Relationship Quality

in the

Media and Advertising Industry

Catherine Genevieve Myhal
Francis A. Buttle
John A. Murphy[1]

[1] Catherine Genevieve Myhal is a doctoral candidate at Manchester Business School, Booth Street West, Manchester M15 6PB, UK. Tel: +44 (0)161 275 6465; Fax: +44 (0)161 275 6464; Email cmyhal@man.mbs.ac.uk Francis Buttle is Littlewoods Professor of Customer Relationship Management at Manchester Business School, UK. Tel: +44 (0)161 275 6508; Fax: +44 (0)161 275 6464; Email: fbuttle@man.mbs.ac.uk John Murphy is Abbey National Visiting Professor of Service Quality at Manchester Business School. Tel: +44 (0)161 275 6513; Fax +44 (0)161 275 6464; Email: jmurphy@man.mbs.ac.uk

Relationship Quality in the

Media and Advertising Industry

Abstract

Relationship quality has begun to attract interest as a research topic over the past few years. Within this paper, two research questions are explored: "what are the key characteristics of relationship quality" and "Is the actor bonds (B), resource ties (R) and activity links (A) triptych advocated by the IMP group an adequate framework for encompassing relationship quality".

Results from interviews within the media and advertising industry allow better insight into items characterising relationship quality, providing a list of 250 items, some of which relate to characteristics previously identified within the literature and some of which do not. Subsequent coding and classification of these items reveals that the IMP's BRA framework, previously applied to relationship substance, can be successfully applied in providing a classification for relationship quality items as well.

Though a qualitative approach was adopted at this stage, it does provide more insight into the nature of the relationship quality construct, and paves the way for ultimately producing a measurement tool allowing measuring the quality of a given business-to-business relationship.

Research Questions

A number of authors acknowledge the academic and corporate significance of being able to measure relationships and their quality (Naudé and Buttle 1999; Buttle 1996, 1997; Anton 1994; Copulsky & Wolfe 1990; Grönroos 1991).

This paper attempts to answer 2 main questions about relationship quality (RQ):

1. What are the key characteristics of a high quality relationship in a business-to-business context? The literature review which follows gives us some indication of this, but more work is needed to establish a thorough understanding of the RQ construct.
2. Does there exist in the literature a useful conceptual framework for organising the conceptual domain of RQ. In particular, is the BRA (actor **B**onds, **R**esource ties, **A**ctivity links) triptych advocated by the IMP group appropriate?

Other RQ questions remain unaddressed by this particular paper, although we believe that our data will provide some insight. Among the unanswered questions are the following:

✓ Do customers and suppliers agree on what characterises a high quality relationship? Understandably, both parties will probably have a different view of their business relationship, but there must be a degree of co-operation whatever the fundamental level of conflict in order for relationships to flourish (Wilkinson and Young, 1994).
✓ Do construals of relationship quality (RQ) change over time? And, if so, what are the contextual conditions that bring about change?
✓ How does RQ differ from service quality?

Methodology

Our method comprises both literature reviews and primary data collection. The literature review follows. Here, we explain the primary data collection and analysis process. Whereas quantitative research usually relies on an impressive number of context-stripped cases to establish statistical significance, qualitative research usually employs smaller samples of people, embedded in a particular context and studied with more depth (Miles & Huberman, 1994). We adopt a qualitative approach.

Sample

Looking more towards gaining a better understanding of the relationship quality construct and using inductive reasoning, instead of simple theory confirmation, it was decided that a snowball method of sampling would provide a suitable way forward. Miles and Huberman (1994:28) define this as identifying "cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information-rich".

The initial sampling unit was selected through a convenience sampling process. Participants in the research were sought from a class of mature executive MBA students. One of these, a Sales Director in a media firm (print, radio, TV) volunteered to participate and to nominate associates from the industry. A list of contact details was obtained for other media-industry executives, and then, still more contacts from these, and so on. Of the ten executives whose interviews were used for this project, five were either working for media advertising space providers, and five were from intermediates, in other words, media space purchasing agencies. Multiple-case sampling was used, as it was believed this would add a certain degree of confidence to findings

Research design and data collection

An open-ended interview guide was designed and used, which would allow ideas and concepts to emerge without suggesting them directly to the respondents. This is fully concordant with a goal of generating items to characterise high relationship quality. As well, this allowed respondents to provide further explanations concerning the contexts, relationships and episodes they were describing. As McCracken (1988: 9)

puts it, long interviews provide "a clearer understanding of the beliefs and experience of the actors in question". Open-ended interviews can provide deeper, context-rich answers

The main themes covered in the interviews were:

- ✓ Background information
- ✓ Relationship management practices within the company
- ✓ Characteristics of high relationship quality
- ✓ Exploring the company's partners' views on relationships quality
- ✓ Relationship development over time
- ✓ Relationship quality vs. service quality

To ensure comparability of answers (c.f. Foddy, 1993), the same basic questions were asked to each respondent although contextualised probing also took place.

Method of analysis

QSR NU*DIST, a software package specifically designed to perform qualitative data analysis, was used to organise and understand the data. Using NU*DIST, all 10 interviews were coded according to the coding scheme available in the appendix. Coding schemes, conceptual frameworks, are a form of analysis in themselves (Miles and Huberman, 1994), as they entail differentiating and combining the on-hand data and reflecting on the contents of the interviews. Assembling "chunks" of data into categories (or "codes") then leads to the next step, the drawing of conclusions.

The first and second-named authors both examined the interview transcripts in order to reduce researcher bias. This researcher triangulation consisted of both coders independently identifying relationship quality "items" within the data, and determining within which of the three relationship dimensions (actor bonds, resource ties activity links) these could be placed. The coders compared their analyses and, in an iterative process, strove to achieve a 100% consensus.

Reaching consensus on the categorisation of the items identified involved a process of negotiation, reflecting upon the nature and interpretation of each item where there was a difference in categorisation. After much debate, referring to the BRA definitions and to the interview transcripts, the first and second-named authors reached agreement, gaining a better understanding of both the various items and the triptych itself in the process, until finally 99.2% agreement was reached with regards to the 250 identified text items.

Literature reviews

Relationship quality

Within the IMP, channel and relationship marketing literatures, direct references to relationship quality are rather scarce.

Further, there does not seem to be a generally accepted definition of just what "relationship quality" is. However, Maria Holmlund (1997: 9), does offer a dyadic definition of relationship quality:

> "Perceived relationship quality is the joint cognitive evaluation of business interactions by significant individuals in both firms of the [customer-supplier] dyad. The evaluation encompasses a comparison with potential alternative interactions of a similar kind which represent comparison standards."

More information regarding the nature of relationship quality can be found elsewhere, however. For Crosby et al. (1990:77), "relationship quality…. is viewed as a higher order construct (Anderson and Gerbing 1988) composed of at least 2 dimensions, (1) trust in the salesperson and (2) satisfaction with the salesperson". It acts as an indicator of the present and future soundness of long-term service sales relationships.

For Gummesson (1987), relational quality draws attention to the fact that "relations are a part of customer-perceived quality". Higher relational quality will contribute to a positive perception of quality by the customer and thus set the stage for a long-term business relationship. Buttle (1999:1) makes a contribution in the same general direction when stressing that "a high quality relationship will create value and be regarded as successful by at least one of the parties".

Buttle's (1995:153) research shows that relational quality has what he terms "a directional valence". Relationships that exhibit characteristics that are positively valued will be of higher quality.

Lynch (1992) claims that three components, people, product and process, must be successfully managed to ensure a high quality relationship.

Seignour (1998) emphasizes that customer loyalty depends upon the quality of the relationships that are developed over the long term during the different "moments of truth".

Finally, Peck et al. (1999) state that new and existing customers require different marketing strategies as they are in different stages of relationship building. Over time, managers and customers will have to decide how strongly they wish to commit to a particular relationship. One might say this will depend on the quality of the relationship, as the factors considered will be the potential life-time value of a customer and potential benefits resulting from the association (Peck et al., 1999).

A number of qualities are cited in the literature (some frequently) as being linked to achieving a successful, high quality relationship. These are:

- ✓ trust (Naudé and Buttle, 1999; Cunningham and Homse 1986; Wilson and Jantrania 1994).
- ✓ Goal compatibility (Wilson and Jantrania 1994),
- ✓ regard for privacy (O'Malley et al. 1997; Earp, Harrisson & Hunter 1999),
- ✓ communication and information sharing (Buttle 1997; Morgan & Hunt 1994, Anderson & Narus 1990; Cunningham and Homse, 1986),

- ✓ commercial competence (Cunningham and Homse, 1986)
- ✓ technological expertise (Cunningham and Homse, 1986),
- ✓ co-operation (Cunningham and Homse 1986; Anderson & Narus 1990; Wilkinson and Young 1994; Naudé and Buttle 1999; Leek et al. 1999),
- ✓ mutual dependence (Earp et al. 1999; Hunt & Morgan 1994; Naudé and Buttle 1999),
- ✓ flexibility and adaptability (Cunningham and Homse, 1986),
- ✓ mutual investments/bonds (Naudé and Buttle 1999; Storbacka et al. 1994; Wilson and Jantrania 1994),
- ✓ knowledgeable employees (Crosby et al. 1990; Storbacka et al. 1994; Grönroos 1997),
- ✓ supply performance capability (Cunningham and Homse, 1986),
- ✓ satisfaction (Wilson and Jantrania, 1994),
- ✓ organisational effectiveness (Cunningham and Homse, 1986),
- ✓ legitimate exercise of power (Cunningham and Homse, 1986; Wilkinson and Young 1994),
- ✓ customer value (Johnson, Norapol & Weinstein 1999; Cunningham and Homse 1986),
- ✓ goal compatibility (Wilson and Jantrania, 1994),
- ✓ comparison level of the alternatives (Wilson and Jantrania, 1994),
- ✓ customer orientation (Cunningham and Homse, 1986),
- ✓ customer skills (Henning-Thurau, 2000; Cunningham and Homse 1986), and
- ✓ commitment (c.f. Cunningham and Homse 1986; Dwyer, Shurr & Oh 1987; Anderson & Weitz 1992; Morgan and Hunt 1994; Sheaves & Barnes 1996; Garbarino & Johnson 1999).

These authors indicate that relationship quality is a multi-dimensional construct made up of different attributes. All of these components, however, have yet to be identified and their effects explored in detail.

Actor bonds, activity links and resource ties

The IMP group has actively researched business-to-business relationships. In their research, they emphasize core concepts related to business-to-business relationships, such as interaction, relationships, networks, atmosphere, adaptations, bonding and investments.

Within the Interaction Approach, a relationship between a buying and a selling party can be considered in terms of three dimensions that comprise its substance: actor bonds, activity links and resource ties (Håkansson and Snehota, 1995; Ford 1998). Håkansson and Johanson (1992) take this a step further by providing a model in which they explain that actors, activities and resources are the three elements that are interwoven to form industrial networks.

If the substance of relationships is captured within these three dimensions, then it seems logical to use these in order to assess relationship quality. Following this logic, we hypothesised that it should be possible to associate different RQ text units within the transcripts to actor bonds, resource ties or activity links.

The following definitions of actor bonds, activity links and resource ties, provided by Håkansson and Snehota (1995: 153) was adopted within this research:

> "*Activity links* regard technical, administrative, commercial and other activities of a company that can be connected in different ways to those of another company as a relationship develops.
>
> *Resource ties* connect various resource elements (technological, material, knowledge resources and other intangibles) of two companies. Resource ties result from how the relationship has developed and represents in itself a resource for a company.
>
> *Actor bonds* connect actors and influence how the two actors perceive each other and form their identities in relation to each other. Bonds become established in interaction and reflect the interaction process."

The three dimensions forming the substance of business relationships are not independent, according to Håkansson and Snehota (1995). Resources are activated by actors carrying out activities. The resources available limit the range of activities that can be pursued by actors. Resources ties can only be committed, and activity links established, if there are bonds between actors.

Results

Independently, coder 1 identified 215 text units relevant to the first research question: what constitutes relationship quality? Coder 2 identified 194 text units. They jointly identified 260 items in total, of which 143 were common to both coders.

Subsequently, 10 of the text unit items (among which 9 were identified by a single coder) were discarded, as it was recognized that these either didn't really pertain to the research question, that they were more an outcome than a constituent of relationship quality, or that they simply were not meaningful.

Thus, through analysis, 250 RQ items were eventually identified. The full list of items is available upon request from the first named author. With regards to categorizing the items within the actor bonds (B), resource ties (R) and activity links (A) triptych, the original level of agreement between coders was of 41.5% for the 260 items. As previously mentioned, after negotiation and further exploration, a 99.2% agreement was reached, with the coders agreeing on all but two of the items.

Research question 1: What are the key characteristics of a high quality relationship?

Items most often mentioned

The original list of items uncovered is fairly extensive and contains, in our judgement, a large number of (near-) synonyms. The 250 items generated by this research project

will be collapsed through further qualitative and quantitative analysis in order to produce a more manageable and parsimonious list, ultimately leading to the development of a relationship measurement development tool.

However, preliminary analysis allows us to discern that the items mentioned most often revolve around the topics of trust, good and frequent communication, marketing knowledge, respect, social compatibility and value for money. Several - but fewer - items also revolve around the following topics: working together to achieve similar goals, not wasting time, sharing information, having a high quality product and delivering it, as well as commitment.

Insights gained through categorisation

Of the characteristics previously mentioned as being related to relationship quality in the literature, several have emerged within the items found as a result of this research project. Those that are reflected within the media and advertising industry are trust, communication and information sharing, cooperation (expressed as "helpfulness"), knowledgeable employees (referred to in various forms as "marketing knowledge"), commitment and customer value (mostly expressed in relation to "good products" and "fair pricing"). Others items, however, were not mentioned by our respondents. These are regard for privacy, mutual dependence, mutual investments/bonds and customer skills. This is not to say that these specific items are inapplicable or of little importance; they may or may not be. However, they were not directly mentioned by either the buyers or suppliers considered for this project.

Several items mentioned by respondents did not, however, did not feature within our review of the RQ literature. These items included:
✓ respect
✓ social compatibility
✓ not wasting time, among others.
.

Research question 2: can the BRA approach be used to categorise RQ attributes?

As relationship quality is still a relatively new field without an abundance of available literature on the subject, not only is there no general consensus with regards to relationship quality's attributes, there is also no generally accepted model allowing us to characterise relationship quality.

This paper is certainly a step forward in terms of identifying items characterising relationship quality. However, our 10 interviews generated 250 items. This number is too great to constitute a useful management tool; to use the data as such would result in a huge and unwieldy endeavour. There is a need for a more parsimonious and manageable model, one that is simple enough to be applied outside industry-specific boundaries such as that of the media and advertising industry.

The BRA triptych is a concise framework, and, *prima facie*, readily applicable to the relationship quality context. Indeed, relationship quality is inherently linked to

relationship substance, perhaps even encompassed within it. Hence, it seemed natural to apply this triptych and attempt to classify the items within it.

For the 250 items retained as characterising relationship quality, 99.2% agreement was reached by the two coders with regards to classification as actor bonds (B), resource ties (R) or activity links (A). It was indeed possible to attribute each item to one of the three categories. Table 1, below, gives an indication of the distribution of the 250 items amongst the elements of the BRA triptych.

Category	Number of items	Examples of items occurring frequently
Actor bonds (B)	74	✓ Trust ✓ Faith ✓ Honesty ✓ Openness
Resource ties (R)	72	✓ Ideas ✓ Price ✓ Having an understanding ✓ Product
Activity links (A)	102	✓ Regular meetings ✓ Communication ✓ Working on clients' behalf ✓ Not wasting time

Table 1: distribution of items amongst the BRA triptych

Discussion

Since relationship quality is necessarily closely linked to, and is perhaps an integral part of, relationship substance, the BRA triptych was chosen as a classification scheme for the 250 text items identified in the transcripts.

As demonstrated by the above enumeration of items and their categorisation, our results indicate that this application of the dimensions of relationship substance onto relationship quality has been successful. All the items found could be attributed to one or another dimension, though this was not necessarily done without a struggle, as some items originally seemed to be representative of two, or sometimes even three, different dimensions. An example of this is "Has an agenda" This was originally seen as being part of "resource ties" by one researcher and "activity links" by the other (it was subsequently categorized as belonging to "resource ties"). The item "be good at your job" would be another example of a problematic item; this one originally could be seen as fitting into the "actor bonds" or the "activity links" categories, before the coders agreed its proper place would be ultimately be in "resource ties". Differences were resolved, as explained previously, through negotiation and furthering the coders' understanding of the items and the triptych employed.

This new application of the Interaction Approach's relationship substance triptych has allowed the authors to better explore the relationship quality construct. It provided a new platform onto which to build a characterisation of this construct and a classification of its constituting items, hence providing new grounds for a working framework of analysis during continuing and future research.

Conclusion

There still remains a lot of work to be done in the field of relationship quality. Several questions remained unanswered with regards to this emerging construct, some of which have been addressed within this paper, and some of which still remain to be explored.

Our research within the media and advertising industry has helped to shed some light in establishing what are the key characteristics of relationship quality. However, further, more extensive multi-sectoral research remains to be done in order to try and encapsulate what business partners mean when they talk of high quality relationships.

There also remains to establish a generally accepted model that will encompass relationship quality and allow researchers or executives to measure it within current ongoing business-to-business relationships. This task was not completed here, but is part of our agenda. We have established that the actor bonds, resource ties and activity links (BRA) triptych provides a suitable framework. This is definitely a step forward in terms of eventually providing a working relationship quality model.

Further research will be pursued in this area by the authors in the hope of gaining a better understanding of relationship quality and its constituents, with the ultimate goal of providing a practical and functional measurement tool.

References

Anderson, J.C. & Gerbing, D.V. (1984) The Effect of Sampling Error on Convergence, Improper Solutions and Goodness-of-Fit Indices for Maximum Likelihod Confirmatory Factor Analysis, *Psychometricka*. Vol. 49 (2), pp.155-173.

Anderson, J.C. & Narus, J.A. (1990) A Model of Distributor Firm and Manufacturer Firm Working Partnerships, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 (January), pp.42-58

Anderson, E. & Weitz, B. (1992) The Use of Pledges to Build and Sustain Commitment in Distribution Channels, *Journal of Marketing Research*. Vol. XXIX (February) pp. 18-34.

Anton, J. (1996) *Customer Relationship Management – Making Hard Decisions with Soft Numbers*, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Buttle, F. (1996) *Relationship Marketing*, Relationship Marketing Theory and Practice, London: Paul Chapman.

Buttle, F. (1997) *Exploring Relationship Quality*. In R. Ashford et al. (eds). Marketing Without Borders. Proceedings of the 31st annual conference of the Academy of Marketing, Manchester Metropolitan University, pp. 143-156.

Copulsky, J.R. & Wolf, M.J. (1990) Relationship Marketing: Positioning for the future, *The Journal of Business Strategy*, July/August, pp.16-20.

Crosby, L.A., Evans, K. R. & Cowles, D. (1990) Relationship Quality in Services Selling: An Interpersonal Influence Perspective, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol 54 (July) pp.68-81.

Cunningham, M. T. & Homse, E. (1986) Controlling the marketing-purchasing interface: resource development and organizational implications, *Industrial Marketing and Purchasing*, Vol 1 (2), pp. 3-27.

Dwyer, F. R., Schurr, P. H. & Oh, S. (1987) Developing Buyer-Seller Relationships, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol 51 (April) pp.11-27.

Earp, S., Harrison, T. & Hunter, A. (1999) *Relationship Marketing: Myth or Reality*. In McLoughlin, D. and Horan, C. (eds), Proceedings of The 15th Annual IMP Conference, University College, Dublin.

Foddy, W. (1993) *Constructing Questions for Interviews and Questionnaires: Theory and Practice in Social Research.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, D. (1998) *Managing Business Relationships*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Grönroos, C. (1991) The Marketing Strategy Continuum, *Management Decision*, Vol. 29 (1), pp. 7-13.

Grönroos, C. (1997) Value-Driven Relational Marketing: from Products to Resources and Competencies*, Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 13 (5), pp. 407-419.

Gummesson, E. (1987) The New Marketing – Developing Long-term Interactive Relationships, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 20 (4), pp. 10-20.

Håkansson, H. & Johanson, J. (1992) A Model of Industrial Networks. In D. Ford (ed), *Understanding Business Markets, 2nd Edition*. Thomson Learning: London (2000), pp. 129-135.

Håkansson, H. & Snehota, I. (1995) Analysing Business Relationships. In D. Ford (ed), *Understanding Business Markets, 2nd Edition*. Thomson Learning: London (2000), pp. 151-175.

Henning-Thurau, T. (2000) Relationship Quality and Customer Retention through Strategic Communication of Customer Skills, *Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 13 (1-3), pp. 55-79.

Holmlund, M. (2000) *Perceived Quality in Business Relationships*. Helsinki: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration.

Hunt, S.D. & Morgan, R.M. (1994) Relationship Marketing in the Era of Network Competition, Marketing Management, Vol 3 (1) p. 19-28.

Johnson, W.C., Norapol, C. & Weinstein, A. (1999) *Creating Value Through Customer and Supplier Relationships*. In McLoughlin, D. and Horan, C. (eds), Proceedings of The 15th Annual IMP Conference, University College, Dublin.

Leek, S., Turnbull, P.W. & Naudé, P. (1999) *Managing Relationship Research in a Turbulent Environment*. In McLoughlin, D. and Horan, C. (eds), Proceedings of The 15th Annual IMP Conference, University College, Dublin.

Lynch, J.J. (1992) *The Psychology of Customer Care*, Worcester: Billing and Sons Ltd.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long Interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis, Second Edition.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Morgan, R.M. & Hunt, S.D. (1994) The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58 (3), pp.20-38.

Naudé, P. & Buttle, F. (1999) *Assessing Relationship Quality*. In McLoughlin, D. and Horan, C. (eds), Proceedings of The 15th Annual IMP Conference, University College, Dublin.

O'Malley, L., Patterson, M. & Evans, M. (1997) Intimacy or Intrusion? The Privacy Dilemma For Relationship Marketing in Consumer Markets, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 13 (6), pp. 541-559.

Peck, H., Payne, A., Christopher, M. & Clark, M (1999). *Relationship Marketing – Strategy & Implementation*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Seignour, A. (1998) Le marketing interne: un état de l'art, *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, Vol. 13 (3), pp.43-55.

Sheaves, D.E. & Barnes, J.G. (1996) The Fundamentals of Relationships: An Exploration of the Concept to Guide Marketing Implementation, *Advances in Services Marketing and Management*, Vol. 5, pp. 215-245.

Storbacka, K., Strandvik, T. & Grönroos, C. (1994) Managing Customer Relationships for Profit: The Dynamics of Relationship Quality, *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 5 (5), pp. 21-38.

Wilson, D. T. & Jantrania, S. (1994) Understanding the Value of a Relationship In D. Ford (ed), *Understanding Business Markets, 2ⁿᵈ Edition*. Thomson Learning: London (2000), pp. 288-304.

Wilkinson, I. F. & Young, L. C. (1994), "Business Dancing – The Nature and Role of Interfirm Relations in Business Strategy", *Asia-Australia Marketing Journal*, Vol. 2 (1), pp. 67-69.

ORGANISATIONAL INFO   **ORG**
Information about the company (what & where) ORG-INF
Age of company   ORG-AGE
Role of person speaking   ORG-ROL
Clients: Who are they?   ORG-CL-WHO
Clients: Length of relationship   ORG-CL-LEN
Clients: % of business going to main customers ORG-CL-PER
Suppliers: Who   ORG-SU-WHO
Suppliers: Length of relationship   ORG-SU-LEN
Suppliers: % of business going to main suppliers ORG-SU-PER

INDUSTRY INFO   IND
Industry information (INCest, ENTertainment, SHALlow…) IND-INF…
Industry's role to play in relationship quality IND-REL

RM PRACTICES   **REL**
Definition of business relationship   REL-DEF
Do they believe they have ongoing business relationships REL-HAVE
Components of a business relationship   REL-COMP
Relationship preferences (some clients/suppliers better) REL-PREF
Reason for preferences (EMPathy, TRUst, HONesty, TIMing…) REL-PREF-…

HIGH QUALITY RELATIONSHIPS – CUSTOMERS **HQRC**
Definition of HQR   HQRC-DEF
Components of HQR   HQRC-COMP
Items necessary for HQR (UNDerstanding, RESpect, TIMing…) HQRC-IT-…
Examples of good relationships with suppliers HQRC-SU-EX
Consequences of good relationships with suppliers (…) HQRC-SU-CSQ-...

HIGH QUALITY RELATIONSHIPS – SUPPLIERS **HQRS**
Definition of HQR   HQRS-DEF
Components of HQR   HQRS-COMP
Items necessary for HQR (UNDerstanding, RESpect, TIMing…) HQRS-IT-…
Examples of good relationship with clients HQRS-CL-EX
Consequences of good relationship with clients (PERK, EDGE… HQRS-CL-CSQ-...

LOW QUALITY RELATIONSHIPS - CUSTOMERS **LQRC**
Definition of a LQR   LQR-DEF
Items necessary for LQR (MISTrust, ADVersarial, WASt time…) LQR-IT-…
Ongoing LQR, is it possible?   LQR-ONG
What leads to a LQR   LQR-LEAD
How to change a LQR into a HQR   LQR-CHG
Examples of bad relationships with suppliers LQR-SU-EX
Consequences of bad relationships with suppliers (…) LQR-SU-CSQ-...

LOW QUALITY RELATIONSHIPS - SUPPLERS	**LQRS**
Definition of a LQR	LQRS-DEF
Items necessary for LQR (MISTrust, ADVersarial, WASt time…)	LQRS-IT-…
Ongoing LQR, is it possible?	LQRS-ONG
What leads to a LQR	LQRS-LEAD
How to change a LQR into a HQR	LQRS-CHG
Examples of bad relationship with clients	LQRS-CL-EX
Consequences of bad relationship with clients (CASH…)	LQRS-CL-CSQ-...
PARTNER'S VIEWS - CUSTOMERS	**CPAR**
Believe suppliers think they have a relationship	CPAR-THK
Believe suppliers want to have a relationship and why they want it	CPAR-WANT
Items that are important for suppliers (INNovation, MONey,…)	CPAR-IT-…
Believe suppliers holds same view or not as their company about what is a HQR	CPAR-SVIEW
Items and reasons why it's important to hold same view (SGOAL, EMPathy, TRUst…)	CPAR-SVIEW-IT-…
PARTNER'S VIEWS – SUPPLIERS	**SPAR**
Believe customers think they have a relationship	SPAR-THK
Believe customers want to have a relationship and why they want it	SPAR-WANT
Items that are important for customers (INNovation, MONey,…)	SPAR-IT-…
Believe customers holds same view or not as their company about what is a HQR	SPAR-SVIEW
Items and reasons why it's important to hold same view (SGOAL, EMPathy, TRUst…)	SPAR-SVIEW-IT-…
FEEDBACK	**FEED**
Form of feedback received	FEED-FORM
Importance accorded to feedback	FEED-IMP
Result of feedback on relationship	FEED-RES
RELATIONSHIPS OVER TIME	**TIM**
How HQR's develop in the early stages	TIM-EAR-DEV-HQR
How LQR's develop in the early stages	TIM-EAR-DEV-LQR
Items necessary for HQR's in the early stages (LEARning, INFOrmation exchange, UNDerstanding of market…)	TIM-EAR-IT-…
Does it change in later stages?	TIM-LAT-CHG
Items characterising mature relationships (TRUst, RESpect…)	TIM-LAT-IT…

RELATIONSHIP QUALITY VS SERVICE QUALITY   **SQ**
Definition of high quality service   SQ-DEF
Items characterising high quality service (SPEeD, DELivery…)   SQ-HQS-IT-…
Items characterising low quality service (IGNorance, …)   SQ-LQS-IT-…
Differences between service quality and relationship quality   SQ-DIFF
Similarities between service quality and relationship quality   SQ-SAME
HSQ leads to HRQ   SQ-SQ->RQ
HRQ leads to HSQ   SQ-RQ->SQ
Consequences of having HSQ   SQ-CSQ