

Co-creation

A Key Link Between Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Trust, and Customer Loyalty

Iglesias, Oriol; Markovic, Stefan; Bagherzadeh, Mehdi; Singh, Jatinder Jit

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript

Published in:
Journal of Business Ethics

DOI:
[10.1007/s10551-018-4015-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4015-y)

Publication date:
2020

License
Unspecified

Citation for published version (APA):
Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., Bagherzadeh, M., & Singh, J. J. (2020). Co-creation: A Key Link Between Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Trust, and Customer Loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 163(1), 151-166.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4015-y>

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 23. Jul. 2024



Co-creation: A Key Link Between Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Trust, and Customer Loyalty

Oriol Iglesias, Stefan Markovic, Mehdi Bagherzadeh, and Jatinder Jit Singh

Journal article (Accepted version*)

Please cite this article as:

Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., Bagherzadeh, M., & Singh, J. J. (2020). Co-creation: A Key Link Between Corporate Social Responsibility, Customer Trust, and Customer Loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 163(1), 151-166.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4015-y>

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in *Journal of Business Ethics*. The final authenticated version is available online at:

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4015-y>

* This version of the article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the publisher's final version AKA Version of Record.

Uploaded to [CBS Research Portal](#): September 2020

Article reference:

Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., Bagherzadeh, M., & Singh, J. J. (2020). Co-creation: A key link between corporate social responsibility, customer trust, and customer loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 163, 151-166.

TITLE

Co-creation: A key link between corporate social responsibility, customer trust, and customer loyalty

RUNNING HEAD

Co-creation and CSR

AUTHORS

Oriol Iglesias

Department of Marketing
ESADE – Universitat Ramon Llull
Av. Torre Blanca, 59
08172 Sant Cugat del Vallès (Barcelona), Spain
E-mail: oriol.iglesias@esade.edu
Tel.: +34 932806162

Stefan Markovic

(corresponding author)

Department of Marketing
Copenhagen Business School
Solbjerg Plads 3
2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark
E-mail: sm.marktg@cbs.dk
Tel.: +45 38152134

Mehdi Bagherzadeh

Strategy and Entrepreneurship Department
NEOMA Business School
59, rue Pierre Taittinger
51100 Reims, France
E-mail: mehdi.bagherzadeh@neoma-bs.fr
Tel.: +33 326775684

Jatinder Jit Singh

Department of Marketing, Operations and Supply
EADA Business School
C. Aragó 204
08011 Barcelona, Spain
E-mail: jsingh@eada.edu
Tel.: + 34 934520844

1
2
3
4 **TITLE**
5
6
7
8

9 Co-creation: A key link between corporate social responsibility, customer trust, and
10 customer loyalty
11
12
13
14

15
16 **ABSTRACT**
17
18
19
20

21 In an ever more transparent, digitalized and connected environment, customers are
22 increasingly pressuring brands to embrace genuine corporate social responsibility (CSR)
23 practices and co-creation activities. While both CSR and co-creation are social and
24 collaborative processes, there is still little research examining whether CSR can boost co-
25 creation. In addition, while previous research has mainly related co-creation to emotional
26 outcomes (e.g., customer affective commitment), limited empirical research has related it to
27 rational outcomes (e.g., customer trust) and behavioral outcomes (e.g., customer loyalty).
28
29
30
31
32

33 To address these shortcomings in the literature, this paper examines the influence of CSR
34 on customer loyalty, considering the mediating roles of co-creation and customer trust. It
35 also investigates the influence of co-creation on customer trust. The data were collected in
36 Spain in late 2017 using an online survey, and the sample contained 1101 customers of
37 health insurance services brands. Structural equation modeling was used to test the
38 hypothesized relationships simultaneously. The results show that CSR influences customer
39 loyalty both directly and indirectly through co-creation and customer trust. However, the
40 indirect impact is the stronger of the two, implying that embracing co-creation activities
41 and developing customer trust can make it easier for CSR practices to enhance customer
42 loyalty. In addition, co-creation has a direct effect on customer trust.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **INTRODUCTION**
5
6
7
8

9 According to the 2016 Global RepTrak 100 report (Reputation Institute, 2016), corporate
10 social responsibility (CSR) is an important precursor of corporate reputation and is linked
11 to better financial performance in terms of stock value. Accordingly, some 64% of the
12 CEOs surveyed in the 19th annual global CEO survey by PwC (2016) reported that CSR is
13 at the heart of their corporate strategy and actions. Further, some 45% agreed that their
14 investors would expect them to make more socially responsible investments during the next
15 five years. These managerial perceptions and intentions are a response to the growing
16 importance that customers are giving to socially responsible consumption, and to their
17 increasing expectations regarding brands' social engagements (Carrigan and Attalla, 2001;
18 Shaw and Shiu, 2002).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 This growing customer pressure for brands to act in a more socially responsible manner has
37 been largely driven by the rapid development of information technologies, which have
38 fostered a much more connected and transparent environment (e.g., Iglesias et al., 2017;
39 Lindfelt and Tornroos, 2006; Markovic et al., 2018). In this context, public opinion and
40 customers are increasingly aware of poor brand practices and punish those brands whose
41 actions harm the environment and society (Nyilasy et al., 2014). Likewise, superficial
42 (Maxfield, 2008) or insincere (Pope and Waeraas, 2016) CSR actions that merely aim to
43 repair a brand's reputation (Vlachos et al., 2009), are also increasingly criticized on social
44 media. Consequently, some strong brands have started to place social responsibility
45 genuinely at the heart of their business strategies (Markovic et al. 2018; Sierra et al., 2017),
46 becoming true brands with a conscience (Iglesias and Ind, 2016) that can portray their
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 social responsibility sincerely when interacting with customers (Balmer, 2001; Ind, 1997;
5
6 Rindell et al., 2011). When customers perceive this, their loyalty to the brand is likely to
7
8 increase, as they tend to reward those brands that demonstrate to be beneficial to society
9
10 and the planet (Eisingerich et al., 2011; Walsh and Beatty, 2007).
11
12
13
14

15
16 At the same time, the new digitized and connected environment also offers customers the
17
18 possibility of interacting much more directly with brands (Ramaswamy and Ozcan, 2016;
19
20 Ind et al., 2013, 2017). Brands, such as Lego and Adidas, have built much of their recent
21
22 success on a greater openness to the outside world, aiming to develop relationships of trust
23
24 and true partnerships with their customers, making themselves more relevant in an ever
25
26 more competitive marketplace. For example, Mindstorms, one of the best-selling products
27
28 in Lego's history, was co-created with customers. Co-creation can be defined as an active,
29
30 creative, dynamic, and social process aimed at developing new relevant product or service
31
32 innovations through collaborative brand-customer interactions and relationships (e.g., Ind et
33
34 al., 2013, 2017; Markovic and Bagherzadeh, 2018). Embracing co-creation is attractive for
35
36 brands, because it can lead to a plethora of organizational advantages, including cost
37
38 efficiencies, risk reduction, speed-to-market, better insights, and competitive advantage
39
40 (e.g., Hatch and Schultz, 2010; Ind et al., 2013, 2017; Kazadi et al., 2016; Prahalad and
41
42 Ramaswamy, 2000). In addition, engaging in co-creation is a stimulating experience for
43
44 many customers (Ind et al., 2017). First, customers can establish a warm, deep relationship
45
46 with the brand and the other members of the co-creation community (Nambisan and Baron,
47
48 2007). Second, when taking part in a co-creation project, customers often feel that they
49
50 grow as individuals, learn together with the community, and become more creative (Ind et
51
52 al., 2013). In essence, co-creation offers customers opportunities for self-development, as
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 well as social and hedonic benefits (Caru and Cova, 2015; Schau et al., 2009) that lead
5
6 them to feel more closely connected to the brand (Ind et al., 2013).
7
8
9

10
11 Thus, co-creation is a social and collaborative practice (Ramaswamy and Ozcan, 2016; Ind
12 et al., 2017). Curiously, so is CSR, which also consists of trying to provide value for a
13
14 social ecosystem in which multiple stakeholders interact (Vitell, 2015; Singh et al., 2017).
15
16 Socially responsible brands are thus open to listening to and understanding the needs and
17
18 challenges of their stakeholders (Pour et al., 2014), as well as to seeking relevant solutions
19
20 for them. Similarly, co-creation consists in engaging customers, as well as other possible
21
22 stakeholders, in innovation processes that enable the development of relevant solutions
23
24 (Nysveen and Pedersen, 2014). From this perspective, it is plausible to expect that when
25
26 customers perceive brands as socially responsible, they would also perceive them as more
27
28 open to co-creation projects. However, while several authors have shown that CSR can
29
30 influence a multitude of firm/brand and customer outcome variables, such as
31
32 corporate/company evaluation (Brown and Dacin, 1997; Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001),
33
34 firm-idiosyncratic risk (Luo and Bhattacharya, 2009), firm market value and financial
35
36 performance (Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006), brand equity (Sierra et al., 2017), customer
37
38 affective commitment (Markovic et al., 2018), customer purchase intention and behavior
39
40 (Carrigan and Attalla, 2001), and customer perceived service quality (Sierra et al., 2017),
41
42 little research has investigated whether engaging in socially responsible practices can help
43
44 brands boost their co-creation activities (e.g., Lindfelt and Tornroos, 2006; Williams and
45
46 Aitken, 2011).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 In contrast, several studies have suggested that co-creation activities make customers
5
6 develop positive emotions and feelings toward a brand, and thus be more affectively
7
8 committed to it (e.g., Ind et al., 2013, 2017). Nevertheless, there is still scarce research
9
10 relating co-creation to rational and behavioral outcome variables, such as customer trust
11
12 and customer loyalty. This is surprising, because customers' cognitions and behavioral
13
14 intentions can result in various significant organizational benefits, including increased sales
15
16 and positive word-of-mouth (e.g., Markovic et al., 2018).
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 To address the aforementioned gaps in the literature, this paper examines the influence of
24
25 CSR on customer loyalty, considering the mediating roles of co-creation and customer
26
27 trust. It also investigates the influence of co-creation on customer trust. The data were
28
29 collected in Spain in late 2017 using an online survey, and the sample contained 1101
30
31 customers of health insurance services brands. Establishing strong brands is especially
32
33 important in the services sector, because services are intangible and heterogeneous (e.g.,
34
35 Berry, 1980; Zeithaml et al., 1985). From the organizational perspective, this means that it
36
37 is difficult for services brands to deliver a uniform level of quality (Berry, 1980; Booms
38
39 and Bitner, 1981). From the customer perspective, it implies a higher degree of perceived
40
41 purchase risk, when compared to the goods sector (Choudhury, 2014; Eiglier and Langeard,
42
43 1977; Markovic et al., 2018). Furthermore, services brands generally have a greater number
44
45 of touchpoints and interactions with their customers than product brands (Gronroos, 2006).
46
47 This creates significant challenges because services brands need to consistently portray
48
49 their social responsibility at each of these touchpoints if they want to develop various
50
51 positive brand and customer outcomes, such as enhanced brand equity and improved
52
53 customer loyalty (Sierra et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2012). It has thus become increasingly
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 important for services brands to show their societal commitment at the corporate level
5
6 (Balmer, 2001; Ind, 1997). The health insurance services industry in particular was chosen
7
8 because it has invested heavily in CSR since the recent global financial crisis in order to
9
10 regain customer trust and rebuild its reputation (Iglesias et al., 2017). Moreover, leading
11
12 brands in the health insurance services industry have begun to engage in co-creation
13
14 activities, intended in many cases to improve customer experience (Chazal, 2018). For
15
16 instance, since 2016, the health insurance brand AXA has developed a CSR standard that
17
18 must be met in all of its contracts to ensure that the brand and its products comply with 15
19
20 ethical standards, ranging from data privacy to environmental issues. At the same time,
21
22 AXA is fostering co-creation as a key tool to improve customer experience (Chazal, 2018).
23
24 Another interesting example is the health insurer DKV, which has developed a program
25
26 called Health4good aimed at improving health by co-creating relevant solutions with
27
28 organizations specialized in new technologies. DKV has also invested in CSR for many
29
30 years, and is one of the benchmarks in the health insurance services industry (DKV, 2018).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Structural equation modeling was used to test the hypothesized relationships
41
42 simultaneously. The results show that CSR influences customer loyalty both directly and
43
44 indirectly through co-creation and customer trust. However, the indirect impact is the
45
46 stronger of the two, implying that embracing co-creation activities and developing customer
47
48 trust can make it easier for CSR practices to enhance customer loyalty. In addition, co-
49
50 creation has a direct impact on customer trust. These results imply that embracing co-
51
52 creation can play a key role in developing customer trust in a brand and allow brands
53
54 genuinely committed to CSR to differentiate themselves from brands that resort to selective
55
56 disclosure and greenwashing.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 The remaining sections of this paper contain the theoretical background and hypotheses
7
8 development, the methodology, the data analysis and results, and finally, the discussion and
9
10 conclusion.
11
12
13
14

15 16 **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT** 17 18

19 20 21 **CSR and Co-creation** 22 23

24
25
26 According to Singh (2014), CSR is often used interchangeably with corporate ethics,
27
28 sustainability, citizenship behavior and corporate conscientiousness, but the essence of CSR
29
30 reflects the fact that brands are part of a social system and are expected to act responsibly
31
32 (Singh, 2014). In his seminal article on CSR, Carroll (1979) proposed that CSR
33
34 encompasses four types of responsibilities: economic, legal, ethical, and social. In a content
35
36 analysis of 37 previously developed definitions of CSR, Dahlsrud (2008) concluded that the
37
38 definitions represent five, generally congruent, underlying dimensions: environmental,
39
40 societal, stakeholder, economic, and voluntariness. A definition of a socially responsible
41
42 business proposed by Vitell (2015) captures the essence of CSR by highlighting two key
43
44 underlying dimensions: proactive participation in activities offering social benefit or public
45
46 service, and voluntary engagement in avoiding practices that can harm society, even
47
48 without any legal obligation. Overall, it could be argued that the underlying social or
49
50 collective essence of CSR relates to the activity of co-creation, as it is interactional in
51
52 nature (e.g., Hatch and Schultz, 2010; Ind et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2017). In this line,
53
54 Nysveen and Pedersen (2014, p. 811) conceptualize co-creation as the “degree to which
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 consumers actively participate with companies in improving existing solutions or find new
5
6 solutions to create more value both for the consumer and the company.”
7
8
9

10
11 Co-creation is not a novel phenomenon (Bendapudi and Leone, 2003). Its origins date back
12
13 to preindustrial times, during which customers decided what was to be created by the
14
15 craftsperson and how (Wikström, 1996). However, in the industrial period, co-creation lost
16
17 its prevalence in favor of mass production, as products became more standardized to
18
19 achieve greater cost advantages (Harwood and Garry, 2010). Nevertheless, with the
20
21 emergence of the postindustrial era, brands have started to inhabit an environment
22
23 characterized by fast, flexible new production facilities, decentralized organizations, and
24
25 rapidly evolving information technologies (e.g., Füller et al., 2009). In such an
26
27 environment, consumption patterns are becoming increasingly heterogeneous,
28
29 unpredictable, and uncontrollable by brands (Ind et al., 2017). This has limited the ability of
30
31 mass production to satisfy the idiosyncratic needs and desires of customers. Consequently,
32
33 in the early 2000s, co-creation reemerged and started to be considered as the future of
34
35 product and service innovation (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2000). Accordingly, Prahalad
36
37 and Ramaswamy (2004) proposed that the traditional company-centered approach has
38
39 become customer-oriented, characterized by enhanced customer involvement in the joint
40
41 creation of products and services.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The literature has shown that CSR boosts customer satisfaction (Luo and Bhattacharya,
53
54 2006), and when customers are satisfied with a specific brand, they are more likely to
55
56 engage in the co-creation activities of that brand (Ind et al., 2013, 2017). Moreover, Sen et
57
58 al. (2006) found that when customers are aware of the company’s CSR practices, they
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 identify more strongly with the company and become more willing to commit personal
5
6 resources (e.g., money, labor) to benefit the company, which enables co-creation activities.
7
8 In this line, Martinez-Cañas et al. (2016) proposed that, in addition to intrinsic and extrinsic
9
10 motivation factors, customer willingness to co-create also depends on transcendent motives,
11
12 including the benefit that their collaboration provides for others in society. Thus, it is
13
14 plausible to expect that customers will be more likely to participate in co-creation activities
15
16 with brands/companies that they perceive to be socially responsible. Accordingly, we
17
18 hypothesize that:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 H1: CSR will have a positive effect on co-creation
27
28
29
30

31 **CSR and Customer Trust** 32 33 34 35

36 The brand and its customers can be considered business partners, whose dyadic exchange
37
38 relationships are influenced by their respective perceptions of mutual trust (Singh et al.,
39
40 2012). Therefore, trust can be defined as the confidence that each business partner will act
41
42 with integrity and reliability during their interactions (Delgado-Ballester et al., 2003;
43
44 Morgan and Hunt, 1994). Traditionally, various scholars have proposed integrity (e.g.,
45
46 Mayer et al., 1995; Ring and van de Ven, 1992) and reliability (e.g., Giffin, 1967) as key
47
48 antecedents of trust. Moreover, business partners are likely to develop trust by being
49
50 honest, benevolent, and altruistic (e.g., Larzelere and Huston, 1980; Mayer et al., 1995).
51
52 The perception of lack of opportunistic behavior among business partners is also essential
53
54 for trust development, as is the perception that the brand behaves fairly, accountably, and
55
56 responsibly toward its customers (Singh et al., 2012).
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Multiple scholars have shown that customer perceptions that the brand/company behaves in
8
9 a socially responsible manner are positively related to customer trust in such
10
11 brand/company (e.g., Lin et al., 2011; Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque, 2013; Swaen
12
13 and Chumpitaz, 2008). Examining customer perceptions of CSR, Vlachos et al. (2009)
14
15 proposed a model relating customer perceptions of the company's motives for undertaking
16
17 CSR actions (i.e., stakeholder, strategic, egoistic, and value-driven motives) to customer
18
19 trust. Overall, socially responsible behavior is important, because a brand/company that is
20
21 perceived as socially responsible is more likely to be trusted by its customers (Swaen and
22
23 Chumpitaz, 2008).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Accordingly, in a manufacturing context, Kennedy et al. (2001) found that manufacturers'
32
33 ethical concerns positively influence customer trust. Similarly, in a pharmaceutical setting,
34
35 Lagace et al. (1991) showed that ethical behavior by the salesperson has a positive effect on
36
37 customer trust. Likewise, in the field of services, García de los Salmones et al. (2009)
38
39 found that the ethical behavior of a services company has a positive impact on trust.
40
41 Meanwhile, in the context of fair trade product, Castaldo et al. (2009) showed that customer
42
43 perceived CSR is positively related to customer trust in the retailer. Similarly, in a number
44
45 of service industries (e.g., restaurants, airlines, financial services), Choi and La (2013)
46
47 found that customer perceived CSR has a positive impact on customer trust. Likewise, in
48
49 the hotel industry, Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque (2013) provided empirical evidence
50
51 of a positive effect of CSR on customer trust. In this line, in the organic food sector, Pivato
52
53 et al. (2008) showed that CSR is positively related to customer trust. Finally, in the car
54
55 industry, Lin et al. (2011) found that negative CSR perceptions can reduce customer trust.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 In accordance with these findings from different areas, and aiming to shed more light in the
5 services sector, where trust plays a key role (e.g., Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque,
6 2013), we postulate that:
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 H2: CSR will have a positive effect on customer trust
15
16
17

18 **Co-creation and Customer Trust** 19 20 21 22

23 Several scholars have acknowledged that customers are no longer passive recipients of
24 product and service innovations, but that they have the skills and expertise to undertake an
25 active role in co-creation (e.g., Cova and Dalli, 2009; Von Hippel, 2005). Co-creation
26 consists of inviting customers to comment on current brand offerings (products and/or
27 services), and to contribute their ideas and knowledge to the development of new offerings
28 (e.g., Füller et al., 2008; Gouillart, 2014; Markovic and Bagherzadeh, 2018). Thus, instead
29 of trying to discover what customers may want by analyzing market research data or
30 organizing focus groups, brands are now able to gather customer input directly from co-
31 creation projects (Ind et al., 2013, 2017). In addition, co-creation can help brands build and
32 maintain trusting relationships with their customers (Iglesias et al., 2013; da Silveira et al.,
33 2013; Vallaster and von Wallpach, 2013). In this line, multiple scholars have suggested that
34 favorable brand-customer interactions and relationships, on which co-creation initiatives
35 are based, are a key driver of customer trust (e.g., Delgado-Ballester and Munuera-Aleman,
36 2005; Fournier, 1998; Wong and Sohal, 2002).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Accordingly, Madhavan and Grover (1998) proposed that rich interpersonal interactions
5 during the co-creation of new products increase participant trust. Likewise, in a cross-
6 sectorial study, Massey and Kyriazis (2007) showed that a high level of communication
7 among participants during the joint development of new products increases trust. Similarly,
8 in the context of innovative firms, García Rodríguez et al. (2007) found that cooperation in
9 new product development improves trust. In the healthcare services sector, Banyte et al.
10 (2014) showed that patient engagement in co-creation heightens their trust in the clinic. In
11 the travel industry, Rajah et al. (2008) showed that dyadic firm-customer co-creation of
12 services enhances customer trust. Finally, in online brand communities, where customers
13 actively take part in co-creation processes, Brodie et al. (2013) found that engaged
14 customers trust the brand more, and Ind et al. (2013) showed that customer participation in
15 co-creation generates customer trust in the brand. In line with these previous findings from
16 diverse settings, including services, we posit that:
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 H3: Co-creation will have a positive effect on customer trust
39
40
41
42

43 **Co-creation and Customer Loyalty** 44 45 46 47

48 Developing and sustaining customer loyalty is the holy grail of business activity (Singh et
49 al., 2012). In the context of services marketing, customer loyalty can be defined as the
50 customer's willingness to build a long-term relationship with a specific brand, and
51 recommend such brand to other people (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2011; Markovic et al., 2018).
52
53 Scholars have proposed that customer loyalty drives profitability, because of repeat
54 transactions, referrals, willingness to pay a higher price, and reduced cost-to-serve (e.g.,
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Lovelock and Wirtz, 2011). Moreover, research has established various antecedents of
5
6 customer loyalty, being customer trust and customer affective commitment among the most
7
8 common ones (e.g., Leonidou et al., 2013; Markovic et al., 2018; Singh et al., 2012).
9
10 However, while previous research has widely linked rational (e.g., customer trust) and
11
12 emotional (e.g., customer affective commitment) variables to customer loyalty, it has not
13
14 extensively studied interactional variables (e.g., co-creation) as antecedents of customer
15
16 loyalty.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Among this scarce research, in a study on personal care services firms, Cossío-Silva et al.
25
26 (2016) found that customer co-creation behavior boosts customer loyalty. Likewise, in the
27
28 context of brand communities, Kaufmann et al. (2016) proposed that when customers
29
30 actively engage in co-creation, their loyalty to the brand increases. Similarly, Hajli et al.
31
32 (2017) found that co-creation enhances customer loyalty, through participation in online
33
34 brand communities, where customers develop trust in the brand. In the area of banking
35
36 services, Hosseini and Hosseini (2013) and Nysveen and Pedersen (2014) showed that
37
38 involving customers in co-creation positively influences customer loyalty to the bank. In
39
40 the same vein, in the healthcare services sector, Banyte et al. (2014) found that patients'
41
42 involvement in co-creation has a positive effect on their loyalty to the clinic. Finally, in the
43
44 tourism sector, Peña et al. (2014) showed that involving customers in the co-creation of
45
46 travel services positively influences customer loyalty. In accordance with these findings
47
48 from multiple settings, we hypothesize that:
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 H4: Co-creation will have a positive effect on customer loyalty
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Customer Trust and Customer Loyalty

While scarcely linking co-creation with customer loyalty, multiple scholars have argued that trusting relationships between the customers and the brand make the former more likely to become loyal to the brand (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Fournier and Yao, 1997), adopting both a positive attitude toward it and the intention to repurchase its products or services (Delgado-Ballester and Munuera-Aleman, 2005). Developing trusting relationships with customers is important because, according to some estimates, acquiring a new customer could be anywhere between five and 25 times more expensive than retaining an existing one (Gallo, 2014). Accordingly, a substantial body of literature considers that customer trust relates positively to customer loyalty (e.g., Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Delgado-Ballester and Munuera-Aleman, 2005; Delgado-Ballester et al., 2003; Kumar and Advani, 2005).

For example, in the field of retailing, Sun and Lin (2010) showed that customer trust in a department store positively influences customer loyalty to the store. Also in the field of retailing, Stathopoulou and Balabanis (2016) provided empirical evidence of a positive effect of customer trust on customer loyalty to the store. Similarly, in the travel industry, Setó-Pamies (2012) and Rajah et al. (2008) found that customer trust in the travel services provider has a positive effect on customer loyalty. Likewise, in the area of business-to-business services, Hannan et al. (2017) provided empirical evidence of a positive influence of customer trust on customer loyalty. In this line, in the healthcare services sector, Banyte et al. (2014) showed that patients' trust in the clinic boosts their loyalty to the clinic.

1
2
3
4 Moreover, the link between customer trust and customer loyalty has been widely
5
6 researched in the fields of business ethics and CSR. For instance, in a study on retail
7
8 business ethics, Diallo and Lambey-Checchin (2017) found that customer trust in a retailer
9
10 increases customer loyalty to that retailer. Similarly, in a research on customer perceived
11
12 ethicality of product brands, Singh et al. (2012) showed that customer trust has a positive
13
14 effect on customer loyalty. Likewise, in a study on corporate unethicity, Leonidou et al.
15
16 (2013) found that the less customers trust a firm, the less they are loyal to that firm. In a
17
18 study on CSR conducted in the United States, Kang and Hustvedt (2014) provided
19
20 empirical evidence of a positive impact of customer trust in a corporation on customer
21
22 intentions to purchase the products of that corporation. In this line, in the context of CSR
23
24 and fair trade products, Castaldo et al. (2009) found that customer trust positively impacts
25
26 customer loyalty. In a study on ethical sales behavior in the financial services industry,
27
28 Román (2003) showed that customer trust in a financial services company positively
29
30 influences customer loyalty to that company. Also in a study on ethical sales behavior, but
31
32 in the health insurance industry, Chen and Mau (2009) found that customer trust in the
33
34 health insurance company has a positive effect on customer loyalty to that company. In line
35
36 with all this previous research linking customer trust to customer loyalty, especially in the
37
38 fields of business ethics and CSR, and in the health insurance services industry, we
39
40 postulate that:
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 H5: Customer trust will have a positive effect on customer loyalty
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

CSR and Customer Loyalty

In addition to establishing customer trust as a key antecedent of customer loyalty, several scholars have argued that CSR is a key element of corporate success that can shape customer evaluations of a brand, and determine customer intentions to repurchase the brand's products and services (Luo and Bhattacharya, 2006) and to form a long-term relationship with the brand (Markovic et al., 2018; Singh et al., 2012). In fact, a wide body of research has acknowledged that following socially responsible principles can help brands build and maintain long-term relationships with their customers (e.g., Gundlach and Murphy, 1993; Iglesias et al., 2017). Accordingly, research has widely related CSR to customer loyalty from an empirical standpoint (e.g., Castaldo et al., 2009; Diallo and Lambey-Checchin, 2017; Park et al., 2017).

For example, in the context of grocery shops, Ailawadi et al. (2014) found that positive customer perceptions of retailers' CSR initiatives have a positive influence on customer loyalty. Similarly, in the hotel industry, Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque (2013) provided empirical evidence of a positive relationship between CSR and customer loyalty.

In this line, in the banking sector, Mandhachitra and Poolthong (2011) showed a positive effect of CSR on customer loyalty. Also in the banking industry, Pérez and Rodríguez del Bosque (2015) found that CSR is positively related to customer repurchase intentions.

Likewise, in the footwear industry, Kang and Hustvedt (2014) showed that the brand's social responsibility positively influences customer purchase intentions. In the context of fair trade products, Castaldo et al. (2009) found that customer perceived CSR is positively related to brand loyalty. Similarly, in the retail industry, Park et al. (2017) showed that

1
2
3
4 customer perceptions of a company’s commitment to CSR have a positive effect on
5
6 customer loyalty to that company. In a number of service industries (i.e., restaurants,
7
8 airlines, financial services), Choi and La (2013) found that customer perceived CSR
9
10 positively influences customer loyalty. Likewise, in an empirical study on the antecedents
11
12 and consequences of CSR, Stanaland et al. (2011) provided empirical evidence of a positive
13
14 effect of customer evaluations of a firm’s CSR activities on customer loyalty. In line with
15
16 this research from various contexts, we posit that:
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 H6: CSR will have a positive effect on customer loyalty
25
26
27

28 **METHODOLOGY**
29
30
31
32

33 **Survey and Measures**
34
35
36
37

38 The survey contained constructs measured using and adapting existing scale items in the
39
40 literature (see Table 1). All responses were recorded by means of a seven-point Likert
41
42 scale, ranging from “completely disagree” to “completely agree.” A double-blind back-
43
44 translation process was applied to the survey to translate the items into Spanish.
45
46
47
48
49

50 ----- INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE -----
51
52
53
54

55 The survey was pre-tested in two ways. First, to avoid potential misinterpretation by
56
57 respondents, several experts from the fields of brand management and business ethics
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 assessed the conceptual adequacy of the questions and their formulation. Second, several
5
6 target respondents assessed the ease of comprehension of the survey.
7
8
9

10 11 **Data Collection and Sample** 12 13 14

15
16 Data collection was conducted in Spain through an online survey in late 2017 by an
17
18 external company, Eurus e-i, which is specialized in performing market studies. This
19
20 external company was responsible for recruiting target respondents, using two online
21
22 customer panels (i.e., Encuestón and Cint), and for executing the survey (i.e., distributing it
23
24 and managing respondent incentives). The target population comprised Spanish individuals
25
26 between 18 and 65 years old who had health insurance. Respondents were selected using
27
28 several filtering questions to ensure that they belonged to our target population. Regarding
29
30 the sampling procedure, we created stratum, based on socio-demographic variables
31
32 including sex, age, habitat size and geographical location, and calculated the number of
33
34 individuals we needed in each stratum to have a representative sample of the Spanish
35
36 population (according to census data from the Spanish National Institute of Statistics).
37
38 Then, individuals from the above-mentioned customer panels were randomly invited by
39
40 email, which included a link to the survey. The recruitment process continued until each
41
42 stratum was filled. In the email invitation, respondents were also informed about the
43
44 objectives of the survey and that they would get paid €1.50 as compensation for the time
45
46 taken to complete it. This process produced a sample of 1101 customers (useable completed
47
48 surveys) with an average age of 39.9, and a median age of 39. Some 52% of respondents
49
50 were female.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Construct Analysis

We evaluated the factor structure and convergent and discriminant validities of the constructs by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the maximum likelihood method with AMOS 22.0. To assess goodness of fit, we used the chi-square (χ^2), goodness of fit index (GFI), comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). The results showed that all the fit indices were within their acceptable cut-off values, confirming that the hypothesized four-factor measurement model fits the data well ($\chi^2 = 215.813$ with $df = 59$ ($\chi^2/df = 3.66$); GFI = 0.969; CFI = 0.986; RMSEA = 0.049; SRMR = 0.030) (Hu and Bentler, 1999).

In addition, the hypothesized four-factor measurement model provided a significant chi-square improvement over other more parsimonious models. For instance, we evaluated a three-factor measurement model, where the items of the following constructs were set to load on a single factor: co-creation and customer loyalty ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1095.131$, $\Delta df = 3$, p-value < 0.001); customer trust and customer loyalty ($\Delta\chi^2 = 429.425$, $\Delta df = 3$, p-value < 0.001); CSR and customer loyalty ($\Delta\chi^2 = 690.306$, $\Delta df = 3$, p-value < 0.001); customer trust and co-creation ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1025.925$, $\Delta df = 3$, p-value < 0.001); CSR and customer trust ($\Delta\chi^2 = 567.372$, $\Delta df = 3$, p-value < 0.001); and CSR and co-creation ($\Delta\chi^2 = 534.626$, $\Delta df = 3$, p-value < 0.001). In addition, the GFI, CFI, RMSEA and SRMR fit indices were better for the

1
2
3
4 hypothesized four-factor measurement model than for the three-factor model. Overall, these
5
6 results support the hypothesized four-factor measurement model.
7
8
9

10
11 Thereafter, we analyzed the factor loadings of the items (see Table 2). All standardized
12
13 factor loadings were significant and higher than the recommended threshold value of 0.50
14
15 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). The average variances extracted (AVEs) of all four constructs
16
17 were greater than the cut-off value of 0.50 (see Table 2) (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). These
18
19 results support the convergent validity of all the constructs. Following Fornell and
20
21 Larcker's (1981) discriminant validity test, the square root of the AVE of each construct
22
23 was greater than its correlation with all the other constructs (see Table 3), providing
24
25 evidence for the discriminant validity of all four constructs. Finally, Table 2 presents the
26
27 composite reliability (CR) and Cronbach alphas coefficients computed to evaluate the
28
29 reliability of the constructs. The Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from 0.88 to 0.90, and
30
31 the CR values from 0.88 to 0.91, providing evidence of the reliability of all four constructs
32
33 in the hypothesized model (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Overall, these results indicate
34
35 that each of the four constructs has good psychometric properties.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ----- INSERT TABLES 2 AND 3 ABOUT HERE -----
46
47
48
49

50 Finally, to check item distribution, we calculated their skewness and kurtosis. The results
51
52 indicated that all of them were normally distributed (skewness ranged from -1.106 to
53
54 -0.435, and kurtosis from -0.603 to 1.689) (West et al., 1995).
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Common Method Variance

This study is subject to common method variance (CMV), as the data for all constructs were collected from a single respondent (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986). To reduce the potential CMV effect, the dependent, mediating, and independent variables were proximally separated in the survey (Podsakoff et al., 2003). This prevented respondents from linking the variables in this study, and thereby limited the chance that their responses to one set of questions would affect those to the other questions.

Nevertheless, to test whether CMV could bias our results, we first conducted the CFA-based Harman single-factor test (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff and Organ, 1986), using the maximum likelihood method. We set all the items in the study to load on a single factor. This single-factor measurement model did not provide the fit indices within their acceptable ranges ($\chi^2 = 2027.463$ with $df = 65$ ($\chi^2/df = 31.19$); GFI = 0.714; CFI = 0.824; RMSEA = 0.166; SRMR = 0.078). Our hypothesized four-factor measurement model significantly improved the chi-square ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1811.65$, $\Delta df = 6$, $p\text{-value} < 0.001$), and also provided better fit indices than the single-factor measurement model ($\Delta\text{GFI} = 0.255$; $\Delta\text{CFI} = 0.162$; $\Delta\text{RMSEA} = 0.117$; $\Delta\text{SRMR} = 0.048$).

Second, following Lindell and Whitney (2001), we applied the marker variable technique, using psychological risk (Keh and Pang, 2010) as our marker variable (i.e., a variable theoretically-unrelated to the others in this study). The lowest absolute correlation between psychological risk and our four constructs was considered as the CMV estimate (r_s).

1
2
3
4 Psychological risk was correlated with CSR ($r = 0.009$); co-creation ($r = 0.215$); customer
5 trust ($r = - 0.161$); and customer loyalty ($r = - 0.144$). Accordingly, the CMV estimate (r_s)
6 was 0.009, showing a low common variance shared between constructs. To control for
7 potential CMV, the correlation coefficients between all four constructs were adjusted based
8 on $r_s = 0.009$ (see Table 4). All significant unadjusted correlation coefficients remained
9 significant after adjusting for CMV. All these results imply that CMV is not great enough
10 to bias the results of our study.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 ----- INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE -----
24
25
26
27

28 **Hypothesized Structural Model Analysis** 29 30 31 32

33 Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations of the four constructs in this
34 study. The correlations between the constructs provided preliminary support for all six
35 hypotheses, with customer loyalty being significantly associated with CSR ($r = 0.69$), co-
36 creation ($r = 0.58$), and customer trust ($r = 0.76$). CSR is also significantly correlated with
37 co-creation ($r = 0.70$) and customer trust ($r = 0.73$). Finally, there is a significant correlation
38 between co-creation and customer trust (0.60).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 To test the hypothesized relationships between CSR, co-creation, customer trust, and
51 customer loyalty (see Figure 1), we applied covariance-based structural equation modelling
52 (SEM), using the maximum likelihood method, in AMOS 22.0.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ----- INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE-----
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 All the fit indices showed that our hypothesized structural model has an acceptable fit ($\chi^2=$
8
9 215.813 with $df = 59$ ($\chi^2/ df = 3.66$); GFI = 0.969; CFI = 0.986; RMSEA = 0.049; SRMR =
10
11 0.030). Some alternative models (models 1, 2, and 3) to our hypothesized structural model
12
13 (model 4) were specified, and we calculated all their fit indices (see Table 5). In model 1,
14
15 we only specified the direct impacts of CSR, co-creation, and customer trust on customer
16
17 loyalty. In model 2, we specified the direct effect of CSR on both co-creation and customer
18
19 trust, as well as the direct effects of co-creation and customer trust on customer loyalty.
20
21 Alternative model 3 reproduces the hypothesized structural model, but without the direct
22
23 impact of CSR on customer loyalty. As the χ^2/df ratio of the hypothesized structural model
24
25 (3.66) is smaller than the χ^2/df ratios of the alternative models 1 (29.47), 2 (3.80) and 3
26
27 (3.81), the hypothesized structural model fits the data better than alternative models 1, 2
28
29 and 3. Moreover, to compare the hypothesized structural model with alternative models 1, 2
30
31 and 3, we applied the chi-square difference test. The hypothesized structural model
32
33 provided a significant improvement in χ^2 over model 1 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1611.033$, $\Delta df = 3$, p-value
34
35 < 0.001), model 2 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 15.678$, $\Delta df = 2$, p-value < 0.001), and model 3 ($\Delta\chi^2 = 12.967$,
36
37 $\Delta df = 1$, p-value < 0.001). Furthermore, the hypothesized structural model had greater GFI
38
39 and CFI, and smaller RMSEA and SRMR than alternative models 1, 2 and 3. All these
40
41 results confirm that the hypothesized structural model fits the data better than the
42
43 alternative models.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 ----- INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE -----
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 Tests of the hypothesized relationships between the constructs empirically supported all six
7 hypotheses (see Table 6). In addition, the bootstrap procedure using 5000 bootstrapping
8 samples supported all six hypotheses. CSR has significant and positive effects on co-
9 creation ($\beta = 0.79$), customer trust ($\beta = 0.74$), and customer loyalty ($\beta = 0.20$), supporting
10 H1, H2, and H6, respectively. In addition, co-creation has a significant and positive effect
11 on customer trust ($\beta = 0.10$) and customer loyalty ($\beta = 0.09$), which supports H3 and H4,
12 respectively. Finally, customer trust has a significant and positive influence on customer
13 loyalty ($\beta = 0.63$), supporting H5.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ----- INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE -----
29
30
31
32

33 These significant direct effects point to a potential partial mediating effect of co-creation
34 and customer trust in the relationship between CSR and customer loyalty. To test the
35 significance of this potential partial mediating effect, we performed the bootstrap procedure
36 using 5000 samples to develop bias-corrected confidence intervals for the indirect effect.
37 The indirect effect (0.57) was significant at a 95% confidence level (95% Bias-corrected
38 bootstrap CI = [0.46; 0.69]), indicating that the relationship between CSR and customer
39 loyalty is partially mediated by co-creation and customer trust. Some 74% of the total effect
40 of CSR on customer loyalty (0.77) occurs through the two mediators of co-creation and
41 customer trust.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Finally, we analyzed three possible indirect effects of CSR on customer loyalty via co-
58 creation and customer trust (i.e., partial mediators) using the bootstrap procedure suggested
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 by Preacher and Hayes (2004). We performed this bootstrap procedure using the PROCESS
5
6 macro 2.16.2 (Hayes, 2017) in SPSS 23.0. Table 7 presents the three possible indirect
7
8 effects, their bootstrap standard errors, and the 95% bias corrected confidence intervals
9
10 based on 5000 bootstrapping samples. The three indirect effects are significant. Therefore,
11
12 CSR has a significant and positive effect on customer loyalty via co-creation (Indirect
13
14 effect 1 = 0.07), customer trust (Indirect effect 3 = 0.33), and following the path through
15
16 co-creation and then customer trust (Indirect effect 2 = 0.06).
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 ----- INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE -----
24
25
26
27

28 **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**
29
30
31

32 **Theoretical Contributions**
33
34
35
36
37

38 This research has some important theoretical contributions. First, we show that CSR can
39
40 boost customer loyalty. This is because when brands genuinely invest in CSR, sincerely
41
42 strive to generate social benefits, and avoid practices that might harm society and the
43
44 environment (Vitell, 2015), they can connect with their customers emotionally, and thus
45
46 generate greater customer loyalty. This finding reinforces the growing importance of
47
48 responsible and sustainable consumption to customers, and of brand involvement in
49
50 societal causes (Carrigan and Atalla, 2001; Shaw and Shiu, 2001). Nonetheless, brands still
51
52 face a significant challenge, namely, customers who have become increasingly skeptical of
53
54 CSR practices (Nyilasy et al., 2014). The reason is that, all too often, customers perceive
55
56 these practices as insincere (Poppe and Waeraas, 2016). In fact, accusations of
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 greenwashing have intensified over the last few years (Marquis et al., 2016), as has the
5
6 perception that CSR is only a means to repair corporate reputation (Vlachos et al. 2009). In
7
8 short, some customers see CSR as an insincere response (Maxfield, 2008) that brands use
9
10 only superficially and cosmetically (Narth et al., 2007), or as a rhetorical ploy to strengthen
11
12 their reputation (Nyilasy et al., 2014). In these cases, brands tend to implement a selective
13
14 disclosure strategy, designed to inform about and emphasize the benign impacts of their
15
16 actions while hiding their negative effects and thus their true performance (Marquis et al.,
17
18 2016). The ultimate aim of this strategy is to create a false image of transparency and social
19
20 responsibility (Marquis et al., 2016). This, of course, raises concerns about the corporate
21
22 motivations and ethics behind CSR (Joyner and Payne, 2002). This is a complex and
23
24 dangerous situation for brands that do genuinely believe in CSR (brands with a conscience)
25
26 (Iglesias and Ind, 2016), and have included CSR as a core element of their strategy and
27
28 business activity. The challenge for these brands is to find ways of transmitting their
29
30 authentic and sincere commitment to CSR, and of clearly differentiating themselves from
31
32 brands that resort to selective disclosure and greenwashing.

33
34 In this regard, co-creation represents an especially great opportunity for services brands, as
35
36 it can help them to translate their CSR practices into enhanced customer loyalty. Our results
37
38 support this by showing that the indirect effect of CSR on customer loyalty (via co-creation
39
40 and customer trust) accounts for some 74% of the total impact of CSR on customer loyalty.
41
42 This means that when brands involve their customers in co-creation activities and are
43
44 trusted, they can more easily translate their CSR practices into greater customer loyalty.
45
46 This is because by embracing co-creation initiatives, brands inevitably open themselves to
47
48 the outside world and listen to their customers (Ind et al., 2017). They also tend to foment
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 strategic partnerships through which employees and customers jointly define beneficial
5 solutions for both parties (Ramaswamy and Ozcan, 2016). Consequently, co-creation is
6 capable of generating customer trust (Nambisan and Baron, 2007), as customers perceive
7 that brands are genuinely concerned about their needs and desires, and that they listen to
8 them, and act accordingly (Ind et al., 2013).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Additionally, the currently prevalent approach to CSR, in line with the stakeholder theory
20 (Freeman, 1999), argues that any organization should balance the interests of its different
21 stakeholders (Van Marrewijk, 2003). This turns stakeholder opinions and the promotion of
22 stakeholder dialogue into key concerns for brands (O’Riordan and Fairbrass, 2008).
23 Moreover, this explains why brands that adopt an authentic and genuine approach to CSR
24 are likely to devote significant efforts to listening to and understanding the needs and
25 desires of their customers (Pour et al., 2014). Interestingly, co-creation is based precisely
26 on a philosophy of dialogue, openness, listening, and a real commitment to customer needs
27 and desires. This philosophy is also the complete opposite of selective disclosure and
28 greenwashing. Thus, co-creation may enable brands to generate customer trust and to more
29 effectively translate their CSR activities into enhanced customer loyalty.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 This research also shows that customer trust plays a key role in the ability of CSR practices
49 to improve customer loyalty. Thus, services brands need to act with honesty and integrity
50 regarding CSR for it to make a stronger impact on customer loyalty (Delgado-Ballester et
51 al., 2003; Morgan and Hunt, 1994). In addition, services brands have to manage many more
52 touchpoints with their customers (Gronroos, 2006) than, for example, fast-moving
53 consumer goods (FMCG) brands. Consequently, in a service industry’s competitive
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 context, brands can not only instill trust through sincere, transparent, non-manipulative
5
6 communication efforts, but also need to generate trust at every single touchpoint that makes
7
8 up the customer experience, especially when customers interact directly with frontline
9
10 employees (Markovic et al., 2018). Therefore, services brands have to develop and portray
11
12 their commitment to CSR strategies and initiatives carefully at all the different touchpoints
13
14 forming the customer journey (Iglesias et al., 2017).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Overall, the results of our study contribute to the literature on CSR by establishing a new
22
23 and still largely unexplored connection with the emerging field of co-creation, and by
24
25 linking both CSR and co-creation with the key customer outcome variables of customer
26
27 trust and customer loyalty in the context of health insurance services brands, which
28
29 currently have high levels of customer distrust (2018 Edelman Trust Barometer) and whose
30
31 CSR initiatives are often perceived by customers as insincere and manipulative (Hsu, 2012;
32
33 Lock and Seele, 2015).
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Managerial Implications**

41
42
43
44
45 In addition to its theoretical contributions, this research has important implications for
46
47 managers. First, if managers want to increase the customer loyalty deriving from their CSR
48
49 activities, they need to promote an authentic dialogue with customers. In fact, the literature
50
51 on CSR already recommends managers to make stakeholder dialogue a key priority in their
52
53 agendas (O’Riordan and Fairbrass, 2008). The results of our study build on this literature
54
55 by suggesting that managers should embrace co-creation to increase customer trust and to
56
57 more effectively translate their CSR activities into enhanced customer loyalty. This is a
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 novel perspective, because the majority of brands that embrace co-creation do so to produce
5
6 better innovations, but do not realize that co-creation can also be used to boost customer
7
8 trust and loyalty.
9

10
11
12
13
14 Second, although co-creation can make it easier for CSR practices to enhance customer
15
16 loyalty, managers should understand that not all brands embracing co-creation do so as
17
18 effectively as possible. In fact, based on an empirical research on brands from different
19
20 sectors and geographies, Ind et al. (2017) introduced a co-creation continuum that has a
21
22 tactical and a strategic end, and found that most brands understand co-creation from a
23
24 tactical perspective, which impedes them to realize its potential. These brands are much
25
26 more akin to use co-creation as a market research tool than to build strategic partnerships
27
28 with customers through joint innovation projects (Ind et al., 2017). In these cases, the
29
30 brands' underlying assumption is that customers can provide useful information and
31
32 insights, but do not have the required knowledge and expertise to generate substantial
33
34 service innovations (Nambisan and Nambisan, 2008). As a result, brands that adopt this
35
36 tactical view of co-creation only involve customers on an ad-hoc basis to test and refine
37
38 internally-generated ideas (Ind et al., 2017). This could significantly limit the capacity of
39
40 co-creation to boost the effect of CSR on customer loyalty. However, if managers want to
41
42 realize the full potential of co-creation, they have to foment a much more open and
43
44 participatory corporate culture (Iglesias et al., 2013) that genuinely appreciates and
45
46 recognizes customer knowledge and expertise (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2000) and
47
48 authentically takes into account customer idiosyncratic needs and desires. Additionally,
49
50 they need to build long-term, trustworthy collaborative relationships with customers and
51
52 treat them as true strategic innovation partners (Kazadi et al., 2016; Markovic and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 Bagherzadeh, 2018). This strategic approach to co-creation, which is at the opposite end of
5
6 the continuum (Ind et al., 2017), is that with the greatest potential to translate CSR practices
7
8 into enhanced customer loyalty.
9

10
11
12
13
14 Third, the capacity of CSR practices to generate customer trust and loyalty in the services
15
16 sector does not depend solely on communication efforts. It also depends on how well
17
18 services brands embed them at the different touchpoints with customers, especially those
19
20 involving direct customer contact with frontline employees (Markovic et al., 2018).
21
22 Subsequently, managers should ensure that they develop human resource management
23
24 policies that support their CSR strategies (Iglesias and Saleem, 2015). In this regard, they
25
26 should hire employees whose values are aligned with their brand's CSR practices, and
27
28 design training programs to encourage socially responsible behavior among employees. In
29
30 addition, promotion opportunities should also depend on employees' CSR performance and
31
32 ability to embody and enact societal values.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Finally, brands should adhere to a more authentic and sincere approach to CSR, which
42
43 should be grounded in doing good in its own right, although this may lead to some second-
44
45 order benefits for the organization, such as increased customer loyalty. Brands need to
46
47 develop a conscience (Iglesias and Ind, 2016) and be committed to a consistent set of core
48
49 values and principles that authentically guide all the brand's strategic decisions and actions,
50
51 taking a long-term view of CSR, and endeavoring to transform the brand internally and
52
53 improve its positive transformative impact on society and the environment.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Limitations and Future Research

Despite its theoretical contributions and managerial implications, this study has some limitations. First, it is limited to the health insurance services industry, and therefore the external validity of the findings is a concern. Future research should replicate this study in a wider range of services contexts, to figure out whether the results are consistent across the whole services sector. It would also be interesting and useful to test the hypothesized model in the goods sector and compare the results with those from the services sector. Such a study might reveal key differences between services and product brands, and shed light on how they should be managed respectively. Second, as the sample is only representative of the Spanish population, the generalizability of the results is an issue. To address this issue, future research should replicate this study in other countries with relevant cultural differences. This is a relevant future research opportunity, because customers from different cultural backgrounds tend to both assess services brands differently (Imrie, 2005) and define socially responsible brands differently (Iglesias et al., 2017). Third, as all the data for this study were collected using surveys, mono-method bias is a concern. Future research should triangulate this data source by gaining qualitative insights into the effect of CSR on customer loyalty, using focus groups or in-depth interviews, for example. Fourth, this study only uses attitudinal measures for CSR, co-creation, customer trust, and customer loyalty. Although, based on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), measuring a customer's attitude toward a brand is a satisfactory approximation of the customer's actual behavior toward that brand, future studies can add more rigor to our research by developing and using behavioral measures along with the attitudinal ones.

1
2
3
4 Apart from addressing these limitations, there are other relevant opportunities for future
5
6 research. For instance, it would be interesting to discover how employees influence
7
8 customer perceptions of CSR. This is especially important in the context of services brands,
9
10 because services brands generally involve a greater number of customer-employee
11
12 touchpoints than product brands (Gronroos, 2006), where they shape the customer
13
14 experience (Iglesias et al., 2011). Moreover, while this study relates co-creation to different
15
16 types of customer outcome variables, both rational (customer trust) and behavioral
17
18 (customer loyalty), future research could relate it to relevant brand outcome variables, such
19
20 as brand equity, one of the broadest and most important constructs in the field of brand
21
22 management (e.g., Yoo et al., 2000; Sierra et al., 2017). It would be especially interesting to
23
24 figure out which type of brand equity – consumer-based or financial – co-creation boosts
25
26 the most.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS**

37
38
39
40

41 Ethical approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in
42
43 accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research
44
45 committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable
46
47 ethical standards.
48
49
50
51

52
53 Informed consent: Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included
54
55 in the study.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **REFERENCES**
5
6
7
8

9 Ailawadi, K. L., Neslin, S. A., Luan, Y. J., & Taylor, G. A. (2014). Does retailer CSR
10 enhance behavioral loyalty? A case for benefit segmentation. *International Journal of*
11 *Research in Marketing*, 31(2), 156-167.
12
13
14

15
16
17
18 Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
19 *Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
20
21
22

23
24
25
26 Balmer, J. M. T. (2001). The three virtues and seven deadly sins of corporate brand
27 management. *Journal of General Management*, 27(1), 1-17.
28
29
30

31
32
33 Banytė, J., Tarutė, A., & Taujanskytė, I. (2014). Customer engagement into value creation:
34 Determining factors and relations with loyalty. *Engineering Economics*, 25(5), 568-577.
35
36
37

38
39
40 Bendapudi, N., & Leone, R. P. (2003). Psychological implications of customer
41 participation in co-production. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(1), 14-28.
42
43
44

45
46
47
48 Berry, L. L. (1980). Services marketing is different. *Business*, 30(3), 24-29.
49
50

51
52
53 Booms, B. H., & Bitner, M. J. (1981). Marketing strategies and organization structures for
54 service firms. *Marketing of Services*, 25(3), 47-52.
55
56
57

1
2
3
4 Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual
5 brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 105-114.
6
7
8

9
10
11 Brown, T. J., & Dacin, P. A. (1997). The company and the product: Corporate associations
12 and consumer product responses. *The Journal of Marketing*, 61(1), 68–84.
13
14
15

16
17
18 Carrigan, M., & Attalla, A. (2001). The myth of the ethical consumer—do ethics matter in
19 purchase behaviour?. *Journal of consumer marketing*, 18(7), 560-578.
20
21
22

23
24
25 Carroll, A. B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate
26 performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505.
27
28
29

30
31
32 Carù, A., & Cova, B. (2015). Co-creating the collective service experience. *Journal of*
33 *Service Management*, 26(2), 276-294.
34
35
36
37

38
39
40 Castaldo, S., Perrini, F., Misani, N., & Tencati, A. (2009). The missing link between
41 corporate social responsibility and consumer trust: The case of fair trade products. *Journal*
42 *of Business Ethics*, 84(1), 1-15.
43
44
45
46
47

48
49
50 Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand
51 affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Chazal, C. (2008). Co-creation: Insurance done differently. Retrieved from
5
6 <https://www.axa.com/en/spotlight/story/co-creation-insurance-done-differently> [Accessed
7
8
9 26 February 2018].

10
11
12
13
14 Chen, M. F., & Mau, L. H. (2009). The impacts of ethical sales behaviour on customer
15
16 loyalty in the life insurance industry. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(1), 59-74.
17
18

19
20
21 Choi, B., & La, S. (2013). The impact of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and
22
23 customer trust on the restoration of loyalty after service failure and recovery. *Journal of*
24
25 *Services Marketing*, 27(3), 223-233.
26
27

28
29
30
31 Choudhury, K. (2014). Service quality and word of mouth: a study of the banking
32
33 sector. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 32(7), 612-627.
34
35

36
37
38 Cossío-Silva, F. J., Revilla-Camacho, M. Á., Vega-Vázquez, M., & Palacios-Florencio, B.
39
40 (2016). Value co-creation and customer loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(5), 1621-
41
42 1625.
43
44

45
46
47
48 Cova, B., & Dalli, D. (2009). Working consumers: the next step in marketing
49
50 theory?. *Marketing Theory*, 9(3), 315-339.
51
52

53
54
55 Da Silveira, C., Lages, C., & Simões, C. (2013). Reconceptualizing brand identity in a
56
57 dynamic environment. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 28-36.
58
59

1
2
3
4 Dagger, T. S., Danaher, P. J., & Gibbs, B. J. (2009). How often versus how long: The
5 interplay of contact frequency and relationship duration in customer-reported service
6 relationship strength. *Journal of Service Research*, 11(4), 371-388.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Dagger, T. S., David, M. E., & Ng, S. (2011). Do relationship benefits and maintenance
15 drive commitment and loyalty? *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25(4), 273–281.
16
17
18

19
20
21 Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: an analysis of 37
22 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15(1), 1-13.
23
24
25

26
27
28 Delgado-Ballester, E., Munuera-Aleman, J. L., & Yague-Guillen, M. J. (2003).
29 Development and validation of a brand trust scale. *International Journal of Market*
30 *Research*, 45(1), 35-54.
31
32
33

34
35
36
37
38 Delgado-Ballester, E., & Munuera-Alemán, J. L. (2005). Does brand trust matter to brand
39 equity?. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 14(3), 187-196.
40
41
42

43
44
45 Diallo, M. F., & Lambey-Checchin, C. (2017). Consumers' Perceptions of Retail Business
46 Ethics and Loyalty to the Retailer: The Moderating Role of Social Discount
47 Practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141(3), 435-449.
48
49
50

51
52
53
54
55 DKV (2018). DKV, in the Merco top 20 ranking for companies with business responsibility
56 and corporate governance. Retrieved from <https://eng.dkvseguros.com/empresa->
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 responsable/institucional/dkv-entre-las-veinte-empresas-con-responsabilidad-empresarial-
5 y-gobierno-corporativo-del-ranking-merco-12-02-2018 [Accessed 26 February 2018].
6
7
8
9

10
11 Edelman Trust Barometer (2018). 2018 Edelman Trust Barometer Report. Retrieved from
12
13 [https://cms.edelman.com/sites/default/files/2018-](https://cms.edelman.com/sites/default/files/2018-01/2018%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report.pdf)
14
15 [01/2018%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report.pdf](https://cms.edelman.com/sites/default/files/2018-01/2018%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report.pdf) [Accessed 2
16
17
18 August 2018].
19
20
21
22

23
24 Eiglier, P., & Langeard, E. (1977). A new approach to service marketing. In P. Eiglier, E.
25
26 Langeard, C. H. Lovelock, J. E. G. Bateson, & R. F. Young (Eds.), *Marketing Consumer*
27
28 *Services: New Insights* (pp. 33–58). Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
29
30
31
32

33
34 Eisingerich, A. B., Rubera, G., Seifert, M., & Bhardwaj, G. (2011). Doing good and doing
35
36 better despite negative information?: The role of corporate social responsibility in
37
38 consumer resistance to negative information. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(1), 60-75.
39
40
41
42

43
44 Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with
45
46 unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-
47
48 50.
49
50
51
52

53
54 Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in
55
56 consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24(4), 343-373.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Fournier, S., & Yao, J. L. (1997). Reviving brand loyalty: A reconceptualization within the
5
6 framework of consumer-brand relationships. *International Journal of Research in*
7
8 *Marketing*, 14(5), 451-472.
9

10
11
12
13
14 Freeman, R. E. (1999). Divergent stakeholder theory. *Academy of Management*
15
16 *Review*, 24(2), 233-236.
17
18

19
20
21 Füller, J., Matzler, K., & Hoppe, M. (2008). Brand community members as a source of
22
23 innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 25(6), 608-619.
24
25

26
27
28 Füller, J., Mühlbacher, H., Matzler, K., & Jawecki, G. (2009). Consumer empowerment
29
30 through internet-based co-creation. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 26(3), 71-
31
32 102.
33
34

35
36
37
38 Gallo, A. (2014). The Value of Keeping the Right Customers. *Harvard Business Review*
39
40 *Magazine*. Retrieved from hbr.org/2014/10/the-value-of-keeping-the-right-customers
41
42 [Accessed 16 January 2018].
43
44
45

46
47
48 García Rodríguez, N., Sanzo Pérez, M.J., & Trespalacios Gutiérrez, J. A. (2007).
49
50 Interfunctional trust as a determining factor of a new product performance. *European*
51
52 *Journal of Marketing*, 41(5/6), 678-702.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 García de los Salmones, M. D. M., Perez, A., & Rodríguez del Bosque, I. (2009). The
5 social role of financial companies as a determinant of consumer behaviour. *The*
6
7
8
9 *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 27(6), 467-485.

10
11
12
13
14 Gouillart, F. (2014). The race to implement co-creation of value with stakeholders: five
15
16
17
18
19
20 approaches to competitive advantage. *Strategy & Leadership*, 42(1), 2-8.

21
22
23
24 Grönroos, C. (2006). Adopting a service logic for marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 317-
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 333.

33
34
35
36 Gundlach, G. T., & Murphy, P. E. (1993). Ethical and legal foundations of relational
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65 marketing exchanges. *The Journal of Marketing*, 57(4), 35-46.

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2010). Toward a theory of brand co-creation with implications
5
6 for brand governance. *Journal of Brand Management*, 17(8), 590-604.
7
8

9
10
11 Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process*
12 *analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York: Guilford Publications.
13
14

15
16
17
18
19 Hosseini, M. H., & Hosseini, V. S. (2013). The impact of co-production on customer
20
21 loyalty in banking services: a case of Saman Bank. *Iranian Journal of Management*
22 *Studies*, 6(2), 105.
23
24

25
26
27
28 Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
29
30 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: A*
31 *multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1), 1-55.
32
33

34
35
36
37
38 Iglesias, O., & Ind, N. (2016). How to build a brand with a conscience. In N. Ind & S.
39
40 Horlings (Eds.), *Brands with a conscience*. Amsterdam: Kogan Page.
41
42

43
44
45 Iglesias, O., Ind, N., & Alfaro, M. (2013). The organic view of the brand: A brand value co-
46
47 creation model. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(8), 670-688.
48
49

50
51
52
53 Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., Singh, J. J., & Sierra, V. (2017). Do Customer Perceptions of
54
55 Corporate Services Brand Ethicality improve Brand Equity? Considering the roles of Brand
56
57 Heritage, Brand Image, and Recognition Benefits. *Journal of Business*
58 *Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s10551-017-3455-0
59
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Iglesias, O., & Saleem, F. Z. (2015). How to support consumer-brand relationships: The
8
9 role of corporate culture and human resource policies and practices. *Marketing Intelligence*
10
11 & *Planning*, 33(2), 216-234.
12
13

14
15
16 Iglesias, O., Singh, J. J., & Batista-Foguet, J. M. (2011). The role of brand experience and
17
18 affective commitment in determining brand loyalty. *Journal of Brand Management*, 18(8),
19
20 570-582.
21
22

23
24
25
26 Imrie, B. C. (2005). Beyond disconfirmation: the role of generosity and
27
28 surprise. *International Marketing Review*, 22(3), 369-383.
29
30

31
32
33 Ind, N. (1997). *The corporate brand*. Oxford: Macmillan.
34
35

36
37
38 Ind, N., Iglesias, O., & Schultz, M. (2013). Building brands together: Emergence and
39
40 outcomes of co-creation. *California Management Review*, 55(3), 5-26.
41
42

43
44
45 Ind, N., Iglesias, O., & Markovic, S. (2017). The co-creation continuum: From tactical
46
47 market research tool to strategic collaborative innovation method. *Journal of Brand*
48
49 *Management*, 24(4), 310-321.
50
51

52
53
54
55 Joyner, B. E., & Payne, D. (2002). Evolution and implementation: A study of values,
56
57 business ethics and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 41(4), 297-
58
59 311.
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Kang, J., & Hustvedt, G. (2014). Building trust between consumers and corporations: The
8
9 role of consumer perceptions of transparency and social responsibility. *Journal of Business*
10
11 *Ethics*, 125(2), 253-265.
12
13

14
15
16 Kaufmann, H. R., Loureiro, S. M. C., & Manarioti, A. (2016). Exploring behavioural
17
18 branding, brand love and brand co-creation. *Journal of Product & Brand*
19
20 *Management*, 25(6), 516-526.
21
22

23
24
25
26 Kazadi, K., Lievens, A., & Mahr, D. (2016). Stakeholder co-creation during the innovation
27
28 process: Identifying capabilities for knowledge creation among multiple
29
30 stakeholders. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2), 525-540.
31
32

33
34
35
36 Keh, H. T., & Pang, J. (2010). Customer reactions to service separation. *Journal of*
37
38 *Marketing*, 74(2), 55-70.
39
40

41
42
43 Kennedy, M. S., Ferrell, L. K., & LeClair, D. T. (2001). Consumers' trust of salesperson
44
45 and manufacturer: an empirical study. *Journal of Business Research*, 51(1), 73-86.
46
47

48
49
50 Kumar, S. R., & Advani, J. Y. (2005). Factors affecting brand loyalty: A study in an
51
52 emerging market on fast moving consumer goods. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, 4(2),
53
54 251-275.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Lagace, R. R., Dahlstrom, R., & Gassenheimer, J. B. (1991). The relevance of ethical
5 salesperson behavior on relationship quality: The pharmaceutical industry. *Journal of*
6
7 *Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 11(4), 39-47.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Larzelere, R. E., & Huston, T. L. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding
15
16 interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42(3), 595-
17
18 604.
19
20

21
22
23 Leonidou, L. C., Kvasova, O., Leonidou, C. N., & Chari, S. (2013). Business unethicity
24
25 as an impediment to consumer trust: The moderating role of demographic and cultural
26
27 characteristics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112(3), 397-415.
28
29
30

31
32
33 Lin, C. P., Chen, S. C., Chiu, C. K., & Lee, W. Y. (2011). Understanding purchase
34
35 intention during product-harm crises: Moderating effects of perceived corporate ability and
36
37 corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(3), 455-471.
38
39
40

41
42
43 Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in
44
45 cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 114-121.
46
47
48

49
50 Lindfelt, L. L., & Törnroos, J. Å. (2006). Ethics and value creation in business research:
51
52 comparing two approaches. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(3/4), 328-351.
53
54
55

56
57 Lovelock, C., & Wirtz, J. (2011). *Services Marketing: People, Technology, Strategy*. New
58
59 Jersey: Prentice Hall.
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2006). Corporate social responsibility, customer
8 satisfaction, and market value. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(4), 1-18.
9

10
11
12
13
14 Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2009). The debate over doing good: Corporate social
15 performance, strategic marketing levers, and firm-idiosyncratic risk. *Journal of*
16 *Marketing*, 73(6), 198-213.
17
18
19

20
21
22
23
24 Madhavan, R., & Grover, R. (1998). From embedded knowledge to embodied knowledge:
25 new product development as knowledge management. *The Journal of Marketing*, 62(4), 1-
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 Marquis, C., Toffel, M. W., & Zhou, Y. (2016). Scrutiny, norms, and selective disclosure:
5
6 A global study of greenwashing. *Organization Science*, 27(2), 483-504.
7
8
9

10
11 Martínez, P., & Rodríguez del Bosque, I. (2013). CSR and customer loyalty: The roles of
12
13 trust, customer identification with the company and satisfaction. *International Journal of*
14
15 *Hospitality Management*, 35, 89-99.
16
17
18
19
20

21 Martínez-Cañas, R., Ruiz-Palomino, P., Linuesa-Langreo, J., & Blázquez-Resino, J. J.
22
23 (2016). Consumer participation in co-creation: an enlightening model of causes and effects
24
25 based on ethical values and transcendent motives. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 793.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Massey, G. R., & Kyriazis, E. (2007). Interpersonal trust between marketing and R&D
32
33 during new product development projects. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(9/10), 1146-
34
35 1172.
36
37
38
39
40

41 Maxfield, S. (2008). Reconciling corporate citizenship and competitive strategy: Insights
42
43 from economic theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(2), 367-377.
44
45
46
47

48 Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of
49
50 organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
51
52
53
54

55 Mende, M., & Bolton, R. N. (2011). Why attachment security matters: How customers'
56
57 attachment styles influence their relationships with service firms and service
58
59 employees. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 285-301.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6 Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship
7 marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 20-38.
8

9
10
11
12
13
14 Nambisan, S., & Baron, R. A. (2007). Interactions in virtual customer environments:
15 Implications for product support and customer relationship management. *Journal of*
16 *Interactive Marketing*, 21(2), 42-62.
17
18
19

20
21
22
23 Nambisan, S., & Nambisan, P. (2008). How to profit from a better'virtual customer
24 environment'. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 49(3), 53.
25
26
27

28
29
30
31 Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychological theory*. New York, NY:
32 MacGraw-Hill.
33
34
35

36
37
38 Nyilasy, G., Gangadharbatla, H., & Paladino, A. (2014). Perceived greenwashing: The
39 interactive effects of green advertising and corporate environmental performance on
40 consumer reactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125(4), 693-707.
41
42
43
44

45
46
47
48 Nysveen, H., & Pedersen, P. E. (2014). Influences of cocreation on brand
49 experience. *International Journal of Market Research*, 56(6), 807-832.
50
51
52

53
54
55 O'Riordan, L., & Fairbrass, J. (2008). Corporate social responsibility (CSR): Models and
56 theories in stakeholder dialogue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(4), 745-758.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Park, E., Kim, K. J., & Kwon, S. J. (2017). Corporate social responsibility as a determinant
5 of consumer loyalty: An examination of ethical standard, satisfaction, and trust. *Journal of*
6
7
8
9 *Business Research*, 76, 8-13.

10
11
12
13
14 Peña, A. I. P., Jamilena, D. M.F., & Molina, M. Á. R. (2014). Value co-creation via
15 information and communications technology. *The Service Industries Journal*, 34(13), 1043-
16
17
18
19 1059.

20
21
22
23 Pérez, A., & Rodríguez del Bosque, I. (2015). How customer support for corporate social
24 responsibility influences the image of companies: Evidence from the banking
25 industry. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 22(3), 155-168.
26
27
28
29

30
31
32
33 Pivato, S., Misani, N., & Tencati, A. (2008). The impact of corporate social responsibility
34 on consumer trust: the case of organic food. *Business ethics: A European review*, 17(1), 3-
35
36
37
38 12.

39
40
41
42 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common
43 method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended
44 remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
45
46
47
48

49
50
51
52 Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems
53 and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.
54
55
56
57

1
2
3
4 Pope, S., & Wæraas, A. (2016). CSR-washing is rare: A conceptual framework, literature
5 review, and critique. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(1), 173-193.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Pour, B. S., Nazari, K., & Emami, M. (2014). Corporate social responsibility: A literature
12 review. *African Journal of Business Management*, 8(7), 228-234.
13
14

15
16
17
18 Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2000). Co-opting customer competence. *Harvard*
19 *Business Review*, 78(1), 79-90.
20
21

22
23
24
25
26 Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in
27 value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(3), 5-14.
28
29

30
31
32
33 Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect
34 effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods, instruments, &*
35 *computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
36
37
38

39
40
41
42 PwC (2016). Redefining business success in a changing world. Retrieved from
43 [www.pwc.com/gx/en/ceo-survey/2016/landing-page/pwc-19th-annual-global-ceo-](http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/ceo-survey/2016/landing-page/pwc-19th-annual-global-ceo-survey.pdf)
44 [survey.pdf](http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/ceo-survey/2016/landing-page/pwc-19th-annual-global-ceo-survey.pdf) [Accessed 7 April 2018].
45
46
47

48
49
50
51
52
53 Ramaswamy, V., & Ozcan, K. (2016). Brand value co-creation in a digitalized world: An
54 integrative framework and research implications. *International Journal of Research in*
55 *Marketing*, 33(1), 93-106.
56
57
58

1
2
3
4 Rajah, E., Marshall, R., & Nam, I. (2008). Relationship glue: customers and marketers co-
5
6
7 creating a purchase experience. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 35, 367–373.
8
9

10
11 Rindell, A., Svensson, G., Mysen, T., Billström, A., & Wilén, K. (2011). Towards a
12
13 conceptual foundation of ‘Conscientious Corporate Brands’. *Journal of Brand*
14
15
16 *Management*, 18(9), 709-719.
17
18
19

20
21 Ring, P. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1992). Structuring cooperative relationships between
22
23 organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(7), 483-498.
24
25
26

27
28 Reputation Institute (2016). 2016 Global RepTrak 100 Report. Retrieved from
29
30 [https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/ceo-survey/2016/landing-page/pwc-19th-annual-global-ceo-](https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/ceo-survey/2016/landing-page/pwc-19th-annual-global-ceo-survey.pdf)
31
32 [survey.pdf](https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/ceo-survey/2016/landing-page/pwc-19th-annual-global-ceo-survey.pdf) [Accessed 7 April 2018].
33
34
35

36
37
38 Román, S. (2003). The impact of ethical sales behaviour on customer satisfaction, trust and
39
40 loyalty to the company: An empirical study in the financial services industry. *Journal of*
41
42 *Marketing Management*, 19(9-10), 915-939.
43
44
45

46
47
48 Schau, H. J., Muñoz Jr, A. M., & Arnould, E. J. (2009). How brand community practices
49
50 create value. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(5), 30-51.
51
52
53

54
55 Sen, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Korschun, D. (2006). The role of corporate social
56
57 responsibility in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships: A field
58
59 experiment. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2), 158-166.
60
61
62

1
2
3
4
5
6 Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better?
7
8
9 Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing*
10
11 *Research*, 38(2), 225-243.
12
13

14
15
16 Setó-Pamies, D. (2012). Customer loyalty to service providers: examining the role of
17
18 service quality, customer satisfaction and trust. *Total Quality Management & Business*
19
20 *Excellence*, 23(11-12), 1257-1271.
21
22

23
24
25
26 Shaw, D., & Shiu, E. (2002). The role of ethical obligation and self-identity in ethical
27
28 consumer choice. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 26(2), 109-116.
29
30

31
32
33 Sierra, V., Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., & Singh, J. J. (2017). Does ethical image build equity
34
35 in corporate services brands? The influence of customer perceived ethicality on affect,
36
37 perceived quality, and equity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(3), 661-676.
38
39

40
41
42
43 Singh, J. J. (2014). RSC ha llegado para quedarse [CSR is here to stay]. In G. Costa, & M.
44
45 Casabayó (Eds.), *Soul Marketing* (pp.53-62). Barcelona, Spain: Profit Editorial.
46
47

48
49
50
51 Singh, J., Brady, M., Arnold, T., & Brown, T. (2017). The emergent field of organizational
52
53 frontlines. *Journal of Service Research*, 20(1), 3-11.
54
55

1
2
3
4 Singh, J. J., Iglesias, O., & Batista-Foguet, J. M. (2012). Does having an ethical brand
5 matter? The influence of consumer perceived ethicality on trust, affect and loyalty. *Journal*
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Singh, J. J., Iglesias, O., & Batista-Foguet, J. M. (2012). Does having an ethical brand matter? The influence of consumer perceived ethicality on trust, affect and loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(4), 541-549.

Stanaland, A. J., Lwin, M. O., & Murphy, P. E. (2011). Consumer perceptions of the antecedents and consequences of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(1), 47-55.

Stathopoulou, A., & Balabanis, G. (2016). The effects of loyalty programs on customer satisfaction, trust, and loyalty toward high-and low-end fashion retailers. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5801-5808.

Sun, P. C., & Lin, C. M. (2010). Building customer trust and loyalty: An empirical study in a retailing context. *The Service Industries Journal*, 30(9), 1439-1455.

Swaen, V., & Chumpitaz, R. C. (2008). Impact of corporate social responsibility on consumer trust. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (English Edition)*, 23(4), 7-34.

Vallaster, C., & von Wallpach, S. (2013). An online discursive inquiry into the social dynamics of multi-stakeholder brand meaning co-creation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1505-1515.

Van Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and definitions of CSR and corporate sustainability: Between agency and communion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(2-3), 95-105.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Vitell, S. J. (2015). A case for consumer social responsibility (CnSR): Including a selected
8
9 review of consumer ethics/social responsibility research. *Journal of Business*
10
11 *Ethics*, 130(4), 767-774.
12
13

14
15
16 Vlachos, P. A., Tsamakos, A., Vrechopoulos, A. P., & Avramidis, P. K. (2009). Corporate
17
18 social responsibility: attributions, loyalty, and the mediating role of trust. *Journal of the*
19
20 *Academy of Marketing Science*, 37(2), 170-180.
21
22

23
24
25
26 Von Hippel, E. (2005). *Democratizing innovation*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
27
28

29
30
31 Walsh, G., & Beatty, S. E. (2007). Customer-based corporate reputation of a service firm:
32
33 scale development and validation. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 35(1), 127-
34
35 143.
36
37

38
39
40 West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural Equation Models with Non-
41
42 Normal Variables: Problems and Remedies. In R.H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural Equation*
43
44 *Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
45
46
47

48
49
50 Wikström, S. (1996). The customer as co-producer. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(4),
51
52 6-19.
53
54

55
56
57 Williams, J., & Aitken, R. (2011). The service-dominant logic of marketing and marketing
58
59 ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(3), 439-454.
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Wong, A., & Sohal, A. (2002). An examination of the relationship between trust, commitment and relationship quality. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 30(1), 34-50.

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. (2000). An examination of selected marketing mix elements and brand equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2), 195-211.

Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). Problems and strategies in services marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 49(2), 33-46.

FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1 Hypothesized model




Table 1 Constructs and items used in the questionnaire

Constructs	Items	Reference(s)
CSR	The brand is a socially responsible brand.	Eisingerich et al. (2011)
	The brand is more beneficial to society's welfare than other brands.	
	The brand contributes to society in positive ways.	
Co-creation	I often express my personal needs to the brand.	Nysveen and Pedersen (2014)
	I often find solutions to my problems together with the brand.	
	I am actively involved when the brand develops new solutions for me.	
	The brand encourages customers to create new solutions together.	
Customer trust	The brand keeps its promises.	Mende and Bolton (2011)
	The brand can be trusted.	Dagger et al. (2009)
	The brand is trustworthy.	
Customer loyalty	I consider the brand my first choice when I purchase the services they supply.	Dagger et al. (2011)
	I am willing to maintain my relationship with the brand.	
	I am loyal to the brand.	

Table 2 Item descriptive and measurement model assessment

Construct	Items	Mean	SD	Loadings	Cronbach alphas	CR	AVE
CSR					0.89	0.89	0.73
	CSR1	5.25	1.28	0.869			
	CSR2	4.94	1.35	0.818			
	CSR3	5.12	1.28	0.872			
Co-creation					0.88	0.88	0.64
	CO1	4.42	1.70	0.755			
	CO2	4.73	1.54	0.833			
	CO3	4.49	1.68	0.771			
	CO4	4.63	1.54	0.833			
Customer trust					0.90	0.91	0.76
	T1	5.39	1.22	0.841			
	T2	5.66	1.16	0.900			
	T3	5.67	1.16	0.873			
Customer loyalty					0.90	0.90	0.76
	L1	5.41	1.35	0.866			
	L2	5.50	1.30	0.867			
	L3	5.30	1.42	0.876			

Note: Standardized factor loadings are reported. All factor loadings are significant at 0.1% level (two-tailed).

Table 3 Construct descriptive and discriminant validity

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1- CSR	5.11	1.18	0.85			
2- Co-creation	4.57	1.38	0.70	0.80		
3- Customer trust	5.58	1.08	0.73	0.60	0.87	
4- Customer loyalty	5.40	1.24	0.69	0.58	0.76	0.87

Note: Squared root of AVE on the diagonal. All Pearson correlations between constructs are significant at 1% level (two-tailed).

Table 4 CMV-adjusted correlation coefficients

	Unadjusted correlation coefficients	CMV-adjusted correlation coefficients
CSR - Co-creation	0.698	0.695
CSR - Customer trust	0.729	0.727
Co-creation - Customer trust	0.597	0.593
Co-creation - Customer loyalty	0.579	0.575
Customer trust - Customer loyalty	0.764	0.762
CSR - Customer loyalty	0.694	0.691

Note: CMV-adjusted estimates using $r_s = 0.009$. All Pearson CMV-adjusted correlation coefficients between constructs remain significant at 1% level (two-tailed).

Table 5 Fit indices comparison between hypothesized structural model and alternative models

	1 CSR, CO, T → L	2 CSR → CO, T CO, T → L	3 Hypothesized model without direct link between CSR and L CSR → CO, T CO → T CO, T → L	4 Hypothesized model CSR → CO, T, L CO → T CO, T → L
χ^2 (df)	1826.846 (62)	231.491 (61)	228.78 (60)	215.813 (59)
χ^2 /df	29.47	3.80	3.81	3.66
GFI	0.809	0.968	0.968	0.969
CFI	0.842	0.985	0.985	0.986
RMSEA	0.161	0.050	0.051	0.049
SRMR	0.369	0.031	0.031	0.030

Note: CO= Co-creation; T=Customer trust; L= Customer loyalty

Table 6 Direct effects results

	Standardized Coefficients	Standard Error	p-value	90% bias corrected CI*	Result
H1: CSR → Co-creation	0.79	0.036	<0.001	[0.76; 0.82]	Supported ⁺
H2: CSR → Customer trust	0.74	0.043	<0.001	[0.65; 0.82]	Supported ⁺
H3: Co-creation → Customer trust	0.10	0.035	0.033	[0.002; 0.19]	Supported
H4: Co-creation → Customer loyalty	0.09	0.036	0.033	[0.006; 0.17]	Supported
H5: Customer trust → Customer loyalty	0.63	0.051	<0.001	[0.54; 0.70]	Supported ⁺
H6: CSR → Customer loyalty	0.20	0.057	<0.001	[0.09; 0.31]	Supported ⁺

* Bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval based on 5000 bootstrapping samples.

+ Hypothesis is also significant based on 99% bias corrected CI.

Table 7 Indirect effects results

	Standardized Indirect effect	95% bias corrected CI*
1) CSR → Co-creation → Customer loyalty	0.07 (0.021)	[0.02; 0.11] +
2) CSR → Co-creation → Customer trust → Customer loyalty	0.06 (0.013)	[0.04; 0.09] +
3) CSR → Customer trust → Customer loyalty	0.33 (0.024)	[0.28; 0.38] +

Note: Bootstrap standard errors are in parentheses.

* Bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval based on 5000 bootstrapping samples.

+ Indirect effect is also significant based on 99% bias corrected CI.