HAL
open science

# Establishing brand essence across borders

Géraldine Michel, Tim Ambler

## To cite this version:

Géraldine Michel, Tim Ambler. Establishing brand essence across borders. Journal of Brand Management, 1999, 6 (5), pp.333-345. hal-02051150

**HAL Id: hal-02051150**

**https://hal.science/hal-02051150v1**

Submitted on 27 Feb 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Journal of Brand Management[1]

# Establishing brand essence across borders

Géraldine Michel and Tim Ambler

**Abstract**

*This paper uses research on social representation to study brand essence across borders. It is based on a cosmetic brand survey in France, Germany and Italy. The findings indicate that consumer brand familiarity and consumer nationality influence the centrality of associations with familiarity being the more important.*

*Géraldine Michel is Professor at IAE of Paris of Sorbonne University and Tim Ambler is Senior Fellow at London Business School.* *The authors would like to thank FNEGE (Fondation Nationale pour l'Enseignement de la Gestion des Entreprises) for its financial support and also DIMENSIONS for providing data.*

[1] *1999*, 6, 5, 333-345.

# Introduction

The brand concept has evolved extensively. A brand was once applied to only one product but today the same brand could be present in several product categories. For instance, the brand Bic appears on pens, lighters and razors. Vittel is a mineral water brand and also a cosmetic brand in the French market. The 1980s were also characterised by rapid internationalisation of business. Brands are now available in many countries but sometimes with different products. For example, Nesquick brands ice cream, yogurts and chocolate in Spain and in France.

Some research have focused on standardisation versus adaptation (Douglas and Craig 1992). Empirical studies of global branding (Rosen et al. 1989) typically confirm that the number of global and Euro-brands is limited. Companies with established national brands have difficulties in moving towards greater harmonisation on an European scale (Friberg, 1989). This paper proposes a new framework to identify the internal consumers' conceptual structure of the brand, i.e. brand essence.

We develop hypotheses using theory from social representation and brand maturity literature. Brand essence is conceptualised as being an invariant, within a single society, core : "the central nucleus". Our three hypotheses conjecture that consumer brand familiarity influences brand associations and that brand essence changes across national, i.e. social, boundaries. To test these hypotheses, we use a cosmetic brand survey in France, Germany and Italy. Although our study is limited to one cosmetic brand, it illustrates a new approach for the analysis of brand essence across borders. We conclude with discussion of our findings and suggestions for further research.

## Development of hypotheses

*Brand associations*

A brand can be defined as "a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or combination of them which is intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors" (Kotler 1991; p442). It may also be "A product is something that is made, in a factory; a brand is something that is bought, by a customer" (King 1973). Brand knowledge is what comes to mind when a consumer thinks about a brand, such as in response to marketing activity (Alba, Hutchinson & Lynch 1991). Consistently with an associative network model (Anderson 1983, Wyer and Srull 1989), brand knowledge is conceptualised as an area of memory to which associations are linked.

Unique associations differentiate the brand (Keller 1993). The strength of brand associations represents the intensity (Aaker 1991). The congruence of brand association is defined by Keller (1993) as the extent to which any brand association shares meaning with other brand associations. The congruence among brand associations determines the "cohesiveness" of brand image and security for the brand.

Finally, associations differ as to how favourably they are evaluated. The success of a marketing programme is reflected in the creation of favourable brand associations. Krishnan (1996) distinguishes negative and positive associations and the characteristics of brand associations (number of associations, favorability, uniqueness, origin of associations) used to indicate a brand's strength.

*Brand essence*

"Brand essence" is a term for the core value or set of values that standing brand stands for ; this is its DNA (Kelly 1998). The product, the packaging, price positioning, advertising and public relation all reinforce the brand's standing for in the mind of the consumer. These defining values change little over the years, but are interpreted for each new generation.

Recent Volvo communication offers an example - the dull but worthy image of ultra-safe cars for ultra-conservative drivers has been transformed in the 1990s. They are still talking about safety, which is arguably the brand's essence, but have found a way of making this essence much more motivating for today's consumer - by suggesting that safety can be exciting too! (Kelly 1998).

Core brand associations characterise all the products in the brand line and are the strongest (Keller 1998). For example, Nike has expanded from running shoes to other athletic shoes, athleting clothing and athleting equipment, strengthening its associations to "peak performance" and "sports in the process". Managerial awareness of brand essence is essential for the brand extension strategy.

Table 1 compares models of " brand essence " developed by different authors. While the " central nucleus " concept developed in this article is similar to the " brand kernel " (Kapferer, 1994) or brand essence, it is distinguished by the methodology used in order to identify it.

Table 1. Brand essence concepts

| Authors | Notion | Definition | Characteristics | Methodology |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Davidson (1987) | Brand core | Brands have an inner core and an outer core of qualities. | The inner core is made up of intrinsic qualities, which, if tampered with, would change or damage the integrity of the brand. The outer core consists of optional qualities, which have elasticity and can be used to stretch the associations of the brand name. | Not specified |
| Kapferer (1994) | Brand kernel | is its genetic program. | - The external style may change, adapted to modern times, but the kernel must be respected.<br>- Only by looking at brand kernels can one see the difference between lookalike brands. | - Paper and pencyl consumer interviews.<br>- Semioticians |

| Authors | Notion | Definition | Characteristics | Methodology |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Upshaw (1995) | Brand essence | is the core of its identity. | The core value(s) defines the brand and permeates all other aspect of the brand. | - Brand essence can be captured by an “ -ness ” word.<br>- It lies in the perception of marketers |
| Macrae (1996) | Brand essence | is the communication connections which give it an evolutionary right to a unique leadership domain, that is the adding value objective. | Essence can involve everything at the core of a brand which makes the brand unique and represents its future source of power. | - Brand essence is intersection between image, source, function, and differenciation of the brand.<br>- Differences between essence of retailing, manufacturing, service compagny. |
| Michel and Ambler | Central nucleus | is made up of socially shared cultural elements. | - The peripheral system constitutes the interfacing between the central nucleus and the concrete situation of the brand.<br>- The central nucleus is more stable than the peripheral system.<br>- The central nucleus evolves only if the peripheral associations are modified. | The associations are considered to be central when they are discerned by a majority of people (social dimension) as indissociable from the brand (meaning dimension). |

*Social representation*

A "social representation" is a flexible "network of interacting concepts and images whose contents evolve continuously over time and space" (Moscovici 1988). Precisely, social representation is a coherent structure of cultural elements resulting from the interactive, reciprocal, and recursive operation of social influence processes at the individual level (Huguet and Latane 1996). In social psychology, the notion of representation presents some differences with the individual processes mental, studied by cognitive theory. Social representations are not just cognitive (Farr 1988) and are social in at least three senses : They are social in origin, they represent some aspects of the social world, and they are socially shared (Jaspars and Fraser 1984). Only the last is relevant for our study : brand essence is made up of socially shared cultural elements. All social representation is organised around a

central nucleus (Abric, 1994). Thus, we consider the brand as a social representation structured as a central nucleus and a peripheral system.

- *The central nucleus* groups the associations which are seen as indissociable from the brand by the majority of people. The associations are considered to be central when they are discerned by a majority of consumers (social dimension) as indissociable from the brand (meaning dimension).
- *The peripheral system* is organised around of the central nucleus (Abric, 1994) and constitutes the interfacing between the central nucleus and the concrete situation of the brand. The peripheral system is like the defence system of the brand. When the central nucleus of the brand is threatened, the peripheral system introduces some new interpretations and integrates new associations. Most authors who have studied the dynamic of some representations consider that the central associations evolve only if the peripheral associations are modified (Flament 1994 ; Guimelli & Jacobi 1990).

This paper treats brand essence and the central nucleus of associations as the same.

*The influence of brand familiarity on the centrality of brand associations*

Alba and Hutchinson (1987) suggest that consumer knowledge has two components : familiarity and expertise. Familiarity is formed by product-related experiences and expertise is the ability to perform product-related tasks successfully. In general, product experience is a necessary but insufficient condition for consumer expertise.

Thus, product familiarity and consumer knowledge are linked (Johnson and Russo 1984, Hutchinson and Zenor 1986). Marks and Olson (1981) argue that increased familiarity leads to better developed knowledge structures or “ schema ” about a product. Basic on this logic, Roux and Boush (1996) suggest that the association strength and the brand image is stronger for the familiar than for the non-familiar person with the brand. Thus we suppose that,

H1- The consumer brand familiarity increases the number of associations in brand essence

*The influence of cultural context on brand essence*

Foreign consumers associate attributes to the brand in their context (Friedmann 1986; Roth 1992). These context variables can be broken into situational characteristics (level of familiarity with the stimulus, number of available choices, the presence of competing brands), and cultural variables (national character). For instance the colours and texture of brand packaging may evoke different psychological meanings in different cultures (Sherry and Camargo 1987). Therefore, these visual elements of a global brand may involve different meanings across borders. Psychological meaning of a brand with foreign wording can differ from original intention (Schlomer and al. 1994, Douglas and Dubois 1977).

One of the most salient cognitive associations is perceived country of origin. (Shalofsky 1987, Samiee 1994). Therefore, for a brand which is marketed globally, the different cultural contexts will understandably vary the brand association attached to the brand (Roth 1992). Thus we suppose that,

H2- The consumers' nationality moderates brand associations which are central.

*Comparison between the influence of consumer brand familiarity and the consumer nationality*

Esghi and Sheth (1985) studied lifestyle variables across four countries (France, Brazil, Japan and the United States) and showed that lifestyle (within countries) accounted for more variance in the consumption behaviour than the national influence (across countries). The inclusion of national identity as an independent variable in the analysis did not eliminate the effect of lifestyle. On the other hand, according to European studies on lifestyle from the CCA or social cultural trends from the Cofremca, there are less differences between top executives in Italy and in Germany than between executives and employees within Germany (p.346, Kapferer 1997). Thus, we postulate that,

H3- The influence of consumer brand familiarity on the centrality of brand associations is more important than consumer nationality.

## Research methodology

*Data collection procedure*

DIMENSIONS collected attitude and behaviour variables about cosmetic products and particularly about a cosmetic brand in 1998 in France, German and Italy ("brand X" for the confidentiality reasons).

Four focus groups in France generated 52 associations. Analysis eliminated 10 associations as redundant (duplicative). The remaining 39 associations were included in a questionnaire administered at respondent's homes. Completion was about 1.5 time hours. The survey instrument was administered in the respondent's language. For Italy and Germany, the questionnaire was translated and independently back-translated to identify translation errors (Hui and Triandis 1985). Finally, pretests with subjects from the three countries showed that no questions caused comprehension problems.

*Sample characteristics*

The sample comprised 2105 female users of cosmetic products (in the last 12 months), both users and non-users of the brand X. Table 2 shows the relative sample sizes according to country and consumer experience with the brand.

**Table 2. Samples size**

| | **Users of the brand X** | **Non users of the brand X** |
|---|---|---|
| France | 357 | 344 |
| Germany | 350 | 350 |
| Italy | 354 | 350 |

Table 3 shows sample characteristics for age, social group and skin type. According to Green and White (1976), reaching perfect comparability of sample across countries is almost impossible.

**Table 3. Sample characteristics**

| | France | Germany | Italy | Users | Non-users |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | | | | |
| % Less of 35years | 35.3 | 25.4 | 41.5 | 34.1 | 34.0 |
| % 36-45 years | 32.6 | 24.9 | 28.5 | 28.6 | 28.7 |
| % 46-55 years | 22.6 | 24.9 | 22.7 | 23.3 | 23.5 |
| % More of 55 years | 9.5 | 24.8 | 7.3 | 14.0 | 13.8 |
| | | $X^2$=128,00** | | $X^2$=0,02 | |
| **SPC** | | | | | |
| % farmer, artisan | 5.5 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.9 |
| % senior executive | 21.5 | 15.2 | 8.2 | 16.4 | 13.5 |
| % employee | 74.0 | 81.8 | 87.5 | 79.5 | 82.6 |
| | | $X^2$=51,74** | | $X^2$=3,50 | |
| **Nature of face skin** (mean) | 4,30 | 4,17 | 4,47 | 4,45 | 4,18 |
| | | F= 16,03** | | F=14,95** | |
| **Nature of body skin** (mean) | 3,85 | 3,79 | 3,78 | 3,89 | 3,72 |
| | | F= 0,63 | | F= 11,57** | |
| **Sensitivity of face skin** (mean) | 2,01 | 2,30 | 2,00 | 2,05 | 2,16 |
| | | F=28,23** | | F= 9,75** | |
| **Sensitivity of body skin** (mean) | 2,55 | 2,74 | 2,49 | 2,55 | 2,64 |
| | | F= 15,89** | | F= 6,40** | |

** $p<0.001$

Nature of skin is measured on 7-point scale ranging from very fat (1) to very dry (7).

Sensitivity of the skin is measured on 4-point scale ranging from not sensitive (1) to very sensitive (4).

In fact, table 3 shows that users and non-users of the brand X are similar in age and social groups, but the users and the non-users have significantly different skin characteristics. These results suggest that the nature of the skin differentiates the users and the non-users of the brand X.

*Measures*

To measure associations, respondents evaluated their connection strength to the brand X on a 7-point Likert-type scale anchored by weakly associated (1) to highly associated (7).

The principle of "confutation" advanced by Moliner (1988) supposes that challenging a central association modifies the representation meaning (meaning dimension), and therefore a majority of people rejects the representation (social dimension). On the other hand, challenging a peripheral association provokes weak impact on the representation meaning. For example, consider whether the "innovative" association of the brand X is central. The response on a 7-point scale ranges from certainly not (1) to certainly yes (7) to the following question: “ if the product it is not innovative, it could be a product of the brand X ? ”. If a majority answers 1 or 2, the association "innovative" is a central association. Conversely, if a majority does not answer 1 or 2, the association "innovative" is a peripheral association of the brand X (chi-square test).

## Results and discussion

*Identification of the global brand essence*

To ensure consumer relevancy, only the associations with mean strength not less than five, on the seven-point scale, were considered to be linked to the brand. This criterion was chosen as a convenient break point from the distribution of responses (median, asymmetry). Central were distinguished from peripheral brand associations using a chi-square test with $p < .01$. With this sample size, this test implied that 62% of consumers needed to give negative answers “ 1-2 ” on the seven point scale. To test statistic variation, we shared each sample randomly and compared the resulting pairs. The results showed that the identification of central and peripheral brand associations is systematic and not random (table 4).

Table 4

Table 5 summarises the central associations of the brand X across countries and consumer brand familiarity.

**Table 5.The essence of brand X across borders and according to the consumer brand familiarity**

| | Users | Non-Users |
|---|---|---|
| **France** | Serious<br>Care<br>Pharmacy<br>Freshness<br>Thermal<br>Skin health<br>Convenient<br>Daily | Pharmacy |
| **Germany** | Serious<br>Care<br>Pharmacy<br>Freshness<br>Skin health<br>Convenient<br>Daily | Pharmacy |
| **Italy** | Serious<br>Pharmacy<br>Convenient<br>Adapted to all kinds of skin<br>Daily | Pharmacy |

The results show that the brand essence differs according to brand familiarity and country. These results suggest that the meaning of brand X is closer between French and German users (7 common central associations) than between those countries and Italian users.

On the other hand, the essence of brand X is identical for non-users across borders, it corresponds just to the association *pharmacy*. The number of associations assigned to the brand is considerably higher for users than non-users.

A global brand essence is one which perceived to reflect the same set of values around the world. Independent country and consumer brand familiarity, the global essence of brand X is *pharmacy*. For users, independent of country, the brand essence is *pharmacy*, *serious*, *convenient* and *daily*. Centrality of brand associations are shown by the consumer experience and country, using ANOVA analysis (Tables 6).

**Table 6. ANOVA of centrality of brand associations by the consumer brand familiarity**

| | Mean of association centrality | Mean of association centrality | F value |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Users | Non-users | |
| Serious | 1.62 | 2.18 | 176.44** |
| Care | 1.75 | 2.25 | 109.54** |
| Pharmacy | 1.25 | 1.53 | 55.59** |
| Freshness | 1.69 | 2.31 | 183.24** |
| Thermal | 2.12 | 2.96 | 176.16** |
| Skin health | 1.82 | 2.42 | 167.36** |
| Softness | 1.82 | 2.44 | 201.65** |
| Convenient | 1.71 | 2.32 | 189.31** |
| Adapted to all kinds of skin | 1.72 | 2.74 | 334.80** |
| Daily | 1.47 | 2.12 | 205.18** |

** p<.001. Centrality of association is measured by the question: " If the product is not [association] could it be a product of the brand X ? The answer is based on the 7-point scale anchored by certainely not (1) to yes certainely (7). The answers 1 and 7 correspond respectively: high centrality and weak centrality.

Supporting the first hypothesis, for brand associations independently of country, the centrality means of brand associations are significantly higher for users than for non-users (p< .001). Table 5 shows that the number of associations is greater.

In Germany the influence of consumer brand familiarity on the associations centrality is higher than in France and Italy. In contrast, in Italy the influence of consumer brand familiarity on the associations centrality is weaker than in France and Germany. Therefore, consumer nationality seems to moderate the influence of consumer brand familiarity on brand essence, supporting the second hypothesis.

**Table 7. ANOVA of centrality of brand associations by the consumer nationality**

| | Mean of association centrality | Mean of association centrality | Mean of association centrality | F value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | France (1) | Germany (2) | Italy (3) | |
| Serious | 1.86 | 1.93 | 1.92 | 1.00 NS |
| Care | 1.94 [23] | 1.79 [13] | 2.25 [12] | 32.21** |
| Pharmacy | 1.47 | 1.32 | 1.39 | 1.74 NS |
| Freshness | 1.84 [23] | 2.02 [1] | 2.14 [1] | 13.54** |
| Thermal | 1.85 [23] | 2.78 [13] | 2.99 [12] | 126.17** |
| Skin Health | 1.99 [23] | 2.13 [1] | 2.23 [1] | 8.95** |
| Softness | 1.94 [23] | 2.10 [13] | 2.34 [12] | 23.30** |
| Convenient | 2.00 | 2.09 [3] | 1.94 [2] | 3.68* |
| Adapted to all kinds of skin | 2.24 [3] | 2.40 [3] | 2.05 [12] | 11.79** |
| Daily | 1.73 [2] | 1.88 [1] | 1.78 | 3.66* |

* p<.05 ; ** p<.001. The superscripted numbers 1, 2 and 3 represent France, Germany and Italy respectively. For any association, the superscripts indicate the country from which this mean differs based on a Scheffe test at the 0.5 level. For example, for France, the mean of the association " care " is significantly different from the " care " mean of Germany and Italy.

The analysis of F values, presented in tables 6 and 7, shows that the influence of consumer experience on centrality of each association is higher than the influence of consumer nationality, supporting the third hypothesis. However, this relation is not verified for the association "thermal" which is more influenced by the consumer nationality than by the consumer experience with the brand. This result is explained by brand X being French and its association for French people with thermal waters.

## Managerial Implications

Marketing managers seek to harmonise brand image and essence across international markets. (Ambler and Styles 1998). This study provides some indications to consider how brand associations may vary in their centrality across borders and their role in building brand equity.

We have demonstrated that the essence of a cosmetic brand is influenced by consumer brand familiarity and consumer nationality. These results suggest that targeting similar segments across countries may be preferable to developing country-by-country programs.

The influence of consumer brand familiarity is highest in Germany and is weakest in Italy. It suggests that, acting on the familiarity components (purchase, advertising exposure, sale promotion...), in order to modify the centrality of brand associations of the non-users of the brand, and influencing their attitude towards the cosmetic brand could be more difficult in Germany than in Italy.

Finally, our findings reveal that the essence of the cosmetic brand is almost very similar between the French and German users (7 common central brand associations) compared to the Italian users. Thus, although this result is limited to only one brand, more adaptation may be required for cosmetic products in Italy.

This analysis of associations centrality across borders provide some indications for consistency of brand image across borders, which is a success key for the global brand (Keller

1998). This may be particularly important in the cosmetic and fashion markets where international women magazines transmit images across national boundaries.

## Limitations and future Research

These results are limited in several ways which are also areas for further research :

- In this research, the frontier between the core and the peripheral associations of the brand is arbitrary. Research is needed to establish both whether and how the central nucleus can be separately identified.
- It would be useful to evaluate whether centrality is related with the brand's strength or equity and the extent to wich it differentiates the brand.
- Users have significantly different skin characteristics from non-users. The consumer brand familiarity effect may be confounded by the consumer skin types.
- Work is needed to explore the generalisability of these results to other product categories, brands and countries.

## Conclusions

We have proposed a new framework to analyse how brand essence varies across borders and consumer brand familiarity. Although the brand's essence was not stable across borders, the study reveals there are some common central associations between the three countries and between the users and non-users to the brand.

This paper confirmed that the consumer brand familiarity and nationality influence the centrality of brand associations. More particularly according to the proposition of Alba and Hutchinson (1987), users assign more associations to the brand than non-users. The results indicate also that the influence of consumer brand familiarity on the brand essence is higher than effect of consumer nationality.

## References


Aaker D.A (1991), *Management brand equity*, Editions The Free Press.

Abric J.C. (1994), Les représentations sociales : aspects théoriques, in Abric, *Pratiques sociales représentations*, Puf, pp.11-35.

Alba J.W. and J.W. Hutchinson (1987), Dimensions of consumer Expertise, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (March), pp.411-454.

Alba J.W., J.W. Hutchinson and J.G. Lynch (1991), Memory and Decision Making, in *Handbook of Consumer Theory and Research*, H. Kassarjian and T.S. Robertson, eds. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., pp.1-49.

Ambler T. and C. Styles (1998), *Passion and Profit: the new global marketing*, (Draft).

Anderson J.R (1983), *The architecture of cognition*, Cambridge Mass, Harvard University Press.

Davidson H. (1987), *Offensive Marketing*, 2th edition, Aldershot.

Douglas S. and D. Dubois (1977), Looking at the cultural Environment for International Marketing Opportunities, Columbia Journal Of World Business, (Winter), pp.39-50.

Douglas S.P. and C.S. Craig (1992), Advances in international marketing, *International Journal in Marketing*, 9 (December), pp.291-318.

Eshghi A. And J.N. Sheth (1985), The globalization of consumption patterns: An empirical investigation, in Erdener Kaynak (ed.), *Global Perspectives in Marketing*, Praeger: New York, pp.133-148.

Farr R.M. (1988), Les représentations sociales, in Moscovici S., *Psychologie Sociale*, Puf, pp.379-389.

Flament C. (1994), Structure, dynamique et transformation des représentations sociales in Abric J-C *Pratiques sociales, représentations*, Puf, pp.37-57.

Friberg E. (1989), Moves European are Making, *Harvard Business Review*, (May, June), pp. 85-89.

Friedmann R. (1986), The Psychological Meaning of Products: A simplification of the Standardization vs. Adaptation Debate, *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 21 (Summer), pp.97-104.

Green R.T. and P.D White (1976), Methodological considerations in cross-national consumer research, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Fall-Winter, pp.81-87.

Guimelli C. and Jacobi D. (1990), Pratiques nouvelles et transformation des représentations sociales, *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, 3, 3, pp.309-334.

Hui C.H and H.C. Triandis (1985), Measurement in cross-cultural psychology : A review and comparison of strategies, *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, vol2, ed. H.C. Triandis and J.W.Berry, Boston: Allyn & Bacon, pp.127-180.

Hutchinson J.W. and M. Zenor (1986), Product familiarity and the strengths of brand-attribute associations: a signal detection theory approach, *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 13, pp.450-453.

Hugget P. and Latane B. (1996), Social representations as dynamic social impact, *Journal of Communication*, 46, 4, pp.57-63.

Jaspars J. and Fraser C. (1984), Attitudes and social representations, in Farr R. & Moscovici S. (Eds.), *Social Representations*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, pp.102-123.

Johnson E.J. and J.E Russo (1984), Product familiarity and learning New Information, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 (June), pp.542-550.

Kapferer J.N. (1994), *Strategic Brand Management*, The Free Press.

Kapferer J.N (1997), *Strategic Brand Management*, 2th edition, Kogan Page, U.K.

Keller K.L. (1998), *Strategic Brand Management*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Keller K.L. (1993), Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-based brand equity, *Journal of Marketing*, 57, January, pp.1-22.

Kelly T. (1998), Brand essence - Making our brands last longer, *The Journal of Brand Management*, volume 5, 6, July, pp.390-391.

King S. (1973), *Developing New Brands*, London: Pitman.

Kotler P.H. (1991), *Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning and Control*, 8th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Krishnan H.S (1996), Characteristics of memory associations: a consumer-based brand equity perspective, *International Journal of Marketing*, 13, pp.389-405.

Macrae C. (1996), *The brand chartering handbook*, Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Marks L.J. and Olson J.C (1981), Towards a cognitive structure conceptualization of product familiarity, in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 8, ed. Kent B. Monroe, Ann Arbor, MI : Association for Consumer Research, pp.145-150.

Moliner P. (1988), Validation expérimentale de l'hypothèse du noyau central des représentations sociales, *Bulletin de Psychologie*, Tome XLI, 387, pp.759-762.

Moscovici S. (1988), Notes towards a description of social representations, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, pp.211-250.

Rosen B., J. Boddewyn and E. Louis (1989), US brands abroad: An empirical study of global branding, *International Marketing Review*, 6 (1), pp.7-19.

Roth M.S. (1992), Depth versus Breadth Synergies for global Brand Image Management, *Journal of Advertising*, XXI (2), pp.25-36.

Roux E. and Boush D.M. (1996), The role of familiarity and expertise in luxury brand extension evaluation, *Working Paper Essec*, Cergy-Pontoise.

Scholmer E.M., J.M. McCullough and B. Sakkarrapope (1994), Determinants of global brand image, *American Marketing Association Educator's Conferences*, Enhaucing knowledge development in marketing, vol. 5, pp.172-177.

Samiee S. (1994), Customer evaluation of products in a global market, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25, 3, pp.579-589.

Shalofsky I. (1987), Research for global Brand, *European Research*, pp.88-93

Sherry J.F. and E.G. Camargo (1987), May your Life Be Marvelous: English Land Labelling and the Semiotics of Japanese Portion, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 14 (september), pp.

Upshaw L.B. (1995), *Building brand identity*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wyer R.S. and T.K. Srull (1989), Person Memory and Judgment, *Psychological Review*, 96 (1), pp.58-83.

**Table 4. The centrality of brand associations**

| | Users | | | Non-users | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **France** | **Germany** | **Italy** | **France** | **Germany** | **Italy** |
| Pharmacy | **84.9** | **87.3** | **79.1** | **72.6** | **76.5** | **74.4** |
| Daily | **81.1** | **72.5** | **78.5** | 60.3 | 49.1 | 58.1 |
| Serious | **78.4** | **77.4** | **64.2** | 59.2 | 49.1 | 53.3 |
| Freshness | **77.9** | **77.4** | 53.2 | 58.9 | 54.1 | 46.1 |
| Thermal | **76.1** | 58.7 | 36.8 | 59.7 | / | / |
| Care | **72.0** | **78.0** | 54.9 | 57.5 | 59.7 | 47.2 |
| Skin health | **70.4** | **73.0** | 61.3 | 54.7 | 43.0 | 48.8 |
| Convenient | **62.6** | **69.2** | **73.6** | 50.2 | 43.5 | / |
| Softness | 60.5 | 58.9 | 45.6 | 54.7 | 42.4 | 46.1 |
| Simplicity | 60.2 | 50.5 | 50.5 | 39.1 | / | 38.8 |
| Pastel colours | 59.6 | 58.2 | 44.5 | 47.4 | 46.3 | 39.4 |
| Attentive to the women | 59.1 | 60.2 | 57.6 | 40.2 | / | 50.2 |
| Sincerity | 59.1 | 53.8 | 50.5 | 44.6 | / | 36.1 |
| Safety | 59.1 | 60.9 | 59.3 | 56.4 | / | 48.8 |
| Broad product line | 59.1 | 52.1 | 58.2 | 47.4 | 31.8 | 45.0 |
| Credibility | 59.1 | 60.9 | 59.3 | 50.8 | / | 52.2 |
| Effectiveness | 58.6 | 61.2 | 58.2 | 44.1 | / | 45.0 |
| Prevention | 58.0 | 61.5 | 54.3 | 37.4 | / | 46.1 |
| Evolutionary | 58.0 | 58.2 | 57.1 | 37.9 | / | 46.6 |
| Natural | 56.9 | 56.0 | 54.0 | 54.1 | / | 45.0 |
| Classic | 56.4 | 54.3 | 46.7 | 45.8 | / | 35.8 |
| Innovative | 55.9 | 60.4 | 51.6 | / | / | 43.8 |
| Hypoallergenic | 55.9 | 61.5 | 57.5 | 54.7 | / | 56.6 |
| Up-to-date | 55.3 | 57.6 | 52.1 | 31.8 | 34.0 | 42.7 |
| Pleasurable | 55.3 | 59.8 | 49.4 | 38.5 | 42.4 | 43.8 |
| Large distribution | 54.8 | 56.0 | 50.0 | 37.4 | / | 45.0 |
| Adapted to all kinds of skin | 54.3 | 60.4 | **75.2** | 43.0 | / | 53.3 |
| Dynamic | 52.1 | 53.8 | 49.4 | 30.7 | / | 40.0 |
| Recommended by the specialist | 50.5 | 45.0 | 40.6 | / | / | / |
| From mother to daughter | 50.5 | / | 46.1 | 33.5 | / | / |
| Beauty | 50.5 | 60.6 | 52.7 | 47.4 | 46.9 | 48.8 |
| Family | 47.3 | / | / | 27.9 | / | / |
| Ecological | 46.7 | 49.4 | 29.6 | / | / | / |
| Modern | 46.7 | 57.1 | 52.1 | / | 34.6 | 38.3 |
| Feminine | 32.2 | 41.7 | 41.7 | 25.1 | 30.7 | 32.2 |
| Perfume | / | 51.6 | / | / | / | 20.0 |
| Youth | / | 49.4 | 42.3 | / | / | 41.6 |
| Masculine | / | / | / | / | / | / |
| Competitively priced | / | / | / | / | / | / |
| Heavily adverticed | / | / | / | / | / | / |

*Centrality of association is measured by the question: If the product is not [association] could it be a product of the brand X ? The answer is based on the 7-point scale anchored by certainly not (1) to yes certainly (7). The answers 1 and 7 correspond respectively: high centrality and weak centrality. The column indicate the frequencies of people who answer 1 or 2 on this 7-point scale. Association is central when more than 62% of people answered 1 or 2 (Chi-square test statistically significant at 99% level). / : means that the mean of strength association is less than five, then the association is not assigned to the brand.*