

CONSUMER VALUES AND THE TENDENCY TO USE THE BRAND NAME IN PURCHASE DECISIONS:

A COMPARISON BETWEEN SPAIN AND RUSSIA

FRANCISCO JOSÉ SARABIA-SÁNCHEZ, Miguel Hernández University (Spain)

LIUDMILA IVANOVNA OSTROVSKAYA, Miguel Hernández University (Spain)

This work analyses the relationship between personal consumer values and the tendency to use the brand name in consumption decisions. We hypothesized that the tendency to use brand name is influenced by consumer values and that there are differences between countries. Although brand name is an important issue in business strategies and brands are very important in the consumers' lives, there is a little literature about their antecedents.

A Web-based survey of two samples in Spain and Russia was carried out. Results show that nine of eleven values have significant effect on the tendency to use brand name. There is no difference between Spaniards and Russians in terms of the degree by which the values contribute to this explanation. There are differences in the values shown by consumers having high and low tendency to use brand name. Some personal values are antecedents of the tendency to use brand name –where there is a void in the literature– and it can help businesses recognize which ones can help in the design of marketing strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Gardner and Levy (1955) pointed out the importance of the brand name and established it as a complex system of symbols representing ideas and attributes. Since then, the brand name has been thoroughly studied and it is accepted as being crucial in identifying the product, differentiating it from the competition, and creating association with the brand (Del Rio, Vazquez & Iglesias, 2001).

Recent literature has dealt with its influence upon product recognition (Lerman & Garbarino, 2002), upon positioning when the identity it offers can compensate for consumer ignorance (Zhou & Hui, 2003; Strizhakova, Coulter & Price, 2008), or as an indicator of product quality (Brucks, Zeithaml & Naylor, 2000), among others. Moreover, the brand name is more important when there are few attributes to assess (Degeratu, Rangaswamy & Wub, 2000), and it affects the decision-making

process in all phases (e.g. McEnally & De Chernatony, 1999).

Various authors (e.g. Pitts, Canty & Tsalikis, 1985; Quester, Beverland & Farrelly, 2006) claim to know the link between personal values and selection criteria that permits a more complete consumer vision. Pitts et al. (1985) found that consumers perceive those brands that “fit” their value systems to be more attractive. Just the same, Kim, Boush, Marquardt & Kahle (2006) demonstrate that communication that links brands with personal values is more effective. However, little is known about (that we know of) that analyses the role of values in the tendency to use the brand name and, as such, it seems that it is relevant to figure out whether these values serve as antecedents for this tendency.

Our objective is to find out whether consumer values influence use of the tendency to use brand name, if the influence is homogenous between countries, and whether there are values where differences exist between consumers with high/low tendency to use brand name. First, the hypotheses development being assessed is presented. Second, the methodology

used is described to subsequently evaluate the quality of the measurements utilized, to conduct the analyses and discuss the findings. The work finishes with an exposition about future lines of investigation and the limitations of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

What does 'Brand Name' mean?

Brand name is one of the most important components of branding and could be defined as the element of the brand that is verbalized by consumers, and may contain words, numbers and other symbols (Bennett, 1988). As Aaker and Keller (1990) point out, any brand name must be descriptive, suggestive and distinctive as ideal criteria, and should build associations with the product and company. Consistently with the associative network memory model (Anderson, 1993), has been suggested that brand name is a connection between what the corporation wants the consumers realize and the associations they built in their memory (Urde, 1999). Thus, brand name can be related to the consumers' perceptions, expectations and feelings about a product, reflecting the associations, consumers build in their minds.

When is the brand name used? It is used when: (1) the consumer wishes to show it off as a signal of status/quality; (2) the brand name "absorbs" other criteria –due to consumer ignorance or the existence of few relevant criteria; (3) it transforms into a generic term (e.g. aspirin) to determine an entire product category (e.g. analgesics); and, (4) the consumer decision is subordinated to what the brand transmits, this being determinant in the decision output.

In general, brand names provide symbolic meanings which assist in the consumer decision-making process (Herbig & Milewicz, 1993) and can simplify for consumers their decision-making process and their shopping (McNeal & Zerren, 1981). The associations generate value to the consumer, although it will depend on the

consumers' perception and expectation of value.

The Tendency to Use the Brand Name

The tendency to use brand name, as a selection criterion, has been studied principally from the perspective of brand equity (e.g. Jung & Sung, 2008), and from a relational focus (e.g. Aggarwal, 2004). Bengtsson (2003) affirms that frequent interactions with brands can make the consumers more dependent upon them, and it has been affirmed that the consumer-brand relationship can be seen as a dependent and interdependent relationship (Bradley, Maxian, Laubacher & Baker, 2007). Brands are everywhere we look, we must pronounce them when soliciting them and we think about them during the purchasing process. Then, it is normal that a positive or negative susceptibility can be produced towards the use of the brand name. Furthermore, tendency to use brand name or the brand name as the principal or sole reference of the product is due to it acting as a facilitator and transmitter of its image, its culture, its values and quality (Brucks et al., 2000).

Bristow, Schneider & Schuler (2002) state brand dependence as "the tendency of an individual to use brand name in the purchase decision" (p. 346). Therefore, they equate the 'dependence' with the 'tendency to use'. It seems a "light" vision from the 'dependence' concept, just as it is used in psychology or in the organizational areas. In psychology, this has been defined as the necessity of being close to another/others, the inclination of being a recipient of their approval, or the tendency to be in a position of inferiority (Miele et al, 1990). In organizational area, it refers to the situation of subordination where the inputs and outputs are controlled by another/others (Pfeffer, 1992). Therefore, in following the definition of Bristow et al. we will speak about '*the tendency to use the brand name*' and not of Brand Dependence.

To conclude, Hui (2010) points out that there is little attention paid to the role that the brand

name takes in consumers' decision-making, although it is well known the consumer's propensity to use the brand name to deciding which product to buy (Bristow et al., 2002).

Brand Name and Consumer Values

It has been shown that consumers make decisions considering their values, ideas, and personal and cultural symbols (e.g. De Mooij, 2004). That is normally understood as those beliefs that guide the selection of products and decision-making from a desired point of view (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987).

Kim, Forsythe, Gu & Moon (2002) and other authors defend that the brand strategy cannot be developed behind the backs of consumer values, and Pitts and Woodside (1983) indicate that these values are related with the importance given to the selection criteria. Rose, Shoham, Kahle & Batra (1994) find that, in general, social values are positively associated with the use of the brand name for clothing. Tarka (2008) reaches a similar conclusion by affirming that the values of 'Sense of Belonging' and 'Being Well-Respected' are those most associated with the brand name and the product style (clothing especially). From an international perspective, cultural values can influence the policies based on brand name as much as they do in the consumer response before the brand name.

Regarding how these affect the preferences and judgments of consumers and how the values guide product selection, it is coherent to maintain that a relationship between the values and the tendency to use brand name can exist. This is more important by how much Lotz, Shim and Gehrt (2003) affirm that this relationship does not seem to be influenced by the situational context. Therefore:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant impact of the consumer values on the tendency to use the brand name in purchase decision making.

One interesting question in cross-cultural studies is to check whether consumers from

different countries or cultures tend to behave similarly (or not) in an ever-more globalized world. The convergence in the behaviors as consumers and in their antecedents (e.g. values, technology) is important because it affects the policies of brand, distribution and advertising (De Mooij, 2003). This author concludes that the consumers in different countries (European) tend to diverge in how they use and consume products, although the value structure is invariant (Davidov, Schmidt & Schwartz, 2008).

Yeh, Kim, Chompreedac, Rimkeeree, Yaud & Lundahla (1998) found that Chinese, Koreans, and Thai respond differently than Americans concerning hedonism, but that there is homogeneity in the Asian countries. However, Kim et al. (2002) find cultural differences between Chinese and Korean consumers born from different consumer values and necessities. Consumer values affect attitudes and behavior as well as the hierarchy of necessities in purchasing situations for specific products (e.g. Kim et al., 2002). Given that values differ between cultures, it is expected that the effect of the values upon the tendency to use brand name would be distinct in different countries.

Hypothesis 2. Consumers from different countries display values whose contributions on the tendency to use the brand name are different.

The literature and business practices show that the brand name is one of the greatest assets of any business or product.

It is normal for consumers to use the brand name, but the tendency to use it in excess, like the principal or almost lone criterion, does not seem to be a desirable situation if it is advisable for the functioning consumer to utilize more adequate criteria for each purchase situation. Therefore, it appears coherent to propose that a high tendency to use brand name would increase the vulnerability of the consumer to reduce the impact from the functional criteria. Now then, do consumers with tendency to use brand name score higher or lower in some specific values? We have not found previous studies, so therefore we propose:

Hypothesis 3: Consumers with high tendency to use the brand name possess differences in the values with respect to those that possess a low tendency to use the brand name.

METHODS

Countries and product category

The study was conducted in Spain and Russia because it is of interest to contrast two markets with different cultures, and additionally, many Spanish businesses are interested in the Russian market due to it being emerging and having the highest perspectives for growth among the Eastern European economies (World Bank’ Report, 2009).

We have focused on footwear as a reference product because: (a) it is a universal product; (b) many brands develop their brand strategies based on the brand name; and, (c) there are strong economic interests in this. Spain is the second-largest European manufacturer, and exports more than 70% of its production. Presently, Spain is confronted by strong Chinese competition, and is in need of information and innovation in its products as well as in its marketing strategies.

Sampling and Data Collection

A Web-based survey was administered. In order to create the questionnaires in Spanish and Russian, the *back-translation* methodology was followed. The first translation of English to Spanish/Russian was made by university academics, and subsequently revised by a translation business by inverse translation. Finally, both translations to Spanish/Russian were supervised by users whose native tongues include these two languages.

The sampling is not strictly random, as the answers obtained are owed to successive efforts made by the authors and their respective social networks to transmit the URL, with advertising at workplaces and at two Spanish and Russian universities. The sampling design is comparable

to an *Adaptive Web sampling method* (Bao & Bakker, 2010). In order to improve the representation, quotas of sex, relative income, age and habits were required. We eliminated those questionnaires completed: (a) by persons over the age of 80 and under 18; (b) in less time than that estimated as a minimum in the pre-test; and, (c) with systematic, extreme or inconsistent answers.

Table 1 lists the sample profiles for each country; they are made up of young individuals with average ages of 33.5 (Spanish) and 31.3 (Russian), whose difference in absolute terms, 2.2, is not relevant.

**TABLE 1:
Descriptive from Samples**

Variable	Levels	Spain	Russia
	Samples	321	375
Gender (%)	Male	47.4	33.3
	Female	52.6	66.7
Age (%)	Q1(18 – 23 years old)	15.9	28.0
	Q2 (24 – 27)	19.9	20.0
	Q3(28 – 33)	22.8	18.9
	Q4(34 – 41)	22.4	15.0
	Q5 (age > 41)	19.0	18.1
Relative income (%)	Well above average	6.2	2.7
	Above average	12.5	15.2
	On average	52.3	62.1
	Below average	25.2	17.6
	Well below average	3.7	2.4
Habitat (%)	> 4 mill. inhabitants	1.9	65.1
	1.1 to 4 mill. inhabitants	5.9	6.9
	501 th. to 1 mill. inhabitants	11.5	20.8
	100 th. - 500 th. inhabitants	45.2	2.4
	100 th. - 500 th. inhabitants	26.7	2.7
	< 100 th. inhabitants	9.6	2.1
	Scattered		

Scales

Brand dependence. Bristow et al. (2002) scale of seven items with answers having 6 points (1=strongly disagree to 6=strongly agree). Zarantonello (2008) points out that items 2, 3 and 6 present their statements by mentioning a single brand name. Items 1, 4, 5 and 7 “*alternative and competing brand names are indicated as well*” (Zarantonello, 2008, p. 202). Therefore, the former understand it as one-

dimensional and the latter as two-dimensional, without any previous studies existing confirming either one of the positions.

Consumer values: We used the *Portrait Values Questionnaire –PVQ–* (Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris & Owens, 2001) that while different from those proposed by Khale or Rokeach it raises non-abstract items. So the survey must point out to what degree a person is perceived as being equal or not similar. This system is utilized in the European Social Survey, and here it is proposed in the same way.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Bristow’s et al. Scale Reliability and Validity

Tendency to use the brand name (TBN) is analyzed by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and maximum likelihood estimation. The reliability is confirmed by Cronbach’s α , the composite reliability coefficient and the average variation extracted (AVE). In order to check the discriminant validity of the latent variables, it is verified when in all cases the AVE is superior to the square of the correlations with other constructs as well as when none of these includes the value “1” in the confidence interval test.

Because there are two proposals with respect to its dimensionality, we first verified the adjustment for the different options (Table 2). It was observed that none of them offered satisfactory results, so we proceeded to regroup

the items. The best adjustment considers two dimensions:

Dimension 1 (TBN_D1: items 1, 2, 3): namely “the role of brand name as a criterion to make a selection”, and

Dimension 2 (TBN_D2: items 4, 5 and 6): namely “the dependence of brand name to choose between two or more brands”.

The seventh item of the scale of Bristow et al. (2002) was deleted due to its reduced factor loading.

It was observed that the scale shows the best adjustment when a dimension centred on the role of the brand name is considered as a criterion for the decision, and another centred on the use of the brand name as the most important criterion in making a purchase decision. From here on, all the analyses are performed for the dimensions offering the best adjustment (Scale C in Table 2).

Reliability. Cronbach’s α of 0.95 for TBN_D1 and 0.92 for TBN_D2, with a rho coefficient of 0.98, is well above the minimums fixed by the literature. The extracted variance is superior to 50% in all cases, although it is maximized for the best adjustment.

Validity. For the convergent validity, the confirmatory factor loadings must be superior to 0.70 and all must be significant. The discriminating validity is estimated by comparing the AVE and the squared correlation (SC) in such a way that the AVE is greater than the second for each pair of concepts. Our

TABLE 2:
Tendency to use the brand name scale: Fits for global sample (Spain and Russia)

Scale	χ^2	χ^2/df	CFI	IFI	NNFI	SRMR	RMSEA	IFC	AVE
A	171.944*	12.281	0.974	0.974	0.961	0.017	0.127	0.962	0.786
B	171.944*	13.226	0.974	0.974	0.958	0.018	0.133	0.953(D ₁) 0.932(D ₂)	0.872(D ₁) 0.593(D ₂)
C	29.019*	3.627	0.996	0.996	0.993	0.008	0.061	0.965(D ₁) 0.978(D ₂)	0.902(D ₁) 0.830(D ₂)

* p<0.000; A= Scale from Bristow *et al.*; B=Zarantonello’s Proposal; C=Our better fit
D₁ and D₂ are the dimensions of construct

results show that the lowest factor loading is 0.925 for TBN_D1 and 0.901 for TBN_D2. The AVE ranged from 0.660 to 0.526, while the SC ranged from 0.465 to 0.238. These results suggest that the validity and reliability conditions are observed (Table 2).

Invariance. This is proven by multi-group analysis using EQS 6.1, following Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998). Firstly, the ‘configural invariance’ does not set restrictions

between the two samples in order to study whether the same factorial structure is presented. Next, we set the equality restriction in the ‘factor loadings’ for each sample and verify that with the simultaneous estimation of the model in both samples the number of factors is the same and that the adjustment is good (Table 3). Upon adding the equality restriction of factor loadings in both samples, the adjustment of the model does not worsen, confirming the metric invariance.

TABLE 3:
Test of measurement invariance of tendency to use the brand name scale in Russia and Spain

	X ²	df	Δ X ²	Δ df	ρ	RMSEA (90%CI)	SRMR	CFI	NNFI
Single Group Solution									
Spain (n=321)	23.68	8			0.003	0.078 (0.043, 0.115)	0.017	0.993	0.987
Russia (n=375)	12.88	8			0.116	0.040 (0.000, 0.079)	0.004	0.999	0.998
Measurement Invariance									
Equal form	36.57	16			0.002	0.061 (0.035, 0.087)	0.012	0.997	0.994
Equal factor loadings	45.57	22	9.001	6	0.002	0.056 (0.032, 0.078)	0.103	0.996	0.995

TABLE 4:
Descriptives and F, t and z statistics for consumer values

Value	Spain		Russia		F statistic (a)	t-value	K-S z score
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Power	2.89	1.32	3.39	1.47	22.56***	4.71***	2.73***
Achievement	3.26	1.26	3.57	1.37	9.38***	3.04***	1.76***
Hedonism	4.54	1.08	4.10	1.47	21.12***	4.49***	2.17***
Stimulation	3.44	1.36	3.57	1.41	1.43	1.20	0.73
Self-direction	4.62	1.02	4.58	1.16	0.28	0.53	0.47
Universalism	5.04	0.88	3.99	1.42	142.20***	11.52***	4.46***
Benevolence	5.10	0.81	4.69	1.09	33.56***	5.66***	2.71***
Tradition	3.88	1.21	3.51	1.42	13.51***	3.63***	1.42**
Conformity	4.09	1.23	4.71	1.24	43.24***	6.58***	3.39***
Security	3.80	1.41	4.27	1.37	20.40***	4.53***	2.17***

(a) Used Brown-Forsythe test if Levene’s statistic is significative
 *** p<0.001 ; ** p<0.01 ; * p<0.10

Consumer Values

Table 4 shows the descriptives (average and standard deviation), as well as the results of comparing the two countries with respect to consumer values. Different behavior was observed in both the average value (calculated by a t-statistic) as well as in the distribution (proven with the Kolmogorov–Smirnov Z test).

Except for the values of ‘Self-direction’ and ‘Stimulation’, the distributions of the remaining values are different for the two countries under study. The Spanish sample is characterized as being more hedonistic, traditional, wanting to help third parties, and wanting justice for all. In the Russian sample, the desire is for power, the search for success and showing it, greater respect for rules (Conformity) and the desire for Security for their country. With this, it is concluded that the two countries reveal values with a different statistical mean and distribution.

Research Findings

Hypothesis 1. We hypothesized that consumer values influence the tendency to use brand name, and was tested it with linear regressions for the global scale and each subscale where the independent variables are the values and the dependent variables are the consumer’s tendency to use brand name. Table 5 shows the adjusted R^2 , the regression standardized coefficients (betas) and F statistics. The existence of collinearity was verified by the ‘variance inflation factor –VIF–’. As all $VIF < 2.01$, we can conclude that there is no multicollinearity (the rule of Kleinbaum shows there is collinearity if $VIF > 10$).

By applying F-test of R^2 significance (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003), it is observed that the values significantly contribute to the tendency to use brand name, except in the regression for Dimension 1 in Spain, where $p=0.109$. In general, the Russian sample presents more significant values than does the Spanish one (5 against 1 for the general scale, while for Dimension 2 there are 2 against none

– by being the non-significant R^2 – in dimension 1). Thus, although we have found that five of six regression have significant R^2 , our hypothesis is partially supported.

Why our hypothesis fails when Spaniards are considered for Dimension 1 and not the same for Russians? Based on the results of the Table 5 we can conclude that the only difference between Spaniards and Russians is that the last ones present significant beta for the value "stimulation" while the same not occurs for Spaniards. This value is directly related to risk-taking and, therefore, the difference between the two regressions resides in the role that this value plays: For Russians, risk-taking is positively related to the use of brand name as a criterion to make a decision, while the Spaniards, being more cautious, do not express such risk-taking and, therefore, there is no positive impact on the tendency to use the brand name.

More specifically:

By countries, the Spanish sample only reveals a maximum of two contributing significant values to the tendency to use brand name (positive for Tradition and negative for Universalism –it is alone for Dimension 2). In the Russian sample, there are more values which have an influence upon the tendency to use brand name, some positive (Achievement, Stimulation, Tradition), while there are others negative (Hedonism, Benevolence).

Considering the construct dimensions, Dimension 1 (role of the brand name) is that seen influenced less by consumer values, while the use of the brand as the most important criterion (Dimension 2) does show more values that are significant.

Hypothesis 2. We hypothesized that consumer values must show a distinct contribution towards the tendency to use brand name in function of the country. We applied equivalence analysis of the regression

TABLE 5:
Results from regression analyses for H₁

Brand Name Tendency	Scale (global)		TBN_D1		TBN_D2	
	Spain	Russia	Spain	Russia	Spain	Russia
Adjusted R ²	0.072	0.087	0.049	0.075	0.086	0.096
F Test (R ²)	2.405***	2.954***	1.597	2.514***	2.917***	3.292***
ANOVA	3.47***	2.66***	2.66***	4.01***	4.00***	4.97***
Betasà	$\beta_{(Spain)}$	$\beta_{(Russia)}$	$\beta_{(Spain)}$	$\beta_{(Russia)}$	$\beta_{(Spain)}$	$\beta_{(Russia)}$
Power	0.088	0.021	0.072	0.018	0.099	0.023
Achievement	0.082	0.137**	0.084	0.116	0.074	0.155**
Hedonism	-0.066	-0.127**	-0.040	-0.106	-0.090	-0.146**
Stimulation	0.065	0.148**	0.039	0.125**	0.088	0.168***
Self-direction	-0.045	0.021	-0.045	0.032	-0.042	0.009
Universalism	-0.096	-0.013	-0.072	-0.024	-0.116*	-0.001
Benevolence	-0.051	-0.108*	-0.047	-0.091	-0.052	-0.124**
Tradition	0.201***	0.280***	0.186***	0.274***	0.204***	0.280***
Conformity	-0.081	0.048	-0.074	0.050	-0.084	0.044
Security	0.108*	-0.066	0.097	-0.057	0.113*	-0.073

*** p<0.001 ; ** p<0.01 ; * p<0.10

coefficients in two independent samples where for each consumer value the obtained betas must be significantly different in the two countries. This would imply that persons from different cultures respond differently to the tendency to use brand name.

We utilized the proof of Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle & Piquero (1998), that starts from the null hypothesis $\beta_{(Spain)} = \beta_{(Russia)}$. Table 6 shows the results of the test for equality of coefficients, where the betas obtained are compared for each country and by the tendency to use brand name dimension. We did not find the predicted differences in the value coefficients that were significant, concluding that in Spain and Russia the values which do significantly influence the tendency to use brand name do not show statistically different standardized coefficients of regression and, as such, convergence exists in their contribution to the tendency to use brand name.

Based on the above-mentioned, we conclude that H₂ is not supported.

Hypothesis 3. The final hypothesis considers that consumers with high and low tendency to use brand name must show significantly different values. In order to differentiate between high and low tendency to use brand name, we divided the sample into three levels (tertiles) to compare tertile 1 (T1) with tertile 3 (T3). By applying the t-test (Table 7), we observed that the consumers with high tendency to use brand name score significantly higher in Power, Achievement, Stimulation, Tradition and Security. Therefore we accept H₃.

CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The aim of this work is to expand the knowledge about the tendency to use brand name, focused on consumer values and the relationships between these values and the tendency to use brand name in Russia and Spain. Why in these countries? The are limited empirical evidence within actual Russian vs. European consumers and many companies need greater knowledge of both 'new consumers' (from countries that are joining to

TABLE 6:
 $Z_{(dif.betas)}$ scores from Paternoster's *et al.* test

Values	Scale (global)	TBN_D1	TBN_D2
Power	0.867	0.697	0.983
Achievement	0.674	0.394	0.989
Hedonism	0.689	0.748	0.637
Stimulation	1.074	1.112	1.028
Self-direction	0.660	0.767	0.511
Universalism	0.804	0.460	1.114
Benevolence	0.484	0.369	0.608
Tradition	0.960	1.060	0.916
Conformity	1.492*	1.435*	1.477*
Security	2.249**	1.993**	2.408**

*** p<0.001 ; ** p<0.01 ; * p<0.10

TABLE 7:
 Descriptives and t-values for T1 and T3 groups

Consumer Value	T1 Mean(SD)	T3 Mean(SD)	t-value
Power	2.96(1.48)	3.35(1.40)	-2.903***
Achievement	3.21(1.37)	3.53(1.32)	-2.534**
Hedonism	4.24(1.40)	4.17(1.31)	0.598
Stimulation	3.36(1.48)	3.58(1.31)	-1.684*
Self-direction	4.60(1.08)	4.57(1.09)	0.225
Universalism	4.47(1.42)	4.36(1.36)	0.832
Benevolence	4.89(1.07)	4.84(1.08)	0.497
Tradition	3.35(1.42)	4.02(1.26)	-5.399***
Conformity	4.40(1.31)	4.58(1.31)	-1.513
Security	3.98(1.50)	4.26(1.30)	-2.113**
Samples: n(T1)=231 ; n(T2)=228			
*** p<0.001 ; ** p<0.01 ; * p<0.10			

the society of consumption, like Russia) and 'experienced European consumers' (like Spain). We have concluded that Russian and Spanish consumers differ in their values, but the contribution of each value to the tendency to use brand name is fairly similar in both countries. There are also significant differences between consumers having high and low tendency to use brand name with respect to the cited values.

These results suggest that the values are variables that contribute in a significant way (although reduced in absolute contribution) in explaining the tendency to use brand name.

This is important for businesses by offering information that can improve the communication and the product focus, above all in a market –the Spanish one– that is suffering through two crises (the present recession and that produced by competition from Chinese footwear), as well as in the other –the Russian– that is emerging.

Finally, we recommend that companies come up with a strong knowledge about consumers personal values and their connection with brand name if they want to gain their clients, because it not only has the ability to reduce their perceived risk (Srinivasan & Till, 2002) but has

become means for consumers to express themselves as well. Even more if we consider, that the largest worldwide footwear competitor is China, which competes with low prices and by copying designs. This makes it a priority for China's competitors to learn about other elements that allow for differentiation.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

By our judgment, our study has three limitations. First, it deals with a study of exploratory character that must be expanded and deepened in the study of the relationships between decision-making criteria (a person's core values and other more practical values) and brand importance, as well as in the study of the relationships between the dependence the consumer has in many cases upon the brand name and the consumer's values. Second, we utilised values that could be considered 'classic' and positive in focus. Despite coming from the universal list of values, we believe that other "postmodern" values should be included (e.g. independence, globalization, sustainability, social identity, diversity) in addition to anti-values (e.g. conformism, aversion/hostility, insecurity, consumerism) that refer to aspects closer to that recognized as 'the dark side of consumer behavior'. Finally, the sample does not have a strictly random nature because it was obtained by the authors' efforts and the collaboration with their social and professional networks. Although the samples formed by an adaptive *sampling method* are accepted in the literature, they can include non-random biases that must be controlled.

There are two primary lines for future research. Firstly, the introduction of other modern values and anti-values in the analysis to confirm whether the reduced explanation of the values is due to its own nature or due to not analyzing those that could certainly affect the behavior more. Marketing literature has focused on classical personal values using Schwartz's, Kahle's or LOV's proposals. The majority of values are positive and someone are negative (materialism, ethnocentrism). Nevertheless, the

emergency of new values and anti-values may be include in future research due to consumers and societies are changing (Voinea & Filip, 2011).

Secondly, the objective of our line of investigation is to figure out what other values can be antecedents of the tendency to use brand name, like for example, perceived risk or expertise. Managers know that brand name is an important concept in obtaining differential advantages, and a necessary tool for product policy (Aaker & Keller, 1990). Knowing the influence of other modern and postmodern values and their role to increase the tendency to use the brand name may be an interesting contribute to our understanding of consumers' response to brand names.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D.A. & Keller, K.L. (1990). Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(January), 27–41.
- Aggarwal, P. (2004). The effects of brand relationship norms on consumer attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (2), 87–101.
- Bao, Y. & Bakker, E.M. (2010). Content based web sampling. *International Journal of Digital Content Technology and its Applications*, 4(1), 43-68.
- Bennett, P.D. (1988). *Dictionary of Marketing Terms*. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.
- Bengtsson, A. (2003). Towards a critique of brand relationships. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 30(1), 154–158.
- Bradley, S. D., Maxian, W., Laubacher, T. C. & Baker, M. (2007). In Search of Lovemarks: The semantic structure of brands. In: K. B. Sheehan (Ed.), *Proceedings of the American Academy of Advertising*, Eugene, OR: American Academy of Advertising, 42–49. [WWW document]. URL <http://www.commcognition.com/research.html>. Accessed 4 may 2009.

- Bristow, D. N., Schneider, K. C. & Schuler, D. K. (2002). The brand dependence scale: measuring consumers' use of brand name to differentiate among product alternatives. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 11(6), 343–356.
- Brucks, M., Zeithaml, V. A., & Naylor, G. (2000). Price and brand name as indicators of quality dimensions for consumer durables. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(3), 359–374. doi: 10.1177/0092070300283005.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G. & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. (3th. ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Ass., Mahwah, NJ.
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P. & Schwartz, S. H. (2008). Bringing values back in: The adequacy of the European social survey to measure values in 20 countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 3, 420–445. doi:10.1093/poq/nfn035.
- De Mooij, M. (2003). Consumer behaviour: convergence and divergence in consumer behaviour: implications for global advertising. *International Journal of Advertising*, 22(2), 183–202.
- De Mooij, M. (2004). *Consumer behavior and culture. Consequences for global marketing and advertising*, London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Degeratu, A. M., Rangaswamy, A., & Wub, J. (2000). Consumer choice behavior in online and traditional supermarkets: The effects of brand name, price, and other search attributes. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 17(1), 55–78.
- Del Rio, A. B., Vázquez, R. & Iglesias, V. (2001). The role of the brand name in obtaining differential advantages. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 10(6/7), 452–466.
- Gardner, B. B. & Levy, S. J. (1955). The product and the brand. *Harvard Business Review*, 33(2), 33–39.
- Herbig, P. & Milewicz, J. (1993). The relationship of reputation and credibility to brand 'Éxito'. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 10(3), 18–24.
- Jung, J. & Sung, E. Y. (2008). Consumer-based brand equity: Comparisons among Americans and South Koreans in the USA and South Koreans in Korea. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 12(1), 24–35.
- Kim, J. O., Forsythe, S., Gu, Q., & Moon, S. J. (2002). Cross-cultural consumer values, needs and purchase behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19(6), 481–502, doi: 10.1108/07363760210444869
- Kim, W. S., Boush, D. M., Marquardt, A. & Kahle, L. R. (2006). Values, brands and image. In: Kahle, L.R. and Kim, C.H. *Creating images and the psychology of marketing communications*, Erlbaum: Mahwah, 279–290.
- Lerman, D. & Garbarino, E. (2002). Recall and recognition of brand names: A comparison of word and nonword name types. *Psychology and Marketing*, 19(7/8), 621–639.
- Lotz, S. L., Shim, S. & Gehrt, K. C. (2003). A Study of Japanese Consumers' Cognitive Hierarchies in Formal and Informal Gift-Giving Situations. *Psychology and Marketing*, 20(1), 59–85.
- Mcenally, M. & De Chernatony, L. (1999). The evolving nature of branding: consumer and managerial considerations. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 2, [WWW document]. URL <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/mcenally02-1999.pdf>. Accessed 22 november 2010.
- Mcneal, J. U. & Zerren, L. M. (1981). Brand name selection for consumer products. *MSU Business Topics*, 29(2), 35–39.
- Miele, G. M., Tilly, S. M., First, M. & Frances, A. (1990). The definition of dependence and behavioural addictions. *British Journal of Addiction*, 85(11), 1421–1423. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.1990.tb01623.x.
- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P. & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the Correct Statistical Test for the Equality of Regression Coefficients. *Criminology*, 36(4), 859–866.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organizations*. Boston, Harvard Business School Press

- Pitts, R. E. & Woodside, A. G. (1983). Personal values influences on consumer product class and brand preferences. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 119(1), 37–53.
- Pitts, R. E., Canty, A. L. & Tsalikis, J. (1985). Exploring the impact of personal values on socially oriented communications. *Psychology and Marketing*, 2, 267–278.
- Quester, P., Beverland, M. & Farrelly, F. (2006). Brand–personal values fit and brand meanings: Exploring the role individual values play in ongoing brand loyalty in extreme sports subcultures. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 33, 21–28.
- Rose, G. M., Shoham, A., Kahle, L. R. & Batra, R. (1994). Social values, conformity, and dress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24(17), 1501–1519. doi: 10.1111/j.1559–1816.1994.tb01560.x
- Schwartz, S.H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(3), 550–562.
- Schwartz, S.H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M. & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross–cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross–Cultural Psychology*, 32(5), 519–541.
- Srinivasan, S. S. & Till, B. D. (2002). Evaluation of search, experience and credence attributes: role of brand name and product trial. *The Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 11, 417–431.
- Steenkamp, J. B. & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross–national consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(1), 78–90.
- Strizhakova, Y., Coulter, R. A. & Price, L. L. (2008). Branded products as a passport to global citizenship: perspectives from developed and developing countries. *Journal of International Marketing*. Chicago, 16(4), 57–85.
- Tarka, P. (2008). From ranking (Rokeach – RVS) to rating scale evaluation – some empirical observations on multidimensional scaling polish and Dutch youth’s values. *Innovative Management Journal*, 2 (December), 28–50.
- Urde, M. (1999). Brand orientation: A mindset for building brands into strategic resources. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 151-3, 117–133.
- Voinea, L. & Filip, A. (2011). Analyzing the main changes in new consumer buying behavior during economic crisis. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 1(1), 14–19.
- World Bank’ Report (2009). *About Economy in Russia*, No.19, June. The World Bank in Russia. – 2009. [WWW document]. URL <http://www.worldbank.org.ru>. Accessed 15 November 2010.
- Yeh, L. L., Kim, K. O., Chompreedac, P., Rimkeeree, H., Yaud, N. J. N. & Lundahla, D. S. (1998). Comparison in use of the 9–point hedonic scale between Americans, Chinese, Koreans, and Thai. *Food Quality and Preference*, 9(6), 413–419. doi:10.1016/S0950–3293(98)00028–7.
- Zarantonello, L. (2008). *A literature Review of Consumer–Based Brand Scales*. In Schmitt, Bernd H. and Rogers, D.L. (Eds.), *Handbook on Brand and Experience Management*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, Cheltenham. 188–218.
- Zhou, L. & Hui, M. (2003). Symbolic value of foreign products in the People’s Republic of China. *Journal of International Marketing*, 11(2), 36–58.