A Study of Brands and Consumers' Relationship Towards Cognitive Interdependence in the Saudi Market

Mohammad Rishad Faridi [1]

[1] *Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, College of Business Administration, Al Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

Abstract **- COVID-19 has had a drastic effect on human lives on this planet. As a result, a bizarre phenomenal change has occurred in the way consumers react to their preferred brands, thus forcing Marketers to rethink and redesign their marketing plans accordingly. Whether buying patterns will remain stable or further change, is overtly nascent to predict. Digitalization during the COVID-19 era has had a behavioral transformation in the way companies and customers respond to the perceived vanities of life, resulting in changes in market dynamics, market competitiveness, and the larger economic indices during the post-COVID era, which is today. The business landscape around the world has metamorphosed dramatically. Marketers today have an uphill task, especially in understanding cognitive interdependence and consumer psychology, particularly concepts of consumer satisfaction, loyalty, preference, and brand love. This research explores how 'Cognitive Interdependence' influences the consumer buying decision of a given brand in the Saudi market. As far as research suggests, the impact of cognitive interdependence on brand perception within the Saudi market remains unexplored. Hence, this study has been conducted to give an innovative perspective to underpin a brand's life cycle (post-COVID-19) vis-a-vis consumer sentiments and the depth of the process of determining Brand Fidelity.**

DOI: 10.18421/TEM153-31
https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM153-31

Corresponding author: Mohammad Rishad Faridi,
Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, College of Business Administration, Al Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: m.faridi@psau.edu.sa

Received: 18 December 2025.
Revised: 17 February 2026.
Accepted: 18 March 2026.
Published: 27 August 2026.

Keywords **- Cognitive Interdependence, brand commitment, consumer relationship.**

1. Introduction

Cognitive Interdependence (CI) refers to the way people's thoughts and memories become each other's. It's essentially the idea that conceptualized investigation can become intertwined with someone else's, creating a kind of shared mental space [1], [2]. It is the degree to which one is connected to or dependent on the other [3], [4]. Cognitive Interdependence (CI) is a phenomenon that highlights a pluralistic approach to collecting all the expressions and thoughts of commitment [5], [6]. In terms of Consumer Behavior and Brand Association, it could be termed 'The Commitment Collective', an extreme form of Brand Fidelity, emphasizing the collaborative aspect of building Brand Loyalty. From a Marketing perspective, a situation wherein the consumer and the brand have a greater inclusion backed by trust, commitment, love, and loyalty [6]. It also has a direct relationship to the degree to which an individual exhibits feelings for the brand and takes personal ownership of the brand. CI is the critical linchpin that bonds the linking of relationship commitment with an expression of commitment [7]. As per [6], the degree to which the consumers intensely feel and love the brand and its' association, ultimately takes ownership towards the brand. CI is a "habit of thinking" [7]. When a Consumer feels committed to a brand (its presence, has good feelings and thoughts towards it), identifies with its promises, and feels a greater association with it, CI strengthens. Brands offer features, benefits, and a sense of satisfaction that builds loyalty over time. Constant consumption of a particular brand yields a high level of satisfaction and brand loyalty. Consumers connect with brands that fulfil their needs and make them feel good, like how strong friendships develop over time (which leads to a motivation shift) [5]. Cognitive Interdependence (CI) is possible if motivation between both entities exists, in other words, the consumer shifts from a self-centered focus to a relationship orientation.

This two-way bond (Pluralistic Transformation) leads to mutual success (the Brand thrives, and the Consumer feels fulfilled by it). Cognitive Interdependence (CI) can move from "me" to "we," which further spurs feelings and emotions and builds a strong relationship [8]. This connection can be a blend of emotional valence and relationship cognition. Marketers recognize this and thus emphasize instilling this bond to build Brand Fidelity. However, this strong connection required by Companies for Cognitive Interdependence (CI) can sometimes lead to a dilemma, it can be tough to decide which brand to choose and which to forgo. This is where various factors need to be considered while making a decision.

Therefore, the current research is devised to achieve the four major objectives: (1) To make an analysis of the degree of brands' cognitive interdependence with their consumers in the Saudi market, (2) To explore and discover factors that contribute to positive cognitive interdependence, (3) From a country (Saudi Arabia) approach, align the brand towards a Customer-centric environment and how cognitive interdependence will contribute towards achieving that goal, (4) To compare and contrast Saudi brands with multinational brands in the Saudi market. The study will be a valuable contribution to marketing in the Arab region, especially in Saudi Arabia. Businesses are witnessing disruption and disturbance, and companies are encountering massive threats due to sudden changes in the geopolitics of the world economy. At the micro level, consumers' buying patterns are changing as consumers' spending power has become very volatile and uncertain. Thus, this research would be a valuable insight to the marketing department in building a long-term relationship with the customers.

1.1. Literature Review

Extensive research efforts have been conducted previously related to companies, brands, and consumers. This study specifically explores the intensity of cognitive interdependence between brands and consumers in Saudi Arabia. The relationships are divided into two categories according to social psychology: exchange and communal relationships [9], [10]. It points out that the exchange relationship is based on reciprocity, while the communal relationship depends on emotion; the difference between these two associations is echoed in their respective interactive norms, which influence consumers' attitudes and behaviors. Conversational associations are fiscal and offer serviceable aids, while cognitive associations involve sentiments toward others that surpass self-interest [11].

Conversational or Functional associations focus on the practical benefits and functionalities a brand offers, while Cognitive associations center on intense feelings like Brand Loyalty, admiration, and a sense of community (belonging). For a relationship to truly exist, it is evident that there is a need for an interdependence between partners, which implies, that the partners are supposed to affect, define, and redefine the relationship [12]. CI has a strong relationship with brand kinship and is often defined as "the level of obsessive emotive bonding, a gratified customer possesses for a specific brand name" [13], [14]. Despite the continuing debate about the definition of brand affinity and the proportions that ideate the notion, widely held present research on brand affinity approves that the dimensional edifices of interactive and brand affinity are abstractly equivalent [15], [13]. This research suggests a strong equanimity between the dimensions of interactivity and brand affinity, i.e., brand affinity is directly proportional to the interactivity between the consumer and the brand. Strong CI builds on strong brand kinship, which is "the level of obsessive emotive bonding a gratified customer possesses for a specific brand name" [13].

Consumer buying (products and services) behaviors are also governed by factors such as emotions, brand stimulus, and their belief in the firm's approaches which could be translated as feelings towards the brand, its message, its interactions through various mediums including social media and the resonance of company's core values with its customers. Research exploring Cognitive Interdependence (CI) experiences demonstrates a direct link to brand affinity. Existing research clarifies the connection between CI experiences and brand affinity - comes from the brand characteristics that reconnoiters the experiences of CI, and also has a direct relationship with brand affinity which focus on brand characteristics [16], customer appearances [17], and customer–brand associations [18], [19], [20]. This research also emphasizes how 'specific' brand characteristics can cultivate stronger CI. For a CI affiliation to exist, interdependence between associates must be obvious: that is, the associates must jointly affect, define, and redefine the relationship [12]. In the present values-driven era, individuals call for fair treatment beyond simple consumers; rather, they expect to be systemically treated with minds, hearts, and spirits being more cognitively interdependent [21]. As a consequence, Cognitive Interdependence has emerged as a key concept, in that it emphasizes the importance of collaboration in fostering creativity, shared values, and a sense of connection (spirituality).

Hence, this makes companies act as active mediators, pointing at aligning themselves as companies whose brands have admiration and esteem [22]. Furthermore, taking these factors into account, companies endeavor to produce and manage sustainable brands over time, i.e., based on affective and emotive relations typically created between brands and consumers. It is worth mentioning how these research areas have garnered specific attention in the marketing literature due to their distinct relations with sentiments of brand affinity and consumer engagement [23]. The initial empirical studies carried out to study these powerful consumer-brand relationships were those analyzing the first of these concepts and the managerial interest in brand affinity [24], [25], [26]. Worked to conceptualize 'brand affinity' and to draw several empirical applications of it towards a broader spectrum of CI. In CI, one of the key ingredients is trust, and that reflects in its commitment towards quality. Conceptualization of brand association with quality is an overt equivalent to notions of association connected to quality in the relational space and implies that the bond consumers have with brands has similar traits to human relations [27]. Similarly, CI [26] argue that there is possibly an identical kind of variance between human relations and consumers' brand relations. Strong brand relations have a sentimental foundation that is similar to love and passion in the interpersonal domain and cognitive interdependence [27]. Further argues that it is imperative to treat brands as association cohorts and classifies six association dimensions to quantify consumer-brand relationships forte: love/desire, interdependence (cognitive), self-connection, commitment, intimacy, and quality of brand partners. Consumers have a clear affinity towards the brand itself and not just the products it offers. As discerned, this connection is built on mutual experiences and reciprocated relations, and activities. Consumer-Brand relationship is better comprehended as a second-order construct consisting of affective relations and functional relationships and conjectured as an arbitrating variable that links branding energies (assessed by brand experience) and branding outcomes (assessed by brand loyalty) [28]. The key contributions of this association are brand experience, brand faith, and fulfillment, while the key outcome of this alliance is brand loyalty. A brand relationship with cognitive interdependence, self-linking, love/passion, closeness, brand quality, and commitment [29]. For a bond to exist, cognitive interdependence among associates must be obvious; that is, the associates must jointly affect, define, and redefine the relationship [12].

Brand commitment is the nucleus of CI. Brand commitment can be viewed as a scale of two extremes: the strength of the consumer's commitment to the brand and their outward expression of that commitment. Brand commitment can be measured by mainly focusing on emotional attachment (e.g. loyalty, intense attachment, pride) [6], [20], on the other hand, Several studies emphasized the brand commitment can be measured on the behavioral intentions (e.g. ability and willingness to pay a premium, regular buying, buy next time). Ideally, brand identification and brand fidelity are conceptually very much related to each other, which branches out another dimension, i.e., cognitive interdependence [6].

2. Research Methodology

The study is based on the primary data collected by administering the survey instrument adapted [6] for the brand fidelity scale. The questionnaire was translated into Arabic language and administered in Arabic. Ten national and multinational brands were selected for the primary survey. The population selected for the survey was consumers based in the national capital region of Saudi Arabia. The questionnaire was administered to about 500 consumers. Intensive care was taken to validate the data for analysis. Missing values were checked before the final analysis. The major missing responses were eradicated, while the responses with lower missing frequencies were replaced with the series mean. The Outliers were detected with interquartile range (IQR) and box plotting using SPSS. The identified outlier was totally removed from the data. In this way, the total number of usable items for the final analysis was 411. A multiple regression analysis was carried out to observe the inter-relationship between the other variables of brand fidelity with the cognitive interdependence variable. The model below can be observed to estimate the regression analysis using ordinary least squares. The study aims to model the relationship between the dependent variable (CINTR) and the independent variables (ACMPC, ACPRE, and DRALT) using the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method. The regression equation can be expressed as:

$$\boldsymbol{CINTR = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ACMPC + \beta_2 ACPRE + \beta_3 DRALT + \mu} \quad (1)$$

Where:

- Cognitive interdependence (CINTR) is the dependent variable.
- $\boldsymbol{\beta_0}$ is the intercept.
- $\boldsymbol{\beta_1 \beta_2 \beta_3}$ are the coefficients for the independent variables Accommodation/price (ACMPC), Accommodation/performance (ACPRE), and Derogation of alternatives (DRALT), respectively.
- $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the error term.

The OLS method estimates the coefficients ($\boldsymbol{\beta_0}$ $\boldsymbol{\beta_1}\,\boldsymbol{\beta_2}\,\boldsymbol{\beta_3}$) by minimizing the sum of squared residuals between the observed values and the values predicted by the model.

3. Results

Data Characteristics and Demographics: Table 1 reflects the demographic profile of the sample taken for the study which reveals the several key demographic trends. The majority of the participants are young adults, with 59.64% (266 individuals) falling in the age range of 20-30 years, highlighting a predominantly young sample. Participants below the age of 20 account for 17.26% (77 individuals), while participants aged 30-40 account for 10.76% (48 individuals). The representation drops significantly for older age groups, with 3.81% (17 individuals) aged 41-50 years and a minimum of 0.67% (3 individuals) aged 51 years and above. The gender distribution shows a considerable male dominance, with 68.16% (304 individuals) of the sample being male, while 23.99% (107 individuals) are female participants. Marital status data shows that the majority of people, 71.08% (317 individuals), are unmarried, while the number of married individuals is 21.08% (94 individuals).

In terms of educational qualification, the sample is highly educated, with 73.32% (327 individuals) holding a bachelor's degree. Those with education up to grade 12 or a diploma represent 14.35% (64 individuals), while participants with a master's degree and PhD make up 2.24% (10 individuals) of the sample. Overall, the sample is a young, predominantly male, and highly educated demographic, with a significant portion being unmarried. This profile provides a clear context for understanding the research findings and their applicability to similar demographic groups.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	Frequency	Percentage
AGE		
Below 20 Years	77	17.26
20 – 30 Years	266	59.64
30 – 40 Years	48	10.76
41 – 50 Years	17	3.81
51 and above	3	0.67
Gender		
Male	304	68.16
Female	107	23.99
Marital Status		
Married	94	21.08
Unmarried	317	71.08
Educational Qualification		
Till grade 12/ Diploma	64	14.35
Graduate	327	73.32
Masters	10	2.24
Ph.D.	10	2.24

Source: Author's compilation

Favorite Brands: The frequency count (Table 2) reveals the preferences of the respondents regarding their favorite brands. Apple emerged as the most popular brand, receiving 216 counts, which is 52.6% of the total responses. This indicates a strong brand presence and appeal among the respondents, highlighting Apple's dominance in the market. Among the local Saudi brands, Almarai and Al Rajhi are the most preferred, receiving 37 (9%) and 35 (8.5%) responses, respectively, indicating a medium level of preference. Other local brands such as Albaik, Extra, and STC received relatively less preference, receiving 3 (0.7%), 10 (2.4%), and 2 (0.5%) votes respectively. International brands also show notable preferences, except for Apple. Samsung, with 27 responses (6.6%) and Toyota, with 37 votes (9%), are significant players in their respective industries, indicating a strong positive reception. Pepsi, another US multinational, received 16 votes (3.9%), indicating a moderate level of preference for the brand. Local brand Saudia also received a fair preference with 28 votes (6.8%).

Overall, the data shows a strong inclination towards international brands, which collectively account for 72% of the total responses, while local brands make up the remaining 28%. The significant preference for Apple underlines the importance of technology and innovation in consumer choices. Meanwhile, notable votes for brands such as Almarai and Al Rajhi suggest potential growth opportunities for local brands if they increase their market visibility and engagement. International brands such as Samsung and Toyota should continue to emphasize their unique selling propositions to retain and grow their customer base. These findings provide valuable insights for marketers aiming to understand consumer preferences and devise effective strategies. Table 2 reports the favorite brands among Saudi consumers.

Table 2. Favorite brand among Saudi consumers

SN	Brands	Characteristics	Frequency Count
1.	Albaik	Saudi Company	3
2.	Almarai	Saudi Company	37
3.	Al Rajhi	Saudi Company	35
4.	Apple	American (Multinational)	216
5.	Extra	Saudi Company	10
6.	Pepsi	American (Multinational)	16
7.	Samsung	Korean (Multinational)	27
8.	Saudia	Saudi Company	28
9.	STC	Saudi Company	2
10.	Toyota	Japanese (Multinational)	37
		Total	411

Source: Author's compilation

4. Discussion

Descriptive statistics for the study indicate that the mean values for Accommodation/price (ACMPC), Accommodation/performance (ACPRE), Derogation of alternatives (DRALT), and Cognitive interdependence (CINTR) are 3.201, 3.456, 3.391, and 3.279, respectively, indicating that the average scores for these variables are moderate. The low standard errors (0.048 for ACMPC, 0.054 for ACPRE, 0.055 for DRALT, and 0.051 for CINTR) indicate that the sample means are reliable estimates of the population mean. Mean values, which are close to the mean, indicate a symmetric distribution around the central tendency. The mode for all variables is 3.000, indicating that this score occurs most frequently in the sample. The standard deviations (i.e., as illustrated in Table 3) (0.966 for ACPRE, 1.100 for DRALT, and 1.112 for CINTR) and sample variances (0.933, 1.210, 1.236, and 1.054, respectively) reflect a reasonable level of variability within the data, with ACPRE and DRALT showing slightly more dispersion. Kurtosis values indicate that the ACPRE, DRALT, and CINTR distributions are slightly flatter than normal, while ACMPC is closer to a normal distribution. Positive skewness values indicate a slight right skewness in the distributions, meaning there are more high-end values.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics

	ACMPC	*ACPRE*	*DRALT*	*CINTR*
Mean	3.201	3.456	3.391	3.279
Standard Error	0.048	0.054	0.055	0.051
Median	3.000	3.250	3.400	3.167
Mode	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
Standard Deviation	0.966	1.100	1.112	1.027
Sample Variance	0.933	1.210	1.236	1.054
Kurtosis	0.027	-0.565	-0.505	-0.320
Skewness	0.310	0.215	0.172	0.199
Range	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
Minimum	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Maximum	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000
Sum	1315.500	1420.250	1393.600	1347.500
Count	411.000	411.000	411.000	411.000
Confidence Level (95.0%)	0.094	0.107	0.108	0.100

Notes: ACMPC=Accommodation/price, ACPRE=Accommodation/performance, DRALT=Derogation of alternatives and CINTR=Cognitive interdependence.

The range of all variables is 5.000, with minimum and maximum values being 1.000 and 6.000, demonstrating full use of the response scale. The sum of scores and the number of observations for each variable (411) confirm the completeness of the dataset.

The confidence intervals at the 95% level are narrow (0.094 for ACMPC, 0.107 for ACPRE, 0.108 for DRALT, and 0.100 for CINTR), indicating accurate mean estimates. Overall, the statistics show moderate mean scores, symmetric distributions, reasonable variability, and reliable mean estimates, providing a comprehensive overview of the characteristics of the sample.

Regression Analysis: A multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of Accommodation/price (ACMPC), Accommodation/performance (ACPRE), and Derogation of alternatives (DRALT) on the dependent variable, i.e., Cognitive interdependence (CINTR). The model was statistically significant, where $F(3, 407) = 93.45, p < .001$, and explained approximately 40.4% of the variance in the dependent variable. The regression coefficients and their corresponding statistics are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Multiple regression analysis summary

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Intercept	0.742	0.171	-	4.33	< .001
ACMPC	0.151	0.045	.151	3.36	< .001
ACPRE	0.124	0.043	.124	2.91	.004
DRALT	0.479	0.039	.479	12.40	< .001

Notes: ACMPC=Accommodation/price, ACPRE=Accommodation/performance, DRALT=Derogation of alternatives and CINTR=Cognitive interdependence. SE Standard Error of the estimates.

The regression results indicated that *ACMPC* ($\beta = .151, p < .001$), *ACPRE* ($\beta = .124, p = .004$), *and DRALT* ($\beta = .479, p < .001$) were significant predictors of the dependent variable CINTR. The intercept was also significant ($B = 0.742, p < .001$). This suggests that increases in ACMPC, ACPRE, and DRALT are associated with increases in the dependent variable. The model explained a significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable, i.e., Cognitive interdependence (CINTR), suggesting a moderate level of prediction accuracy. DRALT was the strongest predictor, followed by ACMPC and ACPRE.

Discussion: The present study aimed to explore Saudi consumers' cognitive interdependence (CI) by examining their relationships with both national and multinational brands. Furthermore, the study intended to through light on how emotional and cognitive mechanisms jointly influence brand engagement and loyalty in the post-COVID digital era. The findings affirm that Saudi customers are high in brand loyalty and cognitive interdependence, especially on brands that have become part of their everyday life and self-identification.

The preference distribution also shows a definite tendency to multinational brands, as seventy-two percent of consumers consider it, and Apple alone makes up over half of all responses. This observation closely represents a perceived connection with innovation, universal marketability, and fit to lifestyle. Nevertheless, the two findings align with the argument proposed that consumers in the emerging market tend to choose global brands due to their image of prestige and modernity [2]. This observation is self-explanatory considering that the age and gender distribution of the research sample is mainly young, consisting of 59.6 percent who are aged between 20 to 30 years, and the male population makes up 68.2 percent of the total sample size. It increases the significance of digital engagement in the establishment of consumer-brand relations. Aligning with this, it was noted that the marketing arena has been essentially transformed by the COVID-19 experience, especially regarding digital touchpoints, which now form the core means of brand engagement and emotional connection [1].

The regression analysis was significant in assessing the predictors of cognitive interdependence. Each of the three proposed independent variables, Accommodation/price (ACMPC), Accommodation/performance (ACPRE), and Derogation of alternatives (DRALT), was significant, and DRALT represented the best predictor ($\beta = 0.479$, $p < .001$). This supports the idea that cognitive interdependence should not be interpreted as mere passive mental alignment of the consumer's psychology with the brand, but as an active psychological posture in which consumers engage in active underestimation of competitors to remain loyal to the brand [5]. The cognitive processes involved in Derogation of alternatives (DRALT) illustrate a commitment-based thinking in which consumers view other options as either less desirable or less important, implying the "disregarding other alternatives" option that exists in innermost interpersonal relationships [7]. The significant value of Accommodation/price (ACMPC) and Accommodation/performance (ACPRE) implies that emotionally attached consumers are also psychologically open to accepting any notion gaps in terms of price or performance. These results also confirm the hypothesis that Cognitive Interdependence was an outcome of the processes related to commitment that generated brand loyalty [6]. The cognitive actions consumers take to justify the prices or lack of features of a product are indicative of a maintenance behavior, analogous to the attempts individuals will take to sustain a long-term relationship [8]. The hypothesizing of Cognitive Interdependence (CI) as a thinking habit was explicit in all of the data, as consumers who experienced a stronger connection to a brand were also presenting stronger indicators of loyalty, like repeat purchases and brand advocacy [7].

Researchers suggest that this interdependence creates a profound relational alignment [6]. Which later endows the brand as a provider but also a cognitive partner. This is true in the Saudi context: the consumers with high CI are not only loyal to the brand but also see it as its own component of the self-concept and the everyday routine. In addition, the emotional aspects of brand relationships were also discovered to be closely connected with CI.

Additionally, the research reaffirmed that consumers employ the emotional concept of brand love [13] to be more willing to assimilate the brand into the mental internalization, thereby reinforcing the cognitive aspect of loyalty. This resonates with the previous conceptualization of brand love and informs the evidence reported of integrating effective emotions in cognitive processes, creating loyalty [14], [25]. Cognitive interdependence, in the Saudi post-COVID context with the accelerating digital transformation, seems to be especially prominent. The likelihood of brands to instill a continuous emotional and cognitive existence among consumers increases as consumers are turning to social media and online sites to engage with brands [30]. Saudi Arabia offers an ideal environment for such a process: the young and native to the digital world population presents the ideal ground. With implications for marketing tactics and relationship management, the findings highlight the significance of cognitive interdependence in influencing consumer behavior, building brand engagement, and encouraging pro-relationship behaviors. As per novel research results, on the parameter from regression weights, indicate that cognitive interdependence has a significant relation between Saudi brands and Saudi consumers [31].

5. Conclusion

This research was an attempt to validate brands and consumers' relationship towards cognitive interdependence in the Saudi Market. The study also investigates how Saudi brands can create a competitive advantage over multicultural brands. In the long run, however, Saudi brands can pivot to be global players from a sustainability perspective. Marketers are in the race to adapt to digital competitiveness. Marketers are scrambling to adapt in the face of fierce digital competition, at the same time, the challenge is how Saudi brands will improve brand commitment and brand fidelity to elevate cognitive interdependence within the Saudi market.

This research strongly advocates that the future of marketing and brand management needs to demonstrate a sense of being authentic, genuine, and transparent. Brands that have high cognitive interdependence, are well-integrated, and those that embrace honesty, will thrive, while brands that deceive consumers will fail.

It is time for a mindset change, focusing on authenticity. Truthful marketing is not just about being ethical, but it is about minutely reflecting authenticity, veracity, transparency, and credibility, which are the most effective and lasting pillars of a Brand. Brands that build on honesty connect better with consumers. Deceptive branding and marketing, on the other hand, are not only harmful but also unsustainable. Cognitive interdependence thrives on a foundation of trust, truth, and compassionate treatment.

Marketers need to be on top of their game, and the brands must aim for value-adding experiences. Consumer insights reveal trending brand experiences that eventually evolve into future fashion statements and garner a loyal following.

While data marketing fuels modern strategies, the human element remains the heart of core efforts. After all, the magic of simplicity fosters deep brand connections. Finally, will the Metaverse contribute to brand relationships or solve problems? Technology's rapid growth is undeniable. But true progress lies in using it thoughtfully. By approaching technology with a critical eye (admire it), a willingness to learn (learn from it), and a focus on societal good (think of it), the indicated data can harness its power to benefit everyone. In other words, the use of technology needs to be *"Admire it, learn from it, think of it"*. Researchers are encouraged to initiate new avenues by incorporating the Metaverse and Web 3 into the study of the relationship between brands and consumers' cognitive interdependence.

Acknowledgement

This project was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University under the research project (PSAU-2022/01/20699).

References:

[1]. Oluwasanmi, O. O. (2022). COVID-19 and the new marketing paradigm: Transitory or permanent?. *Entrepreneurship and post-pandemic future*, 165–181. Emerald Publishing Limited. Doi: 10.1108/978-1-80117-902-720221010

[2]. Steenkamp, J. B. E., & De Jong, M. G. (2010). A global investigation into the constellation of consumer attitudes toward global and local products. *Journal of Marketing*, *74*(6), 18-40. Doi: 10.1509/jmkg.74.6.18

[3]. Ahn, J., & Back, K. J. (2018). Influence of brand relationship on customer attitude toward integrated resort brands: a cognitive, affective, and conative perspective. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *35*(4), 449-460. Doi: 10.1080/10548408.2017.1358239

[4]. Shin, M., & Back, K. J. (2020). Effect of cognitive engagement on the development of brand love in a hotel context. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *44*(2), 328-350. Doi: 10.1177/1096348019890055

[5]. Agnew, C. R., et al. (1998). Cognitive interdependence: Commitment and the mental representation of close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(4), 939–954. Doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.4.939

[6]. Grace, D., Ross, M., & King, C. (2018). Brand fidelity: a relationship maintenance perspective. *Journal of Brand Management*, *25*(6), 577-590. Doi: 10.1057/s41262-018-0127-z

[7]. Davis, B. A., & Weigel, D. J. (2020). Cognitive interdependence and the everyday expression of commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *37*(3), 1008-1029. Doi: 10.1177/0265407519884640

[8]. Leik, R. K., Owens, T. J., & Tallman, I. (1999). Interpersonal commitments: The interplay of social networks and individual identities. *Handbook of interpersonal commitment and relationship stability*, 239-256.

[9]. Clark Margaret, S., & Mills Judson, R. (2012). A Theory of Communal (and Exchange) Relationships. *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*, *2*, 232-250.

[10]. Aggarwal, P. (2004). The effects of brand relationship norms on consumer attitudes and behavior. *Journal of consumer research*, *31*(1), 87-101. Doi: 10.1086/383426

[11]. Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of consumer research*, *24*(4), 343-373. Doi: 10.1086/209515

[12]. Hinde, R. A. (1979). *Towards understanding relationships.* Academic Press.

[13]. Carroll, B. A., & Ahuvia, A. C. (2006). Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love. *Marketing letters*, *17*(2), 79-89. Doi: 10.1007/s11002-006-4219-2

[14]. Ahuvia, A. C. (1993). *I love it! Toward a unifying theory of love across diverse love objects.* [Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University].

[15]. Albert, N., & Merunka, D. (2013). The role of brand love in consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of consumer marketing*, *30*(3), 258-266. Doi: 10.1108/07363761311328928

[16]. Wallace, E., Buil, I., & De Chernatony, L. (2014). Consumer engagement with self-expressive brands: brand love and WOM outcomes. *Journal of product & brand management*, *23*(1), 33-42.

[17]. Roy, S. K., Eshghi, A., & Sarkar, A. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of brand love. *Journal of Brand Management*, *20*(4), 325-332.

[18]. Bergkvist, L., & Bech-Larsen, T. (2010). Two studies of consequences and actionable antecedents of brand love. *Journal of brand management*, *17*(7), 504-518. Doi: 10.1057/bm.2010.6

[19]. Huber, F., Meyer, F., & Schmid, D. A. (2015). Brand love in progress–the interdependence of brand love antecedents in consideration of relationship duration. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *24*(6), 567-579.

[20]. Ju, Y., et al. (2019). Exploring Airbnb service quality attributes and their asymmetric effects on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *77*, 342-352. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.07.014

[21]. Kotler, P., Kartajaya, H., & Setiawan, I. (2018). Marketing 3.0: From products to customers to the human spirit. In *Marketing wisdom*, 139-156. Springer.

[22]. Jiménez-Zarco, A. I., et al. (2017). Marketing 4.0: Enhancing consumer-brand engagement through big data analysis. *Socio-economic perspectives on consumer engagement and buying behavior*, 94-117. IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

[23]. Gómez-Suárez, M., Benito, L. E. A., & Campo, S. (2016). Exploring the link between brand love and engagement through a qualitative approach. *International Journal of Business Environment*, *8*(4), 367-384. Doi: 10.1504/IJBE.2016.10001655

[24]. Roberts, K. (2006). Lovemarks: The future beyond brands. Power House Books.

[25]. Batra, R., Ahuvia, A., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2012). Brand love. *Journal of marketing*, *76*(2), 1-16. Doi: 10.1509/jm.09.0339

[26]. Jayachandran, S., Gimeno, J., & Varadarajan, P. R. (1999). The theory of multimarket competition: A synthesis and implications for marketing strategy. *Journal of Marketing*, *63*(3), 49-66. Doi: 10.1177/002224299906300304

[27]. Fournier, S., Dobscha, S., & Mick, D. G. (1998). The premature death of relationship marketing. *Harvard business review*, *76*(1), 42-51.

[28]. Leung, L. C., Bougoure, U. S., & Miller, K. W. (2014). The effects of affective and utilitarian brand relationships on brand consideration. *Journal of Brand Management*, *21*(6), 469-484. Doi: 10.1057/bm.2014.15

[29]. Leung, L. C. (2016). The role of consumer-brand experiences and relationship in contributing to brand equity for services. *Athens Journal of Business & Economics*, *2*(2), 195-216. Doi: 10.30958/ajbe.2-2-6

[30]. Aichner, T. (2014). Country-of-origin marketing: A list of typical strategies with examples. *Journal of Brand Management*, *21*(1), 81-93**.**

[31]. Faridi, M. R., & Naushad, M. (2021). A study of brand fidelity: Its contribution and impact on the Saudi market. *Innovative Marketing*, *17*(4), 13. Doi: 10.21511/im.17(4).2021.02