Attributes of a socially responsible brand personality

Atributos de la personalidad de marca socialmente responsable

Javier Mayorga Gordillo. Autonomous university of Occident. Colombia.
jmayorga@uao.edu.co
[CV] ⓘ
Elena Añaños Carrasco. Autonomous University of Barcelona. Spain.
elena.ananos@uab.cat
[CV] ⓘ

ABSTRACT
In the current context where governments, companies and in general, the society are aiming to end poverty, protect the planet and guarantee that people live in peace and prosperity, the social actions undertaken by organisations have turned into an element that can influence the positive perception evoked in the public. Therefore, different studies (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore and Hill, 2006; Du, Bhattacharya and Sen, 2007; Hildebrand, Demotta, Sen and Valenzuela, 2017; Hoeffler and Keller, 2002; Madden, Roth and Dillon, 2012; Manzano, Simó and Pérez, 2013; Rivera, Bigne and Curras-Pérez, 2016; Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001, among others) have focused on analysing the effects of corporate social responsibility (CSR), concluding that they might be a factor that positively modifies the perceptions of consumers about a company and its role in the society, significantly impacting the strength and value of a brand. In this line, this study analyses the communication attributes perceived as determinant traits of a socially responsible brand personality. These traits are assessed by 385 individuals from different nationalities in order to identify the associations and clusters of attributes that allow the construction of a socially responsible brand personality. The results obtained show the existence of different factors that influence the assessment of studied attributes and allow to conclude that there is a relational structure of attributes that can constitute a new dimension of brands, endowing them of a socially responsible personality that complements and enhances the values of the organisation altogether.

KEYWORDS: branding; socially responsible brand; social responsability; brand personality; brand management; corporate communication.

RESUMEN
En el contexto actual donde los gobiernos, las empresas y en general la sociedad están en búsqueda de poner fin a la pobreza, proteger el planeta y garantizar que las personas gocen de paz y prosperidad, las

acciones de tipo social gestionadas por las organizaciones se han convertido en un elemento que puede influir en la percepción positiva que tienen los públicos de las mismas. Es por este motivo que diversos estudios (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore, y Hill, 2006; Du, Bhattacharya, y Sen, 2007; Hildebrand, Demotta, Sen, y Valenzuela, 2017; Hoeffler y Keller, 2002; Madden, Roth, y Dillon, 2012; Manzano, Simó, y Pérez, 2013; Rivera, Bigne, y Curras-Perez, 2016; Sen y Bhattacharya, 2001, entre otros) se han centrado en analizar los efectos de las acciones de responsabilidad social corporativa (RSC), llegando a concluir que pueden ser un factor que modifica positivamente las percepciones de los consumidores sobre una empresa en su conjunto y de su rol en la sociedad, logrando afectar significativamente la solidez y el valor de una marca. En esta línea, este trabajo analiza los atributos comunicacionales que son percibidos como rasgos determinantes de una personalidad de marca socialmente responsable. Dichos rasgos son valorados por 385 sujetos de diferentes nacionalidades con el objetivo de identificar las asociaciones y las agrupaciones de atributos que permiten la construcción de la personalidad de las marcas socialmente responsables. Los resultados obtenidos muestran la existencia de diversos factores que influyen en la valoración de los atributos estudiados y permiten concluir que existe una estructura relacional de atributos que pueden conformar una nueva dimensión de las marcas dotándolas de una personalidad socialmente responsable que complemente y engrandezca los propios valores de la organización en su conjunto.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *branding;* marca socialmente responsable; responsabilidad social; personalidad de marca; gestión de marca; comunicación corporativa.

CONTENTS

Translated by **Yuhanny Henares** (academic translator, Universitat de Barcelona).

1. Introduction

Considering that the brand is a visible communicational element of organisations, and given the current context of society, they are demanded a responsible behaviour and it is required to incorporate tools to the brand managing models, that contribute to the role of agent for social change. Therefore, this study profiles the new conception of brand considering the concepts of social responsibility and sustainability, that allow to identify the attributes and personality traits of the brand contributing to its management and, likewise, connect to the audience in a way compatible to the business behaviour professed by producers in their corporate routine.

The aim with this study is to analyse the features that reflect a personality with a marked social sensitivity and select the most pertinent and relevant ones to describe it. This will be conducted by means of a statistical analysis of the assessments made by respondents in the research, complementing the models of brand personality attributes made by Aaker (1997) and, thus allowing to framework said

model in the current context where brands interact with the society and individuals and also with the environment.

1.1. Background

The society is undergoing a change process that envisions an evolution in terms of environmental, economic, political, technological context as well as social organisation. Different authors have suggested that in the middle of this process of change, a new type of consumer emerges, a type aware of his purchase actions, with different values and concerned about his actions in the market (Crane and Matten, 2004; Hendarwan, 2002; Rochefort, 1995; Strong, 1996) cited by (Dueñas Ocampo, Perdomo-Ortiz and Villa Castaño, 2014) This led organisations, in an attempt to interpret this transformation of the society and especially, consumers, to look for new ways of establishing relationships with their audience from a more committed and responsible perspective, namely, much more sustainable.

From this new perspective of the responsible consumer, there is increase in the interest about the origin of products and their productive and manufacturing process, in compliance with the global norms of fair labour and human rights. On the other hand, there is an increase of the concern about the rise of the military industry, state corruption and animal cruelty, among the many aspects that impact the decision to purchase and use any good or service (Newholm and Shaw, 2007).

Thus, the current consumer is increasingly conscious of the fact that decisions made in the past about political, environmental, social and economic questions have generated categorical changes in quality of life, equity, the environment and wellbeing. This urges to rethink not only about the economic and political models that govern most states, but also those related to production and human consumption.

1.1.1. Current context of the society: the era of Sustainable Development

Based on the aforesaid, it can be observed that the new generations are critical about the current market model and are very concerned about the free market growth fostering, among other things, the pollution and exacerbation of income inequality. But although it might seem paradoxical, they understand that the model of the current society involves technological and communicational progresses favouring these issues (Kahn, 2015). Thus, while a great part of the society tacitly wants to be prosperous and aspires to reduce the world poverty so that future generations can live better; others are concerned about the environmental challenges, climate change, air pollution, protection of biodiversity and the depletion of natural resources that are key for the future of the humanity and its ecosystem. But very few understand the liberal view of the free market growth to reduce the global poverty (Kahn, 2015).

It is due to these and other reasons that governments and great political and opinion leaders, led by the United Nations, presented in 2015, The 2030 Agenda for the World Sustainable Development and together with the Objectives for Sustainable Development, have set the guidelines for the world governments.

According to Kahn (2015) the Sustainable Development can be understood as an intellectual search that attempts to provide meaning to the interactions between the world economy, the global society and the physical environment of the Earth. This author introduces this subject from two perspectives: the positive and the normative perspective. The positive perspective is based on an academic view where

interactions and frictions between the economic-social system and the environmental system can be analysed; namely, it is focused on the interaction of the individual and its collectives with the natural environment sheltering them, allowing to interpret the consequences of the relations where they coexist. On the other hand, the normative perspective allows to obtain a point of view of the design of public policies and their relationship with the different social stakeholders.

From the early days of this century, different authors, leaders and the civil society, among others, have tried to explain and suggest models to achieve an environmental socio-economic development, supporting in an economic system that promotes equity and environmental care. In this sense, Sachs and Vilà (2015) suggest that this way of understanding the new world from a sustainable perspective claim that the growth and progress are based on the elimination of extreme poverty and on the establishment of policies targeted to reinforce communities, so to increase social trust, besides the care and protection of the environment against the systemic and systematic attack caused by men for centuries. According to these authors, the sustainable development needs an holistic view since the society simultaneously pursues social, economic and environmental objectives.

All this justifies that The 2030 Agenda aims to become a plan which core pillar is the dignity and equality of the individual. This is an ambitious and visionary option and requires the participation of different spheres of the society (representatives of governments, the civil society, scholars, the private sector, etc.) that implement it as a tool for creating inclusive and fair societies, at the service of people from the present as well as future generations (CEPAL, 2018).

"The business sector must understand that today and in the future, it is necessary to transform the dominant paradigm of development into one that lead us through sustainable, inclusive development and with a long term perspective" (CEPAL, 2018), understanding that in order to do so, the wellbeing of all individuals must be promoted, beyond the simple reach of the status of social wellbeing, that some nations have, but that most of the world has not yet achieved for its citizens.

According to Sachs and Vilà (2015), to meet the goals of this agenda it is necessary that there is a good governance that promotes a healthy balance between the state, the civil society and the economy market (RAE, 2018). In order to do this, these authors state that companies have a leading role and that good governance is not an activity exclusive of governments, but also large multinational companies are stakeholders with a great political, economic and social power. Thus, the wellbeing of humanity shall be impacted positively if these large companies comply the law and respect and care for the environment, contributing to the continuous improvement of the communities they are immersed in, namely, they are agents of change engaged with the progress of the society.

Companies must not only be means of production, but instead agents of change that aim to maximise benefits. Before, those benefits were basically economic, but now the society claims that social and environmental benefits get the same relevance; therefore, companies must work for the transformation and improvement of their local environments from a global perspective, taking the individual, the society and the ecosystem as baseline. We cannot forget that companies are the centre of the productive and economic fabric of nations, so they must think about the common good, to build and modify the current and future society. Based on this perspective, Kotler, Kartajaya and Setiawan (2010) consider that we are living an era centred on values where organisations do not perceive individuals as simple consumers, but rather conceive them as human beings endowed of intelligence, heart and spirit.

Therefore, it is understood that, in their strategic formulation, current companies must include aspects like social, economic and environmental justice, which will differentiate them during purchase decision making. The consumer today does not only want a mere functional satisfaction, but also a satisfaction of emotional sort. Hence, companies that base their management on values, can offer answers and hope to those facing the current problems of the society (poverty, inequality, inequity, environmental destruction, among others) and will connect with consumers at a higher level (Kotler *et al.,* 2010).

1.1.2. The Brand as an element of corporate competitiveness

The brand is currently a managerial priority due to the increasing trend of making it one of the most valuable intangible assets of companies. The brands are endowed with several essential functions in the process of relation and promotion of companies, their goods and services. For clients, the brands can keep choice simple, promise a particular quality, reduce the risk and generate reliability; this way, one of the relevant aspects of the brand are its intangibles, namely, those aspects related to brand image that do not involve specific attributes or physical benefits of the product (Keller and Lehman, 2006).

Based on the relevance of the brand today, we define it as a joint creation between the audience and manufacturers, from which there generates a series of elements and communicational signs of rational and emotional nature that produce a signifier when interacting between them. This allows not only to identify a product or service, but also to identify and differentiate it within the social context it coexist with and the market it interacts with (Mayorga, 2017). Thus, the brand is much more than a name, term, design, symbol or any other feature that (only) identifies the good or service of a vendor differentiated from those of other vendors (AMA, 2015). Furthermore, according to ISO standards (2018), the brand aims to produce distinctive images and associations in the minds of the different publics, thus generating benefits for organisations and the function is to stablish a differentiating identity of the organisation or product. To do so, it must communicate the unique benefits of said entity, considering that these might be functional, as well as emotional or social.

Different researchers have conducted studies in the search for better ways to face the challenges of brands today. Since the late 20th century, different concepts have been suggested that allow to understand the relevance of brands in the relationship with their audience. Most converge on the idea that the main purpose of a brand is increasing the commercial value of the product/ service it represents as well as the value of the manufacturer, reduce the economic risk and extend the sustainable existence of the producer. From a contemporary perspective, the brand contributes to draw clients and increase income by means of a rise in prices and/or volume rates, besides contributing to the increase of customer loyalty (ISO, 2018).

Thus, beyond the fact brands can reduce costs, create a competitive advantage and impact on income and profitability, they can also influence in the corporate value: therefore, it is necessary that the brand value is not focused only on the financial yields it can contribute to organisations. Instead, there brand business models must be developed where the effect of marketing activities impacting the market behaviour is more relevant, generating value on the brand as a transaction good, emotional good of intangible asset of companies (Faircloth, Capella and Alford, 2001).

Professionals and researchers state that today the aim is building strong brands, namely, to increase the level of positive impact of brands on clients or different *stakeholders*, by means of strategies that pursue

the legal strength of the brand and the enhancement of consumers perceptions. Therefore, in order to know the value of a brand, it is necessary to select the most proper and relevant elements, dimensions and indicators (ISO, 2018). In this sense, a brand must should achieve a key positioning, stablish associations in the mind of clients and develop other differentiating relevant components that distinguish it from the rest and allow it to reach a competitive superiority (Keller and Lehman, 2006). From a relational perspective, it is understood that consumers generate strong associations and bonds with brands in a multifaceted manner, namely, it cannot be determined there exists a single element that produces a durable relationship between the brand and the audience. According to Fournier (cited in Keller and Lehman, 2006) there are six dimensions, beyond loyalty or engagement, across the relationship between the brand and the consumer shifts: the connection of self-concept, commitment or nostalgic connection, the interdependence of behaviour, the triggered love/ passion, intimacy and the brand partner quality.

According to Faircloth et al. (2001), the differential response is the result of a mental effect of brand awareness by consumers, sustained on image and recognition. These authors consider that the brand image is composed of beliefs and perceptive cognitions of the audience about the attributes, benefits and associations of the brand attitude. Therefore, the company managers must pay closer attention on generating the trust of their consumers, since today individuals rely on each other rather than companies (Kotler et al., 2010). According to these authors, companies must comply with the new reliability system of the consumer, where his community stands as agent of change, creating its own products and experiences in collaboration with other individuals composing it. Therefore, the organisations aiming for success within this system, must understand that consumers increasingly appreciate collaboration in the process of creation and development of a brand personality.

1.1.3. The brand as relational element of the corporate identity

Immersed in the era of Sustainable Development, we understand that the value of a brand is strongly linked to the image, coherence and consistency about the organisational behaviour in terms of products and/ or services, and that it is supported in the recognition of its corporate identity. In this context, it is imperative, to know the effects of the actions that a company develops in favour of the improvement of the society, its members and the environment, but not only from the financial value, but also from the relational perspective, namely, based on the way individuals interpret said actions as a dominant attribute that identify and differentiate the brand from the others.

The brands are prone to generate associations that relate to their attributes, benefits and values (Keller and Lehman, 2006). More and more, empirical studies conclude that consumers stablish more durable and profitable relations with the brands that clearly manifest their social nature, based on aspects like the relationship with employees, the environmental impact and its contributions to society. Thus, the brand involves more than a promise; it is a bond, an evolutionary relationship based on perceptions and experiences that the client experiences every time he connects with it, besides generating functional, self-expression and social benefits (Casanoves, 2017).

From the aforesaid, managers of organisations are required to understand that in a market where the evaluation of the contributions to sustainability is increasingly important when choosing between companies, brands and products, it is necessary to develop brand attributes that allow organisations to generate bonds full of social and environmental consciousness. This is not just a communicational drill,

but it also must become a strategical, cultural and behavioural exercise. Therefore, organisations must keep a balance between the compliance of norms, both legal and moral, and the actions over people and environmental care, not only because it will contribute altogether to a better brand image and value, but also because in a not very far future, companies that do not target this sort of sustainability-oriented management will be excluded from the market.

When a company develops coherent strategies new products and innovative services based on the concept of sustainability, using efficient materials manufactured under a cleaner production process, allows that consumers position it in a preferential place during purchase decision making, since today these are choosing the most responsible brands. In this context of sustainability, it is necessary that brand managers understand that an essential element of the brands from today and tomorrow must be focused on integrity, namely, in the compliance of what is offered from its positioning and differentiation, but also it must show credibility by fulfilling the promises of value and establishing a relationship based on reliability.

One of the most relevant foundations of the era of sustainable development is the value-based business management. More and more, companies have been adopting a strategical model based on the formal declaration of corporate values and the managers currently tend to identify the ethical behaviour, honesty, integrity and social concerns as core pillars of their management. Different organisations manifest these values today, allowing that publics identify their corporate priorities and management criteria in favour of the construction of a coherent and stable relationship with said audience. Currently, companies must not base their management solely on profitability and turnover, but rather must also aim for business sustainability without impacting the environmental sustainability.

Casanoves (2017, p. 53) states that "(…) the brand is the accurate reflection of the thoughts, feelings and actions of the consumer, and aims to achieve a strong emotional connection with him, since it is undoubtedly the essential link of the brand value chain." Therefore, if the consumer is rebuilding his structure of principles, beliefs and values, granting more relevance to sustainability, organisations must stablish ways of relation with the society that allow building communities based on this new structure of social values.

Hoeffler and Keller (2002) already established the brand personality as a relationship element that appeals to some distinctive traits of the personality of consumers to stablish strong bonds with the brand, being honesty one of them, a trait that was already presented in the model of Aaker (1997). In addition, they consider there are likely other features of said model that adjust to brand personality, which contents allow to generate bonds between the brand and the audience based on social and environmental aspects, in such a way that a business management based on the collective interest of wellbeing, will allow to generate brand value. This contributes to create brand consciousness, improve brand image, stablish brand credibility, evoke brand feelings and create a sense of community around the brand that increases its commitment.

1.1.4. The brand personality as differentiating element of the brand image

According to Kotler *et al.* (2010), in order to establish a durable relationship with its public, it is necessary that brands develop an authentic DNA that allows the true definition of the brand and differentiates it from the others. These authors consider that brand personality is the means to understand

the construction of an identity and an image coherent with this model of business relation and differentiation. In this sense, companies must aim for authenticity and meet the experience and expectations promised. Their main objective cannot be to seem real in their advertisement, otherwise, they will lose their credibility. Thus, the brand personality turns into the starting point of the brand management as a relational element in the era of Sustainable Development.

Aaker (1997) was the first author that suggested a model that allowed not only to identify the dimensions and attributes of the brands perceived by audiences, but also contributes to its integral management, shaping it in such a way that publics interpret and relate to it in a way closer than previously expected by the company. This author suggests a conceptual model of brand associations encompassed by brand attributes, its benefits and brand attitudes. The attributes of a brand are the most objective and concrete level of association and are perceptive in the sense that correspond to what the consumer perceives about the attribute and determine its relevance or essence (Faircloth *et al.,* 2001).

Faircloth *et al.* (2001) consider that audiences shape the image by means of the sum of all the stimuli generated by the brand, and state that said image is the result of the decoding, extraction and interpretation processes made by consumers. Likewise, the brand image elaborated by the consumer is a result of different accumulated actions that the company has performed as part of its marketing mix, evoking a unique, strong and favourable image. Thus, allowing that the brand and its meaning are strategically differentiated and positioned in the mind of consumers.

Considering the relevance of mental associations in consumers, where the positioning, the recall and the commitment of the individual with the brand are built and that, therefore, constitute the sustenance of its value, it is necessary that producers clearly define what attributes and traits contribute to their definition so that the audience recognises its high social engagement. This creates a need to identify a dimension of the personality of the socially responsible sort of brand, that contributes to its strategical management and allows to stablish an emotional connection between the consumer and the brand. In this sense, we consider it is very important to analyse the possible communicational attributes implicit in the construction of a brand personality that makes it socially responsible.

Dueñas Ocampo *et al.* (2014) study the subject of responsible personality, from an evolutionary perspective of the concept of responsible consumption and consider it is a concept that mainly appeared in the fifties, at the same time with the formalisation of the corporate social responsibility as highlighted by Cochran (2007) and Wartick and Cochran (1985). The authors refer to the studies of Berkowitz and Daniels (1964), Gough, McClosky and Meehl (1952) and Harris (1957) Berkowitz and Lutterman (1968), who mainly base on social transformations and political development, particularly in the United States, leading them to set forth the characteristics or the profile of socially responsible people and the relationship between their responsibility and their behaviour towards different stakeholders.

Back in the seventies, researchers focused their studies on the analysis of socially responsible consumers and the elements that characterise it. According to Dueñas Ocampo *et al.* (2014), one of the most relevant contributions of this decade was that of Anderson and Cunningham (1972) who said that the responsible personality does not directly involves a direct action of responsible sort, namely, it does not lead to a socially responsible consumption. These authors consider that some demographic features can be associated with higher scores in the scale of social responsibility, but that a responsible personality does not engage the consumer into actions that reflect his responsible behaviour. Therefore, the studies

on this subject must be reconsidered and focus mainly on the consumer attitudes, so to understand the drivers generated around his actions.

By the late nineties, studies about brand personality and its relationship with consumers, result in the formulation of a brand personality scale, based on the findings suggested by psychology. This is how Aaker (1997) suggests a model of brand personality based on 5 dimensions, but where there are no attributes explicitly identified that describe a socially marked brand. These dimensions include sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness. Different researches have been conducted after Aaker's proposal (Chu and Sung, 2011; Cuevas Moreno, 2011; Freling, Crosno and Henard, 2011; Goñi, Torres and Aguilera, 2013; Kim, Shim and Dinnie, 2013; Madrigal and Boush, 2008) among others, where there is an attempt to reformulate her model, based on observations about the complexity that comes through when generalising the traits suggested by the author to all world contexts. This fact has led to the definition and research of new attributes and, in some cases, to the definition of new dimensions that compose the brand personality. Thus, for instance, in the Indian context, the studies of Ahmad and Thyagaraj (2017) evidence the presence of a new dimension of brand personality suggested by Aaker that consider to identify this society better; the authors call this dimension Integrity and is associate it to the cultural characteristics of said context.

On the other hand, Mayorga (2017) suggests adding a sixth dimension to the Aaker model, focused on the traits of a personality with a marked social interest. The author denominates said dimension 'sensitivity' and estimates that, when transferring this human virtue to the context of brands, these become more sensitive in relation to their audience, avoiding the indifference towards the social problems of the contexts where they coexist with their publics. This allows the manufacturer to turn into an agent of social change. This virtue of the brand personality is necessary for the construction of relationships between the brands and its consumers, since it generates special bonds between them and contributes to the positioning and the reputation of the brand among their publics.

These theoretical contributions allow shaping a relationship between the company and the audience sustained on the sensitivity of the brand aiming to position it as a relational strategical element in the era of Sustainable Development. From this perspective, we consider it is necessary to analyse the communicational attributes that are part of the definition and construction of a socially responsible brand personality, understanding them as relational elements of strategical nature for the brands and their manufacturers.

Therefore, the objective of this paper is to select and analyse the features or attributes that define and describe the personality of a socially responsible brand and generate a series of traits gathered after the assessment conducted by respondents and that it is not influenced by its demographic and social profile. The final goal is the definition of a dimension of brand personality that sums and complements the dimensions of brand personality suggested in Aaker's model (1997).

The general hypotheses of our study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There are features, adjectives or attributes that define and describe the personality of a socially responsible brand.

Hypothesis 2: The features, adjectives or attributes that compose the personality of a socially responsible brand are independent from the characteristics of the subjects that assess them, namely, they are exempt

from the influence of the socio-demographic variables of people granting a brand the dimension of social responsibility.

2. Methodology

2.1. Data collection instruments

To study and describe the features that reflect a personality with a marked social sensitivity, *the instrument for the Assessment of Attributes that define the Socially Responsible Brand Personality (VAP–SR in Spanish)* (Mayorga and Añaños, 2018), which first section is destined to record the evaluation that individuals grant to each one of the 30 attributes presented by the instrument. These attributes are the result of the lexical and semantic analysis of a total of 275 adjectives related to the corporate social responsibility (Mayorga and Añaños, 2018) and they are as follows:

- Kind
- Charismatic
- Charitable
- Collaborative
- Understanding
- Engaged
- Reliable
- Selfless
- Ecologist
- Empathetic
- Enthusiastic
- Equitable
- Special
- Hopeful
- Generous
- Honest
- Humanitarian
- Tireless
- Inclusive
- Modest
- Noble
- Optimistic
- Positive
- Protective
- Respectful
- Responsible
- Sensitive
- Helpful
- Sincere
- Supportive

In the first section of the VAP-SR the respondents must complete a 5-item Likert scale (whereas 1 means 'Not at all' and 5 means 'Completely'), to determine to what extent each adjective identifies the description of an individual with a marked social interest (Mayorga, 2017). The Table 1 shows the adjectives evaluated and the corresponding Likert scales.

Table 1. *Relation of adjectives and answer options in VAP-SR.*

Adjective	Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	A lot	Completely
Sincere					
Selfless					
Humanitarian					
Charitable					
Protective					
Ecologist					
Special					
Engaged					
Inclusive					
Enthusiastic					
Responsible					
Understanding					
Generous					
Hopeful					
Kind					
Noble					
Respectful					
Optimistic					
Empathetic					
Positive					
Helpful					
Tireless					
Modest					
Reliable					
Honest					
Supportive					
Charismatic					
Sensitive					
Equitable					
Collaborative					

Source: authors own creation.

The purpose of the second part of the questionnaire is to acquire information about the demographic profile of respondents in relation to their age, gender, academic level, country of origin, occupation and level of participation in social activities.

2.2. Population and sample

The selection of the participants was made using a non-probabilistic sample with strategical informers, through chain exponential snowball sampling. This mode of sampling was selected because the distribution dynamic of *VAP-SR* is done through social networks on virtual digital platforms. This sampling is suitable in this kind of situations, because an individual serves as a multiplier agent by reaching a larger number of respondents in a shorter period of time.

The estimation of the sample size is determined using the following formula:

$$n = \left(z_{\alpha/2}\frac{\sigma}{d}\right)^2 + 1 = \left(\frac{z_{\alpha/2}}{k}\right)^2 + 1$$

Based on the recommendations of Hair, Tatham, Anderson, Black and Babin (2005), considering that the number of variables is 36, assuming a confidence of 95% for the estimation of each average and also considering the maximum admissible error as the tenth part of the standard deviation, the required sample size is 385 individuals. The final sample of respondents in the study is 408 individuals, therefore the representation criteria is met. The selection criteria of respondents is established based on the characteristics suggested by Lam (2005), namely, to be older than 16 years old and have the mandatory level of studies.

2.3. Variables and Design

Based on the object of study, the variables that structure the analysis of this research are the following:
  – Dependent variables: Variables that result on the assessment of each one of the attributes of the VAP-RS. There are the same number of variables of this sort as well as adjectives considered in the VAP-SR, including: Kind, Charismatic, Charitable, Collaborative, Selfless, Ecologist, Empathetic, Enthusiast, Equitable, Special, Hopeful, Generous, Honest, Humanitarian, Tireless, Inclusive, Modest, Noble, Optimistic, Positive, Protective, Respectful, Responsible, Sensitive, Helpful, Sincere, Supportive.
  – Independent variables: Variables collected on the second section of the VAP-SR and correspond to the socio-demographic and social features of respondents: age, gender, academic level, country of origin, occupation and participation in social activities.

The design of the research is developed based on its objectives, namely, the analysis of the assessment granted by individuals to the characteristics that describe a personality with a manifested sensitivity towards others. Considering the classification suggested by Ato, López and Benavente (2013), a design with a descriptive strategy of selective character and independent measures is used, whereas all the respondents are subjected to the same assessment conditions.

2.4. Procedure

The study is conducted based on the application of the digital version of the VAP-SR (Mayorga, 2017). Said questionnaire is distributed online through the social networks of participants. Internet is established as the means to distribute the questionnaire, because according to Llieva *et al.* (2002) (cited by (Díaz de Rada, 2012)), the use of this medium optimises the distribution and the completion of a larger number of questionnaires at a higher speed and with a lower expense.

To achieve the participation of subjects the chain sampling of exponential snowball type was used (mentioned earlier). For the distribution of the questionnaire, a structure composed of the following agents is designed: the principal investigator, a group of respondents called 'first level promoters' and a group of respondents called 'multipliers'. The principal investigator is responsible for determining and selecting the first level promoters (whom he contacts) and provides the instructions to spread the questionnaire through their digital social networks and further digital media they deem relevant. The objective of this procedure is to reach the highest number of responses and multiplier respondents; likewise, the multiplier respondents also become agents of the questionnaire and so forth. During the distribution procedure of the VAP-SR, different actions of communication and promotion are developed, in order to get the highest number of respondents.

3. Results

3.1. Description of respondents

The results of the analysis of the information obtained with the application of the VAP-SR allow to describe the characteristics of the respondents sample. Thus, most subjects are young adults and middle-aged adults that represent 60.05% of the sample. Regarding the respondents gender, the sample was composed of 62% women, 34.1% men and 3.9% who did not provide any information about it. The results show a distribution of the academic level of respondents ranging from higher education to doctorate studies, whereas 71.8% of respondents has a professional, university or postgraduate level; 66.42% of respondents shows a labour dependency linkage, namely, they are actively working.

Regarding the analysis of social traits, most respondents (73.8%) are connected to some sort of social action. The specific results obtained in terms of this variable are as follows:

From respondents, 78.8% of individuals ranging between 25 and 50 years old manifest they have performed or still perform some sort of social activity and from them, 78.7% of women state carrying out an activity of this kind. From working respondents, 81.3% also answered positively in relation to their social linkage and, from business respondents, most (88.2%) state to have performed or currently performing some sort of social activity.

These features of subjects participating in the study are relevant, since they allow to consider the internal validity of the completed answers. Most subjects know from experience the concept on which the VAP-SR evaluates a person with a marked social responsibility component.

3.2. Results of the analysis of the attributes that compose the dimension of the socially responsible brand personality

The analysis of the assessment of every attribute is quantified using indicators related to the statistical features of the distribution of frequencies: position, variability and form. To do so, there is estimated: the arithmetic average (or arithmetic mean), standard deviation and Fisher coefficient of skewness. Table 2 shows the results of these indicators in each one of the assessed adjectives, ranked based on the magnitude of the average (obtained mean), observing that the attribute that obtains a higher score is Humanitarian and the one obtaining the lowest score is Modest. Furthermore, the results obtained from the analysis of the Fisher coefficient of skewness have the same trend than the hierarchy obtained in the assessment based on the results obtained on the arithmetical mean.

Table 2. *Result of the parameters of distribution of attributes and their hierarchisation.*

Adjective	Hierarchy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness
Humanitarian	1	90,69	15,432	-3,211
Supportive	2	88,27	20,850	-2,604
Generous	3	86,73	21,274	-2,356
Helpful	4	86,73	21,992	-2,289
Collaborative	5	86,14	20,451	-2,167
Kind	6	84,78	21,608	-2,177
Charitable	7	81,87	23,150	-1,646
Engaged	8	78,44	26,538	-1,540
Sensitive	9	76,91	27,593	-1,387
Responsible	10	72,44	30,512	-1,059
Empathetic	11	69,60	31,746	-,887
Noble	12	69,45	32,318	-,892
Ecologist	13	66,59	30,631	-,757
Respectful	14	66,02	33,915	-,730
Protective	15	63,41	31,977	-,584
Special	16	62,98	34,216	-,589
Positive	17	62,57	33,863	-,568
Equitable	18	61,84	32,912	-,504
Hopeful	19	61,34	32,668	-,468
Understanding	20	60,60	34,665	-,489
Selfless	21	60,32	39,946	-,551
Charismatic	22	59,73	34,066	-,439
Honest	23	58,51	36,208	-,390
Enthusiastic	24	57,20	34,648	-,332
Reliable	25	56,73	35,022	-,292
Optimistic	26	54,85	35,407	-,227
Inclusive	27	53,64	34,481	-,168
Sincere	28	53,32	37,838	-,173
Tireless	29	51,32	36,440	-,100
Modest	30	39,01	36,547	,394

Source: authors own creation.

The analysis of the relationship between the assessment of each one of the attributes and the characteristics of respondents is done by means of an independence statistical test, quantified through the Cramer's contingency coefficient.

The table 3 shows a results synthesis following the analysis on assessments of the 30 adjectives of VAP-SR (position, mean, deviation and skewness coefficient) as well as the results of the analysis of the statistical independence tests of each attribute (independent variables) by each one of the (dependent) variables associated to the demographic and social characteristics of respondents. The last column shows the number of exclusion criteria of each adjective of the construct of the personality marked by a strong component of social responsibility. The exclusion criteria of an attribute are the following: 1) the p value, resulting from the independence test of the assessment of the attributes by each one of the socio-

demographic variables, must be significant, namely, under 0.01 (p<0.01); 2) The arithmetical mean obtained in the assessment of the attribute must have a small value, specifically positioned in the last 5 places of the hierarchy obtained; 3) the standard deviation obtained in the assessment of the attribute must position among the five highest scores of the hierarchy; 4) the value of the skewness coefficient must be high and must specifically position among the five highest coefficients obtained in the hierarchisation (Mayorga, 2017).

Table 3. Summary table of the result of the Decision Making mechanism.

Adjective	Scores Mean	Scores Standard Deviation	Scores Skewness	Occupation Statistic Value	Occupation p Value	Age Statistic Value	Age p Value	Gender Statistic Value	Gender p Value	Educational level Statistic Value	Educational level p Value	Country of origin Statistic Value	Country of origin p Value	Performance of social activity Statistic Value	Performance of social activity p Value	Number of exclusion criteria
1 Sincere	53,32	37,838	-,173	0,299	0,263	0,215	0,374	0,158	0,266	0,258	0,048	0,084	0,949	0,115	0,287	3
2 Selfless	60,32	39,946	-,551	0,269	0,611	0,206	0,473	0,193	0,055	0,266	0,030	0,169	0,184	0,123	0,214	1
3 Humanitarian	90,69	15,432	-3,211	0,267	0,625	0,246	0,117	0,160	0,238	0,220	0,270	0,177	0,128	0,116	0,271	0
4 Charitable	81,87	23,150	-1,646	0,233	0,919	0,246	0,120	0,151	0,326	0,282	0,010	0,141	0,457	0,110	0,330	1
5 Protective	63,41	31,977	-,584	0,313	0,144	0,238	0,170	0,202	0,033	0,287	0,007	0,127	0,607	0,084	0,609	1
6 Ecologist	66,59	30,631	-,757	0,278	0,496	0,243	0,139	0,204	0,030	0,208	0,408	0,188	0,081	0,111	0,317	0
7 Special	62,98	34,216	-,589	0,342	0,024	0,292	0,007	0,217	0,012	0,296	0,003	0,151	0,341	0,053	0,898	2
8 Engaged	78,44	26,538	-1,540	0,325	0,068	0,243	0,136	0,130	0,551	0,218	0,286	0,185	0,086	0,163	0,035	0
9 Inclusive	53,64	34,481	-,168	0,296	0,275	0,304	0,003	0,124	0,634	0,281	0,010	0,239	0,003	0,044	0,948	5
10 Enthusiastic	57,20	34,648	-,332	0,283	0,425	0,237	0,175	0,144	0,397	0,300	0,002	0,213	0,017	0,059	0,857	1
11 Responsible	72,44	30,512	-1,059	0,290	0,360	0,217	0,361	0,152	0,323	0,213	0,355	0,183	0,102	0,130	0,167	0
12 Understanding	60,60	34,665	-,489	0,317	0,113	0,231	0,228	0,188	0,073	0,288	0,006	0,233	0,004	0,117	0,270	2
13 Generous	86,73	21,274	-2,356	0,211	0,982	0,212	0,402	0,163	0,208	0,191	0,589	0,184	0,089	0,039	0,966	0
14 Hopeful	61,34	32,668	-,468	0,291	0,340	0,237	0,176	0,190	0,062	0,240	0,122	0,187	0,080	0,117	0,261	0
15 Kind	84,78	21,608	-2,177	0,255	0,764	0,202	0,525	0,187	0,075	0,145	0,950	0,130	0,571	0,094	0,496	0
16 Noble	69,45	32,318	-,892	0,303	0,218	0,236	0,185	0,156	0,281	0,234	0,159	0,165	0,216	0,098	0,452	0
17 Respectful	66,02	33,915	-,730	0,284	0,430	0,177	0,780	0,148	0,355	0,275	0,017	0,273	0,001	0,189	0,007	2
18 Optimistic	54,85	35,407	-,227	0,335	0,037	0,174	0,806	0,144	0,392	0,234	0,158	0,139	0,465	0,161	0,039	2
19 Empathetic	69,60	31,746	-,887	0,269	0,607	0,321	0,001	0,160	0,235	0,289	0,006	0,174	0,149	0,071	0,748	2
20 Positive	62,57	33,863	-,568	0,310	0,161	0,239	0,158	0,174	0,135	0,206	0,418	0,139	0,472	0,161	0,039	0
21 Helpful	86,73	21,992	-2,289	0,226	0,946	0,220	0,319	0,195	0,048	0,146	0,943	0,173	0,149	0,076	0,697	0
22 Tireless	51,32	36,440	-,100	0,299	0,260	0,276	0,023	0,147	0,367	0,203	0,460	0,221	0,011	0,046	0,940	3
23 Modest	39,01	36,547	,394	0,343	0,022	0,153	0,931	0,160	0,239	0,253	0,063	0,165	0,209	0,089	0,555	3
24 Reliable	56,73	35,022	-,292	0,283	0,436	0,227	0,254	0,120	0,680	0,254	0,059	0,204	0,033	0,079	0,666	0
25 Honest	58,51	36,208	-,390	0,296	0,291	0,203	0,512	0,162	0,225	0,282	0,010	0,140	0,458	0,057	0,875	2
26 Supportive	88,27	20,850	-2,604	0,268	0,623	0,185	0,712	0,162	0,225	0,170	0,806	0,120	0,683	0,056	0,880	0
27 Charismatic	59,73	34,066	-,439	0,278	0,495	0,228	0,246	0,133	0,526	0,165	0,844	0,178	0,125	0,094	0,492	0
28 Sensitive	76,91	27,593	-1,387	0,294	0,311	0,184	0,721	0,223	0,008	0,194	0,561	0,101	0,856	0,110	0,334	1
29 Equitable	61,84	32,912	-,504	0,233	0,918	0,167	0,858	0,182	0,094	0,180	0,715	0,146	0,392	0,067	0,788	0
30 Collaborative	86,14	20,451	-2,167	0,233	0,920	0,217	0,359	0,217	0,013	0,215	0,332	0,134	0,532	0,116	0,276	0

Source: authors own creation.

In short, the results of table 3 show that the evaluation of the attributes *Special, Inclusive and Empathetic* statistically (p<0.01) depend on the age variable. Regarding gender, the results show that the intensity of the statistical dependency is significant (p<0.01) for the attribute *Sensitive.*

In terms of the results obtained in the analysis of the variable educational level, they show how the assessment of the attributes *Charitable, Protective, Special, Inclusive, Enthusiast, Understanding, Empathetic and Honest* depends in a statistically significant manner (p<0.01) on this variable.

Regarding occupation, results show that this variable does not indicate any statistically significant relation in the assessment of any attribute (p>0.01), namely, the assessment of attributes is independent from the labour conditions of respondents.
In the variable of respondents linkage to social activities, the results show that there is only a statistically significant relation of this variable (p<0.01) in the assessment of the attribute *Respectful.*

Based on the results obtained and the inclusion/ exclusion criteria of the attributes in the definition of a personality with a marked social component, we exclude the attributes from the process of structuring the dimension of social responsibility when their assessment depends (statistically significant relation p<0.01) on the levels or categories of any of the variables associated with the personal characteristics of the subjects, or when their assessment is exiguous, namely, not pertinent or when the extreme variability of its assessment makes it an unstable trait. Table 4 shows the attributes excluded as well as the number of exclusion criteria met by each attribute.

Table 4. *List of attributes excluded from the process of structuring the dimension of the personality with the social responsibility component.*

Adjective	Number of exclusion criteria
Sincere	3
Selfless	1
Charitable	1
Protective	1
Special	2
Inclusive	5
Enthusiastic	1
Understanding	2
Respectful	2
Optimistic	2
Empathetic	2
Tireless	3
Modest	3
Honest	2
Sensitive	1

Source: authors own creation.

Thus, from the results obtained, it is deduced that the attributes that should be included in the structuring of the dimension of the socially responsible personality include:

— Humanitarian	— Hopeful	— Reliable
— Ecologist	— Kind	— Supportive
— Engaged	— Noble	— Charismatic
— Responsible	— Positive	— Equitable
— Generous	— Helpful	— Collaborative

4. Discussion and conclusions

The brand personality is a key concept in the business management that can be used to create a competitive differentiation. Therefore, currently the study of brand personality has led different authors to study the different elements that strengthen said construct, providing not only a greater relevance, but also formalising and updating it. In this sense and according to Freling *et al.* (2011) there exist a series of benefits that result from the fact of having a favourable brand personality such as the improvement of the attitudes towards the brand and the increase of purchase intentions and the levels of reliability and loyalty from the consumer. Thus, a brand that is conceived from the relational perspective will improve the client capacity to interpret and process its information, will increase the trust in the purchase decision and will improve the quality of the experience of the user in relation to the brand; in short, the brand will generate value for the manufacturer (Aaker and Álvarez del Blanco, 2014). In the study of the brand personality is important to know how bonds of value are created between brands and their audience; in the current context it is important that these bonds are established and based on the definition of brand containing a high social and environmental sensitivity.

Up until today, the prevalent model about brand personality is based on the dimensions of brand personality proposed by Aaker (1997), where there is not explicitly detected any element that allows to describe a brand personality with a component of social responsibility. There are several authors that have studied brand personality from different perspectives and even have validated the model of the author in different contexts, adding new elements and even proposing different models (Delgado, 2014; Geuens, Weijters and De Wulf, 2009; Goñi *et al.,* 2013; Japutra and Molinillo, 2017; Kim *et al.,* 2013; Ortegon, 2010; Ortíz, 2013; Wang, Wang, Fang and Jiang, 2018); however, in any of those the dimension of socially responsible brand personality.

Considering the main purpose of this research is to define a socially responsible sort of brand personality, it can be concluded that this study establishes a series of features and attributes that contribute to the description of a personality with a marked tendency towards social engagement. The application of these attributes to the brand management represents a very relevant contribution within the current context of the society, because, as Sachs and Vilà (2015) say, today the society is living an era based on sustainability. The results of the research allow to conclude there are fifteen traits or attributes that contribute in the construction of a brand image with a high social sensitivity. These attributes are: Humanitarian, Ecologist, Engaged, Responsible, Generous, Hopeful, Kind, Noble, Positive, Helpful, Reliable, Supportive, Charismatic, Equitable and Collaborative. The first hypothesis presented in this study is therefore, accepted. Furthermore, the statistical analysis of the independence of the assessment of these attributes from the demographic and social characteristics of the respondents, allows to obtain the quantitative arguments that also support the second hypothesis formulated.

Considering that the assessment of these traits or attributes is independent from the demographic and social characteristics of respondents, it can be said that the socially responsible dimension suggested has some features that, when transferred to the brand personality, are exempt of the contextual influence of the audience and, additionally, it can be concluded that said adjectives or attributes can help brand managers to incorporate them in their definition and strategies to achieve that brands are identified, differentiated and positioned as socially responsible brands.

The results obtained in this study are relevant from the perspective of business management because in the current competitive context, marked by the management of sustainability, the construction of a strong brand is a core element of the corporate strategy of any organisation. In this context and according to Manzano *et al.* (2013), we consider that the appropriate management is an intangible asset, like the brand, in such a way that it gets difficult to imitate by competitors, turning into a core pillar upon which most of the success of the company will support. Thus, another of the contributions of this study are the theoretical contributions related to the management of the brands with an accentuated social and environmental sensitivity. The incorporation of these traits will contribute to establishing more durable relationships between the manufacturer and its public, because their assessment by consumers is relevant in their decision making process.

In addition, according to Aldás (2013), we consider that the initiatives on social corporate responsibility can influence in the brand value of companies. To do so, the communication must project a socially driven behaviour and it must be identified by the consumer. The results of this study allow to identify the attributes that can compose a dimension of the brand personality denoting a positive brand attitude before the current needs of the social context. Moreover, if we also consider that a great number of consumers today make their purchase decisions based on the assessments of the contributions of the brands to sustainability, the relevance of these attributes is even higher.

One of the limitations of this study is determined by the fact it was conducted in a Spanish speaking context. Therefore, we deem important to consider its application on populations with different cultural traits, in order to generalise to what extent (or not) these attributes describe, in other contexts, the personality of the brand with socially responsible features.

5. References

Aaker, D. A. y Álvarez del Blanco, R. M. (2014). Las Marcas según Aaker: 20 principios para conseguir el éxito. Empresa Activa (Urano). http://cataleg.uab.cat/record=b1931861~S1*cat

Aaker, J. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 34, 347. https://doi.org/10.2307/3151897

Ahmad, A. & Thyagaraj, K. S. (2017). An empirical comparison of two brand personality scales: Evidence from India. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services,* 36 (January), 86-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.01.006

AMA. (2015). Common Language in Marketing. http://marketing-dictionary.org/ama

Ato, M., López, J. y Benavente, A. (2013). Un sistema de clasificación de los diseños de investigación en psicología Introducción Un marco conceptual para la investigación empírica en psicología. *Anales de Psicología,* 29, 1038-1059. http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/167/16728244043.pdf

Becker-Olsen, K. L., Cudmore, B. A. & Hill, R. P. (2006). The impact of perceived corporate social responsibility on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research, 59*(1), 46-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.01.001

Casanoves, J. (2017). Fundamentos de Branding. Claves para construir una marca poderosa. Profit Editorial. www.profiteditorial.com

CEPAL (2018). Agenda 2030 y los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible, Una oportunidad para América Latina y el Caribe. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Chu, S.-C. & Sung, Y. (2011). Brand personality dimensions in China. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 17*(3), 163-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527260903387931

Cochran, P. L. (2007). The evolution of corporate social responsibility. *Business Horizons, 50*(6), 449-454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2007.06.004

Cuevas Moreno, R. (2011). Las dimensiones de la responsabilidad social de las empresas: una guía de lectura para su estudio, *Revista Facultad de Ciencias Económicas: Investigación y Reflexión, XIX*(1), 7-26. http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=4239475

Delgado, C. (2014). La Personalidad de Marca de las Organizaciones No Lucrativas: Medición y Análisis de la Personalidad de Marca de las ONL Internacionales en el Perú. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.

Díaz de Rada, V. (2012). Ventajas e inconvenientes de la encuesta por internet. *Papers, 97*(1), 193-223. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/papers/v97n1.71

Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B. & Sen, S. (2007). Reaping relational rewards from corporate social responsibility: The role of competitive positioning. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 24*(3), 224-241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2007.01.001

Dueñas Ocampo, S., Perdomo-Ortiz, J. y Villa Castaño, L. E. (2014). El concepto de consumo socialmente responsable y su medición. Una revisión de la literatura. *Estudios Gerenciales, 30*(132), 287-300. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.estger.2014.01.022

Faircloth, J. B., Capella., L. M. & Alford, B. L. (2001). The effect of brand attitude and brand imge on brand equity.pdf. *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice, 9*(3).

Freling, T. H., Crosno, J. L. & Henard, D. H. (2011). Brand personality appeal: Conceptualization and empirical validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39*(3), 392-406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0208-3

Geuens, M., Weijters, B. & De Wulf, K. (2009). A new measure of brand personality. International *Journal of Research in Marketing, 26*(2), 97-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2008.12.002

Goñi, N., Torres, E. y Aguilera, S. (2013). Dimensiones de la personalidad de la marca en México. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales, XIX*(2), 213-225.

Hair, J., Tatham, R., Anderson, R., Black, W. & Babin, B. (2005). Multivariate data analysis. Pearson Prentice Hall. http://cataleg.uab.cat/record=b1694281~S1*cat

Hildebrand, D., Demotta, Y., Sen, S. & Valenzuela, A. (2017). Consumer responses to corporate social responsibility (CSR) contribution type. *Journal of Consumer Research, 44*(4), 738-758. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx063

Hoeffler, S. & Keller, K. L. (2002). Building Brand Equity Through Corporate Societal Marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 21*(1), 78-89. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.21.1.78.17600

ISO (2018). Brand evaluation - Principles and fundamentals. https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:20671:dis:ed-1:v1:en

Japutra, A. & Molinillo, S. (2017). Responsible and active brand personality: On the relationships with brand experience and key relationship constructs. *Journal of Business Research,* (August), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.08.027

Kahn, M. E. (2015). A Review of The Age of Sustainable Development by Jeffrey Sachs. *Journal of Economic Literature, 53*(3), 654-666. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.53.3.654

Keller, K. L. & Lehman, D. R. (2006). Brands and Branding: Research Findings and Future Priorities. *Marketing Science, 25*(6), 740-759. https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.l050.0153

Kim, Y. K., Shim, S. W. & Dinnie, K. (2013). The Dimensions of Nation Brand Personality: A Study of Nine Countries. *Corporate Reputation Review, 16*(1), 34-47. https://doi.org/10.1057/crr.2012.22

Kotler, P., Kartajaya, H. & Setiawan, I. (2010). *Marketing 3.0.* Ediciones de la U, Ed.

Lam, R. (2005). Metodología para la confección de un proyecto de investigación. *Revista Cubana de Hematología, Inmunología y Hemoterapia,* 21. http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0864-02892005000200007&lng=es&nrm=iso

Madden, T. J., Roth, M. S. & Dillon, W. R. (2012). Global Product Quality and Corporate Social Responsibility Perceptions: A Cross-National Study of Halo Effects. *Journal of International Marketing, 20*(1), 42-57. https://doi.org/10.1509/jim.11.0016

Madrigal, R. & Boush, D. M. (2008). Social responsibility as a unique dimension of brand personality and consumers' willingness to reward. *Psychology and Marketing, 25*(6), 538-564. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20224

Manzano, J. A., Simó, L. A. y Pérez, R. C. (2013). La responsabilidad social como creadora de valor de marca: El efecto moderador de la atribución de objetivos. *Revista Europea de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa, 22(*1), 21-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redee.2011.09.001

Mayorga, J. (2017). Personalidad de la marca socialmente responsable. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. http://hdl.handle.net/10803/456576

Mayorga, J. y Añaños, E. (2018). Identificación de atributos comunicacionales para la construcción de una imagen empresarial socialmente responsable en la Sociedad del Conocimiento. En Asociación Española de Investigación de la Comunicación (Ed.), 'Comunicación y Conocimiento' - Libro de comunicaciones. Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de la AE-IC (pp. 2482-2500). Salamanca: Asociación Española de Investigación de la Comunicación. Recuperado a partir de http://ae-ic.org/final/Libro de Comunicaciones del VI congreso AE-IC.pdf

Newholm, T. & Shaw, D. (2007). Studying the ethical consumer: a review of research. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 6*(5), 253-270. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.225

Orteg, L. (2010). Panorama actual de los métodos de medición de marcas y valor de marca desde la orientación al consumidor, *Poliantea, 6*(11), 171-188.

Ortíz, R. (2013). El Efecto De La Imagen Del País De Origen Y La Personalidad De Marca En La Intención De Compra: Un Estudio Transcultural. UNIVERSIDAD DEL TURABO. http://ut.suagm.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/Centro-Estudios-Doctorales/Tesis_Doctorales/2014/ROrtiz.pdf

RAE (2016). Diccionario de la lengua española. www.rae.es

Rivera, J. J., Bigne, E. y Curras-Pérez, R. (2016). Efectos de la responsabilidad social corporativa sobre la satisfacción del consumidor con la marca. *Spanish Journal of Marketing - ESIC, 20*(2), 104-114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjme.2016.06.002

Sachs, J. y Vilà, R. (2015). Introducción al desarrollo sostenible. En La Era del Desarrollo Sostenible, Nuestro futuro está en juego: incorporemos el desarrollo sostenible a la agenda política mundial (p. 606). https://www.planetadelibros.com/libros_contenido_extra/31/30978_La_era_del_desarrollo_sostenible.pdf

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. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.38.2.225.18838

Wang, X., Wang, X., Fang, X. & Jiang, Q. (2018). Power distance belief and brand personality evaluations. *Journal of Business Research, 84*(November 2017), 89-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.11.011

Wartick, S. & Cochran, P. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of management review, 10*(4), 758-769.

AUTHORS:

Javier Andrés Mayorga Gordillo
Department of Marketing. Universidad Autónoma de Occidente. Colombia.
Latest publications: - Book chapter: *Comunicación Experiencial, el nuevo rol de la Gestión Estratégica de Comunicación* (ISBN-13:978-84-16458-82-0/D.L.: TF-1149-2017 / DOI (del libro): 10.4185/129) http://www.revistalatinacs.org/17SLCS/2017_libro/016_Mayorga.pdf. - *El Factor Humano, el punto de contacto más relevante de la comunicación corporativa en la actualidad - Revista Questiones Publicitarias* – UAB: http://www.questionespublicitarias.es/article/view/v1-n21-mayorga. - *Identificación de atributos comunicacionales para la construcción de una imagen empresarial socialmente responsable en la Sociedad del Conocimiento. Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de la AE-IC, Comunicación y Conocimiento.* https://ddd.uab.cat/record/191673?ln=ca / ISBN: 978-84-09-03393-5 http://ae-ic.org/final/Libro%20de%20Comunicaciones%20del%20VI%20congreso%20AE-IC.pdf. **Awards**: - First prize. *Degustaciones – Ciclo de Eventos Jóvenes. Asociación de Organizadores de Fiestas, Reuniones Empresariales y Proveedores de la República Argentina*, Buenos Aires. 17 April 2007. - Winning project. *Semana de proyectos jóvenes de investigación y creación. Universidad de Palermo.* Buenos Aires, Argentina. First quarter of 2007.
jmayorga@uao.edu.co
Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3094-7951

Elena Añaños Carrasco
Department of Advertisement, Public Relations and Audiovisual Communication. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona: Spain.
Latest publications: - Article: Añaños, E. (2018). *El efecto del aroma en la intención de compra de un paquete vacacional. Disertaciones. Anuario electrónico de estudios en Comunicación Social*. 11. p. 150 – 168. - Book chapter: Mayorga, J. & Añaños, E. (2018). *Identificación de atributos comunicacionales para la construcción de una imagen empresarial socialmente responsable en la Sociedad del Conocimiento. VV.AA. Comunicación y Conocimiento. - ed. Salamanca. Asociación Española de Investigación de la Comunicación*; p. 2482 - 2500. - Article: Astals, A. & Añaños, E. (2017). *Estudi amb la tecnologia de l'eye tracking de l'atenció visual dispensada a la publicitat gràfica no comercial: "Vine a donar sang". Comunicació. Revista de recerca i d'Anàlisi*. 34. p. 9 – 32. - Article: Jauset-Berrocal, J. A., Martínez, I. & Añaños, E. (2017). Music learning and education: contributions from neuroscience. Cultura y Educación. 29. p. 833 – 847. - Book chapter: Añaños, E. & Grau, A. (2017). *Efectos de la publicidad basada en la imagen corporal en mujeres con y sin trastorno de la conducta alimentaria (TCA: Estudio comparativo. La omnipresencia de la imagen. Estudios interdisciplinares de la cultura visual.* 1 ed. Madrid. Global Knowledge Academics; p. 299 - 316. - Book chapter: Rodríguez-Muñoz, L. & Añaños, E. (2017). *Los valores percibidos por los adolescentes en las diferentes categorías de la publicidad de productos de alimentación. La omnipresencia de la imagen. Estudios interdisciplinares de la cultura audiovisual.* 1 ed. Madrid. Global Knowledge Academics; p. 317 - 340. - Article: Zhang, B., Añaños, E. & Zhang, M. (2016). Effectiveness of the Auditory and Visual effects of Chinese e-Magazine on the Graduate Students' Reading Process. *Analisi. Quaderns de Comunicació i Cultura*. 54. p. 58 – 74. - Article: 2015. Neuriscience and advertising. Attention, Emotion and its relationship to the spots awarded at the international advertising festival in Cannes. *Analisi*. - Article: Añaños, E. (2015). *Adultos mayores y publicidad integrada en TV: atención sin procesamiento. UAB Divulga. Revista digital*. http://www.uab.cat/web/detalle-noticia-1345680342040.html?noticiaid=1345693354029 - Article: Añaños, E. (2015). EyeTracker Technology

in Elderly People: How Integrated Television Content is Paid Attention to and Processed. *Comunicar*. 45. p. 75 – 83. - Article: Añaños, E. & Oliver, A. (2015). *Atención y atención conjunta a los spots de TV. Estudio con la tecnología del eye tracker. Gráfica*. 3. p. 103 – 114. - Article: Mas-Manchón, L., Rodríguez-Bravo, A., Montoya-Vilar, N., Morales-Morante, F., Lopes, E., Añaños, E., Peres, R., Martínez, M.E. & Grau, A. (2015). *Valores percibidos en la publicidad de alimentos por parte de jóvenes con y sin trastornos de la conducta alimentaria. Salud Colectiva*. 11. p. 423 – 444. - Book chapter: Zhang, B.; Añaños, E. (2014). Study on eye tracking technique: do digital media influence reading comprehension? Javier Sierra Sánchez & Francisco García García (Coord.). *Tecnología y narrativa audiovisual.* 1 ed. Madrid. Fragua; p. 525 - 540. 978-84-7074-627-7. - Article: Añaños, E. & Astals, A. (2013). *¿Imagen o texto? El poder de captar la atención de los elementos gráficos analizado con el Eye Tracker. Gráfica.* 1. p. 87 – 98. **Ongoing research projects**: - 2017SGR0117. *Grup de Recerca en Publicitat i Comunicació Radiofònica (Publiradio). Agència de Gestió d'Ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca.* Convocation to fund research groups conducting studies in Catalonia in the different scientific areas in order to promote their activity, scientific, economic and social impact, as well as to foster the international projection of their research. Perona Páez, Juan José. *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona* (UAB). 01/01/2017 - 31/12/2020. **Awards**: - Lòpez Salas, Sandra. Award to the best End of Course Thesis on Gender Perspective of the graduate studies on Advertising and Public Relations of UAB of the school year 2016-17. *Redes sociales y marcas deportivas: ¿en fuera de género? 28/11/2017.* - Serra Vinardell, Clàudia. Award to the best End of Course Thesis on Gender Perspective of the graduate studies on Advertising and Public Relations of UAB of the school year 2015-16. *Obsesión 90-60-90. Relación entre la publicidad y la percepción de la imagen corporal en las adolescentes.* 29/11/2016. - Teruel, Anna. Award to the best End of Course Thesis on Gender Perspective of the graduate studies on Audiovisual Communication of UAB of the school year 2015-16 *Estereotipos de género en los informativos de televisión: ¿existen unos patrones fijos en los profesionales que los presentan?* 29/11/2016. - Añaños, E. & Valli, A. (2012). FINALIST FOR IAB Europe's Research Awards, CATEGORY AD EFFECTIVENESS.TV Integrated Advertising: Conscious and unconscious processing and effectiveness in young and senior targets. 25/04/2012.

elena.ananos@uab.cat
Orcid ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9893-6848