

Customer Experience Assessment: Forgotten Effects

Carolina Nicolás Alarcón¹⁾, Jaume Gil-Lafuente²⁾

1) University Santo Tomás, Av. Ejercito Libertador n°146, 8370003-Santiago (Chile),
cnicolas@santotomas.cl

2) University of Barcelona, Av. Diagonal n° 690, 08034-Barcelona (Spain), j.gil@ub.edu

Abstract: *The objective of this study is to contribute with new tools to customer experience management, because the importance that is reaching this area in business and academic world. We propose “Forgotten Effects Theory”, developed by Kaufman and Gil Aluja (1988) that look for causality relations to help to recover variables that could be obviated at first, during initial analysis of a problem. Empirical investigation was carried out to 1.045 customers of different air companies of Spanish market, it values variables affecting value chain of this companies, which affect in different degree customer experience and his/her brand satisfaction. Finally we present those variables selected as more important to improve customer experience and so, deliver information to company to development of future strategies.*

Key words: Customer Experience, Experton, Fuzzy Logic, Satisfaction, Forgotten Effects Theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

Have satisfied customer is a basic objective in any business area. A key factor in today's design of activities is achieving it in economical way, identifying those qualities that are more important to customers (Nicolás & Gil-Lafuente, 2011).

Customer satisfaction not only has to be evaluated through a global score, get valuing customer experience with company, also to get more knowledge you have to analyze value chain developed by company to find those spots, dots, of improvement through desagregation of its main activities that create value.

Customer experience is the inner and subjective answer to any direct or indirect contact with the company. Direct contact usually occurs during buying, using and service; commonly started by client. Instead, indirect contact happens more often, when customer meets by chance with company products or product samples, services or brand, that change to oral advices or criticism, advertising, news, or other (Meyer & Schwager, 2007).

To business and academic world, from early XXI century, it gets more sense analyze customer experience according to this information, create goods and services or process improvements inside company to contribute to grow customer fidelity; but when you analyze literature, you observe a lack of knowledge about this matter, since a lot of companies consider that using CRM software and control customer satisfaction and/or advice levels is enough.

In this article we state a methodology that allows to identify those causal variables that affect global experience evaluation of an air company. As methodology we use multivariate analysis and Forgotten Effects Theory from Kaufmann & Gil Aluja (1988).

We set the problem of need to find those items that form value chain that are creating more satisfaction and those that contribute less to customer satisfaction. The goal of empirical investigation is to establish which variables affect value chain of this business model and cause some impact in customer experience, to give more information to managers in their decision making process and strategy development. To answer objectives set out, we made a literature review about “customer experience” in next sections, and we set out methodological development to end with results and conclusions of the work.

2. STATE OF THE ART

Customer Experience management

Nowadays use of internet by a big number of people makes easier, mostly, communication and, at same time, reduces cost of it; also, *data warehouse*, *softwares CRM* (*Customer Relationship Management*), *Data Mining* and tools of *business intelligence* are helping storage and analysis of big amounts of information, achieving improve efficiency of relationship management between companies and customers, fulfilling in a better way specific needs of every customer, Shapiro and Varian (2000).

As expressed previously customer experience is an inner and subjective answer to any direct or indirect contact with company, Meyer et al. (2007). Customer Experience management is composed by a series of processes that get customer opinions about company and convert it in knowledge to stakeholders. This processes allow to tracking customer experience, considering several interaction patterns with customers to obtain a better understanding about their experiences and needs, this phases are classified as: “Persistent”, “Periodic”, “Pulsed”, Meyer et al. (2007) Its correct management allows to reinforce and establish emotional profits of affinity, confidence and security, strong feelings that help organizations to have a competitive advantage over its peers.

In on-line companies world, create experience and that it's accepted positively by users, is essential, because, as is known, first experiences with webpages interfaces are very important to customer retention, Kim et al. (2009). Also, you have to bear in mind that, this experience has to be combined with all customer contact areas, online and off line, Schmitt (2000). For that reason, when all customer experience gather: advertising company communication, mailing, contact by Contact Center, Loyalty Program, Buying process, among other actions.

3. METHODOLOGY

Study has developed under business service context of air companies of Spanish market, as part of a wider study

that expects develop improvement models inside organizations, analyzing customers experience by means of listening his/her voice. This sector has been chosen, considering that in Spain, air transport has grown, during last ten years, reaching a growing of 7, 7%, from 2003 to 2007, turning into the third European country in passenger traffic volume¹.

The big change in this market has come because of emergence of low cost, or no-frills, model air companies, centered in offering low prices that has bring this service closer to mass public, different to business model of traditional air companies, also call full services carriers” (FSC).

Final sample was composed by 1.045 clients that have flight sometimes (during last year) with main air companies of Spanish market, which possess 70% of the market, including low cost and traditional. It is not the objective of this research identify their names, that is why studied brands are omitted.

During the first investigation stage, to analyze relationship between customer satisfactions an different variables that compound value chain of studied companies, a regression multiple model is formulated: Global Satisfaction = $b_0 + b_1*(F1) + b_2*(F2) + b_3*(F3) + b_4*(F4) + b_5*(F5) + b_6*(F6) + e$ (1)

Model does not include Loyalty Programs of VIP Rooms, because not all companies have this service.

Study was applied by online survey, during 2009; people were gain via invitation email, with a previously 15 minutes structured questionnaire. Universe was constituted by active air ticket buyers of last year, over eighteen years old, usual internet users, and living in Spain. Final sample was of 1.045 people, margin of error 3,09², sampling method used is not probabilistic by convenience, see (Chart 1).

Forgotten Effects Theory

Second analysis do it was to evaluate customer experience with different air companies, we apply “forgotten effects theory”, regarding customer satisfaction levels with companies are result of some causes or events that made up, at last, customer experience.

It is known that incidence is a subjective notion, is, usually, difficult to measure, and if applied, in some occasions, probabilities result seldom righty justified, but incidence examination, although been conceivable, even subjectively, allow a reasonable action, Kaufmann et al. (1988).

Methodological foundations of Forgotten Effects Theory:

Given A entity set:

$$A = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_i / i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \quad (\text{Causes}) \quad (2)$$

That has an incidence over other set:

$$B = \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, \dots, b_j / j = 1, 2, \dots, m\} \quad (\text{Effects}) \quad (3)$$

It is considered that exists an incidence of a_i over b_j iv par value (a_i, b_j) is equal to 1 an there is no incidence if value of this par is equal to 0.

$$\mu: A \times B \rightarrow [0,1]$$

$$\text{Then, } \forall (a_i, b_j) \in A \times B, \mu(a_i, b_j) \in [0,1] \quad (4)$$

So, the set of values, valued under this way defines the “incidence matrix”, that shows relations cause-effect produced with different degrees between elements of set A and set B, Kaufmann et al. (1988), see (Chart 1.)

CHART 1: First order Matrix E

A	B						
		b_1	b_2	b_3	b_4	...	b_m
E =	a_1	$\mu a_1 b_1$	$\mu a_1 b_2$	$\mu a_1 b_3$	$\mu a_1 b_4$	...	$\mu a_1 b_m$
	a_2	$\mu a_2 b_1$	$\mu a_2 b_2$	$\mu a_2 b_3$	$\mu a_2 b_4$	...	$\mu a_2 b_m$
	a_3	$\mu a_3 b_1$	$\mu a_3 b_2$	$\mu a_3 b_3$	$\mu a_3 b_4$	...	$\mu a_3 b_m$
	a_4	$\mu a_4 b_1$	$\mu a_4 b_2$	$\mu a_4 b_3$	$\mu a_4 b_4$	...	$\mu a_4 b_m$
	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	a_n	$\mu a_n b_1$	$\mu a_n b_2$	$\mu a_n b_3$	$\mu a_n b_4$	...	$\mu a_n b_m$

These incidences set shows cause-effect relations between two sets of elements that represent the first order matrix, that forms the first step at the moment of establish effects that has some elements over others.

4. RESULTS

In Chart 2 we present a summary of sample description, where we can observe that 48,9% were men and 51,1% women, el 40,9% between 18 and 30 years old, 39,8% between 31 and 40 years old and last 19,3% more than 41 years old, all of them living in Spain. Also 63,9% has university degree, 25,3% higher studies (not university). As average, interviewed fly 4 times per year, 3 of them leisure, and 1 for work.

After getting opinions of five experts of this market, processes that compose value chain were defined, these are: ticket buying satisfaction, web satisfaction, before flight satisfaction, after flight satisfaction, customer service satisfaction.

To identify evaluations from low cost and traditional air companies, we labeled with “L” letter low cost companies and with “M” letter traditional companies, see (Chart 2)

CHART 2: Sample Description
(n=1.045)

		Percentage
Gender	Men	48,9%
	Women	51,1%
Age	From 18 to 30 years	40,9%
	From 31 to 40 years	39,8%
	More than 40 years	19,3%
Geographical Zone	Spain	100%

Customer experience is made by different experiences subjectively evaluated; in air market case this evaluation is different if customer travels in a low cost or traditional air company, because their customer profiles and company strategies are different. But evolution of this market and changes in costumer behavior are leading to consider the same needs, as we can see in (Chart 3), for almost all air companies ticket buying process explains mostly of customer company satisfaction, this is mainly in traditional air model companies, low cost air companies that focus its business on on-line shops, web page is very

¹ IET (Instituto de Estudios Turísticos, Tourist Studies Institute)

² This margin of erro has been calculated for a probability of not been exceed of 95%, in the worse case , that it means, of máximum indetermination (P=Q=50 %) for an infinite universe (N>100.000).

important or, may be, we can say that it is essential to this business models.

CHART 3: Importance of main factors about general satisfaction of air company

Variable/Company	L1	L2	L3	L4	T5	T6	T7
R ²	77.05 %	69.83 %	76.38 %	80.46 %	78.23 %	76.61 %	75.26 %
Ticket buying	29.9%	19.5%	32.6%	8.2%	25.4%	21.5%	20.7%
Services during flight	17.8%	20.1%	14.8%	28.8%	21.6%	14%	13.7%
Services after flight	18%	5.1%	7%	5.3%	6.3%	13.3%	16.9%
Customer services	16,5%	10.7%	13.7%	6.8%	9.7%	19.4%	19%
Services before boarding	2,4%	17.7%	10.1%	19.2%	14.6%	14.2%	19.3%
Web page	15,5%	26.9%	21.9%	31.8%	22.4%	17.5%	10.4%

Source: Own elaboration.

Considering obtained results after do multiple regression, we can observe that the element that explains more customer whole satisfaction is ticket buying process 28%; for this study, after a importance analysis of different elements was made, is mainly conformed by ticket price 32,5%, available destinations 23,5% and sales and promotions 15,2%. The second element that explains customer satisfaction is web page with 18,4%, with, after choose different elements, is form by ease of use 32,6%, number of products offered 27,5%, operation of flight search engine 26,2% and loading page speed 13,7%. These two elements are almost 50% of complete company satisfaction according to the study. This results agree with Kim & Eom (2009) and Casaló (2007), investigations, which state about importance of friendly interface design to internet users, because they affect company experience and satisfaction. See (Chart 4).

CHART 4: Summary of importance of main factors over general satisfaction.

Variable/Importance degree	Degree that explains General Satisfaction	Different importance factors
Ticket buying satisfaction	28,00%	Flight price 32,50%
		Available destination 23,50%
		Promotions, offers 15,20%
Web satisfaction	18,40%	Ease of use 32,60%
		Number of offered products 27,50%
		Search engine performance 26,20%
		Loading page speed 13,70%
Services during flight	15,30%	Plane comfortable 34,10%
		Plane condition 30,50%
		Staff manners 21,20%
Customer service	14,60%	Solving doubts ability 28,50%
		Doubt/Problem solving time 25,10%
		Compensation policy 22,60%
Before boarding service	14,40%	Flight punctuality 31,20%
		Check-in online 12,20%

After flight services	12,40%	Manners of land staff	10,45%
		Airport counters check-in	10,10%
		Flight punctuality	45,70%
		Luggage retirement	28,20%
		Disembarkation delay	26,00%

Source: Own elaboration.

a. Analysis by Forgotten Effects Theory

In order to develop or point variables that affect in greater degree customer satisfaction, a list of elements that compose outside causes that have a bearing on customer experience was made, we try to make a thorough list, but we know that other elements can exist not considered in this model.

In this analysis we try to establish accumulated effects of first and second generation and at last recover forgotten effects. Considered causes (Chart 5):

CHART 5: Elements that compose outside causes that have a bearing on customer satisfaction.

a1	Product price on the market	a13	Capital country of origin
a2	Other companies offers	a14	Company nationality
a3	Brand image	a15	Company General management
a4	Sales source of product	a16	Environment policy
a5	Flight schedules	a17	Social responsibility
a6	Origin/Destination	a18	Customer personality
a7	Flight frequency	a19	Customer Way of life
a8	Country economic situation	a20	Business flight
a9	Customer experience with other companies	a21	Leisure flight
a10	Previous customer experience with the company	a22	Customer culture
a11	Inner customer satisfaction	a23	Education level
a12	Family and friends Experience about the product		

Each of this elements are the result of deep talks with experts of the area of the study, which, also, developed a list of possible effects in satisfaction levels with component of general value chain to this industry, finally for our study were considered this, (Chart 6):

CHART 6: Elements that compose product effects of external causes.

b1	Ticket buying satisfaction
b2	Web satisfaction
b3	On Flight satisfaction
b4	Customer service satisfaction
b5	After flight satisfaction
b6	Before flight satisfaction

To estimate incidence of every cause (Chart 5) over effects described in Chart 6, we asked the most important

expert to evaluate incidence of one element over other ascribing a number between segment [0,1] using a endecadarian system, accepting that influence of a cause over an effect it is never limited to all or nothing, they can exist 11 degrees that are equivalent to different intensities considered as possible, Gil- Lafuente (2001).

The answer has been represented on the following matrix:

CHART 7: Matrix E

	b1	b2	b3	b4	b5	b6
a1	1	0,9	0,7	0,2	0,7	0,8
a2	0,8	0,2	0,4	0,6	0,5	0,4
a3	0,8	0,1	0,6	0,2	0,2	0,7
a4	1	0,4	0	0,6	0	0,8
a5	1	0,7	0,6	0,1	0,8	0,8
a6	0,2	0,2	0,6	0	0,8	0,5
a7	0,9	0,6	0,7	0,1	0	0,5
a8	0,7	0	0	0,6	0	0
a9	0,6	0,5	0,6	0,9	0,6	0,8
a10	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a11	0,9	0,5	0,9	1	0,5	0,9
a12	0,9	0,5	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a13	0	0	0	0,2	0	0
a14	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7
a15	1	1	1	1	1	1
a16	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
a17	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
a18	1	1	1	1	1	1
a19	1	1	1	1	1	1
a20	0,2	0,2	0,8	0,9	0,9	1
a21	0,9	0,9	1	0,9	1	0,9
a22	0,7	0,7	1	0,9	0,9	0,8
a23	0	0	0	1	0	0

After that, we ask the same expert to point the degree of incidence that exists between each cause ($a_1, a_2, a_3 \dots i$) with itself, and the others. As a result we have the square fuzzy matrix U that it is reproduced following (Chart 8):

CHART :8: Square fuzzy matrix U

	a1	a2	a3	a4	a5	a6	a7	a8	a9	a10	a11	a12	a13	a14	a15	a16	a17	a18	a19	a20	a21	a22	a23
a1	1	0,7	1	0,7	0,1	0,9	0,8	0	0,8	0,8	0,9	0,9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,6	0,1	0	0	0
a2	1	1	0,7	0,6	0,8	0,8	0,8	0	1	0,7	0,6	0,7	0,2	0	0	0	0,1	0,1	0	0,9	1	0	0
a3	0,8	0,7	1	0,5	0,7	0,7	0,7	0	0,5	1	1	0,6	0,7	0	0	0	0	0	0,8	0,2	0	0	0
a4	0,2	0,5	0,8	1	0	0	0	0	0,7	0,9	0,9	0,2	0	0	0	0	0,1	0	0	0	1	1	0
a5	1	0,8	0,8	0,6	1	1	1	0	0,9	0,9	0,6	0,9	0	0	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0,8	0
a6	1	1	0,8	0,2	0,5	1	0,8	0	0	0,3	0	0,3	0,2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,4	0,4	0	0
a7	0,4	0,5	0,2	0	0,8	0,3	1	0	0	0,1	0	0,2	0,5	0,3	0	0,1	0	0	0	0,2	0,3	0	0
a8	0,5	0,5	0	0,2	0	0,1	0	1	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	0	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,3	0	0	0,2	0,3	0
a9	0	0	0	0,2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0,8	0	0	0	0	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,1	0
a10	0,2	0	0,2	0,1	0	0,1	0	0	1	1	0	0,2	0	0	0	0	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,3	0,3	0	0
a11	0	0	0,4	0	0	0	0	0	0,2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,2	0	0	0	0	0	0
a12	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,9	0,1	0,8	0,8	0	1	0	0	0	0,2	0,2	0	0,3	0,3	0	0	0	0
a13	0,1	0,2	0	0	0	0,2	0,2	0	0	0	0,1	0	1	0	0,5	0,4	0,4	0	0	0	0	0	0
a14	0,3	0,1	0,3	0,1	0	0,4	0	0	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,4	1	0,5	0,4	0,4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a15	0,2	0	0,3	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,3	0	0	0,1	0,3	0,1	0,1	0	1	0,4	0,4	0	0	0	0	0	0
a16	0,1	0	0,3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,1	0,2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
a17	0	0	0,3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,1	0,2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
a18	0	0	0,4	0,4	0	0,4	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0,3	0,3	1	1	0	0,5	0,5	0	0
a19	0	0	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0,2	0,3	0,5	1	0	0,5	0,5	0	0
a20	0,7	0,5	0,7	0,7	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
a21	0,7	0,5	0,7	0,7	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
a22	0,4	0,4	0,8	0,7	0,1	0,3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0	0	1	0,5	0
a23	0	0	0,8	0,2	0	0	0	0	0,2	0,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0,5	0,5	0,4	0	0	1	1	0

Also, we ask the expert to complete data about incidence degree of each effect ($b_1, b_2, b_3 \dots j$) with itself and the others to get totality of relations between effects. As a result we get square fuzzy matrix I that it is reproduced following:

CHART:9: Square fuzzy matrix I

	b1	b2	b3	b4	b5	b6
b1	1	1	0,3	0,5	0,6	0,8
b2	1	1	0	0,8	0,3	0,1
b3	0,5	0	1	0	0,4	0
b4	0,5	0,4	0	1	1	0,4
b5	0,6	0,1	0	0,8	1	0

b6	0,9	1	0,8	0,5	0,3	1
----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	---

Matrix U y I are square and also, reflexives, but not symmetrical.

To get calculations of effects of first and second generation, first we must do convolution max-min between matrix U and E, in other words, $U \circ E$, for which we search the max-min de of row i and column j , and the obtained results are:

CHART 10: Matrix U $\circ$ E

	b1	b2	b3	b4	b5	b6
a1	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a2	1	0,9	1	0,9	1	0,9
a3	0,9	0,9	0,9	1	0,9	0,9
a4	1	0,9	1	0,9	1	1
a5	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	1
a6	1	0,9	0,7	0,6	0,8	0,8
a7	0,9	0,7	0,7	0,5	0,8	0,8
a8	0,7	0,5	0,5	0,6	0,5	0,5
a9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a10	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a11	0,9	0,5	0,9	1	0,5	0,9
a12	0,9	0,8	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a13	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5
a14	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7
a15	1	1	1	1	1	1
a16	0,3	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,3
a17	0,3	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,3
a18	1	1	1	1	1	1
a19	1	1	1	1	1	1
a20	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	1
a21	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	1
a22	0,9	0,9	1	0,9	0,9	0,9
a23	0,8	0,7	1	1	0,9	0,8

Second stage of analysis is the convolution max-min of matrix U $\circ$ E with matrix I, when apply the same procedure that described to obtain U $\circ$ E, we get:

CHART 10.1: Matrix U $\circ$ E $\circ$ I = E*

	b1	b2	b3	b4	b5	b6
a1	1	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a2	1	1	1	0,9	1	0,9
a3	0,9	0,9	0,9	1	1	0,9
a4	0,9	1	1	0,9	1	1
a5	1	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	1
a6	1	1	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8
a7	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8
a8	0,7	0,7	0,5	0,6	0,6	0,7
a9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a10	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a11	0,9	0,9	0,9	1	1	0,9
a12	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
a13	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5
a14	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7
a15	1	1	1	1	1	1
a16	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3
a17	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3
a18	1	1	1	1	1	1
a19	1	1	1	1	1	1
a20	1	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	1
a21	1	1	0,9	0,9	0,9	1

a22	0,9	0,9	1	0,9	0,9	0,9
a23	0,8	0,8	1	1	1	0,8

In matrix of (Chart 10.1) we can observe that collect full incidences of first and second generation, because it include causality relationship between elements, between them and over self, also with causality relations compiled in matrix I.

To isolate incidences of second generation we made an ordinary difference between matrix E^* and E , that get as a result matrix of (Chart 11), where we observe rising of some second generation effects, and in some situations this elements have a significant impact, we emphasize cases $a_2 \rightarrow b_2$, $a_6 \rightarrow b_4$ y $a_{23} \rightarrow b_5$; where we can see the importance of offers of other companies over satisfaction with web where it was considered of 0,2 its incidence and after analysis changes to 0,8, so we can also stress incidence of origin and destination over customer service, when at first it was considered as 0 after analysis we have a incidence of 0,8; finally, there is incidence of education level over satisfaction after flight, at first it was considered as void, and after analysis is considered as 1.

CHART 11: Results Matrix of difference between matrix E^* and E

	b1	b2	b3	b4	b5	b6
a1	0	0,1	0,2	0,7	0,2	0,1
a2	0,2	0,8	0,6	0,3	0,5	0,5
a3	0,1	0,8	0,3	0,8	0,8	0,2
a4	0	0,6	1	0,3	1	0,2
a5	0	0,3	0,3	0,8	0,1	0,2
a6	0,8	0,8	0,2	0,8	0	0,3
a7	0	0,3	0,1	0,7	0,8	0,3
a8	0	0,7	0,5	0	0,6	0,7
a9	0,3	0,4	0,3	0	0,3	0,1
a10	0	0	0	0	0	0
a11	0	0,4	0	0	0,5	0
a12	0	0,4	0	0	0	0
a13	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,3	0,5	0,5
a14	0	0	0	0	0	0
a15	0	0	0	0	0	0
a16	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
a17	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
a18	0	0	0	0	0	0
a19	0	0	0	0	0	0
a20	0,8	0,8	0,1	0	0	0
a21	0,1	0,1	0	0	0	0,1
a22	0,2	0,2	0	0	0	0,1
a23	0,8	0,8	1	0	1	0,8

5. CONCLUSIONS

Brand customer experience is the result of a serial of incidences than make different processes of interaction customer-company. Disaggregate this different processes entail a deep analysis that through Forgotten Effects Theory (FET) has developed considering different stages of incidence that according to experts opinions would have some degree of influence over customer experiences and, at last, his/her satisfaction.

Some of the variables of forgotten effects that, according to the analysis we made with FET affect in greater degree to customer experiences and at first moment were not considered are: effect of “offers from other companies” over “web satisfaction”, we have a 0,2 of incidence, and after analysis it changes to 0,8; also we can emphasize “origin and destination” over “customer service satisfaction”, at first its incidence was of 0, after analysis we get an incidence of 0,8; finally among the cases, we stress “education level” over “satisfaction over flight” at first it was considered as null or 0, and after analysis it is considered as 1.

Comparing results with multivariable analysis done, we can observe that results complement each other. In statistical analysis we conclude that buying process and web page are main variables that affect global customer satisfaction, analysis that we can complement with forgotten variable study that can have an effect and should be keep in mind to make decisions.

We must bare in mind that effects of studied causes produce effects over other group of variables, which can affect company strategic decisions, as decisions about products, price, distribution or communication, or also can consider image redesign and company placement.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Casaló, L.; Flavián, C.; Guinalíu, M., “The roles de security, Privacy, Usability and Reputation in the Development of Online Banking”, Online Information Review, 31 (5), (2007), pp.583-603.
- [2] Gil Lafuente, A.M., “Nuevos mercados para la recuperación económica: Azerbayán”, Real Academia de Ciencias Económicas y Financieras, Barcelona, (2011), pp.15-26.
- [3] Kaufmann, A.; Gil Aluja, J., “Modelos para la investigación de efectos olvidados”, Editorial Milladoiro, Vigo, (1988), pp.15-17.
- [4] Kim, E.; Eom, S., “Designing Effective Cyber Store User Interface”, Industrial Management & Data Systems, 102 (5), (2002), pp. 241-251.
- [5] Kim, H.B.; Kim, T., Shin, S.W., “Modeling Roles of Subjective Norms and eTrust in Customers’ Acceptance of Airline B2C eCommerce Web-sites, Tourism Management, 30, (2009), pp.266-277.
- [6] Meyer C.; Schwager A., “Understanding Customer Experience”, Harvard Business Review, February 2007, pp. 1-11.
- [7] Nicolás, C. y Gil Lafuente, J., “La Voz del Cliente”, Trend Management Journal, 8, 2011, pp.52-57.
- [8] Schmitt, B., ‘Creating and Managing Brand Experience, 11 (4), (2000), pp.53-58.
- [9] Shapiro, C. and Varian, H., “Information Rules: A Strategic Guide to the New Economy”, Antoni Bosch Editors, Barcelona, (2000), Ch.3