Do Demographic Aspects Have an Effect on Perceived Corporate Brand Attributes of South African Vehicle Owners

Louise van Scheers[1], William Mmatli[2]

Abstract: The main objective of this paper was to explore whether the demographic aspects have an effect on perceived corporate attributes. 205 respondents participated in this study (146 males and 59 females) and were surveyed through a random sampling method. A questionnaire was given to them to complete. The main finding in this paper is that there is a strong and significant relationship between corporate brand's attributes and the perceived behaviour towards the particular brand. It is found that there is no difference between male and female respondents in the way they perceive the attribute of a corporate brand, while and the demographics like age group have a significant impact on the perceived corporate and product attributes.

Keywords: Corporate branding; customer satisfaction; customer loyalty; consumer behavior; brand reputation perception brand image

JEL Classification: O16

1. Introduction

Brands are valued in different measures by consumers and organizations. For consumers they serve as an additional guarantee of product/service quality. For organizations they accord distinctiveness to their products and services and sometimes to the corporation as a whole (Balmer & Greyser, 2003). The corporate brand is seen as representing an expert promise between an organisation and its key stakeholder groups, including its customers (Balmer & Greyser, 2003). Corporate brand does not only create awareness and brand recognition through a name or logo, it has to keep a strong promise within the key stakeholder groups and also be maintained to keep its competitive edge and to ensure that it remains the sign or source of assurance to the consumers (Balmer & Greyser, 2003).

---

[1] Professor, PhD, Department of Marketing & Retail Management, College of Economic & Management Sciences, University of South Africa, South Africa, Address: Pretoria, P.O. Box 329, Unisa 0003, South Africa, Corresponding author: Vscheml@unisa.ac.za.
[2] Lecturer, PhD, Department of Marketing & Retail Management, College of Economic & Management Sciences, University of South Africa, South Africa, Address: Pretoria, P.O. Box 329, Unisa 0003, South Africa, E-mail: mmatlmw@unisa.ac.za.

Consumer perceptions regarding corporate brands are part of what Keller (2003) regards as brand knowledge. According to Winchester, Romaniuk and Bogomolova (2008, p. 553), these perceptions come into existence through brand interactions with the consumers. Such interactions include buying or using the brand, and being exposed to advertising, publicity or word of mouth. This information can create either beliefs about the corporate brand, which may be positive, negative, or neutral (Krishnan, 1996, p. 389). "Positive beliefs represent qualities generally considered to be desirable for a brand in that category (e.g. good value), while negative beliefs are those considered to be undesirable (e.g., poor service)" Krishnan (1996, p. 389).

The main objective of this paper is to explore whether the demographic aspects have an effect on perceived corporate attributes.

2. Research Methodology

Secondary and primary sources were used to gather information analyse the managerial skills of small business owners. The main sources of secondary sources were journals, articles, press reports, books and research studies.

The target population for this study consists of vehicle owners who are the residents of South Africa. The units of analysis are the South African vehicle owners whose behaviour is influenced by the corporate brand attributes. This study is based on a convenience sample; since respondents were chosen because of their convenient accessibility and they were also not difficult choose. Respondents were identified and selected to complete the survey during their convenient time within a given time frame.

This study consisted of a sample size of 205 respondents. The minimum sample size of 30 respondents is recommended for the correlational studies (Ouyang, 2006). Sample size of 205 is therefore deemed to be a significantly large sample size. The screening criterion for respondents in this study was South African vehicle owners between the ages 18 to 60+ who bought a new motor vehicle in the last three (3) years.

3. Literature Review

Corporate branding help the organisations to be differentiate themselves from their competitors and it is also a unique portrayal of the organisation's differentiated products and services. Due to the continuous growth and improvement in technology, organisations these days find themselves in very difficult situations where they have to strive for differentiation, therefore corporate branding strategies

are being recognized as an ideal means of succeeding in precarious markets where uniformity of products is becoming the norm (Anisimova, 2007, p. 404).

3.1. The Importance of Corporate Brand

The primary purpose of brands and brand names is to provide the consumer with a symbolic meaning, which assists the consumer in the recognition and decision-making process. If consumers have positive perceived values associated with the brand, these consumers cannot see the brand risk of poor performance or financial risk (Balmer & Gray, 2003, p. 973). Balmer (2001, pp. 302-303) developed the mnemonic CCITE (C2ITE) in attempting to explore and reflect on the attributes of a corporate brand. According to this the corporate brand has the following characteristics:

• Culture – this means that corporate brands must have strong cultural roots;

• Commitment – senior management is expected to devote sufficient resources such as on-going financial and communication support;

• Intricate – a corporate brand is multi-disciplinary in that it impacts the organisation's stakeholder groups and methods;

• Tangible – it includes product quality, geographical coverage, performance related issues, profit margins or even pay scales;

• Ethereal – it includes elements such as "life style" and way of delivery. There are often emotional responses to elements associated with the brand.

3.2. Corporate Brand and Customer Satisfaction

Corporate brands can be used as signals of quality levels to consumers due to the symbolic associations held with the brand and when these consumers assign a certain value to a specific brand they expect that brand to meet their expectations. According to Haig and Knowless (2005, p. 28) if the brand appeals positively to the consumers, it will reduce the consumers' searching costs and it will also save time. Accordingly, if the brand is perceived to be of a high quality, the organisation will have economic benefits for the brand loyal consumers. "A well-positioned brand will attract and retain quality members of staff, often lead to better terms of business and lower discounts within the trade and can reduce equity and borrowing costs" (Haig & Knowless, 2005, p. 28).

If the corporate brand meets the consumer expectations or even exceeds these expectations, this will lead to a high level of consumer satisfaction and will potentially develop brand trust between the consumers and the organisations, which will eventually lead to brand and consumer loyalty. To develop a corporate brand the organisation must first determine the brand position and all the values that the organisation should abide by.

According to Fevons, Gabbott and De Chernatony (2005, p. 301) some organisations hold the perception that an organisation that truly sets about developing its brand position from the inside is moving towards becoming a true customer-focused business. The organisation must ensure that everyone within the organisation speaks the same language before they decide to conduct or implement their external communication whereby consistency in brand communication is important in building and maintaining a strong brand image (Fevons, Gabbott & De Chernatony, 2005, p. 301).

According to Bloemer and Kasper (1995, p. 321) the relationship between customer satisfaction and customer loyalty is complex and may involve multiple moderating factors. Value attainment and positive mood were the two factors consequently investigated by De Reuyter and Bloemer (1999, p. 321) in relation to customer satisfaction. Thus, research continuously confirms a significant relationship between satisfaction and repeat buying which will eventually lead to brand loyalty and positive word of mouth (Dubrovski, 2001, p. 920).

3.3. Corporate Values, Consumer Behaviour and Loyalty

"All established corporate brands have a track record which may vary in duration and continuity and these corporate brands may also vary in number and in the degree to which they are rooted internally and to what extent they are perceived by the outside world" (Urde, 2009, p. 616). According to Urde (2009, p. 616) the values entrenched in the organisation need to be aligned with the values perceived and enjoyed by consumers over time.

According to Coyles and Gokey (2005, p. 102) the perceived corporate brand value will determine the behaviour of the consumer towards that particular brand. Should the perception be positive, the organisation would be more likely to succeed in terms of their customer retention processes. "Customer retention has become so important for organisations to an extent that some authors even label it as "the Holy Grail' in industries from airlines to wireless" (Coyles & Gokey, 2005, p. 102). However, what constitutes the best measure of customer retention is still open for deliberation.

Anisimova (2007, p. 399) summarised the attitudinal and behavioural values of the organisation (automotive manufacturer) as a corporate brand that could have a direct influence on consumer behaviour as follows:

- Customer focus;
- Constant innovation;
- Respect for the individual;
- Practical technology;
- Ecological responsible motoring;

- Community orientation.

"The degree of consumer loyalty has a tendency to be high when consumer perceptions of an organisation are strongly favourable" (Ngueyen and Leblanc, 2001).

3.4. Corporate Activities and Consumer Behaviour

Souiden, Kassim and Hong (2006, p. 826) believe that whilst "corporate charisma" can affect some consumers' behaviour towards an organisation or a brand, other consumers may stay completely indifferent. This is established by the diversity in outcomes of the effects of corporate image and reputation on consumers. More specifically, Sen and Bhattacharaya (2001) stipulate that some initiatives aimed at enhancing corporate image and reputation like corporate social responsibility (CSR) can, under certain conditions, decrease consumers' intentions to buy a company's products. Interestingly, research in the recent years by Sen, Battacharaya and Korchun (2006) found that the consumers who were aware of corporate social initiatives had significantly more favourable views of the given organisation in terms of their associations, attitudes and behavioural intentions. With the above being mentioned, it seems like there is a relationship between the organisations' corporate activities and consumer behaviour.

An organisation's corporate activities that might have an influence on attitudinal and perceivable consumer behaviour are as follow:

- The organisation's sponsorship of worthy social activities in South Africa;

- Sponsorship of national sporting events;

- Strong support of research into technology;

- Providing consumer-specific motoring solutions.

3. Analysis of Research Results

3.1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 2 gives the demographic distributions of the respondents who participated in this study.

Table 2. Demographic distribution on respondents

Demographic distribution		Frequencies observed	Frequencies merged*	Percentages observed	Percentages merged*
Gender	Male	146	146	71.2	71.2
	Female	59	59	28.8	28.8
Age	18-29	45	45	22.0	22.0
	30-39	55	55	26.8	26.8
	40-49	40	40	19.5	19.5
	50-59	42	65	20.5	31.7
	60+	23		11.2	
Ethnicity	Black	67	67	32.7	32.7
	White	99	99	48.3	48.3
	Coloured	25	39	12.2	19.0
	Indian	13		6.3	
	Asian	1		0.5	

With reference to table 2, the sample of 205 consisted of 71% males and 29% females; 22% of the respondents were between the age group 18-29, 26.8% were between 30-39 years and 19.5% were aged between 40-49 while the other 31.7% were 50 years or older. The majority of the respondents 48.3% were white, 32.7% were black while the remaining 19% consisted of coloureds, Indians and there was only one Asians in the sample.

Normality test

In order to test the hypotheses, it is necessary to establish whether the data follow the normal distribution. Table 3 provides the results of the tests of normality.

Table 3. Normal distribution test

Normality Tests	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Corporate – Activities	3.499	0.994	0.119	205	0.000	.955	205	0.000
Corporate – Values	4.185	0.728	0.147	205	0.000	.897	205	0.000
Corporate - Customer Orientation	4.179	0.860	0.188	205	0.000	.845	205	0.000
Coporate - Employee Orientation	3.932	0.950	0.172	205	0.000	.888	205	0.000
Corporate – Standing	4.076	0.912	0.191	205	0.000	.858	205	0.000
Corporate – Responsibility	3.766	0.963	0.118	205	0.000	.928	205	0.000
Product – Smart	4.182	0.887	0.235	205	0.000	.831	205	0.000
Product – Technology	4.249	1.006	0.309	205	0.000	.743	205	0.000
Product - Functional Benefits	4.406	0.709	0.232	205	0.000	.801	205	0.000
Product - Emotional Benefits	4.486	0.743	0.282	205	0.000	.708	205	0.000
Product - Symbolic Benefits	3.900	1.057	0.202	205	0.000	.883	205	0.000

The significance (Sig.) = 0.000 which shows that the scores were not normally distributed (see table 3). Therefore the non-parametric tests should also be conducted

which make no assumption about how the nature of the distribution of the data. When the subgroups (sample in subgroup > 30) in the samples are relatively large, violations from the normality assumption should not have a large effect on the results obtained from the non-parametric tests. Therefore, in the results presented for each of the first three hypotheses, both the parametric and the non-parametric results are provided.

HYPOTHESIS 1: Gender differences

In order to interpret the correct t-test, it is required that the equal variances assumption is also conducted for both the parametric and the non-parametric tests. Table 4 displays the results of the F-test and the independent samples Mann-Whitney U-test which compares the distributions of the scores obtained from 2 independent gender groups. The results suggest that it would be reasonable to assume that the variances across the two samples are not significantly different, except for the last variable, Product – Symbolic Benefits. When the results of the Mann-Whitney U-test are interpreted, it is seems as if one can assume that the distributions of the scores across the two gender groups are similar.

Table 4. F-test and the independent samples Mann-Whitney U-test over gender

	Standard deviation		F-test			Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U-test	
	Male	Female	F-test	Sig.	Decision	Sig.	Decision
Corporate – Activities	1.041	0.870	2.737	0.100	Retain H0	0.329	Retain H0
Corporate – Values	0.725	0.741	0.041	0.841	Retain H0	0.797	Retain H0
Corporate - Customer Orientation	0.858	0.874	0.086	0.769	Retain H0	0.913	Retain H0
Coporate - Employee Orientation	0.939	0.985	0.240	0.624	Retain H0	0.914	Retain H0
Corporate – Standing	0.901	0.934	0.082	0.775	Retain H0	0.183	Retain H0
Corporate - Responsibility	0.993	0.892	0.399	0.528	Retain H0	0.436	Retain H0
Product – Smart	0.897	0.869	0.384	0.536	Retain H0	0.879	Retain H0
Product – Technology	0.974	1.087	0.466	0.496	Retain H0	0.264	Retain H0
Product - Functional Benefits	0.692	0.754	0.002	0.965	Retain H0	0.434	Retain H0
Product - Emotional Benefits	0.767	0.675	2.452	0.119	Retain H0	0.103	Retain H0
Product - Symbolic Benefits	1.088	0.937	4.177	0.042	Reject H0	0.052	Retain H0

T-test and the independent samples Medians test

Table 5 shows the results of the T-test over the two gender groups, as well as the estimated means to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the means of two independent gender groups. Similarly, because the data are not normally distributed, in support of the t-test, the results of the independent

samples medians test are also provided. The results suggest almost no significant differences in the scores for the two groups, except that males seem to perceive the symbolic benefits of the product significantly higher than females do. This result is only evident in the parametric t-test with p=0.042.

Table 5. T-test and the independent samples means over gender

	Means		Test-test				Independent Samples Medians test	
	Male	**Female**	**Equal variances**	**T-test**	**Sig.**	**Decision**	**Sig.**	**Decision**
Corporate – Activities	3.526	3.432	assumed	0.609	0.543	Retain H0	0.116	Retain H0
Corporate – Values	4.190	4.173	assumed	0.156	0.876	Retain H0	0.931	Retain H0
Corporate - Customer Orientation	4.178	4.181	assumed	-0.020	0.984	Retain H0	0.857	Retain H0
Corporate - Employee Orientation	3.932	3.932	assumed	-0.005	0.996	Retain H0	0.557	Retain H0
Corporate – Standing	4.123	3.958	assumed	1.179	0.240	Retain H0	0.145	Retain H0
Corporate - Responsibility	3.784	3.720	assumed	0.429	0.668	Retain H0	0.592	Retain H0
Product – Smart	4.166	4.220	assumed	-0.395	0.693	Retain H0	0.880	Retain H0
Product – Technology	4.226	4.305	assumed	-0.509	0.612	Retain H0	-	Unable to compute
Product - Functional Benefits	4.387	4.453	assumed	-0.606	0.545	Retain H0	0.919	Retain H0
Product - Emotional Benefits	4.441	4.599	assumed	-1.383	0.168	Retain H0	-	Unable to compute
Product - Symbolic Benefits	3.798	4.153	not assumed	-2.338	0.021	Reject H0	0.015	Reject H0

HYPOTHESIS 2. Ethnic differences

In order to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference or homogeneity between the variances across the independent ethnic groups, Levene's test for homogeneity of variances is used, with the results displayed in Table 6. The results suggest that significant differences in variability exist for the measure of perceived corporate responsibility, and the perceived emotional benefits as well as the perceived symbolic benefits of the product.

Table 6. Levene's test for homogeneity of variances across ethnic groups

	Std. Deviation			Test of Homogeneity of Variances (df1=2, df2=202)				
	Black	White	Other	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.	Decision
Corporate - Activities	1.116	0.911	0.988	1.911	2	202	0.151	Retain H0
Corporate - Values	0.724	0.772	0.627	1.216	2	202	0.298	Retain H0
Corporate - Customer Orientation	0.694	0.967	0.769	2.910	2	202	0.057	Retain H0
Corporate - Employee Orientation	1.018	0.916	0.897	1.796	2	202	0.169	Retain H0
Corporate - Standing	0.761	0.986	0.928	2.991	2	202	0.052	Retain H0
Corporate - Responsibility	1.171	0.834	0.888	5.434	2	202	0.005	Reject H0
Product - Smart	0.867	0.882	0.915	.494	2	202	0.611	Retain H0
Product - Technology	1.126	0.955	0.910	1.172	2	202	0.312	Retain H0
Product - Functional Benefits	0.714	0.728	0.654	1.775	2	202	0.172	Retain H0
Product - Emotional Benefits	0.592	0.825	0.749	5.770	2	202	0.004	Reject H0
Product - Symbolic Benefits	0.879	1.123	1.114	3.901	2	202	0.022	Reject H0

Based on these results in table 6, the tests for the equality of means also include the Welch and Brown-Forsythe results, which are more robust against a deviation from the assumption of equal variances. The results for the test of equal means are provided in Table 7. Since the scores are not normally distributed, the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test are also provided as an additional check.

Table 7. ANOVA test for homogeneity of variances across ethnic groups

	Means			ANOVA Significance				Kruskal-Wallis test	
	Black	White	Other	Anova	Welch	Brown-Forsythe	Decision	Significance	Decision
Corporate – Activities	3.519	3.535	3.372	0.673	0.665	0.683	Retain H0	0.675	Retain H0
Corporate – Values	4.227	4.174	4.144	0.832	0.814	0.818	Retain H0	0.538	Retain H0
Corporate - Customer Orientation	4.378	4.024	4.231	0.030	0.027	0.020	Reject H0	0.089	Retain H0
Corporate - Employee Orientation	4.090	3.823	3.936	0.208	0.233	0.207	Retain H0	0.009	Reject H0
Corporate – Standing	4.261	3.975	4.013	0.124	0.091	0.117	Retain H0	0.675	Retain H0
Corporate – Responsibility	3.694	3.823	3.744	0.691	0.710	0.698	Retain H0	0.660	Retain H0
Product – Smart	4.351	4.073	4.167	0.141	0.139	0.146	Retain H0	0.000	Reject H0
Product Technology	4.284	4.162	4.410	0.403	0.353	0.398	Retain H0	-	Unable to compute
Product - Functional Benefits	4.384	4.371	4.532	0.467	0.428	0.451	Retain H0	0.195	Retain H0
Product - Emotional Benefits	4.602	4.401	4.504	0.229	0.194	0.212	Retain H0	-	Unable to compute
Product - Symbolic Benefits	4.107	3.731	3.974	0.070	0.058	0.069	Retain H0	0.030	Reject H0

The results in Table 7, suggest that there a significant differences between ethnic groups on the corporate employee orientation score, as well as the perceived "smartness" of the product, and the perceived symbolic benefits of the product. In order to examine where the significant differences are, pairwise comparisons are

conducted. It is possible that the pairwise comparisons still do not show significant differences, even if the omnibus tests in Table 7 suggest significant differences (Field, 2009). The results in Table 8 suggest that there the only significant differences based on a pair-wise comparison are between the perceived symbolic benefits of the products. It seems as if black respondents reported significantly higher symbolic benefits of the product compared to white respondents.

Table 8. Pair-wise comparison of significant differences across ethnic groups

			Means		Assuming unequal variances			
		N	Subset 1	Subset 2	Tamhane	Dunnet T3	Games-Howell	Dunnet C
Corporate - Employee Orientation	White	99	3.823					
	Other	39	3.936		Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
	Black	67	4.090					
Product - Smart	White	99	4.073					
	Other	39	4.167		Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
	Black	67	4.351					
Product - Symbolic Benefits	White	99	3.731					
	Other	39	3.974	3.974	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
	Black	67		4.107				

Hypothesis 3. Age Differences

In order to test whether there are significant differences between age groups, it was necessary to test whether the variances were equal across age groups. The results in Table 9 suggest that there are significant differences in the variability across all scores for the different age groups, except on the score for symbolic benefits of the product. Therefore, Table 10, the results of the ANOVA, which tests for equality of means across age groups, also provides the results of the more robust Welch and Brown-Forsythe tests, as well as the Kruskal-Wallis test, which makes no distributional assumptions about the data.

Table 9. Results of Levene's test for homogeneity of variances across age groups

	Std. Deviation				Test of Homogeneity of Variances				
	19-29	30-39	40-49	50+	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.	Decision
Corporate - Activities	1.039	0.792	1.091	1.043	3.949	4	200	0.004	Reject H0
Corporate - Values	0.679	0.613	0.582	0.852	5.909	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Corporate - Customer Orientation	0.504	0.721	0.734	1.105	14.437	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Coporate - Employee Orientation	0.706	0.754	1.004	1.163	9.688	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Corporate - Standing	0.951	0.518	0.909	1.025	13.985	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Corporate - Responsibility	1.020	0.758	1.050	1.002	3.363	4	200	0.011	Reject H0
Product - Smart	0.843	0.696	0.869	1.011	6.933	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Product - Technology	0.824	0.640	1.050	1.230	7.691	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Product - Functional Benefits	0.431	0.629	0.652	0.911	12.312	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Product - Emotional Benefits	0.798	0.625	0.539	0.877	5.973	4	200	0.000	Reject H0
Product - Symbolic Benefits	1.201	0.770	1.038	1.005	2.144	4	200	0.077	Retain H0

When the results of Table 10 is considered, it seems that there are significant differences across all age groups for most of the scores, except for perceived corporate activities, employee orientation and perceived smartness of the product.

Table 10. ANOVA test for homogeneity of variances across age groups

	Means				ANOVA Significance				Kruskal-Wallis test	
	18-29	30-39	40-49	50+	Anova	Welch	Brown-Forsythe	Decision	Significance	Decision
Corporate – Activities	3.261	3.586	3.450	3.619	0.396	0.435	0.407	Retain H0	0.059	Retain H0
Corporate – Values	3.876	4.440	4.185	4.185	0.003	0.002	0.003	Reject H0	0.000	Reject H0
Corporate - Customer Orientation	4.370	4.448	4.117	3.856	0.001	0.006	0.002	Reject H0	0.005	Reject H0
Corporate - Employee Orientation	4.044	4.136	3.825	3.746	0.148	0.193	0.172	Retain H0	0.448	Retain H0
Corporate – Standing	3.733	4.500	4.013	3.992	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reject H0	0.003	Reject H0
Corporate – Responsibility	3.733	3.564	3.738	3.977	0.098	0.102	0.104	Retain H0	0.000	Reject H0
Product – Smart	4.044	4.514	4.038	4.085	0.029	0.010	0.035	Reject H0	0.098	Retain H0
Product – Technology	4.044	4.673	4.225	4.046	0.003	0.000	0.004	Retain H0	-	Unable to compute
Product - Functional Benefits	4.344	4.609	4.400	4.281	0.072	0.099	0.066	Retain H0	0.000	Reject H0
Product - Emotional Benefits	4.348	4.679	4.425	4.456	0.100	0.076	0.092	Retain H0	-	Unable to compute
Product - Symbolic Benefits	3.541	4.442	3.604	3.872	0.000	0.000	0.000	Reject H0	0.000	Reject H0

The pair-wise comparisons in Table 11 suggest that generally speaking, older persons compared to younger persons perceive corporate values more positively. Further, younger persons seem to be significantly more positive about perceived

corporate customer orientation. Older persons are significantly more positive about corporate standing and corporate responsibility compared to younger persons. Among the product variables, the age group 30-39 seems to have significantly higher scores than the other age groups in terms of perceived functional benefits and perceived symbolic benefits.

Table 11. Pair-wise comparison of significant differences across age groups

| | Age | N | Means | | | Assuming unequal variances | | | |
			Subset 1	Subset 2	Subset 3	Tamhane	Dunnet T3	Games-Howell	Dunnet C
Corporate - Values	18-29	45	3.876						
	50-59	42	4.114	4.114					
	40-49	40	4.185	4.185		Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
	60+	23		4.313					
	30-39	55		4.440					
Corporate - Customer Orientation	50-59	42	3.802						
	60+	23	3.957						
	40-49	40	4.117	4.117		Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
	18-29	45		4.370					
	30-39	55		4.448					
Corporate - Standing	18-29	45	3.733						
	50-59	42	3.845	3.845					
	40-49	40	4.013	4.013		Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
	60+	23		4.261	4.261				
	30-39	55			4.500				
Corporate - Responsibility	30-39	55	3.564						
	18-29	45	3.733	3.733					
	40-49	40	3.738	3.738		Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
	60+	23	3.739	3.739					
	50-59	42		4.107					
Product - Functional Benefits	50-59	42	4.196						
	18-29	45	4.344	4.344					
	40-49	40	4.400	4.400		Not significant	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
	60+	23	4.435	4.435					
	30-39	55		4.609					
Product - Symbolic Benefits	18-29	45	3.541						
	40-49	40	3.604						
	60+	23	3.775			Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
	50-59	42	3.925						
	30-39	55		4.442					

5. Concluding Remarks

The objective of the study is to explore whether demographic aspects have an effect on perceived corporate brand attributes. There is no significant difference between the different ethnic groups in terms of the role played by the corporate attributes towards their decision to buy a certain vehicle. In terms of the corporate attributes, there is only one attribute corporate responsibility- where there is a significant difference between the ethnic groups. Smartness similarly influence the ethnic groups in this study as well as technology levels and functional benefits of the vehicles to purchase it. They just differ significantly in term of how they are influenced by the emotional and symbolic benefits of a vehicle.

The ANOVA test also illustrate the differences between the mean scores across the ethnic groups. According to the latter test there is no significant difference between the means across the ethnic group in all the corporate attributes except for the organization's customer orientation and on the product attributes, there is no significant difference on mean scores across the ethnic groups except for the symbolic benefits attribute. Overall, the main significant difference across the ethnic groups is the symbolic benefits within the product attributes.

There is no significant difference in the scores achieved between the age groups regarding the level of influence by the corporate attributes and product attributes towards their decision to buy a vehicle. In terms of the product attributes, there is only one attribute, symbolic benefits. The score is significantly different between the age groups. A certain age groups are interested in one benefit more than the other age group and vice versa.

In terms of the corporate attributes, there is no significant difference across the age groups on the corporate activities, employee orientation and corporate responsibility and on the product attributes side there is no significant difference across the age groups on the functional benefits and emotional benefits. There is a significant difference across the age groups on both the corporate attributes (customer orientation, employee orientation and standing) and product attributes (smartness, technology level, symbolic benefits). The pair wise test comparison of significance differences across age groups confirms that there is a significance difference across the age groups in terms of values, customer orientation, standing and symbolic benefits. The latter test attests that the differences in the organization's responsibility and functional benefits of the vehicle are not significant.

Although there are some similarities and significant differences across gender, ethnic groups and age groups, the Pearson's correlation values for the attributes are all closer or equal to1, which suggest that there is a positive correlation between the corporate attributes of the organization and the product attributes of the vehicle.

Bibliography

Anisimova, T.A. (2007). The effects of corporate brand attributes on attitudinal and behavioural consumer loyalty. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 24(7), pp. 395-405.

Balmer, J.M.T. (2001). Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate marketing: seeing through the fog. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(3/4), pp. 248-291.

Balmer, J.T.M. & Gray, E.R. (2003). Corporate brands: what are they? What of them: *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(8/9), pp. 972-997.

Balmer, J.M.T. & Greyser, S.A. (2003). *Revealing the corporation: perspective on identity, image, reputation, corporate branding and corporate-level marketing*. New York: Routledge.

Bloemer, J.M.M. & Kasper, J.D.P. (1995). The complex relationship between consumer satisfaction and brand loyalty. *Journal of Economic psychology*, 16(2), pp. 311-329.

Coyles, S. & Gokey, T.C. (2005). Customer retention is not enough. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22(2), pp. 101-105.

De Ruyter, K. & Bloemer, J. (1999). Customer loyalty in extended service settings. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 10(3), pp. 320-336.

Dubrovski, D. (2001). The role of customer satisfaction in achieving business excellence. *Total Quality Management*, 12(7&8), pp. 920-925.

Fevons, C.; Gabbot, M. & De Chermatony, L. (2005). Customer and brand manager perspectives on brand relationships: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 14(5), pp. 300-309.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. 3rd ed. London: Sage.

Haig, D. & Knowles, J. (2005). What's in a name? Branding: what it means to you and your customer. *Strategic Direction*, 21(6), pp. 27-29.

Keller, K.L. (2003). Brand Synthesis: The Multidimensionality of Brand Knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(4), pp. 595-600.

Krishnan, H.S. (1996). Characteristics of memory associations: a consumer-based brand equity perspective. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13, pp. 389-405.

Ouyang, R. (2006). *Basic concepts of quantitative research.* Online Available from: http://ksumail.kennesaw.edu/~rouyang/ED-research/methods.htm Accessed: 2018-07-26.

Sen, S. & Bhattacharaya, C.B. (2001). Does doing good always leads to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38, pp. 225-243.

Sen, S.; Bhattacharaya, C.B. & Korchun, D. (2006). The role of corporate social responsibility in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships: a field experiment. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2), pp. 158-166.

Souiden, N.; Kassim, N.M. & Hong, H. (2006). The effects of corporate branding dimensions on consumers' product evaluation: a cross-cultural analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(7/8), pp. 825-845.

Urde, M. (2009). Uncovering the corporate brand's core values. *Management Decision*, 47(4), pp. 616-638.

Winchester, M.; Romaniuk, J. & Bogomolova, S. (2008). Positive and negative brand beliefs and brand defection/uptake. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(5/6), pp. 553-570.