



**HAL**  
open science

# Enhancing Brand Attachment Through Social Responsibility Associations: A Two-Path Moderated Model

Tarek Abid, Marie-Aude Abid-Dupont, Jean-Louis Moulins

► **To cite this version:**

Tarek Abid, Marie-Aude Abid-Dupont, Jean-Louis Moulins. Enhancing Brand Attachment Through Social Responsibility Associations: A Two-Path Moderated Model. 21st Academy of Marketing Science World Marketing Congress (AMS WMC), Academy of Marketing Science World Marketing Congress, Jun 2018, Porto, Portugal. hal-04373886

**HAL Id: hal-04373886**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04373886>**

Submitted on 5 Jan 2024

**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.

# **Enhancing Brand Attachment Through Social Responsibility Associations: A Two-Path Moderated Model**

Tarek Abid

UniLaSalle, Rouen, France, [abid.tarek@gmail.com](mailto:abid.tarek@gmail.com)

Marie-Aude Abid-Dupont

University of Toulouse Capitole, France, [marie-aude.abid-dupont@tsm-education.fr](mailto:marie-aude.abid-dupont@tsm-education.fr)

Jean-Louis Moulins

Aix Marseille Université, France, [jean-louis.moulins@univ-amu.fr](mailto:jean-louis.moulins@univ-amu.fr)

## **ABSTRACT**

Social responsibility has become cornerstone marketing policy, enabling brand differentiation in a high growth market. By distinguishing between symbolic and utilitarian associations of social responsibility, our study identifies two levers for consumer brand attachment. We posit that utilitarian associations enhance consumer brand attachment by strengthening consumer trust in a context imbued with fear and skepticism about consequences of consumption for health. We also argue that brands can encourage consumer attachment through their environmental and philanthropic engagements by conveying values with which consumers can identify. This second attachment lever is argued to be particularly effective for consumers with strong social/environmental personal norms. We empirically test our research model on a sample of regular consumers of organic food brands validating the two pathways from social responsibility to brand attachment. The moderating role of consumers' personal norms on the process was also confirmed regarding the philanthropic dimension but not the environmental one. Contributions and implications of these findings are presented in the discussion part.

**Brand Social Responsibility, Brand Attachment, Brand Trust, Brand Identification,  
Personal Norms**

# **Enhancing Brand Attachment Through Social Responsibility Associations: A Two-Path Moderated Model**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is generally considered to be an asset for the firm, extending its shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2011) and strengthening the performance of their relations with principle stakeholders and particularly with clients (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). Thus, social responsibility has become for many brands such as “Ben & Jerry”, “Ecover”, “Patagonia” or “Björk a central element of brand differentiation policy (Hildebrand, Sen & Bhattacharya, 2011). However, despite the number of studies demonstrating the influence of social responsibility associations on the consumer-brand relationship (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001; Lindgreen, Swaen & Johnston, 2009; Lacey & Kenett-Hensel, 2010), most research has only focused on social responsibility holistically without taking account of its many facets that are likely to condition consumer reactions. To study this relationship, we examine brand attachment as a central variable of an effective relational marketing policy (Thomson, 2006) for building a durable and a strong relationship between consumers and brands (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). The objective of this research is thus to study how and in which conditions these dimensions of social responsibility influence the process of brand attachment.

## **THEORITICAL BACKGROUND**

In marketing, CSR is generally approached through consumers’ perception of the firm’s activities and engagements related to its obligations towards society or towards stakeholders (Brown & Dacin, 1997). Abid & Moulins (2015) propose an approach to consumers’ perception of brands’ social responsibility by focusing on consumers’ specific brand expectations regarding three dimensions (1) the consumer dimension, or the brand’s capacity to propose safe and healthy products and provide correct information as to their ingredients; (2) the environmental dimension, or the brand’s capacity to reduce its environmental footprint and (3) the philanthropic dimension, or the brand’s participation in the societal and cultural life of its locality and/or its support of important causes such as handicap or child-protection.

The influence of perceptions of social responsibility on consumers’ attachment towards a company has received a certain amount of support (Valchos, 2012). Nevertheless, the literature explains this influence through different theoretical perspectives:

Based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), the consumer develop a relationship with the brand after a subjective analysis of the costs and benefits and in comparison with alternative solutions (Stafford, 2008). The consumer is committed to brands that he considers socially responsible for instrumental reasons in other words, for personal benefits. The “consumer” dimension of social responsibility (1) has utilitarian benefit for consumers in terms of health or quality (Abid & Moulins, 2015). In fact, by committing to reduce or eliminate potentially dangerous chemical products, a brand sends consumers a signal of its concern for their health and welfare and can be perceived by them as a credible and honest brand: two central dimensions of trust (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995). The importance of trust as a central mediator between brand activities and consumer attachment has also been widely demonstrated in the relational marketing literature (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001). We therefore postulates that:

**H1: Brand trust mediates the relationship between the consumer dimension of social responsibility and brand attachment.**

However, the influence of CSR on consumers' attachment has also been studied from the angle of social identity theory and self-categorization (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Socially responsible initiatives have symbolic value for consumers (McEnally & De Chernatony, 1999) enabling them to recognize themselves in the values conveyed by these initiatives and thus developing their social identity through their consumption. These symbolic values of social responsible initiatives refer to the brand's capacity to (2) reduce its environmental footprint and to (3) participate in the societal and cultural life of its local region of activity. These symbolic aspects humanize the brand (Fournier, 1998) and express consumer identity by attributing the brand's positive characteristics to themselves (Ahearne, Bhattacharya & Gruen, 2005). Thus, it is the brand identification which refers to the "inclusion" of the brand in one's own concept of self (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2006). Bhattacharya & Sen (2004) declare that one of important internal consumer response to CSR initiatives is the sense of attachment that reflects the consumer's connection feeling with company engaging in CSR activities. The influence of brand identification on consumer attachment has been demonstrated empirically by several studies (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Ahearne, Bhattacharya & Gruen, 2005; Thomson, MacInnis & Park, 2005; Whan Park & al., 2010). We thus postulate that:

**H2: Brand identification mediates the relationship between the environmental dimension of social responsibility and brand attachment**

**H3: Brand identification mediates the relationship between the philanthropic dimension of social responsibility and brand attachment**

Finally, it is commonly admitted that consumers' expectations in terms of social responsibility are far from being uniform; they vary from one consumer to another (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). Personal norms, in terms of social responsibility, appear as the principal explanation of individuals' predispositions to support causes (Stern, 2000). We can thus suppose that consumers' reactions to the symbolic dimensions of social responsibility depend on the congruence they perceive between the brand's values as revealed by its environmental and societal commitments, and their own. These perceptions of congruence are likely to vary from one consumer to another depending on consumers' personal norms regarding social responsibility (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2006). We thus postulate that:

**H4 : Consumers' personal norms moderate the indirect link between the environmental dimension of social responsibility and brand attachment via brand identification such that this mediation is stronger (weaker) when respondents' personal norms are high (low).**

**H5 : Consumers' personal norms moderate the indirect link between the philanthropic dimension of social responsibility and brand attachment via brand identification such that this mediation is stronger (weaker) when respondents' norms are high (low).**

## **MATERIAL AND METHOD**

To test our research model, we carried out a survey among regular consumers of national brands<sup>1</sup> of organic foods sold through mass retail. Indeed, organic food is one of the fastest growing industries in socially responsible consumption<sup>2</sup> and requires a high level of

---

<sup>1</sup>We eliminated retailers' brands to control the effect of the image of the retail brands, specialized stores versus supermarkets such as Biocoop have a more positive image than traditional retail distributors like Auchan or Leclerc.

<sup>2</sup>Organic food reach a market penetration rate of 96.3% in 2013 "Kantar World panel".

involvement in the consumer buying process, which is a necessary condition for studying relational variables such as attachment. The consumption of organic products is based both on instrumental motives, related to health protection, quality and to more ethical concerns such as preserving the environment and/or philanthropic activities (Magnusson et al., 2003). The final sample of our survey comprised 299 respondents of whom 55% were women with an average age of 37 years.

Research on socially responsible consumption has shown that social desirability can influence consumers' responses (Roberts, 1995). To check for social desirability bias, we measured it with a 10-item scale by Strahan & Gerbasi (1972). We withdrew items strongly correlated with social desirability; in all, 7 items were withdrawn respectively from the scales of brand identification<sup>3</sup> (3 items withdrawn), brand attachment<sup>4</sup> (1 item withdrawn), personal norms<sup>5</sup> (2 items withdrawn) and trust<sup>6</sup> (1 item withdrawn). All final scales presented good reliability. To test our mediating hypotheses (H1, H2 & H3), we used the structural equation method (SEM) (Zao, Lynch & Chen, 2010) by using a bootstrap procedure. There is a current consensus in the literature that recognizes the superiority of bootstrapping compared to the Baron and Kenny approach for testing mediation effects (Hayes, 2013).

Hypotheses H4 and H5 correspond to a conditional indirect effect (Hayes & Preacher, 2013). To test these effects, we use the macro PROCESS developed by Hayes (2013) that tests them directly using a bootstrap procedure using SPSS.

## RESULTS

The results of the tests of the mediating effects confirm hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 relative to the mediating role of trust and identification (table 1 and 2).

	M1		M2		Y	
	Trust		Identification		Attachment	
	$\beta$	t-test	$\beta$	t-test	$\beta$	t-test
Consumer SR	.565	9.517***			.028	.436 (ns)
Environmental SR			.450	8.394***	-.035	-.569 (ns)
Philanthropic SR			.411	7.693***	.144	2.829**
Trust					.393	6.965***
Identification					.582	8.729***
R <sup>2</sup>	.32		.50		.70	

**Table 1: Test of mediation model**

**Note: entries are standardized regression weights \*p <.05; \*\* p<.001; \*\*\* p<.0001**

<sup>3</sup> 6 items Escalas & Bettman (2003; 2005)

<sup>4</sup> 9-item scale Terrasse (2006) adapted to the French context of the Gruen et al. (2000) and Bansal et al. (2004)

<sup>5</sup> 8 item scale Harland, Staats & Wilke (1999)

<sup>6</sup> 8 item scale Gurviez & Korchia (2002)

Hypothesis	Indirect effect	Confidence Interval		Direct effect	Confidence Interval		Result
		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper	
H1	.222	.137	.319	.040	-.125	.213	Full mediation
H2	.262	.182	.369	-.045	-.227	.111	Full mediation
H3	.239	.155	.346	.143	.027	.251	Partial mediation

**Table 2: Test of mediation paths**

**Note: confidence interval of 95% for the indirect and direct effects by bootstrap 5000 corrected for bias**

The global model including the three mediating effects explains almost 75% of the variance of brand attachment. It presents an acceptable fit.

$\chi^2$	df	$\chi^2/n$	AGFI	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
603.7	216	2.795	.816	.936	.925	.078

**Table 3: Model fit**

Furthermore, the inclusion of the mediating effects in the model significantly increases the model's fit to the data, as shown in the following table.

	$\chi^2$	df	$\Delta \chi^2$
Independent model	1191	224	
Direct effects	858	219	333(5)***
H1	770	218	88(1)***
H1 & H2	661	217	109(1)***
H1, H2 & H3	604	216	57(1)***

**Table 4: Fit Improvement**

Our results do not allow validating hypothesis H4 relative to the conditional effect of personal norms on the indirect effect of the environment dimension on brand attachment. Tables 5 and 6 below present these results in detail.

	M (Identification)		Y (Attachment)	
	Coef.	T-test	Coef.	T-test
Age	.092	2.012*	-.014	-.409(ns)
Gender	-.080	-1.798 (ns)	.265	.803(ns)
X : Environmental Social Responsibility	.477	9.642***	.009	.213(ns)
M : Identification			.795	18.733** *
W : Personal norms	.227	4.527***		
X x W (interaction)	-.001	.045 (ns)		
R <sup>2</sup>	.35***		.64***	

**Table 5: Model of conditional indirect effect of environment on attachment through identification**

\*p <.05; \*\* p<.001; \*\*\* p<.0001

Moderator W (Personal norms)	Indirect effect	Confidence Interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
-1	.380	.294	.477
0	.379	.310	.450
1	.379	.281	.472
<i>Index of moderated mediation</i>	-.001	-.063	.058

**Table 6: Test of Indirect conditional effect of environment on attachment through identification at different levels of personal norms (H4)**

However, the indirect effect appears significantly stronger when consumers' personal norms are high, as supposed in H5. We can deduce that personal norms condition the strength of the indirect effect of the philanthropic dimension on brand attachment through identification.

	M (Identification)		Y (Attachment)	
	Coef.	T-test	Coef.	T-test
Age	.072	1.563(ns)	-.014	-.437(ns)
Gender	-.048	-1.075 (ns)	.193	.619(ns)
X : Philanthropic Social Responsibility	.458	9.022***	.216	5.404***
M : Identification			.694	17.660** *
W : Personal norms	.265	5.241***		
X x W	.079	1.661(ns)		
R <sup>2</sup>	.33***		.67***	

**Table 7: Model of conditional indirect effect of philanthropy on attachment through identification**

\*p <.05; \*\* p<.001; \*\*\* p<.0001

Moderator W (Personal norms)	Indirect effect	Confidence Interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
-1	.263	.185	.358
0	.318	.246	.396
1	.373	.277	.471
<i>Index of moderated mediation</i>	.055	.001	.105

**Table 8: Test of indirect conditional effect of philanthropy on attachment through identification at different levels of personal norms (H5)**

## DISCUSSION

Our research reconciles two theoretical perspectives that have often been considered separately to explain the benefits of social responsibility on the consumer-brand relationship. By distinguishing between symbolic and utilitarian associations of social responsibility, our study identifies two levers for consumer brand attachment.

We posit that utilitarian associations enhance consumer brand attachment by strengthening consumer trust in a context imbued with fear and skepticism about consequences of consumption for health. The consumer dimension of social responsibility thus influences the consumer-brand relationship according to a classic relational process, based on reciprocity and respect of promises in the exchange. Trust plays a central role as a mechanism of consumer attachment (Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Thomon, 2006) concerning the consumer dimension of social responsibility.

However, our research shows that trust is not the only lever of consumer attachment. In fact, consumption is not related only to a functional end but also fulfills a role of expression (Baudillard, 1970). Our research extends previous studies (Thomson, 2006) by showing that identification to a brand is the fundamental process of consumer attachment regarding the symbolic dimensions of social responsibility. Furthermore, our results attest to the role of personal norms that condition the influence of the philanthropic dimension on consumer attachment through identification. It thus seems that the influence of the philanthropic dimension on consumer identification and attachment is greater for individuals with strong personal norms.

Finally, our research underlines the major role brands play in firms' social responsibility policy. Social responsibility is often approached at the firm level without taking account of the role of brands. This empirical research validates the suggestions of previous research holding that social responsibility can be applied to brands (Lindgreen, Swaen & Johnston, 2009; Lindgreen et al., 2012).

### Managerial Implications

Our research attests to the central role played by the marketing function in setting up a social responsibility policy (Maignan, Ferrell & Ferrell, 2005), particularly in terms of brand policy (Lindgreen, Swaen & Johnston, 2009). Social responsibility applied to brands secures brand value in terms of durability (Hildebrand, Sen & Bhattacharya, 2011). Consumers take account of the criteria of social responsibility to evaluate the brands they buy. Studying social



responsibility at brand level is even more necessary in so far as a large number of firms adopt mixed or multi-brand strategies (Lindgreen & al.,2012).

Our research shows that attachment mechanisms differ depending on the type of social responsibility initiatives highlighted by brands and their symbolic or utilitarian nature for consumers. Understanding these mechanisms helps to guide managerial decisions in terms of the design and promotion of various socially responsible actions that should encourage consumer attachment and loyalty. Brands positioned on attributes such as product safety and quality should communicate about the respect of promises by providing consumers with guarantees of product safety and quality through quality certificates to develop trust and overcome widespread consumer skepticism (Bibb & Kourdi, 2004).

In terms of brands' attachment for social and environmental benefits, the objective should be to increase the attractiveness of brand identity for targeted consumers. For this, the characteristics of the targeted consumers should be studied to make sure that the engagements made by brands are compatible with consumers' values in order to encourage brand identification. The communication should be thought of in terms of activating personal norms. Following Schwartz' model, personal norms influence behavior under two conditions (1) when people think that their action will have real consequences on others' well-being;(2) when they can attribute responsibility for this action to themselves. To activate consumers' personal norms and thus encourage their attachment, marketing managers should play on these two levers in their communication.

### **Limitations and Research Avenues**

Like any study, this one also presents a certain number of limitations that need to be underlined. First of all, we chose to test our model of research on consumers of only one product category, namely, organic food products. This choice certainly strengthened the internal validity of the research. However, it opens the way to a certain number of questions as to the possible generalization of the results to other product categories. The external validity of this study should thus be reinforced by studying other fields.

Next, we tested our model on consumers of national brands. Our results converge with those of researchers in Europe and the United States (Maignan, Ferrell & Ferrell, 2005; Lindgreen, Swaen & Johnston, 2009). It seems therefore that social responsibility can contribute in a similar way to national brands, as well as to a global, transnational brand strategy (Pestre, 2014), or a mixed “glocal<sup>7</sup>” strategy (Persais, 2010). Our results should thus be completed by testing the model on consumers of multinational brands such as “Björk” or “Patagonia”.

The third limit of this research is related to time. Like all studies in the relational stream, our research is transversal and does not take account of temporal aspects in the construction of a relationship. A longitudinal study thus seems appropriate to account for the role of interactions taking place between the consumer and the brand studied.

Regarding future perspectives, a promising avenue of research is the reaction to inconsistencies between engagements that firms convey and their actual practices when these are discovered to be divergent. In fact, we could imagine that consumer reactions to allegations of irresponsibility will depend on the utilitarian or symbolic nature of their commitments. Furthermore,

---

<sup>7</sup>While previous researches set local strategies against global strategies, [Persais \(2010\)](#) suggests combining both, benefiting from advantages of local and global CSR strategies.

mechanisms for reinstating trust may differ from levers of reconstructing the attractiveness of the brand identity. These research avenues appear particularly promising. Finally, other variables may modify the relation between consumers and brands, such as the degree of consumer skepticism or the relative weight of social responsibility initiatives during purchase decisions. Other variables, outside the scope of the present study but identified in the literature on ethical and equitable consumption might also be integrated into future work. We can thus mention consumers' tendency towards collectivism or individualism or their sensitivity to products' origin. Cultural and/or national differences are highly likely to play an important role in evaluating brand social responsibility and its influence on consumers.

## References

- Abid T., & Moulins J.L. (2015). Une échelle de mesure de la responsabilité sociétale des marques : application aux consommateurs de marques alimentaires biologiques. *Revue Française du Marketing*, 254, 4/4, 23-37.
- Ahearne M., Bhattacharya C.B. & Gruen T.W. (2005). Antecedents and Consequences of Customer-Company Identification: Expanding the Role of Relationship Marketing. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 3, 574-585.
- Bagozzi R.P., & Dholakia U.M. (2006). Antecedents and purchase consequences of customer participation in small group brand communities. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23, 45-61.
- Bansal H.S., Irving P.G., & Taylor S.F. (2004). A Three-Component Model of Customer Commitment to Service Providers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32, 3, 234-250.
- Baudrillard J. (1970). *La société de consommation, ses mythes, ses structures*. Paris :Denoël (chapter 2).
- Bhattacharya C.B. & Sen S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, why and How consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*. 47, 1, 9-24.
- Bibb S. & Kourdi J. (2004). *Trust Matters: For organizational and Personal Success*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Blau P.M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Brown T.J. & Dacin P.A. (1997). The Company and the product: corporate associations and consumer product responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 61, 1, 68-84.
- Chaudhuri A. & Holbrook M.B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65, 2, 81-93.
- Escalas J.E., & Bettman J. (2005). Self-Construal, Reference Group and Brand Meanings. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32, 378-389.
- Fournier S. (1998). Consumers and their brand: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24, 4, 343-373.

Gruen T.W., Summers J.O., & Acito F. (2000). Relationship Marketing Activities, Commitment, and Membership Behaviors in Professional Associations. *Journal of Marketing*, 64, 34-49.

Gurvies P., & Korchia M. (2002). Proposition d'une échelle de mesure multidimensionnelle de la confiance dans la marque. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, 17, 3 41-61.

Harland P., Staats H., & Wilke H.A.M. (1999). Explaining Proenvironmental Intention and Behavior by Personal Norms and the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 29, 12, 2505-2528.

Hayes A.F. (2013). Introduction to mediation, moderation and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. New York: Guilford Press.

Hayes A.F., & Preacher K.J. (2013). Statistical mediation analysis with a multicategorical independent variable. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 67, 3, 451-470.

Hildebrand D., Sen S., & Bhattacharya C.B. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility: A Corporate Marketing Perspective. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45, 9/10, 1353-1364.

Lacey R., & Kennet-Hensel P.A. (2010). Longitudinal effects of corporate social responsibility on consumer relationship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97, 581-597

Lichtenstein D.R., Drumwright M.E., & Braig B.M. (2004). The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer donations to corporate supported nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 4, 16-32.

Lindgreen A., Swaen V., & Johnston W.J. (2009). Corporate social responsibility: An empirical investigation of U.S. organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 5, 2/3, 303–323.

Lindgreen A., Xu Y., Maon F., & Wilcock J. (2012). Corporate social responsibility brand leadership: a multiple case study. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46, 7/8, 965 - 993.

Magnusson M.K., Arvola A., Hursti U.K.K., Aberg L. & Sjöden P.O. (2003). Choice of organic foods is related to perceived consequences for human health and to environmentally friendly behaviour. *Appetite*, 40, 109-117.

Maignan I., Ferrell O.C. & Ferrell L. (2005). A stakeholder model for implementing social responsibility in Marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39, 9/10, 956-977.

Mayer R.C., Davis J.H., & Schoorman F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 3, 709–734.

McEnally M., & De Chernatony L. (1999). The Evolving Nature of Branding: Consumer and managerial considerations. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2, 1626.

Morgan R.M., & Hunt S.D. (1994). The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 3, 20-38.

Pérez A., & Del Bosque I.J. (2014). The role of CSR in the corporate Identity Banking Service Providers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108, 2, 145-166.

Persais E.(2010). La gestion de la RSE dans un contexte international : vers une «glocalisation » des pratiques ? Une étude de cas d'entreprises françaises implantées au Mexique. *Management International*, 14, 2, 11-30.

Pestre F.(2014). Local, global and transnational CSR strategies in the multinational corporation. *Management International*, 18, 21-41.

Porter M.E, & Kramer M.R.. (2011). Creating Sharing Value. *Havard Business Review*, February.

Roberts J. (1995). Profiling levels of socially responsible consumer behaviour: a cluster analytic approach and its implications for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 3, 4, 97-117.

Sen S., & Bhattacharya C.B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38, 2, 225-243.

Stafford L. (2008). Social Exchange Theories. Chapter 28. In Baxter L.A. & Braithwaite D.O. (Eds). *Engaging theories in interpersonal communications: Multiple perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 377- 389.

Stern P.C. (2000). New Environmental Theories: Toward a coherent Theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 3, 407-424.

Strahan R., & Gerbasi K.C. (1972). Short, Homogeneous Versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 28, 2, 191-193.

SwaenV., & Chumpitaz C.R. (2008). L'impact de la responsabilité sociale des entreprises sur la confiance des consommateurs. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing*, 23, 4, 7-35.

Tajfel H., & Turner J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In Austin W.G. & Worchel S. (Eds). *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole, 33-47.

Terrasse C. (2006). L'engagement envers la marque: Proposition d'un modèle théorique et application à la comparaison de la fidélité aux marques nationales et aux marques distributeurs. PhD, Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, HEC- Paris.

Thomson M. (2006). Human Brands: Investigating antecedents to consumer's strong attachment to celebrities. *Journal of Marketing*, 70, 104-119.

Thomson M., MacInnis D.J. & Whan Park C. (2005). The ties that bind: Measuring the strength of consumers' Emotional Attachment to Brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15, 1, 77-91.

Valchos P.A. (2012). Corporate social performance and consumer-retailer emotional attachment: The moderating role of individual traits. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46, 11/12, 1559-1580.

Whan Park C., MacInnis D.J., Priester J., Eisingerich A.B., & Lacoumbucci D. (2010). Brand Attachment and Brand Attitude Strength: Conceptual and Empirical differentiation of two critical brand equity drivers. *Journal of Marketing*, 74, 1-17.

Zao X., Lynch J.G. & Chen Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 2, 197-206.