

Sustainable Approaches for Examining the Potential Use of Nanoparticles in Future Research

Gunjan Sharma^{1,*}, Mitra Amini²

Abstract

Theoretical stagnation can always be an eminent danger for any research field. Therefore, the contemporary research themes are constantly explored and examined through battery of examination. Based on the aforesaid rationale, this study examined the counterfeit purchase intention of the youth based on different constructs such as Market mavenism, Cool consumption, Postmodernism, Schadenfreude, Public self-consciousness, Generational norms, and Generational Identification. The questionnaire was administered for collecting the data the responses on convenient basis. In total, 337 responses were collected and analyzed using Smart PLS 3.0. The findings revealed certain interesting facts that Generational Identification was able to moderate the Market mavenism and Cool consumption with counterfeit purchase intentions. Further, Generational norm fully moderated, Market mavenism and Postmodernism with counterfeit purchase intentions. Through these findings, this paper opens the new avenue of research in the counterfeit product purchase intention of the youth. Based on the findings, the organizations can take the measures and adjust themselves accordingly. Moreover, these findings can facilitate the brand managers to design their marketing strategies.

Keywords: Counterfeit Product; Youth; Generation; Generational norm; Generational identification; Consumption; Market; Purchase Intention

INTRODUCTION

People have been buying more fake products lately, with the exception of a few countries where the original brand and products are not available due to political or geographical reasons. Online influencers can persuade other people to try counterfeit goods, which are less expensive than their genuine counterparts but also of lower quality and, in some cases, even more dangerous leading to the higher health risk. Consumers purchase imitations for a variety of reasons but neglecting the health concerns. This condition applies to every product in the world. Both counterfeit brand-name and generic goods are packaged and labeled. False goods deceive consumers and impact all manufacturers. The enforcement of counterfeiting is evolving. Social motivation, personal satisfaction, perception, value, brand loyalty, and ethics all have an impact on consumers' intent to purchase counterfeit goods. A survey revealed that the "influence of society" and "value for money" are the primary motivators for purchasing counterfeit products [1, 2]. Consumers purchase counterfeit luxury brands to express themselves or to fit in with various social groups. When luxury brand attitudes are socially adaptive rather than value-expressive, consumers' preferences for a counterfeit brand and the subsequent decline in their preferences for the actual brand are significantly greater. Consumers' counterfeit brand preferences depend on their attitudes towards luxury brands; however, the marketing

*Author for Correspondence

Gunjan Sharma

¹Assistant Professor, Institute of Business Management, GLA University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India

²Assistant Professor, School of Management, Bennett University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received Date: January 16, 2024

Accepted Date: February 12, 2024

Published Date: April 15, 2024

Citation: Gunjan Sharma, Mitra Amini. Sustainable Approaches for Examining the Potential Use of Nanoparticles in Future Research. Journal of Polymer & Composites. 2024; 12(Special Issue 1): S1–S8.

mix can influence the social functions of consumers' luxury brand attitudes, thereby assisting marketers in reducing counterfeit brand demand [3]. Product performance expectations influence counterfeit purchase propensity positively, whereas lawfulness influences it negatively [4]. Consumers with economic and moral justifications for purchasing counterfeit goods are likelier to attempt a purchase [5]. There is a typology of consumer accomplices, such as sly consumers who purchase fake goods to demonstrate their consumer savvy and economic concern. The ethical aspect—religion, ethical relationship, and lawfulness—directly and indirectly influences consumers' propensity to purchase counterfeit goods [6]. Relationship marketing can reduce fraudulent transactions and increase brand loyalty [7]. Penz et al. [8] found that fake and real brands were given different ratings and reviews on social media. Bian et al. [9] investigated consumer purchase intent for nondeceptive counterfeits. Price influences counterfeit sales in diverse ways [5]. Hedonism motivates luxury brand forgers [10]. Park-Poaps et al. [11] investigated the impact of brand reputation (high versus low), product features, and counterfeiting attitudes on the purchase of non-luxury fashion products (shirts, handbags, and shoes). The majority of studies disregard theory to explain counterfeit purchases. Miao [12] employs social comparison theory to investigate how social-psychological envy (malicious and benign) influences consumers' purchases of counterfeit versus authentic brand products. Integrity, moral judgement, extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity, and ethical concern influence attitudes towards fake luxury goods [13]. The need for community and connection to a communal brand moderates counterfeit purchasing [14]. Luxury brand imitations affect purchase intent [15]. Psychographic factors, such as status-seeking and positive brand identity signals, influence consumer behaviour in developing nations [16]. The price reflects the perceptions of consumers regarding counterfeit goods. As long as counterfeits satisfy fundamental functional requirements or possess symbolic value, they are acceptable [17]. It is possible for normative, informative, and collectivist dispositions to influence luxury brand counterfeiting attitudes [18]. Consumer ethnocentrism, product similarity, and social influence were variables that were subject-related (social recognition by others). The frequency with which consumers purchase counterfeit luxury brands influences their attitudes towards counterfeits. Consumers were more likely to purchase counterfeit luxury brands that resembled the originals [19] [20]. Individuals who seek social acceptance and status purchase luxury items. Premium brands seek exclusivity. However, counterfeit luxury brands make them accessible to everyone, harming the essence of a luxury brand and eroding its brand equity [21]. People purchase counterfeits because they are popular, have a good reputation, are readily available, and are inexpensive [22]. Bian and Veloutsou [23] discovered that consumers have difficulty telling the difference between authentic and counterfeit brands. Therefore, based on the above discussion, this study attempts to examine the various constructs in the light of the youth's counterfeit purchase intention and examines the role of nanoparticles apparel.

Gap in the Study

This study gives an overview of “counterfeit purchase intention through social media influencers,” including its causes and effects, as well as how it relates to demographic factors and how different generations see themselves in relation to purchasing brands. The age aspect of market mavenism hasn't been studied as much as it should be, and there is a need to look into how shopping habits differ between different generations. The study could also benefit from examining how media and music affect young people's choices about what to wear and how social comparison affects how people judge each other within the same group. Also, previous studies mentioned that public self-consciousness affects consumer behaviour and purchase intentions, but they did not explain why this is the case. Further elaboration on the psychological mechanisms underlying this relationship could be useful. Previous studies give some ideas about how Schadenfreude affects the way people act, but they don't talk about what this feeling means for marketing in terms of ethics. In particular, it doesn't talk about whether or not it's morally okay for brands to use ‘*schadenfreude*’ to hurt their competitors. There is no study of how people feel about fake products or whether they plan to buy them. Therefore, researching the ethical implications of using Schadenfreude in marketing could provide valuable insights for companies. Also, finding out how consumers feel about fake products and what they plan to do with them can help brands figure out what might happen if they use such tactics.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the counterfeit purchase intention of consumers in the light of generational identification and generational norm. For this, the data was collected using questionnaire through online mode [24]. A total of 437 participants were contacted, out of which, 368 responses were received, 31 responses were eliminated after data cleaning for either missing responses or outliers [25]. In total, the 337 responses were found usable [26, 27]. Generally, the online survey was considered to be non-personal mode of data collection, However, in the changed circumstances where significant number of people are having their online presence, this mode has become new normal. Moreover, collecting the data using online survey allow the people to record their opinions free from socially desirability bias and inconvenient timing. The participants were mostly in their early adult age between 19 years to 28 years. The reason for selecting this age bracket is due to youngsters increased inclination towards fashion, luxury goods, apparels and alike. The questionnaire was distributed on convenience basis. The questionnaire was administered in a way that the working definition of counterfeit products was provided to bring the participants to a common understanding and the demographic information was asked in the last section. Participants were not asked to share any identity revealing information due to the sensitivity of the topic. The information was sought keeping the luxury goods such as apparels in to consideration.

Measures

The items and constructs in the questionnaire were collected from different sources such as Feick and Price [28], Warren et al. [29], Firat and Shultz [30], van Dijk et al. [31] and Dalakas and Melancon [32], Fenigstein et al. [33], Liu and Shi [34], Luhtanen and Crocker [35], and Beck and Ajzen [36] and Dodds et al. [37] also referred in the recent work of Khan et al. [38] including Market mavenism, Cool consumption, Postmodernism, Schadenfreude, Public self-consciousness, Generational norm, Generational identification and Counterfeit purchase Intention (Figure 1). The Likert scale (1=Strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree) was used to record the responses. Further, all the items were examined for their statistical significance.

RESULT ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The results were obtained using the Smart-PLS v.3 software. After the data cleaning, the analysis was run to obtain the results.

Measurement Model

Initially, the common method bias was checked by Harman's single-factor post hoc test. No single factor accounted for the majority variance. Hence, no common method bias was evident. Further, the Cronbach's α was above the range of 0.7 i.e. between 0.8-0.9 (Table 1). The convergent and discriminant validity were established by factor loading, composite reliability and average variance extracted, respectively (Table 1). The factor loadings were between the range of 0.845 to 0.956 i.e. above the threshold value of 0.70. Next, Composite reliability was above 0.85 [39] and average variance extracted was more than 0.50 indicating that the variance explained by the construct is larger than the variance explained by the measurement error [40]. Thus, the convergent validity of the measurement model is established. The discriminant validity established by heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlation (HTMT) and Fornell Larcker (Table 2). Both the values were established the discriminant validity as per established standards (Table 3). Almost, all the VIF values ranged below the range of 5, which is acceptable. Hence, there is no significant issue of collinearity [41].

Overall Hypotheses Testing

There are two intermediate variables in the study's model, namely generational identification (GI) and generational norm (GN). All the five predictors were linked to GI and GN. The results of path analysis are presented in Table 4. In this study, CC ($p=0.008$), MM ($p=0.00$) and PM ($p=0.024$) were found to have positive and significant relationship with GI. It means the hypotheses H1a, H6a and H7a were supported. Further, MM ($p=0.00$), PM ($p=0.024$) and SF ($p=0.025$) were found to have

significant positive relationship with GN (Table 4). It means hypotheses H1b, H5b and H6b were found significant. Considering the above findings, it is evident that the other hypotheses were rejected except the mediation analysis that is being discussed as follows.




Figure 1. Conceptual Model including generational values, proximal antecedents and prototypical behaviour.

Table 1. Construct reliability and validity.

Constructs	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
CC	0.844	0.857	0.905	0.761
CPI	0.94	0.946	0.961	0.893
GI	0.894	0.901	0.934	0.826
GN	0.939	0.941	0.961	0.891
MM	0.942	0.955	0.958	0.852
PM	0.941	0.944	0.962	0.894
PSC	0.95	1.01	0.967	0.907
SF	0.916	0.954	0.947	0.855

Table 2. Discriminant validity-HTMT.

	CC	CPI	GI	GN	MM	PM	PSC	SF
CC								
CPI	0.354							
GI	0.283	0.401						
GN	0.105	0.388	0.545					
MM	0.153	0.487	0.402	0.281				
PM	0.482	0.308	0.285	0.218	0.21			
PSC	0.164	0.275	0.076	0.133	0.306	0.173		
SF	0.251	0.399	0.126	0.227	0.288	0.236	0.534	

Table 3. Discriminant validity-Fornell Larcker.

	CC	CPI	GI	GN	MM	PM	PSC	SF
CC	0.872							
CPI	0.314	0.945						
GI	0.248	0.37	0.909					
GN	0.096	0.367	0.497	0.944				
MM	0.137	0.46	0.375	0.268	0.923			
PM	0.43	0.291	0.264	0.206	0.2	0.946		
PSC	0.147	0.27	0.076	0.129	0.299	0.167	0.953	
SF	0.226	0.38	0.121	0.213	0.277	0.224	0.5	0.925

Table 4. Path coefficients.

Constructs	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	P values	Conclusion
CC -> GI	0.155	0.056	2.67	0.008	Supported
CC -> GN	-0.022	0.057	0.423	0.672	Not supported
GI -> CPI	0.251	0.062	4.016	0	Supported
GN -> CPI	0.243	0.059	4.132	0	Supported
MM -> GI	0.349	0.054	6.504	0	Supported
MM -> GN	0.213	0.061	3.431	0.001	Supported
PM -> GI	0.14	0.066	2.148	0.032	Supported
PM -> GN	0.147	0.065	2.257	0.024	Supported
PSC -> GI	-0.068	0.059	1.213	0.225	Not supported
PSC -> GN	-0.023	0.063	0.397	0.692	Not supported
SF -> GI	-0.006	0.06	0.104	0.917	Not supported
SF -> GN	0.139	0.062	2.246	0.025	Supported

Table 5. Mediation effect: Specific indirect effect.

Path	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	p values	Conclusion
MM -> GI -> CPI	0.088	0.027	3.212	0.001	Mediation
PSC -> GI -> CPI	-0.017	0.016	1.125	0.261	No mediation
PM -> GI -> CPI	0.035	0.019	1.866	0.062	No mediation
CC -> GN -> CPI	-0.005	0.014	0.414	0.679	No mediation
SF -> GN -> CPI	0.035	0.019	1.753	0.08	No mediation
MM -> GN -> CPI	0.052	0.02	2.501	0.012	Mediation
PSC -> GN -> CPI	.006	0.016	0.382	0.703	No mediation
SF -> GI -> CPI	0	0.015	0.101	0.92	No mediation
CC -> GI -> CPI	0.039	0.018	2.099	0.036	Mediation
PM -> GN -> CPI	0.036	0.018	1.983	0.047	Mediation

Apart from the direct effects between constructs, the current study examined indirect and total effects, which are the consolidation of direct and indirect effects in structural model (Hair et al., 2019). Mediation table presents the mediation effect of GI and GN. Based on the obtained results, GI fully mediate the relationship of MM and CC with CPI (Table 5). GI did not mediate the relationship of PSC, PM, SF with CPI. Similarly, GN mediate the relationship of MM and PM with CPI. In addition, GN did not mediate the relationship of CC, SF and PSC with CPI.

CONCLUSION

In the ear of changing market dynamics where the consumers are going through the transformation, experimentative and quality conscious, the marketers need to keep the pace and must fall in line with the customers' expectations intelligently. The buying behaviour of consumers is reflecting the clear and loud message intertwined with their purchasing pattern that they are now more vocal, expressive, demanding and above all see them selves as a relevant entity. Unlike, the past where the customers were offered what was considered 'right' for them, the customers are becoming the catalyst and also main force to decide the future of the market. However, it is worth noting fact that each and every trend, purchasing pattern is subject to the though evaluation and review. So is the case with the counterfeit purchase intention amongst the youngsters. The examination of the reasons and rationales behind the inclination towards counterfeit product purchase is imperative so that the companies and adjust and prepare accordingly. The fact that counterfeit products do not have the legal sanction but still have the significant presence in the market. This gives the dent on the profit margins of the organizations that are spending much to track the pulse of the customers. This research is based on the work of Khan et al. [38], to revisit and extend the suggested findings. It was assumed that youngsters' generational identity gets the thrust and ultimately forms the generational norms. The finding shows that market mavenism is taken in to consideration by the youth as relevant source of information. Generally, youth do not rely completely on the information provided by the marketers. There are chances of green washing and other issues. Like the use of nano-silver and nano-titanium dioxide that provide the clothes anti-bacteria properties and sun protection. Now this information might not be considered true and hence the youth will explore his/her source of information. The results shows that market mavenism effect the generational identity of the youth leading to counterfeit product purchase intention. Simultaneously, market mavenism also effect the generational norms persuading the youth to go for CPI. Further, the cool consumption that reflects the autonomy, rebelliousness and/or sometimes moral deviance [42] [43], motivates the youth to follow the fashion trends or habits that makes them feel associated with certain group membership. In the similar lines, the results shows that cool consumption leads to counterfeit purchase intention through generational identity.

REFERENCES

1. Kassim, N.M., Zain, M., Bogari, N. & Sharif, K. (2021). Why do consumers buy counterfeit luxury products? A tale of two major cities in two different countries. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 33 (2), 416-446.
2. Geiger-Oneto, S., Gelb, B., Walker, D. & Hess, J. (2013). Buying status' by choosing or rejecting luxury brands and their counterfeits. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 41, 357-372.
3. Wilcox, K., Kim, H. M., & Sen, S. (2009). Why Do Consumers Buy Counterfeit Luxury Brands? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46 (2), 247-259.
4. Cordell, V. V., Wongtada, N., & Kieschnick, R. L. (1996). Counterfeit purchase intentions: Role of lawfulness attitudes and product traits as determinants. *Journal of Business Research*, 35(1), 41-53.
5. Poddar, A., Foreman, J., Banerjee, S. S., & Ellen, P. S. (2012). Exploring the Robin Hood effect: Moral profiteering motives for purchasing counterfeit products. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(10), 1500-1506.
6. Quoquab, F., Pahlevan, S., Mohammad, J., & Thurasamy, R. (2017). Factors affecting consumers' intention to purchase counterfeit product. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 29(4), 837-853.
7. Kwon, J. H., Jung, S. H., Choi, H. J. & Kim, J. (2021). Antecedent factors that affect restaurant brand trust and brand loyalty: focusing on US and Korean consumers. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30 (7), 990-1015.
8. Penz, E., & Stottinger, B. (2008). Original brands and counterfeit brands—do they have anything in common? *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 7(2), 146-163. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.243>
9. Bian, X., & Moutinho, L. (2011). The role of brand image, product involvement, and knowledge in explaining consumer purchase behaviour of counterfeits. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45 (1/2), 191-216.

10. Musnaini, N., Astuti, S. W., Sukoco, B. M., & Yacob, S. (2017). Effect of hedonic value and consumer knowledge on buying intention for luxury brand counterfeit products. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 19(4), 497.
11. Park-Poaps, H., & Kang, J. (2018). An experiment on non-luxury fashion counterfeit purchase: the effects of brand reputation, fashion attributes, and attitudes toward counterfeiting. *Journal of Brand Management*, 25(2), 185–196.
12. Miao, M. (2020). Buying Authentic Luxury Products or Counterfeits: The Role of Benign and Malicious Envy: An Abstract. *Marketing Opportunities and Challenges in a Changing Global Marketplace*, 13–14.
13. Jiang, Y., Miao, M., Jalees, T., & Zaman, S. I. (2019). Analysis of the moral mechanism to purchase counterfeit luxury goods: evidence from China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 31(3), 647–669.
14. Hawkins, M. A. (2020). The moderating effect of need for belonging and communal-brand connection on counterfeit purchasing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 57, 102250.
15. Phau, I., Teah, M., & Lee, A. (2009). Targeting buyers of counterfeits of luxury brands: A study on attitudes of Singaporean consumers. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 17(1), 3–15.
16. Eisend, M., Hartmann, P., & Apaolaza, V. (2017, December). Who Buys Counterfeit Luxury Brands? A Meta-Analytic Synthesis of Consumers in Developing and Developed Markets. *Journal of International Marketing*, 25(4), 89–111.
17. Eisend, M. & Schuchert-GuLer, P. (2006). Explaining counterfeit purchases: a review and preview. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 12, 1-25.
18. Kim, S. & Yim, M.Y.-C. (2022). Exploring consumers' attitude formation toward their own brands when in crisis: cross-national comparisons between USA and China. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 31 (1), 56-72.
19. Dash, A., Sarmah, S.P., Tiwari, M.K. & Jena, S.K. (2023). Combating deceptive counterfeiting in digital supply chain. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 38 (10), 2061-2091.
20. Davidson, A., Nepomuceno, M.V. & Laroche, M. (2019). Shame on you: when materialism leads to purchase intentions toward counterfeit products. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155 (2), 479-494.
21. Nia, A. & Zaichkowsky, J.L. (2000). Do counterfeits devalue the ownership of luxury brands?. *The Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 9 (7), 485-97.
22. Perez, M.E., Castano, R. & Quintanilla, C. (2010). Constructing identity through the consumption of counterfeit luxury goods. *Qualitative Market Research*, 13 (3), 219-235.
23. Bian, X., & Veloutsou, C. (2007, February). Consumers' attitudes regarding non-deceptive counterfeit brands in the UK and China. *Journal of Brand Management*, 14 (3), 211–222.
24. Harr, A., vom Brocke, J. & Urbach, N. (2019). Evaluating the individual and organizational impact of enterprise content management systems. *Business Process Management Journal*, 25(7), 1413-1440.
25. Vij, S. & Bedi, H.S. (2016). Are subjective business performance measures justified?. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(5), 603-621.
26. Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. & Anderson, R.E. (2014), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th ed., Pearson Education Limited, London.
27. Hair, J.F., Jr, William, C.B., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. & Andreson, R.E. (2019), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 8th ed., Pearson, Edinburgh.
28. Feick, L.F. & Price, L.L. (1987). The market maven: a diffuser of marketplace information. *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (1), 83-97.
29. Warren, C., Batra, R., Loureiro, S.M. & Bagozzi, R.P. (2019). Brand coolness. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 83 No. 5, pp. 36-56.
30. Firat, A.F. & Shultz, C.J. (2001). Preliminary metric investigations into the nature of the 'postmodern consumer. *Marketing Letters*, 12 (2), 189-203.
31. van Dijk, W.W., Goslinga, S. & Ouwkerk, J.W. (2008). Impact of responsibility for a misfortune on schadenfreude and sympathy: further evidence. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 148 (5), 631-636.

32. Dalakas, V. & Melancon, J.P. (2012). Fan identification, schadenfreude toward hated rivals, and the mediating effects of importance of winning index (IWIN). *Journal of Services Marketing*, 26(1), 51-59.
33. Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M.F. & Buss, A.H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 43 (4), 522-527.
34. Liu, J. & Shi, R. (2019). How do online comments affect perceived descriptive norms of E-Cigarette use? The role of Quasi-Statistical sense, valence perceptions, and exposure dosage. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 24(1), 1-20.
35. Luhtanen, R. & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective Self-Esteem scale: self-Evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 18 (3), 302-318.
36. Beck, L. & Ajzen, I. (1991). Predicting dishonest actions using the theory of planned behaviour. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 25 (3), 285-301.
37. Dodds, W.B., Monroe, K.B. & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28 (3), 307.
38. Khan, S., Fazili, A.I. & Bashir, I. (2022). Constructing generational identity through counterfeit luxury consumption. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 31 (3), 415-437.
39. Bagozzi, R.P. & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 16 (1), 74-94.
40. Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39.
41. Williams Jr, R.I., Pieper, T., Kellermanns, F. & Astrachan, J. (2019). Applying an organizational effectiveness approach to measure family business performance. *Journal of Family Business Management*, 9 (3), 349-374.
42. Dar-Nimrod, I., Ganesan, A. & Maccann, C. (2018), "Coolness as a trait and its relations to the big five, self-esteem, social desirability, and action orientation", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 121, 1-6.
43. Bird, S. & Tapp, A. (2008). Social marketing and the meaning of cool. *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 14 (1), 18-29.