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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

This data article focuses on the relationship between consumer satisfaction, brand attitude, brand preference, and purchase intentions. The data was collected from dairy products consumers within the Laayoune-Sakia El Hamra region in Morocco. The research data are collected via an on a self-administered online questionnaire, from a sample of 195 Moroccan consumers of dairy products (Sakia brand). The data were analysed using a structural equation modeling method under the Partial Least Squares approach (PLS-SEM). Data analysis was performed using SmartPLS 3 software.
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Specifications Table

| Subject                                | Marketing |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|
| Specific subject area                  | Relationship marketing: |
| Type of data                           | Tables and Figures |
| How data were acquired                  | A survey was carried out among Moroccan consumers of the dairy products offered by the Sakia agricultural dairy cooperative. |
| Data format                            | Raw, analyzed and descriptive data |
| Parameters for data collection          | The sample consisted of consumers of the dairy products offered by the Sakia agricultural dairy cooperative (Sakia brand). The choice of this brand is justified by its strong cultural reputation among the population of the Laâyoune Sakia El Hamra region. The questionnaire was self-administered via the Google Forms tool during the month of April 2020. |
| Description of data collection         | The survey link was disseminated via social networks (Facebook, WhatsApp). |
| Data source location                   | Laâyoune City/ Laâyoune Sakia El Hamra region Morocco; Latitude: 31.7945 Longitude: -7.0849. |
| Data accessibility                     | Repository name: Mendeley Data Data identification number: 10.17632 / nj9r2k8zp9.4 Direct URL to data: https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/nj9r2k8zp9/4 |

Value of the Data

- The dataset is useful because it helps to explain the effect of consumer satisfaction on brand attitude, brand preference and purchase intentions in the context of dairy industry.
- This dataset can be used to enlighten dairy industry brand managers on the importance of consumer satisfaction as a key factor to improve brand attitude and brand preference.
- This dataset provides insights into diverse aspects of consumer satisfaction, brand attitude, brand preference, and purchase intentions.
- With this data, academics and students will find a practical example of the SEM-PLS approach use in the relationship marketing area.
- The dataset can be adapted for use in other similar contexts such as soft drinks industry.

1. Data Description

The constructs and measurement items used in this data article were drawn from previous relationship marketing research (Table 1). A questionnaire survey was carried out among Moroccan consumers of the dairy products offered by the Sakia agricultural dairy cooperative (Sakia brand). The questionnaire was self-administered via the Google Forms tool during the months of April 2020. The data raw and the research questionnaire are available in mendeley data on: https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/nj9r2k8zp9/4.

The profile and characteristics of the SAKIA brand consumers who participated in this survey are illustrated in Table 2. A total of 195 responses from consumers were received, including 110 women (56.4%) and 85 men (43.6%). The age of the respondents varies between 16 and 60 with an average age of 24.9587. Finally, 78.6% of the respondents are single, 19.5% married and 2% divorced.

2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

Fig. 1, illustrates the research hypotheses based on previous marketing research. The developed model suggests that consumer satisfaction explains brand attitude (H1), brand preference (H2) and purchase intentions (H3). In addition, brand attitude contributes to the explanation of brand preference (H4) and purchase intentions (H5). Finally, the model shows a direct positive and significant relationship between brand preference and purchase intentions (H6). To test the hypotheses and the research model, we used the structural equations method under the Partial
Table 1
Measurement instruments

| Variables                        | Adapted Items                                                                 | Scale                                |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Consumer satisfaction [1]         | CS1 I am satisfied with my decision to customize the product from this brand. | 5-point Likert satisfaction scale    |
|                                  | CS2 Consuming dairy products from this brand is a good idea                   |                                      |
|                                  | CS3 I am happy that I customized the product from this brand.                 |                                      |
|                                  | CS4 Consuming dairy products of this brand is a good choice                   |                                      |
|                                  | CS5 I am disappointed with this brand (reverse scoring)                       |                                      |
| Brand attitude [2]               | BA1 Unpleasant/ pleasant                                                      | 5 degree Osgood differential scale   |
|                                  | BA2 Bad/ good                                                                 |                                      |
|                                  | BA3 Unfavourable/favourable                                                  |                                      |
| Brand preference [3]             | BP1 I like this brand better than any other brand of dairy products.          | 5-point Likert-scale                 |
|                                  | BP2 I would consume this brand more than any other brand of dairy products...  |                                      |
|                                  | BP3 I would be inclined to buy dairy products from this brand over rather than from other brands. | |
|                                  | BP4 This is my preferred brand overall brands of dairy products               |                                      |
| Purchase intentions [4]          | PI1 What is the likelihood that you would recommend this brand to someone close to you? (1) low; (5) high | 5-Likert-type scale                  |
|                                  | PI2 You were again consuming dairy products offered by this brand?           |                                      |
|                                  | PI3 Would you recommend dairy products offered by this brand to a friend and/or relative? |                                      |
|                                  | PI4 Were you buying products offered by this brand?                          |                                      |

Table 2
Profile and characteristics of respondents (n = 195)

| Attributes        | Characteristic | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Gender            | Male           | 85        | 43.60          |
|                   | Female         | 110       | 56.40          |
| Marital status    | Single         | 153       | 78.50          |
|                   | Divorced       | 4         | 2.00           |
|                   | Married        | 38        | 19.50          |

Fig. 1. Conceptual framework.
Least Squares approach (PLS-SEM). As indicated in Table 3, the implementation of this method takes place in two steps [5]. The first one consists of assessing the reliability and validity of the measurement models, while the second step focuses on assessing the fit of the structural model. Data analysis was performed using SmartPLS 3 software [6].

Table 4 shows the summary of the convergent validity, according to several criteria: individual item reliability (Cronbach’s alpha > 0.7), composite reliability (CR > 0.7), factor loadings (Outer loading > 0.7) and average variance extracted (AVE > 0.5). The outputs illustrated in the tables (Table 5 & Table 6) make it possible to verify the discriminant validity of the latent variables, in terms of the variable correlation [7] and the cross-loading criterion [8]. The SEM-PLS estimation for the measurement and structural model are shown in Fig. 2.

The values of the coefficient of determination of the couple endogenous latent variables; brand attitude and brand preference are moderated, which are 0.340 and 0.479 respectively. The purchase intentions are explained at 73.4% (R² = 0.734 ≥ 0.67). This indicates a substantial level of determination. The size effect (f²) values are all acceptable (Table 7).

The Predictive relevance (Q²) values are all greater than zero, which makes it possible to consider that the model has an acceptable predictive quality [5]. The fit of the global model (GoF) is very strong, with a value of 0.657 [9]. According to SmartPLS outputs, it turns out that consumer satisfaction greatly contributes to the explanation of brand attitude, brand preference and purchase intentions. Likewise, the brand attitude has a positive and significant effect on
Table 4
Convergent validity

| Constructs                  | Items | Outer loading (>0.7) | Cronbach's alpha (>0.7) | Rho-A (>0.7) | CR (>0.7) | AVE (>0.5) |
|-----------------------------|-------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Consumer satisfaction (CS)  | CS1   | 0.928                | 0.945                   | 0.953        | 0.959     | 0.825      |
|                             | CS2   | 0.939                |                         |              |           |            |
|                             | CS3   | 0.947                |                         |              |           |            |
|                             | CS4   | 0.942                |                         |              |           |            |
|                             | CS5   | 0.772                |                         |              |           |            |
| Brand attitude (BA)         | BA1   | 0.935                | 0.927                   | 0.927        | 0.953     | 0.872      |
|                             | BA2   | 0.937                |                         |              |           |            |
|                             | BA3   | 0.929                |                         |              |           |            |
| Brand Preference (BP)       | BP1   | 0.937                | 0.958                   | 0.959        | 0.970     | 0.889      |
|                             | BP2   | 0.943                |                         |              |           |            |
|                             | BP3   | 0.949                |                         |              |           |            |
|                             | BP4   | 0.942                |                         |              |           |            |
| Purchase Intentions (PI)    | PI1   | 0.726                | 0.886                   | 0.889        | 0.923     | 0.751      |
|                             | PI2   | 0.924                |                         |              |           |            |
|                             | PI3   | 0.894                |                         |              |           |            |

Table 5
Discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion).

| Constructs                  | BA     | BP     | CS     | PI     |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Brand Attitude (BA)         | 0.934* |        |        |        |
| Brand Preference (BP)       | 0.529  | 0.943* |        |        |
| Consumer satisfaction (CS)  | 0.583  | 0.671  | 0.908* |        |
| Purchase Intentions (PI)    | 0.694  | 0.717  | 0.779  | 0.867* |

* Root square of AVE

Table 6
Discriminant Validity - Loading and Cross-Loading criterion.

| constructs                  | Brand Attitude | Brand Preference | Consumer satisfaction | Purchase Intentions |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| BA1                         | 0.935          | 0.490            | 0.540                 | 0.636               |
| BA2                         | 0.937          | 0.495            | 0.540                 | 0.644               |
| BA3                         | 0.929          | 0.497            | 0.553                 | 0.663               |
| BP1                         | 0.497          | 0.937            | 0.647                 | 0.690               |
| BP2                         | 0.474          | 0.943            | 0.631                 | 0.657               |
| BP3                         | 0.531          | 0.949            | 0.633                 | 0.706               |
| BP4                         | 0.491          | 0.942            | 0.619                 | 0.649               |
| CS1                         | 0.597          | 0.608            | 0.928                 | 0.760               |
| CS2                         | 0.466          | 0.642            | 0.939                 | 0.704               |
| CS3                         | 0.574          | 0.658            | 0.947                 | 0.722               |
| CS4                         | 0.545          | 0.638            | 0.942                 | 0.748               |
| CS5                         | 0.451          | 0.486            | 0.772                 | 0.586               |
| PI1                         | 0.818          | 0.512            | 0.555                 | 0.726               |
| PI2                         | 0.578          | 0.693            | 0.749                 | 0.924               |
| PI3                         | 0.472          | 0.634            | 0.652                 | 0.894               |
| PI4                         | 0.527          | 0.634            | 0.726                 | 0.909               |

Table 7
Effect size.

| Constructs                  | Effect size (f²) | Signification |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| Consumer satisfaction       | Brand Attitude   | 0.515         | Large effect size |
|                            | Brand Preference | 0.382         | Large effect size |
|                            | Purchase Intentions | 0.308       | Medium effect size|
| Brand Attitude              | Brand Preference | 0.055         | Small effect size |
|                            | Purchase Intentions | 0.219       | Medium effect size|
| Brand Preference            | Purchase Intentions | 0.151       | Medium effect size|
brand preference and purchase intentions (Fig. 3). On the other hand, brand preference has a significant effect on the purchase intentions.
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