

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]



**BRAND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY:
CONSTRUCT AND SCALE DEVELOPEMNT**

Simla Barki

**A Thesis
in
The John Molson School of Business**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science in Administration (Marketing) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada**

July 2009

© Simla Barki, 2009



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-63112-6
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-63112-6

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

ABSTRACT

Brand Social Responsibility: Construct and Scale Development

Simla Barki

Although corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been a widely researched topic, no universally accepted scale exists that adequately measures consumers' perceptions of CSR, or accounts for the possible differences between a parent brand's SR and its subsidiary's SR. Existing CSR scales are also based on a managerial versus marketing perspective and have weak psychometric properties. This study aims to (1) introduce a new construct, Brand Social Responsibility, which defines SR pertaining to brands from a consumer standpoint, and (2) develop a scale with predictive and discriminant validity to measure BSR.

**This Thesis is dedicated to my loving parents and husband.
Thank you for your never-ending support.**

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....		vii
Chapter 1	Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2	Background.....	2
	Corporate Social Responsibility.....	2
	Branding Strategy and Social Responsibility.....	10
	Brand Personality.....	14
	Brand Credibility.....	15
	Definition of Brand Social Responsibility.....	17
Chapter 3	Initial Item Generation.....	19
	First Stage.....	19
	Second Stage.....	20
	Third Stage.....	20
Chapter 4	Study 1.....	21
	Procedure.....	21
Chapter 5	Results.....	23
	Scale 1: Descriptors.....	23
	Scale 2: Statements.....	23
Chapter 6	Study 2.....	25
	Procedure.....	26
Chapter 7	Results.....	27
	Scale 1: Descriptors.....	27
	Scale 2: Statements.....	28

Chapter 8	Discussion.....	35
Chapter 9	Limitations and Future Research.....	46
References.....		49
Appendices	Appendix A.....	52
	Appendix B.....	54
	Appendix C.....	69
	Appendix D.....	78
	Appendix E.....	82

List of Tables

Table 1	Definitions of CSR.....	4
Table 2	Brown and Dacin (1997) Product Social Responsibility Scale.....	7
Table 3	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) CSR Perceptions Scale.....	7
Table 4	Lichtenstein et al. (2004) Perceptions of CSR Scale.....	7
Table 5	Laforet and Saunders (1994) Branding Strategies.....	11
Table 6	Brands Used in Study 1 and Study 2.....	22
Table 7	Total Variance Explained for Descriptors.....	24
Table 8	Total Variance Explained for Statements.....	25
Table 9	Total Variance Explained for Descriptors.....	28
Table 10	Total Variance Explained for Statements.....	28
Table 11	Comparison of Cronbach's Alpha across Scales.....	29
Table 12	Correlations between Scales.....	30
Table 13	Correlations between Scales and Purchase Likelihood.....	30
Table 14	Predictive Validity at Brand Level.....	33
Table 15	Predictive Validity at Brand Level.....	33
Table 16	Independent Samples Test for SR Brands versus SIR Brands.....	37
Table 17	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	38
Table 18	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	39
Table 19	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	40
Table 20	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	41
Table 21	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	42

Table 22	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	43
Table 23	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	44
Table 24	Independent Samples Test for Product Categories.....	45

According to the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation, the Responsible Purchasing Network, and Ecologo's "*The Eco Markets 2008 Summary Report*," 68% of North American organizations increased their green purchasing in the past 12 months and 91% of purchasers believe they will become more active green purchasers over the next two years. As firms and consumers become ever more concerned with "being green," Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has become a very widely researched topic, yet there is no universally accepted and used definition of the construct, nor a measurement with sound psychometric properties (Brown and Dacin 1997; Dean 2004; Mohr, Webb, and Harris 2001; Sen and Bhattacharya 2001; Yoon, Gurhan-Canli, and Schwarz 2006). Existing CSR scales have all been independently created and no research has comparatively examined the effectiveness of each scale. In addition, past research has defined CSR based primarily from a managerial perspective. The construct has therefore failed to measure Social Responsibility (SR) from consumers' point of view, which would be more relevant and useful for marketers (Golob, Lah, and Jancic 2008; Maignan 2001; de los Salmones, Crespo, and del Bosque 2005).

In order to better understand SR from a consumer perspective one must examine the relationship between the SR of parent brands and their respective subsidiary brands. A parent brand may possess a very different SR image than one of its subsidiary brands. For example, *Unilever* has been charged with failing to live up to certain environmental standards by using palm oil suppliers accused of deforestation. Meanwhile, a subsidiary brand of *Unilever's*, *Ben & Jerry's*, is known for its environmentally friendly business practices, such as using fair-trade ingredients and green energy on their farms.

Consumers may therefore have a positive perception of *Ben & Jerry's* SR, but a negative perception of *Unilever's* SR. Another subsidiary brand of *Unilever's*, *Dove*, has become known for its ethical advertising campaign—the *Dove* real beauty campaign. Yet another of *Unilever's* brands, *Axe*, has been accused of having a sexist advertising campaign. Clearly, there can be discrepancies between a parent brand's SR and those of its subsidiaries, as well as inconsistencies between the subsidiary brands. In such situations, the parent brand's unfavorable SR image may negatively affect its subsidiary's SR image. Therefore, the definition of a separate and more specific construct other than CSR and the development of a corresponding scale would more accurately reveal consumers' perceptions of a corporate brand's SR and its subsidiary's SR.

CSR as a construct and the existing CSR scales which measure the construct do not account for the possible differences between a parent brand's SR and its subsidiary's SR, as well as the possible effects these differences might have on a consumer's perception of a brand's SR. Therefore, the primary purpose of this research is to introduce *Brand Social Responsibility* (BSR) as a new construct, and to develop a scale to measure this construct.

BACKGROUND

Corporate Social Responsibility

Extant research makes use of numerous and differing definitions of CSR and CSR measures. The definitions used can be characterized by (i) being very broad and conceptually inconsistent (Brown and Dacin 1997; Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig

2004; Sen and Bhattacharya 2001), (ii) having a managerial perspective and not a consumer perspective (Golob et al. 2008; de los Salmones et al. 2005; Maignan 2001), and (iii) having weak psychometric properties, if presented at all (Brown and Dacin 1997; Golob et al. 2008; Lichtenstein et al. 2004; Maignan 2001; Mohr and Webb 2005; Sen and Bhattacharya 2001; de los Salmones et al. 2005).

Recent research has used five different definitions of the construct as shown in Table 1. Some of these definitions are broad and do not specify the CSR domain, such as those of Brown and Dacin (1997) and Lichtenstein et al. (2004). Lichtenstein et al. (2004) define CSR as “the obligations of the firm to society” (Lichtenstein et al. 2004, p. 16). This definition does not necessarily encompass or adequately portray all of the elements and dimensions that may make up CSR. Some research, such as that of Maignan (2001) and de los Salmones et al. (2005), has found the construct to be multidimensional, while other scales, such as those of Brown and Dacin (1997) and Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) are unidimensional. Regardless of whether CSR is a unidimensional or a multidimensional construct, the definition of the construct should clearly communicate the dimension(s) that constitutes CSR. When a broader definition is used, the inclusion and refinement of items are important procedures to increase content validity. For instance, when CSR is defined as “the obligations of the firm to society” (Lichtenstein et al. 2004, p. 16), the domains of CSR that should be tapped on to improve content validity range from a company’s global environmental responsibilities to the standards of work safety practiced in its factories.

McWilliams and Seigel (2001) and Mohr et al.'s (2001) definitions of CSR, which are more precise and thus perhaps more accurate in terms of content validity, have not been used in CSR scale development.

Carroll's (1979) definition of CSR specifically communicates four dimensions of CSR. This definition however, raises further issues. Carroll's (1979) definition of CSR

TABLE 1
Definitions of CSR

Research	Definition
Brown and Dacin (1997) Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	A firm's status and activities with respect to its perceived societal obligations
Carroll (1979) Maignan (2001) de los Salmones, Crespo, and del Bosque (2005) Golob, Lah, and Jancic (2008)	The economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time
Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004)	The obligations of the firm to society
McWilliams and Seigel (2001)	Actions that appear to further some social good, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law
Mohr, Webb, and Harris (2001)	A company's commitment to minimizing or eliminating any harmful effects and maximizing its long-run beneficial impact on society

has a managerial perspective; the dimensions encompass aspects of social responsibility that may be of concern to managers more so than marketers, such as economic and legal issues. Managers are more interested in SR in relation to achieving organizational effectiveness as well as attaining financial benefits (Singhapakdi, Vitell, Rallapalli, and Kraft 1996). However, marketers must examine SR from consumers' point of view, as the use of SR in marketing will only be advantageous if it creates positive perceptions of a brand. Therefore, the economic dimension of CSR is not as salient for marketers as it

may be for managers; marketers, whether their end goal is generating sales or improving brand image, must do so by effectively communicating messages to consumers, and must therefore understand SR through a consumer's perspective. Maignan (2001) and de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) research provides evidence that the economic dimension is not salient for consumers with regards to CSR. It can therefore be argued that Carroll's (1979) definition of CSR is not appropriate from a marketing perspective.

Maignan (2001) and de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scales are the most comprehensive CSR scales which have been developed, yet their scales are based on Carroll's managerially oriented definition of CSR. These scales therefore include dimensions of CSR that are not salient for consumers, such as the economic dimension (de los Salmones et al. 2005). Maignan (2001) even states that "the applicability of Carroll's (1979) categorization of corporate social responsibilities to consumers" (Maignan 2001, p. 69) is unsupported.

Other scales have weak psychometric properties and have a limited scope, such as the scales shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4. Brown and Dacin (1997), Lichtenstein et al. (2004), and Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) do not provide any information regarding the psychometric properties of their scales. The studies which do follow the proper steps in scale development (item generation, expert judgment, and pre-testing), such as those of Maignan (2001) and de los Salmones et al. (2005), do not provide any evidence of discriminant or predictive validity.

Brown and Dacin's (1997) research does not provide any information as to how they developed or tested their three item scale for measuring CSR (Table 2). Lichtenstein et al. (2004) also do not provide any details as to how their scale (Table 3) was developed,

and only present results of a reliability analysis for the scale ($\alpha=.90$). However, reliability is merely a prerequisite for validity and the authors provide no evidence of discriminant or predictive validity for their scale. Similarly, Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) do not provide any insight as to how they developed their list of items (Table 4). There is some evidence presented for reliability ($\alpha=.98$), but the authors do not provide any evidence of validity. In addition, Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) presented participants with CSR information about several companies and created their CSR scale to then measure the perceived SR of these companies; their scale, therefore, was created specifically for measuring the issues of CSR present in the information provided to study respondents. Consequently, the scale does not necessarily include all dimensions or elements relevant for consumers regarding CSR.

Mohr and Webb's (2005) scale was also created specifically to measure the issues of CSR present in the information provided to study respondents. The authors also do not provide any specific information as to how their scale was developed, nor do they provide any evidence of validity.

Golob et al. (2008) generated a pool of items that were then pre-tested, resulting in a scale of 22 items to measure consumers' CSR expectations. We are not, however, provided with any information as to how the items were generated, or how they were refined following the pre-test. We are also not provided with the full scale, but only four of the items and the four dimensions of their scale: economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary. We are provided with the results for each dimension's reliability analysis; economic ($\alpha=.80$), legal ($\alpha=.73$), ethical ($\alpha=.84$), and discretionary ($\alpha=.83$) (Golob et al. 2008). But again, we are not provided with any scale validity measures.

TABLE 2
Brown and Dacin (1997) Product Social Responsibility Scale

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
This is a socially responsible product	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This product is more beneficial to society's welfare than other products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This product contributes something to society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

TABLE 4
Lichtenstein et al. (2004) CSR Perceptions Scale

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree	Cronbach's alpha	Dimensions
(Company name) is committed to using a portion of its profits to help non-profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0.90	Philanthropic
(Company name) gives back to the communities in which it does business	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Local non-profits benefit from (company name)'s contributions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
(Company name) integrates charitable contributions into its business activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
(Company name) is involved in corporate giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

TABLE 3
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) CSR Perceptions Scale

	Very Unfavourable						Very Favourable	Cronbach's alpha	Dimensions
Corporate giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0.98	Philanthropic
Community involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Position on women's issues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		Minority and women's rights
Position on ethnic minority issues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Position on gay and lesbian issues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Position on disabled minority issues	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

Maignan (2001) used two existing scales to initially develop her items, yet these were managerially based scales: Aupperle, Carroll, and Hatfield's (1985) scale for measuring managers' evaluations of the four dimensions identified by Carroll (1979), and Maignan and Ferrell's (2000) scale for gauging "business's commitment to corporate citizenship on the basis of information provided by managers" which was also based on Carroll's definition of CSR (Maignan 2001, pg 62). The results of Maignan's (2001) study reveals that the economic dimension is not salient for consumers when evaluating CSR. However, we are not provided with any evidence of discriminant or predictive validity.

De los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scale is also based on Carroll's (1979) definition of CSR and thus comprised of four dimensions (economic, legal, philanthropic, and ethical) which are relevant first and foremost from a managerial perspective. Just as Maignan (2001), de los Salmones et al. (2005) conclude that "from the consumers' perspective the economic dimension is not a component of social responsibility" (de los Salmones et al. 2005). Their research also finds that the legal and ethical dimensions combine to create a single factor suggesting that consumers' categorization of the elements that constitute CSR differ from those of managers (de los Salmones et al. 2005). De los Salmones et al. (2005) examine their scale's validity in relation to consumer loyalty. However, their results prove to be statistically insignificant.

The legal dimension—whether a firm conducts its activities within the boundaries of the legal system—may *be* of concern to consumers, but it may not necessarily be categorized as an entirely separate dimension. For instance, while there may be laws against the use of child labor, or quotas on the amounts of pollution that may be created by certain types of firms, but from a consumer perspective these issues are more likely to

be thought of as ethical issues—many consumers are probably unaware of the specific laws that may govern air pollution. Although consumers are of course concerned with legal issues, they may tend to think of these issues in terms of ethicality. For example, the public may become outraged if they were to learn that a particular firm was paying its employees a salary below the minimum wage. This is illegal, but most consumers would be concerned with the questionable ethics of this issue rather than the legalities. Such laws as minimum wage are instituted firstly because of ethical and moral issues: it is considered, in today's society, to be immoral and unethical for firms to impose low wages on employees. Golob et al.'s (2008) research further corroborates these assumptions as their study reveals that the legal, ethical, *and* philanthropic dimensions merge into one single factor.

The preceding evidence demonstrates that Carroll's (1979) definition of CSR is not applicable to marketing as only one dimension is salient from consumers' perspective: the ethical/philanthropic/legal dimension.

As the existing CSR scales either do not encompass all the elements which constitute SR, or encompass dimensions that are not salient from a consumer's perspective, it could be argued that these scales may be lacking elements which would be more salient for consumers. The two most comprehensive scales (i.e., Maignan 2001 and de los Salmones et al. 2005) include items based on a managerially oriented definition of SR. However, other issues, such as trustworthiness and sincerity for example, may be important factors for consumers when assessing a brand's SR (Erdem and Swait 2004; Yoon et al. 2006). Sincerity has been found to be a mediator in determining the effectiveness of CSR initiatives (Yoon et al. 2006). In addition, a brand's trustworthiness

has been revealed to affect consumers' brand choices; when a brand fails to deliver what has been promised, consumers are likely to doubt the sincerity of the brand's intentions (Erdem and Swait 2004). If a subsidiary brand promotes environmentally friendly business practices but its parent brand is found guilty of being environmentally unfriendly, consumers may doubt the trustworthiness of the subsidiary brand. The possibility of other factors that may be relevant for consumers must be considered, and thus a more specific and marketing relevant definition of CSR is necessary, as well as a scale to measure the construct.

Branding Strategy and Social Responsibility

Consumers' perceptions of a corporate brand's and a subsidiary brand's SR will differ based on the branding strategy used by a firm (see Table 5 for a summary of the three branding strategies proposed by Laforet and Saunders [1994]). If a monolithic brand strategy is used, the corporate brand is dominantly visible in the advertisements of all subsidiary brands, such as the *Virgin Group*. Under such a strategy the subsidiary and the parent brand are essentially the same and, therefore, very likely to trigger identical SR perceptions for the subsidiary brand. However, if an endorsed brand strategy is used, the subsidiary brands are endorsed by the parent brand in order to add credibility to the subsidiary brands, e.g. *Kellogg's Rice Krispies*. In this case, the subsidiary brands will have separate marketing strategies and therefore possibly different SR initiatives than the parent brand. The *Kellogg Company* is known for having a poor environmental record,

TABLE 5
Laforet and Saunders (1994) Branding Strategies

Strategy	Monolithic Brand Strategy	Endorsed or House Brand Strategy	Branded or Pure Brand Strategy
Description	Under a monolithic brand strategy a firm uses a single brand name across all its activities. This brand name is how the firm is known to all stakeholders, including both consumers and shareholders.	Under an endorsed or house brand strategy all subsidiary brands are endorsed by the parent brand (the parent brand name is visible on all subsidiary brand products).	Under the branded or pure brand strategy individual subsidiary brands are offered to consumers, and the parent brand is given little or no prominence.
Example	<i>Lego</i>	<i>Nestle's Aero</i> <i>Nestle's KitKat</i>	Parent Brand: <i>Unilever</i> Subsidiary Brands: <i>Degree, Dove, Sunlight</i>

while *Kellogg's Rice Krispies* recently initiated the "Share a Square" bake sale for charity. When there are such inconsistencies between the initiatives of the parent brand and the subsidiary brand, the two brands' SR perceptions have to be measured separately, and thus a separate construct comes into play: Brand Social Responsibility. Since the *Kellogg Company* has a negative SR image and *Kellogg's Rice Krispies* has a positive SR image, the *Kellogg Company's* negative image may adversely affect *Kellogg's Rice Krispies'* positive image.

In a pure brand strategy the parent brand is given little or no prominence and individual subsidiary brands are marketed separately (as in the case of *Procter and Gamble*). In this case, if consumers are unaware that a brand is actually a subsidiary of a larger brand, the SR image of the parent brand will not influence consumers' SR perceptions of the subsidiary brand. However, if consumers are aware of both brands,

then any inconsistencies between the two brands' SR's may have an influence on consumers' perceptions.

Berens, Riel, and Bruggen (2005) find that when a monolithic brand strategy is used and the corporate brand is therefore "dominantly visible" CSR has no influence on product evaluations. However, when an endorsed brand strategy is used, CSR does have an influence on product evaluations. As a possible explanation, the authors suggest that when consumers appraise a product based on quality, the level of dominance of the corporate brand increases the accessibility of corporate ability (CA) or corporate association connotations and diminishes the accessibility of CSR connotations. They argue that in the case of high corporate brand dominance consumers are more inclined to evaluate a product's quality and therefore focus on corporate ability rather than CSR.

Four main issues can be raised regarding Berens et al.'s (2005) research. First, they do not measure consumers' CA and CSR associations of the parent brands under an endorsed strategy. Measuring CSR associations of only subsidiary brands does not reveal any information about the discrepancies that may exist between a parent brand's SR and its subsidiary's SR, nor will it reveal any information about the possible influence of the parent brand's SR on the subsidiary brand's SR. As illustrated in previous examples (such as with *Unilever* and *Dove*) the parent brand's SR image may influence its subsidiary's SR image and thus not measuring the parent brand's CSR associations will not reveal this possible influence. Second, Berens et al. (2005) only consider consumers' associations with a single parent brand that does not possess conflicting SR images with its subsidiary brands. Again, this will not reveal the possible influence the parent brand's SR will have on the subsidiary brand's SR. The authors themselves state that their results

cannot be generalized to include instances with positive versus negative corporate associations (Berens et al. 2005). If the parent brand and the subsidiary brand have conflicting SR images then consumers may be even more inclined to consider SR information; the discrepancy between the two brands may cause consumers to question the brand's motivations for its SR initiatives. Third, subsidiary brands unknown to the public were used in the study. This will not reveal the possible influence of the parent brand's SR. Finally, Berens et al. (2005) use Fombrun, Gardberg, and Sever's (2000) reputation quotient scale to measure CSR, which gauges six dimensions of corporate reputation, only one of which is social and environmental responsibility.

Berens et al.'s (2005) research supports the argument that when a monolithic brand strategy is used there may be no need for BSR as a company uses only a single brand name. The research also supports the proposition that when an endorsed brand strategy and a pure brand strategy are used there will be a need for using brand specific social responsibility measures; in such instances the parent brand is cognitively less accessible and consumer decisions are primarily based on the subsidiary brand (Berens et al. 2005). For example, consumers may be unaware that *Iams*, which runs pet adoption campaigns, is actually owned by *Procter and Gamble*, which is known for testing on animals. In such an example of a pure brand strategy the influence of the parent brand's SR may be diminished because of decreased accessibility. However, in the example of *L'Oréal* and *Garnier*, consumers may be users of both the parent brand and the subsidiary brand (i.e. *L'Oréal* makeup and *Garnier* shampoo). In such cases the parent brand's SR would be likely to influence the subsidiary brand's SR. A subsidiary brand is a subdivision of a parent brand, and its activities are therefore directed by the parent brand—consequently

its image is likely to be influenced by the parent brand's image. As a result, a subsidiary brand's SR image is likely to be influenced by the parent brand's SR image; if a parent brand has a positive SR image, its subsidiaries will most likely also have a positive SR image. However, if a parent brand has an unfavorable SR image it may have a negative influence on its subsidiaries' SR images.

A subsidiary brand's SR image may also affect its parent brand's SR image. Research concerning brand extensions has found that a brand extension can negatively influence its parent brand (Czellar 2003; Grime, Diamantopoulos and Smith 2002). If the brand extension is viewed in a negative light, this can cause dilution of the core brand. Using CSR to assess a subsidiary brand's SR would not account for these issues and thus the need for BSR.

Brand Personality

Madrigal and Boush (2008) argue that SR is a dimension of brand personality. However, brand personality is defined as "the unique set of human personality traits both applicable and relevant to brands" (Azoulay and Kapferer 2003, p. 153). SR cannot really be looked at as a human personality trait and therefore cannot be a dimension of brand personality as Madrigal and Boush (2008) suggest. An individual can be generous, caring, and respectful and as a result of such personality traits be socially responsible. Social responsibility is more a resulting behavior of possessing certain personality traits and not a personality trait in itself, and is therefore not a dimension of brand personality. Nevertheless, it is possible that there is a relationship between consumers' brand personality and social responsibility perceptions (Jean-Ruel 2008).

Two more issues can be raised regarding Madrigal and Boush's (2008) study. First, the authors did not use a specific scale for measuring SR. A brand's SR was measured using one or more of five items depending on the scenario with which study participants were presented regarding a brand. The five items included the following: (1) environmentally friendly, (2) more beneficial to the environment than other types of clothing, (3) good for the earth, (4) cares about doing the right thing, and (5) accountable for its actions. Furthermore, as acknowledged by the authors, their results are not generalizable to corporate brands with many subsidiaries as only corporate brands were used in the study with no mention made of any subsidiary brands.

Brand Credibility

Brand credibility is defined as "the believability of an entity's intentions at a particular time and is posited to have two main components: trustworthiness and expertise" (Erdem and Swait 2004, p. 192). A brand is seen as credible if consumers perceive that it has the capability and "willingness to continuously deliver what has been promised" (Erdem and Swait 2004, p. 192). More importantly, Erdem and Swait (2004) find that trustworthiness, as opposed to expertise, is more likely to affect consumers' brand choices. Consequently, if a subsidiary brand is marketed to be a socially responsible brand, as in the case of *Iams*, but consumers learn that it is owned by *Procter and Gamble*, which is known to test on animals, this may be considered a breach of trustworthiness and consequently harm the brand's credibility. A parent brand's SR may therefore have a negative effect on a subsidiary brand's SR. When brands fail to deliver what has been promised consumers are likely to doubt the sincerity of a brand's

intentions (Erdem and Swait 2004). If a subsidiary brand promotes environmentally friendly business practices, but the parent brand is found guilty of being environmentally unfriendly, consumers may doubt the trustworthiness of the subsidiary brand.

Sincerity has been found to be a mediator in determining the effectiveness of CSR initiatives (Yoon et al. 2006). Several variables have been found to affect consumers' perceived sincerity of SR, including the benefit salience of the cause, the source through which consumers learn about SR activities, and the ratio of SR contributions versus the amount spent on advertising SR initiatives (Yoon et al. 2006). Timing would also be an issue to consider, as Ellen, Mohr, and Webb (2000) find that consumers develop more positive perceptions of firms which participate in "reactive" CSR activities versus firms which donate to ongoing causes. This is only when CSR activities are in response to such things as natural disasters—Ellen et al. (2000) argue that supporting ongoing causes can arouse suspicion regarding companies' motives. However, Becker-Olsen, Cudmore, and Hill (2006) find that consumers perceive firms more negatively when their CSR activities are reactive in response to problems created by the firm itself, such as *McDonald's* use of recyclable packaging material. Batson's (1998) research further corroborates these findings; he argues that "extrinsic or self-interested motives have the ultimate goal of increasing the brand's own welfare (e.g., increase sales/profits or improve corporate image), whereas intrinsic or selfless motives have the ultimate goal of doing good and/or fulfilling one's obligations to society" (Batson 1998, p. 1049).

Thus consumers' perceived trustworthiness of a brand's SR activities and the factors which mediate the perception of this trustworthiness (such as the issue of timing) may greatly affect consumers' perceptions of a brand's SR. This again exemplifies the need

for two separate constructs: CSR and BSR. As in the preceding *Iams* and *Procter and Gamble* example, if one were to only measure CSR, one would be measuring both *Iams*' and *Procter and Gamble*'s SR simultaneously without understanding or revealing the interaction between the two brands' separate SR's; CSR alone would not assess the influence of the parent brand's SR on the subsidiary's SR. One would also not be measuring the differences between the two SR's.

Definition of Brand Social Responsibility

There are numerous definitions of CSR which attempt to encompass *all* of a firm's activities with regard to being socially responsible (Brown and Dacin 1997; Lichtenstein et al. 2004; McWilliams and Siegel 2001; Mohr et al. 2001). Yet this construct is then measured with differing and inconsistent scales composed of very few items and even fewer studies for validation.

A more detailed definition of CSR is Carroll's (1979) definition of corporate social performance (Golob et al. 2008; Maignan 2001; de los Salmones et al. 2005). This definition, however, is from a managerial perspective and therefore has limited salience from a marketing perspective. As previously discussed, three of the four CSR dimensions specified by Carroll (1979) are not salient from a consumer point of view (Golob, et al. 2008; Maignan 2001; de los Salmones et al. 2005).

There seems to be a lack of consensus as to what "elements constitute CSR" (Golob et al. 2008, p. 84). Several studies suggest that consumers' perceptions of CSR differ from those of managers and marketers (Becker-Olsen et al. 2005; Knox and Maklan 2004; Ruf, Muralidhar, and Paul 1998; Singhapakdi et al. 1996). Knox and Maklan (2004) and

Singhapakdi et al.'s (1996) research emphasizes that, for managers and marketers, being ethically and socially responsible must help achieve organizational effectiveness, as well as provide financial benefits. However in order to provide financial benefits, a firm must have a positive SR image from consumers' perspective; "[a] firm's CSR helps build a satisfied customer base and that customer satisfaction partially mediates the financial returns to CSR" (Luo and Bhattacharya 2006, p. 15). In order to create a positive SR image, marketers must understand SR from a consumer's point of view. Thus, a more consumer relevant definition is necessary.

In addition, a parent brand might have negative SR associations and its subsidiaries have positive SR associations (e.g., *Unilever vs. Ben and Jerry's*, or *L'Oréal vs. The Body Shop*). In such instances, the differences between the two brands will affect consumers' SR perceptions. Because a consumer's perceptions of SR are more likely to be influenced by brand related issues as opposed to corporate issues (such as the economic and legal dimensions, or corporate ability) a new construct is needed—one that assesses their perceptions of *brand* SR as opposed to *corporate* SR.

A new construct is therefore proposed. Brand Social Responsibility is defined as the extent to which consumers perceive that a brand and sustained voluntary activities associated with the brand improve the welfare of society. This definition considers BSR as a global construct for one important reason: extant research has failed to properly identify the dimension or dimensions which constitute CSR from a consumer perspective. The definition of BSR, therefore, is general enough to encompass any and all elements that consumers may perceive to constitute BSR. This definition is, however, specific in establishing that a brand itself can influence consumer perceptions of the brand's SR.

The goal of the research is twofold: (1) to introduce *Brand Social Responsibility* (BSR), as a new construct, and (2) to develop a scale to measure this construct. The next section addresses the second goal: developing a scale for measuring BSR and establishing discriminant and predictive validity for the scale.

INITIAL ITEM GENERATION

First Stage

A pre-test was run to gain some preliminary insights with regard to consumers' general perceptions of BSR, as well as develop an initial list of items. A sample of 84 respondents (66% male, average age of 21, 50% Canadian, median income of less than \$10,000) answered a short questionnaire (Appendix A). Participants were presented with the above definition of BSR and asked to (1) list any SR activities firms should engage in, (2) list brands they believe to be social responsible and explain why, (3) list brands they believe to be socially irresponsible and explain why, and (4) to list the adjectives which they think describe SR brands and socially irresponsible brands. The participants' answers to questions 1 and 4 helped generate the initial item list. This resulted in an initial list of 347 items, comprised of 225 descriptors and 122 statements that described socially responsible brands. Items were also borrowed and adapted to a brand context from existing CSR scales, including those of Brown and Dacin (1997), Lichtenstein et al. (2004), Maignan (2001), Mohr and Webb (2005), de los Salmones et al. (2005), and Sen and Bhattacharya (2001).

Second Stage

Of the 347 items generated in the first stage, 225 were descriptors and 122 were statements (Appendix B). Following this first stage an initial review of the items was conducted. The author and her supervisor reviewed the full list of items and eliminated descriptors that could not be classified as adjectives, as well as redundant descriptors and statements. A total of 89 descriptors and 101 statements were retained resulting in a scale containing 190 items (Appendix C).

Third Stage

The resulting 190 items were sent to five experts for further evaluation and item reduction. The expert judges were selected based on their expertise in scale development, consumer behavior, and social responsibility. Four of these experts had a Ph.D. in marketing and one expert was a Ph.D. candidate in management. All were actively involved in relevant consumer behavior and/or CSR research. They were presented with the definition of BSR and asked to rate each item on a seven point scale with anchors 1="not representative of brand social responsibility," 4="somewhat representative of brand social responsibility," and 7="very representative of brand social responsibility." The judges were also asked to assess the clarity and conciseness of the items.

Items that received a rating of 3 or less by the majority of the experts (3 or more) were removed. A total of 67 items were deleted (37 descriptors, 30 statements) resulting in a scale comprised of 123 items (52 descriptors, 71 statements).

STUDY 1

At this stage, two separate scales were prepared with the retained 123 items. The first scale consisted of 52 descriptors and the second scale consisted of 71 statements (Appendix D).

Six product categories were used with two brands in each product category, and the 12 brands used were based on the results of the pre-test. The brands that were most often listed as socially responsible or socially irresponsible were used, and brands were chosen to represent both a socially responsible example and socially irresponsible example in similar product categories. For example, *American Apparel* was listed often as a socially responsible brand, and *Gap* was listed several times as a socially irresponsible brand. Oil companies such as *Esso* were listed multiple times as socially irresponsible, whereas *Shell* was the only gas company listed several times as being socially responsible. Thus six product categories emerged represented by 12 brands. Table 6 provides a full list of the brands used in the study.

The reason for selecting multiple product categories and brands was to create variance in the BSR construct that could originate from both the product category and the brand. Brand was used as the single between-subjects factor in the design, with a total of 12 brands.

Procedure

Participants were presented with one of the 12 brands and the two scales: a Semantic Differential scale in which they were asked to rate the descriptors as “very descriptive”

versus “not at all descriptive” of the brand on a seven point scale, as well as a Likert scale in which they were asked to indicate whether they “strongly agreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statements regarding the brand on a seven point scale. Following the BSR scale respondents were also presented with a measure for brand familiarity.

A total of 477 individuals participated in Study 1. After eliminating incomplete questionnaires and participants that did not know about the brand, there was a total of 413 participants. Of the remaining participants, 51% were male and the average age was 25.

TABLE 6
Brands Used in Study 1 and Study 2

Study 1 Brands	Study 2 Brands
L'Oréal	Stonyfield Farm Yogurt
Aveda	Dannon LaCreme Yogurt
Subway	Dove Soap
Burger King	Lever 2000 Soap
Ford	Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream
Toyota	Breyers Ice Cream
American Apparel	Kashi Flakes Cereal
Gap	Fruit Loops Cereal
Esso	Boca Meatless Sausages
Shell	Oscar Meyer Sausages
Ben & Jerry's	The Body Shop Moisturizer
Häagen Dazs	Garnier Moisturizer

RESULTS

Scale 1: Descriptors

Exploratory factor analysis (extraction method: Principal Component Analysis, rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization) using SPSS 16.0 revealed 7 factors with Eigenvalues greater than one (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994). A review of the Eigenvalues (Table 7) and the scree plot suggested limiting the number of factors extracted to three, accounting for 57% of the variance. The first factor included descriptors reflecting philanthropic activities, trustworthiness and value. The second factor included descriptors related to innovativeness, awareness, and environmental consciousness. The third factor represented environmental friendliness, durability, as well as several descriptors that did not fit any general category.

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha; all three factors exceeded accepted standards: Factor 1 = 0.936, Factor 2 = 0.916, Factor 3 = 0.911.

An examination of the item-total correlations revealed that all descriptors had item-total correlations greater than 0.5. Items were deleted if their factor loadings were less than 0.7 and if there were significant cross-loadings on multiple factors (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994). Thus 34 descriptors were deleted resulting in a scale comprised of 18 descriptors.

Scale 2: Statements

Exploratory factor analysis (extraction method: Principal Component Analysis, rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization) using SPSS 16.0 revealed 13 factors with

Eigenvalues greater than one (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994). An examination of the Eigenvalues (Table 8) and the scree plot suggested limiting the number of factors extracted to four, accounting for 54% of the variance. The first factor included items reflecting philanthropic and ethical activities, as well as trustworthiness. The second factor represented environmental friendliness as well as the capacity for satisfying customer needs and expectations primarily from an ethical standpoint. The third factor represented legal obligations and environmental friendliness. The fourth factor included items representing donations to charity.

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha; all four factors exceeded accepted standards: Factor 1 = 0.973, Factor 2 = 0.926, Factor 3 = 0.921, Factor 4 = 0.892.

An examination of the item-total correlations revealed that only 13 of the statements had item-total correlations less than 0.5. Items were deleted if their factor loadings were less than 0.7, item-to-total correlations were less than 0.5, and if there were significant cross-loadings on multiple factors (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994). Thus 62 statements were deleted resulting in a scale of nine statements.

TABLE 7
Total Variance Explained for Descriptors

Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues	
		% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	20.834	45.292	45.292
2	2.987	6.494	51.786
3	2.775	6.032	57.818
4	1.737	3.777	61.595
5	1.658	3.604	65.199
6	1.203	2.616	67.815
7	1.095	2.379	70.195

TABLE 8
Total Variance Explained for Statements

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	27.528	35.750	35.750
2	6.944	9.018	44.769
3	4.323	5.614	50.383
4	2.959	3.843	54.226
5	2.021	2.625	56.850
6	1.707	2.217	59.067
7	1.620	2.105	61.172
8	1.478	1.920	63.091
9	1.413	1.836	64.927
10	1.343	1.745	66.672
11	1.253	1.627	68.299
12	1.176	1.528	69.827
13	1.012	1.314	71.141

STUDY 2

At this stage, the scale was again divided into two separate parts with the retained 27 items. The first scale consisted of 18 descriptors and the second scale consisted of 9 statements (Appendix E).

Six product categories were used with two brands in each product category (refer to Table 6 for a list of all brands used in the study). The reason for selecting multiple product categories and brands was to create variance in the BSR construct that could originate from both the product category and the brand.

Brand was used as the single between-subjects factor in the design, with a total of 12 brands. The brands were chosen based on their reputation, and as in Study 1, brands were chosen to represent both a socially responsible example and socially irresponsible example in similar product categories. The brands used in Study 1 could not be used in Study 2 as they were obtained through a Canadian sample and Study 2 was run using an American sample. The brands were therefore chosen based on their SR reputation as revealed through various media and news sources, including brands' Web sites as well as sources such as *Green America* and the *Organic Consumers Association*, which provide consumers with detailed information about brands' SR and Socially Irresponsible (SIR) activities. The final 12 brands chosen were found to be the best examples of socially responsible and socially irresponsible brands in their respective product categories. Additionally, the brands were chosen because they were subsidiaries under the same parent brands. For example, *Dove* and *Lever 2000* are both owned by *Unilever* and *The Body Shop* and *Garnier* are both owned by *L'Oréal*.

Procedure

Respondents were presented with one of the 12 brands and the two scales: a Semantic Differential scale in which they were asked to rate the descriptors as "very descriptive" versus "not at all descriptive" of the brand on a seven point scale, as well as a Likert scale in which they were asked to indicate whether they "strongly agreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the statements regarding the brand on a seven point scale.

Following the BSR scale, respondents were also presented with the existing six CSR scales, followed by the same measure for brand familiarity used in Study 1, as well as purchase frequency and purchase likelihood measures.

A panel of 300 American consumers with respondents over the age of 18 and employed full-time participated in Study 2. After eliminating incomplete questionnaires and participants who did not know about the brand, there was a total of 256 participants. Of these participants, 59% were male, the average age was 41, 82% were Caucasian and the median income was 30,001\$ to 40,000\$.

RESULTS

Scale 1: Descriptors

Exploratory factor analysis (extraction method: Principal Component Analysis, rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization) using SPSS 16.0 revealed two factors with Eigenvalues greater than one (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994). A review of the Eigenvalues (Table 9) and the scree plot suggested limiting the number of factors to one, accounting for 72% of the variance. The remaining factor included descriptors reflecting a brand's trustworthiness and awareness.

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and the factors exceeded accepted standards: Factor 1 = 0.969.

All descriptors had factor loadings greater than 0.7.

An examination of the item-total correlations revealed that all descriptors had item-total correlations greater than 0.7.

TABLE 9
Total Variance Explained for Descriptors

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	13.000	72.223	72.223
2	1.078	5.991	78.214

Scale 2: Statements

The Eigenvalues (Table 10) and the scree plot revealed that the statements loaded on one factor, accounting for 83% of the variance.

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and the factor exceeded accepted standards: Factor 1 = 0.974.

All statements had factor loadings greater than 0.7.

An examination of the item-total correlations revealed that all statements had item-total correlations greater than 0.7.

TABLE 10
Total Variance Explained for Statements

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.500	83.331	83.331

Table 11 compares Cronbach's alpha for the BSR descriptors scale (BSR 1), the BSR statements scale (BSR 2), as well as the existing six CSR scales. It can be noted that our scales have the highest levels of reliability.

TABLE 11
Comparison of Cronbach's Alpha Across Scales

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
BSR 1	.977
BSR 2	.974
Brown and Dacin (1997)	.874
Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004)	.956
Maignan (2001)	.909
Mohr and Webb (2005)	.903
de los Salmones et al. (2005)	.934
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	.927

Table 12 illustrates that the majority of scales are highly correlated and therefore all measure a similar construct. Maignan (2001), de los Salmones et al. (2005), and Mohr and Webb's (2005) scales are highly correlated with each other, and Maignan (2001) and Mohr and Webb's (2005) scales have a weak positive association with the BSR 1, BSR 2, and other CSR scales. A possible explanation could be that the BSR scales are unidimensional (as opposed to Maignan (2001), Mohr and Webb (2005) and de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scales, which are multidimensional). This study has completed the preliminary step (exploratory factor analysis) towards determining whether BSR is a unidimensional construct as outlined by Gerbing and Anderson (1988). The next step would involve confirmatory factor analysis (more specifically, structural equation modeling), but this is beyond the scope of this study.

TABLE 12
Correlations Between Scales

	BSR 1	BSR 2	Brown and Dacin (1997)	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	Maignan (2001)	de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Mohr and Webb (2005)
BSR 1	1.000	.571**	.565**	.497**	.492**	.192**	.494**	.206**
BSR 2	.571**	1.000	.679**	.718**	.775**	.300**	.512**	.205**
Brown and Dacin (1997)	.565**	.679**	1.000	.640**	.696**	.289**	.557**	.281**
Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	.492**	.775**	.696**	.760**	1.000	.374**	.602**	.288**
Maignan (2001)	.192**	.300**	.289**	.310**	.374**	1.000	.619**	.630**
Mohr and Webb (2005)	.206**	.205**	.281**	.151*	.288**	.630**	.514**	1.000
de los Salmones et al. (2005)	.494**	.512**	.557**	.481**	.602**	.619**	1.000	.514**
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	.497**	.718**	.640**	1.000	.760**	.310**	.481**	.151*

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). N 256

TABLE 13
Correlations Between Scales and Purchase Likelihood

Scale	Scale/Purchase Likelihood	R Square
BSR 1	.398**	.158
BSR 2	.405**	.164
Brown and Dacin (1997)	.357**	.127
Lichtenstein, Drumwright, and Braig (2004)	.434**	.189
Maignan (2001)	.297**	.088
Mohr and Webb (2005)	.319**	.102
de los Salmones et al. (2005)	.503**	.253
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	.384**	.147

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N 256

As can be seen in Table 12, the BSR 2, Brown and Dacin (1997), Lichtenstein et al. (2004), and Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) scales are all highly correlated, while the BSR 1 scale is only moderately correlated with these scales (de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scale is also moderately correlated with these scales). This indicates convergent validity, as these five scales all measure some form of SR, yet it is clear that BSR 1 “taps” into a different construct, as it has a weak positive association with four of the existing CSR scales and little or no association with two of them. A review of the correlations between scales at the brand level revealed similar results; the BSR 1 scale is only moderately correlated with the Brown and Dacin (1997), Lichtenstein et al. (2004), and Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) scales, and has little or no association with the Maignan (2001), Mohr and Webb (2005) and de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scales. In some instances, such as with *The Body Shop* and *Breyers*, the BSR 1 scale was found to have little or no association with the three scales with which it was previously moderately correlated, including those of Brown and Dacin (1997), Lichtenstein et al. (2004), and Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) (Pearson Correlation $r < 0.3$).

Table 13 presents the R Square values for predicting purchase likelihood of the BSR scales and the six CSR scales, as well as the correlations between the scales and purchase likelihood. The R Square value for the BSR scales (0.158 and 0.164) are higher than all other scales except for those of Lichtenstein et al. (2004) and de los Salmones et al. (2005) whose scores are 0.189 and 0.253 respectively. The BSR scales also have the highest correlation with purchase likelihood except for the Lichtenstein et al. (2004) and de los Salmones et al. (2005) scales. A closer inspection of purchase likelihood at the brand level reveals that the BSR scales are in fact better at predicting purchase likelihood

than the Lichtenstein et al. (2004) and de los Salmones et al. (2005) scales. Tables 14 and 15 reveal that the BSR 1 scale predicts purchase likelihood more consistently for brands that are considered socially responsible. All other scales are inconsistent in their predictions; they either better predict purchase likelihood for socially irresponsible brands, or no distinction between socially responsible and socially irresponsible brands is identifiable. For example, de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scale better predicts purchase likelihood for two of the socially irresponsible brands versus the socially responsible brands in the same product category, and no distinction can be made between the SR and SIR products in all other product categories. Lichtenstein et al.'s (2004) scale better predicts purchase likelihood for three of the socially irresponsible brands versus the socially responsible brands in the same product category (*Dannon, Lever 2000, and Fruit Loops*). The BSR 1 scale however, accurately identifies a distinction between the brands in four of the product categories, and better predicts purchase likelihood for the socially responsible brands in those particular product categories. Sen and Bhattacharya's (2001) scale accurately predicts purchase likelihood for four of the socially responsible brands. However, as noted in Table 13, the BSR 1 and BSR 2 scales have a higher overall correlation with purchase likelihood, as well as a higher overall R Square value for purchase likelihood than the Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) scale.

The BSR 1 scale predicts purchase likelihood more consistently for brands that are considered socially responsible rather than brands that are considered socially irresponsible, providing evidence that SR and SIR are distinct constructs as opposed to ends on a continuum. Wagner, Bicen, and Hall's (2008) study further corroborates this finding, as they developed a scale for measuring Corporate Social Irresponsibility (CSIR)

TABLE 14
Predictive Validity at Brand Level

Scale	Stonyfield Farm Yogurt	Dannon LaCreme Yogurt	Dove Soap	Lever 2000 Soap	The Body Shop Moisturizer	Garnier Moisturizer
BSR 1	0.594**	0.442*	0.458*	0.320	0.705**	0.182
BSR 2	0.228	0.616**	0.526*	0.311	0.271	0.120
Brown and Dacin (1997)	0.587**	0.544*	0.336	0.171	0.300	-.053
Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	0.373	0.685**	0.381	0.437*	0.437*	0.383
Maignan (2001)	0.386	0.341	0.095	0.179	0.229	0.361
Mohr and Webb (2005)	0.386	0.342	0.033	0.383	0.135	0.452*
de los Salmones et al. (2005)	0.610**	0.669**	0.194	0.747**	0.388	0.706**
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	0.085	0.643**	0.535*	0.300	0.551**	0.152

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). N 256

TABLE 15
Predictive Validity at Brand Level

Scale	Boca Meatless Sausages	Oscar Meyer Sausages	Kashi Flakes Cereal	Fruit Loops Cereal	Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream	Breyers Ice Cream
BSR 1	0.140	0.169	0.237	0.760**	0.622**	.413*
BSR 2	0.504*	0.412	0.541*	0.603**	0.689**	.154
Brown and Dacin (1997)	0.624**	0.242	0.486*	0.573**	0.565**	.259
Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	0.625**	0.395	0.406	0.596**	0.537*	.124
Maignan (2001)	0.630**	0.560**	0.372	0.065	0.369	.324
Mohr and Webb (2005)	0.418	0.443*	0.376	0.378	0.258	.326
de los Salmones et al. (2005)	0.473	0.339	0.592**	0.506*	0.413	.420
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	0.655**	0.114	0.251	0.528**	0.722**	.257

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). N 256

which is comprised of 12 factors. Many of these factors, such as local employment, employee benefits, employee wages, local business, and foreign economies differ greatly from the factors identified by the BSR scales. This suggests that brands could potentially rate high both in terms of SR and SIR.

De los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scale includes economic and legal dimensions which may explain why it has a higher overall correlation with purchase likelihood—consumers are likely to consider such factors when making a purchase. However, economic factors may affect purchase decisions for different reasons than a brand's level of social responsibility. In order to properly measure consumers' purchase patterns based on social responsibility, SR must be considered separately than economic issues—by using de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scale it is not clear how much of consumers' purchase likelihood is based on economic factors versus philanthropic factors. As can be seen in Tables 14 and 15, at the individual brand level, the de los Salmones et al. (2005) scale does not reveal a distinction between SR and SIR brands. (As previously noted, the de los Salmones et al. (2005) scale better predicts purchase likelihood for two of the socially irresponsible brands versus the socially responsible brands in the same product category, and no distinction can be made between the SR and SIR products in all other product categories.) De los Salmones et al. (2005) state themselves that “there is a need to further develop the measuring scale of social responsibility from the consumers' perspective. We started from Carroll's model...[although] consumers may not see social responsibility in this way, nor include the same obligations in the construct” (de los Salmones et al. 2005, p. 381). Therefore, although de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scale has a higher correlation with purchase likelihood, the BSR scales are better for predicting

consumers' purchase likelihood based on their perceptions of a brand's social responsibility.

T-tests were used to compare the means between socially responsible brands and socially irresponsible brands, as well as between brands in each of the six product categories. As can be seen in Table 16 none of the scales had significant differences in the means between SR brands and SIR brands when compared collectively. This provides further evidence that SR and SIR are distinct constructs.

As noted in Tables 17 through 24, the means for the brands in three of the product categories are significantly different when measured with the BSR 1 scale. Using Maignan's (2001) scale the means for the brands in two of the product categories are significantly different, and when measured with Mohr and Webb (2005), Sen and Bhattacharya (2001), and de los Salmones et al.'s (2005) scales the means for the brands in only one product category are significantly different. The BSR 1 scale clearly measures BSR more accurately at the brand level than the existing CSR scales.

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to develop a better understanding of consumers' perceptions of social responsibility by defining a new construct, BSR, and by developing a scale for measuring the construct. Following a literature review of the existing scales for measuring CSR, it was found that existing CSR scales are either conceptually inconsistent, have a managerial versus consumer perspective, or have weak psychometric properties. Moreover, existing CSR scales do not account for the possible differences

between a parent brand's SR and its subsidiary's SR, as well as the differences between subsidiaries' SR's.

By means of exploratory factor analysis it was determined that many of the dimensions of existing CSR scales are not salient from a consumer's perspective, such as the economic and legal dimensions. Of the two scales developed in this study, one scale (BSR 1) was composed primarily of descriptors concerning a brand's trustworthiness and awareness, and the second scale (BSR 2) was composed primarily of statements regarding a brand's philanthropic activities. This provides evidence that existing CSR scales do not measure the dimensions of SR that are most relevant for consumers. Discriminant and predictive validity for the BSR 1 scale revealed that it more accurately measures consumers' perceptions of a brand's social responsibility (but not a brand's social irresponsibility) than do existing CSR scales.

The two BSR scales suggest that there may be one scale composed of two dimensions. As previously mentioned, future research could attempt to discern the dimensionality of BSR with the use of confirmatory factor analysis.

Predictive validity analysis and the Independent Samples Test for SR brands versus SIR brands provide evidence that SR and SIR are distinct constructs; the BSR 1 scale predicts purchase likelihood more consistently for brands that are considered socially responsible, and none of the BSR and CSR scales had significant differences in the means between SR brands and SIR brands when compared collectively. As also evidenced by Wagner et al.'s (2008) research, consumer perceptions of SR and SIR are seemingly influenced by different factors and each construct therefore requires a distinct

scale of measurement and could be considered both socially responsible and irresponsible.

A further contribution of this study is the comparison between existing scales; all existing CSR scales were created mainly for use in separate studies and were often based on differing definitions of CSR. This study contrasts these scales with new scales that capture brand level social responsibility (BSR 1 and BSR 2), and also provides a comparison between the effectiveness of all scales.

TABLE 16
Independent Samples Test for SR Brands versus SIR Brands

			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means																																																																										
			Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)																																																																								
BSR 1	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.28	1.433	-.605	254	.546																																																																								
		SIR Brands	3.96	1.633				BSR 2	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.96	1.271	-.378	254	.706	SIR Brands	3.93	1.178	Brown and Dacin (1997)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.20	.811	-1.196	254	.233	SIR Brands	3.01	.918	Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.15	1.176	.937	254	.349	SIR Brands	4.02	1.249	Maignan (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	5.08	.974	1.769	254	.078	SIR Brands	5.23	1.001	Mohr and Webb (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.06	.776	1.614	254	.108	SIR Brands	4.12	.804	de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.72	1.037	.208	254	.835	SIR Brands	4.76	1.057	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850
BSR 2	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.96	1.271	-.378	254	.706																																																																								
		SIR Brands	3.93	1.178				Brown and Dacin (1997)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.20	.811	-1.196	254	.233	SIR Brands	3.01	.918	Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.15	1.176	.937	254	.349	SIR Brands	4.02	1.249	Maignan (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	5.08	.974	1.769	254	.078	SIR Brands	5.23	1.001	Mohr and Webb (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.06	.776	1.614	254	.108	SIR Brands	4.12	.804	de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.72	1.037	.208	254	.835	SIR Brands	4.76	1.057	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850	254	.396	SIR Brands	3.81	1.117						
Brown and Dacin (1997)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.20	.811	-1.196	254	.233																																																																								
		SIR Brands	3.01	.918				Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.15	1.176	.937	254	.349	SIR Brands	4.02	1.249	Maignan (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	5.08	.974	1.769	254	.078	SIR Brands	5.23	1.001	Mohr and Webb (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.06	.776	1.614	254	.108	SIR Brands	4.12	.804	de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.72	1.037	.208	254	.835	SIR Brands	4.76	1.057	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850	254	.396	SIR Brands	3.81	1.117																	
Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.15	1.176	.937	254	.349																																																																								
		SIR Brands	4.02	1.249				Maignan (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	5.08	.974	1.769	254	.078	SIR Brands	5.23	1.001	Mohr and Webb (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.06	.776	1.614	254	.108	SIR Brands	4.12	.804	de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.72	1.037	.208	254	.835	SIR Brands	4.76	1.057	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850	254	.396	SIR Brands	3.81	1.117																												
Maignan (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	5.08	.974	1.769	254	.078																																																																								
		SIR Brands	5.23	1.001				Mohr and Webb (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.06	.776	1.614	254	.108	SIR Brands	4.12	.804	de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.72	1.037	.208	254	.835	SIR Brands	4.76	1.057	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850	254	.396	SIR Brands	3.81	1.117																																							
Mohr and Webb (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.06	.776	1.614	254	.108																																																																								
		SIR Brands	4.12	.804				de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.72	1.037	.208	254	.835	SIR Brands	4.76	1.057	Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850	254	.396	SIR Brands	3.81	1.117																																																		
de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	4.72	1.037	.208	254	.835																																																																								
		SIR Brands	4.76	1.057				Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850	254	.396	SIR Brands	3.81	1.117																																																													
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Equal variances assumed	SR Brands	3.95	1.112	.850	254	.396																																																																								
		SIR Brands	3.81	1.117																																																																											

TABLE 17
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means			
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
BSR 1	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	4.91	1.201				
		Dannon LaCreme	3.64	2.064	Equal variances not assumed	2.054	24.72	.051
	Soap	Dove	4.59	1.158				
		Lever 2000	3.51	1.763	Equal variances not assumed	2.068	25.69	.049
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	4.77	1.537	Equal variances assumed	-.599	32	.553
		Breyers	5.07	1.390				
	Cereal	Kashi	3.67	1.787	Equal variances assumed	-1.017	35	3.16
		Froot Loops	4.31	2.009				
	Sausage	Boca	4.74	1.605	Equal variances assumed	2.222	31	.034
		Oscar Meyer	3.49	1.632				
	Moisturizer	The Body Shop	4.03	1.452	Equal variances assumed	1.490	34	.145
		Garnier	3.27	1.570				

TABLE 18
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means			
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
BSR 2	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	3.96	1.122	Equal variances assumed	.125	26	.901
		Dannon LaCreme	3.90	1.351				
	Soap	Dove	4.05	1.103	Equal variances assumed	1.379	31	.178
		Lever 2000	3.49	1.200				
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	4.83	1.338	Equal variances assumed	.951	32	.349
		Breyers	4.45	1.000				
	Cereal	Kashi	3.63	1.320	Equal variances assumed	-.898	35	.375
		Froot Loops	4.07	1.601				
	Sausage	Boca	3.87	1.271	Equal variances assumed	.124	31	.902
		Oscar Meyer	3.82	1.415				
	Moisturizer	The Body Shop	3.71	1.547	Equal variances assumed	.418	34	.679
		Garnier	3.53	1.001				

TABLE 19
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means			
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Brown and Dacin (1997)	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	3.47	.611	Equal variances assumed	1.134	26	.267
		Dannon LaCreme	3.06	1.130				
	Soap	Dove	3.35	.478	Equal variances assumed	1.565	31	.128
		Lever 2000	3.00	.789				
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	3.40	.904	Equal variances assumed	.553	32	.584
		Breyers	3.22	.922				
	Cereal	Kashi	2.94	1.150	Equal variances assumed	-.394	35	.696
		Froot Loops	3.08	1.042				
	Sausage	Boca	3.23	.814	Equal variances assumed	1.441	31	.160
		Oscar Meyer	2.71	1.218				
	Moisturizer	The Body Shop	3.12	.979	Equal variances assumed	.770	34	.447
		Garnier	2.89	.754				

TABLE 20
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation		t-test for Equality of Means		
						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sen and Bhattacharya (2001)	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	3.71	1.052	Equal variances assumed	-.756	26	.457
		Dannon LaCreme	4.09	1.510				
	Soap	Dove	4.23	.965	Equal variances assumed	1.824	31	.078
		Lever 2000	3.64	.889				
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	4.52	1.235	Equal variances assumed	1.062	32	.296
		Breyers	4.12	.960				
	Cereal	Kashi	3.36	1.132	Equal variances assumed	-1.268	35	.213
		Froot Loops	3.94	1.566				
	Sausage	Boca	3.71	1.276	Equal variances assumed	1.479	31	.149
		Oscar Meyer	3.07	1.209				
	Moisturizer	The Body Shop	4.32	1.009	Equal variances assumed	2.044	34	.049
		Garnier	3.69	.841				

TABLE 21
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means			
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Lichtenstein et al. (2004)	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	4.12	1.269	Equal variances assumed	.472	26	.898
		Dannon LaCreme	4.19	1.547				
	Soap	Dove	4.45	1.101	Equal variances assumed	1.814	31	.079
		Lever 2000	3.71	1.224				
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	4.79	1.257	Equal variances assumed	1.073	32	.291
		Breyers	4.38	.965				
	Cereal	Kashi	3.69	.970	Equal variances assumed	-1.273	35	.211
		Froot Loops	4.26	1.597				
	Sausage	Boca	3.92	1.254	Equal variances assumed	.313	31	.756
		Oscar Meyer	3.76	1.647				
Moisturizer	The Body Shop	4.24	1.318	Equal variances assumed	1.239	34	.224	
	Garnier	3.72	1.199					

TABLE 22
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means			
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Maignan (2001)	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	5.18	.840				
		Dannon LaCreme	5.07	1.366	Equal variances not assumed	.267	25.20	.791
	Soap	Dove	5.06	.784	Equal variances assumed	-.527	31	.602
		Lever 2000	5.21	.870				
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	5.08	1.004	Equal variances assumed	-1.062	32	.296
		Breyers	5.40	.751				
	Cereal	Kashi	4.79	1.149	Equal variances assumed	-1.418	35	.165
		Froot Loops	5.35	1.237				
	Sausage	Boca	4.81	1.011	Equal variances assumed	-3.195	31	.003
		Oscar Meyer	5.72	.595				
	Moisturizer	The Body Shop	5.76	.655	Equal variances assumed	2.089	34	.044
		Garnier	5.25	1.046				

TABLE 23
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means			
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
de los Salmones et al. (2005)	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	5.12	1.020	Equal variances assumed	.515	26	.611
		Dannon LaCreme	4.86	1.486				
	Soap	Dove	5.07	.819	Equal variances assumed	2.069	31	.047
		Lever 2000	4.49	.775				
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	4.90	1.066	Equal variances assumed	-1.290	32	.206
		Breyers	5.32	.804				
	Cereal	Kashi	4.47	1.163	Equal variances assumed	-1.422	35	.164
		Froot Loops	5.05	1.312				
	Sausage	Boca	4.62	1.223	Equal variances assumed	-.861	31	.396
		Oscar Meyer	4.96	1.029				
Moisturizer	The Body Shop	5.03	.794	Equal variances assumed	1.904	34	.065	
	Garnier	4.47	.932					

TABLE 24
Independent Samples Test for Product Categories

Scale	Product Category	Brand	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means			
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Mohr and Webb (2005)	Yogurt	Stonyfield Farm	4.35	.566	Equal variances assumed	.723	26	.476
		Dannon LaCreme	4.12	.942				
	Soap	Dove	4.15	.640	Equal variances assumed	-.122	31	.903
		Lever 2000	4.18	.769				
	Ice Cream	Ben & Jerry's	4.19	.735	Equal variances assumed	-.327	32	.746
		Breyers	4.27	.707				
	Cereal	Kashi	3.85	1.036	Equal variances assumed	-1.511	35	.140
		Froot Loops	4.30	.760				
	Sausage	Boca	4.02	.869	Equal variances not assumed	-2.174	31	.037
		Oscar Meyer	4.54	.447				
Moisturizer	The Body Shop	4.22	.594	Equal variances assumed	.812	34	.422	
	Garnier	4.02	.833					

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Further validation of the BSR scales is required in terms of consumer behavior: this research did not measure consumers' level of knowledge regarding subsidiary brands and their parent brands. This study also did not test the scale with parent brands and their subsidiaries; in Study 2 the brands used were subsidiaries under the same parent brand. Future research could more closely examine the effects of opposing SR images between parent brands and their subsidiaries.

The samples used in the first stage of item generation and in Study 1 were not representative of the population. Student samples were used in both cases because of monetary limitations.

The brands used in Study 2 were based on the author's research; future research could use brands identified by consumers (as in Study 1) to obtain more generalizable results. For example, as noted in Tables 19 and 21 through 28, neither the BSR scales nor the CSR scales accurately identified the difference between *Kashi Flakes* and *Fruit Loops* cereals. This suggests that these two brands are not prime examples of a socially responsible and socially irresponsible brand.

As previously mentioned, future research should conduct confirmatory factor analysis to determine whether BSR is a unidimensional construct.

Future research could also use the BSR 1 scale in conjunction with brand personality measures to better understand the relationship between brand personality and consumers' perceptions of BSR. The strength of the consumer-brand relationship could also be examined with regard to BSR. As demonstrated through the pre-test, several brands were

considered equally responsible and irresponsible. *McDonald's* was listed as socially responsible by eight respondents, but as socially irresponsible by eight others. Those who believed *McDonald's* to be a socially responsible brand cited its activities with children's charities (namely the *Ronald McDonald* charities) as the reason. Those who believed *McDonald's* to be a socially irresponsible brand cited several reasons such as poor wages, pollution (more specifically individual packaging), unhealthiness, and only being concerned with profit. Another such example is that of *Nike*. Numerous respondents listed *Nike* as a socially irresponsible firm, all citing the issues the brand has had in the past with child labor and sweat shops. Those who believed the firm to be socially responsible had different reasons, including: (1) its health consciousness—promoting good and healthy lifestyles, (2) donations to charity (“re-use a shoe” program), and (3) the brand's plans to be more eco-friendly.

Some brands were listed multiple times as socially responsible and never as being socially irresponsible, while some brands were commonly listed as socially irresponsible brands and never as socially responsible. Car companies including *GM*, *Hummer* and *Ford* were only listed as socially irresponsible by multiple respondents. *Toyota* however, was only listed as being a socially responsible brand. This demonstrates that a product category which is not socially responsible in itself (e.g., because it causes pollution) can still have a positive SR image based on its SR initiatives and brand image: *Toyota* was repeatedly cited as a brand that makes a genuine effort to create environmentally friendly vehicles.

Other brands whose products themselves are frequently perceived as socially irresponsible, such as gas and oil companies, were also listed as socially irresponsible,

including *Exxon Mobil*, *Petro Canada*, *Esso*, *Ultramar* and *Shell*. *Shell*, however, was the only oil/gas brand also listed as being socially responsible. It was described as trying to “increase the quality of life through technological improvement or try to counter their obvious negative effects with very good advertising” and as “pursuing research in better, cleaner gasoline.” This suggests that environmentally unfriendly (and thus socially irresponsible) products can still be perceived as socially responsible via their brand image.

The results of the pre-test suggest that a brand’s image, personality, and consumers’ relationships with a brand can lead consumers to develop opposing perceptions of BSR for the same brand. Future research could therefore further develop the BSR 1 scale to better understand the moderating effects of brand image, brand personality, and consumer-brand relationships.

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, Pankaj (2004), "The Effects of Brand Relationship Norms on Consumer Attitudes and Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (3), 87-101.
- Aupperle, K. E., A. B. Carroll, and J. Hatfield (1985), "An Empirical Examination of the Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility and Profitability," *Academy of Management Journal*, 28 (2), 446-463.
- Azoulay, Audrey and Jean-Noel Kapferer (2003), "Do Brand Personality Scales Really Measure Brand Personality?" *Journal of Brand Management*, 11 (2), 143-155.
- Becker-Olsen, Karen L., B. Andrew Cudmore, and Ronald Paul Hill (2006), "The Impact of Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility on Consumer Behavior," *Journal of Business Research*, 59 (1), 46-53.
- Berens, Guido, Cees B.M. van Riel, and Gerrit H. van Bruggen (2005), "Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses: The Moderating Role of Corporate Brand Dominance," *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (3), 35-48.
- Brown, Tom J. and Peter A. Dacin (1998), "The Company and the Product: Corporate Associations and Consumer Product Responses," *Journal of Marketing*, 61 (1), 68-84.
- Carroll, Archie B. (1979), "A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance," *The Academy of Management Review*, 4 (4), 497-505.
- Czellar, Sandor (2003), "Consumer Attitude toward Brand Extensions: An Integrative Model and Research Propositions," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 20 (1), 97-115.
- Dean, Dwane Hal (2004), "Consumer Perceptions of Corporate Donations," *Journal of Advertising*, 32 (4), 91-102.
- Ellen, Pam Scholder, Lois A. Mohr, and Deborah J. Webb (2000), "Charitable Programs and the Retailer: Do They Mix?" *Journal of Retailing*, 76 (3), 393-406.
- Erdem, Tülin and Joffre Swait (2004), "Brand Credibility, Brand Consideration, and Choice," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (3), 191-198.
- Fombrun, Charles J., Naomi A. Gardberg, and Joy M. Sever (2000), "The Reputation Quotient: A Multi-Stakeholder Measure of Corporate Reputation," *Journal of Brand Management*, 7 (4), 241-55.
- Gerbing, David W. and James C. Anderson (1988), "An Updated Paradigm for Scale Development Incorporating Unidimensionality and Its Assessment," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25 (2), 186-192.

- Golob, Urša, Marko Lah, and Zlatko Jančič (2008), "Value Orientations and Consumer Expectations of Corporate Social Responsibility," *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 14 (2), 83-96.
- Grime, Ian, Adamantios Diamantopoulos, and Gareth Smith (2002), "Consumer Evaluations of Extensions and their Effects on the Core Brand," *European Journal of Marketing*, 36 (11/12), 1415-1438.
- Jean-Ruel, Émilie (2008), "The Effect of Ethical Attributes on Brand Personality and Consumer-Brand Relationships," M.Sc., Concordia University (Canada), 1-50.
- Knox, Simon and Stan Maklan (2004), "Corporate Social Responsibility: Moving Beyond Investment Towards Measuring Outcomes," *European Management Journal*, 22 (5), 508-516.
- Laforet, S. and J. Saunders (1994) "Managing Brand Portfolios: How the Leaders Do It," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39 (1), p. 64-76.
- Lichtenstein, Donald R., Minette E. Drumwright, and Bridgette M. Braig (2004), "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Customer Donations to Corporate-Supported Nonprofits," *Journal of Marketing*, 68 (4), 16-32.
- Luo, Xueming and C.B. Bhattacharya (2006), "Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Satisfaction, and Market Value," *Journal of Marketing*, 70 (4), 1-18.
- Maignan, Isabelle (2001), "Consumers' Perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibilities: A Cross-Cultural Comparison," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 30 (1), 57-72.
- and O.C. Ferrell (2000), "Measuring Corporate Citizenship in Two Countries: The Case of the United States and France," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23 (3), 283-297.
- Madrigal, Robert and David M. Boush (2008), "Social Responsibility as a Unique Dimension of Brand Personality and Consumers' Willingness to Reward," *Psychology & Marketing*, 25 (6), 538-564.
- McWilliams, Abigail and Donald Seigel (2001), "Corporate Social Responsibility: A Theory of the Firm Perspective," *The Academy of Management Review*, 26 (1), 117-127.
- Mohr, Lois A., Deborah J. Webb, and Katherine E. Harris (2001), "Do Consumers Expect Companies To Be Socially Responsible? The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Buying Behavior," *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35 (1), 45-72.

- and Deborah J. Webb (2005), “The Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility and Price on Consumer Responses,” *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 39 (1), 121-147.
- Nunnally, J.C. and I. H. Bernstein (1994), *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ruf, Bernadette, Krishnamurty Muralidhar, and Karen Paul (1998), “The Development of a Systematic, Aggregate Measure of Corporate Social Performance,” *Journal of Management*, 24 (1), 119-133.
- de los Salmones, Ma del Mar Garcia, Angel Herrero Crespo and Ignacio Rodriguez del Bosque (2005), “Influence of Corporate Social Responsibility on Loyalty and Valuation of Services,” *Journal of Business Ethics*, 61 (2), 369–385.
- Sen, Sankar and C. B. Bhattacharya (2001), “Does Doing Good Always Lead to Doing Better? Consumer Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (2), 225-243.
- Singhapakdi, Anusorn, Scott J. Vitell, Kumar C. Rallapalli, and Kenneth L. Kraft (1996), “The Perceived Role of Ethics and Social Responsibility: A Scale Development,” *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15 (11), 1131-1140.
- Wagner, Tillmann, Pelin Bicen, and Zachary R. Hall (2008), “The Dark Side of Retailing: Towards A Scale of Corporate Social Irresponsibility,” *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 36 (2), 124-141.
- Yoon, Yeosun, Zeynep Gurhan-Canli, and Norbert Schwarz (2006), “The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Activities on Companies with Bad Reputations,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16 (4), 377-390.

Appendix A

We are interested in understanding how consumers perceive social responsibility of brands. Please read the definition of brand social responsibility and answer the following questions. There are no right or wrong answers.

BRAND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IS THE EXTENT TO WHICH A BRAND AND SUSTAINED VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE BRAND IMPROVE THE WELFARE OF SOCIETY.

- 1. Please describe any activities a brand could engage in that would improve the welfare of society.**
- 2. Please list some brands that you consider to be socially responsible.**
- 3. Why do you consider the above brands to be socially responsible?**
- 4. Please list some brands that you consider to be socially *irresponsible*.**
- 5. Why do you consider the above brands to be socially irresponsible?**
- 6. What adjectives or descriptors would be associated with a brand that is HIGH on Brand Social Responsibility?**
- 7. What adjectives or descriptors would be associated with a brand that is LOW on Brand Social Responsibility?**

Next, you will be asked to answer a number of questions for classification purposes.

You are: (Please check the correct box)

	Male	Female
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please indicate your age: _____ years old

Please indicate your ethnicity: (Please check the correct box)

- Canadian
- American
- Italian
- Greek
- Middle Eastern
- Chinese
- Other (please specify) _____

Please indicate your **current** income level, in Canadian dollars: (Please check the correct box)

- \$10,000 or less
- \$10,001 – 20,000
- \$20,001 – 30,000
- \$30,001 – 40,000
- \$40,001 – 50,000
- \$50,001 – 60,000
- \$60,001 – 70,000
- \$70,001 – 80,000
- More than 80,000

Thank you for your cooperation. We value your responses to this questionnaire.

Appendix B

1	Beneficial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Charitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Ethical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Affordable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Keeps its promises	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	Conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	Careful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	Responsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	Caring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	Giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	Informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Loyal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	Aware	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	Safe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	Easy to use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	Durable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	Long-lasting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	Healthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22	Resourceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	Sustainable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	Recycle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

25	Reuse	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	Eco-friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	Biodegradable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	Useful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	Helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	Knowledgeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31	Respectful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	Worthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	Thoughtful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34	Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35	Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36	Universal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37	Good quality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38	Warranties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39	Satisfying	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40	Relevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41	Famous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42	Involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43	Proactive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44	Highly equipped	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45	Wanted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46	Needed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47	Appreciated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48	Humble	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49	Generous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

50	Happy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51	Cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52	Charismatic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53	Environmentally friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54	Green	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
55	Innovative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56	Efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
57	Reasonably priced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
58	Smart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
59	Unselfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60	Humane	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
61	Compassionate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62	Trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63	Acceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64	Optimistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65	Pure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66	Honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
67	Sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
68	Modest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69	Social leader	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
70	Developer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
71	Environmentally aware	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
72	Low carbon monoxide emissions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
73	Gives back to the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
74	Environmentally conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

75	Provides customers with value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
76	Community involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
77	Aiming for quality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
78	Non-profit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
79	Satisfying customers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
80	Honourable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
81	Excellent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
82	People oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
83	Likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
84	Good image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
85	Respects human values	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
86	Popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
87	Great	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
88	Visible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
89	Interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
90	Nice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
91	Good customer service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
92	Concerned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
93	Selfless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
94	Competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
95	Considerate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
96	Willing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
97	Democracy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
98	Openness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
99	Transparency	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

100	Approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
101	Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
102	Recent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
103	Right	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
104	Family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
105	Youth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
106	Open-minded	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
107	Cheerful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
108	Enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
109	Sensible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
110	Cost efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
111	Clean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
112	Updated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
113	Revolutionary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
114	Culture conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
115	Appealing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
116	Community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
117	Environmentally safe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
118	Local production	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
119	Donations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
120	Good reputation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
121	Energy efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
122	Equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

123	Monopolistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
124	Expensive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
125	Unethical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
126	Disappointing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
127	Naïve	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
128	Careless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
129	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
130	Irresponsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
131	Profit oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
132	Selfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
133	Dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
134	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
135	Harmful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
136	Complex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
137	Temporary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
138	Wasteful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
139	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
140	Blind	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
141	Cheap	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
142	Pollution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
143	Disrespectful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
144	Uncaring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
145	Unreliable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
146	Barbaric	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
147	Irrelevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

148	Expendable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
149	Replaceable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
150	Rich	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
151	Frustration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
152	Uses up scarce resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
153	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
154	Unjust	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
155	Biased	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
156	No worker rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
157	No returns	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
158	Unexpected	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
159	Bad quality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
160	Money-driven	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
161	False representation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
162	Not trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
163	Unequipped	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
164	Unprepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
165	Ignorant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
166	Doesn't care what others think	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
167	Concerned about themselves	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
168	Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
169	Greedy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
170	Antipathy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
171	Environmentally harmful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
172	Dollar driven	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

173	Lobbyist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
174	Superficial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
175	Low wages	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
176	Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
177	Overpriced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
178	Damaging	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
179	Inhumane	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
180	Destructive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
181	Indifferent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
182	Unacceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
183	Unappealing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
184	Stupid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
185	Pointless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
186	Materialistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
187	Exploiter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
188	Polluting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
189	Capitalist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
190	Unhelpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
191	Mass-produced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
192	Not efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
193	Wastes energy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
194	Self-involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
195	Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
196	Shallow	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
197	Bad image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

198	Evil	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
199	Money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
200	Hypocritical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
201	Unconcerned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
202	Low class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
203	Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
204	Arrogant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
205	Tricky	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
206	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
207	Suffering	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
208	Unaware	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
209	Profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
210	Cheap labor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
211	Old	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
212	Out of date	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
213	Uncool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
214	Unsocial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
215	Dirty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
216	Not cost efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
217	Uninterested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
218	Outsourcing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
219	Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
220	Bad reputation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
221	Deplorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
222	Inequality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

223	Tyranny	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
224	Mindlessness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
225	Short-sightedness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	I believe that a socially responsible brand should...							
226	Make charitable donations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
227	Deliver the advantages and features that it promotes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
228	price its products fairly and accordingly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
229	provide necessary instructions for use and/or warnings on the label	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
230	Organize fundraising walk-a-thons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
231	Provide donations for hospitals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
232	donate to local homeless shelters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
233	volunteer their time at a food bank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
234	pay their workers a fair amount (minimum wage)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
235	not employ children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
236	raise money for activities involving children wearing/using their brand name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
237	help students by discounting products for students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
238	Use environmentally friendly products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
239	Produce healthy products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
240	Produce products that are worth their value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
241	satisfy customer wants and needs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
242	use recycled products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
243	not produce a lot of pollution during production	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
244	not exploit workers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
245	Make donations to the poor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

246	help poor children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
247	sponsor some non-profit organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
248	establish social organizations that benefit needy people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
249	use clean and efficient energy sources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
250	sponsor some voluntary services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
251	promote their brand with good messages to society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
252	Engage in activities that promote environmental	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
253	Engage in activities that consumers can relate to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
254	Conduct charity events to help raise money for diseased people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
255	Provide a feeling of belonging and being needed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
256	Create after school programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
257	Run contests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
258	Be actively involved in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
259	Promote health, fitness and exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
260	build houses for the poor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
261	donate to natural disaster sites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
262	be more sensitive and try to solve problems in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
263	lower their prices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
264	help the homeless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
265	market products that are not harmful to one's health	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
266	advertise a cause in their commercials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
267	raise awareness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
268	donate money for cancer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
269	not waste paper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
270	not overuse resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
271	make sure the brands' products don't harm the consumers that buy them	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

272	associate itself with major charity foundations that are positive within their target market	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
273	Be sweatshop free	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
274	pay employees more than minimum wage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
275	Adhere to the Kyoto protocol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
276	decrease pollution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
277	be responsible toward employees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
278	be responsible toward investors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
279	be responsible towards its consumers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
280	give/send out a positive image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
281	be honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
282	promoting social cohesion (family events, donations, social initiatives)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
283	consider the advantages and disadvantages the product poses to families	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
284	hire youth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
285	avoid any immoral connections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
286	build parks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
287	donate to schools, hospitals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
288	affect global change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
289	involve employees in every voluntary activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
290	participate in youth activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
291	not use plastic bags	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
292	raise awareness for a specific cause by supporting non-profit organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
293	recycle within production	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
294	offer trade-ins for old models and recycle parts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

295	create more jobs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
296	have good healthcare services for their employees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
297	Companies should make every effort to reduce the pollution from their factories	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
298	Companies should use recycled materials in manufacturing new products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
299	Companies should have factory programs to conserve water and energy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
300	Companies should regularly make donations to charity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
301	Companies should have programs to recognize employees for their volunteer work in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
302	Companies should donate some of their products to people in need	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	I believe that....							
303	Socially responsible behavior detracts from companies' ability to provide the best possible products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
304	Socially responsible behavior is a drain on a company's resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
305	Socially responsible behavior by firms is often a cover-up for inferior product offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
306	Socially responsible firms produce worse products than do firms that do not worry about social responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
307	All else equal, a socially responsible firm is likely to have lower technological expertise than a firm that is not socially responsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

308	Firms that devote resources towards socially responsible actions have fewer resources available for increasing employee effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
309	A company can be both socially responsible and manufacture products of high value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
310	Firms engage in socially responsible behaviors to compensate for inferior product offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
311	Resources devoted to social responsibility come at the expense of improved product offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	I believe that brands must:	Totally Disagree						Totally Agree
312	Maximize profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
313	Control their production costs strictly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
314	Plan for their long term success	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
315	Always improve economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
316	Ensure that their employees act within the standards defined by the law	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
317	Refrain from putting aside their contractual obligations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
318	Refrain from bending the law even if this helps improve performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
319	Always submit to the principles defined by the regulatory system	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
320	Permit ethical concerns to negatively affect economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
321	Ensure that the respect of ethical principles has priority over economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
322	Be committed to well-defined ethics principles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
323	Avoid compromising ethical standards in order to achieve corporate goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
324	Help solve social problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
325	Participate in the management of public affairs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
326	Allocate some of their	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	resources to philanthropic activities							
327	Play a role in our society that goes beyond the mere generation of profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
328	be committed to using a portion of its profits to help non-profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
329	give back to the communities in which it does business	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
330	Ensure that local non-profits benefit from it's contributions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
331	integrate charitable contributions into its business activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
332	be involved in corporate giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	I believe that brands must...							
333	try to obtain maximum profit from their activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
334	try to obtain maximum long-term success	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
335	always try to improve their economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
336	always respect the norms defined in the law when carrying out their activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
337	be concerned to fulfill their obligations vis-à-vis their shareholders, suppliers, distributors and other agents with whom they deal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
338	Behave ethically/honestly with their customers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
339	Respect ethical principles in their relationships over achieving superior economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
340	be concerned with respecting and protecting the natural environment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
341	Actively sponsor or finance social events (sports, music...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
342	Direct part of their budget to donations and social works favoring the disadvantaged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
343	be concerned with improving the general well-being of society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
344	Respect gay and lesbian rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
345	Respect women's rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
346	Respect ethnic minorities' rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
347	Respect disabled individuals' rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix C

We are interested in understanding how consumers perceive social responsibility of brands. Please read the definition of brand social responsibility below.

BRAND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IS THE EXTENT TO WHICH A BRAND AND SUSTAINED VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE BRAND IMPROVE THE WELFARE OF SOCIETY.

Please indicate the extent to which you think the following items are representative of brand social responsibility using the following 7 point scale:

	Not Representative of Brand Social Responsibility		Somewhat Representative of Brand Social Responsibility				Very Representative of Brand Social Responsibility	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	ethical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	careful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	responsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	respectful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	humane	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	compassionate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	thoughtful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	charitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	caring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	pro-active	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15	generous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	unselfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	selfless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	concerned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	people oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	affordable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22	reasonably priced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	cost-efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25	worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	useful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	beneficial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	appreciated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	wanted	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	needed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31	appealing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	keeps its promises	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	loyal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34	trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35	honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36	sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37	honorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38	humble	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39	modest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

40	good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41	excellent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42	great	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43	nice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44	conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45	aware	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46	knowledgeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47	culture-conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48	relevant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49	smart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50	open-minded	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51	updated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52	revolutionary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53	innovative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54	resourceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
55	highly equipped	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56	efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
57	competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
58	safe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
59	healthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60	sustainable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
61	biodegradable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62	environmentally friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63	green	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64	environmentally conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

65	energy efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66	clean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
67	cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
68	charismatic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69	likeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
70	approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
71	enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
72	durable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
73	long-lasting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
74	universal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
75	famous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
76	popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
77	happy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
78	optimistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
79	positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
80	cheerful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
81	good image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
82	visible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
83	willing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
84	pure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
85	sensible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
86	acceptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
87	easy to use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
88	satisfying	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
89	informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

90	provide donations for hospitals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
91	make donations to the poor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
92	sponsor voluntary services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
93	donate to natural disaster sites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
94	help the homeless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
95	donate money for cancer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
96	donate to schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
97	raise awareness for a specific cause by supporting non-profit organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
98	regularly make donations to charity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
99	donate some of their products to people in need	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
100	allocate some of their resources to philanthropic activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
101	be committed to using a portion of its profits to help non-profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
102	ensure that local non-profits benefit from it's contributions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
103	integrate charitable contributions into its business activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
104	be involved in corporate giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
105	direct part of their budget to donations and social works favouring the disadvantaged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
106	organize fundraising walk-a-thons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
107	volunteer their time at a food bank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
108	raise money for activities involving children wearing/using their brand	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
109	establish social organizations that benefit needy people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

110	conduct charity events to help raise money for diseased people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
111	build houses for the poor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
112	build parks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
113	involve employees in every voluntary activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
114	participate in youth activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
115	have programs to recognize employees for their volunteer work in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
116	actively sponsor or finance social events (sports, music...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
117	create after school programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
118	be actively involved in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
119	be more sensitive and try to solve problems in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
120	promote social cohesion (family events, donations, social initiatives)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
121	participate in the management of public affairs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
122	give back to the communities in which it does business	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
123	deliver the advantages and features that it promotes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
124	be honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
125	price its products fairly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
126	discount products for students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
127	lower their prices	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
128	maximize profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
129	control their production costs strictly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
130	plan for the brand's long term success	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
131	always improve economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

132	always try to improve their economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
133	be concerned to fulfill their obligations vis-à-vis their shareholders, suppliers, distributors and other agents with whom they deal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
134	ensure that the respect of ethical principles has priority over economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
135	be committed to well-defined ethics principles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
136	avoid compromising ethical standards in order to achieve corporate goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
137	behave ethically/honestly with their customers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
138	respect ethical principles in their relationships over achieving superior economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
139	provide necessary instructions for use and/or warnings on the label	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
140	produce healthy products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
141	promote health, fitness and exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
142	make sure the brands' products don't harm the consumers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
143	consider the advantages and disadvantages the product poses to families	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
144	pay their workers a fair wage (minimum wage)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
145	be sweatshop free	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
146	not employ children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
147	pay employees more than minimum wage	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
148	be responsible toward employees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
149	hire youth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
150	create more jobs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
151	have good healthcare services for their employees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
152	respect gay and lesbian rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
153	respect women's rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

154	respect ethnic minorities' rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
155	respect disabled individuals' rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
156	ensure that their employees act within the standards defined by the law	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
157	refrain from putting aside their contractual obligations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
158	always submit to the principles defined by the regulatory system	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
159	always respect the norms defined in the law when carrying out their activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
160	refrain from bending the law even if this helps improve performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
161	use environmentally friendly products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
162	use recycled products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
163	not produce a lot of pollution during production	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
164	use clean and efficient energy sources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
165	engage in activities that promote environmental consciousness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
166	not waste paper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
167	not overuse resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
168	adhere to the Kyoto protocol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
169	affect global change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
170	not use plastic bags	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
171	offer trade-ins for old models and recycle parts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
172	make every effort to reduce the pollution from their factories	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
173	use recycled materials in manufacturing new products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
174	have factory programs to conserve water and energy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

175	be concerned with respecting and protecting the natural environment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
176	produce products that are worth their value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
177	be both socially responsible and manufacture products of high value	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
178	satisfy customer wants and needs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
179	engage in activities that consumers can relate to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
180	associate itself with major charity foundations that are positive within their target market	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
181	be responsible towards its consumers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
182	promote their brand with good messages to society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
183	advertise a cause in their commercials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
184	raise awareness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
185	give/send out a positive image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
186	provide a feeling of belonging and being needed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
187	play a role in our society that goes beyond the mere generation of profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
188	be concerned with improving the general well-being of society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
189	run contests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
190	avoid any immoral connections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix D

Part 1. In this part of the questionnaire, we would like you to indicate how descriptive the following adjectives are of the brand:

AVEDA

	Not at all descriptive						Very descriptive
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ethical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
responsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
respectful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
humane	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
compassionate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
thoughtful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
charitable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
caring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
pro-active	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
generous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
unselfish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
selfless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
concerned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
useful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
beneficial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
keeps its promises	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
loyal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
honorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
aware	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
knowledgeable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
culture-conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
open-minded	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
updated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
revolutionary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
innovative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
resourceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
safe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

healthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sustainable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
biodegradable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
environmentally friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
green	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
environmentally conscious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
energy efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
clean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
durable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
long-lasting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
good image	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
willing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sensible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part 2. In this section, please indicate your agreement with the following statements about:

AVEDA

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
This brand provides donations for hospitals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand makes donations to the poor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand sponsors voluntary services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand donates to natural disaster sites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand helps the homeless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand donates money for cancer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand donates to schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand raises awareness for a specific cause by supporting non-profit organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand regularly makes donations to charity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand donates some of their products to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand allocates some of their resources to philanthropic activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is committed to using a portion of its profits to help non-profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand ensures that local non-profits benefit from its contributions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand integrates charitable contributions into its business activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is involved in corporate giving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand directs part of their budget to donations and social works favouring the	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand organizes fundraising walk-a-thons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand volunteers their time at a food bank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand establishes social organizations that benefit needy people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

This brand has programs to recognize employees for their volunteer work in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is actively involved in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is more sensitive and tries to solve problems in the community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand gives back to the communities in which it does business	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand plans for the brand's long term success	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is concerned to fulfill their obligations vis-à-vis their shareholders, suppliers, distributors and other agents with whom they deal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand ensures that the respect of ethical principles has priority over economic performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is committed to well-defined ethics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand avoids compromising ethical standards in order to achieve corporate goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand behaves ethically/honestly with their	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand respects ethical principles in their relationships over achieving superior economic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand respects ethical principles in their relationships over achieving superior economic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand provides necessary instructions for use and/or warnings on the label	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand produces healthy products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand makes sure the brands' products don't harm the consumers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand considers the advantages and disadvantages the product poses to families	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is sweatshop free	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand does not employ children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand pays employees more than minimum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is responsible toward employees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand creates more jobs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand has good healthcare services for their	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand respects gay and lesbian rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand respects women's rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand respects ethnic minorities' rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand respects disabled individuals' rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand ensures that their employees act within the standards defined by the law	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand refrains from putting aside their contractual obligations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand always submits to the principles defined by the regulatory system	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

This brand always respect the norms defined in the law when carrying out their activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand refrains from bending the law even if this helps improve performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand uses environmentally friendly products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand uses recycled products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand does not produce a lot of pollution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand uses clean and efficient energy sources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand engages in activities that promote environmental consciousness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand does not waste paper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand does not overuse resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand does not use plastic bags	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand offers trade-ins for old models and	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand makes every effort to reduce the pollution from their factories	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand uses recycled materials in	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand has factory programs to conserve	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is concerned with respecting and protecting the natural environment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand satisfies customer wants and needs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand associates itself with major charity foundations that are positive within their target	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is responsible towards its consumers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand promotes their brand with good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand provides a feeling of belonging and	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand plays a role in our society that goes beyond the mere generation of profits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand is concerned with improving the general well-being of society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This brand avoids any immoral connections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
Aveda offers high quality products	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Aveda is expensive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am familiar with Aveda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part 10

*Please indicate how frequently you purchase Kashi products.

	Never (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very frequently (7)
I purchase Kashi products...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Part 11

*If you were in the market for this product category, how likely would you be to purchase Kashi products?

	Very unlikely (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	Very likely (9)
I would be...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Classification Questions

In this section you will be asked a few questions for classification purposes.

*Please indicate your gender

Female

Male

*Please indicate your age

Only numbers may be entered in this field

***Please indicate your ethnicity**
Check at most 1 answers

- African American
- Asian American
- Hispanic
- Pacific Islander
- Caucasian
- Native American
- Other:

Classification Questions

***Please indicate your current income level**
Check at most 1 answers

- \$10,000 or less
- \$10,001 - 20,000
- \$20,001 - 30,000
- \$30,001 - 40,000
- \$40,001 - 50,000
- \$50,001 - 60,000
- \$60,001 - 70,000
- \$70,001 - 80,000
- More than 80,000