

Analyzing Factors Affecting Repurchase Intention During Gezi Park Brand Protests

Aslı Kuşçu¹ Dilek Sağlık Özçam^{2*}

1. Department of Management, Boğaziçi University, Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey
2. Business Administration Department, Yeditepe University, Ataşehir, Istanbul, Turkey

* E-mail of the corresponding author: dsaglik@yeditepe.edu.tr

Abstract

During the Gezi Park protests, some major brands were criticized within social media either for what they did or did not and social pressure to boycott those brands was highly apparent. Many newspaper articles highlighted that negative WOM during the protests might have affected consumers' brand related knowledge. This notion is further supported by previous research. What happened during and after Gezi Park protests creates a perfect environment to analyze this effect. In addition, it was believed that only a portion of the consumers were highly affected by the protest calls. Consequently, this study aims to understand whether consumers have really changed their intention to buy from of a bank and a domestic coffee chain due to protest calls. The study also analyzes whether only a proportion of the consumers were affected and whether their trust, loyalty, awareness, perceived quality, and self-construal, and the company's perceived social responsibility played a significant role in this change. A hierarchical logistic regression procedure (Forward Wald) with 357 usable cases was used with likelihood of change in purchase as the dependent variable. The results indicate that for the domestic coffee shop only perceived social responsibility plays a role in the change of consumers' purchase intention. However, for the bank within the study, perceived social responsibility is found to be an insignificant contributor, whereas loyalty and awareness are found to be significant contributors to consumers' purchase decisions. Perceived quality/trust and consumers' self-construal are found to have no effect on the change of consumers' intention for both brands under study.

Keywords: Brand Communication, Boycott, Brand Loyalty, Purchase Intention

1. Introduction

On May 28, people from Istanbul started to occupy Gezi Park. The park witnessed a continuous influx of protestors who wanted to show their discontent with the transformation of the park (Hurriyet 2013). The protestors communicated with each other through various social media channels, particularly Facebook and Twitter; and a significant amount of their communication revolved around the brands. During the protests, some major brands were criticized within social media either for what they did or did not. By forwarding, sharing, liking, or commenting content, consumers used social media very effectively to create a common ground to boycott some brands. Previous research suggests that during a crisis, a company's image and reputation and also its financial well-being is affected (Coobs and Holladay 1996). Especially with the use of Internet technologies, the real prevalence and power of boycotts can be experienced (Sen et al. 2001).

The role of branding in stimulating demand is acknowledged for some time. There is significant amount of research proving that branding has the power to influence consumer purchase decisions and has its own added value independently from the value of the product (Strivasan 1979). Aaker (1991) defines a brand as "one of the most important intangible asset of any business." The customer-oriented definitions emphasize the benefits customers get from purchasing brands. In line with this, Keller (2003) suggests that a brand is something that resides in the minds of the consumers. According to de Chernatony (2001) a brand is "an identifiable product, service, person, or place augmented in such a way that the buyer or the user receives relevant, unique, sustainable added value, which match their needs most closely." Brands provide information about the tangible and intangible benefits of the products and have different meanings for product oriented consumers (Kotler 2000), and serve as a source of quality (Bharadwaj et al. 1993; de Chernatony and Riley 1999), especially in perceived high risk situations.

Branding is also important for companies, retailers, and distributors. Even though most of the positive effects of branding on the firms come from its influence on consumers, brands also provide legal protection to companies for unique features and aspects of their products (Keller 2003). Strong branding increases effectiveness of marketing communications (Yoo et al. 2000), provides positive stock market responses (Simon and Sullivan 1993), and decreases vulnerability to competitive marketing actions (Aaker 1991). Anything can be branded, but

the key is that consumers perceive differences among the brands in a category (Keller 2003). Basically, what distinguishes a brand from its competitors is its equity in sum, that is what consumer's perceptions and feelings are about the product, company or the brand. A brand carries a promise considering qualities and features that make the organization, product, or service special. With the dominant logic shifting from tangible to intangibles (Vargo and Lusch 2004) and managers being aware that brands have become real strategic assets, brands' unique functional values are of great importance to companies as well as to consumers. As Wheeler (2003) states: "People fall in love with brands. They trust them, develop strong loyalties, buy them, and believe in their superiority."

Boycotts or anti-consumption/brand avoidance calls are a way to express consumers' disapproval with the products of a brand or its corporate behavior (Zack 1991). It can be triggered due to unmet expectations, or symbolic incongruence and ideological incompatibility between the consumer and the brand (Lee et al. 2009). Boycott or brand avoidance activity affected most prominent companies and brands (John and Klein 2003; Thompson et al. 2006; Pal 2009). Previous research about boycotting behavior suggests that consumers evaluate their losses and gains when deciding about boycotting a brand/product or not. (John and Klein 2003; Sen et al. 2001). The more strongly consumers initially prefer and are committed to a product, the higher will be their cost of boycotting that product, as such consumers' initial trust, loyalty, perceived quality perceptions and their awareness are expected to have an influence in the likelihood of their change in purchasing intention.

This study tests the findings of previous research within the Gezi Park protests context and analyses the effects of protests on consumers' purchasing behavior of a bank and a domestic coffee chain. Both brands were accused of not being helpful to protesters and witnessed large protests in terms of boycotts or even vandalism from the consumers. Many consumers distributed extensive negative WOM about the brands' behavior, such that a social pressure to boycott the brands was felt especially by the people of Istanbul. Specifically, this study tries to understand whether consumers have really changed their intention to buy and if they did, whether consumers' perceptions, along with their self-construal, and the companies' perceived social responsibility during the protests played a significant role in this change. To achieve this objective, a hierarchical logistic regression analysis is employed with taking change in purchase decision as the categorical dependent variable. The paper is organized as follows: In the following section, the relevant literature is reviewed and a set of hypotheses are created. Sampling and measurement are discussed in the methodology section. Within the next section, results are presented. Finally, the paper ends with a discussion and limitations and future research sections.

2. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

2.1 Trust

Trust is defined by Morgan and Hunt (1994) as "confidence in an exchange partner's reliability and integrity" and is regarded as a key variable in the development of long-term relationships. Several definitions are provided in literature for brand trust. Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) define brand trust as "the willingness of the average consumer to rely on the ability of the brand to perform its stated function" and believe that it leads to both purchase and attitudinal loyalty. Dawar and Pillutla (2000) describe brand trust in terms of reliability and dependability. With the intent to develop a brand trust scale, Delgado-Ballester and Munuera-Aleman (2003) define brand trust as "feeling of security held by the consumer in his/her interaction with the brand, that it is based on the perceptions that the brand is reliable and responsible for the interests and welfare of the consumer." Trust is viewed as the essence of the value that a strong brand provides to consumers (Berry 2000). In other words, it is the most important element of any brand (Scott 2000). Brand trust leads to higher levels of loyalty as trust creates exchange relationships (Morgan and Hunt 1994), which is one of the reasons why trust is highly valuable for consumers and companies especially in high risk environments. In such environments, consumers try to reduce the uncertainty and complexity of their buying processes (Chaudhuri and Holbrook 2001) by applying mental shortcuts such as trust and search for a trustworthy brand (Delgado-Ballester and Munuera-Aleman 1999). A crisis is defined by Smith (2006) as a physical, financial, or reputational damaging event with emergent properties (cited in Carroll 2009). Boycotts are serious crises companies can face (Hunter et al. 2008). As such, trust plays a significant role in consumers' decisions regarding to be involved in the boycott, or not. Moreover, previous research shows that consumers who trust in the management are less likely to boycott the organization, even if they are dissatisfied with its actions (Hoffmann and Müller 2009).

Hypothesis 1: Level of consumers' trust towards the brand will be negatively associated with likelihood of change in purchase decision.

2.2 Loyalty

Brand loyalty is the attachment that a customer has to a brand (Aaker 1991). Brand loyalty directly translates into sales, reduces marketing costs, attracts new customers, and provides time to respond to competitive threats (Aaker 1991). It is one of the many advantages of creating a positive brand image and having high brand equity (Keller 2003). Brand loyalty is often considered as the manifestation of brand equity since consumers with strong brand equity often display loyalty to that brand. In line with that, Light (1994) suggests that brand-loyal consumers may be up to nine times as profitable as disloyal ones for companies. It is a “deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same brand or same brand set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behavior” (Oliver 1997). The relationship between loyalty and repeat purchase is strong; however it is moderated by social and situational factors (Dick and Basu 1994).

Consumers do not buy products solely due to their functional utilities but also due to their symbolic meanings (Belk 1988). Thus, all voluntary consumption carries in fact, either consciously or unconsciously, a symbolic meaning (Elliot and Wattanasuwan 1998; Reed and Forehand 2003). Consumers by using specific products or brands not only gain self-enhancement (Grubb and Grathwahl 1967), but also approval, acceptance, and status within the social environment, which significantly affects a person’s social behavior (Jackson and Smith, 1999). The direct effect of self-congruence on loyalty has also been empirically demonstrated (Samli and Sirgy 1981; Han and Back 2008; Kressmann et al. 2006) with social forces moderating this relationship (Malär et al. 2011). The meaning and value of a brand is not just its ability to express the self, but also its role in helping consumers create and build their self-identities (McCracken 1989). What makes social identity so important for marketers is that consumers are attracted to products and brands that are linked to their social identity (Forehand et al. 2002). Thus, factors like social effects must also be considered within consumer-brand relationships, and one significant effect can be visible when consumers avoid certain products or brands due to their negative associations (Englis and Solomon 1997; Levy 1959; Thompson and Arsel 2004). Consumers reject those brands in order to avoid adding undesired meaning to themselves. This effect is particularly evident for initially loyal consumers when they are dissatisfied because of the undelivered promise of the brand (Lee 2007).

Hypothesis 2: Level of consumers’ loyalty towards the brand will be positively associated with likelihood of change in purchase decision.

2.3 Brand Awareness

According to Aaker (1996), brand awareness can affect perceptions and attitudes and reflects the salience of the brand in the customer’s mind. Both Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) acknowledge the importance of awareness in the creation of brand equity. As such, brand awareness plays an important role in consumers’ decision making. It is the basic step in the communication with the consumers, which affects consumer decision making by influencing the formation and strength of brand associations in the brand image. For consumers to have an image of a brand, they must first be aware of the brand (Keller 1993). Moreover, consumers cannot choose a product or service if they are not aware of the brand in the first place. However, a consumer’s awareness of a certain brand, even if s/he does not really know anything about it, will increase the likelihood that the brand will be purchased. This may be especially true for low involvement products (Keller 1993). Brand awareness can also affect consumer perceptions. People are comforted by the familiar and have a tendency to “ascribe all sorts of good attitudes to items that are familiar to them” (Aaker and Joachimsthaler 2000). In a similar vein, unfamiliar brands are believed to have low quality and usually associated with higher risk (Richardson et al. 1996), therefore it can be concluded that the higher the awareness of the consumer, the less likely will be the change in purchase intention.

Hypothesis 3: Level of consumers’ awareness towards the brand will be negatively associated with likelihood of change in purchase decision.

2.4 Perceived Quality

Perceived quality can be defined as the customers’ perception of the overall quality or superiority of a product or service with respect to its intended purpose, relative to alternatives (Aaker 1991). It involves performance, features, reliability, durability of the products and services perceived by the consumers. High perceived quality drives consumers to choose the brand rather than other competing brands (Yoo et al. 2000). Erdem and Swait (1998) argue that brand investments and consistency, credibility and clarity of brand signals increase perceived

quality, decrease perceived risk and information costs, and thus increase brand equity. Consequently brand equity is defined as the value of a brand signal to consumers, whereas a brand signal is composed of a firm's past and present marketing mix strategies and activities associated with that brand.

Perceived quality has received attention within boycott literature dealing with the impact of a boycott on quality judgments, reflecting mixed findings. Klein et al. (1998) found that consumer anger was related to purchase refusal but unrelated to consumers' judgments of product quality. On the contrary, Klein et al. (2004) suggested that consumers' quality judgments fall when they participate in a boycott. Giving these findings, no previous study has demonstrated the effect of perceived quality on the change of purchase intention during a call for boycott.

Hypothesis 4: Level of consumers' quality perception towards the brand will be negatively associated with likelihood of change in purchase decision.

2.5 Perceived Social Responsibility

According to Carroll (1979) corporate social responsibility has three components: economic, legal/ethical and philanthropic. Kotler (2000) defines social responsibility in a more abstract way as "doing business in a way that maintains or improves both the customer's and society's well-being." Petkus and Woodruff (1992) also add avoiding harm and doing good into the definition. The management literature has acknowledged social responsibility as an important corporate duty and tried to establish a link between corporate social responsibility and a firm's financial performance (Pava and Krause 1996; Stanwick and Stanwick 1998). Previous research also looks at the relationship between social initiatives and positive affective, cognitive, and behavioral responses by consumers (Folkes and Kamins 1999; Sen and Bhattacharya 2001). Mohr et al. (2001) cite several studies that show consumers develop neither positive attitudes nor higher purchase intentions towards firms after receiving socially responsible messages from those companies. Over interviews, the researchers further find that most respondents do not use social responsibility as a criterion for their purchase decisions. On the directly opposing direction though, Maignan and Ferrell (2004) provide evidence that some consumers are ready to sanction companies by boycotting their products and services, when companies are perceived to behave in a socially irresponsible way.

Hypothesis 5: Level of consumers' perceived social responsibility of the brand will be negatively associated with likelihood of change in purchase decision.

2.5 Self-Construal (independent/interdependent)

Culture can be defined as a system of shared meanings like symbols, language, or values that grows out of cultural qualities and this system provides a common lens for perception (Veroff and Goldberger 1995). Moreover, culture not only influences the self-concept (Marsella et al. 1985), but also the social identities of the individual. Two of the dominant constructs that are used to identify cultural influences on "the self" are Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of collectivism and individualism. As demonstrated by Chattaraman et al. (2010), especially cultural based identity salience is influential in consumers' brand choices and culture plays an important role in consumers' brand evaluations and their connections with brands (Escalas and Bettman 2005; Swaminathan et al. 2007). As a result, applying Hofstede's typology at the individual level is reasonable. Not all consumers within a country can have the same preferences that are affected by the country's overall culture. Good examples may be United States, scoring high on individualism dimension and Turkey, scoring high on collectivism dimension. Both countries reflect great cultural heterogeneity that mainly originates from the sub-cultures within the country. Identifying all individuals as individualistic within the USA and all individuals as collectivistic within Turkey, may be a big generalization. As suggested by Singelis (1994) and by Oyserman and Lee (2008), each society may have a culture that includes both individualism and collectivism, which is reflected in the individual's self-construal as independent and interdependent. Individuals with an independent self-construal view themselves as separate individuals, and their opinions are altered by individual thoughts and personal opinions; whereas individuals with an interdependent self-construal view themselves as part of a group and base their attitudes and behavior on the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others (Markus and Kitayama 1991). During the Gezi Park protests, the coffee chain brand in question was accused of not being helpful to protesters and witnessed large protests in terms negative WOM within social media and even vandalism from the consumers. John and Klein (2003) argue that consumer boycotts are collective social actions. Moreover, Garret (1987) states that social pressure plays a significant role in boycotting behavior. Sen et al. (2001) further state that the success of a boycott depends on the extent that the consumers are susceptible to normative influence. It can therefore be expected that the ones with an interdependent self-construal, being more sensitive to public

opinion, may start to question their relationship with the coffee shop and thus may change their buying intention.

Hypothesis 6a and 6b: Level of consumers' independent (interdependent) self-construal will be negatively (positively) associated with likelihood of change in purchase decision.

3. Methodology

The study uses a self-administered, paper-based questionnaire to measure the constructs. In order to decrease the non-response bias, one of researchers was present in all instances during the data collection stage. The measures employed in the analysis are adopted from existing scales and are modified to the context of the study. The items are assessed on a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 for "strongly disagree" to 5 for "strongly agree." Their wording is translated and then back translated from English to Turkish to increase face validity; and pre-tested with a small sample (n=30) to eliminate redundant and ambiguous items. Convenience sampled respondents are initially asked to state whether and how often they shop from the brand in question. They are also requested to name other brands within the category to increase their cognitive involvement with the study. To measure respondents' brand related evaluations, six questions regarding awareness, four questions measuring perceived quality and four questions about loyalty are adopted from Yoo et al. (2000). Two additional self-developed questions are added to assess loyalty, in order to capture the "price premium" sub-dimension of loyalty (Aaker 1996). Additionally, three questions regarding brand trust are self-constructed by the researchers. The research instrument then reminded subjects about what happened in Gezi Park by asking them whether they are aware of it or not, followed by the question whether they see the brands' behavior during Gezi Park protests as socially responsible or not. After this question, the respondents are again asked whether they will shop from the brand. In the third part of the questionnaire, the respondents are requested to fill out fifteen questions adopted from Singelis (1994) measuring their self-construal. The last part of the instrument is about the demographic classification of the respondents.

The data used in the analysis consists of 357 usable cases. Subjects who do not score high on either independent or dependent self-construal are eliminated from the analyses leaving the final sample to 306 respondents; 160 females and 146 males; ranging from 16 to 72. 53.3% are assessed as independent, whereas 46.7% are found as interdependent. The biggest groups in terms of demographics are respondents with university education (54.2 %), earning more than 8000 TL per month (25.5 %), and identifying themselves as upper-middle class (42.8%). Table 1 provides demographic profile information for the total sample. For both brands under study (i.e. bank and domestic coffee shop), majority of the respondents (81.9 %; 76.5%) declare that they find the behavior of the particular brand as not socially responsible. Moreover, the percentage of the consumers who declare that they changed their purchase intention due to what happened is 60.9% and 53.3%, respectively. The respondents are found to have above average awareness ($\mu_{\text{bank}}=3.2$; $\mu_{\text{domestic}} = 3.5$ out of 5) and perceived quality ($\mu_{\text{bank}}=3$; $\mu_{\text{domestic}}=3.3$ out of 5) perceptions, but below average loyalty ($\mu_{\text{bank}}=1.7$; $\mu_{\text{domestic}}= 1.8$ out of 5) to the brands within the study.

4. Results

The difference between the answers to two purchase related questions; one at the beginning of the questionnaire, the other after respondents were reminded of Gezi Park protests, are used to assess the change in consumers' purchase intentions. Table 1 provides demographic profiles for the sample divided in terms of those who changed their purchase intention ($\Delta\text{PI} = 1$) versus those who did not ($\Delta\text{PI} = 0$). The items are first subjected to exploratory factor and reliability analyses to test the factor structure and six items (one from awareness and five from self-construal) are removed from the analysis due to low loadings during factor analysis. The items measuring perceived quality and trust emerged into one dimension. Factor loadings and reliability coefficients of the constructs are given in Table 2.

A hierarchical logistic regression procedure with Forward Wald method is used to test the proposed relationships for each brand. The first step estimated Model 1 using perceived quality, awareness, and loyalty as predictors of change in consumers' purchase intentions. In the second step, perceived social responsibility and consumers' self-construal are added to the model (Model 2) to see whether they add any value to the overall understanding. The demographic indicators are not added to the model since descriptive analyses reveal that there is no significant difference between the ones who change their purchase intention and those who do not. As can be seen from Table 3, baseline model is the model where none of the predictors are included into the model to see the improvement between the models. Model 1 tests the main effects of perceived quality, awareness, and loyalty

on the change in consumers' purchase intent. Model 2 analyzes the incremental effects of perceived social responsibility and self-construal of the respondents.

For both brands in the study, the models (base model, model 1 and model 2) fit the data, showing an improvement for every model as more suggested indicators are added to the models, reflected in the decrease of -2LL values. Hosmer-Lemeshow Test indicates that all models are significant. For the bank brand, in Model 1, only loyalty ($b_{\text{Loyalty}} = (-)0.493$; $p=0.012$) and awareness ($b_{\text{Awareness}} = 0.545$; $p=0.000$) are found as significant predictors. According to the model's results, perceived quality/trust does not play a role in the likelihood of change. For the domestic coffee shop, none of the three suggested predictors turn out to be significant. For model 2, perceived social responsibility and self-construal are added to the model. For the bank under study, again loyalty ($b_{\text{Loyalty}} = (-)0.479$; $p=0.017$) and awareness ($b_{\text{Awareness}} = 0.543$; $p=0.000$) reflect a positive relation with consumers' change in purchase decision. For the domestic coffee brand, only perceived social responsibility displays an effect ($b_{\text{PSR}} = -0.867$; $p=0.005$), however it is found insignificant for the bank in study. Self-construal and perceived quality are both found to have no influence in the change of consumers' purchase intentions for both brands.

Overall for the bank brand, out of six hypotheses listed within the conceptual framework and hypotheses section, none of the hypotheses are supported. The relationships stated in H1, H4, H5, and H6 are found to be insignificant. And finally, proposed relationships in H2 and H3 are found to be in the opposite directions. For the domestic coffee brand, only H5 finds support, where all other relationships suggested turn out to be non-significant.

5. Discussion

The results indicate that for the domestic coffee shop only perceived social responsibility plays a role in the change of consumers' purchase intention. As a result, among the population used in this study, the higher is perceived social responsibility, the higher is the likelihood that consumers' will continue to buy from the coffee shop. This finding is actually in line with the latest literature emphasizing the importance of corporate social responsibility. Consumers more and more are expecting companies to be socially responsible (Broderick et al. 2003), and are more forgettable in the case of a misconduct with those companies, that they think are socially responsible (Klein and Dawar 2004). As a result, companies should make the public aware of their social responsible acts, to be able to recover from an unpredictable crisis more easily. However, this communication should not be in the form of advertisements and consumers must sense congruence between the company and the social responsibility act (Mohr et al. 2001). However, for the bank within the study, perceived social responsibility is found to be an insignificant contributor. This may be attributed to the fact that the banks are not expected to behave in a socially responsible way. Consumers do not consider social responsibility as a significant indicator of a bank's image or trustworthiness; as a result, they do not base their decisions regarding banks on social responsibility perceptions.

For the bank brand under study, loyalty and awareness are found to be significant contributors to consumers' purchase decisions. Previous research suggests that loyal consumers would be more open to withdraw their consumption from the brand, when they believe that the brand does something which they don't approve (Lee 2007). However, in the present study, loyalty is found to be in a negative relationship with likelihood of change in consumption. More specifically, loyal consumers are found less likely to change their buying pattern, which is contrary to our expectations. Even though the results of our study reassures the strong relationship between loyalty and repurchase intention, it may also point that there might be a threshold for the initial loyalty level of the consumers. The population used in this study has below average loyalty, which may have affected the results. It may indicate that for less loyal consumers, the brand's negative actions may not be considered as an issue to change their consumption, as it is the case in our study. However, for heavy loyal consumers, i.e. real admirers of the brand, negative actions may trigger a cognitive calculation concerning their relationship with the brand. Another finding of the article is that higher awareness can be associated with higher likelihood of change in purchase intention, which is again contrary to our expectations based on previous literature stating that well-known brands are better off with crises than less well-known ones (Carroll 2009). This effect is most likely visible due to the timing of the research, when conversations about the misconduct of both brands are still alive. Consumers may have become aware of the brands because of what happened during Gezi Park and that may have affected their responses to questions measuring awareness. Moreover, the social pressure felt during the protests may have caused a social desirability among the respondents. Replicating the study within a different time frame would create different outcomes.

Perceived quality/trust and consumers' self-construal are found to have no effect on the change of consumers' intention for both brands under study. The non-significant effect of perceived quality/trust may be attributed to the effect that none of the negative communication was about the quality of the products or services offered. The non-significant effect of self-construal may be attributed to the fact that both independents and interdependents find the act as socially irresponsible and react in the same pattern. In that sense, it should be kept in mind that the study tries to take a snapshot of a latest important incident which found large space in both local and international media. Many newspaper articles have highlighted the fact that the protests might have affected consumers' brand related knowledge. This study goes a step further and demonstrates this effect.

6. Limitations and Future Research

The study has several limitations. First, the study uses a convenience sample even though the researchers tried to approach different demographic segments. Second, the research design enables only a static analysis. However, with the depth of issue at hand, the study may benefit from triangulation with some qualitative methods, like personal or group interviews. This could widen up the view. This would add more variables to the analysis and increase the exploratory power of the suggested relationships. As a suggestion, whether the company has apologized or not may be one of the additional determinants of the proposed relationships. This strategy is called "mortification" and encompasses apologizing, delivering admissions of guilt, and expressing regret to seek forgiveness from the consumers (Coombs and Holladay 2001). Research suggests that consumers forgive and forget more easily when companies apologize of what they did wrong (Lyan and Cameron 2004). Within the context of this study, only 21% of the consumers indicate that they change their attitude towards the bank, whereas there are 50% of consumers, who declare they will no longer purchase from the domestic coffee shop. This may be attributed to the fact that upper management of the bank has apologized to the consumers through media. This issue needs further study. Also, as stated earlier, timing of the study may create some common method biases, such as social desirability bias. The social pressure may have distorted the responses of some respondents. Replicating similar studies after some time of the protest calls may create different results. As a result, as a future research, time can be considered as an additional determinant of consumer attitude change. Also, type of brand related communication received may have played a role in consumers' decisions. Consumers who were able to follow news over social media were receiving more uncensored news as well as more calls for protests regarding the brands, whereas other media were just covering the story without any protest calls. The fact that some consumers followed social media and others did not, was not taken into account within this study. Future studies may consider this difference and result in different likelihood functions.

References

- Aaker, D. (1991), "Managing Brand Equity," Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Aaker, D. (1996), "Measuring Brand Equity Across Products and Markets," *California Management Review*, 38(3), 102-120.
- Aaker, D. & Joachimsthaler, E. (2000), "The brand Relationship Spectrum," *California Management Review*, 42(4), 8-23.
- Belk, R. W. (1988), "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139-168.
- Berry, L. (2000), "Cultivating Service Brand Equity," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(1), 128-137.
- Bharadwaj, S. G., Varadarajan, P. R. & Fahy, J. (1993), "Sustainable Competitive Advantage in Service Industries: A Conceptual Model and Research Propositions," *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 83-99.
- Broderick, A., Amandeep, J. & Tony, G. (2003), "Tickled Pink: The Personal Meaning of Cause- Related Marketing for Customers," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 19(5/6), 583-610.
- Carroll, A. B. 1979. "A Three-Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance?" *Academy of Management Review*, 4 (4), 497-505.
- Chattaraman, V., Lennon, S.J. & Rudd, N.A. (2010), "Social identity salience: Effects on identity-based brand choices of Hispanic consumers," *Psychology and Marketing*, 7, 263-284.
- Chaudhuri, A. & Holbrook, M.B. (2001), "The Chain of Effects from Brand Trust and Brand Affect to Brand Performance: The Role of Brand Loyalty." *Journal of Marketing*, 65, 81-93.
- Coombs, W. T. & Holladay, S.J. (2001), "An Extended Examination of the Crisis Situation: A Fusion of the Relational Management and Symbolic Approaches", *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13, 321-340.
- Dawar, N. & Pillutla, M.M. (2000), "Impact of Product-Harm Crisis on Brand Equity: The Moderating Role of Consumer Expectations", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37, 215-226.
- de Chernatony, L. & Dall'Olmo Riley, F. (1999), "Experts' Views About Defining Services Brands and The Principles of Services Branding," *Journal of Business Research*, 46(2), 181-192.

- de Chernatony, L. (2001), "A Model for Strategically Building Brands," *Journal of Brand Management*, 9(1), 32-44.
- Delgado-Ballester, E. & Munuera-Alema'n, J.L. (2003), "Development and Validation of a Brand Trust Scale", *International Journal of Market Research*, 45(1), 35-54.
- Delgado-Ballester, E. & Munuera-Alema'n, J.L. (1999), "Does Brand Trust Matter to Brand Equity", *The Journal of Product and Brand Manager*, 14 (2/3), 187-196.
- Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994), "Customer Loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual Framework," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(2), 99-113.
- Elliot R. & Wattanasuwan, K. (1998), "Brands as Symbolic Resources for the Construction of Identity," *International Journal of Advertising*, 17(2), 131-144.
- Englis, B. G. & Solomon, M.R. (1997), "I am not... Therefore, I am: The role of avoidance products in shaping consumer behavior," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24, 61-63.
- Erdem, T. & Swait, J. (1998), "Brand Equity as a Signalling Phenomenon," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7(2), 131-157
- Escalas, J. E. & Bettman, J.R. (2005), "Self-Construal, Reference Groups, and Brand Meaning," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32, 378-389.
- Folkes, V. S. & Kamins, M.A. (1999), "Effects of Information about Firms' Ethical and Unethical Actions on Consumers' Attitudes," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 8(3), 243-259.
- Forehand, M. R., Deshpande, R. & Reed, A. (2002), "Identity Salience and the Influence of Differential Activation of the Social Self-Schema on Advertising Response," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1086-1099.
- Garret, D. E (1987), "The Effectiveness of Marketing Policy Boycotts: Environmental Opposition to Marketing," *The Journal of Marketing*, 46-57.
- Grubb, E. L. & Grathwohl, H.L. (1967), "Consumer Self Concept, Symbolism, and Market Behavior: A Theoretical Approach," *Journal of Marketing*, 3:1, 22-27.
- Han, H. and Back, K. (2008), "Relationships Among Image Congruence, Consumption Emotions, and Customer Loyalty in the Lodging Industry," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 32(4), 467-490.
- Hoffmann, S. & Müller, S. (2009), "Consumer Boycotts due to Factory Relocation," *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 239-247.
- Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's consequences*, Beverly Hills, CA:Sage.
- Hunter, M. L, Menestrel, M. & De Bettignies, H. (2008), "Beyond Control: Crisis Strategies and Stakeholder Media in the Danone Boycott of 2001," *Corporate Reputation Review*, 11(4), 335-350.
- Hurriyet (2013) "Gezi Parkı'na şafak baskını" retrieved at <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/23396499.asp>.
- Jackson, J. W. & Smith, A.R. (1999), "Conceptualizing Social Identity: a New Framework and Evidence for the Impact of Different Dimensions," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(1), 120-135.
- John, A. & Klein, J. (2003), "The Boycott Puzzle: Consumer Motivations for Purchase Sacrifice," *Management Science*, 49(9), 1196-1209.
- Keller, K.L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity", *Journal of Marketing*, 57,1-22.
- Keller, K. L. (2003), *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring and Managing Brand Equity*. Pearson International Edition.
- Klein, J. G. & Niraj, D. (2004), "Corporate Social Responsibility, Consumers' Attribution and Consumers' Brand Evaluation in a Product-Harm Crisis," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 21(3), 203-217.
- Klein, J. G., Smith, N. C. & John, A. (2004) "Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation," *Journal of Marketing*, 2004, 92-109.
- Klein, J. G.; Ettenson, J. & Morris, M. D. (1998), "The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China," *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 89-100.
- Kotler, P. (2000). *Marketing Management The Millenium Addition*. Prentice Hall.
- Kressmann F., Sirgy, J.; Herrmann, A.; Huber, F.; Huber, S. & Lee, D. (2006), "Direct and indirect effects of self-image congruence on brand loyalty," *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 955-964.
- Lee, M. S. W.; Motion, J. & Conroy, D. (2009), "Anti-consumption and Brand Avoidance," *Journal of Business Research*, 62(2), 169-180.
- Lee, M. S. W. (2008), "Brands we Love to Hate: An Exploration of Brand aAvoidance," PhD Thesis. ResearchSpace@Auckland.
- Levy, S. J. (1959), "Symbols for Sale," *Harvard Business Review*, 37(4), 117-124.
- Light, L (1994), "Brand Loyalty Marketing Key to Enduring Growth", *Advertising Age*, 65(42), 20.

- Lyan, L. & Cameron, G. T. (2004), "A Relational Approach Examining the Interplay of Prior Reputation and Immediate Response to a Crisis," *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 16(3), 213-241.
- Maignan, I. & Ferrell, O. C. (2004) "Corporate Social Responsibility and Marketing: An Integrative Framework", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), 3-19.
- Malär, L. H.; Hoyer, W. D. & Nyffenegger, B. (2011), "Emotional Brand Attachment and Brand Personality: The Relative Importance of the Actual and the Ideal Self," *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 35-52.
- Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991), "Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation" *Psychological review*, 98(2), 224.
- Marsella, A.J.; Devos, G. & Hsu, F.K.L. (1985), Introduction: Approaches to Culture and Self. in A.J. Marsella, G. Devos and F.K.L. Hsu (ed.) *Culture and Self: Asian and western perspectives* (pp. 2-23), New York:Tavistock Pub.
- McCracken, G. (1989), "Who Is the Celebrity Endorser? Cultural Foundations of the Endorsement Process," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (December), 310-321.
- Mohr, L.A.; Webb, D.J. & Harris, K. E. (2001), Do Consumers Expect Companies to be Socially Responsible? The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Buying Behavior," *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1), 45-70.
- Morgan, R. M. & Hunt, S.D. (1994) "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 20-38.
- Oliver, R. L. (1997), *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oyserman, D. & Lee, S. W. S. (2008), "Does Culture Influence What and How We Think? Effects of Priming Individualism and Collectivism," *Psychological Bulletin*, 134 (2), 311-342.
- Pal, N. (2009), "From Starbucks to Carrefour: Consumer Boycotts, Nationalism and Taste in Contemporary China," *PORTAL Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, 6(2), 1-25.
- Pava, M.L. & Krause, J. (1996), *Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance: The Paradox of Social Cost*, Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Petkus, E. & Woodruff, R. B. (1992), "A Model of the Socially Responsible Decision-Making Process in Marketing: Linking Decision Makers and Stakeholders," *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 3,154-61.
- Reed, A. II & Forehand, M. (2003), "Social identity and marketing research: An integrative framework", Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved on 10 August 2013, from <http://marketing.wharton.upenn.edu/ideas/pdf/Reed/Simktstrategy-ar14.pdf>.
- Richardson, P. S., Jain, A.K. & Dick, A. (1996), "Household Store Brand Proneness: a Framework," *Journal of Retailing*, 72(2), 159-185.
- Samli, A. C. & Sirgy, M. J. (1981), "A multi-dimensional approach to analyzing store loyalty: A predictive model. In K. Bernhardt & B. Kehoe (Ed.), *The changing marketing environment: New theories and applications* (pp. 113-116). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Scott, D. (2000), "One Day and a Lifetime of Brand Lessons," *Brandweek*, 41 (34), 30-32.
- Sen, S., Gürhan Canli, Z. & Morwitz, V. (2001), "Withholding Consumption: A Social Dilemma Perspective on Consumer Boycotts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(3), 399-417.
- Sen, S. & Bhattacharya, C.B. (2001) "Does Doing Good always Lead to Doing Better? Consumer Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 225-243.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994), "The measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 580-591.
- Simon C.J. & Sullivan, M.W. (1993), "The Measurement and Determinants of Brand Equity: A Financial Approach," *Marketing Science*, 12, 28-52.
- Stanwick, P. A. & Stanwick, S.D. (1998), "The Relationship between Corporate Social Performance, and Organizational Size, Financial Performance, and Environmental Performance: An Empirical Examination," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(2), 195-204.
- Srinivasan, V. (1979), "Network models for estimating brand-specific effects in multi-attribute marketing models", *Management Science*, 25, 11-21.
- Swaminathan, V., Page, K and Gurhan-Canli, Z. (2007), "My" Brand or "Our" Brand: The Effects of Brand Relationship Dimensions and Self-Construal on Brand Evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34 (August), 248-259.
- Thompson, C. J., Rindfleisch, A. & Arsel, Z. (2006), "Emotional Branding and the Strategic Value of the Doppelgänger Brand Image," *Journal of Marketing*, 50-64.
- Thompson, C. J. & Arsel, Z. (2004), "The Starbucks Brandscape and Consumers' (anticorporate) Experiences of Globalization," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(3), 631-642.

- Wheeler, C. S. & Berger, J. (2007), "When the same prime leads to different effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34, 357-368.
- Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, V. (2004), "Evolving to A New Dominant Logic For Marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68, 1-17.
- Veroff, J. B. & Goldberger, N.R. (1995), What's in a Name? The Case of Intercultural. in N.R. Goldberger and J.B. Veroff ed. *The culture and psychology reader* (pp. 3-24), New York: New York University Press.
- Yoo, B., Donthu, N. & Lee, S. (2000), "An Examination of Selected Marketing Mix Elements and Brand Equity," *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 28, 195-211.
- Zack, J. (1991), "The Hullabaloo over Boycott Ballyhoo," *Business & Society Review*, 78, 9-15.

Table 1. Demographics of the Sample

Demographic Profile			
n=306			
Age	%	Income	%
16-20	12,1	under 3000 TL	32,4
21-30	65,4	3001 TL - 5000 TL	22,2
31-40	18,3	5001 TL - 8000 TL	19,9
41-50	2,3	over 8001 TL	25,5
51-72	2,0		
		Social Status	%
Education	%	Lower class	1,6
Primary school	0,6	Lower-middle class	3,6
Junior high school	0,7	Middle class	41,5
High school	36,3	Upper-middle class	42,8
University	54,2	Upper class	10,5
Master	4,6		
PhD	3,6	Gender	%
		Female	52,3
		Male	47,7

Table 2. Factor and Reliability Analyses Results

Dimension	Item	Loading	Cronbach's Alpha	Dimension	Item	Loading	Cronbach's Alpha
Loyalty	I consider myself to be loyal to this brand	0.768	0.845	Awareness	I know what this brand looks like	0.821	0.882
	I usually buy this brand	0.701			I can recognize X among other competing brands. Some characteristics of X come to my mind quickly.	0.817	
	X would be my first choice.	0.696			I am aware of X.	0.782	
	I will not buy other brands if this brand is not available.	0.790			I can quickly recall the symbol or logo of X.	0.776	
	I would buy another brand only if this brands' prices are too high	0.707			I will stay in a group if they need me even when I am not happy with the group	0.707	
Perceived Quality/	I am willing to pay extra	0.692	0.911	Interdependent self-construal	I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans	0.714	0.730
	This brand has high quality products	0.815			It is important to me to respect the decision made within the group	0.733	
	The likely quality of this brand is extremely high.	0.813			I would offer my seat to my professor	0.615	
	The products of this brand must be of very good quality.	0.645			My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me	0.560	
Trust	This brand appears to be of very poor quality.	0.744	0.710	Independent self-construal	I enjoy being unique and different from others	0.664	0.710
	The likelihood that this brand is reliable is very high.	0.793			My personal identity independent of others is very important for me	0.664	
	I trust this brand	0.640			I act the same way no matter who I am with	0.702	
	I trust products/services of this brand	0.678			I prefer to be direct with someone who I just met	0.619	
					Being able to take care of myself is my priority	0.653	

Table 3. Model Summaries

		B (p)	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R ²	Nagelkerke R ²	Pseudo R ²
Baseline Model	Bank		287,439			
	Domes. C. Shop		418,608			
Model 1 - main effects	Bank		266,881	0,068	0,109	0,072
	Domes. C. Shop		413,831	0,016	0,021	0,011
Loyalty	Bank	(-)0,493 (0,012)				
	Domes. C. Shop	n.s.				
Awareness	Bank	0,545(0,000)				
	Domes. C. Shop	n.s.				
Perceived quality/Trust	Bank	n.s.				
	Domes. C. Shop	n.s.				
Model 2	Bank		266,651	0,069	0,11	0,072
	Domes. C. Shop		403,065	0,05	0,067	0,037
Loyalty	Bank	(-)0,479(0,017)				
	Domes. C. Shop	n.s.				
Awareness	Bank	0,543(0,000)				
	Domes. C. Shop	n.s.				
Perceived quality/Trust	Bank	n.s.				
	Domes. C. Shop	n.s.				
Self-Constual	Bank	n.s.				
	Domes. C. Shop	n.s.				
Per. Social Responsibility	Bank	n.s.				
	Domes. C. Shop	(-)0,867(0,005)				

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

