between individuals from different organizations. Similarly, Doney and Cannon (1997) differentiate between salesperson and supplier firm trust. Therefore, it is appropriate to conceptualize trust at the level of the interpersonal interaction and relationship.

Trust is a temporary, situation-dependent state rather than a personality characteristic (Ross and LaCroix 1996). Trust is incremental – it is built over time as people or parties interact with one another (Butler 1999; Morrow, Hanson, and Pearson 2004).

### 7.3.3 Self-Esteem

Self-esteem is a person’s sense of value or worth about him/herself (Rosenberg 1979, p. 54). In marketing, self-esteem has been studied in a consumer research context (e.g., Mandel and Smeesters 2008), but to my knowledge, has not been substantially incorporated in business-to-business research. In research on justice and the group-value model, researchers have found that justice – which includes elements of respect – impacts on self-esteem (e.g., Smith and Tyler 1997). Self-esteem can be conceptualized as a more general trait or as a specific state (Leary et al. 1998). In my research, I focus on state self-esteem, because it is specific to a particular interaction and relationship.
Leary et al. (1998) explain that, according to self-verification theory, people with low levels of trait self-esteem might prefer things that reinforce their negative self-views, for example, critical and rejecting feedback. Leary et al.’s research, however, did not find evidence that trait self-esteem moderates state self-esteem. In my research, I am therefore comfortable capturing only state self-esteem.

7.3.4 Emotion
Emotion is defined as a “mental state of readiness that arises from cognitive appraisals of events or thoughts; has a phenomenological tone; is accompanied by physiological processes; is often expressed physically (e.g., in gestures, posture, facial features); and may result in specific actions to affirm or cope with the emotion” (Bagozzi, Gopinath, and Nyer 1999, p. 184). This definition implies that emotions have a specific referent (e.g., a specific incident or person or relationship). Emotions have been conceptualized as bi-polar (e.g., happy vs. sad) and unipolar (e.g., very happy vs. not at all happy); Bagozzi, Gopinath, and Nyer (1999) recommend a unipolar conceptualization. Emotions can be analyzed at a specific level (e.g., joy, sadness), or they can be conceptualized in general terms as positive versus negative (e.g., Chaudhuri 2002; Huang 2001; Laros and Steenkamp 2005; Lee et al. 2008) as exemplified by the circumplex model of affect (Russell 1980). Lawler’s affect theory of social exchange is a foundation for my work, and Lawler also views emotions following the circumplex model of emotion. My interest is in more general (rather than specific) emotions because my concern is whether, not what, emotional consequences arise from respect.

Marketers have studied emotions in a variety of contexts, for example, in consumption and product usage situations, in the context of services and favourite possessions, and in relation to satisfaction (Richins 1997). Emotions are known to occur within the context of interpersonal
relationships (Burkitt 1997), therefore it is also appropriate to study emotions in buyer-seller relationships. Social exchange theory (Homans 1958), a foundational theory in marketing, has historically regarded exchange partners as ‘rational actors’ and has largely ignored the emotional forces intertwined in these interactions. Similar to recent developments in social exchange theory that incorporate the role of emotion (Lawler and Thye 1999), there is room to include both rational and emotional forces in our understanding of B2B marketing relationships. According to Lawler’s work on social exchange theory, repeated social exchanges serve not only to reduce the uncertainty of relationship partners, but also to create an ‘emotional buzz’. The role of emotions in a B2B context, however, has been minimally addressed. Kiely (2005), one of few examples, has investigated the interpretation and management of emotions in cargo services relationships. Bagozzi (2006, p. 457) makes an excellent case for why we need to start integrating emotion into our understanding of B2B interactions:

Business-to-business relationships are not atomistic occurrences between distinct entities so much as they are mutual, social constructions whereby the parties to the relationship jointly commit themselves to satisfying commonly held goals […] and come to see their relationship as ‘us’ or ‘we’ in its broadest sense and in their dealings with each other. […] Perhaps in the end, we will come to see that business-to-business marketing, in general, and salesperson-customer relationships, in particular, require a new conceptualization where rational and emotional forces are considered together within the penumbra of a truly social-centered framework that recognizes that people and nature are in this thing called life together.

7.3.5 Transaction Costs
Transaction costs are those costs and efforts required to develop and maintain a relationship, monitor relationship partners, and guard against opportunism (Pilling, Crosby, and Jackson 1994; Rindfleisch and Heide 1997). Transaction cost economics (Williamson 1979; 1981) has been applied in the marketing literature as transaction cost analysis, or TCA (e.g., Joshi and Campbell 2003; Joshi and Stump 1999). Much of TCA research explores the governance mechanisms that are required to solve certain governance problems. These governance problems result from the
fact that marketing relationship partners are expected to act in their own self-interest ('opportunism'). Because relationship partners can’t know everything ('bounded rationality'), they need to actively guard against opportunism. In this context, governance mechanisms result in transaction costs related to establishing a relationship and negotiating a particular agreement, and also monitoring the relationship and enforcing agreements on an ongoing basis (Rindfleisch and Heide 1997).

These costs may be ex-post (during relationship initiation) or ex-ante (during the course of the interaction). King (2007) outlines three general categories of transaction costs – finding partners, negotiating agreements, and monitoring/enforcing compliance with agreements. In my research, only ex-ante transaction costs will be considered because I am studying the ongoing relationship. Therefore, costs associated with monitoring and enforcing compliance with agreements are most relevant.

### 7.3.6 Citizenship Behaviours

Citizenship behaviours refer to an employee’s extra-role behaviours (e.g., helping) towards his/her organization ('organizational citizenship behaviours') or towards another employee ('interpersonal citizenship behaviours'). Interpersonal citizenship behaviours are defined as occurring when people “assist one another beyond their job requirements in such a way that results, either directly or indirectly, in enhanced individual job performance and ultimately contributes to group and organizational functioning” (Bowler and Brass 2006, p. 70). Netemeyer et al. (1997) summarize common elements of citizenship behaviours: they are above and beyond what is formally prescribed in an organizational role, discretionary, not directly/explicitly rewarded, and important for effective/successful organizational functioning. In the organizational literatures, citizenship behaviours are typically an intra-organizational phenomenon (e.g., directed
at employees from the same organization). In a few instances, however, this variable has been extended to employees from different organizations (e.g., Ahearne, Bhattacharya, and Gruen 2005). Settoon and Mossholder (2002) call for more research that investigates citizenship behaviours in a relational context. In my research, interpersonal citizenship behaviours are conceptualized as extra-role behaviours directed at a relationship partner who is a member of another organization.

In the organizational research, there is significant evidence that citizenship behaviours have important outcomes. Specifically, citizenship behaviours contribute “to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ 1997, p. 91). Interpersonal citizenship behaviors have a number of positive consequences – they enhance productivity, free up resources, and increase the stability of organizational performance (Podsakoff et al. 2000).

Citizenship behaviours have not been widely researched in a marketing context, despite their ability to impact on overall relationship performance. A small group of marketers have looked at citizenship behaviours in a sales context (Chang and Dubinsky 2004; Netemeyer et al. 1997; Piercy et al. 2006), in a services context (Bettencourt 1997), in a professional association context (Gruen and Acito 2000), in an intra-organizational volunteerism context (Peloza and Hassay 2006), and as a consequence of customer-company identification (Ahearne, Bhattacharya, and Gruen 2005).

7.3.7 Commitment

Commitment has been defined in the marketing literature as “an implicit or explicit pledge of relational continuity between exchange partners” (Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh 1987, p. 19), “an exchange partner believing that an ongoing relationship with another is so important as to warrant
maximum efforts at maintaining it” (Morgan and Hunt 1994, p. 23), and “a desire to develop a
stable relationship, a willingness to make short-term sacrifices to maintain the relationship, and a
confidence in the stability of the relationship” (Anderson and Weitz 1992, p. 19). The definition
of commitment for the purpose of this study, adapted from these seminal works, is simply stated
as ‘a desire, effort, and intention to maintain a relationship’. This definition for commitment has
been chosen because it captures the core meaning of commitment that is common across different
definitions, and eliminates the peripheral aspects of commitment that may conceptually overlap
with other constructs in this study (e.g., the concept of sacrifice may overlap with citizenship
behaviours).

In terms of outcome variables, there are many that could be studied in the context of marketing
relationships, such as loyalty, relationship satisfaction, or relationship quality. Commitment has
been selected as one of the focal outcome variables for this study because it has been widely
researched. Including this variable will allow a comparison of the results incorporating respect
and emotion to other research where commitment is an outcome. Rylander, Strutton, and Pelton
(1997) suggest that commitment is a key construct in the relationship marketing paradigm. In
their review of the literature, they conclude that commitment leads to the important consequences
of satisfaction with the relationship, long-term relationships, and greater returns on investment.
Commitment also affects important behaviours, such as switching intentions and willingness to
pay (Fullerton 2003).

Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp (1995) have pointed out that affective commitment, expectations
of continuity, and willingness to invest are often considered three dimensions of commitment in
the relationship marketing literature. Grundlach, Achrol, and Mentzer (1995) similarly suggest
three components of commitment: (1) attitudinal, (2) temporal, and (3) instrumental. Based on
Kumar and colleagues’ typology, the affective dimension is a psychological, belief-based variable, while expectations of continuity and willingness to invest capture the intention to perform certain commitment-related behaviours.

*Affective Commitment.* Affective commitment is defined as a “desire to maintain a relationship because of positive affect toward the partner” (Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp 1995, p. 251) and as such, it captures the ‘desire’ portion of commitment. The definition provided by Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp makes explicit the fact that this type of commitment is expected to result from positive emotions (this will be further explored when I explain the hypothesized relationships in detail).

*Expectations of Continuity.* Expectations of continuity are “the firm’s and the partner’s intent to remain in the relationship, which, thereby, reflect the relationship’s stability” (Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp 1995, p. 351). Given the fundamental assumption in relationship marketing that enduring relationships are desirable, expectations of continuity represent an ideal outcome from a firm’s perspective.

*Willingness to Invest.* Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp (1995, p. 351) define willingness to invest as “a desire to do more than just remain – it is an intention to become more deeply involved in the relationship through investments of capital and effort”. Willingness to invest is an important outcome variable, because it captures a party’s instrumental commitment to a relationship and that party’s willingness to take risks within the relationship.

**7.3.8 Word-of-Mouth**

Word-of-mouth is defined as “the likelihood that a customer will refer a seller positively to another potential customer” (Palmatier et al. 2006, p. 140). Word-of-mouth is a form of
communication that may reflect either actual positive referrals (Harrison-Walker 2001) or intended positive referrals (Brown et al. 2005), and can be measured as such (de Matos and Rossi 2008).

Word-of-mouth may be the best indicator of “intense loyalty” because it assesses a relationship partner’s willingness to risk its own reputation for the sake of another company. “Only customers who have strong relationships with sellers are willing to risk their own reputation by giving a referral” (Palmatier et al. 2006, p. 147). Word-of-mouth is frequently measured as an outcome variable in the marketing literature (e.g., Brown et al. 2005). Harrison-Walker (2001) cites word-of-mouth communication as, in some cases, the ultimate product success factor. Word-of-mouth can be described as both an attitudinal and behavioural variable (Palmatier et al. 2006).

### 7.4 Hypotheses

Based on the above definitions of key constructs, the following section provides theoretical and practical explanations for the proposed interrelationships between constructs.

#### 7.4.1 Components of Respect

In order to manipulate respect, it was important to consider the behavioural variables that would communicate respect or lack of respect. While respect is conceptualized in this research primarily as a relationship phenomenon, perceptions of relationship respect are preceded by a combination of individual-level variables – the behaviours that contribute to a person’s feeling of being respected (see “Feel Respected” in Figure 7-1) and a person’s respect for a relationship partner (see “Respect Other”).

To select behavioural variables that would impact on a person’s feeling of being respected, I looked back at the results of the in-depth interviews and the literature review. Two key
behavioural variables emerged in the elite interviews around the meaning of respect – being listened to, and being truly understood as a whole person.

Miller (2001) provides a strong argument of why being listened to, or “voice”, is related to respect. He argues that voice – defined as both the opportunity to speak and the experience of being listened to – is considered a fundamental entitlement in our society. Thus, when a person is denied voice, or when they are not listened to, then they will feel that they have been treated unjustly or disrespected – conversely, one can assume that if they are afforded voice, they will feel respected. Other researchers have empirically demonstrated that when people judge a group’s processes to be fair (e.g., if they are afforded voice), then they will have the feeling that they are respected (Tyler and Blader 2002).

In terms of understanding, Dillon (1992) describes a particular form of “care respect” as one in which relationship partners truly pay attention to human particularities and context, which makes it appropriate to treat individuals differently – in other words, respect is about understanding the other person at an individual level. Similarly, Joh (2001), in his theory on respect, suggests that it is about recognizing that people are distinct and have different desires, interests, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours – in other words, relationship partners need to be understood in order to be respected. As I noted earlier, Yvette, one of the informants in the interview process, summarized the importance of both voice and understanding as follows:

Respect to me is understanding that people might have different points of view, understanding that they may be coming from a different place, but making sure that you listen to where they’re coming from, that you try to understand where they’re coming from, that at the end of the day, a lot of the people that you work with will have a ton of experience that is probably divergent from your own, and you probably have a lot to gain from listening and understanding them.
Therefore, these two behaviours – voice and understanding – are hypothesized as antecedent components of a person’s feeling of being respected in a relationship.

\[ H1a \] – A relationship partner’s feeling of being respected increases if his/her voice is encouraged in the relationship.

\[ H1b \] – A relationship partner’s feeling of being respected increases when he/she is understood (as a whole person) in a relationship.

The behavioural variables that are expected to impact a person’s respect for the other are based primarily on theoretical considerations. In Chapter 2, I noted Darwall’s (1977) distinction between recognition respect (deserved by all people) and appraisal respect (earned or merit-based). A relationship partner’s respect for another will be driven in part by their general tendency to respect others (recognition respect), but will also be motivated by the other’s ability to earn their respect. Through the interviews, I learned there are many different reasons why we respect others, and that these depend on what we value as unique individuals. However, one common characteristic that is widely valued is integrity. (This is even reflected in Kant’s notion that all humans are worthy of respect because they are moral agents who are capable of responsible action, see Bowie 1999.) Therefore, a person’s principled behaviour should earn respect from his/her relationship partner.

\[ H2a \] – A relationship partner’s respect for the other increases when the other engages in principled behaviour.

A key objective of this research is to demonstrate that respect is different from trust. However, it is still important to acknowledge the potential relationship between these two variables. Reliability is a primary antecedent of trust, as I will explain. However, it is also possible that
reliable relationship partners earn respect as a result of this often valued interpersonal characteristic. Therefore, reliability is hypothesized to be the second behavioural variable that will result in a person’s respect for the other.

\[ H2b – A relationship partner’s respect for the other increases when the other demonstrates reliability. \]

7.4.2 Components of Trust

In order to manipulate trust, as with respect, it was important to consider the behavioural variables that would communicate trust or lack of trust in a relationship. The behavioural variables that I ultimately chose – reliability, non-malfeasance, and formalization of contracts – arose from the definition of trust offered by Doney and Cannon (1997): “the perceived credibility and benevolence of a target of trust” (p. 36). Credibility is the expectation that another party’s promise can be relied upon – in other words, it is perceived reliability. Benevolence is interpreted here as one party not intending to harm the other – termed “non-malfeasance”. While the issue of contracts is not explicitly outlined in Doney and Cannon’s definition, in trust research in general, formal contracts are a governance mechanism – the fewer formal contracts that are required, the higher the level of trust must be.

Specifically, I expect that a person will have more trust in a relationship partner (“Trust Other”) that they can rely on, and who demonstrates they would not intentionally cause harm. I also expect that a person will feel more trusted (“Feel Trusted”) if their relationship partner does not require them to sign formal contracts for all details of an agreement. This is summarized in the following hypotheses.
H3a – A relationship partner’s trust for the other increases when the other demonstrates reliability.

H3b – A relationship partner’s trust for the other increases when the other demonstrates non-malfeasance.

H4 – A relationship partner’s feeling of being trusted increase when the other requires fewer formal contracts.

7.4.3 Perceptions of Respectful and Trusting Relationships

As stated in Hypotheses 1 and 2, individual level behaviours are expected to result in perceptions of respect for and of the other. These perceptions should, in turn, contribute to overall assessments of respect at the level of the relationship. The relationship between these variables is straightforward – a person’s assessment of being involved in a respectful relationship will result from both his/her feeling of being respected, as well as his/her respect for the other.

It is possible that a person’s feeling of being respected in a relationship could result in greater respect for that relationship partner, or vice-versa. In fact, the interview findings were inconclusive regarding the reciprocity of respect. In some cases respect could be one-sided and still be authentic, and in other cases respect had to be reciprocated in order to result in perceptions of respectful relationships. However, the current study was not aimed at teasing out the fine details regarding respect’s directionality, therefore simple predictions are made – perceptions of relationship respect are increased when either person A respects person B, person A feels respected by person B, or both.
H5a – The perception that a relationship is respectful increases when a person respects the other.

H5b – The perception that a relationship is respectful increases when a person feels respected.

To ensure parallel treatment of both respect and trust, the same logic was applied to respect such that perceptions of trust in a relationship should increase when person A trusts person B, person A feels trusted by person B, or both.

H6a – The perception that a relationship is trusting increases when a person trusts the other.

H6b – The perception that a relationship is trusting increases when a person feels trusted.

7.4.4 Relationship between Respect, Self-Esteem, and Emotion

The preliminary interviews provided evidence that perceived respect has emotional outcomes. Respectful relationships cause the informants to feel excitement and fulfillment, or just a general sense of ‘feeling good’. Relationships where there is a lack of respect similarly result in feeling frustrated, angry, or indignant.

The connection between respect and emotion has been acknowledged in past literature. The philosophy literature has noted this connection (Ellemers, Doosje, and Spears 2003; Seidler 1986; Simon and Stürmer 2003). Also, in the social and organizational psychology literature, Barclay, Skarlicki, and Pugh (2005) found that interactional justice, a component of respect, had emotional outcomes. Similarly, Buckley, Winkel, and Leary (2004) found that acceptance or rejection (i.e., being valued or not valued) had emotional outcomes. Berry and Lampo (2004), in a conceptual
paper on the branding of services, suggest that ‘humanistic clues’ – the stimuli that emanate from people, such as performing with respect – tend to be interpreted emotionally rather than rationally by customers.

There are theoretical reasons why one would expect respect to have emotional outcomes. Following appraisal theory, as described by Lazarus (1991), emotions arise in response to an appraisal of some incident in which a person has a personal stake. An incident where a person’s social- or self-esteem is affected would be considered one in which that person has a personal stake. Because respect by definition is about the inherent value or worth of a person in a relationship, it is tightly connected to a person’s self-worth or self-esteem. Rosenberg (1979) defines self-esteem as “a positive or negative orientation toward an object … When we characterize a person as having high self-esteem … we mean, rather, that he has self-respect, considers himself a person of worth” (p. 54). There is empirical evidence in group-value research that respect from group members has implication for self-esteem (Smith and Tyler 1997) – because a group’s respect towards an individual conveys that individual’s value to the group, it also impacts their sense of personal value or worth.

According to sociometer theory, which has been empirically validated (Leary et al. 1998), “others’ reactions exert such a strong effect on self-esteem because the self-esteem system itself is a subjective monitor or gauge of the degree to which the individual is being included and accepted versus excluded and rejected by other people” (p. 1290). Leary et al.’s theory is drawn from Charles Horton Cooley’s concept of the ‘looking glass self’, which suggests that our view of ourselves grows from our perceptions of what others think of us. More recent empirical work has found that this relationship holds regardless of whether a person believes that they are impacted by others’ regard for them (Leary et al. 2003). Because people’s feelings about themselves
reflect in part how they perceive others feel about them, the level of respect that a person observes in a relationship should impact their feelings about themselves.

Based on appraisal theory, if an incident is congruent with a person’s goals, then positive emotions will result and if it is incongruent, negative emotions will result. Thus, if a person is engaged with another in a relationship in which there is respect, it will reinforce their positive self-worth or self-esteem (which is goal congruent) and they will experience positive emotions. If, on the other hand, a person perceives that they are engaged in a relationship that is not filled with respect, this will challenge their self-esteem (which is goal incongruent) and they will experience negative emotions. This conclusion is based on the assumption that people generally prefer to have positive self-views and that, even if their existing self-views are negative (i.e., low trait self-esteem), this will not moderate their reaction to things that enhance their self-esteem in a particular context (see Leary et al. 1998). In the preliminary interviews, Erin’s comments support this theoretical explanation:

I think it would be hard for a lot of people to feel that someone doesn’t respect them. I think that really goes to you know the core of who they are, most people want to feel respect.

In comparing respect to trust, trust in a relationship is not as tightly connected to a person’s self-esteem because it is not about relationship partners’ inherent worth, rather it is about believability and non-malfeasance. If respect exists in a relationship, then parties are essentially saying to each other – you are valuable and you have worth. Thus, each party feels a greater sense of self-worth or self-esteem and is expected to react positively to this affirmation (following the predictions of appraisal theory). If trust exists in a relationship, then parties are essentially saying to each other – you have demonstrated (either in the past or through some other cues) that you can be relied upon to act in a way that is true to your word. Thus, each party feels a greater sense of certainty
about and confidence in the relationship, as well as a reduced need for monitoring the actions of
the other party. To summarize, when there is respect in a relationship, it feels better to have that
relationship because parties are made to feel good about themselves. When there is trust in a
relationship, it works better because parties have more certainty about the outcomes of the
relationship and do not incur governance costs.

In Lazarus’ (1991) discussion of appraisal theory, knowledge is distinguished from appraisal.
When knowledge has no personal significance, then it is non-emotional or ‘cold’. When
knowledge becomes relevant to personal well-being, then it becomes emotional or ‘hot’. Trust in
the proposed model is not personally significant to the same degree that respect is. Trust is about
reliability and non-malfeasance, whereas respect is about inherent value and worth. Therefore,
trust is expected to be ‘colder’ and respect ‘hotter’.

Lazarus (1991) makes predictions about the specific kinds of emotions that result from different
experiences. When a person experiences a goal incongruent incident in which their ego-identity
is attacked (i.e., lack of respect in a relationship), anger and anger-related emotions are expected
to result (e.g., indignation, irritation, annoyance, dislike, bitterness). When a person experiences
a goal congruent incident in which self- and/or social-esteem is enhanced (i.e., respect in a
relationship), one would expect happiness or happiness-related emotions to result (e.g., enjoyed,
satisfied, gratified, glad, delighted). However, my research is more concerned about whether, and
not what, emotions result from respect in relationships. Thus, the following predictions are made:
H7a – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in more positive (negative) emotions – for example, emotions in the family of happiness (anger).

H7b – The relationship between respect and emotion will be mediated by self-esteem. In other words, respect (lack of respect) makes a person feel better (worse) about the self, which in turn creates positive (negative) emotions.

In addition to the mediation hypothesized above, I propose that trust will moderate the relationship between respect and emotion. Under conditions where trust is low, it will be difficult for respectful relationships to result in strong, positive emotions. This is because even though the relationship may be fulfilling at a personal level, the relationship partners will always worry about their ability to fulfill the business objectives. Under conditions where trust is high, however, the relationship between respect and emotion will be the strongest. In this case, relationship partners will be able to experience positive emotions when there is respect because they can feel confident that, aside from their positive interpersonal relationship, the business transaction can be successfully achieved. On the other hand, when there is lack of respect – even in the case of high trust – the relationship partners will experience negative emotions that arise from lack of respect. The impact of trust on the relationship between respect and emotion is depicted in Figure 7-2.
This is outlined in the following hypothesis.

\[ H7c (i) – The relationship between respect and positive emotion will be moderated by trust. In other words, respect makes a person feel even better when there is trust. \]

\[ H7c (ii) – The relationship between respect and negative emotion will be moderated by trust. In other words, lack of respect makes a person feel even worse when there is lack of trust. \]

### 7.4.5 Relationship between Respect/Emotion and Citizenship Behaviours

The interview findings support a positive relationship between respect and interpersonal citizenship behaviours – informants suggested that a respected party will provide more help and support, put more effort and energy into the exchange, and will even be willing to bend over backwards for the other. The following conversation with Lana articulates this relationship:

Interviewer: Can you expand on that a little bit more, understanding the person versus just the business relationship?
Lana: Let’s say with some suppliers I only meet them for brief meetings, or deal with them through email and phone calls that are relatively short. With this one particular supplier, I had to travel relatively long distances, like a few hours in the car, to meetings with, I’ve had lunch a few times with them. There’s one in particular, the one contact I have in particular as well as I have ridden the subway with her, had a chance to talk to them about things above and beyond just work, so I understand more where they’re coming from, so we’ve made a connection at a personal level.

Interviewer: OK, and how does that change things?

Lana: I think you can, the person becomes more rounded, I guess. You understand, I’ve found connections with them, outside of the office that we have to talk about briefly, the, sort of the neighbourhood we live in, or things that are going on in the city. That sort of thing. And so it’s more than just working with a supplier, it’s like working with a friend, I guess.

Interviewer: How does that change the business relationship then?

Lana: I think it makes it, just, I think there’s more support going back and forth, it’s not just an email from another supplier, it’s somebody I want to get back to because I appreciate the person perhaps that little bit more as a person.

Interviewer: Does that change the outcomes of the relationship then?

Lana: Maybe at some level, and it’s not to say that I don’t make an effort and my other suppliers don’t make an effort, but me, I think it’s just in that situation, one I feel more comfortable calling up and asking for things that might be a little bit of a stretch in responsibility, but I know they have the capabilities, two I perhaps put more into it myself as well. So perhaps we give a little bit more in the, sort of the work aspect.

Support for this relationship is also found in other research. In the organizational theory literature, a construct called perceived organizational support (POS) is an antecedent to citizenship behaviours (Piercy et al. 2006). POS is a general perception that an organization values and cares for its employees, which reflects the core concept of respect. Similar to arguments made by Settoon and Moosholder (2002) and Spitzmuller, Van Dyne, and Ilies (2008), when people are in supportive or high quality relationships (e.g., relationships that promote well-being), based on social exchange theory and/or norms of reciprocation, people will respond with
citizenship behaviours. Mutual concern and sensitivity are part of the domain of respect. Stürmer, Simon, and Loewy’s (2008) research found that intra-organizational respect (i.e., respect between individuals within an organization) result in higher levels of organizational participation – efforts to contribute to a group’s welfare and goal achievements.

I expect that positive emotions mediate the link between respect and citizenship behaviours because of a norm of reciprocity (Netemeyer et al. 1997) – when people feel good about a relationship, they will do nice things for their relationship partner in order to make them feel good too. Given this, I hypothesize the following:

\[
H8a \text{ – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of interpersonal citizenship behaviours.}
\]

\[
H8b \text{ – The relationship between respect and interpersonal citizenship behaviours is mediated by emotion.}
\]

7.4.6 Relationship between Respect/Emotion and Commitment
The informants in my preliminary research emphasized the way in which respect resulted in greater commitment to the relationship. This is not surprising, as Crosby, Evans, and Cowles (1995) have also argued that interpersonal relationships play a significant role in the anticipation of future interactions. Maslow’s (1943) classic theory of human motivation helps to support the relationship between respect and commitment. Specifically, this theory predicts that people are motivated by their esteem needs. According to Maslow, people’s esteem needs can be fulfilled by respect from other people, recognition, and/or attention. Assuming that people pursue those things that contribute to their esteem and avoid those things that deplete it, we can speculate that...
people will pursue or will want to remain in relationships in which there is respect. They will similarly avoid relationships in which there is a lack of respect.

Lawler and Yoon (1998), in their affect theory of social exchange, assume that people strive to reproduce positive feelings and avoid negative feelings, and that feelings and emotions are attributed in part to the relevant social units. “Emotions are motivating because ‘feeling good’ is positively valued in itself and ‘feeling bad’ is negatively valued in itself” (Lawler 2001, p. 327). This theory predicts that if a positive emotion is attached to a social unit, then a person will develop stronger affective attachments to that social unit and vice-versa. Following these same assumptions, I expect that people should be committed to respectful relationships that generate positive emotions and feelings. Past research has similarly implied a connection between positive emotion and commitment. Sierra and McQuitty (2005) found that when the strength of positive emotions increased, loyalty (i.e., unlikely to switch) to a service brand was positively impacted.

Lazarus’ (1991) appraisal theory can also help us to understand why one would expect emotions to be related to commitment. Appraisal theory divides the appraisal process into two – primary and secondary appraisals. The notion of comparing an incident to one’s goals (as discussed in the previous section) is part of the primary appraisal process. The secondary appraisal is the process of coping with the emotion that is in response to some trigger. Coping is the “cognitive and behavioural efforts to manage specific external or internal demands (and conflicts between them) that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person” (Lazarus 1991, p. 112). There are two types of coping – problem-focused and emotion-focused. Problem-focused coping involves taking action to deal with an emotion. Emotion-focused coping is interpreting or thinking about a relationship in a new way so that the emotion is not felt anymore (e.g., denying the existence of something). If a person experiences a negative emotion in response to a
relationship that lacks respect, it is expected that they will want to alleviate the emotion or the source of the emotion. Therefore, one coping strategy would be to reduce one’s commitment to the relationship. Or, if a person experiences a positive emotion in response to a relationship, it is expected that they would want to continue gaining the benefits of this positive emotion. Therefore, one coping strategy would be to maintain or possibly even increase one’s commitment to the relationship.

As I noted earlier, Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp (1995) (as well as Grundlach, Achrol, and Mentzer 1995) have pointed out that affective commitment, expectations of continuity, and willingness to invest are often considered three dimensions of commitment in the relationship marketing literature. I expect that respect should be positively related to expectations of continuity, mediated by emotion, given the theoretic explanations provided above.

I also expect that respect should be related to affective commitment, but not willingness to invest. The rationale for this argument is again rooted in Lawler’s work. Lawler, Thye, and Yoon (2000) have empirically confirmed that, in the context of social exchange, there are two routes to commitment – an emotional and affective route, as well as an uncertainty-reduction and instrumental route. The affective process produces commitment manifested in expressive forms of commitment, such as gift-giving, and uncertainty-reduction process produces commitment manifested in more instrumental behaviours such as risk-taking. The uncertainty reduction process helps to set the focal relationship apart from alternatives (a ‘boundary defining’ process), whereas the emotional process allows the relationship to become an object of attachment (a ‘social bonding’ process) (Lawler and Yoon 1996). “Through an emotional/affective mechanism, [relationship partners] come to define themselves as a group, ascribe value to the group itself, and become more inclined to stay or continue with the group and to give members token gifts.
Through an uncertainty reduction mechanism, they come to trust their exchange partners and become more willing to partake in ventures that entail risk of malfeasance” (Lawler, Thye, and Yoon 2000, p. 652). Respect is thus expected to result in higher levels of affective commitment, reflecting the emotional attachment process described above. This is in comparison to trust, which is expected to result in greater willingness to invest, reflecting the uncertainty-reduction and risk-taking processes.

Ultimately, my goal was to demonstrate that respect (in addition to trust) has implications that matter not just to people, but also to companies and organizations. As a result, several of the outcome variables pertain specifically to the company rather than the person. In the case of affective commitment, a person’s commitment towards the company is important, but because affective commitment is an emotional variable that may be more strongly felt towards people as compared to non-person entities like organizations, I have included affective commitment towards the person as a hypothesized outcome variable so I do not discount this potential relationship.

H9a – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of affective commitment (i) towards the person and (ii) towards the company.

H9b – The relationship between respect and commitment is mediated by emotion.

H10a – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of expectations of continuity towards the company.

H10b – The relationship between respect and expectations of continuity is mediated by emotion.
7.4.7 Relationship between Respect/Emotion and Word-of-Mouth

I expect that respect will be positively related to word-of-mouth communications. Blodgett, Wakefield, and Barnes (1995) found that respectful treatment (in terms of interactional justice, or courteous and respectful treatment) following a service failure led to positive word-of-mouth. One reason why this relationship is expected to hold is because word-of-mouth, which typically occurs within one’s own reference group, entails an element of risk to one’s own reputation. As a result, people are expected to recommend those relationship partners with whom they have a respectful relationship – they would not want to risk their reputation within their own reference group by recommending a partner with whom the relationship has the potential to be disrespectful. Also, the interview informants – like Sandra – suggested a positive relationship between respect and word-of-mouth.

When people feel good (vs. bad) about a relationship, they will be motivated to talk about that relationship and share it. Researchers de Matos and Rossi (2008) suggest, in their meta-analysis on the antecedents of word-of-mouth, that future research should investigate the affective mechanisms that are related to word-of-mouth. Therefore, I expect that emotion should mediate the positive relationship between respect and positive word-of-mouth.

\[ H11a \] – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of positive word-of-mouth.

\[ H11b \] – The relationship between respect and word-of-mouth is mediated by emotion.

7.4.8 Relationship between Trust and Transaction Costs

Williamson’s transaction cost theory (1979; 1981) suggests several costs are associated with each transaction, ranging from transaction specific investments to the time spent negotiating or
monitoring the relationship partner. When there is trust in a relationship, it is assumed that transaction costs (i.e., time and effort) will decrease because a person will not have to monitor the other party’s actions or enforce negotiated agreements. As Bharadwaj and Matsuno (2006) explain, when exchange partners believe that the other is trustworthy/reliable and will not act opportunistically, there is lower behavioural uncertainty and in turn, lower transaction costs in terms of monitoring and evaluating the other. Similarly, “Trust counterbalances the need for a costly safeguard mechanism against opportunism because of the expectancy held by a supplier that the buyer’s word or written statement can be relied on” (Claro, Hagelaar, and Omta 2003, p. 706; citing Rotter 1980).

These arguments result in the following hypothesis:

\[ H12 – \text{Higher (lower) levels of trust result in lower (higher) transaction costs.} \]

### 7.4.9 Relationship between Trust/Transaction Costs and Commitment

It has been well established in the literature that trust is an important determinant of commitment (e.g., Gounaris 2005; Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande 1992; Morgan and Hunt 1994). My prediction that trust results in commitment is rooted in transaction cost theory (Rindfleisch and Heide 1997), which suggests that trust can reduce governance and monitoring costs (Doney and Cannon 1997). Because trust is conceptualized as incremental, there is a cost to building trust. Therefore, there are costs to switching relationship partners when the current relationship is laden with trust (i.e., the opportunity cost of reduced need for governance, and the time required to build trust in a new relationship) and so partners remain tied to current relationships. Thus, trusting relationships should last longer than non-trusting ones.
I reviewed Lawler, Thye, and Yoon’s (2000) work earlier in which they demonstrated that, in the context of social exchange, there are two routes to commitment – an emotional and affective route, as well as an uncertainty-reduction, instrumental route. Again, the affective process produces commitment manifested in expressive forms of commitment, such as gift-giving, and the uncertainty-reduction process produces commitment manifested in more instrumental behaviours such as risk-taking. As hypothesized earlier, respect is expected to result in higher levels of affective commitment, reflecting the emotional attachment process described above. In contrast, trust is expected to result in higher levels of instrumental commitment, such as risk-taking. A relationship partner’s willingness to invest in a relationship is a clear indication of risk-taking as a form of commitment. This relationship between trust and willingness to invest should be mediated by transaction costs – trust matters to relationship partners because it reduces transaction costs, therefore it is the reason why relationship partners would be willing to invest in each other.
7.4.10 Relationship between Trust/Transaction Costs and Word-of-Mouth

The relationship between trust and positive word-of-mouth is well-documented in the literature (c.f. Garbarino and Johnson 1999). A recent meta-analysis of the antecedents of word-of-mouth found that there is a significant positive effect of trust on word-of-mouth, and that the correlation between trust and word-of-mouth was 0.46 – interpreted as a large effect size (de Matos and Rossi 2008). The rationale for this relationship, as explained by de Matos and Rossi, is that customers will be more likely to recommend providers that they have confidence in, especially because these recommendations are often made to others within one’s own reference group. Also, from a theoretical perspective, people are going to be willing to refer relationship partners that they feel are reliable and will not cause harm. Again, this relationship between trust and word-of-mouth should be mediated by transaction costs – trust matters to relationship partners because it reduces transaction costs, therefore it is the reason why relationship partners would be willing to spread positive word-of-mouth about each other.

As a result, I hypothesize the following:

- **H15a** – Higher (lower) levels of trust result in higher (lower) levels of positive word-of-mouth.
- **H15b** – The relationship between trust and word-of-mouth is mediated by transaction costs.

7.4.11 The Service-Dominant Orientation, Respect, and Trust: A Moderated Interaction

As I explained earlier, my interviews revealed that a service-dominant orientation may determine whether respect will in fact matter in B2B relationships. An underlying assumption of the service-dominant orientation is that participatory relationships are part of the organizational culture. As Vargo and Lusch (2004) clearly point out, “Interactivity, integration, customization,
and co-production are the hallmarks of a service-centered view and its inherent focus on the
customer and the relationship” (p. 11). Also, a service-dominant orientation means relationship
partners are seen as individuals with unique needs – Vargo and Lusch (2004) suggest that the
service-dominant view is about “being adaptive to [customers’] individual and dynamic needs”
(Vargo and Lusch 2004, p. 6). Again, this requires a respectful approach to be successful.

From a theoretical perspective, the fact that respect matters in some relationships but not others
has implications for the outcomes that are hypothesized to result from both respect and trust.
Consider a relationship in which respect matters to the relationship partner (i.e., the relationship
partner has a SD orientation) – in this case, the positive outcomes due to trust will be much
greater when there is also respect, even though lack of both respect and trust will produce the
same negative outcome. Intuitively, this outcome results because respect is important to the
relationship partner. On the other hand, in the case where the relationship partner does not care
about respect (i.e., he/she has a GD orientation), the positive (negative) outcomes due to high
(low) levels of trust will be the same regardless of the level of respect in the relationship.
Intuitively, this is because respect does not matter to the relationship partner, therefore it plays no
role in determining outcomes.

Given this, I make the following prediction, as depicted in Figure 7-3.
7.4.12 Distinction between Respect and Trust

In Chapter 2, a number of arguments were provided as to why respect and trust are different. To review, trust is a belief that another party is credible and will act in a manner that demonstrates non-malfeasance. In contrast, respect is recognizing and valuing the other’s personhood, rights, merits, and talents. Intuitively, even though I trust another person, I may not respect her. For example, I may not respect Charlie’s skills as a marketing manager, even though I trust that she will stay true to her promises. Another distinction between respect and trust is that trust provides
people with a foundation for working together – it is the reason why parties would choose to work together. Respect, on the other hand, is a mechanism or tool that guides and facilitates the process of working together (almost like a 'best practice') – it is how people work together.

Though some researchers have equated trust and respect by measuring these two constructs in the same scale (Drehmer and Grossman 1984; Kickul, Gundry, and Posig 2005), in a majority of cases there are conceptual and empirical arguments that respect and trust are distinct (Baldasare 1995; Brashear, Boles, Bellenger, and Brooks 2003; Cranor 1975; Cronin 2003; Jehn and Mannix 2001; Jurkiewicz and Giacalone 2004; Sennett 2003; Simon, Lücken, and Stürmer 2006).

There are a number of ways that I can empirically demonstrate discriminant validity: through unique antecedents and through distinct outcomes. In the experiment, trust and respect are uniquely manipulated, and manipulation checks are used to determine that these unique manipulations do in fact hold. Trust and respect are also measured, and the fact that items do not cross-load can be interpreted as evidence of discriminant validity. By demonstrating that respect affects the outcome variables through emotion, and trust through transaction costs, respect and trust will be shown to have discriminant validity. Also, establishing citizenship behaviours and affective commitment as unique outcomes of respect, and willingness to invest as a unique outcome of trust, will provide additional support.

7.5 Method

7.5.1 Research Design
A 2x2 (trust: high/low x respect: high/low) between-subjects experiment was designed to test the model depicted in Figure 7-1 and the hypotheses stated above. The experiment was completed online. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions and, after reading a letter
of information and consenting to participate, read a scenario. The order in which the trust and respect manipulations appeared was randomized. After reading the scenario, participants responded to a series of questions (Appendix H).

7.5.2 Pre-Testing
As I worked through the development of this experiment, I conducted various rounds of informal pre-testing. Approximately twenty-five marketing practitioners and academics reviewed the scenarios, completed the trust, respect, and other measures, and provided feedback over a number of iterations. This allowed me to revise the scenarios and the measures in an iterative fashion.

7.5.3 Participants
Participants were recruited through several different organizations/groups. I selected these groups because I anticipated their members would understand the nature of business-to-business buyer-seller relationships. I received cooperation from administrators to contact the members of the following groups: the Canadian Marketing Association (approximately 140 members), the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors (170), University of Saskatchewan MBA alumni (52), Queen’s 2009 AMBA class (86), and Queen’s MBA alumni (61). In addition, an announcement was posted on the portal for the Queen’s National EMBA program, though these individuals were not personally contacted about the research. From the direct mailing list of 509, I received a final response of 124, which represents a response rate of 24%. Responses were screened, and subjects who spent less than 15 seconds reading the scenario page (n = 10) were eliminated because their responses were likely based on insufficient information. This resulted in a final sample size of 114.
7.5.4 Manipulations

The manipulations were developed by creating scenarios that reflected the behaviours anticipated to influence perceptions of respect and trust, as described earlier in Sections 7.4.1 and 7.4.2. These scenarios were reviewed by several marketing academics and practitioners and were revised in an iterative fashion to ensure that there were no conceptual overlaps or reasons for potential confusion. The scenarios are included in Appendix H.

7.5.5 Measures

All scale items are included in full in Appendix H. To create a composite measure for each construct, I calculated the average of the scale items.

Manipulation check. Items for the respect manipulation check were adapted from DeCremer (2002) and were informed by the key findings about respect indicators from the interviews. These items (or behaviours) were summarized in Section 7.4.1. Items for the trust manipulation check were drawn from Doney and Cannon’s (1997) definition of trust, and were summarized in Section 7.4.2.

Respect. To select items for measuring “Feel Respected”, “Respect Other”, and “Relationship Respect”, I used the data that had been collected through the expert item analysis presented in Chapter 6. Using the forty-one items that the experts deemed most representative of respect and with face validity as a primary consideration, I grouped the items based on perceived similarity. I worked to select a subset of items that were non-redundant and that, based on my literature review and interviews, continued to resonate as central to the domain and definition of respect. Feedback from the informal pre-tested assisted with this process.
**Trust.** The items for “Trust Other” were adapted from Jacobs, Hyman, and McQuitty (2001); “Feel Trusted” items were adapted from Salamon and Deutsch (2008) (two of the three items in their scale were adapted and a third item was added to capture non-malfeasance); and the items for “Trusting Relationship” were adapted from Doney and Cannon’s (1997) scale to measure salesperson trust.

**Self-esteem.** No appropriate measure to capture self-esteem for this context could be found in the existing literature. Therefore, this measure was developed based on suggestions directly from Dr. Mark Leary, an expert in self-esteem research.

**Emotions.** An emotions inventory was created for the purpose of this research. I drew a list of emotions from Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, and O’Connor (1987) and Richins (1997) by selecting the emotions that are most relevant to a B2B relationship. The question format is similar to Murry and Dacin (1996), and is also similar to Bagozzi and Dholakia (2006), all of whom have studied emotions in a marketing context.

**Transaction costs.** As Rindfleisch and Heide (1997) note, few researchers in marketing have directly measured transaction costs directly. Instead, measuring monitoring costs is appropriate, since ex-post (vs. ex-ante) costs are the concern. There are several measures of monitoring costs developed by other researchers (e.g., Dahlstrom and Nygaard 1999; Heide, Wathne, and Rokkan 2007; Noordewier, John, and Nevin 1990); however, in each instance, the measure is very specific to the research context (e.g., oil and gas industry). Therefore, the measure of monitoring I have chosen is taken from Stump and Heide (1996).

**Citizenship behaviours.** LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) suggest that “researchers should measure OCB [organizational citizenship behaviours] in a manner that is consistent with how
behavioural performance constructs are measured. That is, they should identify activities that contribute positively and negatively to the organization (albeit, the organization’s social and psychological context) and then obtain ratings of how likely it is that an employee would engage in those behaviors …” (p. 62). The current research focuses on relationships across a variety of sectors, therefore specific citizenship behaviours that apply to a variety of settings are difficult to identify. Instead, McAllister’s (1995) measure of ‘affiliative citizenship behaviour’ provides a list of items that apply to a variety of relationship types and was therefore adapted to fit a marketing relationship context.

*Commitment, expectations of continuity, and willingness to invest.* These three measures were adapted from Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp (1995), which align with the definitions of these three constructs taken from the same researchers’ work.

*Word of mouth.* The word-of-mouth measure was adapted from Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry’s (1996) work on the behavioural consequences of service loyalty, in which a measure of loyalty contained three items that captured word-of-mouth explicitly. This measure of loyalty was adopted because it is concise and because it directly reflects the definition of word-of-mouth in my research. A precedent for this three-item scale is also found in Wang and Huff (2007), who used the same three items (reverse-coded).

*Service dominant (SD) orientation.* There is currently no measure of the SD orientation available, based on direct consultation with Dr. Stephen Vargo. Ingo Karpen, a PhD student from New Zealand, is working to develop one but he has informed me it is not yet validated and it is in a consumer context. Instead of using an existing measure, I developed a list of items that I believe capture various elements of the service-dominant (SD) versus the goods-dominant (GD) orientation, as explained by Vargo and Lusch (2004). Three concepts were selected to represent
the SD orientation: participation, personal interaction, and customization; and three were selected to represent the GD orientation: price, monetary costs, and product quality. Participants were asked to rank the six factors in order of priority in terms of what matters most when choosing relationship partners. To create a SD score based on these responses, if the first priority was a SD factor, it received a score of +6 and if it was GD factor, it received a score of -6. If the second priority was a SD factor, it received a score of +5 and if it was a GD factor, it received a score of -5, and so on, until the sixth priority received scores of +1 and -1 for SD and GD factors respectively. The total score for the six priorities was summed, and was then subject to a median split in order to create a dichotomous variable for use in the ANOVAs.

7.5.6 Preliminary Manipulation Check

Before implementing the full experiment, I conducted a manipulation check with 50 participants (MBA students from the University of Saskatchewan and undergraduate business students from Queen’s University). Subjects read the scenarios online, as in the main experiment, and responded only to the sections of the questionnaire that contained items related to respect and trust. Due to the small sample size, significance testing was not expected to shed substantial insight. Instead, the overall pattern of results (the means of the various dependent variables in the four conditions) was inspected. Based on these preliminary manipulation checks, within the constraints of the small sample size, it seemed that the manipulations worked quite well. Looking first at the six items meant to capture the respect/trust behaviours in the scenario, the results indicated that the manipulations were understood, as outlined in Table 7-1.
Table 7-1  Preliminary Manipulation Check: Respect/Trust Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (Behaviour)</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M (Low Trust)</th>
<th>M (High Trust)</th>
<th>Sig. (Trust)</th>
<th>M (Low Respect)</th>
<th>M (High Respect)</th>
<th>Sig. (Respect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principled behaviour</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-malfeasance</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7-1, it is clear that the difference in mean scores between high and low respect conditions is larger for measures of respect behaviours, and the difference in mean scores between high and low trust conditions is larger for measures of trust behaviours (noted in italics).

A similar pattern of results was found for the scales that measured respect and trust at the level of the interaction and of the relationship, see Table 7-2.

Table 7-2  Preliminary Manipulation Check – Respect/Trust Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Construct)</th>
<th>M (Low Trust)</th>
<th>M (High Trust)</th>
<th>Sig. (Trust)</th>
<th>M (Low Respect)</th>
<th>M (High Respect)</th>
<th>Sig. (Respect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feel respected</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect other</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful relationship</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel trusted</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust other</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above table, even though all of the expected main effects are significant (i.e., respect condition impacts on respect scales, and trust condition impacts on trust scales), most of the main effects that were not expected (i.e., respect condition impacts on trust scales and vice-versa) were also significant. Again, because of the small sample size, I observed the pattern of results rather than specific significance levels. In this case, the differences in mean scores
between high and low respect conditions on “Feel Respected”, “Respect Other”, and “Respectful Relationship” were all larger than the differences in mean scores between high and low trust conditions. The opposite held true for trust – the differences in mean scores between high and low trust conditions on “Feel Trusted” and “Trust Other” were larger than the differences in mean scores between high and low respect conditions. Unexpectedly, for the outcome variable “Trusting Relationship”, the difference in mean scores was larger for high vs. low respect than it was for high vs. low trust. Because of the small sample size, and because all other relationships were as expected, this exception was not deemed significant at the time. In retrospect, however, this finding was a preview to some of the problems that would be encountered in the main experiment.

7.5.7 Manipulation Check in the Main Experiment

I took two different approaches to determining the success of the manipulations. First, using SPSS, I conducted ANOVAs with the respect and trust conditions as fixed factors and “Respectful Relationship” and “Trusting Relationship” as dependent variables.

Respectful relationship scores are significantly higher for subjects in the high respect condition (M = 4.58) as compared to those in the low respect condition (M = 2.98; F(1, 114) = 126.16, p < 0.05). This provides evidence of convergent validity – in other words, the respect manipulation had the desired effect on evaluations of the relationship. The trusting relationship scores, on the other hand, were also significantly impacted by the respect manipulation. Subjects in the high trust condition (M = 4.02) as compared to the low trust condition (M = 3.53) also show significant differences in their evaluation of respectful relationships, which represents a potential confound (F(1, 114) = 11.85, p < 0.05). However, the partial η² of “Respectful Relationship” is much higher for those in the respect condition (.543) as compared to the trust condition (.097).
According to Perdue and Summers (1986), “When in the analysis of the manipulation check for A the effect sizes for B and AB are much smaller than for A, their statistical significance should probably not be of much concern” (p. 623). Note also that the interaction between the respect and trust conditions on the level of respect in the relationship was not significant (F(1, 114) = 2.12, p > 0.05).

The trust manipulation also worked well. Specifically, participants in the high trust condition (M = 4.26) rated the relationship as significantly higher in trust as compared to those in the low trust condition (M = 3.53; F(1, 114) = 34.49, p < 0.05). However, the trust manipulation also impacted on participants’ perceptions of respect, an additional potential confound in this study. Specifically, participants in the high respect condition (M = 4.28) rated the relationship as significantly higher in trust as compared to those in the low respect condition (M = 3.51; F(1, 114) = 34.49, p < 0.05). In this case, the partial $\eta^2$ of “Trusting Relationship” is actually lower for the trust condition (.239) as compared to the respect condition (.259), further indicative of a confound. Note also that the interaction between respect and trust conditions on “Trusting Relationship” was not significant (F(1, 114) = 2.50, p > 0.05). One conclusion that arises from these results is that while respect may not have a large impact on evaluations of trust in the relationship, behaviours indicative of respect significantly impact relationship partners’ assessments of trust. Until now, preliminary findings and theory regarding the relationship between respect and trust has been mixed. This finding, however, might shed some light onto the nature of the relationship between respect and trust in a practical setting. Because this finding is emergent, however, it cannot be further tested here.

Second, using AMOS, I followed the guidance of MacKenzie (2001). He suggests that manipulations can be tested with SEM by demonstrating that the path from the manipulation
through the conceptual independent variable (i.e., the conceptual measure of the manipulation) to
the dependent variable is significant, whereas the path directly from the manipulation to the
dependent variable is not. If this second path from the manipulation to the dependent variable is
significant, then there must be some confound involved. I therefore ran a number of small
models in AMOS to test the manipulations of respect and trust on the dependent variables
hypothesized to be unique outcomes of these independent variables (except “Affective
Commitment to the ABC Company”). The results are reported in Table 7-3 below (significant
relationships are in italics).

Table 7-3  Manipulation Check with SEM (AMOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect condition</td>
<td>Respectful relationship</td>
<td>2.414</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>47.319</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful relationship</td>
<td>Citizenship behaviours</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>6.969</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust condition</td>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>35.993</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>Transaction costs</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>8.077</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust condition</td>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>35.993</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>Willingness to invest</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6.731</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust condition</td>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>35.993</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>Willingness to invest</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6.731</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust condition</td>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>35.993</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting relationship</td>
<td>Willingness to invest</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>6.731</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As these results demonstrate, in four of the six analyses performed above (respect-citizenship
behaviours; respect-self-esteem; trust-transaction costs; trust-willingness to invest), the path that
is mediated by the conceptual independent variable (“Respectful Relationship” or “Trusting Relationship”) is significant, whereas the path directly from the manipulation to the dependent variable is not. Thus, it seems that the manipulations are reasonably acceptable.

7.5.8 Measures
I first conducted reliability analysis in SPSS. Each of the measures demonstrates good reliability based following the common guideline that Cronbach’s alpha (α) be greater than 0.70 (Cortina 1993; though Cortina also notes the caveat that Cronbach’s alpha is a function of the number of items and should therefore be interpreted with caution). In order to further assess the reliability of the measures, I conducted factor analysis in SPSS (i.e., unweighted least squares, direct oblimin rotation, pairwise deletion of missing variables). Each of the measures is represented by a single factor solution (except for emotion and trust, which will be explained in more detail below), and all factor loadings are greater than 0.6 (except for qu63 and qu65, which are still greater than 0.4). These results are outlined in Table 7-4.

Table 7-4  Reliability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading (Rotated if applicable)</th>
<th>% (Cumulative) Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>qu1</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>.89 (n=110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu2</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu3</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu4</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion – Factor 1 (Positive)</td>
<td>qu5</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>59.74</td>
<td>.93 (n=110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu6</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu7</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion – Factor 2 (Negative)</td>
<td>qu8</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>.92 (n=112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu9</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu10</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>qu11</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>63.35</td>
<td>.87 (n=112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu12</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu13</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu14</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Factor Loading (Rotated if applicable)</td>
<td>% (Cumulative) Variance</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Behaviours</td>
<td>qu15</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>56.90</td>
<td>.89 (n=98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu16</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu17</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu18</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu19</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu20</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (Pat)</td>
<td>qu21</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>75.62</td>
<td>.90 (n=111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu23</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu25</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (ABC)</td>
<td>qu22</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>.81 (n=105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu24</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu26</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of Continuity</td>
<td>qu27</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>.79 (n=95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu28</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu29</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Invest</td>
<td>qu30</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>.88 (n=93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu31</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu32</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-Mouth</td>
<td>qu33</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>88.96</td>
<td>.96 (n=109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu34</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu35</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Respect</td>
<td>qu46</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>86.78</td>
<td>.95 (n=103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu47</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu48</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Other</td>
<td>qu49</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>56.04</td>
<td>.78 (n=99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu50</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu51</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful Relationship</td>
<td>qu52</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td>.94 (n=98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu53</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu54</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu55</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu56</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu57</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Other</td>
<td>qu58</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>80.70</td>
<td>.92 (n=105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu59</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu60</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Trust</td>
<td>qu61</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>66.51</td>
<td>.79 (n=102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu62</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu63</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Factor Loading (Rotated if applicable)</td>
<td>% (Cumulative) Variance</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting Relationship - Factor 1</td>
<td>qu64</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td>.87 (n=96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu66</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu67</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu70</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting Relationship - Factor 2</td>
<td>qu65</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu68</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu69</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu71</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Emotion” items loaded on two separate factors, which was expected because the emotion scale was conceptualized as a combination of positive and negative emotions. Therefore, a two-factor structure of emotions is used in subsequent analyses. “Trusting Relationship” items also loaded on two separate factors, which was unexpected because it had been conceptualized as a unidimensional construct. Because the correlation between the two factors is .615 and the overall reliability of this scale is still high (Cronbach’s α = .873), the unidimensionality of this construct was preserved.

**7.5.9 Validity Assessment**

I assessed the measurement properties of the dependent variables using confirmatory factor analysis in AMOS (17.0). Overall, the results suggest that the fit of the data to the measurement model is not entirely adequate ($\chi^2 (1072) = 2028.3, p = 0.000$; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .089; comparative fit index (CFI) = .796; normed fit index (NFI) = .657; relative fit index (RFI) = .608; and incremental fit index (IFI) = .803). (Note that a good fitting model is suggested by the following: a non-significant $\chi^2$ RMSEA ≤ 0.05 to 0.1; CFI > 0.95; NFI > 0.90; and RFI and IFI values close to .95 represent superior fit.)
Overall, this lack of good fit is not surprising for a number of reasons. The significant $\chi^2$ may well be due to the relatively small sample size rather than a true lack of fit. Other fit indices also tend to underestimate fit where there are smaller sample sizes (e.g., NFI) or complex models. Some fit indices do however account for these deficiencies – the CFI accounts for small sample sizes, and the IFI accounts for small sample sizes as well as lack of model parsimony (Byrne 2001).

Perhaps the most useful fit statistic and one that is growing in popularity, according to Byrne (2001), is the RMSEA because it takes into account the complexity of the model being estimated, though this advantage is subject to some debate. Byrne, in citing others, suggests that values less than 0.05 represent excellent fit, between 0.05 and 0.08 represent reasonable errors of approximation, between 0.08 and 0.10 represent mediocre fit, and above 0.10 represent poor fit. Therefore, the current measurement model could be described as representing a mediocre fit. However, even though the confidence interval around the RMSEA is relatively narrow (.083 to .095), the $p$-value is .000 when it should be above .50 (Byrne 2001) – but again, the confidence intervals are strongly impacted by sample size.

This information is useful, because it helps to explain lack of fit in the overall model. It is possible that a lack of fit in an overall model may be due to the lack of fit in the measurement model, rather than a lack of fit in the structural model. In other words, while theory might hold, the measures used to test that theory may not be ideal.

The discriminant validity of respect and trust is an important question in this research, and was assessed in part by the factor structures of these two constructs. In SPSS, I first ran a factor analysis (unweighted least squares, direct oblimin rotation) on all items related to “Respectful Relationship” (qu52 to qu57) and “Trusting Relationship” (qu64 to qu71). To be conservative,
results were analyzed to ensure that factor loadings were > 0.6 and that cross-loadings were not > 0.4. The results suggested two distinct factors. While all of the respect items loaded onto Factor 1, only four of the eight trust items loaded onto Factor 2. The remaining four trust items loaded onto respect (Factor 1) – see Table 7-5. I argue that this is potentially due to confounds in the original manipulation rather than any conceptual overlap between trust and respect.

Table 7-5  Factor Analysis: Respect and Trust Relationship Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptualized Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix Factor 1 (Respect)</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix Factor 2 (Trust)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>qu52</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu53</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu54</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu55</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>-.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu56</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu57</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>qu64</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu65</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu66</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu67</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu68</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu69</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu70</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu71</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, I ran an additional factor analysis in SPSS (unweighted least squares, direct oblimin rotation) where I included all respect items (i.e., “Respect Other”, “Feel Respected”, and “Respecting Relationship”) as well as all trust items (i.e., “Trust Other”, “Feel Trusted”, and “Trusting Relationship”). In this case, I constrained the solution to two factors. The pattern matrix of results for this factor analysis provided a much clearer distinction of the originally conceptualized respect and trust scales. I believe that this clearer distinction may have emerged because the antecedents of respect and trust in the relationship (i.e., respect and trust other, feel
respected and trusted) correlated highly with their respective relationship constructs and therefore were better able to tease apart the two overarching constructs. In particular, all of the items conceptualized to be a part of respect loaded onto Factor 1, and a majority of the items conceptualized to be a part of trust loaded onto Factor 2 – only questions 66 and 70 loaded onto respect as compared to trust, and question 67 cross-loaded onto respect. See Table 7-6.

Table 7-6  Factor Analysis: All Respect and Trust Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptualized Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix Factor 1 (Respect)</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix Factor 2 (Trust)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feel Respected</td>
<td>qu46</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu47</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu48</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Other</td>
<td>qu49</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu50</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu51</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Relationship</td>
<td>qu52</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu53</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu54</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu55</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu56</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu57</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Other</td>
<td>qu58</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu59</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu60</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Trust</td>
<td>qu61</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu62</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu63</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Relationship</td>
<td>qu64</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu65</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu66</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu67</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu68</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu69</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu70</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu71</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item (question) 66 states, “This relationship is completely open”, and have may loaded onto respect if the word “open” was interpreted as voice and understanding (respect) as compared to honesty (trust). Item (question) 70 states, “In this relationship, people seem to be concerned with each other’s needs.” This item represents the non-malfeasance dimension of trust, which is not a core component of the trust construct as compared to reliability. Therefore this is not a significant concern in demonstrating the discriminant validity of respect versus trust.

The differential relationship between respect and trust was also assessed through a factor analysis using SEM (AMOS). Following Kelloway (1998), I conducted a nested model comparison. I created a measurement model in AMOS for the conceptual measures of “Respectful Relationship” and “Trusting Relationship”. In Model 1, I allowed the latent variables to covary without constraint. In Model 2 (the nested model), I created a unidimensional factor structure where respect and trust were combined as one latent variable. The fit statistics indicate that Model 1 fit the data the best (RMSEA Model 1 = .139 and Model 2 = .152; NFI Model 1 = .811 and Model 2 .784; RFI Model 1 = .739 and Model 2 = .705; IFI Model 1 = .862 and Model 2 = .834; CFI Model 1 = .859 and Model 2 = .830). Were the improvements in fit for Model 1 over Model 2 actually significant? This was tested by comparing the change in $\chi^2$. For Model 1, $\chi^2 = 242.7$ (76) and for Model 2, $\chi^2 = 278.0$ (77). The change in $\chi^2$ of 35.3 is higher than the critical $\chi^2$ of 3.84 at 1 degree of freedom (77-76), therefore the improvement in fit of Model 1 over Model 2 is significant. In other words, respect and trust are best conceptualized as two factors (that covary or correlate) rather than as one unidimensional factor. Thus, based on the results of the factor analysis using SEM, the constructs “Respectful Relationship” and “Trusting Relationship” demonstrate discriminant validity.
In order to further assess the discriminant validity of respect from other potentially similar constructs, I included four items that assessed friendship and liking in the questionnaire. I ran a factor analysis in SPSS (unweighted least squares, direct oblim rotation) including these four items and the six items that measured respect at the level of the interaction. The factor analysis suggests (based on eigenvalues > 1 and an assessment of the scree plot), that a two factor solution best fits the data, with respect items loading on Factor 1 and the friendship/liking items loading on Factor 2. There are no cross-loadings. The results of the factor analysis are in Table 7-7.

Table 7-7  Factor Analysis: Respect vs. Friendship and Liking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix Factor 1 (Respect)</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix Factor 2 (Liking/Friendship)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>qu36</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu37</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>qu38</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu39</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Respected</td>
<td>qu46</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu47</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>-.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu48</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>-.0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Other</td>
<td>qu49</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu50</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qu51</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.10 Hypothesis Testing

As evidenced by the earlier analysis, the manipulations may not have been ideal in uniquely driving perceptions of respect versus trust at the level of the interaction and the relationship. Therefore, in this section, I report (1) the results of ANOVAs where the manipulations or treatments form the independent variables, and (2) the results of multiple regressions where the measures of respect and trust at the level of the relationship ("Respectful Relationship" and "Trusting Relationship") are treated as conceptual independent variables in the analysis (and are
thus referred to as “conceptual independent variables” throughout the remainder of this thesis). Note that in the second set of analyses, however, the results cannot be interpreted in a causal fashion. Because participants’ evaluations of their relationships did not perfectly align with the treatment conditions, the treatment conditions are no longer random and the results are instead interpreted as correlational only.

Given the sample size (n=114), both sets of analyses are appropriate. For ANOVA, Cohen (1992) recommends at least 18 subjects per cell for a large effect size at power = 0.80 and $\alpha = 0.05$ (based on 4 groups in the analysis). Each of the cell sizes in my analysis exceeded this minimum of 18. For multiple regression, Cohen recommends at least 30 respondents for a large effect size at power = 0.80 and $\alpha = 0.05$ (based on 2 independent variables) or 67 respondents for a medium effect size.

Components of respect and trust. The first four hypotheses made predictions about the behaviours that comprise respect and trust at the level of the interpersonal interaction. Because these behaviours were specifically manipulated, testing these hypotheses was conducted by way of ANOVAs with the experimental conditions as fixed factors and the dependent variables of “Respect Other”, “Feel Respected”, “Trust Other”, and “Feel Trusted”. The results of the ANOVAs to test hypotheses 1 through 4 are summarized in Table 7-8. Significant relationships are noted in italics.
Table 7-8  Results for Hypotheses 1-4: Components of Respect and Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Respect Condition</th>
<th>Trust Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M_hilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a – respect condition (voice) ⇒ feel respected</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.62/3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b – respect condition (understanding) ⇒ feel respected</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.53/3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a – respect condition (principled behaviour) ⇒ respect other</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.35/3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b – trust condition (reliability) ⇒ respect other</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.61/3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7-8, it is clear that hypotheses 1 to 4 are supported. However, it is also clear that the behaviours intended to influence perceptions of respect influenced perceptions of trust and vice-versa. At the same time, however, by assessing the overall pattern of results rather than the significance levels, one can conclude that behaviours intended to predict perceptions of respect and trust did in fact have the intended results (except for H4 – the impact of governance behaviours on feeling trusted). Specifically, the F-values for the respect condition in testing hypotheses 1 and 2 are substantially larger than the corresponding F-values for the trust condition (i.e., 117 vs. 23 and 95 vs. 14), and the opposite holds true for hypothesis 3 (i.e., 109 vs. 32). I predicted that reliable behaviours would result in perceptions of both trust and respect, but for different reasons, and both hypotheses 2b and 3a are supported.

Hypotheses 5 and 6 predicted that perceptions of respect and trust at the interpersonal level would in turn result in perceptions of respect and trust at the relationship level. These hypotheses were tested via multiple regression, because both the predictors and the outcomes are continuous.
variables. In the multiple regression equation to test hypothesis 5, “Respectful Relationship” was the dependent variable and all four potential antecedents (i.e., “Feel Respected”, “Respect Other”, “Feel Trusted”, and “Trust Other”) were analyzed together as predictor variables. As predicted in hypotheses 5a and 5b, both “Feel Respected” (.58; t = 7.21, p < 0.05) and “Respect Other” (.41; t = 6.37, p < 0.05) are significantly related to “Respectful Relationship”, whereas “Feel Trusted” (.06; t = 1.05, p > 0.05) and “Trust Other” (.08; t = -1.19, p > 0.05) are not.

Hypothesis 6a predicted that a person’s feelings of being trusted would lead to perceptions of trust in the relationship. Hypothesis 6a is supported – “Feel Trust” is significantly related to “Trusting Relationship” (.38; t = 4.77, p < 0.05), whereas “Feel Respect” is not (.19; t = 1.87, p > 0.05). Hypothesis 6b predicted that a person’s trust in the other would also result in more trusting relationships, but this was not supported. Specifically, “Trust Other” was not significantly related to “Trusting Relationships” (.15; t = 1.62, p > 0.05). Unexpectedly, “Respect Other” was significantly related to “Trusting Relationship” (.26; t = 3.18, p < 0.05). This is likely due to the original behavioural manipulations that were intended to influence “Trust Other” – reliability and non-malfeasance. As I explained earlier, reliability was predicted to impact on respect and it did, and non-malfeasance did not significantly predict trust. Therefore, the lack of support for H6b is not surprising, given the lack of support for earlier hypotheses.

The relationship between respect and emotions. An ANOVA suggests that higher levels of respect result in more positive emotions, in partial support of H7a. Specifically, there is a significant main effect for the respect condition (F(1, 114) = 111.00, p < 0.05) – subjects in the high respect condition reported strong positive feelings (M = 4.23) whereas those in the low respect condition reported weak positive feelings (M = 2.29). Similarly, however, there is a significant main effect for the trust condition (F(1,114) = 13.31, p < 0.05), where subjects in the
high trust condition also reported strong positive feelings (M = 3.59) as compared to those in the low trust condition (M = 2.92). This is inconsistent with the original model and theoretical reasoning.

Multiple regression with the conceptual independent variables, on the other hand, shows a slightly different pattern of results. The effect of respectful relationships on positive emotions is statistically significant (.67; t = 5.92, p < 0.05) whereas the effect of trusting relationships on the same dependent variable is not (.027; t = 0.234, p > 0.05). Thus, when potential confounds due to the manipulations are removed, it appears that respect can be discriminated from trust by its effect on positive emotions.

The second part of hypothesis 7a suggested that lower levels of respect would result in stronger negative emotions. This prediction is supported by an ANOVA, where there is a significant main effect for respect on negative emotions (F(1, 114) = 40.16, p < 0.05); lower levels of respect result in stronger negative emotions (M = 4.35) as compared to higher levels of respect (M = 2.77). At the same time, however, there is a significant main effect for trust on negative emotions (F(1,114) = 44.87, p < 0.05); those in the low trust condition reported stronger negative emotions (M = 4.40) as compared to those in the high trust condition (M = 2.72).

Multiple regression with the conceptual independent variables provides a similar pattern of results. Specifically, respectful relationships are significantly related to negative emotions (-.25; t = -2.12, p < 0.05) as are trusting relationships (-.43; t = -3.64, p < 0.05). Again, this is inconsistent with my original theoretical reasoning as to the differences between respect and trust. However, one possible explanation for these findings is that trust is a necessary condition for any relationship – therefore lack of trust is likely to result in negative emotions. Respect, on the other
hand, may not be a core expectation so that when it exists in relationships, it has the ability to foster positive emotions because it is something special.

Hypothesis 7b stated that the relationship between respect and emotion would be mediated by self-esteem. For this and other tests of mediation, I followed the procedures outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986). First, I regressed the dependent variable on the independent variable. Second, I regressed the mediator on the independent variable. The goal was to ensure these first two relationships were significant. Third, I regressed the dependent variable on both the mediator and the independent variable. If only the mediator was significant, I concluded full mediation, and if both the independent variable and the mediator were significant, I concluded partial mediation. In applying Baron and Kenny’s procedures in the case of the conceptual independent variables, I mean-centered “Respectful Relationships” and “Trusting Relationships” to guard against multicollinearity.

In testing hypothesis 7b, I combined positive and negative emotions into one variable (with the negative emotion items reverse coded) to ensure that I was capturing the full domain of emotions (rather than only positive or only negative emotions). In testing for mediation with the experimental condition as the independent variable, I found that (1) the respect condition is significantly related to emotions (.66; t = 9.19, p < 0.05); (2) the respect condition is significantly related to self-esteem (.52; t = 6.41, p < 0.05); and (3) when entered together in the regression equation, both respect (.47; t = 6.12, p < 0.05) and self-esteem (.36; t = 4.77, p < 0.05) are significantly related to emotions. Therefore, self-esteem partially mediates the relationship between the respect condition and emotions.

I conducted the same mediation analysis with the conceptual independent variables. I found that (1) respect in the relationship is significantly related to emotions (.72; t = 10.90, p < 0.05); (2)
respect is significantly related to self-esteem (.58; \( t = 7.62, p < 0.05 \)); and (3) together, both respect (.55; \( t = 7.12, p < 0.05 \)) and self-esteem (.28; \( t = 3.69, p < 0.05 \)) are significantly related to emotions, so again, partial mediation appears to exist.

Hypothesis 7c predicted that the relationship between respect and emotion is moderated by trust. In the case of positive emotions, the interaction effect between respect and trust in the ANOVA is not significant (\( F(1, 114) = 1.76, p > 0.05 \)). However, in the case of negative emotions, the interaction between respect and trust is significant (\( F(1, 114) = 7.83, p < 0.05 \)) – see Figure 7-4. When trust is low in a relationship, the impact of respect on negative emotions is not as strong. When trust is high in a relationship, however, the impact of lack of respect (as compared to respect) is much stronger. In other words, it is within the context of high trust relationships that differences in respect have the biggest impact on negative emotions. Hypothesis 7c is therefore partially supported.
In the analysis with the conceptual independent variables, the results suggest that, while only respect in the relationship (vs. trust in the relationship) is significantly related to positive emotions, there is also a significant interaction effect between respect and trust in the relationship on positive emotions (.16; t = 2.42, p < 0.05). However, there is no significant interaction effect between the conceptual independent variables as they relate to negative emotions (-.05; t = -.64, p > 0.05).

Based on guidelines provided by Aiken and West (1991), I investigated the significance of this interaction. Specifically, when investigating an interaction involving continuous variables, the following steps must be performed, using mean centered data of the predictors, “Respectful Relationship” = X and “Trusting Relationship” = Z:
1. Create two new variables for Z to represent two levels of Z. If SD represents the standard deviation of Z, then the two new variables are represented by: (a) Z minus SD, and (b) Z plus SD.

2. Form the crossproduct of the new variable in (1) with the main predictor, X. In other words, (a) X * Z minus SD, and (b) X * Z plus SD.

3. Regress the criterion (Y) on (a) X, Z minus SD, and X * Z minus SD, and (b) X, Z plus SD, and X * Z minus SD.

If the t-test of the beta coefficient for the interaction term in (3) is significant, then this indicates that the regression of Y on X varies across the range of Z. Applying this procedure to my data, I found that the interaction terms were significant. Specifically, the interaction between relationship respect and relationship trust (one standard deviation above) was significant (.223; t = 2.42, p < 0.05) and the interaction between relationship respect and relationship trust (one standard deviation below) was also significant (.204; t = 2.42; p < 0.05). Given this, I conclude that the impact of respectful relationships on positive emotions varies across the range of the level of trust in the relationship. Thus, again, hypothesis 7c is partially supported, albeit in a different manner.

The relationship between trust and transaction costs. In hypothesis 12, I predicted that higher (lower) levels of trust lead to lower (higher) transaction costs. The results of the ANOVA support this hypothesis; subjects in the high trust condition (M = 4.63) reported lower transaction costs as compared to those in the low trust condition (M = 5.61; F(1, 114) = 27.58, p < 0.05). Similarly, subjects in the high respect condition (M = 4.85) also reported lower transaction costs as compared to those in the low respect condition (M = 5.39; F(1, 114) = 8.46, p < 0.05).
Therefore, while hypothesis 12 is supported, my theoretical reasoning that trust but not respect should impact on transaction costs does not appear to hold. Unexpectedly, the results of the multiple regression suggest that respect in the relationship (\( -.32; t = -2.26, p < 0.05 \)) but not trust in the relationship (\( -.16; t = -1.12, p > 0.05 \)) is significantly related to transaction costs. This may be due in part to the fact that the measure of transaction costs does not fully capture the domain of transaction costs in a relationship. It may also be due to the fact that disrespectful relationships are costly in terms of the time and energy required to manage the consequences of disrespect.

**The relationship between respect and citizenship behaviours.** Hypothesis 8a predicted that higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of interpersonal citizenship behaviours. This hypothesis is supported by an ANOVA, where those in the high respect condition (\( M = 4.38 \)) anticipated more citizenship behaviours as compared to those in the low respect condition (\( M = 3.31; F(1, 114) = 48.711, p < 0.05 \)). However, the same conclusion can be made for trust – specifically, those in the high trust condition (\( M = 4.12 \)) also reported greater anticipated citizenship behaviours as compared to those in the low trust condition (\( M = 3.57; F(1, 114) = 13.02, p < 0.05 \)).

The multiple regression analysis, on the other hand, provides a pattern of results that is more consistent with my original theoretical reasoning. Specifically, the level of respect in a relationship is significantly and positively related to citizenship behaviours (\( .67; t = 5.77, p < 0.05 \)), whereas the level of trust is not (\( .02; t = .18, p > 0.05 \)).

Hypothesis 8b predicted that the relationship between respect and interpersonal citizenship behaviours would be mediated by emotion. Following Baron and Kenny’s (1986) analysis in the case of the experimental manipulations, the results suggest that (1) the respect condition has a significant main effect on citizenship behaviours (\( .56; t = 7.08, p < 0.05 \)); (2) the respect
condition has a significant main effect on emotion (.66; \(t = 9.19, p < 0.05\)); and (3) together, both respect (.21; \(t = 2.33, p < 0.05\)) and emotion (.52; \(t = 5.66, p < 0.05\)) have a significant effect on citizenship behaviours. Therefore, I conclude that emotion partially mediates this relationship.

A similar pattern of results is suggested by an analysis involving the conceptual independent variables. Specifically, (1) respect in the relationship is significantly related to citizenship behaviours (.68; \(t = 9.88, p < 0.05\)); (2) respect in the relationship is significantly related to emotion (.72; \(t = 10.90, p < 0.05\)); and (3) together, both respect (.43; \(t = 4.57, p < 0.05\)) and emotion (.35; \(t = 3.77, p < 0.05\)) are significantly related to citizenship behaviours. Again, this suggests partial mediation and hypothesis 8b is supported.

The relationship between respect and affective commitment. Hypothesis 9a (i) predicted that higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of affective commitment towards the person – in this case, Pat. The results of the ANOVA support this hypothesis. Subjects in the high respect condition (\(M = 4.53\)) reported significantly higher levels of affective commitment towards the relationship partner, Pat, as compared to those in the low respect condition (\(M = 2.83; F(1, 114) = 94.93, p < 0.05\)). Subjects in the high trust condition (\(M = 3.97\)) also reported higher levels of affective commitment towards Pat as compared to those in the low trust condition (\(M = 3.39; (F (1, 114) = 11.20, p < 0.05\)).

Multiple regression on the conceptual independent variables suggest that subjects’ evaluation of respect in the relationship is significantly related to the level of affective commitment towards Pat (.74; \(t = 6.58, p < 0.05\)) whereas their evaluation of trust in the relationship is not (-.04; \(t = -.34, p > 0.05\)).
Hypothesis 9b predicted that the relationship between respect and affective commitment would be mediated by emotion. Testing for mediation with the experimental conditions, the results suggest that (1) there is a main effect for respect on affective commitment towards Pat (.68; t = 9.70, p < 0.05); (2) there is a main effect for respect on emotion (.66; t = 9.19, p < 0.05); and (3) together, both respect (.37; t = 4.51, p < 0.05) and emotion (.47; t = 5.83, p < 0.05) are significantly related to affective commitment towards Pat, suggesting partial mediation.

Testing this same hypothesis with the conceptual independent variables provides the same pattern of results. These show that (1) respect in the relationship is related to affective commitment towards Pat (.71; t = 10.53, p < 0.05); (2) respect is related to emotion (.72; t = 10.90, p < 0.05); and (3) both respect (.40; t = 4.56, p < 0.05) and emotion (.43; t = 4.85, p < 0.05) together are related to affective commitment towards Pat, indicating partial mediation.

While H9a (i) made predictions about the level of affective commitment towards the person, H9a (ii) predicted that higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of affective commitment towards the company. This hypothesis was not supported by either the ANOVA or the multiple regression. There was neither a significant relationship between the level of respect in the relationship and affective commitment towards the company in the ANOVA (Mhr = 4.11; Mr = 4.02; F(1, 112) = .231, p > 0.05), nor was there a significant relationship in the multiple regression (.11; t = .68, p > 0.05).

The relationship between respect, trust, and expectations of continuity. I predicted that higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of expectations of continuity in H10a, and similarly, that higher (lower) levels of trust result in higher (lower) levels of expectations of continuity in H13a. The results of the ANOVA support both hypotheses. In the ANOVA, subjects in the high respect condition (M = 3.96) were significantly more likely to continue the
relationship as compared to those in the low respect condition (M = 3.53; F(1, 113) = 6.87, p < 0.05). Similarly, subjects in the high trust condition (M = 4.05) reported that they were more likely to continue the relationship as compared to those in the low trust condition (M = 3.44; F(1, 113) = 13.81, p < 0.05). In the multiple regression, however, participants’ responses suggest that the level of trust in the relationship is significantly related to expectations of continuity (.56; t = 4.21, p < 0.05), whereas respect is not (-.03, t = -.24, p > 0.05).

In hypothesis 10b, I predicted that the relationship between respect and expectations of continuity would be mediated by emotion. This hypothesis is supported in an analysis with the experimental manipulations, as (1) respect has a main effect on expectations of continuity (.26; t = 2.87, p < 0.05); (2) respect has a main effect on emotion (.66; t = 9.19, p < 0.05); and (3) together, emotion has a significant effect on expectations of continuity (.45; t = 3.93, p < 0.05) but respect does not (-.03; t = -.27, p > 0.05). Thus, emotion fully mediates this relationship.

Hypothesis 13b predicted that the relationship between trust and expectations of continuity would be mediated by transaction costs. In testing for mediation with the experimental manipulations, (1) there is a main effect for trust on expectations of continuity (.34; t = 3.85, p < 0.05); (2) there is a main effect for trust on transaction costs (-.46; t = -5.48, p < 0.05); and (3) both trust (.24; t = 2.44, p < 0.05) and transaction costs (-.22; t = -2.25, p < 0.05) are significant when included together. Therefore, transaction costs partially mediates this relationship.

Conducting the same analysis with the conceptual independent variables, (1) trust is significantly related to expectations of continuity (.54; t = 6.71, p < 0.05); (2) trust is significantly related to transaction costs (-.41; t = -4.79, p < 0.05); and (3) only trust remains significant in the third equation (.48; t = 5.52, p < 0.05) whereas transaction costs is not (-.13; t = -1.53, p > 0.05).
Therefore, based on the analysis with the conceptual independent variables, transaction costs do not mediate this relationship.

The relationship between respect, trust, and word-of-mouth. Hypothesis 11a posited that higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of positive word-of-mouth, and hypothesis 15a posited that higher (lower) levels of trust result in higher (lower) levels of positive word-of-mouth. The results of the ANOVA support both hypotheses, whereas the results of the multiple regression support only hypothesis 11a. Based on the ANOVA, subjects in the high respect condition (M = 4.48) were more inclined than those in the low respect condition (M = 3.71) to spread positive word-of-mouth about the relationship partner (F(1, 112) = 19.72, p < 0.05), similar to those in the high versus low trust conditions (Mht = 4.39; Mlt = 3.80; F(1, 112) = 11.62, p < 0.05). In the multiple regression, however, participants reported that the level of respect in the relationship is significantly related to word-of-mouth (.60; t = 4.54, p < 0.05), whereas trust in the relationship is not (-.04; t = -.32, p > 0.05).

Hypothesis 11b predicted that the relationship between respect and word-of-mouth would be mediated by emotion. The analysis involving the experimental manipulations supports this hypothesis, as full mediation is apparent – (1) there is a significant main effect for the respect condition on the dependent variable (.41; t = 4.71, p < 0.01); (2) there is a significant main effect for respect on emotion (.66; t = 9.19, p < 0.05); and (3) when entered together, emotion is significant (.37; t = 3.31, p < 0.05) but respect is not (.17; t = 1.54, > 0.05).

The analysis with the conceptual independent variables, on the other hand, provides no evidence of mediation. While (1) respect in the relationship is related to word-of-mouth (.56; t = 7.15, p < 0.05) and (2) respect is related to emotion (.72; t = 10.90, p < 0.05), when (3) both are analyzed
together, only respect is significant (.46; t = 4.06, p < 0.05) but emotion is not (.15; t = 1.33, p > 0.05).

Hypothesis 15b predicted that the relationship between trust and word-of-mouth would be mediated by transaction costs. Analyses with the experimental manipulations as independent variables found evidence of partial mediation only – (1) trust has a main effect on word-of-mouth (.33; t = 3.62, p < 0.05); (2) trust has a main effect on transaction costs (-.41; t = -5.48, p < 0.05); and together, both trust (.23; t = 2.31, p < 0.05) and transaction costs (-.21; t = -2.09, p < 0.05) significantly impact on word-of-mouth.

*The relationship between trust and willingness to invest.* Hypothesis 14a predicted that higher (lower) levels of trust result in higher (lower) levels of willingness to invest. This hypothesis is supported by the ANOVA but not the multiple regression analysis. The results of the ANOVA point to a significant relationship between trust and willingness to invest, such that subjects in the high trust condition (M = 4.03) were more willing to invest in the relationship as compared to those in the low trust condition (M = 3.65; F(1, 109) = 4.41, p < 0.05). In addition, subjects in the high respect condition (M = 4.08) reported a higher willingness to invest in the relationship as compared to those in the low respect condition (M = 3.60; F(1, 109) = 7.02, p < 0.05). This does not support the discriminant validity of respect and trust with regards to the dependent variable, willingness to invest. On the other hand, the results of the multiple regression suggest that the level of trust in the relationship is not significantly related to a person’s willingness to invest in that relationship (.26; t = 1.82, p > 0.05) nor is the level of respect in the relationship (.23; t = 1.61, p > 0.05).

Hypothesis 14b predicted that the relationship between trust and willingness to invest would be mediated by transaction costs. This hypothesis is not supported. Although there is a main effect
for (1) the trust condition on willingness to invest (.44; t = 5.13, p < 0.05) and (2) trust on transaction costs (-.46; t = -4.79, p < 0.05), (3) neither the mediator (-.14; t = -1.28, p > 0.05) nor trust (.16; t = 1.56, p > 0.05) are significant when entered into the regression equation together.

Hypothesis 16a proposed that for a person whose firm followed a more service-dominant logic of marketing, respect (lack of respect) would strengthen (weaken) the positive (negative) relationship between trust and commitment, trust and expectations of continuity, as well as trust and word-of-mouth. In order to test this hypothesis, I conducted hierarchical regression with main effects in the first block (respect condition, trust condition, and SD orientation), two-way interactions in the second block (respect x trust, respect x SD orientation, trust x SD orientation), and the three-way interaction in the third block (respect x trust x SD orientation). There were no significant three-way interactions between the trust condition, respect condition, and service-dominant (vs. goods dominant) orientation in the case of the three outcome variables listed above, thus hypothesis H16a is not supported. However, there was a significant three-way interaction in the case of transaction costs (F(1, 114) = 5.15; p < 0.05). Although this is a post-hoc finding, it is still interesting to report as it may shed insight into directions for future research.

Table 7-9  Trust x Respect x SD Orientation: Mean Transaction Cost Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goods-Dominant Orientation</th>
<th>Service-Dominant Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Respect</td>
<td>High Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Trust</strong></td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Trust</strong></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This three-way interaction is plotted in Figure 7-5. Note that transaction costs are scored such that higher scores represent higher transaction costs.
These interaction effects follow the predictions I originally made for the outcome variables of commitment, expectations of continuity, and word-of-mouth. Within an SD orientation, it appears that respect enhances the positive effects of trust on transaction costs. In hypothesis 16b, I predicted that within a GD orientation, respect would have no significant effect on the relationship between trust and commitment, trust and expectations of continuity, as well as trust and word-of-mouth. This finding is supported by the lack of three-way interactions on these dependent variables. However, with transaction costs as the outcome variable, in the case of the goods dominant orientation, it appears that lack of respect amplifies the negative consequences that low trust has on transaction costs.

Interestingly, the post-hoc finding that lack of respect amplifies the negative outcomes due to lack of trust on transaction costs stands in contrast to the reasoning behind this original prediction. These counterintuitive findings, and the lack of support for hypotheses 16 in general, is most likely due to the lack of a rigorous measure for the service-dominant orientation, as I explained earlier.
Summary. Table 7-10 below summarizes the hypotheses and the significant findings versus non-significant findings. The grey cells are the significant findings that I expected, based on my hypotheses; the white cells are those that I did not expect to be significant; and the black cells are not-applicable or are redundant. In the table, a checkmark (✓) indicates a significant relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, NS = not significant, FM = full mediation, PM = partial mediation, and n/a = not applicable.

Table 7-10 Summary of Hypotheses and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Hypothesis</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a – A relationship partner’s feeling of being respected increases if his/her</td>
<td>Feel Respected</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice is encouraged in the relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b – A relationship partner’s feeling of being respected increases when he/she</td>
<td>Feel Respected</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is understood (as a whole person) in a relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a – A relationship partner’s respect for the other increases when the other</td>
<td>Respect Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engages in principled behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b – A relationship partner’s respect for the other increases when the other</td>
<td>Respect Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a – A relationship partner’s trust for the other increases when the other</td>
<td>Trust Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b – A relationship partner’s trust for the other increases when the other</td>
<td>Trust Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates non-malfeasance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 – A relationship partner’s feeling of being trusted increase when the other</td>
<td>Feel Trusted</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires fewer formal contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a – The perception that a relationship is respectful increases when a person</td>
<td>Respect Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respects the other</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b – The perception that a relationship is respectful increases when a person</td>
<td>Feel Respected</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feels respected</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a – The perception that a relationship is trusting increases when a person</td>
<td>Trust Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusts the other</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Hypothesis</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b – The perception that a relationship is trusting increases when a person feels trusted</td>
<td>Feel Trusted (IV)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a (i) – Higher levels of respect result in more positive emotions – for example, emotions in the family of happiness</td>
<td>Positive Emotions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a (ii) – Lower levels of respect result in more negative emotions – for example, emotions in the family of anger</td>
<td>Negative Emotions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b – The relationship between respect and emotion will be mediated by self-esteem. In other words, respect (lack of respect) makes a person feel better (worse) about self, which in turn creates positive (negative) emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7c (i) – The relationship between respect and positive emotion will be moderated by trust. In other words, respect makes a person feel even better when there is trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7c (ii) – The relationship between respect and negative emotion will be moderated by trust. In other words, lack of respect makes a person feel even worse when there is lack of trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of interpersonal citizenship behaviours</td>
<td>Citizenship Behaviours</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8b – The relationship between respect and interpersonal citizenship behaviours is mediated by emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a (i) – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of affective commitment towards the person</td>
<td>Affective Commitment Towards Person</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a (ii) – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of affective commitment towards the company</td>
<td>Affective Commitment To Company</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9b(i) – The relationship between respect and commitment towards the person is mediated by emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9b(ii) – The relationship between respect and commitment towards the company is mediated by emotion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10a – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of expectations of continuity</td>
<td>Expectations of Continuity</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10b – The relationship between respect and expectations of continuity is mediated by emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11a – Higher (lower) levels of respect result in higher (lower) levels of positive word-of-mouth</td>
<td>Word-of-Mouth</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Hypothesis</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11b – The relationship between respect and word-of-mouth is mediated by emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12 – Higher (lower) levels of trust result in lower (higher) transaction costs</td>
<td>Transaction Costs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13a – Higher (lower) levels of trust result in higher (lower) levels of expectations of continuity</td>
<td>Expectations of Continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13b – The relationship between trust and expectations of continuity is mediated by transaction costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14a – Higher (lower) levels of trust result in higher (lower) levels of willingness to invest</td>
<td>Willingness to Invest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14b – The relationship between trust and willingness to invest is mediated by transaction costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15a – Higher (lower) levels of trust result in higher (lower) levels of positive word-of-mouth</td>
<td>Word-of-Mouth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15b – The relationship between trust and word-of-mouth is mediated by transaction costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16a – Under SDL conditions, respect (lack of respect) will strengthen (weaken) the positive (negative) relationship between trust and commitment, trust and expectations of continuity, as well as trust and word-of-mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16b – Under GDL conditions, respect will have no significant effect on the relationship between trust and commitment, trust and expectations of continuity, as well as trust and word-of-mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These same results (for the outcomes of respect and trust) are also depicted in the models on the following two pages (Figures 7-6 and 7-7).
Figure 7-6 Summary of Hypothesized Conceptual Model and Results (ANOVA)

Note – Solid lines represent hypothesized relationships, dotted lines represent relationships not originally hypothesized.
Figure 7-7 Summary of Hypothesized Conceptual Model and Results (Multiple Regression)

Note – Solid lines represent hypothesized relationships, dotted lines represent relationships not originally hypothesized.
Overall model testing. Despite the small sample size (114 as compared to a minimum of 200 which is recommended for structural equation modeling, I still tested the full model using AMOS structural equation modeling (SEM) software to begin exploring issues of model fit, which should help me prepare for subsequent studies on this topic. Even in face of the small sample size, SEM is appropriate for testing this particular model because (1) the model includes latent variables; and (2) it allows for testing mediation (MacKenzie 2001). A structural equation model implies a structure of the covariance matrix of the measures. Once the model’s parameters have been estimated, the resulting model-implied covariance matrix is compared to an empirically-based covariance matrix. In order to conclude that the model is a good representation of the relationship between the latent constructs, the two covariance matrices should be similar.

As already mentioned, one key limitation in testing this model using AMOS is that the sample size was only 114, which falls below the suggested minimum of 200. Therefore, the results must be interpreted with caution and are only meant to inform future studies.

The results suggest that the fit of the data to the overall model is not entirely adequate ($\chi^2 (1210) = 2489.3, p = 0.000$; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .097; comparative fit index (CFI) = .743; normed fit index (NFI) = .605; relative fit index (RFI) = .568; and incremental fit index (IFI) = .749. Again, this lack of fit is not entirely surprising given the small sample size combined with the lack of model parsimony. At the same time, however, the RMSEA falls below .10 and can therefore be described as representing mediocre fit. Therefore, it seems there is room to make theory-based modifications to the model and to test these modifications on new samples with the expectation that model fit would significantly improve as a result.
7.6 Discussion

7.6.1 Key findings
While the tests of the individual hypotheses presented in the previous section provide detailed information about the various aspects of my conceptual model that are or are not supported, there are three overarching findings that I believe result from my analysis: (1) the measurement of respect; (2) the differences between respect and trust; and (3) the ways in which respect matters in B2B relationships.

Respect, its measurement, and its components. The scale that I developed to measure respect at the level of the relationship demonstrated good reliability and convergent validity. Specifically, the scale to measure “Respectful Relationship” emerged as a single factor in the factor analysis with no overlap onto trust, and it demonstrated a high reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.94$). As well, this construct had a significant relationship with hypothesized dependent variables (e.g., positive emotion, citizenship behaviours, affective commitment), therefore this measure could be adopted in future research.

Respect and trust are different. One of the objectives of my research was to explore whether respect and trust are distinct constructs. Based on the results of this study, I can conclude that these two constructs are in fact different. Evidence of this conclusion comes in a number of forms. First, the results of the exploratory factor analysis show that respect and trust items load on two separate factors. Second, the results of the confirmatory factor analysis demonstrate that respect and trust are best conceptualized as two separate factors, as compared to a single, unidimensional factor. Third, the fact that respect has implications on marketing relationships that are unique from trust is further evidence of its discriminant (as well as convergent) validity, which will be explained in more detail in the next section.
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Respect matters. The results of this study demonstrate that respect matters in marketing relationships because it has a significant and unique impact on key outcome variables. Because of the problems that were inherent in the manipulation of trust vs. respect, this conclusion is drawn primarily from the analyses with the conceptual independent variables (subjects’ perceptions of respect and trust) rather than the experimental conditions (that may or may not have been accurately perceived). This analysis intuitively makes sense, because it is ultimately our perceptions of relationships that drive our decisions in those relationships rather than some externally-defined reality about that relationship.

This study found participants’ perceptions of respect were related to strongly felt positive emotions, or that their perceptions of lack of respect were related to strongly felt negative emotions. The participants anticipated that these emotions, together with the perception of respect or lack of respect, would in turn be related to the level of interpersonal citizenship behaviours towards the relationship partner, as well as the level of affective commitment towards the relationship partner. These outcomes are unique to respect as compared to trust. These findings are important, because they point to the distinctive role that respect plays in business relationships – it is a source of how we feel about that relationship and the relationship partner, our attachment to the relationship partner, and it has the potential to motivate us to go the extra mile in our interactions with a particular individual.

At the end of the questionnaire, subjects were given an opportunity to voice any other thoughts. A number of responses emerged that further validate the notion that respect matters in B2B marketing relationships:

I have been in this sort of buyer/seller B2B scenario as a buyer. The business relationship was strengthened because of a strong personal relationship. (high respect, high trust condition)
I strongly believe that when a business relationship becomes personal, it is much easier to deal with the other party. I prefer these kinds of relationships; and pricing would be secondary … (high respect, high trust condition)

Business is not about price; but it is all about value. Value can be stated in products and relationships. (low respect, low trust condition)

Building strong business relationships based on trust and respect is important in achieving a long-term business relationship. Although price of products and services is important it is more important to build a relationship whereby individuals feel open to share their concerns, ideas and thoughts in solving business issues. (high respect, high trust condition)

Finally, while not all of the hypotheses were supported in the ANOVAs and the multiple regression, the results of the SEM do point to a level of acceptable fit in the overall model. Thus, I believe that by refining the manipulations of respect and trust, as well as refining the measure of trust to reduce overlap with respect, the overall model warrants further testing in other forms and contexts.

7.6.2 Limitations

Manipulations of respect and trust. While the manipulations had their intended main effects, there were also confounds in the original manipulations – the respect condition had a significant impact on perceptions of trust and the trust condition had a significant impact on perceptions of respect. It is therefore not surprising that the trust condition was significantly related to the relationship outcomes originally predicted to be unique to respect and vice-versa. It is important to continue to develop manipulations that are more tightly related to the core constructs and that result in a more orthogonal evaluation. For example, can the non-malfeasance dimension of trust be operationalized in a way that it does not significantly cross-load onto trust, or can it be eliminated? Reliability is a core component of trust, but it also has the ability to impact on respect evaluations when respect is a result of assessing a relationship partner’s character. Can
the reliability component of trust be manipulated in such a way that it remains distinct from evaluations of respect?

Note, however, that a manipulation check using structural equation modeling (SEM) suggests that the manipulations were at least partially successful, warranting further possible investigation of the model based on the experimental manipulations as they stand. In terms of improving the current scenarios, two of the experimental subjects raised a potentially important issue in their open-ended feedback. These subjects pointed out that the level of governance in the scenario may actually be out of Pat’s control, and not actually indicative of the level of trust in the relationship:

It was indicated that Pat requires a signed agreement for each deal – this could be a company requirement. Even though Pat may totally trust me/my company this may be out of his control. (high respect, low trust condition)

As for pushing the customer to sign a contract; I don’t believe it is Pat who wants a contract signed, but rather his employer. (high respect, low trust condition)

Thus, there is room to improve the operationalization of governance in the scenarios.

Relationship between respect and trust. The precise relationship between respect and trust remains unclear. I originally hypothesized that the reliability component of the trust manipulation would impact on perceptions of respect; however, I did not hypothesize that respect would impact on trust perceptions. The cross-sectional nature of the data do not allow me to draw conclusions about the manner in which respect and trust drive each other. Further research is necessary to investigate the precise nature of this relationship.

Measure of trust. The measure of “Trusting Relationship” was not ideal for this study. The scale tended to two factors (though it was retained as a single factor), its reliability was adequate but
not ideal (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.87$), and it had several items that cross-loaded onto respect or loaded onto respect versus trust. This measure of trust was originally chosen, however, because it is an established measure of interpersonal trust in a salesperson context (Doney and Cannon 1997). These results cause me to question whether past conceptualizations of trust have inadvertently captured elements of respect, and whether there is more work to be done in conceptualizing and operationalizing the core domain of trust. Perhaps another definition, conceptualization, and operationalization of trust that more adequately captures what is central to trust would be able to address this issue. For example, Murphy et al. (2007) adopt a definition of trust that they attribute to Rotter (1967), “a generalized expectancy held by an individual that the word of another can be relied upon” (p. 45). This definition does not include elements of benevolence or non-malfeasance, as we see in other definitions.

*Measure of transaction costs.* I hypothesized that while respect would lead to positive emotions, trust would reduce transaction costs and that this distinction is what fundamentally separates the role of respect from trust. In the analyses, however, the respect condition was significantly related to transaction costs. One possible explanation for this lack of theoretical support is that the measure of transaction costs was inadequate. Transaction costs were assessed using a proxy (monitoring), which is only one aspect of overall transaction costs involved in a relationship. Because the measure of transaction costs did not capture the full domain of this construct, the results may be difficult to interpret. Based on a thorough search, however, there is no comprehensive measure of transaction costs that has been developed to date.

*Affective commitment towards the company.* The results suggest that affective commitment towards the company was not significantly related to respect, even though affective commitment towards the person was. This is somewhat surprising, given previous research on the three targets
of commitment (i.e., person as individual, person as service provider, and service company). Specifically, Jones, Taylor, and Bansal (2008) found that commitment to a service provider enhanced commitment towards the company. In my study, Pat’s attributes – as compared to those of his company – were highlighted in the scenario. Thus, subjects may have been unable to recognize their level of affective commitment to the company without more information.

**Complexity of the constructs.** One overarching reason why I believe that the overall conceptual model, as well as certain individual hypotheses, lacked strong support is due to the complexity of respect. Based on my extensive literature review, I am not aware of any other studies that have manipulated respect at a relationship level, and its complexity may be part of the reason why there is still a scarcity of research on respect. Respect has numerous potential antecedents, and it can be experienced in many different ways depending on the person, their background, and their expectations. Therefore, it may be that the concept of respect, given my current limited understanding of what it is about, is at this early stage too complex for experimental design.

In the open-ended responses, one experimental subject reflected this same concern:

> Human relationships and interactions are often too complex and too difficult to observe with words sometimes. (high respect, high trust condition)

**Complex individual differences.** In addition to the complexity of respect itself, there are also complex individual differences that alter the meaning, experience, and importance of respect for different people. As I explained earlier, for some of the study participants, respect matters. For others, however, respect is not an integral factor in their business relationship decisions, as evidenced by the following open-ended comments that were returned at the end of the questionnaire:
This is a business relationship that has the added benefit (and complexity) of a personal element. People who engage in social business relationships need to be able to separate their emotions from the need to do good business. (high respect, low trust condition)

To me, different values would not be sufficient reason to terminate a business relationship; so long as no harm is done or laws broken. (low respect, high trust condition)

I find there to be too much suggestion that the personal relationship will influence decisions here. This can be the case in smaller or unsophisticated procurement organizations, but experienced people in this field understand that equity and value can be retained in BtoB transactions while still developing a relationship. (high respect, low trust relationship)

While these were the respondents’ reports, I question whether they were influenced by perceptions of socially desirable business relationships (i.e., that they are strictly about business). In contrast, other literature strongly suggests that “there is evidence all around us of the extent to which business relations are mixed up with social ones” (Granovetter 1985, p. 495) and that “friendship and business relationships frequently co-occur” (Grayson 2007, p. 121).

I tested the potential moderating impact of both a service-dominant orientation (an organizational-level variable). There is likely a wider range of moderating variables that impact when respect matters and when it doesn’t, from individual-level to organizational-level variables, and these may be too convoluted to tease out in a single study. Thus, there is room to explore in more detail what some of these other moderating variables might be.

7.7 Conclusion for this Chapter

This chapter outlined an experiment which tested the effects of respect, as they compare to trust, on outcomes that matter in B2B marketing relationships. First, I presented a theoretical rationale for a larger model of respect’s role in these relationships and I then presented hypotheses that elaborated on why I expected each of the proposed relationships to hold. Finally, I explained my
method and presented the results from this experiment. The results point to respect having an important impact in marketing relationships that is different from the impact of trust.
Chapter 8
Discussion, Contributions, Limitations, and Future Research

8.1 Overview
In this chapter, I discuss the major findings of my thesis as they relate to my original research questions. Then, I outline the contributions this thesis makes. Next, I address some key limitations of the research and finally, I outline directions for future research that I hope to address as a result of the questions raised by the studies to date.

8.2 Discussion of Results
In this section, I discuss the findings of studies 1 through 4 as they relate to the research questions that were posed at the outset of this dissertation.

8.2.1 What is the meaning of respect?
An extensive literature review, combined with findings from seventeen exploratory, in-depth interviews, allowed me to arrive at a definition of respect for the purpose of this thesis. To review,

*Respect, in the context of an inter-personal relationship, is defined as regarding a relationship partner to be valuable or, in other words, to have worth. Respect is directed at a target. The other person has various aspects (e.g., rights, dignity, characteristics, talents, achievements) that can be respected. Respect is a belief. Respect is not, however, an action or behaviour – respectful actions and behaviours are manifestations of respect.*

The meaning of respect was explored in detail in the exploratory interviews. Fundamentally, respect is something that exists within a particular relationship – it’s about viewing the relationship partner as important and valuing them. Erin described this succinctly:
[...] acknowledging someone’s experience or someone’s thoughts or, what they bring to the table, what they offer, the value they bring, it’s knowing that everyone does have something to offer. I had worked with an agency [...] they had someone who was brand new, she had just graduated and she was writing the text for one of our pieces. And she was pretty new at it and probably needed a lot of hand holding or direction. But certainly acknowledging that she still you know added something to the work.

Respect is most commonly manifested in people’s behaviours and treatment of others, as well as the language they use in their interactions with and about others. Two primary behavioural manifestations of respect include (1) demonstrating an understanding of the other as a whole person, and (2) listening to the other person. As Jennifer suggested, respect is about understanding people’s individuality:

So it [respect] really has to do with being in tune to people and understanding how they want to be approached and how some people want to be listened to, some people just want to talk, some people want you to tell them what they need to do.

Respect is also about providing people with ‘voice’ – giving them an opportunity to speak, truly hearing what they have to say, and engaging them in a meaningful way.

8.2.2 How can we measure respect in a B2B relationship marketing context?

While it is acknowledged that respect is a complex construct (Sennett 2002), I still endeavoured to develop a measure of respect, since no adequate measure could be found in existing research on this topic. From the literature review and the exploratory interviews, I generated a list of items that were then subject to an expert analysis. From there, preliminary testing and face validity considerations allowed me to refine the list of items to a manageable number. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses suggest the following items to measure respect are appropriate:

Feel Respect (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.95$)

1. Pat takes my experiences seriously.
2. Pat values my participation.
3. Overall, I would say Pat respects me.

Respect Other (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$)
1. I would recognize Pat’s experiences.
2. I think Pat’s opinions are trivial. (R)
3. I respect Pat.

Respectful Relationship (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.94$)
1. This is a disrespectful relationship. (R)
2. People in this relationship value each other.
3. People in this relationship are important.
4. In this relationship, people are appreciated for who they are.
5. People in this relationship respect each other’s beliefs.
6. This relationship is characterized by respect.

The reliability of the “Feel Respect” and “Respectful Relationship” scales is high. The reliability of the “Respect Other” scale is lower, but still exceeds 0.70 (Cortina 1993). This, combined with the conclusions in Chapter 8 about the convergent and discriminant validity of respect, suggest that these scales are acceptable for use in future research.

**8.2.3 How does the meaning and domain of respect vary versus that of trust?**

The definition and meaning of respect was summarized in Section 8.2.1. To review, at the interpersonal level, respect is about the value and worth of a relationship partner, whereas trust is about the reliability of a relationship partner. Similarly, at the relationship level, respect is about the extent to which relationship partners fundamentally value each other, and trust is about the extent to which relationship partners see each other as reliable.

Conceptually, respect and trust can also be described in different ways. Trust – because it is about a relationship partner’s reliability – may be a key reason why one would choose to enter
into a business relationship. Because business relationships are about business at their core, a relationship partner that cannot be relied upon can seriously jeopardize the instrumental goals of an exchange or transaction. Thus, trust becomes an essential requirement for business relationships. Respect – because it is about the value and worth of the other person – might instead be about the process of the business relationship unfolding, and as such might provide a reason why partners may choose to engage in their relationships wholeheartedly. Because the consequences of respect speak directly to the person as compared to the transaction, respect becomes a value-added feature (rather than an essential requirement) for marketing relationships. Whereas trust might provide a reason for choosing to work together, respect could instead be the reason why relationships flourish.

Aside from these definitional and conceptual differences, there are empirical arguments that support the differences between respect and trust that have been gathered through my dissertation research. First, the discriminant validity of respect and trust was demonstrated through an exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The results of the EFA suggest that, within a two-factor solution, the respect and trust items loaded on their respective factors (except for two trust items). Also, in a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), a two-factor solution provided a better fit to the data than a single-factor solution.

Second, the discriminant validity of respect and trust was demonstrated by the fact that these two constructs had unique outcome variables, especially when the analysis was conducted with the conceptual independent variables (i.e., perceptions of respectful and trusting relationships). As predicted, respect alone had a significant relationship with the outcome variables of citizenship behaviours and affective commitment, mediated by emotion. This is in line with the notion that respect, as compared to trust, is predominantly about the person rather than the transaction, and is
therefore a logical predictor of outcomes that are also related to the person – going the extra mile for the relationship partner, and an emotions-based sense of attachment to that relationship partner.

The fact that only perceptions of respectful relationships (and not perceptions of trusting relationships) were positively related to affective commitment stands in contrast to what has been found in previous research (e.g., Morgan and Hunt 1994). One explanation for this contradictory finding is that, because previous research has not specifically measured the level of respect in the relationship, trust and respect have been unknowingly confounded. Respondents in these other research studies may have been inferring a level of respect based on the level of trust (e.g., the fact that my relationship partner is trustworthy is also good reason to respect him/her) and providing responses based on these inferences.

Unexpectedly, when analyzing the data using perceptions of respect and trust in the relationship as independent variables, both respect and trust were significantly related to negative emotional outcomes (though only respect was significantly related to positive emotional outcomes). There is a potential explanation for this unanticipated relationship. Earlier, I explained that trust may be an essential requirement for business and marketing relationships, therefore when it is missing, it has the ability to produce negative emotions. If trust is an essential expectation, its presence would not result in any positive emotions because it is simply fulfilling expectations. And if respect is more of a value-added feature as compared to an essential requirement, then respect’s presence in a relationship would have the ability to produce positive emotions because it is above and beyond what is expected.

This logic can be compared to theory on expectation disconfirmation, satisfaction, and delight. Based on the disconfirmation paradigm, if actual performance of some product or service meets
or exceeds expectations, then customers are satisfied, but if actual performance falls below expectations, customers are dissatisfied (Szymanski and Henard 2001). If, on the other hand, a customer’s expectations are met and exceeded, there is a possibility that the customer will be delighted – where delight is a “profoundly positive emotional state generally resulting from having one’s expectations exceeded to a surprising degree” (Rust and Oliver 2000 p. 86).

Whereas trust in a relationship may have the ability to produce outcomes that conceptually parallel satisfaction and dissatisfaction, respect in a relationship may have the ability to influence outcomes that conceptually parallel delight.

Another potential explanation for this finding regarding the relationship between trust and negative emotions is that, unlike my predictions, trust may in fact have an affective component. Specifically, there are emerging theoretical arguments in the relationship marketing literature that trust does have affective (rather than only calculative) features (e.g., Young 2006).

8.2.4 How does respect impact on important relationship marketing outcomes?

First and foremost, respect matters to marketing relationships. Evidence of this was first found in the exploratory interviews when informants were asked to describe their good and bad marketing relationships. Without even knowing my topic of study, several specifically used the word respect in describing these relationships or referred to elements of respect in their descriptions. Further evidence of this reality was then found in the results of the scenario-based experiment.

The importance of respect is apparent when one considers the consequences of respect. From the literature review, it became clear that respect is related to a number of potential outcome variables, such as commitment, behavioural loyalty, satisfaction, identification, cooperation, and positive word-of-mouth. Then, the exploratory interviews revealed the importance of some of these same outcomes, as well as additional potential outcomes. Specifically, from the exploratory
interviews, I concluded that respect also has the potential to impact on inter-personal identification (i.e., perceived similarity), reputation, word-of-mouth, and emotions. In addition, respect can impact on the amount of effort and energy that is put into the exchange, the level of satisfaction that is experienced, the innovativeness of the outcomes – and the list goes on.

From the multitude of potential consequences of respect, a small number of key outcome variables were selected to be tested in an experimental setting based on (1) the key outcomes in the relationship marketing literature, and (2) the outcomes that would help to discriminate respect from trust. Study 4 (the scenario-based experiment) provided evidence that respect is related to the following marketing relationship consequences: citizenship behaviours, affective commitment towards the person, word-of-mouth communications, and expectations of continuity.

The impact that respect has on these outcome variables is either fully or partially mediated by self-esteem and emotions, which provides an explanation for how and why respect realizes these relationship-level outcomes. To review, respect is about the value or worth of a relationship partner, and therefore when one relationship partner respects another, this impacts on relationship-specific self-esteem. Leary’s (2007) sociometer theory suggests that “self-esteem is part of a sociometer that monitors people’s relational value in other people’s eyes. Because people’s well-being requires that they be valued and accepted by other people, people must be attuned to indications that other people do not value them as social interactants, group members, and relationship partners” (p. 328). In other words, our self-esteem directly results from the perception we have that others value – or respect – us. The relationship-specific self-esteem that results from respect in turn has positive emotional consequences. This is because, according to appraisal theory, we experience positive emotions when our goals – including our goals to enhance our self-esteem – are met.
8.2.5 What is the role of emotion within B2B relationships; specifically what role does it play as an outcome of respect?

As explained in the previous sections, emotion – and specifically positive emotion – emerged in this research as a unique consequence of respect. Evidence of this relationship was first found in the exploratory interviews, where the informants suggested that respectful relationships make people feel happy, excited, and fulfilled, whereas relationships that lack respect lead people to feel angry, frustrated, or indignant. Because the role of emotion in B2B marketing relationships is important but severely understudied (Bagozzi 2006), my research on respect represented a prime opportunity to incorporate the role of emotion into our understanding of these relationships.

While emotions are an outcome of respect, they may not be the most important outcome from a B2B relationship perspective. Whether relationship partners are happy or sad may have little to do with the business- and marketing-related consequences of those relationships. But, the consequences that can arise from emotions are important. My research found that emotion mediates (or partially mediates) the impact that respect has on citizenship behaviours and affective commitment towards the person (as well as word-of-mouth and expectations of continuity in the ANOVA-based analysis). All of these outcome variables are important in a relationship marketing context, because they in turn have implications for the overall success of that relationship from a marketing and an exchange perspective.

8.3 Contributions

This study makes empirical, theoretical, and practical contributions. The literature review and interviews helped to map out the meaning of respect, as well as a model of respect’s impact in B2B marketing relationships. The empirical contributions include establishing a measure of respect. The experiment assisted in confirming the discriminant validity of respect and trust. In
addition, the experiment tested a model of respect that incorporated commitment (affective
commitment, expectations of continuity, and willingness to invest), word-of-mouth, and
citizenship behaviours as key outcome variables, and emotion/self-esteem and transaction costs as
key mediating variables.

The theoretical contributions include integrating the assumptions from various conceptual streams
of work, such as relationship marketing, emotions, and the service-dominant logic. Through
model testing, I have achieved a fuller understanding of the network of relevant relationship
marketing variables. This expanded network includes not only respect and emotion, but also the
outcome variable of citizenship behaviours and the integration of service-dominant orientation as
a potential moderator. In addition, these studies challenge the notion that marketing relationships
are only rational or cognitive in nature. This is accomplished by incorporating emotions into the
model testing. As Haytko (2004) explains, much less attention has been given in the relationship
marketing literature to the more personal and emotional factors in those relationships, as
compared to the attention given to more impersonal and detached antecedents such as trust. This
contribution also speaks to the challenge raised by Ferguson, Paulin, and Bergeron (2005), who
note, “Academics and managers are confronted with reconciling the social and economic aspects
of business-to-business exchanges” (p. 217).

In terms of practical contributions, this research provides an improved understanding of what
respect is (through the exploratory work and the refinement of relevant measurement items) and
why respect is important (through the exploratory work and the model testing). This information,
in turn, is expected to help marketing managers build more successful B2B relationships which
incorporate respect.
8.4 Limitations

My dissertation research faces a number of limitations. In the exploratory interviews, I was the sole researcher involved in the full analysis (e.g., coding, etc.) of the transcripts. Therefore, there may be a risk of missing other viewpoints and perspectives in the analysis. This risk was mitigated by discussing various aspects of the data analysis with my committee members.

Second, the analysis occurred at the level of the data, rather than at the interpretive level (Braun and Clarke 2006). This level of analysis was appropriate here, because my aim was to build a model that could be tested. However, additional insights could be gained by taking a more interpretive approach.

In the experiment, there were a number of limitations. First, while the sample size of 114 was adequate for the analysis (ANOVA and a 2x2 between-subjects experimental design), this smaller sample size impeded adequate analysis of potential moderators. Second, despite pre-testing, it appears that the manipulations were not entirely successful in driving accurate perceptions of high/low respect versus high/low trust in the relationship. Third, the fact that the experiment relied on scenarios rather than experiences means that I assessed anticipated as compared to real outcomes.

Fourth, the length of the questionnaire was constrained to ensure that busy marketing practitioners and professionals would agree to participate and complete all sections. This meant that I had to keep the scales short and the number of scales to a minimum. I therefore could not always test the full range of items that might have been desirable. For example, more respect items would have made it easier to determine the items that are best suited to measuring this construct.
Overall, I believe that the complexity of respect as a construct was a limitation. Because respect is so complex, and its domain not fully understood despite the steps taken as part of this dissertation, it was difficult for some of the informants to reflect on, difficult to manipulate, and difficult to measure. Combined with the fact that there is extremely limited existing empirical research on respect, I feel that this was the biggest challenge of my research. In fact, I have at times wondered if I was overly ambitious in my attempt to manipulate and test respect in an experimental context at all, especially at this early stage of research on the topic.

8.5 Future Research

As research on respect is new in several fields, and is especially new in the field of marketing, there is an abundance of future research directions that can be pursued. Thus, respect is an exciting research stream for me at this early stage in my academic career.

With my existing data, there are two areas of future research. First, with the exploratory interview data, it would be meaningful to pursue a more interpretive analysis of the transcripts (Braun and Clarke 2006). I believe that interpretive analysis, because it looks for the meaning behind what is said as compared to more literal interpretations, would lead to novel findings that would be valuable in their own right. Second, I feel that it is appropriate to conduct path analysis with the experimental data from Study 4, because path analysis is appropriate for smaller sample sizes (as compared to structural equation modeling).

There are many directions for future studies involving the collection of new data. These are listed below.

a. The exploratory interviews and the experiment in Study 4 have not allowed me to confirm the distinct relationship between trust and respect. For example, does trust result
in respect and/or vice versa? If so, how come? Future research is needed to explore the precise relationship between these two variables. I anticipate that longitudinal data may be required to achieve this outcome, since it may be necessary to observe the co-development of these two variables over time in a relationship. Schurr (2007) similarly recommends that there is substantial room to investigate relationships as series of interaction episodes, and that longitudinal data is useful in building our understanding of B2B relationships. He states, “Perhaps the most curious aspect of the bountiful research on relationship development – particularly the quantitative studies – is that so many studies are locked in a moment of time” (p. 168).

b. It is also important to tease out the reciprocity of respect. As Palmatier et al. (2006) explain, reciprocity is the foundation of exchange, and therefore understanding reciprocity is important to fully explaining performance in relationships. As I noted following the exploratory interviews, the reciprocal nature of respect remained unclear and was not further tested in the experiment in Study 4. For example, if Person A respects Person B, will this result in Person B respecting Person A, and if so, under what conditions?

c. It may be important to not only investigate the relationship between respect and trust and the reciprocity of respect, but it may also be important to conduct individual research projects that would investigate, in more detail, the different pieces of the conceptual model I have proposed and tested here. Perhaps given the complexity of the model and the constructs involved, it is necessary to work out the relationship between respect vs. trust on emotion, then respect vs. trust on transaction costs, and so on, to before re-conceptualizing this larger model. This would have two advantages – first, it would
allow for shorter questionnaires and thus minimize participant fatigue, and second, it would allow me as the researcher to be more confident in my understanding of what portions of the model do not hold and why.

d. In future research, it will be important to collect survey data so that I can generalize results to a wider population (i.e., enhance external validity). The fact that the measure of respectful relationships demonstrated good discriminant validity suggests that it might be successfully implemented in a survey setting.

e. Much research in relationship marketing is beginning to adopt larger units of analysis, for example, networks and multiple dyads (Heide and Wathne 2006). Given the reality that marketing relationships are more frequently within the context of larger networks, future research might explore respect as a network phenomenon. In fact, one of the subjects in the experiment provided feedback in the open-ended question that indicated B2B relationships are, in reality, not always person-to-person as the scenario suggested.

f. Study 4 did not find that the service-dominant orientation was a prominent moderator of respect’s impact in marketing relationships. While there is an opportunity to re-investigate the moderating role of the service-dominant orientation with an empirically validated measure (as opposed to the current measure, which was developed for the purpose of this research), there is also an opportunity to explore additional potential moderating variables. Heide and Wathne (2006), in their research on relationship roles, find that when relationship strategies are clanlike in terms of selection and socialization, these may be linked with “friend” type relationships that are guided by logics of appropriateness; whereas relationship strategies that involve harder governance mechanisms, incentives, and monitoring may be linked to the businessperson role and a
logic of consequences. Clanlike versus governance relationship strategies may similarly be a moderator of the importance of respect in B2B marketing relationships.

g. There are emerging theoretical arguments in the relationship marketing literature that trust does, in fact, have an affective (rather than only calculative) component (e.g., Young 2006). Future studies may work to distinguish respect and trust based on the kinds of emotions that result from each, rather than the strict presence versus absence of emotions.

h. Finally, once I have more confidence in the different components and outcomes of respect, additional experimental research could be conducted with scenarios that more accurately manipulate respect versus trust, and data could be collected with a larger sample size. It is important for the manipulations of respect and trust to result in accurate perceptions of respect and trust, respectively, to ensure the validity of the analysis. A larger sample size would enable additional analysis of potential moderators.

8.6 Conclusion
As a whole, this thesis has explored the meaning and impact of respect in a B2B relationship marketing context. The literature review and the preliminary interviews made progress towards understanding the meaning of respect – how it can be defined and its key features. The literature review and the preliminary interviews, together with the scenario-based experiment, also provided insight into the importance of respect – its expected impact on emotion, commitment, word-of-mouth, and citizenship behaviours, and the way in which it is independent from trust.
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Appendix A

Study 1: Recruitment Materials for Interviews (Phase 1)

Hello, my name is Maureen Bourassa. I am a PhD Student in Marketing at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. I am conducting research for my dissertation about marketing relationships.

In the first and current phase of my research, I am conducting face-to-face and telephone interviews with marketing practitioners. These interviews are completely voluntary. The interviews focus on relationships that marketers have with buyers or sellers from other organizations. The results of these interviews will be analyzed and will be the foundation for the second phase of my dissertation. All participants will be given an executive summary of my dissertation.

The interview would take approximately one hour to complete. I would be free to do the interview at your convenience. Would you be willing to consider participating in this study? If so, I would like to give you some time to think about this. I will get back in touch with you on ___________ (at least 24 hours later). In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns regarding my research, please contact me at mbourassa@business.queens.ca or at phone: (306) 384-0947, cell: (613) 453-1180.

Warm regards,
Maureen
Appendix B

**Study 1: Interview Guide (Phase 1)**

Please tell me about some of the business relationships you have been a part of in the past, or that you are currently involved in. Specifically, this should be a relationship with a person at another company (or a group of people at another company) from/to whom you bought and/or sold products or services.

Think of a time when you were involved in a business relationship that went well. Please describe this relationship to me.

- If examples of respect emerge, probe informant to “tell me more about …”
- What caused respect to exist in the relationship?
- What were the outcomes of having a respectful relationship?
- Why would you say this was a relationship that ‘went well’ (i.e., in your eyes, what are the factors for judging marketing relationship success)?

Think of a time when you were involved in a business relationship that didn’t go very well. Please describe this relationship to me.

- If examples of disrespect emerge, probe informant to “tell me more about …”
- What caused disrespect to exist in the relationship?
- What were the outcomes of having a disrespectful relationship?
- Why would you say this was a relationship that ‘didn’t go well’ (i.e., in your eyes, what are the factors for judging marketing relationship success)?

Thinking in terms of your job and your marketing relationships, what comes to mind you hear the word “respect”?

- What does respect mean to you?
- What are some of the key features of respect?
- What are the most important features of respect?
- Are there different kinds of respect? If so, what are they?
• If a person respects you, do you automatically respect them (or vice versa)?
• What happens when you act like you respect someone but don’t really respect them (or vice versa)?
• Who deserves respect?

When is respect most important, do you think? In other words, when does it matter the most? When is it not important?
• Does respect lead to different kinds of relationships?
• Is it more or less important in certain kinds of relationships?

Note: The bullet points may or may not emerge in each interview, depending on the direction of the discussion.
Appendix C

Study 2: Recruitment Materials (Telephone) for Interviews
(Phase 2)

Hello, my name is Maureen Bourassa. I am a PhD Student in Marketing at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario and an Assistant Professor of Marketing at the University of Saskatchewan. I am conducting research for my dissertation about marketing relationships.

I am conducting telephone interviews with marketing practitioners. These interviews are completely voluntary. The interviews focus on relationships that marketers have with buyers or sellers from other organizations. The results of these interviews will be analyzed and will be the foundation for the second phase of my dissertation. All participants will be given an executive summary of my dissertation.

The interview would take approximately 30 minutes to complete. I would be free to do the interview at your convenience. Would you be willing to consider participating in this study? If so, I would like to give you some time to think about this. I will get back in touch with you on ___________ (at least 24 hours later). In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns regarding my research, please contact me at mbourassa@business.queens.ca or at phone: (306) 966-2119.

Thank you!
Maureen
Appendix D

Study 2: Interview Guide (Phase 2)

Questions

General questions:
- Please tell me about a successful buyer or supplier relationship. What factors make this relationship successful?
- Please tell me about an unsuccessful buyer or supplier relationship. What factors make this relationship unsuccessful?
- How important was “respect” to each of the above relationships?

Respect-specific questions:
- Please think about a relationship with a buyer or supplier that has a lot of respect. Now think about another relationship that doesn’t have a lot of respect. What makes these relationships different? What makes them the same? How are they different from your other relationships? How are they the same?
- How important was respect to the success/lack of success in the relationship?
- What do you think caused high respect vs. lack of respect in the two relationships?
- What were the outcomes of high respect vs. lack of respect in the two relationships?
- How much trust was there in each of these relationships? How come?
- How did you show your respect/lack of respect? What made you believe that the other party respected/did not respect you?

Model-related questions:
- Please take a look at the document that I emailed to you as an attachment (model).
- Does this model make sense to you?
- Do you need me to explain anything?
- Does this model capture the kinds of relationships you are involved with?
- Would you add anything to this model? Any success factors, outcomes, or arrows?
- Would you delete anything from this model?

**Attachment sent by email**

**Working “Model” of Business-to-Business Relationship Respect**
Appendix E

Study 3: Recruitment Materials for Expert Analysis

Hello, my name is Maureen Bourassa. I am a PhD Student in Marketing at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. I am conducting research for my dissertation about respect in the context of marketing relationships.

I am currently conducting a study to develop a measure of respect. I am asking a variety of experts to complete a questionnaire about respect. Participation is completely voluntary. The results will be analyzed and will help me to test a more precise measure of respect.

The questionnaire will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. You may complete the questionnaire either on paper or electronically. You may complete the task at your convenience (on or before INSERT DATE). Would you be willing to consider participating in this study? If so, I would like to give you some time to think about this. I will get back in touch with you on ___________ (at least 24 hours later). In the meantime, if you have any questions or concerns regarding my research, please contact me at mbourassa@business.queens.ca or at (613) 453-1180.

Warm regards,
Maureen
Appendix F

Study 3: Questionnaire for Expert Analysis

INSTRUCTIONS: Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study by completing the attached questionnaire. The questionnaire includes a list of items; the purpose is to evaluate how well these items represent respect. In other words, is a particular item quite central to the meaning of respect, or does it have little to do with respect? First, carefully read through the following definition of respect:

Respect, in the context of an interpersonal relationship, is to regard another person as worthy or valuable, no matter how different they are from you. The other person has various aspects (e.g., rights, dignity, characteristics, talents, achievements) that can be respected. Respect is a belief. Respect is not, however, an action or behaviour - respectful actions and behaviours are the manifestations of respect.

Now, please evaluate each of the following items in terms of how well they reflect respect according to the definition. While you do so, it is helpful to think of a specific person that you are engaged in a business relationship with and that makes you feel respected.

To rate each item, click on the corresponding ‘RATING’ and a drop down menu will appear. Select the appropriate number from the drop down menu, where 7 = strongly representative of respect and 1 = not at all representative of respect. Remember, you are evaluating whether or not the item is representative of respect; you are not evaluating a particular person.

If you have any suggestions for improving the wording of a certain item, please write your suggestion below the item. To insert your suggestion, click to the immediate right of the arrow - a blue or black box will appear, and you can begin typing your suggestion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as though I have a good reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is interested in me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not try to ‘take care of’ or protect me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person admires my achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person values what I bring to the table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person appreciates me for who I am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person holds my achievements in high regard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person accepts my differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person acknowledges that I may be different than they are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7 = strongly representative, 1 = not at all representative)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This person recognizes my experiences</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person accepts my ideas</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person appreciates my work</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person holds me in high regard</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person recognizes my ‘personhood’</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is attentive to my needs</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person tries to understand my vision</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is proud to be associated with me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person puts priority on me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person values my position/job</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is not judgmental of me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I deserve to be treated fairly by this person</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person regards me highly</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person sees potential in me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person has an honest relationship with me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person values my knowledge</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person understands my day-to-day challenges</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person seriously considers my ideas and suggestions</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not feel he/she is more important than me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person thinks I am important</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person thinks I have worth</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person considers my unique needs</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person considers me to have integrity</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person understands my constraints</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person takes my needs seriously</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person sees the positive in me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person values me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person gives me special consideration</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person feels positively towards me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person thinks I have a useful perspective</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person values my experiences</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person admires the way I do things</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person values my thoughts and opinions and ideas</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is empathetic towards me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person admires my ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person looks out for my best interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is able to see the world through my eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is honest with me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person gives regard to my views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is concerned with my input</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person considers my ideas and opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as I deserve to be treated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person respects my beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person evaluates my achievements/behaviours positively</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is sympathetic towards me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person pays attention to me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person accepts me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person thinks highly of me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as though I’m credible</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as though they have confidence in me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person cares about me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person accepts in me even what they don’t understand</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person approves of me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My opinion is important to this person</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is able to put him/herself in my shoes</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is proud of me</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person wants to get to know the organization that I work for</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person looks up to me</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person values the ways in which I might be different</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person recognizes my feelings</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person honours me</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is concerned about me and how I feel</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is open with me</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person admires me</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person would defer to me</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is considerate towards me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is interested in my thoughts and opinions</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as though my ideas are well-founded</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person holds my skills in high regard</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as though I set a good example</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person understands my unique goals and projects to be important</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is sensitive to my rights</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is responsive to me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person acknowledges my space</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person considers my beliefs</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, please evaluate each of the following items in terms of how well they represent a lack of respect. Again, it is helpful to think of a specific person that you are engaged in a business relationship with and that does not make you feel respected.

To rate each item, click on the corresponding ‘RATING’ and a drop down menu will appear. Select the appropriate number from the drop down menu, where 7 = strongly representative of lack of respect and 1 = not at all representative of lack of respect.

Again, if you have any suggestions for improving the wording of a certain item, please write your suggestion below the item. To insert your suggestion, click to the immediate right of the arrow - a blue or black box will appear, and you can begin typing your suggestion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This person does not believe in my talents</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not understand that I have to balance multiple demands</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not believe I am autonomous – he/she does not believe I am able to make my own decisions</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not admire my character</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not want to get to know me better</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not appreciate my idiosyncrasies</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not understand me at an individual level</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not acknowledge my dignity</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is not considerate of my feelings</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not pay special attention to me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is selfish in regards to me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as though I do things the wrong way</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This treats me as though I am not ethical</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not value my judgment</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is not aware of what affects me</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not understand my job</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is not aware of who I am</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not evaluate me positively</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is not interested in my success</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person is not concerned about me and how I feel</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not value my thoughts and opinions and ideas</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person does not understand what I need to succeed</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This person treats me as though I have nothing to offer</td>
<td>RATING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Your help is very much appreciated!
Appendix G

Study 4: Emails to Potential Participants in Online Experiment

Pre-notification html email (example)

Understanding Successful Marketing Relationships

My name is Maureen Bourassa. I received your name and contact information from the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, which is supporting my research. I am a PhD Student in Marketing at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario and an Assistant Professor of Marketing at the University of Saskatchewan. I am conducting research for my dissertation about successful business-to-business marketing relationships between buyers and sellers. I am wondering if you might help me out.

As a participant, you would read a scenario and complete a questionnaire online (approx. 15 minutes). The results will help marketers and managers come to a more complete understanding of what makes buyer-seller relationships at the business-to-business level more successful. All participants will be offered an executive summary of my dissertation and may choose to enter a draw to win an iPod Touch.

You can look forward to receiving the materials by email in approximately one week. Or, if you feel that someone else at your organization would be more qualified to participate, please let me know. Also, please contact me if you have questions or concerns at:

bourassa@edwards.usask.ca or at (306) 966-2119.

Your participation would be very much appreciated.

Warm regards,

Maureen Bourassa  
PhD Candidate, Queen's School of Business, Queen's University  
Assistant Professor of Marketing, Edwards School of Business, University of Saskatchewan
Dear INSERT NAME,

I am a PhD Candidate in Marketing at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario and an Assistant Professor of Marketing at the University of Saskatchewan (both in Canada). I received your name and contact information from the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, which is supporting my research. As you might remember from the notice I recently sent you, I am conducting research for my dissertation on marketing relationship success. I would like your help.

The focus of my research is on successful business-to-business marketing relationships between buyers and sellers (i.e., not end customers). As a thank you, participants may choose to enter a draw to win an iPod Touch. Participants will also be offered an executive summary of my research results.

As a participant, you will read a scenario and complete a questionnaire online. The complete task takes no more than 15 minutes. If you are willing to participate, please click here (http://web.business.queensu.ca/faculty/lashworth/relationshipsurvey/default.asp?g=wd) on or before Monday, June 8, 2009. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at bourassa@edwards.usask.ca or by phone at (306) 966-2119.

Thank you for considering this request; I look forward to your participation!

Warm regards,
Maureen

----------------------
Maureen Bourassa
Assistant Professor of Marketing
Edwards School of Business
University of Saskatchewan
PotashCorp. Centre, 25 Campus Drive, Room 180
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada S7N 5A7
Phone: (306) 966-2119
Reminder email

Dear INSERT NAME,

As you might remember from the email I sent you last week, I am conducting research for my PhD thesis on marketing relationship success. If you have already completed your participation in my study, thank you very much! If you have not yet had a chance to participate in the study, I would like you to consider helping me out.

I am a PhD Student in Marketing at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada and an Assistant Professor of Marketing at the University of Saskatchewan, Canada. The focus of my research is on successful business-to-business marketing relationships between buyers and sellers (i.e., not end customers). Participants may choose to enter a draw to win an iPod touch. Participants will also be offered an executive summary of my research results.

As a participant, you will read a scenario and complete a questionnaire. The task takes approximately 15 minutes. If you are willing to participate, please click here (http://web.business.queensu.ca/faculty/lashworth/relationshipsurvey/default.asp?g=wd) on or before Monday, June 8, 2009. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at bourassa@edwards.usask.ca or by phone at (306) 966-2119.

Thank you for considering this request!

Warm regards,

Maureen

Maureen Bourassa  
PhD Candidate at Queen’s School of Business, Queen’s University  
Assistant Professor of Marketing at Edwards School of Business  
University of Saskatchewan  
PotashCorp. Centre, 25 Campus Drive, Room 180  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada S7N 5A7  
Phone: (306) 966-2119  
Fax: (306) 966-251
Appendix H

Study 4: Experimental Manipulations and Survey Instrument

Welcome to the Business Relationship Study and thank you for participating!

Below is an official "Letter of Information and Consent Form", as mandated by the Queen's University and University of Saskatchewan's Ethics Boards. You will need to indicate that you agree to participate under the conditions outlined to continue.

Thanks again for your help! Click here to indicate you agree to participate under the conditions outlined below.

Letter of Information and Consent Form

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are not obliged to answer any questions that you find objectionable. There is no known risk associated with your participation. You may withdraw from this study at any time by closing the Web browser. Submitted responses cannot be removed from the database, however, due to the fact that all information is stored anonymously.

Your questionnaire responses are confidential and anonymous. Only Maureen Bourassa, her dissertation advisors (Peggy Cunningham, Jay Handelman, and Laurence Ashworth - Queen's School of Business faculty), and research assistants (who will sign confidentiality agreements) will have access to the data. All data (excluding personal information) will be stored (in aggregate format) indefinitely in secured computers. If you wish to be entered in the iPod Touch draw or receive an executive summary, you will be asked to provide your email address - this will never be linked to your responses. All email addresses collected will be destroyed after the draw for the iPod Touch and after electronic distribution of the executive summary. Data will only ever be reported in aggregate, including demographic data, so that there is no way individual participants can be identified in reports of this research.
You will need to indicate your consent to participate under these conditions by checking the box above. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (306) 966-2119 or bourassa@edwards.usask.ca. You may also contact:

- Dr. Peggy Cunningham, my research supervisor, at 613.533.2327 or pcunningham@business.queensu.ca
- Dr. Jane Webster, Chair of the Queen's School of Business Unit Research Ethics Board, at 613.533.3163 or jwebster@business.queensu.ca
- Dr. Joan Stevenson, Chair of the General Research Ethics Board (c/o Office of Research Services), at 613.533.6081 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca
- University of Saskatchewan Ethics Office at 306.966.2084

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Queen's University General Ethics Board (January 31, 2009) and by the University of Saskatchewan's Behavioural Research Ethics Board (February 3, 2009).

You will be sent a reminder about this study in approximately one week. You may print a copy of this letter for your own records.

Warm regards,
Maureen Bourassa

---

**Instructions**

For this study, you are being asked to imagine yourself in a scenario. You are a purchasing agent (a buyer) at your organization. You are involved in a business-to-business relationship with a salesperson named Pat from the ABC Company, your supplier.

Please try to imagine yourself in this situation described. Once you have read the scenario we will ask you some questions about some of the thoughts and feelings you might anticipate experiencing in such a situation.
**Scenario**

You and Pat have been in this relationship for the past three years. There are only a few alternative suppliers that you could consider who would provide a comparable offering at a comparable price (including shipping costs). Switching suppliers would take some effort, especially because the alternative suppliers are slightly outside of your traditional geographic area, but switching is possible given the situation.

The key features of your interactions are described below.

*Note: Each participant was randomly assigned to two of the four conditions – 2 (trust: high/low) x 2 (respect: high low).*

(High Trust) Competition is tight in your industry right now. Pat wants to retain you as a customer, so always keeps promises that are made. If Pat tells you something is going to be done, you know it will happen. Similarly, you have always issued payments to Pat on time and so you have noticed that Pat no longer asks you to sign formal contracts for your purchases as compared to when you first started working together. It seems that Pat feels your word can be counted on. You believe Pat would not do something to intentionally hurt you, and you also would not purposely harm Pat. You have both turned down opportunities to work with competing companies because you know this would have been detrimental to the other.

(Low Trust) Competition is tight in your industry right now. Because Pat wants to keep you as a customer, Pat sometimes makes promises that cannot be kept. If Pat tells you something is going to be done, you are not sure it will happen. Once, you were accidentally late in issuing a payment to Pat and so you have noticed that Pat continues to ask that you sign formal contracts for your purchases, even though you have been working together for three years. It seems that Pat feels your word cannot be counted on. With industry competition and mounting pressures, Pat has started supplying one of your indirect competitors, which has the potential to hurt you and your business. Similarly, you recently placed an order with one of Pat's offshore competitors, because the offshore company was able to offer a one-time low price.
(High Respect) Last year you and Pat attended the same industry conference, and when you were out for dinner one evening, you witnessed Pat struggle with a moral dilemma. In the end, Pat did - in your view - the right thing, and you shared your approval with Pat. You have regard for Pat and so, for example, you take time out of your hectic schedule to meet when Pat is in your area. Whenever there is a problem in the relationship and you suggest a solution, Pat listens to you and seriously considers your ideas about how to solve the problem. When you leave voice mails, Pat returns your phone calls faster than any of your other suppliers. In your interactions, you and Pat take the time to learn about each other's lives outside of work - you often spend time talking about your families and your holidays over lunch.

(Low Respect) Last year you and Pat attended the same industry conference, and when you were out for dinner one evening, you witnessed Pat struggle with a moral dilemma. In the end, Pat did - in your view - the right thing, and you shared your approval with Pat. You have regard for Pat and so, for example, you take time out of your hectic schedule to meet when Pat is in your area. Whenever there is a problem in the relationship and you suggest a solution, Pat listens to you and seriously considers your ideas about how to solve the problem. When you leave voice mails, Pat returns your phone calls faster than any of your other suppliers. In your interactions, you and Pat take the time to learn about each other's lives outside of work - you often spend time talking about your families and your holidays over lunch.

Please click to continue to the questions when you are ready.

For these questions, please try hard to imagine yourself in the situation described. We are interested in the kind of thoughts and feelings you would anticipate having in this situation. We will be asking you a series of questions that attempt to get at some of the reactions you may have. We will also give you an opportunity to describe your reactions in your own words later in the survey.
Please note: you may find that not all questions will be directly applicable to your reactions. This is by design, and it is important that you answer these questions as best you can. You can always indicate "don't know" if a question does not make sense to you.

First, a few questions about your feelings.

[Self-Esteem]
1. Imagining yourself in this relationship, how do you think it would make you feel about yourself? (7 point scale plus “don’t know”)  
   - Bad-good (qu1)  
   - Worthwhile-worthless (qu2)  
   - Desirable-undesirable (qu3)  
   - Accepted-unaccepted (qu4)

[Emotion]
2. To what extent would interacting with Pat make you feel each of the following emotions?  
   (7 point scale from “not-at-all” to “very much so” plus “don’t know”)  
   - Excited (qu5)  
   - Fulfilled (qu6)  
   - Happy (qu7)  
   - Angry (qu8)  
   - Disappointed (qu9)  
   - Frustrated (qu10)

[Monitoring]
Based on your reactions to the scenario, please rate the extent to which you would want to monitor Pat's behaviour in each of the following areas. Monitoring refers to the extent to which you might keep close watch over, observe, or check Pat's actions. The mid-point of the scale, 4, would imply a moderate or "typical" level of monitoring in such a relationship. (7 point scale from “no monitoring” to “extensive monitoring” plus “don’t know”)
1. Product quality (qu11)
2. Delivery timeliness (qu12)
3. Price competitiveness (qu13)
4. Order or service specification accuracy (qu14)

[Citizenship Behaviours]
Based on your reactions to the scenario, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your willingness to help Pat? (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

1. I would be willing to help Pat. (qu15)
2. I would NOT be willing to cooperate with Pat. (qu16)
3. I would be willing to assist Pat with personal matters. (qu17)
4. I would be willing to engage in behaviours that benefit Pat. (qu18)
5. I would be altruistic in helping Pat. (qu19)
6. I would be willing to go the extra mile for Pat. (qu20)

[Affective Commitment ... towards Pat ... towards Company]
The following statements relate to how you might feel about your relationship with Pat and the ABC Company. Based on your reactions to the scenario, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

1. Even if I could, I would not drop this relationship because I would like being associated with … (a) Pat (qu21) … (b) the ABC Company. (qu22)
2. Because I would genuinely enjoy this relationship, I would want to remain a member of … (a) Pat’s network (qu23) … (b) the ABC Company’s network. (qu24)
3. My positive feelings towards this relationship partner would be a major reason I would continue working with … (a) Pat (qu25) … (b) the ABC Company. (qu26)

[Expectations of Continuity]
A few more statements relating to how you might feel about your relationship with the ABC company. (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

1. I would expect to continue my relationship with the ABC Company for a long time. (qu27)
2. My renewal of this relationship with the ABC Company would be virtually automatic. (qu28)
3. It is unlikely that in two years I would still be doing business with the ABC Company. (qu29)

[Willingness to Invest]
A few final statements about your relationship with the ABC Company. (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

1. If requested, I would be willing to make further investment into supporting the ABC Company's product/service. (qu30)
2. I would be willing to put extra effort and investment into building my business with the ABC Company. (qu31)
3. I would work to link myself in the customer's mind with the ABC Company. (qu32)

[Word-of-Mouth]
Given your reactions in the scenario, please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about recommending the ABC Company. (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)
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1. I would say positive things about the ABC Company to other people. (qu33)
2. I would recommend the ABC Company to someone who seeks my advice. (qu34)
3. I would encourage friends and colleagues to do business with the ABC Company. (qu35)

[Liking and Friendship]
Some final questions about your impression of Pat. Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

1. I think that Pat is a person I would like. (qu36)
2. Pat seems very likeable. (qu37)
3. I think Pat could be a friend of mine. (qu38)
4. I think Pat would fit well into my circle of friends. (qu39)

[Service-Dominant Orientation]
Thinking about the culture within your own organization, when choosing your relationship partners what factors are most important to your organization's decision? Please rank the following factors, where 1 is the most important to your decision and 6 is the least important.

1. Participatory Nature of Relationship (priority1)
2. Price (priority2)
3. Monetary Costs (priority3)
4. Level of Product Quality (priority4)
5. Level of Personal Interaction (priority5)
6. Customization of Services (priority6)
[Behavioural Manipulation Checks]

Please rate your agreement with each of the following statements about the impression you would have of Pat based on the scenario: (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

1. Pat listens to my input. (qu40)
2. Pat makes an effort to understand my background. (qu41)
3. Pat has integrity. (qu42)
4. Pat is reliable. (qu43)
5. Pat engages in actions that may hurt me and my business. (qu44)
6. Pat formalizes our deals. (qu45)

[Feel Respect (46-48) and Respect Other (49-51)]

A few statements that relate to your and Pat’s opinions of each other. (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

1. How do you think Pat is likely to act towards and think about you?
   - Pat takes my experiences seriously. (qu46)
   - Pat values my participation. (qu47)
   - Overall, I would say Pat respects me. (qu48)
   - I would recognize Pat’s experiences. (qu49)
   - I think Pat’s opinions are trivial. (qu50)
   - I respect Pat. (qu51)

[Respectful Relationship]

2. How would you characterize the relationship with Pat?
   - This is a disrespectful relationship. (qu52)
   - People in this relationship value each other. (qu53)
   - People in this relationship are important. (qu54)
   - In this relationship, people are appreciated for who they are. (qu55)
- People in this relationship respect each other’s beliefs. (qu56)
- This relationship is characterized by respect. (qu57)

A few final statements about your trust in one another. (6 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

[Trust Other]
1. To what extent would you agree or disagree or disagree with the following statements about Pat?
   - Pat can be relied on to keep promises. (qu58)
   - Pat is trustworthy. (qu59)
   - I trust that Pat would not intentionally harm me. (qu60)

[Feel Trust]
2. To what extent do you think Pat would think the following about you?
   - Pat believes I can be trusted. (qu61)
   - Pat places trust in me. (qu 62)
   - Pat’s behavior would suggest I am out to hurt Pat. (qu63)

[Trusting Relationship]
3. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements about the relationship?
   - This is a frank relationship. (qu64)
   - This relationship is built on false claims. (qu65)
   - This relationship is completely open. (qu66)
   - There is trust in this relationship. (qu67)
   - People involved in this relationship are not trustworthy. (qu68)
   - In this relationship, people are only concerned about themselves. (qu69)
   - In this relationship, people seem to be concerned with each other’s needs. (qu70)
   - People in this relationship are prepared to cause the other harm. (qu71)
If you have any other comments that you would like to add about how you would respond to the relationship in this scenario, please elaborate here. You may also include any comments you might have that pertain to the survey itself.

To write comments here, just start typing …

Some questions about some of your general beliefs and values: (7 point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” plus “don’t know”)

- I believe that, in general, other people are worth respecting. (qu72)
- I believe that reliability is an important characteristic. (qu73)
- I believe that it is important for people to engage in principled behavior. (qu74)

Finally, some information about yourself so that we can see if we have a reasonable cross-section of respondents. This information will not be linked to your responses and will never be used to identify you. Your confidentiality is guaranteed.

1. What industry does your company operate in? (open-ended)
2. What is your job/position title? (open-ended)
3. How many years have you been in your position? (<1; 1-2; 3-5; 6-9; 10-19; 20+)
4. How many years of formal work experience do you have? (<1; 1-2; 3-5; 6-9; 10-19; 20+)
5. Please describe your role within your organization. (open-ended)
6. How many people do you manage? (<5, 5-9; 10-19; 20-49; 50-99; 100-499; 500+)
7. How many people does your organization/company employ? (<5, 5-9; 10-19; 20-49; 50-99; 100-499; 500+)
8. Please indicate your gender: (male; female)
9. Your age: (under 18; 19-24; 25-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60-69; 70+)
10. Language you most commonly speak at home: (open-ended)
11. Your country of birth: (open-ended)
12. Highest currently completed education: (some high school; high school graduate; some college; associate’s degree; bachelor’s degree; some graduate work; graduate degree)
13. To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statement? (6 point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree) “I have taken this survey seriously and answered the questions as accurately as possible.” (qu75)

Thank you for helping me with my research. Your participation is very valuable and greatly appreciated.
- In order to thank you for your time, you may have your name entered in a draw to win an iPod Touch. Would you like to have your name entered? (yes/no)
- If YES, please provide your email address so I can contact you if you are a winner. (Note that your email address will not be connected in any way to your responses.)
- Also, I would like to share an executive summary of my research results with you. Are you interested in receiving a copy of my research results? (yes/no)
- If YES, please provide your email address so I can send you the executive summary. (Note that your email address will not be connected in any way to your responses.)

Congratulations!
You have finished the study.
Thank you very much for your participation.