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Structured Abstract

Purpose: This paper re-conceptualizes and measures brand identity from a services perspective. It develops and tests a psychometrically valid and reliable scale to measure service brand identity.

Design/Methodology/Approach: A multi-stage research design was adopted drawing on qualitative and quantitative studies consistent with extant scale development procedures. Qualitative studies comprised comprehensive literature review, expert panel review and interviews to develop theoretical framework and generate items. Quantitative studies comprised pilot testing (n=106), online survey for scale development (n=245) and scale validation (n=246) on UK-based consumers using Exploratory and Confirmatory factor analysis.

Findings: The study finds support for a five-dimensional Service Brand Identity (SERVBID) scale comprising: process identity; organization identity; symbolic identity; servicescape identity; communication identity.

Practical Implications: The SERVBID scale provides practitioners with a practical tool to understand, benchmark and assess service brand identity. The scale will assist marketers in assessing the strength of brand identity overall as well as strength of individual facets of brand identity.

Originality/Value: This study provides a deeper and complete understanding of the theoretical construct of brand identity through a service-dominant lens, in particular recognizing the defining role of service process and servicescape in service brand identity construction.
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Introduction

How do organizations develop brand identity? How is brand identity assessed? Does brand identity have an impact on consumer trust and loyalty? This study addresses these questions from the viewpoint of service organizations. Brand identity (BI) is an essential prerequisite for efficient brand management (Kapferer, 2012) and acts as an anchor of meaning for the brand (Csaba and Bengtsson, 2006) fulfilling consumers’ symbolic and self-definitional needs for uniqueness (He et al., 2012). While a number of BI conceptual models and frameworks exist (e.g. Aaker, 1996; De Chernatony, 1999; Ghodeshwar, 2008; Burmann et al., 2009; Kapferer, 2012), they are largely conceived from a tangible goods perspective, mirroring wider branding research (Ostrom et al., 2010) and viewing BI as primarily a managerial construct (e.g. Aaker, 1996; De Chernatony, 1999; Coleman et al., 2011; Viot, 2011).

The current focus in branding has shifted from a ‘detached-from-consumer’ approach to one that recognizes consumers as key stakeholders and contributors engaging in the conceptualization and development of the brand and its identity (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016; Da Silveira et al., 2013). Prior conceptualizations of BI, now over two decades old, do not adequately reflect this view. Re-examining brand identity through a service-dominant lens allows a more experiential, interactive and dynamic view of brand identity.

The purpose of this study is to conceptualize and empirically validate BI from a consumer service perspective through the development of a service brand identity scale, which, we argue, is necessary for theoretical and practical reasons. First, from a theoretical perspective, we acknowledge the dominant and theoretically defining role of services and extend the conceptual domain of brand identity through the inclusion of services specific
dimensions. To our knowledge, this has not been accounted for in extant research which has largely focused on brand identity from a goods-dominant perspective. In doing so, we contribute to and extend the literature on brand identity (e.g. Upshaw, 1995; Aaker, 1996; De Chernatony, 1999; Kapferer, 2000; Burmann et al., 2009; Coleman et al., 2011) to include attention to the service domain. As such, our findings provide a deeper understanding of the key dimensions of brand identity and suggest two key dimensions that are particularly relevant for services that have not been previously highlighted in the brand identity literature: 

process identity and servicescape identity.

Second, we provide a valid, reliable scale for assessing brand identity for service brands. Prior studies of BI are largely descriptive, suffer from a lack of empirical testing (Coleman et al., 2011), and a lack of consensus on what constitutes BI. Prior studies have largely advanced formative arguments on the role/importance of BI (Coleman et al., 2015). We present a rationale for modeling service brand identity as a higher-order formative construct.

Third, from a managerial perspective, successful management of a brand necessitates effective measurement. A valid, reliable service brand identity scale provides a tool by which service marketers/brand managers can improve their brand management efforts. Prior conceptualizations and measures provided only a partial view of brand identity and did not reflect the true assessment of services brand identity dimensions that might impact the development and subsequent maintenance of brand identity. Our scale provides a means by which managers can gain a deeper and more complete understanding of their brand’s identity and the constituent dimensions. Brand managers can use the scale to assess the facets of the brand’s identity that are performing well and those that are not in strengthening overall brand identity. This can help direct input in improving the overall effectiveness of their brand building efforts.
We contend that the proposed service brand identity scale contributes to a greater and more complete understanding of the dimensionality of brand identity from a service-centered view that embraces process and experiential orientations. Our scale responds to calls for research in effectively branding services (Ostrom et al., 2010; Bitner, 2014) and contributes to a wider research effort that is seeking to re-envision branding from a service perspective and develop measurements specific to service branding (e.g. Völckner et al., 2010).

We begin with a comprehensive review of the literature to identify key dimensions of BI, integrating traditional goods-dominant perspectives on BI literature with service-relevant constructs. Then, from a methodological perspective, we develop the SERVBID (Service Brand Identity) scale that empirically validates the key dimensions of service brand identity and provides a robust measurement of the construct. Finally, we test the applicability of the scale in predicting other consumer behavior outcomes (e.g. trust and loyalty).

**Conceptual Background**

**Construct Definition**

The term brand identity (BI) has been used to describe the essential idea of the brand (Aaker, 1996), the brand’s specific and unique attributes (Kapferer, 2012), and its innermost substance (Csaba and Bengtsson, 2006). Given its multidimensionality, BI has been defined in different ways (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016; Da Silveira et al., 2013). Some common themes are discernible across these definitions. For instance, BI refers to the distinguishing features of the brand (what makes it unique, Kapferer, (2012)), the meaning of the brand (what the brand stands for, Aaker (1996)) and the attributes that define the brand (what makes it recognizable, Kapferer (2012)). Thus, we conceptualize the construct of Brand Identity as the sum of various attributes that define the brand, that give it distinguishable features and make it recognizable.
Domain of the Construct

Brand identity is related to, but conceptually different from, other branding constructs. Table 1 compares brand identity to several other constructs to highlight the points of difference and further delineate BI as a unique construct.

[Insert Table 1 here]

The current branding literature recognizes that BI is a dynamic, multifaceted, multidimensional construct (Da Silveira et al., 2013; Coleman et al., 2013), which has been studied from a wide range of disciplines (Bravo et al., 2017). Consistent with this view, a number of BI frameworks have been put forward in the literature to describe BI and assist in its creation and management. Table 2 presents a brief summary of these frameworks.

[Insert Table 2 Here]

Albeit fundamental and informative, these frameworks largely adopt an individualistic perspective and do not directly account for the role of other stakeholders in constructing BI (Voyer et al., 2017). This could be attributed to the fact that these frameworks adopt a purely output orientation, which is most evident in the goods-dominant paradigm. Not surprisingly, this limits their applicability to a services context that embraces a process orientation. Drawing on the notion of the socially constructed nature of identity, Da Silveira et al. (2013, p. 28) propose a conceptualization of BI ‘as dynamic and constructed over time through mutually influencing inputs from managers and other social constituents (e.g. consumers)’.

Acknowledging service to be the ‘common denominator of exchange’ (Merz et al., 2009, p.238), it is contended that there is a need to explore BI specifically from a service context that embraces a process orientation rather than a purely output orientation most evident in previous goods-dominant BI frameworks.
Furthermore, BI research relies heavily on conceptualizing the construct from a managerial perspective, lacking account of other stakeholders, most prominently that of customers. This is in contrast to the view that firms now regard customer engagement and feedback as key inputs in shaping their BI (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016). While some research recognizes that the brand manager should not be the sole creator of a brand’s identity (Csaba and Bengtsson, 2006; Schau et al., 2009, Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004; Iglesias et al., 2013), researchers have not yet adopted this in their empirical design. Amongst others, Iglesias et al. (2013), and Kennedy and Guzman (2016) caution brand managers from conceptualising brand identity without recognizing the power of customer inputs in its creation and shaping. This paper accounts for the consumer perspective of BI through qualitative (interviews) and quantitative (survey) research to shape, test and validate BI and its dimensions from a service perspective.

This study addresses the research gaps by developing and validating a measurement scale for service BI. The scale provides an empirically valid conceptualization of service BI and a means to measure the construct. Scale applicability is tested by assessing the impact of service BI on brand loyalty and brand trust – recognized as two of the most important consequences of BI (He et al., 2012).

**SERVBID Scale Development Process**

To develop the SERVBID scale, Churchill’s (1979) paradigm was followed in conjunction with recommendations from DeVellis (2003) and other scale development studies (Brakus et al., 2009; Walsh and Beatty, 2007; Yoo and Donthu, 2001). A multistage research design was adopted to develop the final scale. First, an extensive literature review and semi-structured interviews served as the primary basis for clarifying the domain of the construct and generating items. Second, a three-stage process was adopted to refine the generated
items, involving expert judgement. Third, a pilot study (n= 106) was conducted to identify a reduced set of items based on item-to-total correlations and results of principal components analysis. Fourth, Study 1 (n=246), based on a survey of UK-based consumers, was used for scale refinement and empirical validation of the proposed service brand identity (SERVBID) scale. This was followed by Study 2, using another UK-based consumer sample (n=245), to validate the final scale and test for nomological validity.

Construct specification

To ascertain the domain of the construct, an in-depth review of literature was undertaken resulting in the identification of 21 different dimensions (see appendix A) of BI from various conceptualizations. Two independent academic experts were asked to review these dimensions to identify similar/overlapping areas and to re-group them into core groupings. This exercise resulted in four broad facets: brand-as-symbol, brand-as-product, brand-as-organization, brand-as-communication. They were labelled following Aaker’s (1996) terminology to denote broad categories that encapsulate a wider set of attributes in the literature.

To ascertain a consumer perspective of the BI construct, face-to-face in-depth consumer interviews were conducted. Consistent with theoretical saturation (Glaser and Strauss, 1968) interviews were conducted until no new insights were generated; a total of eleven interviews. The interviews provided support for the four facets identified from the literature, while additionally suggesting three unique facets specific to the service context. Extending Aaker’s labelling convention, these new facets were provisionally labelled as ‘brand-as-servicescape’, ‘brand-as-service process’ and ‘brand-as-service experience’. Overall, the construct specification process resulted in the identification of seven broad facets of BI to be further investigated as potential BI dimensions.
Item generation and content validity

Items were generated for each of the seven service brand identity facets from extant measures in the literature and the interview transcripts. In stages one and two, two independent marketing academic experts were asked to review the items for clarity, conciseness, readability, relevancy or redundancy (DeVellis, 2003; Furr, 2011) thus ensuring content validity. This process resulted in the reduction of items from 79 to 47.

In stage three, an independent expert panel comprising ten academic and managerial experts from the US and the UK evaluated the items. The panel review suggested that 12 items were not capturing the respective BI facet adequately thereby compromising content validity; consequently, these 12 items were eliminated. Overall, the process resulted in a refined set of 35 items with multiple items to represent each of the seven key facets of service BI.

Pilot survey (n=106)

An online pilot survey was administered to a convenience sample of 106 individuals recruited via social media. The sample comprised 47.2% female; 44.4% aged 20-29 years and 17.6% aged 50-59 years.

This sample size represented approximately 20% of the final sample, which was considered adequate for testing (Chisnall, 2001). The respondents were asked to think of a service brand that they have used in the past six months, and to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree (on a 7-point Likert scale) that each of the items (statements) contribute to building brand identity for their chosen service brand. Next, the data collected was checked for any missing values or incomplete responses. However, apart from a few missing responses to classification questions (particularly nationality and income) all other responses were complete. At this stage, since the objective was to refine items, missing data
on classification questions did not pose any difficulty. Hence, all the responses were included in the analysis.

A KMO of 0.80 indicated the suitability of the data for factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (using principal components analysis and orthogonal rotation) was conducted primarily to refine the items. The analysis resulted in the deletion of six items based on low factor loadings (<0.50), cross-loadings and low item-to-item correlations (r < 0.30) (Field 2009). The remaining item factor loadings ranged from 0.51 to 0.88. This resulted in 29 items to be tested on a wider sample (Churchill, 1979).

**Measurement Model Specification**

We conceptualize the measurement model as a second-order formative construct with first-order reflective constructs. Given the lack of empirical studies on BI (as highlighted in Table 2), extant research remains silent on whether the relationship between brand identity and its dimensions is formative or reflective.

Applying Jarvis et al.’s (2003, p.203) decision rules for determining whether a construct is formative or reflective, we propose that the first-order dimensions of service brand identity must be formative indicators of the second-order ‘service brand identity’ construct, because together they are determining service brand identity rather than resulting from it. This also corresponds to our conceptually-derived definition of service brand identity. Thus, we contend that the first-order dimensions are not interchangeable, because each dimension captures a unique aspect of the construct domain.

Therefore, this research aims to develop a reflective first order and formative second order scale to measure service brand identity. In developing and validating formative constructs, we follow recommendations and guidelines provided by Jarvis et al. (2003),
Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer (2001), Diamantopoulos et al. (2008), and Sarstedt et al. (2019).

Study 1: Scale refinement and validation (n=246)

This study aimed to empirically validate the 29 items using exploratory factor analysis. An online survey was administered to a sample of UK consumers using a permission-based mailing list from a list broker. To develop a generalizable scale that functions well in multiple service contexts, we asked respondents to complete the survey in reference to a brand from one of four services categories (airlines, banking services, hair salons or hotels). These services were identified from the interview stage and, according to Bitner’s (1992) typology, represent a broad spectrum of services categories. Respondents were asked to select a service category and name their chosen brand.

Just under half (47.6%) of respondents chose a brand in the banking sector, 24.8% chose an airline brand, 19.9% chose a hotel brand, while 7.7% chose a salon service brand. The survey asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they agreed/disagreed that each of the 29 items contributes to the development of the brand identity of their chosen service brand. Items were measured using a seven-point Likert scale anchored on 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The sample (n=246) comprised 57.7% males, 42.3% females; 36.2% aged 55 years or above, 18.3% aged 45-54 years, 17.9% aged 35-44 years, 19.5% aged 25-43 years.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to assess the dimensionality of the scale and the appropriateness of the 29 items for capturing the dimensions of service BI. Prior to performing EFA the suitability of the data for EFA was assessed.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.92 and Bartlett’s test of sphericity reached statistical significance ($\chi^2 (378) = 4432.97, p<0.001$), supporting
the factorability of the data (Hair et al. 2006). The correlation matrix revealed a substantial number of correlations of 0.3 and above (Walsh and Beatty, 2007; Hair et al., 2006) with the exception of one item that showed consistently low (<.3) and insignificant (p >.10) correlations with a large number of other items. Due to low correlations, this item was excluded from further analysis (Field, 2009), leaving 28 items.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

The remaining 28 items were subjected to EFA, using principal components analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. Based on a minimum eigenvalue of 1, a five-factor solution was extracted accounting for 68% of the cumulative total variance which is considered to be acceptable (Brace et al., 2003). Factor loadings and communalities of 0.5 and above were treated as significant (Hair at al., 2006). Two items demonstrating low communality (<0.50) and low factor loading (<0.5) were eliminated. There were no significant cross-loadings. The remaining factor loadings were significant and ranged between 0.52 and 0.84.

Following Churchill (1979), the reliability of each factor was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha; these ranged between 0.75 and 0.90, indicating good internal consistency. This resulted in a five-factor 26-item structure. These five factors represented the initially proposed seven facets of BI but with greater parsimony.

Each of the five empirically-derived factors were labelled based on the core theme shared by its items (Field, 2009). The first factor was labelled *Process Identity*, because it contained items relating to the process of making the service brand available. The second factor contains items relating to the organizational image and reputational aspects of a service brand, such as organizational values projected by the brand and public relations activities. This factor was labelled *Organization Identity*.
The third factor incorporates items that are related to the symbolic aspects of the brand such as name, logo, colour etc. This factor was labelled Symbolic Identity. The fourth factor contains three items that were conceptualized to form the originally proposed facet Brand-as-Servicescape. This factor was re-labelled Servicescape Identity. The fifth factor contains items relating to the communication aspects that can contribute to building or reinforcing BI building. This factor was labelled Communication Identity.

The originally proposed facets Brand-as-Product and Brand-as-Experience did not emerge as distinct dimensions; the retained items making up these dimensions were subsumed into other dimensions, reflecting the intangibility of the service offering (product) as largely experienced as a process and emphasising the role of communication and symbolic representation of the brand. For example, the items originally proposed in the Brand-as-Experience facet (e.g. ‘Your relationship with the people providing brand X’ and ‘Your relationship with other customers using brand X’), were subsumed into the Brand-as-Process dimension. Items originally proposed under the Brand-as-Product facet were subsumed into the Brand-as-Symbol dimension (e.g. ‘The country of origin of brand X’), and the Brand-as-Communication dimension (e.g. ‘The value-added benefits offered by brand X’).

Checking for Common Method Variance (CMV)

Harman’s single-factor test is a commonly used technique to identify the issue of common method variance. However, researchers consider it to be a diagnostic technique rather than a statistical method (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is seen as a more sophisticated test to check for CMV. As a result, for this study CFA analysis using AMOS was used to identify and rule out any possible common method effects. Podsakoff et al. (2003) suggest using the single-method factor approach to check for any method biases.
at measurement level. This technique has been used and recommended by other studies (e.g. Elangovan and Xie, 2000; Widaman, 1985). Following this, we introduced a common latent variable (CLV) also referred to as method factor to the measurement model. We checked for model fit, with and without the CLV. If the introduction of CLV does not significantly improve the fit over the model without the CLV, then it demonstrates that the results are not affected by CMV. Also, the measurement model factors’ loadings must continue to be significant in both cases (with and without CLV). The analysis results showed that the fit of the model did not improve significantly with the addition and specification of CLV over the specified measurement model alone.

The overall chi-square fit statistics for the original measurement model was \(\chi^2(109) = 292.78, p=0.000, \text{GFI} = 0.873\) while the fit statistics for the measurement model with CLV was \(\chi^2(124) = 287.62, p=0.000, \text{GFI} = 0.881\). Although the overall chi-square fit statistics are significant, the incremental fit index yielded a rho of 0.014 which suggests insignificant improvement (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980). This indicates that method effects are insignificant. Additionally, the measurement model factor loadings were significant even after method effects were partialled out. Overall, these tests indicate that the results obtained through data analysis show true relationships among the variables and are not affected by CMV.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

The five-factor model identified from EFA was further subjected to Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using AMOS. An initial inspection of model fit revealed marginal fit \(\chi^2/\text{df} = 3.11; \text{CFI}=0.85; \text{SRMR}=0.87\) and \(\text{TLI}=0.83\). This warranted further examination of the modification indices, standardized residuals, and standardized regressions weights to make re-estimation (MacCallum et al.1992; Hair et al., 2006; Furr, 2011).
A sequential model modification approach (MacCallum et al., 1992) was adopted to improve its overall fit. Standardized regression weights (or estimated loadings) were reviewed to ensure they were all above the significant level of 0.5. Modification indices were examined that identified three items with cross loadings (Jöreskog and Sorbom, 1988; Sin et al., 2005; Yoo and Donthu, 2001). Standardized residuals ideally should fall between 2.5 and 4.0 (Hair et al., 2006); items with values above 4.0 may be candidates for removal if they perform poorly on other criteria (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1988). Six items were outside these limits. Before making any decision to remove an item, authors considered how each item performed across all three parameters (i.e. standardized regression weights, modification indices, and standardized residuals). At the same time authors ensured close consultation with theory (McDonald and Ho, 2002) to preserve content validity.

The above process resulted in the removal of nine items. After re-specification and re-estimation, the measurement model demonstrated an acceptable fit ($\chi^2$/df = 2.15; CFI=0.95; SRMR=0.05 and TLI=0.93). All the standardized loadings were above 0.50 indicating their statistical significance (see Table 3). The unstandardized loadings were also examined: for all items, t-values were significant (p<0.001) thus establishing the statistical significance of each loading. Thus, at the end of this stage, the final five factor 17-item SERVBID scale was obtained. This scale was further tested on a different sample (study 2) to establish its reliability and validity.

Second-order measurement model validation (PLS-SEM)

Study 2: Scale Validation using a Different Sample (n=245)
We conducted additional research to assess the proposed SERVBID scale’s structure and properties. To prevent the problem of ‘capitalization on chance’ (MacCallum et al., 1992) and to assess the consistency of the underlying model from the previous analysis, the five-factor SERVBID scale identified from study 1 was cross-validated on a different sample (n=245) of UK-based customers (Churchill, 1979). Similar to study 1 data collection, an online survey was administered to a sample of UK consumers using a permission-based mailing list from a list broker. The objective was to cross-validate the scale and reconfirm the validity and reliability of the SERVBID scale (MacCallum et al., 1992; Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). Our additional objective was to assess the nomological validity of the scale. So, we included measures of brand trust and loyalty for this purpose. The results support the five-dimensional SERVBID scale. As shown in Table 3, all the reflective indicators load significantly on their respective factors, with loadings ranging from 0.69-0.92.

The validity of the formative dimensions was assessed through the significance and strength of the path (factor weights) from the particular dimension to the higher order construct. This is in line with the proposed approach by MacKenzie et al. (2005) and Sarstedt et al. (2019). Figure 1 shows that the weights for the five brand identity dimensions suggest that each dimension is an important determinant of Service Brand Identity (all the standardized weights were significant at p<.001 and range between 0.16-0.34).

![Insert Figure 1 here]

The composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha values were used to confirm the reliability of Service Brand Identity (SBI) dimensions. Table 4 shows that the composite reliability ranges from 0.86 to 0.92, and Cronbach’s alpha values were between 0.78 and
0.89. Drawing on Hair et al. (2006) and Walsh and Beatty (2007), the validity of the scale was assessed based on three criteria: content validity, construct validity and, through application of the scale, nomological validity.

The content validity of the scale was established through high inter-item correlations and the results of qualitative analysis. Construct validity was established through convergent validity and discriminant validity. Convergent validity (CV) assesses the extent to which measures that should be related to each other are in fact related. CV was not assessed based on Mackenzie et al.’s (2005) recommendations that the dimensions making up the formative construct (BI in this case) are not necessarily correlated. Discriminant validity (DV) provides evidence of the distinctiveness of each dimension of the scale. DV of the scale was assessed by comparing the AVE with the corresponding inter-construct squared correlations. All AVE values were greater than the inter-construct squared correlation, thus suggesting that the scale exhibits good discriminant validity.

[Insert Table 4 here]

Nomological Validity

Nomological validity is established when the scale behaves according to theoretical prediction (Westbrook, 1980). Nomological validity was established using two methods, as suggested by Hair et al. (2006). First, correlations among the proposed five dimensions of brand identity were examined to establish that they are positively related as theoretically predicted. Correlation estimates between each pair of factors were indeed positive and significant (p<0.001) (Table 4).

Second, to assess the nomological validity and scale applicability, we applied the scale to examine the relationship between the dimensions forming the higher-order service brand
identity construct and other theoretically related constructs (Churchill, 1995). Literature identifies brand trust and brand loyalty as two key consequences of BI, suggesting a positive link between BI and trust (Burmann et al., 2009; Ghodeshwar, 2002) and BI and brand loyalty (He et al., 2012).

Ghodeshwar (2002) suggests that a strong BI, when communicated well and experienced positively by customers, results in the development of brand trust. The relationship between BI and trust can be visualized as a process that starts with BI that attracts consumers towards the brand (Schmitt and Simonson, 1997), consumers then build a relationship with the brand over time (Fournier, 1998) and develop trust that moderates in strengthening that relationship (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). On this basis, it is posited that there is a positive and significant relationship between service BI and trust. To measure brand trust, we adopted four standard trust items from Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001): “I trust brand X”; “I rely on brand X”; “Brand X is an honest brand”; and “Brand X is safe.”

Brand identity is argued to contribute to brand loyalty in several ways. It “helps in establishing a relationship between the brand and the customer by generating a value proposition involving functional, emotional, or self-expressive benefits” (Aaker, 1996, p.168). Strong brand-customer relationships elicit (or lay the foundation for) a behavioral response from customers such that they are more likely to prefer the product or service in the future and remain loyal (Oliver, 1999; Fournier and Yao, 1997). Customers may also display a high degree of commitment due to the unique set of associations of the brand (i.e. identity), thereby exhibiting affective loyalty. To the extent that loyalty is grounded in the existence of a valued relationship between the consumer and the brand (Oliver, 1999), it is expected that BI impacts brand loyalty directly and positively. We measured loyalty using five standard items from Yoo and Donthu’s (2001) work: “In the future, I will be loyal to
brand X”; “I will buy brand X again”; “Brand X will be my first choice in the future”; “I will not buy other brands if brand X is available”; and “I will recommend brand X to others.”

The correlations between brand trust, brand loyalty and the dimensions of the brand identity were positive and significant (p<0.001) (Table 4). Overall, the measures correlated in a manner hypothesized by theory, thus confirming the nomological validity of the SERVBID scale.

**Results by Dimension**

The final SERVBID scale (Appendix B) is a short, easy to administer scale consisting of 17 items, which further increases its practical relevance in a professional context. The scale has been subject to various reliability and validity tests and can be used for both academic research as well as managerial practice. The scale comprises 5 dimensions:

*Process identity* encapsulates how the service is delivered/produced for consumers and the behaviour of or interaction with staff in the process. It emphasizes what Sirianni et al. (2013) refer to as the ‘branded service encounter’, recognizing the specific role of service interactions in delivering evidence of the brand and its positioning at every customer touch point. An organization’s employees are particularly critical in building strong brands through service encounters as they represent the brand to customers (Wallace and De Chernatony, 2007). When the source of customer value shifts from the physical product offering to the service, frontline staff become key to delivering on promises and predominantly shape the consumer brand experience (Berry, 2000). Thus, BI is highly dependent on the actions and attitudes of staff (Punjaisri et al., 2009); ‘strong and successful service brands are realized through positive employee behavior’ (King and Grace, 2010, p. 939), and customers are
sensitive to the behavior and attitudes of staff towards them during service encounters (Schlager et al., 2011).

Employees are an essential and critical stakeholder group that interact with customers and, thus, can influence BI management strategy for services (Löhndorf and Diamantopoulos, 2014). Given the intangibility of services, employees can shape customer perceptions towards the company brand (Papasolomou and Vrontis, 2006; Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010) and communicate and deliver brand promise to customers (Punjaissri and Wilson, 2011). More generally, Löhndorf and Diamantopoulos (2014) suggest that service firms need to develop their employees into ‘brand champions’. They argue that ‘people are motivated to maintain continuity in their self-concept …A brand identity that matches an employee’s sense of self can help maintain this consistent, stable self-concept, which has a positive effect on the employee’s identification with the organization.’ (p.314).

Organization identity refers to the organizational values, visions or ethos that represent the brand and make it recognizable at a strategic level. This dimension has strong theoretical priors, as evident in the literature review. Identifying and sustaining the values of a service brand is key to brand success. Zhang and Bloemer (2008) suggest that in a services context, values become especially important because they fill an evaluation void created by the absence of tangible functional attributes. Social responsibility values in particular can strategically enrich a company’s BI (Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001). Indeed, De Chernatony at al. (2004) identified that values represented the third most important theme for successful service brands after a focused position and consistency. A clear organizational vision provides a sense of direction for BI to proceed (Aaker, 1996; De Chernatony, 1999). The identity of a brand must be consistent with the company vision; inconsistencies between the communicated identity and company vision can create confusion in the minds of consumers thereby affecting the strength of BI.
Symbolic identity encapsulates the signs and symbols used to represent the brand and its outer appearance; elements that have featured consistently in previous studies of BI (Aaker, 1996; Kapferer, 2012; Wheeler, 2012; Coleman et al., 2011). In addition to the traditional elements of brand name, logo/symbol, and colour associated with the brand, country of origin of the brand also emerged as a key symbol factor. There is evidence to suggest a link between country-of-origin and brand quality perceptions (Godey et al., 2012) which broadly contributes to overall BI.

Servicescape identity refers to the identity of the delivery environment, its ambience and atmosphere. The servicescape is the environment where the service is rendered and consumed (Nguyen, 2006) and is long recognized as a key factor affecting the quality of the service offering (Bitner, 1992). However, an explicit link has not been made previously between the potential for the servicescape to contribute to BI. The servicescape communicates cues to consumers of the capabilities and quality of the service firm and the identity and purpose of the service firm. This in turn is argued to create an impact on consumers in terms of their overall experience with the firm, their satisfaction, and loyalty towards the service brand (Bitner, 1992; Mayer et al., 2003; Harris and Ezeh, 2008). Since, BI is often described in terms of how a service may be perceived by the customers (Coleman et al., 2011), the servicescape elements have the potential to affect BI. This is also supported by Keller’s (1993) assertion that the place where a service is delivered plays a key role in building brand associations in the customer's mind set. In a very practical sense, the servicescape provides a tangible and visual representation of the service brand, which contributes to its identity (Underwood et al., 2001). The servicescape dimension can apply equally well to physical environments and online environments.

Communication identity refers to the means by which the identity is communicated and any distinctive use of communication channels. The findings indicate that communication
plays an important role in developing BI. Keller (1993) suggests that marketing communications exist as a way for firms to engage in dialogue with consumers and communicate their offerings. Furthermore, Duncan and Moriarty (1998) posit that communication channels help in generating a favourable response from consumers. Our results suggest that the nature of the communication (independent of the message) impacts on BI.

Discussion and Conclusion

We propose a novel and more inclusive definition of the construct of Service Brand Identity conceptualized as: the sum of process, organizational, symbolic, servicescape and communication attributes that define the brand, give it distinguishable features and make it recognizable. The need for a more holistic approach to consider key brand identity dimensions and to design a measurement tool emerged from both the academic literature and professional arena. The value and uniqueness of this paper lies in its novel conceptualization of service brand identity as a five-dimensional construct and the development of a theoretically consistent, valid and reliable measurement tool for the assessment of brand identity in a service context. Our study makes theoretical and practical contributions.

Theoretical Contributions

The findings extend initial studies on brand identity (e.g. Upshaw, 1995; Aaker, 1996; De Chernatony, 1999; Kapferer, 2000; Burmann et al., 2009; Coleman et al., 2011) by providing an updated and comprehensive investigation into brand identity and accounting for the dominant and theoretically defining role of services as recognized by various scholars.

There is some productive overlap between our study and extant literature, but two of the five factors (Process identity and Servicescape identity) are completely distinct and extend prior conceptualizations of brand identity that have not emphasized the role of service
process and servicescape in developing or shaping brand identity. To the best of our knowledge, this scale is the first to make an explicit link between these dimensions and brand identity.

Process identity represents the critical role of service staff in building strong brands through service encounters as they represent the brand to customers (Wallace and De Chernatony, 2007). It plays an important role in delivering evidence of the brand and in positioning the brand at every customer touch point (Sirianni et al., 2013). In addition to this, Servicescape (or the delivery environment) emphasizes the tangible and visual representation of the service brand (Underwood et al., 2001).

This study also contributes to a more holistic and dynamic understanding of BI. Prior conceptualizations portray BI as a unilateral construct comprising the firm’s view of how it wants the brand to be perceived (Coleman et al., 2011; Aaker, 1996; De Chernatony, 1999). The need to account for the consumer perspective in shaping and strengthening BI has been underlined by many scholars in recent studies (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016; Iglesias et al., 2013; Hatch and Schultz, 2010). In doing so, this research contributes by responding to calls for more research on marketing constructs that account for the consumer perspective (Payne et al., 2009; Kennedy and Guzman, 2016).

Overall, we provide a deeper and more complete understanding of the theoretical construct of BI through a service-dominant lens, in particular recognizing the defining role of people, processes and the delivery environment in developing the identity of the service brand.

Managerial Contributions

Businesses reportedly spend billions of dollars trying to create brand identities, yet many brands fail (Wheeler, 2003). To build a strong, unique and enduring brand identity managers...
need to understand what makes up their brand’s identity, and be able to measure it effectively. Our research provides brand managers with: (a) a better understanding of what constitutes BI; (b) a diagnostic tool to observe and evaluate the identity of their brand; (c) a clarification of the impact of brand identity on customer relationships (through brand trust and loyalty); (d) a potential measurement tool to assess the performance and financial return of brand identity.

Our research provides managers with a better understanding of the constituent dimensions of their brand’s identity, taking into account a more complete account of brand identity. Prior conceptualizations and BI measures have provided only a partial view of brand identity, accounting for largely a goods-dominant view of branding. Our scale takes account of service specific aspects which makes it more complete and relevant to today’s brands, given that three of the top five global brands (Interbrand.com) in 2019 are largely service-based organizations (Google, Amazon, Microsoft).

Managers can use the SERVBID scale as a diagnostic tool to assess the relative importance of individual dimensions on overall brand identity. Brand managers can use the scale to assess which facets of a brand’s identity are contributing positively or negatively to the overall identity of the brand. This can help guide brand management input in improving the overall effectiveness of their brand building efforts. For example, managers might use the tool to identify particular area(s) (e.g. service process, communication, and servicescape) that require support or attention.

The SERVBID scale also provides managers with a valuable barometer by which to gauge the performance of the brand. This may be achieved by using the scale (a) as a reference point for the measurement of KPIs in relation to individual aspects of the brand’s identity; (b) to benchmark against competitor brands; or (c) to track the relationship between brand identity and key performance metrics, such as brand equity, sales or customer
relationship metrics (e.g. satisfaction, loyalty). Used in this way, managers can understand how the overall brand identity or individual aspects of it relate to return on investment.

Understanding the importance of the different dimensions of BI should be useful in helping brand managers to develop more sophisticated segmentation and positioning and communication strategies. Research shows that brand identity has a positive impact on brand communication and brand strategy (Melewar et al., 2017). The SERVBID scale can assist managers in understanding the impact of each of the scale’s dimensions on brand strategy and controlled and uncontrolled communication. This can contribute to managers overall efforts in brand building strategies.

Limitations and Future Directions
The limitations of this research may act as potential avenues for future research. Whilst this research has extended the traditional unilateral view of BI by incorporating a consumer perspective, further research could focus on applying the scale in a variety of contexts and explore a wider range of consequences as well as potential antecedents.

Our study accounted for four service brand categories (banks, hotels, airlines and salon services). There is scope to apply the scale to an extended range of service brands and explore potential differences between brands and service categories with regards to brand identity dimensions. Linked to this, further research could explore the settings in which the service brand is delivered to ascertain the impact on various levels of brand identity. The scale could be used explicitly to explore service BI in offline and online environments and in comparing service situations that vary in the degree of customer involvement or co-creation.

We focused on two key potential consequences of brand identity: brand loyalty and brand trust. Further research could explore a wider range of potential consequences, in particular those related to the financial performance of the brand. Research might usefully seek to
evaluate the link between service BI and pricing (Csaba and Bengtsson, 2006) and service
brand equity (Madhavaram et al., 2005). In doing so, it may be possible to ascertain the
financial impact of individual dimensions of brand identity, enabling brand managers to
target investment in those facets of a brand’s identity that yield a higher financial return.

Productive links might also be explored between self-image/identity (both actual and
ideal) and brand identity using congruence theory. Congruence theory (Sirgy, 1982) suggests
that an individual’s behavior would be regulated by the congruence between their perception
of a brand’s identity and their own self-image/identity. Further research could usefully
explore the extent to which self-image/identity may serve as potential antecedents or
consequences.

Another avenue for investigation could be brand communities (Fournier, 1998) and
brand identity, exploring the interplay between different brand relationships and brand
identity, such as brand tribalism. Indeed, taking a stakeholder approach to the development
of brand identity, brand communities could be explored in terms of their shaping of brand
identity.

Linked to the above, research could use the scale to understand and measure service BI
from the perspectives of both consumers and firms simultaneously and conduct a gap
analysis in perceptions. This would enable a closer understanding of the interaction between
the projected and perceived BI, referred to elsewhere as ‘the brand face’ and ‘the consumer
face’ (Da Silveira et al., 2013).

Finally, our research has been undertaken in a single country context (the UK). The scale
could usefully be applied in other country contexts and cultural contexts to confirm the
scale’s external validity and reliability. Such replication will provide a solid understanding
of differences or similarities between consumers’ perspectives on service BI in different
cultures and would inform global brand marketing efforts.
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### Table 1 Relationship between brand identity and other similar constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Brand Identity comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brand personality  |  ‘The set of human characteristics associated with a brand’ Aaker (1997)  
In contrast to ‘product-related attributes which tend to serve a utilitarian function for consumers, brand personality tends to serve a symbolic or self-expressive function’ (Keller, 1993).  
Measured based on personality traits.  
Aaker’s (1997) Brand Personality Framework, based on the ‘Big Five’ personality traits, measures brand personality according to: sincerity; excitement; competence; sophistication; ruggedness. | Personality is a key dimension of brand identity (Aaker, 1996; Kapferer, 2000; De Chernatony, 1999).  
Identity is a combination of both product-related attributes as well as symbolic attributes (Aaker, 1996). |
| Brand image        | The depiction of the brand in the mind of consumers (Aaker, 1996; Keller, 1993).  
A brand's image is what people think and feel about it (Bullmore, 1984)  
The set of symbolic meanings and perceptions consumers attach to the brand (Padgett and Allen, 1997; Low and Lamb, 2000).  
Brand image is generally measured using statements that assess how consumers feel towards a brand or what their impressions are of it. Cretu and Brodie (2007) operationalize brand image by asking consumers to rate a brand’s image as: fashionable, reputed, elegant, sophisticated, useful, well known etc. | Brand image is consumers’ perceptions of a presented brand identity.  
Brand image is both the result and the interpretation of brand identity (Kapferer, 2000)  
Brand identity incorporates part of brand image (i.e., self-image) (Kapferer, 1997). |
| Brand reputation   | Generally refers to an evaluative judgment; how consumers evaluate a brand over time, usually derived from direct experience of the brand and/or comparisons with competing brands (Gotsi and Wilson, 2001).  
The overall value, esteem and character of a brand (Selnes, 1993).  
Perception of quality associated with the brand name (Veloutsou and Moutinho, 2009).  
Measured according to the extent to which the brand is perceived to be reputable, to be trustworthy, and to make honest claims about its offering (Veloutsou and Moutinho, 2009). | Brand identity is ‘a unique set of brand associations’ (Aaker, 1996) that can be configured by words, images, ideas, symbols etc. (Upshaw, 1995).  
No evaluative judgment is implied with brand identity; brand identity is what the brand is, it does not imply that it is good or bad.  
Brand identity contributes to brand reputation (De Chernatony, 1999).  
Brand reputation is therefore an outcome of brand identity. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Construct definition</th>
<th>Construct dimensions</th>
<th>Study type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaker (1996, p.68)</td>
<td>'a unique set of brand associations that the brand strategist aspires to create or maintain.'</td>
<td>Brand-as-product (<em>product scope, product attributes, quality/value, uses, users, country of origin</em>)&lt;br&gt;Brand-as-organization (<em>organizational attributes, local versus global</em>)&lt;br&gt;Brand-as-person (<em>brand personality, brand-customer relationships</em>)&lt;br&gt;Brand-as-symbol (<em>visual imagery/metaphors and brand heritage</em>)</td>
<td>Conceptual framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapferer (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physique&lt;br&gt;Personality&lt;br&gt;Culture&lt;br&gt;Relationship&lt;br&gt;Reflection&lt;br&gt;Self-Image</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Chernatony (2006, p.45)</td>
<td>'the distinctive or central idea of a brand and how the brand communicates this idea to its stakeholders'</td>
<td>Brand vision&lt;br&gt;Brand Culture&lt;br&gt;Brand Positioning&lt;br&gt;Brand Personality&lt;br&gt;Brand Relationships&lt;br&gt;Brand Presentation</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmann et al. 2009 (p.115)</td>
<td>(brand identity) 'can be regarded as a type of group identity, expressed through various means like competences, origin, vision, communication style and behaviour.'</td>
<td>Brand Promise&lt;br&gt;Brand Behaviour&lt;br&gt;Brand experience&lt;br&gt;Brand Expectations</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3  Confirmatory Factor Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Initial Sample (n=246) Loadings</th>
<th>Validation Sample (Loadings) (n=245)</th>
<th>t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1 Process Identity (PI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6 The behaviour of staff delivering brand X</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>27.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12 The expertise of staff working for brand X</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>33.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14 The quality of interaction with staff delivering brand X</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>47.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21 The quality of the service provided by brand X</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>33.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29 The consistency of service of brand X</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>26.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2 Organization Identity (OI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31 The company vision associated with brand X</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>82.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 33 Your relationship with other customers using brand X</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>32.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34 The social responsibility projected by brand X</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>37.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3 Symbolic Identity (SyI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1 The name of brand X</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>32.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2 The logo or symbols used to identify brand X</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>43.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7 The colour(s) associated with brand X</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>24.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8 The country of origin of brand X</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4 Servicescape Identity (SI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13 The appearance of the delivery environment used by brand X</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>26.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27 The ambience in brand X's delivery environment</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>49.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 32 The general environment in which brand X is delivered</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>35.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 5 Communication Identity (CI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20 Promotions carried out by brand X</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>38.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22 The value-added benefits offered by brand X</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>98.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 Correlation Matrix (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validation Sample (Study 2) (n=245)</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability (CR)</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
<th>Brand Loyalty</th>
<th>Brand Trust</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>OI</th>
<th>SyI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.67 (0.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.68 (0.82)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.68 (0.83)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.75 (0.87)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SyI</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.61 (0.78)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.75 (0.87)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.82 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Square root of average variance extracted (AVE) is reported on the diagonal. PI=Process Identity, OI=Organization Identity, SyI=Symbolic Identity, SI=Servicescape Identity, CI=Communication Identity.
Figure 1 Confirmatory factorial analysis: Brand Identity as a second-order construct

The values for the first-order dimensions of brand identity are path coefficients, and parentheses show t-values. Path coefficients and t values for the reflective indicators are provided separately in Table 5. (Acronyms: PI=Process Identity; OI=Organization Identity; SyI=Symbolic Identity; SI=Servicescape Identity; CI=Communication Identity)
## Appendix A: Dimensions/components of academic brand identity models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand as person</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand as organization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand as symbol</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand as product</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand as process</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand promise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Logo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: The SERVBID Instrument

This survey seeks your opinion regarding factors that contribute in building a strong brand identity for brand _____________. The following questions seek your level of agreement or disagreement, on a scale of 1 to 7, with the following statements related to brand _____________. There are no right or wrong answers for this. We are primarily interested in your opinion and in the numbers that best highlight your level of agreement or disagreement.

On a scale of 1 to 7 with '1' meaning strongly disagree and '7' meaning strongly agree, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that each of the following contribute in building brand identity for brand _____________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The name of brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The logo or symbols used to identify brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The colour(s) used by brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country of origin of brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company vision associated with brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your relationship with other customers using brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The social responsibility projected by brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behaviour of staff delivering brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expertise of staff working for brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of interactions with staff delivering brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consistency of service of brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appearance of the delivery environment used by brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ambience in brand X’s delivery environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions carried out by brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of service provided by brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general environment in which brand X is delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value-added benefits offered by brand X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This SERVBID scale can be used by surveying consumers using the 17 items (scored from 1 to 7) and summing the values obtained for each dimension and for the overall service brand identity construct. The minimum SERVBID score can be 17 and maximum score can be 119. Independent scores can also be obtained for each of the five scale dimensions, which will help identify areas (with low scores) that need further development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer 2 Comments</th>
<th>Author Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The author(s) have done a fine job with their revision opportunity. As a result,</td>
<td>Thank you for the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the contribution to the literature and fit with the JSM mission have been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningfully improved. My biggest concerns have been adequately addressed. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe the manuscript will be well-received by the JSM readership. Job well done!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify</td>
<td>Thank you for the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication?: I think so; the revision effort proved successful in this regard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding</td>
<td>Thank you for the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes; the literature review is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robust and thorough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory,</td>
<td>Thank you for the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The method employed appears effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the</td>
<td>Thank you for the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify</td>
<td>Thank you for the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in research (contribute to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: This area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the manuscript is much improved from the original submission. As a result, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fit with the JSM mission is apparent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured</td>
<td>Thank you for the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your very thorough revision. I believe you have taken all the appropriate measures to address my original concerns about this manuscript with the exception of one small area. I refer to the construct definition. You provide a broad definition of brand identity that has been adopted for this study. However, you provide no actually definition for your construct “Service Brand Identity”. What you are actually arguing through the paper is that Service Brand Identity is the sum of process, organizational, symbolic, servicescape and communication attributes that form the identity of the service brand. Please make sure you provide a specific definition of SBI that includes your identified dimensions.

We have added the following construct definition at the start of the conclusion (p.21):

“We propose a novel and more inclusive definition of the construct of Service Brand Identity conceptualized as: the sum of process, organizational, symbolic, servicescape and communication attributes that define the brand, give it distinguishable features and make it recognizable.”

Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes.

Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Literature is thorough and appropriate

Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes - but please see overall comment

Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes

Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is

Thank you for the comment
the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes

Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: High quality

Thank you for the comment

**Reviewer 3 Comments**

**Author Response**

The authors have made substantial strides in clarity and organization of the paper. The shift to a first order reflective, second order formative construct for BI made a huge difference (in my view) in the ability to understand the model, the analyses, and the implications. My comments at this point primarily focus on minor and easily addressable issues.

Page 3 - The sentence about contributing to the literature on brand identity should either place an "e.g.," inside of the citations, as these are examples of the literature on brand identity, or the citation should be removed as they are fairly unnecessary in this statement.

Page 8 - Be consistent in your use of % or percent (follow journal guidelines). Also, "percent" should be percent.

Page 9 - The first line should read ..."that each of the items (statements) contribute..."

Page 9 - Also, "However, apart from a few..." adding "a" into the sentence

Be sure to recheck citations. Sometimes commas are being used and sometimes they are not. Additionally, there is often no order to the citations. Follow journal guidelines for citations throughout.

'\text{e.g.}' added inside of the citations

'Per cent' changed to '%'

Change done in-text

Added 'a'

All in-text citations checked for consistency
Page 12 - please provide a slightly deeper explanation of the result of Brand-as-Product and Brand-as-Experience being subsumed into process and servicescape dimensions. Offer some examples or further information beyond offerings being experienced as a process delivered via a service environment. Use the items as examples to make this case a little easier to accept functionally.

We have extended the explanation as follows (on p.12):

“The originally proposed facets Brand-as-Product and Brand-as-Experience did not emerge as distinct dimensions; the retained items making up these dimensions were subsumed into other dimensions, reflecting the intangibility of the service offering (product) as largely experienced as a process and emphasising the role of communication and symbolic representation of the brand. For example, the items originally proposed in the Brand-as-Experience facet (e.g. ‘Your relationship with the people providing brand X’ and ‘Your relationship with other customers using brand X’), were subsumed into the Brand-as-Process dimension. Items originally proposed under the Brand-as-Product facet were subsumed into the Brand-as-Symbol dimension (e.g. ‘The country of origin of brand X’), and the Brand-as-Communication dimension (e.g. ‘The value-added benefits offered by brand X’).”

It appears as though Table 4 is mislabeled given the discussion around it. Unless I’ve misunderstood something at the top of page 8, the final dimension to be listed should be “Brand as Service Process” and the second to last dimension should be “Brand-as-Service-Process” rather than “Brand-As-Service-Experience.”

We’ve removed Table 4, because, on reflection, it wasn’t saying any more than was already said in the paper, and was clearly causing confusion.

Figure 2 seems unnecessary given Figure 1. Figure 1 should simply be updated to either spell out the constructs in the model or annotate at the bottom the meaning of each acronym.

Figure 2 removed;

Meaning of each acronym used in figure 1 added at the bottom as follows:

“(Acronyms: PI=Process Identity; OI= Organization identity; SyI=Symbolic Identity; SI=Servicescape Identity; CI=Communication Identity)”

Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The development of a brand identity scale represents a modest advancement in the ability to measure brand identity. Gains are primarily made through considering service dominant logic and the inclusion of process identity and servicescape identity. These adaptations and extensions merit publication in a services journal like JSM.

Thank you for your comment.
| Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: **The foundational literature is adequately covered and overlaps among different areas are highlighted. Extensions of BI into services are justified through literature and expert rater evaluation.** |
| Thank you for your comment |
| Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: **The methods have been suitably updated and explained. For example, the primary construct for BI is now formative rather than reflective and sub components are shown to be reflective.** |
| Thank you for your comment |
| Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: **The whole paper is much clearer, including the results.** |
| Thank you for your comment |
| Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: **Following reviewer comments the implications have been much better fleshed out. Research and practice are much clearer and value added in this revision.** |
| Thank you for your comment |
| Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: **Overall, the communication quality has increased, though** |
| Thank you for your comment |
there are some minor issues I point out to the author(s).
### Appendix C SERVBID Scale Development Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Development Stage</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specify domain of construct</strong></td>
<td>To determine what to measure; to set boundaries of what the scale can or cannot measure</td>
<td>Proposed preliminary definition of brand identity. Postulated dimensions of brand identity as given in the literature.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generate an item pool</strong></td>
<td>To develop a set of items to capture each dimension of brand identity</td>
<td>Generated items from literature. Generated items and three new dimensions through in-depth consumer interviews.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refine Items (Initial Item Purification)</strong></td>
<td>To evaluate the clarity, conciseness and readability of each item, thereby establishing face and content validity of items</td>
<td>Stage 1 &amp; 2 – Items refined by two independent marketing academic experts; 79 items reduced to 47 items. Stage 3 – Items subjected to review by a panel of 10 academic experts within UK and US; 47 items reduced to 35 items.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop and pre-test survey (Pilot Study, n=106)</strong></td>
<td>To further refine the items, check convergent validity and to eliminate items with low factor loadings</td>
<td>35 items pilot-tested in a survey administered to a sample of 106 participants. Coefficient alpha and inter-item correlations calculated to check internal consistency. EFA conducted; 35 items reduced to 29 items for final testing.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administer final survey to wider sample (Study 1, n=246)</strong></td>
<td>To develop the SERVBID scale</td>
<td>Survey administered to UK consumer sample; Data from 245 responses refined through coefficient alpha, inter-item correlations, and EFA. CFA conducted for confirming the scale structure.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-Validation of scale (Study 2, n=245)</strong></td>
<td>To establish the construct and nomological validity of the scale</td>
<td>Conducted cross validation to establish construct and nomological validity. SERVBID scale applied to test impact on brand trust and loyalty using PLS SEM.</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D Brand Identity dimensions from literature and consumer interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand-as-Symbol</td>
<td>It encapsulate elements that deal with outer appearance of a brand, its name, logo, symbol, slogan, packaging, presentation and metaphors</td>
<td>Literature + Validated through Consumer Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-as-Product</td>
<td>It includes product related aspects that can contribute to building of a brand identity, for e.g. product attributes, quality, uses and users</td>
<td>Literature + Validated through Consumer Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-as-Organization</td>
<td>It includes organization related aspects that can contribute in building brand identity, like innovation, vision, company culture, social responsibility initiatives</td>
<td>Literature + Validated through Consumer Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-as-communication</td>
<td>It includes aspects like positioning, advertising, celebrity endorsement, promotion, and peer influence</td>
<td>Literature + Validated through Consumer Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-as-Servicescape</td>
<td>It includes elements like service environment, ambience and site, atmosphere, and facilities</td>
<td>Consumer Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-as-Service Experience</td>
<td>It includes elements of consumer experience, and reputation</td>
<td>Consumer Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-as-Service Communication</td>
<td>It includes aspects like positioning, advertising, celebrity endorsement, promotion, and peer influence</td>
<td>Consumer Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E: Initial Item Pool (after Pilot Testing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item number and Statement</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>The reliability of brand X over time</td>
<td>0.8575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>The quality of the service provided by brand X</td>
<td>0.8315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>The value-added benefits offered by brand X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>The accessibility of brand X</td>
<td>0.6402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>The quality of the delivery of brand X</td>
<td>0.7208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>The consistency of service of brand X</td>
<td>0.8123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>The celebrity endorsement associated with brand X</td>
<td>0.8447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>The advertising used by brand X</td>
<td>0.8688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>Promotions carried out by brand X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>Public Relations (PR) activities associated with brand X</td>
<td>0.8235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>The behaviour of staff delivering brand X</td>
<td>0.7474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>The expertise of staff working for brand X</td>
<td>0.8217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>The quality of interaction with service staff delivering brand X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>Your relationship with the people providing brand X</td>
<td>0.7993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>Your relationship with brand X</td>
<td>0.7423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>The appearance of the delivery environment used by brand X</td>
<td>0.8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>The ambience in brand X's delivery environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 32</td>
<td>The general environment in which brand X is delivered</td>
<td>0.8239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>The company culture associated with brand X</td>
<td>0.7917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>The values projected by brand X</td>
<td>0.8180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td>The company vision associated with brand X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td>The social responsibility projected by brand X</td>
<td>0.7817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>The name of brand X</td>
<td>0.8296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>The logo or symbols used to identify brand X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>The colour(s) associated with brand X</td>
<td>0.8747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>The word-of-mouth communication from other consumers (face-to-face or social media) related to brand X</td>
<td>0.6794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 33</td>
<td>Your relationship with other customers using brand X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>The customers who buy brand X</td>
<td>0.8889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>The colour(s) associated with brand X</td>
<td>0.8292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>The country of origin of brand X</td>
<td>0.8292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items Candidate for Deletion (did not load on any factor)**

- Item 5: The distinctiveness of brand X
- Item 9: The reputation of brand X
- Item 10: Your prior experience with brand X
- Item 17: The facilities available in brand X's delivery environment
- Item 23: The personality of brand X
Appendix F: List of items that were dropped and items that were retained following EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Item Pool</th>
<th>Items Dropped</th>
<th>Items Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 1 Brand-as-symbol (5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item1 The name of brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item2 The logo or symbols used to identify brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item7 The colour(s) associated with brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item23 The personality of brand X</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item35 The customers who buy brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 2 Brand-as-service offering (5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item5 The distinctiveness of brand X</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item8 The country of origin of brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item22 The value-added benefits offered by brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item24 The accessibility of brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item30 The positioning of brand X relative to other similar brands</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 3 Brand-as organization (5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item9 The reputation of brand X</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item15 The company culture associated with brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item25 The values projected by brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item31 The company vision associated with brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item34 The social responsibility projected by brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 4 Brand-as-Service Process (7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item6 The behaviour of staff delivering brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item12 The expertise of staff working for brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item14 The quality of interaction with service staff delivering brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item18 The reliability of brand X over time</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item21 The quality of the service provided by brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item26 The quality of the delivery of brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item29 The consistency of service of brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 5 Brand-as-Service Communication (5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item3 The celebrity endorsement associated with brand X</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item4 The advertising used by brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item11 The word-of-mouth communication from other consumers (face-to-face or social media) related to brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item20 Promotions carried out by brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item28 Public Relations (PR) activities associated with brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 6 Brand-as-Service Experience (4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item10 Your prior experience with brand X</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item16 Your relationship with the people providing brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item19 Your relationship with brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item33 Your relationship with other customers using brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 7 Brand-as-Servicescape (4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item13 The appearance of the delivery environment used by brand X</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item17 The facilities available in brand X's delivery environment</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item27 The ambience in brand X's delivery environment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item32 The general environment in which brand X is delivered</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items Dropped: 1a—in the initial item purification through pilot testing; 1b—after exploratory factor analysis (study1); “Items Retained” column shows items that were retained for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis.
Appendix G: Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>40.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>