

EFFECTS OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ON CONSUMER CREDIBILITY PERCEPTION AND ATTITUDE TOWARD LUXURY BRANDS

YOUNG-JU JIN
Ewha Womans University
SUK-CHUL PARK
Hanyang University
JAE-WOONG YOO
Eulji University

We examined the effect of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on consumer behavior in relation to luxury brands. We adopted a 2×3 factorial design to examine 2 product types (rational and emotional) and 3 types of CSR activities (donations, employee volunteering, and nonperformance of CSR) to examine the effects of the CSR activities of a company manufacturing a luxury brand on consumers' perceptions of that company's credibility and the consumers' brand attitudes. The results showed that after CSR exposure there was no significant difference for the three measures, regardless of product type or CSR activity. However, we found statistically significant differences in brand attitude and perception of credibility when companies did not engage in CSR activities.

Keywords: luxury goods, corporate social responsibility, corporate credibility, brand attitude.

The luxury goods market worldwide grew at the rate of 7% annually between 1995 and 2013, earning total revenue of €217 billion (US\$240 billion) in 2013, and it has been suggested in predictions that this market will grow at a 9% annual rate through to 2020 (D'Arpizio, Levato, Zito, & Ile de Montgolfier, 2014). The continued worldwide growth of the luxury market has prompted researchers

Young-Ju Jin, Entrepreneurship Center, Ewha Womans University; Suk-Chul Park, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Hanyang University; Jae-Woong Yoo, Department of Public Relations and Design, Eulji University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jae-Woong Yoo, Eulji University, Department of Public Relations and Design, 461-713, 212 Yangji-dong, Sujeong-gu, Seongnam-si, Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea. Email: yoojw777@hanmail.net

to conduct numerous studies on luxury-good consumption. The general trend in research from a marketing standpoint has been to investigate the factors influencing consumer preferences and characteristics, or to investigate the effects of these factors on attitudes toward, or behaviors in regard to, consumption of luxury goods (e.g., Chandon, Laurent, & Valette-Florence, 2016; Kapferer & Laurent, 2016; Zhang & Kim, 2013).

In contrast to the traditional product-related factors that have influenced consumers' opinions of companies in the past, consumers now increasingly emphasize facets of corporate social responsibility (CSR) as important factors in their purchasing decisions (Dawkins & Lewis, 2003). With this increasing emphasis, CSR has recently emerged as an important issue in the business community (Golob, Lah, & Jančič, 2008).

Indeed, the results of a McKinsey & Company global survey showed that 76% of executives believed that CSR contributes positively to long-term shareholder value, and 55% of them agreed that sustainability helps their companies build a strong reputation (McKinsey & Company, 2010). Regardless of the growing importance of CSR for the business community, few researchers have examined interactions between CSR effects and product types (Torelli, Monga, & Kaikati, 2012).

Our purpose in this study was to conduct a comparative analysis of the effects of CSR on consumer perceptions of corporate credibility and consumer attitudes toward luxury brands in terms of the differences among product types and forms of CSR activity.

Luxury Goods and Consumer Behavior

Luxury goods or *status goods* are defined as products of particular brands, the mere use or display of which confers prestige on the owner, apart from any functional utility (Grossman & Shapiro, 1988). The luxury concept is associated with the truly exceptional, be it in terms of rarity, quality, raw components, craftsmanship, or other aspects (Wiedmann, Hennigs, & Siebels, 2009), all of which leads to a high price for the product (Kapferer & Laurent, 2016).

Previous researchers on luxury goods and consumer behavior have typically focused on which consumer segment purchases the items, what accounts for their preferences, and the characteristics of these consumers (e.g., Chandon et al., 2016; Kapferer & Laurent, 2016; Zhang & Kim, 2013). With regard to purchasing motivation and market characteristics, Dubois and Duquesne (1993) proposed that many consumers purchase luxury goods primarily to satisfy an appetite for symbolic meaning. Nia and Zaichkowsky (2000) similarly concluded that individuals use status goods as symbols to communicate meaning about themselves to their reference groups. Zhang and Kim (2013) found that brand consciousness, social comparison, and fashion innovation had a significant

impact on attitude toward purchase of luxury fashion goods among Chinese consumers.

Corporate Social Responsibility and Consumer Attitudes Toward Luxury Goods

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) does not have a consistent or agreed-upon definition (Amin-Chaudhry, 2016). Mackey, Mackey, and Barney (2007) defined CSR as voluntary corporate actions designed to improve social conditions; Ward, Wilson, and Zarsky (2007) proposed that “CSR can be defined as the overall contribution of business to sustainable development” (p. 1); and the Australian Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility (2011) judged the best definition of CSR as being the one set out in the Guidance Standard on Social Responsibility (ISO 26000) of the International Organization for Standardization (2010). This defines CSR as “the responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities on society and the environment, through transparent and ethical behavior that contributes to sustainable development including the health and the welfare of society, takes into account the expectations of stakeholders, is in compliance with applicable law and consistent with international norms of behavior, and is integrated throughout the organization and practiced in its relationships” (p. 200).

As a symbolic activity demonstrating a corporation’s fulfillment of a social duty beyond the pursuit of profit, most researchers have found CSR to have a positive influence on consumer attitudes and behavioral intentions with regard to a company or brand (e.g., Klein & Dawar, 2004; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Communication of CSR activities not only boosts consumers’ purchase intentions but also enhances their evaluations of the company or brand (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Further, CSR can elicit a more favorable response by consumers to events supported by the company (Lichtenstein, Drumwright, & Braig, 2004), can increase consumer loyalty and advocacy behaviors (Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2007), and may even result in a less severe shareholder or public response to crisis events involving the company (Klein & Dawar, 2004). Conversely, consumers tend to adopt a negative perspective toward companies that are perceived as uncaring, neglectful of social issues, or focused solely on profit (Mullen, 1997).

In line with these findings, many companies have been directing increased attention to, and investment in, CSR. In South Korea, CSR spending has shown a pattern of continual increase. In a study of CSR spending conducted by the Federation of Korean Industries (2012) with the country’s top 500 companies, it was found that the 222 companies that replied had spent approximately US\$3.12 billion on CSR in 2011. This represents an increase of around 8.7% from the US\$2.87 billion recorded in 2010, and around 17.8% from the US\$2.65 billion

recorded in 2009. As South Korean businesses have increased their interest and investment in CSR, foreign luxury brands in the South Korean market have shown low levels of CSR investment in their marketing activities, prompting critics in the South Korean press to accuse these foreign businesses of focusing more on their own profits than on social responsibility (Kim, 2014).

In summary, numerous previous researchers have reported CSR as having a positive effect on consumer attitudes and behaviors toward the companies in question and their products (e.g., Du et al., 2007; Klein & Dawar, 2004; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). In view of the criticisms that have been directed toward certain manufacturers of luxury brands with regard to their low level of CSR investment, we predicted a negative effect on consumer attitude toward those brands. Accordingly, we proposed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Corporate social responsibility by manufacturers of luxury brands will have a positive effect on consumer perception of their corporate credibility, whereas nonperformance of corporate social responsibility by manufacturers of luxury brands will have a negative effect.

Hypothesis 2: Corporate social responsibility by manufacturers of luxury brands will have a positive effect on consumers' brand attitude, whereas nonperformance of corporate social responsibility by manufacturers of luxury brands will have a negative effect.

We also examined the differences in consumer behavior associated with different forms of CSR and different products. In a study of CSR activities by South Korea's major corporations (Federation of Korean Industries, 2012) it was found that CSR activities consisted mainly of donations and directly administered volunteer programs. For our study, we considered two main types of CSR activities, donations of financial and material assistance, and directly administered volunteer programs.

In terms of product type, the typical approach has been to distinguish *high-involvement* and *low-involvement* types (e.g., Zaichkowsky, 1985); in the case of luxury goods, the importance of consumer interest and purchasing has resulted in research being restricted to high-involvement items. For this study, we examined product types with a Foote, Cone, and Belding CB grid model applying two forms, *high-involvement rational* and *high-involvement emotional*. To examine the differences in consumer response by CSR activity and product type, we proposed the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: The effects of corporate social responsibility performed by manufacturers of luxury brands on consumer response will differ according to type of activity (i.e., donation, volunteer service, or nonperformance of corporate social responsibility).

Method

Stimuli

We adopted a 2×3 factorial design, with two forms of product (rational and emotional) and three forms of CSR (donation, volunteer service, and nonperformance). For products, we selected basic materials from issues published between November 2013 and January 2014 of *Luxury*, a monthly Korean luxury-product magazine (<http://luxury.designhouse.co.kr>) published by Design House. Examination of the materials yielded 45 examples of accessories presented in the magazine, 39 for cosmetics, 27 for clothing, 15 for bags, 12 for automobiles, 13 for electronic appliances, 13 for daily items, eight for furniture, six for perfume/cologne, six for alcoholic beverages, and two for sound equipment. Through discussion with three people, each of whom had over 15 years experience of working in the advertising and public relations sectors, we selected automobiles as an example of a rational product and bags as an example of an emotional product.

Participants and Measurement of Perceived Luxury

We asked 35 undergraduate students, age range = 19 to 27 years, $M = 8.7$, $SD = 1.9$; women, $n = 19$ (54.3%), men, $n = 16$ (45.7%) at universities in the Seoul area to assess 12 automobiles and 15 bags on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *would never agree* to 9 = *very much agree*, developed by Choi, Hong, and Lee (2010) to measure perceived luxury.

This measure was designed to analyze the structure of luxury goods in terms of functional, emotional, and symbolic components, with four factors used for the functional aspect, high quality, high price, unique design, luxury sales environment; three for the emotional aspect, artisanal spirit, very important person (VIP) service, high social standing; and two for the symbolic aspect, brand legacy and brand recognition. Two or three items were developed to measure each factor. For the functional measure of quality, respondents were asked to state their level of agreement with three statements: "The brand has superior quality," "The brand uses superior materials," and "The brand uses the highest quality fabric." For price, the statements read "The product is very high-end," "The product has a high price," and "The product is not in a price range that anyone could afford." For design, the statements read "The product has a unique design that people would recognize," "The product was designed by a designer with a reputation in the artistic community," and "The product has a unique brand image." For the factor of luxury sales environment, the statements read "The product has an exclusive sales outlet at a well-known department store," and "The product has a sales outlet in a department store's 'brand-name' section." For the emotional component, artisanal spirit was examined with the respondent's level of agreement to two items: "The product is produced using

traditional methods,” and “The product reflects a technician’s expertise.” For VIP service, the statements read “The brand is recognized for its friendly response to customer complaints (including after-sales service and returns) and professional treatment of customers,” and “The brand’s sales staff provide customers with the best treatment.” For high social standing, the statements read “The brand reflects the user’s high social status,” and “The brand makes me feel like I belong to the same group as people who use the product.” In terms of the symbolic component, brand legacy was measured according to the responses to three statements: “The product could be passed down to the next generation,” “I could use the product for a long time,” and “The value of the product would not change even if it were used for a long time.” For brand recognition, the statements read “The product’s name would be recognized by anyone” and “Others who saw the product would easily recognize which brand I own.” The results showed Mercedes-Benz to be the top-ranked automobile with a score of 8.7, and Cartier to be the top-ranked bag with a score of 8.3.

For CSR type, we composed mock newspaper articles for the three categories of donations, employee volunteering, and nonperformance of CSR. As the products were divided into rational and emotional types, six experimental stimuli were developed, with three each for the rational product (the Mercedes Benz automobile) and the emotional product (the Cartier bag). The articles were written to differ in message content but to be otherwise identical in terms of length, layout, and photographs, and the copy was written in a similar style in order to eliminate the potential effects of factors other than CSR type. All articles used as stimuli were examined and revised by a professor with experience in newspaper journalism and an advertising professor with years of experience in advertisement planning and production.

Data Collection and Procedure

For the study, we selected a specialist firm with a strong history of online survey experience to administer a web-based experiment in April 2014. For the administration of the survey, six experimental groups were established, with a distinction between two types of product (rational and emotional) and three forms of CSR (donation, volunteer service, and nonperformance of CSR).

In view of the average rate of response received by the survey firm, emails were sent to 500 people per experimental group (3,000 in total). To ensure homogeneity in the six experimental groups, each was assigned identical gender (men 50%, women 50%) and age (20–29 years, 24%; 30–39 years, 28%; 40–49 years, 28%, 50 years and over, 20%) distributions to those found in Statistics Korea’s 2010 population census, with identical conditions and procedures followed in the online survey for each group. We also took measures to ensure that the same people did not participate in more than one survey.

From the 3,000 emails sent, 1,758 responses were received, with 1,433 people taking part in the survey (35.8% rate of response). We eliminated responses from 930 people because of the requirements for quotas in terms of gender and age distribution, and we screened out 143 people who had spent less than 30% of the average time on completing their response, leaving a pool of 330 respondents who had completed the survey. A further 30 responses were discarded as unreliable (e.g., giving identical responses for multiple items), leaving a final sample of 50 per experimental group (300 in total).

Measurement of Corporate Credibility and Brand Attitude

Both perceptions of corporate credibility and brand attitude were measured with a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 9 = *strongly agree*. Corporate credibility was assessed using three items developed from the model of Dekimpe, Steenkamp, and Mellens (1997), “This company is trustworthy,” “This company is credible,” and “This company is worthy of confidence.” Attitude toward brand, which is a measure of the consumer’s general feeling toward a particular brand (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1980), was measured using items adopted from Holbrook and Batra (1987) and Simons, Correia, Carey, and Borsari (1998), “I have positive feelings toward this brand,” “This brand is useful,” “This brand is beneficial,” “This brand has value,” “This brand is satisfactory,” and “This brand is of high quality.”

Data Analysis

To test the hypotheses in this study, we used the SPSS WIN 15.0 program. The statistical significance level was set at $p < .05$. Factor analysis was performed to verify the validity of scales used in this study and to examine the reliability of the internal consistency in the survey items. A *t* test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were performed to examine the influences of luxury brand and CSR type on corporate credibility and brand attitude.

Results

Validity of Key Constructs

Exploratory factor analysis was performed to identify common factors of the scale items used in this study and to verify the validity of the variables. For analysis, a principal component analysis extraction model was applied and the Varimax rotation method was used. We used a standard Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value of 0.6 (Garson, 2013), which is regarded as strict. For communality, indicating the correlation between items, the generally used standard of .4 was applied (Field, 2000). Items that did not meet the standards were excluded. Factor loading of 0.4 or higher was regarded as indicating significant variables (Goodman, Dolan, Morrison, & Daniels, 2005). The standard for factor

Table 1. Differences in Consumers' Perceived Corporate Credibility by Luxury Brand Corporate Social Responsibility Activity Type

| Category | Dependent variable | Product type | CSR type | CSR condition | | N | M | SD | Confidence intervals | | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------|---------|------|----|----------------------|------|------|
| | | | | (1) | (2) | | | | (LL) | (UL) | |
| Corporate credibility | Emotional | Donation | Pre-CSR (1) | 50 | 6.97 | 1.22 | .812 | | | | |
| | | | Post-CSR (2) | 50 | 6.95 | 1.44 | | | | | |
| | Volunteering | Pre-CSR (1) | 50 | 6.93 | 1.16 | .718 | | | | | |
| | | Post-CSR (2) | 50 | 6.89 | 1.28 | | | | | | |
| | Nonperformance of CSR | Pre-CSR (1) | 50 | 6.80 | 1.66 | .000*** | | | | | |
| | | Post-CSR (2) | 50 | 5.90 | 1.96 | | | | | | |
| Rational | Donation | Pre-CSR (1) | 50 | 6.98 | 1.22 | .637 | | | | | |
| | | Post-CSR (2) | 50 | 6.95 | 1.29 | | | | | | |
| | Volunteering | Pre-CSR (1) | 50 | 7.39 | 1.08 | .344 | | | | | |
| | | Post-CSR (2) | 50 | 7.30 | 1.26 | | | | | | |
| | Non-CSR | Pre-CSR (1) | 50 | 6.99 | 1.01 | .000*** | | | | | |
| | | Post-CSR (2) | 50 | 5.99 | 1.29 | | | | | | |

Note. (1) Before exposure to CSR activity (pre-CSR); (2) After exposure to CSR activity (post-CSR). *** $p < .001$.

Table 2. Differences in Consumers' Brand Attitude by Luxury Brand Corporate Social Responsibility Activity Type

| Category | Dependent variable | Product type | CSR type | CSR condition | | N | M | SD | Confidence intervals | | Sig. |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|---------------|------|-------|-------|---------|----------------------|------|------|
| | | | | (1) | (2) | | | | (LL) | (UL) | |
| Brand attitude | Emotional | Donation | Pre-CSR | 50 | 6.93 | 1.35 | -.189 | .289 | .920 | | |
| | | | Post-CSR | 50 | 6.92 | 1.42 | | | | | |
| | Volunteering | Pre-CSR | 50 | 6.74 | 1.29 | -.254 | .234 | .935 | | | |
| | | Post-CSR | 50 | 6.75 | 1.50 | | | | | | |
| | Nonperformance of CSR | Pre-CSR | 50 | 6.67 | 1.32 | .435 | 1.065 | .000*** | | | |
| | | Post-CSR | 50 | 5.92 | 1.87 | | | | | | |
| Rational | Donation | Pre-CSR | 50 | 7.05 | 1.14 | -.167 | .254 | .681 | | | |
| | | Post-CSR | 50 | 7.01 | 1.19 | | | | | | |
| | Volunteering | Pre-CSR | 50 | 7.46 | 1.11 | -.016 | .290 | .079 | | | |
| | | Post-CSR | 50 | 7.32 | 1.19 | | | | | | |
| | Nonperformance of CSR | Pre-CSR | 50 | 6.95 | 1.04 | .641 | 1.319 | .000*** | | | |
| | | Post-CSR | 50 | 5.93 | 1.46 | | | | | | |

Note. (1) Before exposure to CSR activity (pre-CSR); (2) After exposure to CSR activity (post-CSR). *** $p < .001$.

extraction was set as the number of factors with an eigenvalue greater than one. The factor analysis showed ratings of 90.11% for corporate credibility and 77.53% for attitude toward the brand in extraction sums of squared loading, all of which exceeded 50%. Eigenvalues and factor loading were greater than the strict standard of 0.6 for all items, indicating their appropriateness for use as measures in our experiment. In addition, Cronbach's α scores were also used in a reliability test to confirm the internal consistency of the survey items. The examination showed scores above the widely adopted standard of .7 for both areas (.945 for corporate credibility and .941 for attitude toward brand), confirming the appropriateness and reliability of all survey items for the final analysis to proceed.

To test Hypothesis 1, we performed a *t* test on the effects of luxury brand CSR on corporate credibility. The validity of the hypotheses was examined through the mean, standard deviation, 95% confidence interval, and significance of differences before and after exposure for each variable. As shown in Table 1, no statistically significant difference was detected in pre-exposure and postexposure levels for donation CSR and volunteering CSR in the emotional condition. In the case of nonperformance of CSR, however, a statistically significant decrease was observed postexposure compared to the pre-exposure levels.

Comparison for rational/donation CSR and for rational/volunteering CSR yielded no statistically significant difference between pre-exposure and postexposure levels. In the case of rational/nonperformance, however, a statistically significant decrease was observed postexposure compared to the pre-exposure levels. Hypothesis 1 was, thus, partially supported.

As shown in Table 2, in a comparison of emotional/donation CSR and emotional/volunteering CSR, the results show there was no statistically significant difference between the pre-exposure and postexposure levels. However, compared to pre-exposure levels, a statistically significant decrease was observed postexposure to the emotional/nonperformance-of-CSR stimulus.

For rational/donation CSR and rational/volunteering CSR, no statistically significant difference was observed between pre-exposure and postexposure levels. However, compared to pre-exposure levels, a statistically significant decrease was observed postexposure to the rational/nonperformance-of-CSR stimulus. Hypothesis 2 was, thus, partially supported.

An ANOVA was performed to test for differences in consumer response by type of CSR performed by firms making luxury brands, with a Scheffé's test performed to assess the results. As shown in Table 3, higher levels of corporate credibility and more positive brand attitudes were observed for simple donations than for nonperformance of CSR, and for volunteer activities compared to nonperformance of CSR. No statistically significant difference was observed between results for the activities of donations and volunteering. Hypothesis 3 was, thus, partially supported.

Table 3. ANOVA for Consumer Response by Luxury Brand Corporate Social Responsibility Activity Type

| Dependent variable (Scheffe) | CSR Type | N | M | SD | F | Post hoc test |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----|------|------|--------|---------------|
| Corporate credibility | Donation (a) | 100 | 6.95 | 1.36 | 18.952 | a > c*** |
| | Volunteering (b) | 100 | 7.09 | 1.28 | | b > c*** |
| | Nonperformance of CSR (c) | 100 | 5.94 | 1.65 | | |
| Brand attitude | Donation (a) | 100 | 6.97 | 1.31 | 18.131 | a > c*** |
| | Volunteering (b) | 100 | 7.04 | 1.38 | | b > c*** |
| | Nonperformance of CSR (c) | 100 | 5.93 | 1.67 | | |

Note. *** $p < .001$.

Discussion

The findings of this study showed that firms making luxury brands did not necessarily achieve a positive influence on consumer response through engaging in CSR for any of the product types, but that they may encounter negative outcomes from not engaging in CSR. One of the most significant theoretical implications of our findings was the lack of any significant effect from exposure to a company's CSR activity—regardless of whether the CSR type was donation or volunteering or whether the product type was emotional or rational—on consumer perceptions of corporate credibility or on their attitude toward the brand. At the same time, statistically significant differences were recorded for both areas when companies did not engage in CSR.

In previous studies on CSR effects, the researchers have frequently concluded that such activities have a positive impact on corporate image, resulting in a halo effect that leads to positive effects on consumer perception of the brand, which ultimately results in increased purchase intentions (e.g., Du et al., 2007; Lichtenstein et al., 2004). The difference between these findings and our findings in the current study regarding CSR effects for luxury brands may be explained as follows.

Torelli et al. (2012) found that a conflict effect existed between luxury brands and CSR. In other words, because luxury brands are associated with a consumer's self-enhancement concept that differs from ordinary products, the self-transcendence concept of protecting general welfare invoked by CSR information creates a conflict between the brand and the CSR activity. This interaction effect may account for the failure of CSR performed by makers of luxury brands to exert the same positive effect on consumer attitudes that would ostensibly be found with a nonluxury brand.

In contrast, it has been found that the failure of firms making luxury brands to engage in CSR activities results in the same negative effects on consumer attitudes and behavioral intentions as occurs with nonluxury items (Mullen, 1997). The implication here may be that CSR is perceived, quite literally, as a responsibility, such that makers of brands who neglect or ignore CSR are perceived by consumers as failing to perform a basic duty, resulting in a negative effect. Although mere involvement in CSR may not necessarily lead to positive effects on consumer attitudes with regard to the brand, neglect of CSR appears to have a negative effect, suggesting that the makers of luxury brands should focus their attention on CSR, if not to improve or enhance consumer attitudes toward the brand, then at least to avoid the potential negative consequences of not engaging in CSR.

Second, we noted that consumer responses to luxury brand CSR were more positive for donation and volunteering activities than for the nonperformance condition, but the difference in response to donation and volunteering was nonsignificant. In other words, no difference was found in consumer response by CSR type. This may be attributed to the conceptual conflict associated with luxury brands and CSR as explicated in Torelli et al. (2012), such that CSR type does not exert differential effects for consumer perception of luxury brands.

In addition to the theoretical implications of our findings, there are also several practical implications. First, although no significant difference was observed between consumers' pre-exposure and postexposure responses to CSR activities of makers of luxury brands, negative press reports about a company's lack of interest in CSR may have a negative effect on consumer attitudes with regard to the brand, suggesting a need for companies making luxury brands to focus more attention on CSR in the interest of maintaining customer loyalty. These findings echo those of previous studies in which it was shown that there was a negative perception among consumers toward companies that are perceived to be uncaring or neglectful of social issues, and to be solely focused on profits (Mullen, 1997). We would, therefore, advise such companies to adopt a strategic approach of engaging in a level of CSR activity that is appropriate to the sales and profit ratio of the luxury goods in the allied market on an ongoing basis, while observing trends for the industry as a whole and the luxury-brand industry in particular.

Second, although we did not find any statistically significant difference between the effects of financial donations and volunteer activities, the latter type of activity was found to have a strong effect on consumers' perception of corporate credibility and their brand attitude. This indicates that volunteering CSR activities may be more effective in enhancing the symbolic values of corporate credibility and brand attitude for luxury products, whereas donation CSR activities may be more effective in promoting actual marketing values.

Limitation and Future Research

There are three limitations that necessitate caution in terms of interpreting or generalizing the findings of our study. First, because the products investigated were restricted to Cartier bags (emotional) and Mercedes-Benz automobiles (rational), in future studies researchers may be able to expand the interpretation and generalizability by investigating a broader range of brands. Second, in this study we adopted donation and volunteering as two representative forms of CSR for makers of luxury brands, but in future research there would be benefits from expanding the scope to a broader range of CSR types. Third, whereas the focus of the current study was on South Korean consumers, future researchers may identify significant differences in consumer characteristics by examining a wider range of consumers from different countries and cultures.

References

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Amin-Chaudhry, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility: From a mere concept to an expected business practice. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 12, 190–207. <https://doi.org/bm3p>
- Australian Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility. (2011). *Corporate social responsibility* (definition). Retrieved from www.accsr.com.au/html/definecsr.html
- Chandon, J.-L., Laurent, G., & Valette-Florence, P. (2016). Pursuing the concept of luxury: Introduction to the JBR special issue on “Luxury marketing from tradition and innovation”. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 299–303. <https://doi.org/bkq7>
- Choi, E.-J., Hong, K.-H., & Lee, Y.-J. (2010). Korean consumer’s perceptions toward luxury products [In Korean]. *Journal of Fashion Business*, 14, 195–215.
- D’Arpizio, C., Levato, F., Zito, D., & Ile de Montgolfier, J. (2014). *Luxury goods worldwide market study Fall-Winter 2014: The rise of the borderless consumer*. Paris, France: Bain & Company. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2rhgfMv>
- Dawkins, J., & Lewis, S. (2003). CSR in stakeholder expectations: And their implication for company strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, 185–193. <https://doi.org/dvqkrv>
- Dekimpe, M. G., Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., & Mellens, M. (1997). Decline and variability in brand loyalty. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 14, 405–420. <https://doi.org/dxp5hd>
- 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, 224–241. <https://doi.org/bfzc4c>
- Dubois, B., & Duquesne, P. (1993). The market for luxury goods: Income versus culture. *European Journal of Marketing*, 27, 35–44. <https://doi.org/cx6knc>
- Field, A. (2000). *Discovering statistics using SPSS for Windows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Federation of Korean Industries. (2012). *Corporate community relations white book 2012* [In Korean]. Seoul, Korea: The Federation of Korean Industries.
- Garson, G. D. (2013). *Factor analysis*. Retrieved from <https://www.2chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/factor.html>
- Golob, U., Lah, M., & Jančič, Z. (2008). Value orientations and consumer expectations of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 14, 83–96. <https://doi.org/btrmjw>

- Goodman, E., Dolan, L. M., Morrison, J. A., & Daniels, S. R. (2005). Factor analysis of clustered cardiovascular risks in adolescence. *Pediatric Cardiology, 111*, 1970–1977. <https://doi.org/bvth46>
- Grossman, G. M., & Shapiro, C. (1988). Counterfeit-product trade. *The American Economic Review, 78*, 59–75.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Batra, R. (1987). Assessing the role of emotions as mediators of consumer responses to advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research, 14*, 404–420. <https://doi.org/d449rv>
- Kapferer, J.-N., & Laurent, G. (2016). Where do consumers think luxury begins? A study of perceived minimum price for 21 luxury goods in 7 countries. *Journal of Business Research, 69*, 332–340. <https://doi.org/bkq8>
- Kim, K. D. (2014, April 13). Foreign companies ignoring CSR should be encouraged to donate through tax breaks? [In Korean]. *Financial News*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2qDCDxo>
- Klein, J., & Dawar, N. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and consumers' attributions and brand evaluations in a product-harm crisis. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 21*, 203–217. <https://doi.org/dz78k8>
- 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*, 16–32. <https://doi.org/f9pp6b>
- Mackey, A., Mackey, T. B., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and firm performance: Investor preferences and corporate strategies. *Academy of Management Review, 32*, 817–835. <https://doi.org/c4z6dw>
- McKinsey & Company. (2010). How companies manage sustainability: McKinsey global survey results. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2rlgrw1>
- Mullen, J. (1997). Performance-based corporate philanthropy: How “giving smart” can further corporate goals. *Public Relations Quarterly, 3*, 42–48.
- Nia, A., & Zaichkowsky, J. L. (2000). Do counterfeits devalue the ownership of luxury brands? *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 485–497*. <https://doi.org/bnmt5q>
- 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*, 225–243. <https://doi.org/fc2wbz>
- Simons, J., Correia, C. J., Carey, K. B., & Borsari, B. E. (1998). Validating a five-factor marijuana motives measure: Relations with use, problems, and alcohol motives. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 265–273. <https://doi.org/bpgjcn>
- Torelli, C. J., Monga, A. B., & Kaikati, A. M. (2012). Doing poorly by doing good: Corporate social responsibility and brand concepts. *Journal of Consumer Research, 38*, 948–963. <https://doi.org/fzdppb>
- Ward, H., Wilson, E., & Zarsky, L. (2007). CSR and developing countries: What scope for government action? *Sustainable Development Innovation Briefs, 1*. New York, NY: Policy Integration and Analysis Branch of the Division for Sustainable Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations.
- Wiedmann, K.-P., Hennigs, N., & Siebels, A. (2009). Value-based segmentation of luxury consumption behavior. *Psychology & Marketing, 26*, 625–651. <https://doi.org/fkgz7b>
- Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer Research, 12*, 341–352. <https://doi.org/ct3>
- Zhang, B., & Kim, J. (2013). Luxury fashion consumption in China: Factors affecting attitude and purchase intent. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 20*, 68–79. <https://doi.org/bkq9>