land use #7

December 12th 2017 EFSEC HEARING

PUBLIC TESTIMONY FROM DR. MARK PRITCHARD

Bio

Professor, Department of Management,

Central Washington University, College of Business

Specialization in Corporate Social Responsibility

- 2017 publication on Renewable Energy, CSR in Electric Utilities

Specialization in Ag. Business

- 2017 Chair, CWU's Annual Economic Outlook Conference, "Trends, Challenges & Opportunities in Washington State's Hay & Potato Industries".
- 2016 Chair, CWU's Annual Economic Outlook Conference, "Trends, Challenges & Opportunities in Washington State's Fruit Industry".

POSITION: TO DENY TUSSO ENERGY'S APPLICATION FOR EXPEDITED APPROVAL.

Primary Rationale: That the applicant's request to use prime irrigated farmland to site multiple Utility Scale Solar complexes in Kittitas County will not serve the long term best interests of WA residents.

While pursuing renewable energy holds merit, doing so on irrigated AG land sets a terrible precedent for developments in our state. Without proper placement of these types of projects, renewable energy risks losing public support and the moral high ground on land use. Like the timber industry before them, large, responsible energy companies need to avoid actions that undermine their reputation and credibility as "authentic" partners that value the best interests of our communities. Efforts that pursue "green" energy at any cost lead to a lamentable formula, that "Profit minus conscience = Loss". PSE cannot wash its hands in this matter and profess to be a sensitive, responsible energy corporation, and not come out against developing projects on high value natural resource lands, particularly prime Ag. lands.

Issues Against Approval:

1. Significant public investment (state & federal $'s) in irrigation, KRD's long history of service.
2. Efforts to pursue renewable energy have general public support, yet that support will change when governments and companies set a "low bar" in the proper siting of these facilities.
3. Current siting practices in CA and OR counties limit the use of irrigated land to 10 and 12 acres respectively. Tusso's proposal exceeds this current practice by 20 fold. With other applicants waiting in the wings to see how this plays out, using prime irrigated land sets an extraordinary precedent for WA. Why should WA set such a low bar that its sister states would not consider.
4. A "Gold Rush" mentality that quickly develops renewable energy sites and asks for an expedited decision will not consider the full cost or impact to those communities. WA and Kittitas does not need to rush into things and take the first suitor on the "dance card". Let's weigh our options carefully.

5. The classic best picture "How Green Was My Valley" (1941) relates another type of impact when it shows a Welsh community struggling to exist in the face of another 'energy gold rush'. But the question posed in the title is germane to the council's deliberation. How many EFSEC projects exist in Kittitas County? With approval of the current application, why should almost 50% of EFSEC's projects center on this green valley? Given its current footprint, I submit that even greater care be taken when deciding where to locate solar complexes in our valley.

J Brand Manag
DOI 10.1057/s41262-017-0071-3

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Building corporate reputation through consumer responses to green new products

Mark Pritchard[1] · Theresa Wilson[1]

© Macmillan Publishers Ltd 2017

Abstract The importance of sustainability to customers, companies, and society requires an examination of the effects of green new products (GNPs). This study extends past research by examining consumer responses to a GNP and their impact on a parent firm's corporate reputation (CR). Survey responses were used to test a structural model that investigated whether consumer responses to a new wind farm bolstered an energy service company's CR. Results suggest adding a GNP to a service company's portfolio can improve consumer-based perceptions of CR. Perceptions of fit between the GNP and its larger parent company were also found to moderate explanatory links in the model. However, preexisting beliefs consumers held about the value of CSR practices and the importance of the CSR domain in which those actions were engaged did not. Strategic implications discuss how service managers can better use GNP associations to boost CR.

Keywords Corporate reputation · Green new products · Services · CSR · Sustainability

Introduction

Sustainability has become a core business issue and a significant challenge to company strategy. A recent survey of corporate executives found over half were concerned with how to manage the issue of sustainability and respond to societal obligations, and the environmental, social, or governance issues, their firms faced. Although a large share of these managers consistently cite corporate reputation as a primary reason their companies address sustainability, a similar number say the activities their firms pursue in the area of corporate social responsibility (CSR) add little value to how their reputation is perceived in the larger marketplace (McKinsey 2015). It appears management practices for adding value to a company's reputation through CSR are somewhat elusive. Yet, for many, they offer opportunities for "significant value-creation potential" (McKinsey 2015, p. 4).

Clarifying ways that leverage a company's sustainability initiatives is widely regarded as a strategic imperative worthy of research (Lubin and Esty 2010). Such initiatives typically contribute as formative elements in corporate reputation (CR) (Agarwal et al. 2015; Fombrun et al. 2000). Despite the bulk of attention focusing on corporate-level environmental initiatives (e.g., avoidance of ozone-depleting chemicals, energy conservation, pollution control, and recycling), it would be a mistake for managers to view a company's sustainability efforts simply, as synonymous with "green initiatives" (Mysen 2012, p. 496) undertaken at the corporate level. Brown and Dacin's (1997) seminal work on companies and their products supported links between the corporate associations consumers held (i.e., views of the organization's abilities and CSR) and their responses to its products. Their report expanded views of product-level responses (e.g., perceptions of quality, reliability, sophistication) to include impressions of a product's social responsibility. Other empirical studies followed in a similar vein, substantiating various links between corporate associations

✉ Mark Pritchard
PritchaM@cwu.edu

[1] College of Business, 400 East University Way, MS-7485, Ellensburg, WA 98926, USA

and product responses (e.g., Berens et al. 2005; Madrigal 2000).

Olsen et al. (2014, p. 119) expanded on the connection further when they verified that the introduction of GNPs, "products that offer environmentally sustainable features," altered attitudes toward a larger parent brand. Consumer impressions of green extensions at the product level are used to build company-level associations like CR in the marketplace. Anecdotal evidence is seen in Starbucks Inc.'s recognition for its "greening efforts" in the coffee industry (Unruh and Ettenson 2010, p. 4). The company's reputation for being eco-friendly benefited from launching several green lines of coffee endorsed by nonprofit partners such as the Audubon Society or the Rainforest Alliance. Also, starting in 2005, General Electric invested $15 billion into launching green new business-to-business products. This corporate response followed decades of negative publicity tying the firm's manufacturing processes to environmental pollution (Makower 2015). By 2014, GE's ranking had improved significantly to 23rd on Interbrand's Best Global Green Brands list (Dumaine 2014). This turnaround in CR was particularly interesting given General Electric's long history, and poor record in sustainability.

While the above examples offer evidence of companies successfully leveraging CR through green new products, research corroborating the value of sustainability at the product level is often overlooked (Sen et al. 2006). Few field experiments address whether responses to company GNPs influence consumer impressions of CR (Peloza and Shang 2011). The current study addresses this question and contributes to extant knowledge in a number of ways. First, it combines and extends previous work by asking whether consumer impressions of a GNP activate CR by generating favorable "mental associations about the organization" (Walsh et al. 2009, p. 189). Second, as outlined in the following review, the study considers a range of moderators and their effects. Reflections on contingencies are important as they help to describe the conditions under which effects might be more or less pronounced. Third, the context of the study extends the line of inquiry from manufactured goods (Brown and Dacin 1997; Olsen et al. 2014) to a service setting. Some contend contextual differences exist for service brands - where reputation plays "an especially important strategic role" (Wang et al. 2003, p. 76). Energy services industry with its questionable environmental record, is the context for the current study. Although GE was able to use GNPs to change their brand's reputation, work is needed to confirm if an energy company's reputation can benefit in a similar fashion from the introduction of a GNP (i.e., a wind farm).

Literature review

Corporate reputation (CR)

Fombrun (2012, p. 100) defines corporate reputation as "a collective assessment of a company's attractiveness to a specific group of stakeholders" relative to other companies with which it competes for resources. Walker's (2010) review summarizes CR similarly, as a stable aggregation of views of the company from both internal and external stakeholders (e.g., investors, employees, customers, local community, government) on a variety of issues (e.g., profitability, social responsibility, product quality, corporate governance). Positive CR is viewed as an intangible source of competitive advantage (Dowling and Moran 2012) impacting stakeholder satisfaction and financial performance (Ali et al. 2015). A good CR signals stakeholder groups that a company is interested in building solid relationships. This in turn reduces stakeholder perceptions of risk in developing an exchange relationship with that firm (De Leaniz and Del Bosque 2013).

Context matters when examining CR. The varying interests of a company's stakeholder groups frequently mean CR management needs to consider a range of viewpoints (Bromley 2001; Walker 2010). Work on formative factors building CR has found stakeholders differ in how those antecedents contribute. For example, "top management and analysts are usually more concerned about financial performance, whereas, customers may be more conscious about the quality of products and services" (Ali et al. 2015, p. 1114).

Recent work has begun to give more attention to a key stakeholder, consumers. Customer perceptions of CR are important as they have a direct impact on revenue and profits. Reputation can influence customer attitudes toward the firm which in turn affect customer purchase decisions. Ali et al. (2015) and Walsh et al. (2009) found that various customer outcomes (i.e., engagement, trust, loyalty) were directly impacted by CR. Reputation also has a promotional effect. The growth of social media and its capacity for viral impact emphasizes the need for impression management. Strong existing attitudes about CR in consumers can frame and defend brands from negative impressions or resonate with messages reinforcing positive impressions (Funk and Pritchard 2006; Hooghiemstra 2000; Olsen et al. 2014).

In consumer groups, CR stems from an evaluation customers make from "personal interaction experiences with the firm, as well as from reputation-relevant information received about the firm" (Walsh and Beatty 2007, p. 129). Agarwal et al. (2015) believe customer CR evaluations source from two areas of the firm: (1) its ability to produce valued goods and services and (2) the collective identity it manifests from the integrity of its organizational

practices. Others report a more complex view of CR sources with five dimensions: customer orientation, product and service quality, good employer, reliable and financially strong company, and social and environmental responsibility (Walsh and Beatty 2007).

Work on corporate associations offers a close parallel that overlaps with CR (Walsh et al. 2009). Brown and Dacin (1997) described corporate associations as a collective impression or evaluation originating from associations consumers held of both the company's abilities and its efforts to act in a socially responsible manner. Corporate ability was further defined as a "company's expertise in producing and delivering its outputs" (Brown and Dacin 1997, p. 68), where expertise was evident through investments in innovation, research and development, employee skills and knowledge, customer orientation, and industry leadership. In addition to corporate ability, these same researchers included a second type of corporate association, CSR (e.g., environmental sustainability, corporate giving to worthy causes, local support and involvement). When considered collectively, these corporate associations are very similar to Walsh and Beatty's (2007) customer based CR definition. However, Dacin and Brown (2002, p. 255) further distinguished the connection between the two when they defined CR as "a summary corporate association" consumers hold that develops "many lower-level corporate associations".

Building a corporate reputation with consumer responses to products

Walsh et al. (2009) notes previous research on CR has considered it as both an antecedent and an outcome of various relationships. In the current study, focus on the effects of a GNP means examining CR as a dependent outcome influenced by perceptions of the product. Brown and Dacin's (1997, p. 71) work on corporate associations and responses to new products studied two aspects of product response (PR). PR was comprised of "product attribute perceptions" of the new product that considered its level of technological sophistication and the degree to which it acted in a socially responsible manner. Perceptions of a product's attributes are said to originate through either "rational" or "emotional routes" (Keller 2016, p. 4), but often entail the use of both when consumers ascribe meaning to their observations. Brown and Dacin (1997, p. 70) contend once PR develops from "salient or diagnostic attributes of the product,...[-consumers] form an opinion of the product" amounting to a summary judgment or "product evaluation" (p. 71). This sequence, of product perceptions leading to PE, is consistent with satisfaction research that depicts attribute level perceptions forming the basis for evaluative attitude (Mittal et al. 1998; Oliver 1993).

As a distinct type of product, GNPs are also thought to have an additional capacity to influence positive PR. Associative network theory suggests positive PR perceptions for GNPs, or in this case "green energy", are enhanced by halo effects (Chernev and Blair 2015) and the "psychological capital" of affective imagery associated with sustainability (Stinson and Pritchard 2014, p. 230). In this context, green product evaluation occurs once PR perceptions of functional and socially responsible new product attributes (Ellen et al. 2006) are processed, associated, and interpreted with preexisting attitude such as attitudes toward green practices or the industry (e.g., Newman et al. 2014). While green PR reflects consumer impressions framed in a particular context (Olsen et al. 2014), PE's summative judgment of the overall product (e.g., its quality, comparative performance, attractiveness) may also be influenced by information from sources outside of the GNP itself (e.g., past experience, industry expectations; Oliver 1993).

Consistent with Brown and Dacin's (1997) original examination, the culmination of this discussion supports the first hypothesis:

H1 Perceptions of a green new product's attributes (PR) will have a direct, positive influence on a consumer's evaluative judgment (PE).

PE also plays an integral role in the formation of consumer perceptions of CR. Walsh and Beatty (2007, p. 129) clarified this significant link in their definition of reputation as being primarily sourced from customer "reactions to the firm's goods, services, communication activities interactions with the firm and its representatives." Earlier work in energy services had confirmed a strong correlation between a form of product evaluation (i.e., customer satisfaction) and CR (Walsh et al. 2006). However, a subsequent test of several antecedents clarified the connection further when it verified the significant part consumers' evaluative judgments of satisfaction play in forming CR (Walsh et al. 2009). Similarly, Chang and Zhu (2011) found summary assessments of product or service quality can intervene and play a strong mediating role between the effect of perceptions of products' attributes (i.e., market orientation) and CR. The gist of these findings suggests that consumers often summarize their perceptions of a new product's attributes (i.e., PR) into positive or negative judgments of satisfaction or quality with the product (i.e., PE). This in turn provides a basis for CR's development.

The spillover effects of brand extensions toward their larger corporate parents augers in further support. Theoretically, supportive cognition in PR and PE toward a GNP should generate positive spillover effects from the brand extension toward the parent company (Ahluwalia and Gürhan-Canli 2000; Pina et al. 2013). Findings do vary on

this. Olsen et al. (2014) found a GNP positively influenced attitude toward the existing (corporate) brand, whereas Sheinin's (2000) work suggested no spillover effect from the product to its related corporate parent.

The convergence of work on brand extensions (Olsen et al. 2014) and the role of PE as an antecedent in CR (Walsh et al. 2009) form the following research hypothesis.

H2 Summary evaluations of a green new product (PE) will mediate the effect of PR and have a direct, positive influence on consumer estimates of a corporate parent's reputation (CR).

The role of moderators

In their work on consumer reactions to products, companies, and CSR initiatives, Sen and Bhattacharya (2001, p. 225) argued that attention to moderators was key as they had the potential to deliver strong insights on the mechanisms at work in "when, how, and why consumers react." Typically, the interaction effect of a moderator allows for a more precise explanation of causal effects. It provides a way for explaining not only *how* X affects Y, but also under what circumstances the effect of X changes when faced with the moderating condition of variable Z.

A range of moderators have been used in the past to better explain how consumer views of a product link to corporate associations and reputation. Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) examined whether the relevance and importance of CSR domain (the area of CSR action) alters how information about those CSR initiatives are weighed in consumer judgments of new products. A CSR-relevant domain is one in which the CSR initiative has some relevance to the products made by the company. Actions taken in CSR-relevant domains do moderate product purchase intention directly and positively. In fact, initiatives that focus on social or environmental issues important to customers not only garner their support for the product but also sway attitude relative the organizations sponsoring those cause-based actions (Sen and Bhattacharya 2001, p. 228).

When a CSR domain (CSRD) becomes relevant and important to consumers, ease of accessibility to knowledge about that domain will increase and elicit favorable responses from consumers to products or companies associated with that area (Ahluwalia and Gürhan-Canli 2000; Bang et al. 2000). In our study on energy services, the environmental domain of CSR is particularly relevant to the product's production. Consumers who place a high importance on environmental issues will demonstrate stronger attitudes and place greater value on actions in this domain (i.e., CSRD). Thus, consistent with Bhattacharya and Sen (2004) and previous empirical evidence, this position will be examined with the following two hypotheses:

H3a High levels of importance attached to domain-specific CSR activities (CSRD) will positively moderate the effect of a green new product's attribute perceptions (PR) on its evaluation (PE).

H3b High levels of importance attached to domain-specific CSR activities (CSRD) will positively moderate the effect of a green new product's evaluation (PE) on consumer estimates of the corporate parent's reputation (CR).

Sen and Bhattacharya (2001) also considered the moderating effects of consumer beliefs about CSR practices (CSRB–CSR Beliefs). Some consumers see CSR activities like the introduction of GNPs as a needless expense instead of a benefit. There is evidence some consumers believe green products lead to lower quality standards (Chernev and Blair 2015; Olsen et al. 2014). For others, the additional costs and higher prices associated with launching GNPs (e.g., research and development, marketing expenses) provide little benefit. In their eyes, customers "foot-the-bill," while companies take the credit for being socially responsible (Habel et al. 2016). Both attitudes undermine the value and efficacy of CSR practices in this area and dampen a consumer's perception and evaluation of a GNP. In Sen and Bhattacharya's (2001) case, the scale they developed found negative beliefs consumers held about the value of CSR moderated company and product evaluations. The hypotheses proposed below are consistent with this, noting that strong views of CSR as ineffective or a liability will negatively dampen the effects of PR and PE.

H4a Strong beliefs that CSR activities are ineffective (CSRB) will dampen the effect of a green new product's attribute perceptions (PR) on its evaluation (PE).

H4b Strong beliefs that CSR activities are ineffective (CSRB) will dampen the effect of a green new product's evaluation (PE) on consumer estimates of the corporate parent's reputation (CR).

A final moderator to be examined is the level of product-company fit. Fit entails perceptions of "similarity between a product and a [corporate] brand" (Berens et al. 2005, p. 37). Other areas of business have considered the notion of fit in the context of consumers. Sports marketers have considered sponsor-event fit and the similarity of sponsors and the events they sponsor (Olson and Thjømøe 2011; Speed and Thompson 2000). Cause marketers have examined brand-cause fit and its role in consumer receptivity to marketing campaigns (Pracejus and Olsen 2004).

Berens et al. (2005) proposed that associations evoked by the corporate brand and new products had the capacity to overlap. A consistent fit, with shared associations between the two, is thought to aid evaluation as fit

Fig. 1 Proposed structural model

influences the diagnosticity of associations used to judge products and companies. Under conditions of high fit, consumers find the effect of PR on PE increases as diagnosticity of all relevant information is higher and cues for evaluation are stronger (Ahluwalia and Gürhan-Canli 2000; Madrigal 2000). Higher levels of product-company fit will enable new products to be more easily evaluated as authentic, natural extensions. Dowling and Moran (2012) argued that when CSR initiatives spring from a firm's core competencies they do a better job of building corporate reputation. Empirical research show positive affect and perceptions of company competence stemming from strong PE are more likely to transfer from GNPs to CR under conditions of high fit (Bhattacharya and Sen 2004; Ellen et al. 2006; Pina et al. 2013). The hypotheses tendered below summarize the moderating effects of strong product-company fit, that perceived fit will heighten the effects of PR on PE and PE to CR.

H5a Strong impressions of product-company fit (FIT) will positively moderate the effect of a green new product's attribute perceptions (PR) on its evaluation (PE).

H5b Strong impressions of product-company fit (FIT) will positively moderate the effect of a green new product's evaluation (PE) on consumer estimates of the corporate parent's reputation (CR).

Figure 1 summarizes the five hypotheses tendered. The model proposes a series of relationships examining how consumer responses to GNPs enhance views of a corporate parent's reputation. The current study will first test the model's structural links before investigating the role of three moderators (i.e., whether explanations varied under different conditions).

Methodology

Setting

The link between a green product and corporate reputation was examined in the context of the US energy industry. Work specifically focused on consumer attitudes toward a utility company (corporate parent) with a 135-year history in the energy industry and a recently launched 4-year-old wind farm (green new product). Justification for considering this energy facility a green product followed Olsen et al.'s (2014, p. 127) framework for assessing green claims when they are "expressly communicated by the brand or observable on the product." In this case, the term "renewable energy" frames the link from the corporation to the product it operates and features prominently on the product's home page. Consistent with past approaches to this topic, a brief descriptive profile of the corporation and the green product itself were provided (see "Appendix 1") prior to respondents being asked to complete survey questions about the entities (cf. Brown and Dacin 1997, p. 74).

An invitation to participate in a survey of regional energy service providers was emailed to (i) 450 local Chamber of Commerce members from the region the product (i.e., wind farm) was located in and (ii) 380 members of the general public who had completed tours of the corporate utility's wind farm facility in the Pacific Northwest of the USA. A link to the survey, which consisted of attitudinal, behavioral, and demographic questions, was provided at the end of an emailed invitation. Approximately 20% of those contacted ($n = 183$) undertook the survey. Incomplete responses reduced the sample further ($n = 139$). Females accounted for 51.8% of those who completed the survey. The most frequently occurring age groups for subjects were 40–49 years (24.6%) and 50–59 years (26.1%), the older group constituting the sample's median age. Respondents on average were college-educated, with an undergraduate (29.0%) or graduate (27.5%) education. Median household incomes ranged from $75,000 to $99,000. Eighty-five percent of respondents were in-state residents who had visited the product facility [wind farm], whereas a third or more of the sample were current users of the corporate utility, either at work (33.1%) or at home (38.4%).

Construct measures

Product response and product evaluation scales were adapted from Brown and Dacin's (1997) work. Measures of PR asked respondents to rate their impression of two product features, product sophistication (PS), and product social responsibility (PSR), on six items that were attached to seven-point Likert scales (1—strongly disagree to 7—strongly agree). Estimates of PE asked respondents to record their overall impression of the product and its performance on quality, operation, and attractiveness. These four items were attached to seven-point Likert-style scales (1—very low quality to 7—very high quality). Nine statements were also adapted from Brown and Dacin (1997) to provide a summary assessment of CR. These

items asked for an overall impression of the company and gathered associations consumers had about corporate abilities (e.g., CA: innovation, research, industry leadership) and the degree to which the company acted in a socially responsible manner (e.g., CSR: environmentally, socially, community involvement). Consistent with past work, items were attached to six-point Likert-style scales (1—very unfavorable to 6—very favorable) that asked how favorably respondents associated each attribute with the company (c.f. Brown and Dacin 1997).

Moderator measures

Three factors were proposed as independent moderators of the sequence depicted in Fig. 1. CSR beliefs (CSRB), a multi-item scale developed by Sen and Bhattacharya (2001), was used to gauge the degree to which consumers believed CSR efforts undermine or diminish PE and CR (eight items on seven-point Likert scales, 1—strongly disagree to 7—strongly agree). Three brand fit items were adapted from work by Berens et al. (2005) and attached to six-point Likert scales (1—strongly disagree to 6—strongly agree). Consumer outlooks on the importance of the CSR domain (CSRD) adapted three items to assessed attitude toward the environmental domain from work by Bang et al (2000). These tapped attitudes toward renewable energy and consumer "concern about the environment" and were attached to seven-point bipolar importance rating scales (1—not important to 7—very important).

Findings

Measurement results

Construct measures proposed in Fig. 1 were initially examined with responses to 19 PR–PE–CR items. A principle component factor (PCF) analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted. Contrary to a more complex factor structure reported by Brown and Dacin (1997), and to some extent Berens et al (2005), item loadings for product responses (i.e., product sophistication and socially responsible), product evaluation, and corporate associations (i.e., corporate abilities and corporate social responsibility) generated a simpler three-factor structure (eigenvalues >1.0) that explained 73.1% of the variance (see Table 1). Cattel's scree test also supported a three-factor interpretation, with corporate association items constituting the largest factor (eigenvalue = 6.43) explaining 33.87% of variance in the data. Product response items comprised the second largest factor (eigenvalue = 4.50, 23.70%). Having items group as either product or corporate indicators is consistent with measurement work reported by Sheinin (2000). Table 1's item loadings agree with this and show consistent item themes emerging.

Following Dacin and Brown's (2002, p. 255) definition of corporate reputation as a type of "summary corporate association", factor one's item loadings commend it as a collective estimate of CR. Item loadings for factor two support accepting it as a summary representation of PR, whereas the nature of factor three's make-up describes an estimate of PE. Although PCF analysis with the 19 items provided a thematic, "simple structure" (Bearden et al. 1989, p. 475), this parsimonious account needed validation. Using AMOS 23 (Arbuckle 1994), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to further test the three-factor solution. Burnkrant and Page (1982) recommend several tests to clarify whether factors are discrete and should stand alone. A series of discriminant and convergent validity ratios, average variance extracted (AVE) and maximum shared variance (MSV) were generated (Hair et al. 2010). Contrary to Brown and Dacin's (1997, p. 71) original six-factor portrayal with these measures, AVE and MSV ratios suggest that corporate ability and social responsibility items collectively reflect one factor (CA↔CSR correlation coefficient = 0.89, AVE's = 0.73 and 0.71, respectively) and product sophistication and product social responsibility items another (PS↔PSR correlation coefficient = 0.87; AVE's = 0.63 and 0.76, respectively).

While these ratios supported a three-factor solution, fit indices from the CFA called for scale refinement (Bentler 1990). This began with a review of construct alpha coefficients for the three factors: CR ($\alpha = 0.95$), PR ($\alpha = 0.93$), and PE ($\alpha = 0.87$). Although these estimates of internal consistency were robust, two items (PR1 and PE3) possessed weaker corrected item-to-total correlations (<0.6). Their initial elimination further improved corresponding alpha values (Ruekert and Churchill 1984). However, a follow-up three-factor CFA with the remaining items supported further improvements ($\chi^2 = 347.5$, df 116, $p < 0.01$). Standardized residual covariance estimates (SRC) and modification indices from the CFA were used to identify where discrepancies lay. Significant SRC's (i.e., absolute value >2.58) were observed in the residuals matrix for three CR items (i.e., CR 1, 4 and 9). Modification indices were used to corroborate that their removal improved the fit of the measurement model (cf. Berens et al. 2005).

The final 14-item, three-factor solution, was resubmitted for CFA ($\chi^2 = 104.7$, df 74, $p > 0.01$). Paired-fit indices, standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR = 0.04), and root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA = 0.05), verified the final measurement model (Hu and Bentler 1998). Significant standardized regression coefficients characterized item loadings for each of the three constructs and generated robust internal consistency estimates (see measurement results reported in Table 2).

Table 1 Factor analytic results of product-corporate attitude items ($n = 139$)

Factor/items	Factor Loadings[a]			
	Mean/SD	F1	F2	F3
Product Responses[b]				
PR1...is probably more advanced than other energy facilities like it.	(5.3/1.2)	0.048	**0.713**	0.027
PR2...uses advanced components in producing energy.	(5.6/1.3)	0.162	**0.841**	0.203
PR3...is a sophisticated facility.	(5.8/1.3)	0.183	**0.855**	0.225
PR4...is a socially responsible product.	(5.9/1.4)	0.135	**0.821**	0.259
PR5...is more beneficial to society's welfare than other products.	(5.4/1.5)	0.069	**0.835**	0.248
PR6...contributes positively to society.	(5.9/1.5)	0.078	**0.847**	0.343
Product Evaluation[c]				
PE1...overall impression of [product name]?	(6.1/1.0)	0.197	0.325	**0.822**
PE2...quality of how [product name] operates?	(6.0/1.0)	0.313	0.224	**0.766**
PE3...quality of [product name] relative to other energy facilities?	(5.7/1.2)	0.275	0.309	**0.619**
PE4...attractiveness of the [product name] facility?	(6.2/1.1)	0.234	0.297	**0.812**
Corporate Reputation[d]				
CR1...overall sense of [corporate name]	(4.8/0.8)	**0.823**	0.117	0.101
CR2...leadership in the energy industry	(4.9/0.8)	**0.828**	0.114	0.205
CR3...progressiveness as a company	(4.9/0.8)	**0.804**	0.125	0.163
CR4...research and development	(4.7/0.8)	**0.844**	0.071	0.110
CR5...innovative solutions to problems	(4.7/0.9)	**0.863**	0.111	0.178
CR6...social responsibility	(4.8/0.9)	**0.845**	0.171	0.296
CR7...concern for the environment	(4.9/1.0)	**0.821**	0.168	0.269
CR8...local community involvement	(4.8/1.0)	**0.797**	0.108	0.124
CR9...corporate giving to worthy causes	(4.8/0.8)	**0.768**	0.000	0.120
Eigenvalue		6.43	4.50	2.95
% Explained variance		33.87	23.70	15.56

[a] Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation. Rotated component matrix shown, see factor loadings in bold

[b] Attached to seven-point Likert scales (1—strongly disagree to 7—strongly agree)

[c] Attached to seven-point Likert-style scales (1—very low quality to 7—very high quality)

[d] Attached to six-point Likert-style scales (1—very unfavorable to 6—very favorable)

Structural model results

Examining the stability of this solution entailed testing for measurement invariance (VanderbergVandenberg and Lance 2000). In this case, the CFA's parameters were fitted simultaneously across gender to both male and female subjects. Although slightly less robust ($\chi^2 = 249.6$, *df* 148, $p > 0.01$), configural invariance for the measurement model across both groups was supported by virtue of acceptable model fit indices (SRMR = 0.05, RMSEA = 0.07). An assessment of metric invariance necessitated examining whether critical ratios of difference existed between males and females on the CFA's parameters. Invariance across groups was corroborated by the absence of significant critical ratios ($p < 0.01$) for items on all three factors (Hair et al. 2010).

With valid measures of PR, PE, and CR, path analysis of Fig. 1 was undertaken. SEM results supported the proposed model; see fit indices reported in Table 2. As hypothesized in **H1** and **H2**, PR significantly propels PE ($\beta = 0.645$) and PE in turn offers a significant explanation of CR ($\beta = 0.547$). Although PE → CR was supported, **H2** also questioned PE's role as a mediator. Past methods of gauging mediation typically used Chi-square difference tests between nested models to substantiate the effect (Bagozzi and Yi 1988). Critiques since have recommended taking stock of both direct and indirect effects (Zhao et al. 2010). This entails testing to see if PE fully mediates the effect of PR on CR. While partial mediation holds that direct (from PR to CR) and indirect effects via PE should be significant, full mediation requires that the direct effect becomes nonsignificant when the mediator PE is present and that the indirect effect of PR on CR be significant. Assessing this calls for modifications to the model (i.e., examining effects with and without the mediator PE) and the use of bootstrapping to report the significance of both

Table 2 Path analytic results ($n = 139$)

Measurement results	Loading	Construct relationships	Path	
	λ^a		β^a	$p<$
CR: Corporate Reputation				
Industry leadership	0.833	**H1** PR → PE	0.645	0.01
Progressive company	0.803	**H2** PE → CR	0.547	0.01
Innovative solutions	0.841			
Socially responsible	0.945			
Concern for the environment	0.919			
Local community involvement	0.767	SMC (R^2)		
		PE	0.416	0.01
PE: Product Evaluation		CR	0.299	0.01
Overall impression	0.919			
Quality of operation	0.759	Model fit[a]		
Facility attractiveness	0.871	χ^2	104.7	
PR: Product Responses		df	75	
Uses advanced components	0.823	$p > 0.01$		
Is a sophisticated facility	0.861	SRMR	0.042	
Socially responsible	0.875	RMSEA	0.054	
Beneficial to society's welfare	0.848			
Contributes positively to society	0.934			

[a] Standardized loading or regression coefficients

[b] Dual-index presentation strategy to support fit

direct and indirect effects (cf. Hair et al. 2010, pp. 751–755). Bootstrapping is a resampling method used to construct a confidence interval for the indirect effect. See Preacher and Hayes (2004) for a more detailed discussion of this approach.

Standardized regression coefficients in Table 3 support the claim that PE fully mediates the effect of PR on CR. Direct effects prior to adding the mediator ($\beta = 0.353$) and indirect effects of PR ($\beta = 0.355$) both proved significant, whereas direct effects of PR with the mediator present were not ($\beta = -0.004$). These findings clarify and support **H2**.

A further validity test was undertaken to assess whether common method variance (CMV) was an issue. Concerns over inflated correlations between constructs in cross-sectional studies have provoked researchers to account for CMV (Podsakoff et al. 2003). Lindell and Whitney (2001) suggest marker variable analysis as one way to account for method variance. This approach uses a variable theoretically unrelated to the constructs of interest and examines its correlation with each of the factors. In this case, two survey questions rating the importance of reliable service in the energy industry formed a marker variable testing for CMV in the data. Construct correlations between the PR–PE–CR factors were found to be theoretically sound, significant, and discrete with acceptable AVE and MSV ratios, whereas marker variable correlations with Fig. 1's three constructs and the proposed moderators all proved non-significant (see Table 4).

Testing the moderators

Construct measures for the three moderators, CSRD, CSRB, and fit, were initially examined with consumer responses to 14 items. Again, PCF analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted. A simple three-factor structure (eigenvalues >1.0) emerged that explained 76.9% of the variance resulted (see "Appendix 2"). Factor-item loadings show discrete, consistent item themes. Validity estimates reported in Table 4 denote strong levels of internal consistency (IC's > 0.89). The link between CSRD and CRSB

Table 3 Testing for mediation

Hypothesis	Direct effect without PE	Direct effect with PE	Indirect effect of PR	Type of mediation
Mediation PR–PE–CR	0.353 ($p < 0.001$)	−0.004 ($p = 0.833$)	0.355 ($p = 0.002$)	Full mediation

Table 4 Construct validity ratios and correlations ($n = 139$)[a]

Construct	Items	Item mean *St. Dev.*	IC[b]	AVE[c]	MSV[d]	ASV[e]	CR	CSRB	PR	PE	FIT	CSRD	MV
Corporate Reputation	6	4.84 *0.78*	0.94	0.71	0.35	0.14	**0.84**[f]						
CSR Beliefs	5	5.82 *1.12*	0.92	0.69	0.25	0.08	0.20	**0.83**					
Product Responses	5	5.73 *1.24*	0.94	0.76	0.41	0.14	0.37**	0.22	**0.87**				
Product Evaluation	3	6.13 *0.95*	0.89	0.72	0.49	0.22	0.55**	0.27*	0.64**	**0.85**			
Brand Fit	3	4.99 *0.88*	0.89	0.74	0.49	0.19	0.59**	0.22	0.46**	0.70**	**0.86**		
CSR Domain	3	6.07 *1.10*	0.90	0.74	0.25	0.08	0.19	0.50**	0.20	0.27*	0.19	**0.86**	
Marker Variable	2	6.53 *0.69*	0.74	0.58	0.04	0.01	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.21	**0.76**

* $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.001$

[a] Ratios and correlations generated from CFA

[b] Internal consistency = $(\Sigma\lambda)^2/((\Sigma\lambda)^2 + \Sigma\text{errors})$. Composite reliability demonstrated when IC coefficient >0.70

[c] Average variance extracted = $(\Sigma\lambda^2)/((\Sigma\lambda^2) + \Sigma\text{errors})$. Convergent validity demonstrated when AVE > 0.50

[d] Maximum shared variance. Discriminant validity demonstrated when MSV < AVE

[e] Average shared variance. Discriminant validity demonstrated when ASV < AVE

[f] Square root of AVE

was significant ($r = 0.50$); however, discriminant ratios emphasized the discrete nature of the two moderators (e.g., AVE's > 0.50).

To assess the interactive effects (Hair et al. 2010, p. 347) for the three moderators proposed in **H3**, **H4**, and **H5**, a re-specification of the latent variable model was undertaken to form a SEM interaction model. This approach followed guidelines recommended by Gaskin (2016) for testing interaction effects using SEM. Re-specification to assess moderator effects added six interaction terms (XY → Z) as direct paths, three each to both PE and CR. In this case, interaction effects consider the joint effects of two predictor variables, in addition to the individual main effects, and represent another form of moderation examining how the X to Y relationship changes in light of another explanatory variable (the moderator). Factor and interaction terms were first summarized to produce a single-item indicator for each and then centered (Edwards 2009) eliminating issues of multi-collinearity (Ping 1995). The initial model tested included all moderator main and interaction effects ($\chi^2 = 16.06$, *df* 7, $p = 0.02$). Model fit indices (SRMR = 0.008, RMSEA = 0.097) suggested some refinements were needed. Nonsignificant paths from CSRD and CSRB and their interaction terms were eliminated, and the model was re-run. The fit that resulted was stronger, with a nonsignificant Chi-square and an improved RMSEA (see Table 5).

Results from Table 5 show only two of the six hypothesized interaction effects moderating PE and CR. Both CSRD and CSRB failed to interact with either PR or PE in explaining either of these two outcomes, and offered no support for the moderator effects proposed in **H3** or **H4**. A notable exception to this trend was observed for product-company fit. This moderator interacted with both PR and PE and played a significant role ($p < 0.01$) in moderating subsequent explanations of PE and CR ($\beta = -0.303$ and 0.269, respectively). Explained variance estimates for product evaluations of the GNP and corporate reputation dramatically benefited from adding fit to the model (Rsq. = 0.761 and 0.467, respectively), with significant main and interaction effects for the moderator contributing to the final explanation of both outcomes.

Graphic representations of these two moderator effects are shown in Fig. 2. These plot two-way interaction effects that categorize Z, the linear interactions, and X variable effects as either low or high. The first graph depicts fit between the product and company playing a dampening role on the positive relationship between PR and PE. A negative coefficient shown in Table 5 for the PR × FIT interaction ($\beta = -0.303$) relates a similar account but runs contrary to the direction specified in **H5a**. The second

Table 5 SEM test of interaction effects ($n = 139$)

Hypotheses[a] and paths	Coefficient (β)[b]	p value	Final model fit[c]
PR → PE	0.399	0.001	
CSRB → PE	0.120	0.014	
CSRD → PE	0.021	0.664	
FIT→ PE	0.336	0.001	
H3a PR × CSRD interaction → PE	−0.066	0.349	
H4a PR × CSRB interaction → PE	−0.024	0.724	
H5a PR × FIT interaction → PE	−0.303	0.001	SMC (R^2)
			PE = 0.761, CR = 0.467
PE → CR	0.375	0.001	**Model fit**
CSRB → CR	−0.017	0.830	$\chi^2 = 22.02$
CSRD → CR	0.004	0.960	$df = 14$
FIT→ CR	0.523	0.001	$p = 0.078$
H3b PE × CSRD interaction → CR	0.085	0.340	
H4b PE × CSRB interaction → CR	−0.096	0.298	SRMR = 0.020
H5b PE × FIT interaction → CR	0.269	0.005	RMSEA = 0.064

[a] Hypotheses in bold

[b] Using standardize (centered) summary estimates

[c] Dual-index presentation strategy to support fit

graph shown paints the reverse story. In this case, perceptions of product-company fit were found to strengthen the positive relationship between PE and CR. To sum up, a significant negative coefficient in Table 5 supports the link but rejects the direction proposed in **H5a**, whereas a positive coefficient corroborates fit's moderating role ($\beta = 0.269$) in PE's effect on CR (**H5b**). The nature of these effects is considered further in the discussion that follows.

Discussion

Consistent with past work (Olsen et al. 2014), the current study found consumer views of a company's CR in the energy industry were strengthened by perceptions of one of the firm's GNPs. Positive responses to attributes consumers saw in a GNP supported judgments of product performance. This evaluation in turn contributed to explaining a significant proportion of the parent company's reputation. Using Brown and Dacin's (1997) measures, study results indicate GNPs do more than influence product attitude; they can also form associations we have of CR. While most previous work in corporate associations accounts for the influence of corporate-level social responsibility initiatives on CR, this research notes the potential for responses to GNPs to have a similar effect.

Study findings on this relationship were further nuanced by the impact of fit as a moderator. Although it appears that high GNP fit with the firm amplifies PE's capacity to positively leverage CR, the same condition muffled PR's effect on PE. Consumers who saw a strong relationship between the energy utility and the GNP lowered their overall evaluation of the GNP. In our estimation, this counterintuitive effect may result from the study's industry context and consumer dispositions toward vice brands, those industries and brands that are associated with long-term negative societal consequences. Olsen et al. (2014) found GNP extensions offered stronger benefits for well-established vice brands than for similarly positioned virtue brands. However, they did not include product evaluation in their research. In our study, the 135-year-old energy services company operated in a "vice-related category" that has a long-term dependency on fossil fuels and would be characterized as an older, vice brand (Olsen et al. 2014, p. 124). Thus, it appears that a consumer's internal assessment and appraisal of the GNP itself suffers when it is associated too closely with its corporate parent.

This implies companies with issues in sustainability should consider dual level communication strategies when they introduce and position the GNP. Communication about the GNP should refrain from generating direct associations with its corporate parent. However, a separate landing page and/or strategy should be considered for the corporate brand. Positioning at this level should link to and benefit from its association with the GNP. According to Van Rekom et al. (2013), this platform is effective because CSR activities directly related to a company's core activities effectively frame and strengthen views of these actions as positive, long-term social benefits. When a

Fig. 2 The interactive effects of product-company fit

company's core activities include a GNP, consumers tend to view sustainability as endemic and more authentic than when associations are activated through peripheral action (e.g., donating to environmental causes, planting trees). The GNP's production is an integral part of the company's existence and mission (Dowling and Moran 2012). So, if the intent is to leverage CR authentically with company stakeholders, brand managers should feature their portfolio's green product prominently in corporate communications (Hooghiemstra 2000).

While the current study's focus on energy services limits the generalizability of the findings, it does offer some insights for older companies in industries with historically poor environmental records. Sheinin (2000) found that consumers were inflexible in their responses to a parent brand, regardless of their experience with a brand extension. This implies companies or brands with suspect sustainability records should question whether investments in GNPs can elevate CR. However, Olsen et al. (2014) found the opposite result for older, vice brands and GNPs. Our results corroborate their argument that older companies in industries with poor sustainability records can benefit positively from adding a GNP. A deficient history in sustainability does not necessarily preclude a company from reaping future benefits of doing good.

Many brand managers want to "do good" in the area of sustainability for altruistic reasons. However, arguments for "doing good" by delivering socially beneficial products

become stronger when managers can also demonstrate economic returns. Adding GNPs can strengthen a company's reputation and product portfolio and offer a way for companies to secure the environmental, social, and financial benefits described by Elkington's triple bottom line (Savitz 2012). Although not examined longitudinally here, the capacity for GNPs to bolster CR may address the escalating need for environmentally friendly offerings while simultaneously contributing to the company's long-term economic growth.

Limitations and future research

While our field survey with an energy services company shows a GNP contributing to CR, its use of one context and cross-sectional sampling limits generalizations to other industries and inferences about causality. A wider scope of inquiry, study controls, and research designs in subsequent work may bring some relief to these concerns (Winer 1999). In light of past research, the lack of significant moderator effects on explanations of PE or CR by either CSRB or CSRD is surprising. These previously developed moderator measures did not detect similar effects in our sample (Sen and Bhattacharya 2001; Bang et al. 2000). Yet, limitations may not rest with the measure themselves. Follow-up work may need to consider a broader range of factors in the inquiry. For example, Bang et al. (2000) also reported using knowledge of renewable energy as a factor in the formation of consumer attitudes. In the context of our research, 85% of the sample toured the visitor center and were familiar with the wind farm. Work with subsequent samples may need to control for different levels of consumer knowledge or familiarity with the energy industry. A final related extension in energy services could focus expressly on the public policy implications of GNPs in a utility company's service portfolio. Inquiries could determine whether enhancing CR via GNPs can sway public opinion and voter decisions (Swofford and Slattery 2010). For example, county voters in the USA often choose between service providers, private or public utilities for their communities. Subsequent extensions could test whether GNP-enhanced CR is capable of moving the dial on voter behavior in this context (Burton and Netemeyer 1992).

A further theoretical implication of the current study is the simplification of Brown and Dacin's (1997) original two factors, corporate ability and CSR, into a unidimensional representation of CR. Measurement findings showed items loading significantly, with internal consistency and other validity ratios (convergent & discriminant) further corroborating this finding. Although this portrayal is consistent with higher order depictions of CR as a summary construct for corporate consumers, it stands in contrast with more complex accounts that denote CR as multidimensional (Walsh and Beatty 2007). Additional research comparing the efficacy of these measures with a range of benchmarks across different settings would be helpful (Walsh et al. 2014).

Along these lines, extensions with a wider platform of CSR initiatives must also be considered if we are to take stock of the relative efficacy of CSR activities across domains and stakeholders (Peloza and Shang 2011). While our research showed that a GNP can impact CR in energy services, we recommend that subsequent examinations of GNPs be considered alongside other CSR activities. Estimates here could tease out differential effects and relative contributions to ROI from these activities as brands strive to "do good" in their respective industries.

Appendix 1

Corporation/Product Descriptions Used[1]

Corporate Profile:

The state's oldest, local energy utility, [Corporation] has a rich 135 year history of energy leadership, groundbreaking, innovation and dedicated customer service to local communities. [Corporation] focuses on delivering safe, reliable, affordable energy, and is committed to great customer service and making our communities better places to live and work.

Fast facts

- Employees: 2800
- Customers: 1.1 million electric, 750,000 + natural gas
- Service: 6000 + sq.miles, approx.4 million + residents

Corporate mission

Ethics and Compliance: summarized in a sentence, "Do what is right."

Environment: Doing smart things for the planet and customers with clean, green, efficient technology.

The Land: Protecting habitat, clearing trails, restoring stream banks and planting trees.

Fish Friendly: Enhancing fish populations and mitigating the impact of state hydropower operations.

Bird Safety: Modifying energy facilities and power lines to protect our avian friends.

[1] Incorporated in the e-survey, descriptions were adapted directly from each entity's respective Web site.

Green New Product Profile:

[Product Name] *Wind and Solar Farm has 149 turbines spanning across 10,000 acres. Since 2009, the facility can generate up to 273 megawatts of electricity, enough to serve more than 80,000 homes. [Product Name] benefits the surrounding community by creating jobs, lease income for landowners, significant local tax revenues, and contains the region's largest solar power array.*

Appendix 2

Factor analytic results of moderator variables ($n = 139$)

Factor/items	Factor Loadings[a]			
	Mean/SD	F1	F2	F3
CSR domain[b] (Bang et al. 2000)				
CSRD 1 environmental impact	(6.0/1.2)	0.329	**0.873**	0.044
CSRD 2 pollution	(6.3/1.0)	0.266	**0.861**	0.020
CSRD 3 water usage	(5.8/1.4)	0.122	**0.859**	0.189
Product-corporate brand fit[c] (Berens et al. 2005)				
FIT 1 [product name] fits with the overall image of [corporate name]	(5.0/0.9)	0.082	0.051	**0.933**
FIT 2 [product name] is a logical product for [corporate name] to have developed	(5.2/1.0)	0.248	0.047	**0.864**
FIT 3 In many ways [product name] is similar to [corporate name]	(4.7/1.0)	0.024	0.061	**0.884**
CSR Beliefs[d] (Sen and Bhattacharya 2001)				
CSRB 1 SR[e] behavior weakens a company's ability to provide the best	(5.6/1.6)	**0.831**	0.300	0.128
CSRB 2 SR behavior drains company resources	(5.5/1.6)	**0.781**	0.384	0.020
CSRB 3 SR behavior by firms often covers up for inferior products	(5.4/1.6)	**0.828**	0.040	0.132
CSRB 4 SR firms produce worse products than other firms	(5.8/1.3)	**0.900**	0.167	0.053
CSRB 5 All things equal, SR firms have lower technological expertise than others	(5.8/1.4)	**0.876**	0.157	0.045
CSRB 6 Firms devoting resources to SR action have less for training employees	(5.8/1.3)	**0.889**	0.131	0.005
CSRB 7 Companies can be both SR and manufacture products of high value	(6.4/0.9)	**0.661**	0.251	0.128
CSRB 8 Resources devoted to SR come at the expense of improving product offerings	(5.4/1.6)	**0.733**	0.152	0.222
Eigenvalue		5.59	2.64	2.54
% Explained variance		39.93	18.88	18.15

[a] Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation. Rotated component matrix shown, see factor loadings in bold

[b] Attached to seven-point bipolar importance rating scales (1—not important to 7—very important)

[c] Attached to six-point Likert-style scales (1—strongly disagree to 6—strongly agree)

[d] Attached to seven-point Likert scales (1—strongly disagree to 7—strongly agree)

[e] Socially responsible

References

Agarwal, J., O. Osiyevskyy, and P. Feldman. 2015. Corporate reputation measurement: Alternative factor structures, nomological validity, and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics* 130(2): 485–506.

Ahluwalia, R., and Z. Gürhan-Canli. 2000. The effects of extensions on the family brand name: An accessibility-diagnosticity perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research* 27(3): 371–381.

Ali, R., R. Lynch, T. Melewar, and Z. Jin. 2015. The moderating influences on the relationship of corporate reputation with its antecedents and consequences: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Business Research* 68(5): 1105–1117.

Arbuckle, J. 1994. AMOS: Analysis of moment structures. *Psychometrika* 59: 135–137.

Bagozzi, R., and Y. Yi. 1988. On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 16(1): 74–94.

Bang, H., A. Ellinger, J. Hadjimarcou, and P. Traichal. 2000. Consumer concern, knowledge, belief, and attitude toward renewable energy: An application of the reasoned action theory. *Psychology & Marketing* 17(6): 449–468.

Bearden, W., R. Netemeyer, and J. Teel. 1989. Measurement of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence. *Journal of Consumer Research* 15(4): 473–481.

Bentler, P. 1990. Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin* 107(2): 238.

Berens, G., C. Van Riel, and G. Van Bruggen. 2005. Corporate associations and consumer product responses: The moderating role of corporate brand dominance. *Journal of Marketing* 69(3): 35–48.

Bhattacharya, C., and S. Sen. 2004. Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review* 47(1): 9–24.

Bromley, D. 2001. Relationships between personal and corporate reputation. *European Journal of Marketing* 35: 316–334.

Brown, T., and P. Dacin. 1997. The company and the product: Corporate associations and consumer product responses. *Journal of Marketing* 61(1): 68–84.

Burnkrant, R., and T. Page. 1982. An examination of the convergent, discriminant and predictive validity of Fishbein's behavioral intention model. *Journal of Marketing Research* 19: 550–561.

Burton, S., and R. Netemeyer. 1992. The effect of enduring, situational, and response involvement on preference stability in the context of voting behavior. *Psychology & Marketing* 9(2): 143–156.

Chang, T., and W. Zhu. 2011. Enhancing corporate reputation for market expansion in China: Customer orientation and the mediating effect of product and service quality. *Journal of Strategic Marketing* 19(2): 153–170.

Chernev, A., and S. Blair. 2015. Doing well by doing good: The benevolent halo of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Consumer Research* 41(2): 1412–1425.

Dacin, P., and T. Brown. 2002. Corporate identity and corporate asociations: A framework for future research. *Corporate Reputation Review* 5(2/3): 254–263.

De Leaniz, P., and I. Del Bosque. 2013. Intellectual capital and relational capital: The role of sustainability in developing corporate reputation. *Intellectual Capital* 9(1): 262–280.

Dowling, G., and P. Moran. 2012. Corporate reputations: Built in or bolted on? *California Management Review* 54(2): 25–42.

Dumaine, B. 2014. Is Apple "greener" than Starbucks? Fortune, 24 June 2014, http://fortune.com/2014/06/24/50-best-global-green-brands-2014/. Accessed May 26, 2016.

Edwards, J. 2009. Seven deadly myths of testing moderation in organizational research. In *Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends: Doctrine, verity and fable in the organizational and social sciences*, ed. C.E. Lance and R.J. Vandenberg, 143–164. New York: Routledge.

Ellen, P., D. Webb, and L. Mohr. 2006. Building corporate associations: Consumer attributions for corporate socially responsible programs. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 34(2): 147–157.

Fombrun, C., N. Gardberg, and J. Sever. 2000. The reputation quotient: A multi-stakeholder measure of corporate reputation. *Journal of Brand Management* 7(4): 241–255.

Fombrun, C. 2012. The building blocks of corporate reputation: Definitions, antecedents, consequences. In *The Oxford handbook of corporate reputation*, ed. M. Barnett and T. Pollock, 94–113. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Funk, D., and M. Pritchard. 2006. Sport publicity: Commitment's moderation of message effects. *Journal of Business Research* 59(5): 613–621.

Gaskin, J. 2016. Structural equation modeling: Testing interaction effects. Accessed March 1, 2016. From Gaskination's StatWiki, http://statwiki.kolobkreations.com.

Habel, J., L. Schons, S. Alavi, and J. Wieseke. 2016. Warm glow or extra charge? The ambivalent effect of corporate social responsibility activities on customers' perceived price fairness. *Journal of Marketing* 80(1): 84–105.

Hair, J., W. Black, B. Babin, and R. Anderson. 2010. *Multivariate data analysis*, 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hu, L., and P. Bentler. 1998. Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods* 3 (4): 424–453.

Hooghiemstra, R. 2000. Corporate communication and impression management: New perspectives why companies engage in corporate social reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics* 27(1): 55–68.

Keller, K. 2016. Reflections on customer-based brand equity: Perspectives, progress, and priorities. *AMS Review* 6(1–2): 1–16.

Lindell, M., and D. Whitney. 2001. Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(1): 114–121.

Lubin, D., and D. Esty. 2010. The sustainability imperative. *Harvard Business Review* 88(5): 42–50.

Madrigal, R. 2000. The role of corporate associations in new product evaluation. In *Advances in consumer research*, vol. 27, ed. S. Hoch and R. Meyer, 80–86. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Makower, J. 2015. Ecoimagination at 10: A status report. Green Biz, https://www.greenbiz.com/article/ecomagination-10-status-report. Accessed May 27, 2016.

McKinsey and Company. 2015. Sustainability's strategic worth, http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/sustainability/sustainabilitys_strategic_worth_mckinsey_global_survey_results. Accessed January 9, 2016.

Mittal, V., W. Ross, and P. Baldasare. 1998. The asymmetric impact of negative and positive attribute-level performance on overall satisfaction and repurchase intentions. *Journal of Marketing* 62(1): 33–47.

Mysen, T. 2012. Sustainability as corporate mission and strategy. *European Business Review* 24(6): 496–509.

Newman, G., M. Gorlin, and R. Dhar. 2014. When going green backfires: How firm intentions shape the evaluation of socially beneficial product enhancements. *Journal of Consumer Research* 41(3): 823–839.

Oliver, R. 1993. Cognitive, affective, and attribute bases of the satisfaction response. *Journal of Consumer Research* 20(3): 418–430.

Olsen, M., R. Slotegraaf, and S. Chandukala. 2014. Green claims and message frames: How green new products change brand attitude. *Journal of Marketing* 78(3): 119–137.

Olson, E., and H. Thjømøe. 2011. Explaining and articulating the fit construct in sponsorship. *Journal of Advertising* 40(1): 57–70.

Peloza, J., and J. Shang. 2011. How can corporate social responsibility activities create value for stakeholders? A systematic review. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 39(1): 117–135.

Pina, J., F. Dall'Olmo Riley, and W. Lomax. 2013. Generalizing spillover effects of goods and service brand extensions: A meta-analysis approach. *Journal of Business Research* 66(9): 1411–1419.

Ping, R. 1995. A parsimonious estimating technique for interaction and quadratic latent variables. *Journal of Marketing Research* 32(3): 336–347.

Podsakoff, P., S. Mackenzie, J. Lee, and N. Podsakoff. 2003. Common methods bias in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88(5): 879–903.

Pracejus, J., and G. Olsen. 2004. The role of brand/cause fit in the effectiveness of cause-related marketing campaigns. *Journal of Business Research* 57(6): 635–640.

Preacher, K., and A. Hayes. 2004. SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* 36(4): 717–731.

Ruekert, R., and G. Churchill Jr. 1984. Reliability and validity of alternative measures of channel member satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research* 21(2): 226–233.

Savitz, A. 2012. *The triple bottom line: How today's best-run companies are achieving economic, social and environmental success, and how you can too*. New York: Wiley.

Sen, S., and C. Bhattacharya. 2001. Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research* 38(2): 225–243.

Sen, S., C. Bhattacharya, and D. Korschun. 2006. The role of CSR in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships: A field experiment. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Research* 34(2): 158–166.

Sheinin, D. 2000. The effects of experience with brand extensions on parent brand knowledge. *Journal of Business Research* 49(1): 47–55.

Speed, R., and P. Thompson. 2000. Determinants of sports sponsorship response. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 28(2): 226–238.

Stinson, J., and M. Pritchard. 2014. Leveraging sport for social marketing and corporate social responsibility. In *Leveraging brands in sport business*, ed. M. Pritchard and J. Stinson, 221–237. New York, London: Routledge.

Swofford, J., and M. Slattery. 2010. Public attitudes of wind energy in Texas: Local communities in close proximity to wind farms and their effect on decision-making. *Energy Policy* 38(5): 2508–2519.

Unruh, G., and R. Ettenson. 2010. Winning in the Green Frenzy. *Harvard Business Review* 88(11): 1–6.

Vandenberg, R., and C. Lance. 2000. A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods* 3(1): 4–70.

Van Rekom, J., G. Berens, and M. Van Halderen. 2013. Corporate social responsibility: Playing to win, or playing not to lose? Doing good by increasing the social benefits of a company's core activities. *Journal of Brand Management* 20(9): 800–814.

Walker, K. 2010. A systematic review of the corporate reputation literature: Definition, measurement, and theory. *Corporate Reputation Review* 12(4): 357–387.

Walsh, G., B. Bartikowski, and S. Beatty. 2014. Impact of customer-based corporate reputation on non-monetary and monetary outcomes: The roles of commitment and service context risk. *British Journal of Management* 25(1): 166–185.

Walsh, G., and S. Beatty. 2007. Customer-based corporate reputation of a service firm: Scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 35 (1): 127–143.

Walsh, G., K. Dinnie, and K.P. Wiedmann. 2006. How do corporate reputation and customer satisfaction impact customer defection? A study of private energy customers in Germany. *Journal of Services Marketing* 20(6): 412–420.

Walsh, G., V. Mitchell, P. Jackson, and S. Beatty. 2009. Examining the antecedents and consequences of corporate reputation: A customer perspective. *British Journal of Management* 20(1): 187–203.

Wang, Y., H.P. Lo, and Y.V. Hui. 2003. The antecedents of service quality and product quality and their influence on bank reputation: Evidence from the banking industry in China. *Managing Service Quality* 13(1): 72–83.

Winer, R. 1999. Experimentation in the 21st century: The importance of external validity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 27(3): 349–358.

Zhao, X., J. Lynch, and Q. Chen. 2010. Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research* 37: 197–206.

Mark Pritchard (Ph.D.) is a Professor of Marketing in the College of Business at Central Washington University and has held faculty appointments in marketing in Canada, Australia, Singapore, France, and the USA. His research concentrates on issues in services marketing.

Theresa Wilson (Ph.D.) is an Assistant Professor of Marketing in the College of Business at Central Washington University. Her research interests are marketing strategy, organizational learning, and marketing education.