EFFECTS OF GLOBAL *MARKET* CONDITIONS ON *BRAND* IMAGE CUSTOMIZATION AND *BRAND* PERFORMANCE

What ***market*** conditions do managers consider when deciding whether to standardize or customize their global ***brand*** image? To what extent do those ***market*** conditions moderate the effects of ***brand*** image customization/standardization ***strategies*** on ***brand*** performance? To answer these questions, the author reports the results from a research study based on both secondary environmental data and survey responses from international ***marketing*** managers. The results show that (1) although managers consider some cultural and socioeconomic conditions of foreign countries in forming their international ***brand*** image ***strategies***, and (2) those conditions moderate the ***market*** share effects of their ***brand*** image ***strategies***, (3) managers can enhance ***brand*** performance by broadening the information they use in making global ***brand*** image ***strategy*** decisions. The implications of the results for ***marketing*** and ***advertising*** managers are discussed.

For many years, ***marketing*** and ***advertising*** managers and researchers have wrestled with the issue of customizing versus standardizing as ***strategies*** for international ***markets***. Managers can achieve economies of scale, message consistency, and the ability to attract common cross-national ***market*** segments through the use of global, standardized ***marketing*** programs (e.g., Levitt 1983). However, because of significant differences in consumers, cultural and socioeconomic conditions, and ***market*** structures, customization to local/national ***markets*** may be worth the additional expense (e.g., Douglas and Wind 1987). Although most firms' ***strategies*** are somewhere between the extremes of total customization and total standardization (Quelch and Hoff 1986), managers have little empirical evidence indicating when they should customize their ***marketing*** programs and how their ***strategy*** selection will affect ***brand*** performance (e.g., Jain 1989; Szymanski, Bharadwaj, and Varadarajan 1993).

Researchers have begun to investigate customization and standardization ***strategies***, but three areas have not been adequately addressed. First, most empirical research has examined just two aspects of the ***marketing*** mix--***advertising*** messages and product features (see Aulakh and Kotabe 1993 for a recent review). Research on ***brand*** equity and ***brand*** image management (e.g., Aaker and Keller 1990; Keller 1993; Park, Jaworski, and Macinnis 1986; Park, Milberg, and Lawson 1991; Reth 1992, 1995) suggests that ***marketers*** should develop ***brand*** image ***strategies*** before focusing on tactical ***marketing*** mix issues. Within the field of ***advertising***, practitioners and researchers advocate that the ***brand***'s image be the basis for developing sound product positioning and ***advertising strategies*** (e.g., Ogilvy 1963; Reynolds and Gutman 1984). Studies on global ***brand*** image and ***brand*** equity ***strategies*** are needed (Szymanski, Bharadwaj and Varadarajan 1993).

Second, although empirical studies have investigated cross-national or cross-country differences (e.g., Boote 1983; Huszagh, Fox, and Day 1986; Martenson 1989; Szymanski, Bharadwaj, and Varadarajan 1993), many ***marketers*** realize that countries are in fact heterogeneous, comprising culturally and socioeconomically diverse regions (Douglas and Wind 1987; Hill and Still 1984; Jain 1989; Kale and Sudharshan 1987; McKenna 1992; Mehrotra 1990). Targeting similar segments across ***markets*** may be preferable to developing country-by-country programs, but international customization research has yet to examine such an intermarket approach.

Third, little research has been done on the effects of customization and standardization on relative product performance measures such as ***market*** share (Jain 1989; Keegan, Still, and Hill 1987). Two recent exceptions are noteworthy. Samiee and Roth (1992) found that across a

variety of global industries, performance did not differ between firms using global standardization and firms using customization as ***marketing strategies***. What determines the effectiveness of ***marketing*** program customization and standardization ***strategies***? Szymanski, Bharadwaj, and Varadarajan (1993) began to explore this question, finding that resource allocation ***strategies*** (e.g., the amount of resources dedicated to communications programs) can enhance global ***market*** share and profitability across national boundaries. Their findings provide insights about resource allocation patterns for ***marketing*** products in multiple international ***markets***, but managers still must determine the extent to which the content of their ***marketing*** programs should be customized or standardized to enhance performance. To what extent should ***brand*** image be customized or standardized to build and maintain ***brand*** equity? Can conditions be identified that alert managers to the need for customizing or standardizing their ***brand*** image to maximize their global business performance?

A study was conducted to address the three areas in which research is lacking. Specifically, three research questions were pursued. First, what ***market*** conditions affect the extent to which international ***marketing*** managers customize or standardize their ***brand*** image across ***markets***? Conceptual frameworks have been prescribed to help managers determine the degree to which they should customize their ***marketing*** programs (Jain 1989), and this study empirically explores which ***market*** conditions are most related to managers' ***brand*** image ***strategy*** selection. Second, what ***market*** conditions moderate the effects of ***brand*** image customization/standardization ***strategies*** on performance? The study identified the ***market*** conditions managers should consider when making ***brand*** image customization/standardization decisions. The third research question tied the first two together--are managers using the right ***market*** information in their ***brand*** image ***strategy*** decisions? If so, the conditions that relate to ***strategy*** selection will also relate to ***brand*** performance. If not, managers should identify ***market*** conditions that moderate ***brand*** performance and use them as a basis for ***strategy*** selection.

These questions were examined empirically by combining survey data from international ***marketing*** managers with secondary data on global ***market*** conditions. Ten countries representing Asia, Western and Eastern Europe, and South America were used to provide a global sample. Sixty regions within those countries were identified, and a database of the national and intermarket cultural and socioeconomic characteristics of each ***market*** was developed. Consumer goods firms ***marketing*** their products in the 10 countries were identified and their managers surveyed about ***brand*** image ***strategies***, performance, and other relevant matters for each ***market***. The extent to which managers customize their ***brand*** image across ***markets*** is influenced by environmental, consumer behavior-related ***market*** conditions such as national culture and national and intermarket socio-economics. As in other recent studies of consumer goods ***strategy*** and performance (Simon and Sullivan 1993; Smith and Park 1992), the success of ***brand*** image customization ***strategies*** was gauged in terms of ***market*** share.

The next two sections provide background on global ***brand*** image management and customization/standardization ***strategies***. Then the research design and data collection procedures are described. Results are reported and their managerial and theoretical implications are discussed. Finally, areas for future research are suggested.

Global *Brand* Image Management

Despite the strategic importance of ***brand*** image, surprisingly little is known about the effects of ***brand*** image ***strategies*** across international ***markets***. In practice, firms within the same industry often differ in the extent to which they customize or standardize their ***brand*** images. In the

athletic shoe ***market***, for example, the two leading global competitors have very different ***strategies*** (Fireman 1991; Klopp and Sterlicchi 1990; Sloan 1993; Willigan 1992). Nike maintains a standardized fitness and performance image in all of the ***markets*** it serves. This functional image of fitness and performance is the basic platform underlying Nike's product development, styling, ***advertising***, promotions, merchandising, pricing, and so forth. Throughout the world, the same Nike ***brand*** image is evident. At the local ***market*** level, managers have discretion as to how they create and implement that image. Basketball, running, and cross-training represent Nike's largest ***market*** segments in the United States, but other sports are emphasized in Europe, such as soccer and cricket in the United Kingdom and windsurfing in France. In addition to using different national product mixes, Nike uses locally known sports and athletes to endorse its products, develops unique communication messages, uses different distribution outlets, and adopts separate pricing ***strategies*** across ***markets***. The common denominator is that in all ***markets***, each ***marketing*** program is designed to create and reinforce the same fitness and performance image. Nike's ***strategy*** is called pattern standardization (Peebles, Ryans, and Vernon 1977; Walters 1986) -- that is, Nike headquarters develops a global policy or theme (in this case a high-performance fitness image) to be used across all ***markets***, but gives local managers flexibility in creating and implementing the programs necessary to implement the theme.

Nike's major competitor, Reebok, customizes its image on the basis of national and regional differences it perceives in consumer tastes and preferences. Its managers believe that there are important ***market*** differences across continents (e.g., the U.S., Europe, and Asia), as well as nationalistic fragmentations (e.g., within Europe), that necessitate customized programs. Although Reebok currently uses the "Planet Reebok" ***advertising*** theme globally, the images conveyed differ across ***markets***. In the United States, for example, Reebok tries to balance lifestyle and athletic images. It stresses functional performance (like Nike), but places less emphasis on the athlete and more on the active person whose lifestyle includes, but is not dominated by, sports. Reebok uses both athlete and rock musician endorsers to ***advertise*** its ***brand*** in the United States, and frequently deepens its product line by adding colors and styles that have fashion appeal. In Western Europe, however, the ***brand*** image focuses more narrowly on athletics and performance, requiring fewer style varieties and relying primarily on athletic ***advertising*** themes. Unlike Nike, Reebok does not follow a ***strategy*** of ***brand*** image pattern standardization. Rather, it allows local flexibility in both ***brand*** image customization and subsequent ***marketing*** program adaptation for image creation and implementation.

To date, little is known about conditions affecting the degree to which ***companies*** such as Nike and Reebok choose to customize their ***brand*** image ***strategies***, or whether those ***strategies*** help explain their success against competitors. In a widely cited review and position paper, Jain (1989) identified five factors that may affect the success of ***marketing*** program customization: (1) target ***market***, (2) ***market*** position, (3) nature of the product, (4) ***marketing*** environment, and (5) organization factors. Research has begun to show that those factors do indeed relate to the firm's emphasis on customization. For example, Samiee and Reth (1992) found that firms are more likely to standardize their programs when the rate of technological change is high, and when they compete in industries where product changes are frequent. More empirical research is needed to explore the extent to which ***market*** conditions related to consumer behavior affect ***brand*** image ***strategy*** selection. Furthermore, research must begin to examine the effects of such factors on not only ***strategy*** selection, but also ***strategy*** effectiveness.

Park, Jaworski, and Macinnis (1986) have proposed a useful model of ***brand*** image ***strategies*** suggesting that managers should base their images on a particular consumer need (i.e., develop an image that relates to a functional, social, or sensory need). In an international context, research has shown that ***brand*** images incorporating fewer needs (a depth approach) tend to outperform those incorporating multiple needs (a breadth approach), and that the relationship between number of needs and business performance can be moderated by ***markets***' economic development, cultural context, and extent of competition (Roth 1992). Nike's standardized ***brand*** image is clearly very functional, as it emphasizes performance and fitness. Reebok's U.S. image combines functional (performance) and social (lifestyle) needs, whereas its European image ***strategy*** is strictly functional. An important yet unaddressed issue for international ***marketers*** is determining when it is appropriate (if at all) to customize needs-based ***brand*** images across ***markets***, and the extent to which such customization affects ***brand*** performance.

Market Conditions, *Brand* Image *Strategy*, and *Brand* Performance

Figure 1 is a diagram of the relationships among ***market*** conditions, ***strategy*** formulation, and ***brand*** performance. Examining these relationships requires two steps. First, the effects of hypothesized ***market*** conditions on managers' choice of ***brand*** image ***strategies*** is indicated by line (1). Second, effects on ***market*** share may be direct or indirect. In other words, ***brand*** image ***strategy*** may affect performance directly (line 2a), or its effect on performance may be moderated by the prevailing ***market*** conditions (line 2b).

Market Conditions Affecting the Decision to Customize or Standardize *Brand* Image

To manage ***brand*** images successfully internationally, managers must be cognizant of and responsive to important differences across international ***markets***. Various ***market*** conditions have been prescribed as important for determining when to customize or standardize ***marketing*** programs (see Jain's 1989 review). In relating those conditions to consumer needs and ***brand*** image management, managers have been advised to examine each foreign ***market***'s culture and socioeconomic environment to evaluate ***marketing*** opportunities.

Cultural ***Market*** Conditions. Environmental aspects (e.g., economic, social, cultural) of foreign ***markets*** have long been recommended as signals firms should use in deciding upon customized or standardized ***marketing*** programs (Buzzell 1968; Jain 1989; Onkvisit and Shaw 1987). Cultural differences across ***markets*** are an indicator that consumers in different nations have different needs, and hence may require tailored ***brand*** images. A commonly used typology of cultural characteristics developed and tested by Hofstede (1984) has been applied in international ***marketing*** settings (for a recent example relating Hofstede's typology to cross-national consumer behavior, see Lynn, Zinkhan, and Harris 1993). Three of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism, relate to the needs-based ***brand*** image framework. Power distance is a culture's degree of social inequality, and can be directly related to the use of social or symbolic ***brand*** image. For example, images that project social class status and affiliation (e.g., Levi's Dockers) will have more appeal the greater the culture's power distance. Uncertainty avoidance is the cultural pattern of seeking stability and predictability as opposed to change and new experiences, and can be related to the appeal of functional (stable) and sensory (experiential) images. For instance, innovative processing and great taste is the image Molson has created for its Molson Ice beer, an image that may be unsuitable where high uncertainty cultures where risk-averse consumers have little interest in new brewing techniques and flavors. Finally, individualism is people's tendency to value personal and individual time, freedom, and experiences, and can be related to the appeal of sensory and social images.

Although Nike's "just do it" image of individual freedom and boundless potential may work well in individualistic cultures, such an image may be less attractive to consumers in cultures where conformity is the norm. Hofstede's research revealed one other cultural dimension, masculinity, but no relationships between the needs-based ***brand*** image model and social gender differences are apparent.

In summary, when managers consider ***markets*** that differ in one or more of the cultural dimensions related to consumer needs, ***brand*** image customization may be appropriate. When cultural conditions are similar across ***markets***, standardization is likely to be preferable.

Socioeconomic ***Market*** Conditions. National socio-economic conditions that affect consumer spending and buying power are also important indicators of the feasibility of standardizing ***marketing*** programs. Consumption patterns, such as the use of functional self-sufficiency products by Zinderois Nigerians (who have very limited economic resources) and the use of symbolic and experiential products by affluent North ***Americans*** (Wallendorf and Arnould 1988), attest to the linkage between economics, consumer needs, and ***brand*** images. Information on the socioeconomic conditions of foreign nations is widely available and ranges from individual countries' government census reports to comprehensive computerized databases. One common indicator, GDP per capita, gives managers an overall assessment of a nation's income and thus its ability to spend money on goods and services. When countries differ greatly in GDP per capita or other socioeconomic indicators, managers should consider customizing their ***brand*** image unless they are targeting similar intermarket segments or have a product that is positioned as a functional, low cost ***brand*** (Roth 1995). When socioeconomic conditions are similar across countries and/or intermarket segments, standardization of ***brand*** image should be appropriate.

Consumer heterogeneity within any one country is likely to be high. Firms may benefit from seeking similar segments across ***markets*** and standardizing their ***marketing*** programs rather than customizing programs to appeal to different segments in different ***markets***. Such an approach of identifying and targeting distinct segments is being used by many firms in the U.S. that once had a single national ***strategy*** but are now establishing regional ***marketing*** programs (McKenna 1992; Mehrotra 1990). Similarities and differences in regional (city, town, province) ***market*** environmental characteristics may be useful for determining when customization and standardization are most appropriate Regional or intermarket socio-economic conditions relevant to consumer behavior include the extent to which consumers are mobile, have personal access to mass media, and live in urban areas, as those conditions shape their needs and the products they perceive as satisfying them (Belk 1988; Jain 1989; Keegan, Still, and Hill 1987; Keyritz 1982; O'Guinn, Lee and Faber 1986). Emphasis on media and mobility can lead too "demonstration effects" whereby exposure to Western materialism drives the consumption of hedonic goods when economic conditions are not well developed (Belk 1988; Keegan, Still, and Hill 1987; Keyfitz 1982; Nurske 1953). Regional socio-economics should be useful in intermarket assessment because socioeconomic similarity across cities or regions should provide opportunities for ***brand*** image standardization.

The following two research propositions summarize the anticipated effects of prevailing ***market*** conditions on manager's global ***brand*** image ***strategies*** (see line 1 in Figure 1):

> P1: Managers are more likely to customize global ***brand*** image when cultural variations (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism) across ***markets*** are high than when cultural variations across ***markets*** are low.

Conversely, managers are more likely to standardize global ***brand*** image when cultural variations across ***markets*** are low than when cultural variations across ***markets*** are high.

P2: Managers are more likely to customize global ***brand*** image when socioeconomic variations (national and/or intermarket) across ***markets*** are high than when socio-economic variations across ***markets*** are low.

Conversely, managers are more likely to standardize global ***brand*** image when socio-economic variations across ***markets*** are low than when socioeconomic variations across ***markets*** are high.

Market Conditions Moderating the Effects of *Brand* Image Customization on *Brand* Performance

In addition to considering ***market*** conditions, managers who are responsible for ***brand*** image ***strategy*** decisions need to gauge consumer response to ***marketing strategies***. An increasingly common approach is to assess a ***brand***'s performance in relation to that of other ***brands*** by measuring its ***market*** share (e.g., the Simon and Sullivan 1993 and Smith and Park 1992 studies assessing the effectiveness of ***brand*** extension ***strategies***). Of interest here is the relationship between ***brand*** image customization/standardization ***strategy*** and ***market*** share, and whether it is contingent on any of the ***market*** conditions.

The contingency perspective is important, as there is no reason to expect customization to be an inherently more successful ***strategy*** than standardization or vice versa. In fact, Samiee and Reth (1992) investigated the direct effect of degree of ***marketing*** standardization on product performance and found no significant relationship. The important question is what ***market*** conditions moderate the effects of ***marketing*** (specifically image) ***strategies*** on performance. Because culture and socio-economics affect consumer needs and responses to ***marketing*** stimuli, those ***market*** conditions affect the acceptance of standardized ***marketing*** programs (Aydin and Terpstra 1981; Jain 1989; Parameswaran and Yaprak 1987; Schiffman, Dillon, and Ngumah 1981; Wells 1994). As Friedmann (1986) suggests, standardization should be predicated on the meaning consumers will associate with the product in a given ***market***. Because ***brand*** image is the framework that establishes for consumers the needs the product will fulfill and thus the meaning they should associate with the ***brand***, the success of image ***strategies*** is contingent on their fit with local ***market*** conditions. When a new ***market*** is being evaluated for an established ***brand***, the cultural and/or socioeconomic conditions in that ***market*** are likely to affect the success of the ***brand***'s current image ***strategy***. If the conditions in the new ***market*** are similar to those in ***markets*** currently served, a standardized image is likely to yield commensurate ***brand*** performance. However, if conditions in the new ***market*** differ significantly from those in currently served ***markets***, the same (standardized) image may not attract and appeal to customers. The ***brand***'s performance is likely to be enhanced by modification of its image to match the local culture or socioeconomic environment. The moderating effects of ***market*** conditions on the success of global ***brand*** image ***strategies*** are summarized in the following two propositions (see line 2b in Figure 1):

P3: When cultural variations (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism) across ***markets*** are high, ***market*** share is greater when ***brand*** image is customized than when ***brand*** image is standardized. Conversely, when cultural variations across ***markets*** are low, ***market*** share is greater when ***brand*** image is standardized than when ***brand*** image is customized.

P4: When socioeconomic variations (national and/or intermarket) across ***markets*** are high, ***market*** share is greater when ***brand*** image is customized than when ***brand*** image is standardized.

Conversely, when socioeconomic variations across ***markets*** are low, ***market*** share is greater when ***brand*** image is standardized than when ***brand*** image is customized.

Finally, it is critical to understand which of the ***market*** conditions moderate the effects of ***brand*** image ***strategy*** on ***brand*** performance, and to determine whether those conditions are the ones on which managers are basing their image ***strategies***. When the ***market*** conditions affecting performance are not the same as those on which managers base their ***strategies***, ***brand*** image customization is likely to be less effective than it would be if all relevant ***market*** conditions were considered. Hence, a final proposition relates to the discrepancy between ***market*** conditions moderating performance and those on which managers base their image ***strategies***.

P5. ***Market*** share is larger (smaller) when the ***market*** conditions moderating the effects of ***brand*** image ***strategy*** on ***brand*** performance are (not) the same as those on which managers base their ***brand*** image ***strategies***.

Method

Countries and regions that differ in cultural and socioeconomic characteristics were identified. Socio-economic data were collected for each country (cultural and socioeconomic measures) and regional (socio-economic measures) ***market***. A questionnaire then was administered to ***marketing*** managers of consumer goods to determine the ***brand*** image and target ***marketing strategies*** used in those ***markets***. the extent of competitive and ***marketing*** implementation problems, and ***brand*** performance. Collectively, the secondary and primary data provided the means to examine the ***market*** conditions influencing managers' ***brand*** image ***strategies***, and the ***market*** conditions' moderating effects on ***strategy*** success.

Data Collection

Collection of the secondary and survey data consisted of five steps.

Step 1: Environmental database. A database of socio-economic characteristics was compiled for 60 regions (cities and towns) within 10 countries (Argentina, Belgium, China, France, Germany, Japan, Italy, Netherlands, Peru, and Yugoslavia). The 10 countries were chosen because of their social, economic, and cultural diversity (Hofstede 1984; World Bank 1990). National cultural characteristics were drawn from the indexes that Hofstede (1984) developed from an exhaustive attitudinal survey administered to more than 100,000 people in 66 countries. The respondents were well matched in occupation, sex, age, and other variables; the only systematic difference was in nationality. Hence, the indexes are appropriate for examining differences across countries. The three cultural characteristics incorporated into the environmental database were (1) power distance, (2) uncertainty avoidance, and (3) individualism. National socio-economics was assessed by using the common GDP per capita measure (World Bank 1990). Regional socioeconomic data (to assess differences across geographic intermarket segments) were drawn from a variety of publicly available statistical data sources. Because multiple variables were used to develop a socioeconomic profile for each region, a procedure to assure construct validity was necessary. As in other analyses of multi-item, multimarket socioeconomic data (e.g., Johansson and Moinpour 1977; Sethi 1971), factor analysis was used to develop a scale for assessing each regional ***market***. The data and procedures used are described in the Appendix.

Step 2: Questionnaire development. A survey instrument was developed that included questions about the ***brand*** image ***strategy*** used, target ***market strategy***, ***marketing*** implementation problems, and product performance for a ***brand*** in a particular regional ***market***. The questions were generated based on depth interviews with managers responsible for development of international consumer goods ***marketing*** programs. The questionnaire was pretested with managers who had similar responsibilities, and modifications made to the wording and scales. A final version was prepared for administration to ***marketing*** and product managers responsible for ***marketing*** their products in one or more of the 10 countries in the database.
Step 3: Sample. U.S. firms manufacturing ***branded*** consumer goods in the athletic shoe, beer, and blue jean categories were identified. The product categories (athletic shoes, beer, blue jeans) were chosen because of the diverse ***brand*** image ***strategies*** used to ***market*** them internationally (refer to the discussion of Nike and Reebok). In addition, many multinational ***companies*** compete in all three of these categories thus affording an opportunity to explore strategic performance across all of the regions in the database.
Step 4: Manager Identification. ***Marketing*** managers at each ***company*** were contacted by telephone and asked to identify the countries in which they ***marketed*** their products. For firms ***marketing*** multiple ***brands*** internationally, the ***brand*** with the most extensive geographic ***market*** presence was selected. The person contacted often provided the name(s) of another manager responsible for international ***marketing*** for a particular geographic region (e.g., Western Europe, Latin America) or country. If a firm ***marketed*** a ***brand*** in one or more ***markets*** within the 10 countries, the managers were asked to participate in a ***market*** research study examining the success of ***brand*** image ***strategies*** in international ***markets***.
Step 5 - Questionnaire administration. A questionnaire customized for each country, a cover letter, and $1.00 as a token of gratitude were mailed to each manager. The questionnaire contained items for each region within the country(ies) served by the firm. Reminder letters and questionnaires were mailed if a response was not received after two to three weeks.
Forty-one managers in 13 firms reported on 233 cases of a particular ***brand***'s image ***strategy***, competitive and implementation conditions, and performance in a particular regional ***market***. Respondents were managers in five athletic shoe, five blue jean, and three beer manufacturing ***companies***. In some cases multiple managers within a firm completed and returned questionnaires, but only one ***brand*** per firm was investigated. Many of the managers participating in the study were responsible for managing or overseeing a particular ***brand*** in multiple foreign ***markets***. For some firms, one manager provided all of the data; for other firms, multiple respondents provided data for particular countries or regions (e.g., one manager reported data for Germany, another for Japan). On average, each manager participating in the study reported six cases. Responses were evenly distributed across countries and regions for each product category (i.e., ***brands*** in each category were ***marketed*** across most of the 60 regions). In some cases, data were provided for the ***brand*** in all of the regions within a country, whereas in others data were reported only for a "lead" ***market*** (e.g., Paris). Thirty-three percent of all firms to which questionnaires were sent participated in the study. To assess the degree of nonresponse bias, a sample of 10 managers in firms that did not return questionnaires were contacted by telephone and asked to provide information on certain items (***brand*** image ***strategy***, target ***markets***, and ***marketing*** implementation problems). Nonrespondents did not differ from respondents. The most common reasons for not returning the questionnaire were lack of time, lack of regional-level data, and proprietary data concerns.

Measures

Intermarket Socio-economics. Regional or intermarket socio-economics was measured from the secondary data described in the Appendix. Factor scores were computed to determine the socioeconomic level for each of the 60 regions. The Anderson and Rubin method was followed to compute the factor scores, as it has been found to produce accurate estimates for use as independent variables in regression analyses (Lastovicka and Thamodaran 1991).

Brand Image Customization/Standardization. The questionnaire asked managers to characterize their ***brand***'s image in each particular regional ***market*** by allocating 100 points across three types of need-based images: functional, social, and sensory, with more points being allocated to the more emphasized images (see the Appendix for the question and the means and standard deviations). Managers could allocate 100% of the points to one need (depth approach), or allocate the points across two or three needs (breadth approach). Although the normative model suggests firms should select only one type of need when developing ***brand*** images (Park, Jaworski, and MacInnis 1986), research has shown that (1) firms tend not to emphasize only one need and (2) images emphasizing fewer needs tend to perform as well, if not better, than those based on multiple needs (Reth 1992). These findings indicate that managers feel it is either necessary and/or advantageous to diversify ***brand*** image across two or more needs. The survey responses were consistent with the previous findings in that no managers used a ***brand*** image based entirely on one need (i.e., the most points allocated to any one need was 75 of 100).

For the study, the extent to which managers customize their ***brand*** image across the international ***markets*** they serve had to be determined. Variation (or deviation) scores were developed to assess the degree of difference in a ***brand***'s image across ***markets***. Because differences between and across ***markets*** are of interest, not the absolute scores, a measure was developed for the similarity between a ***brand***'s image in one ***market*** and the average or typical image used across all of the ***markets*** served by the ***brand***.

Three steps were necessary to develop an image customization measure for each of the ***brands***. First, for each ***brand***, the mean emphasis placed on functional, social, and sensory needs across all ***markets*** served was calculated. Equation 1 shows the calculation used for each type of need.

(1) Multiple line equation(s) cannot be represented in ASCII text

where: I[sub ijk] = image score for the ith ***brand*** across j ***markets*** for k needs (functional, social, sensory)

n[sub i] = number of cases for the ith ***brand***

I[sub ik] = mean image score for the ith ***brand*** for k needs

Second, for each ***market*** in which a ***brand*** was sold, the emphasis placed on each need was subtracted from its respective across-***market*** mean (calculated in equation 1) and the difference was squared (e.g., the deviation between the mean functional cross-***market*** emphasis and the functional emphasis in each ***market***). This step provided squared functional, social, and sensory image deviations from the means for all ***markets*** in which the ***brand*** was sold. Equation 2 shows how the squared deviation (d[sub ijk]) for each ***brand*** in each ***market*** for each type of need was calculated.

(2) Multiple line equation(s) cannot be represented in ASCII text

Third, the image deviations were summed across the three types of needs to develop an overall ***brand*** image customization score, C[sub ij] (that accounts for functional, social, and sensory ***brand*** image deviation), for each ***brand*** in each ***market***, as shown in equation 3.

(3) Multiple line equation(s) cannot be represented in ASCII text

The ***brand*** image customization score, C[sub ij], represents the extent of ***brand*** image pattern customization/ standardization for a ***brand marketed*** in a particular region, based on the average or typical ***brand*** image ***strategy*** used across all of the international ***markets*** in which the ***brand*** was available.

As a validity check of the ***brand*** image customization scores, the extent of customization was related to the extent to which managers were targeting different types of consumers across ***markets***. Targeting the same types of customers across ***markets*** affords greater opportunities for a successful ***brand*** image standardization ***strategy*** (see Hill and Still 1984; Levitt 1983). The questionnaire asked managers to describe, in open-ended format, the types of customers they were targeting. Typical responses were demographic descriptions. Responses for each ***brand*** were coded as representing either the same types of consumers (assigned a value of l) or different types of consumers (assigned a value of 0) across all of the ***markets*** served. As expected, when ***brands*** were targeted to different types of consumers across ***markets***, managers customized their ***brand*** image much more than when ***brands*** were targeted to the same types of consumers (means = 311.17 and 11.69, respectively; $t = 5.42$, $p < .001$, one-tailed test). Hence, the customization score appears to be a valid assessment of cross-***market*** image variation.

Cultural and Socioeconomic Variability. A similar procedure was used to calculate variation in cultural power distance, cultural uncertainty avoidance, cultural individualism, national socio-economics, and regional socio-economics. For each of those variables, the mean value for each ***brand*** across all ***markets*** served was computed (refer to equation 1). A variation measure was then calculated by squaring the difference between the actual value in a given ***market*** and the ***brand***'s mean score across ***markets*** (refer to equation 2). These squared deviations represent the degree of variation between any one ***market*** served by a ***brand*** and the average across all of the ***markets*** served by the ***brand***.

Brand Performance. Managers indicated the ***brand***'s ***market*** share during the most recent annual period in each regional ***market***. Through the use of actual performance measures, ***brand*** image ***strategy*** could be related to ***market*** performance, an important yet neglected approach in international ***marketing*** research (Jain 1989; Keegan, Still, and Hill 1987). ***Market*** share was chosen because of its wide use as an indicator of performance among consumer product ***marketers*** (e.g., Smith and Park 1992), its association with a business's relative size in its served ***market*** (e.g., Buzzell and Gale 1987), and its consistent use in other international ***marketing*** studies examining effects on performance (e.g. Roth 1992, 1995; Ryans 1988; Szymanski, Bharadwaj, and Varadarajan 1993). Although ***market*** share is different from typical measures of communication effectiveness (e.g., ***brand*** awareness, ***brand*** attitude), the image ***strategies*** reported underlie the firm's entire ***marketing*** program--not just its ***advertising*** (Park, Jaworski, and MacInnis 1986), and therefore necessitate a measure that accounts for the entire ***marketing*** program's performance.

Covariate. A final set of measures were included in the study to account for barriers managers might face in implementing ***marketing strategies*** internationally. Successful ***brand*** image management requires the use of ***marketing*** tools (i.e., the ***marketing*** mix) to convey effectively the ***brand***'s meaning and its ability to satisfy customer needs (Park, Jaworski, and MacInnis

1986). If managers face difficulties in developing and implementing their ***advertising***, promotion, product, pricing, or distribution ***strategies***, they will have difficulty maintaining those ***strategies*** across ***markets***, and be less able to pursue global pattern standardization (Kreutzer 1988; Shimaguchi and Rosenberg 1979; Tajima 1973; Thorelli and Sentel 1982). Extent of ***marketing*** implementation problems was therefore included in the study as a covariate that might affect ***brand*** performance. Managers used four 7-point Likert scales to indicate the extent to which they were having problems with each ***marketing*** mix variable in each regional ***market*** (see the Appendix). All items were positively and highly correlated (all inter correlations were significant at $p < .01$, one-tailed test) and were combined into a summed scale. Cronbach's alpha for the four-item scale was .719. Hence, a single item titled "***marketing*** implementation problems" was created as a covariate for subsequent analyses.

Table I reports Pearson correlations and descriptive statistics for the variables used to examine the research propositions. Interestingly, ***brand*** image customization was not highly correlated with ***market*** share, indicating the same lack of relationship as was found between the degree of standardization and performance in other studies (Roth and Morrison 1990; Samiee and Roth 1992). Firms differed in the extent to which they customized their ***brand*** image. The procedure used to develop the customization scores provides a range from zero (total standardization) to 20,000 (total customization). As shown in Table 2, roughly half of the managers sampled had adopted a ***strategy*** of ***brand*** image pattern standardization and the others differed in the extent to which they customized their ***brand*** image. (For example, a firm with a totally functional image in all but one of its ***markets*** [approximately 100% functional] could use a totally social image in the remaining ***market*** [100% social]. The customization score for the unique ***market*** would be calculated as [100-0][sup 2] + [0-100][sup 2] = 20,000.) Not surprisingly, no firms customized a ***brand*** image to the extreme end of the customization scale, as doing so would be cost prohibitive and would preclude managers from leveraging current ***brand*** equity or organizational competencies.

Because of scale differences across the measures, and to reduce any possible multicollinearity, all of the ***market*** condition variables were centered (i.e., put in deviation score form with means of zero). This process is recommended for regression analyses with interaction terms as it helps ensure unbiased parameter estimates (e.g., Aiken and West 1991; Cronbach 1987; Dillon and Goldstein 1984; Marquardt 1980).

Results

Market Conditions Affecting *Strategy* Selection

To examine the first two propositions, the ***market*** condition variables were regressed on ***brand*** image customization. The objective of this analysis was to determine which ***market*** conditions were related to the extent to which managers customized their ***brand*** image. Because the data included responses for three product categories, the possible impact of category differences was examined first. Analysis of variance showed that the three categories were managed differently in terms of the extent of image customization ($F[sub\ 2,210] = 20.647$, $p < .001$). Post hoc Newman-Keuls tests ($p < .05$) showed the order of ***brand*** image customization across the three categories to be athletic shoes > blue jeans > beer. Because the three categories differ in pattern standardization, dummy variables for category effects were included in the subsequent analyses. Dummy variables also were used to account for within-category ***brand*** effects.

Table 3 gives the results of the multiple regression analysis on extent of ***brand*** image customization. Three environmental ***market*** conditions are related statistically to ***brand*** image

customization at p < .05. Specifically, the greater the variation in cultural uncertainty avoidance (beta = .086, p < .05), individualism (beta = .142, p < .01), and national socio-economics (beta = .276, p < .01), the more likely managers were to customize their ***brand*** image. Cultural power distance and intermarket socio-economics are not related statistically to extent of customization, indicating that those ***market*** conditions are not related to ***brand*** image ***strategy*** decisions. Hence, although many ***market*** conditions have been prescribed as useful in ***brand*** image ***strategy*** decisions (e.g., Onkvisit and Shaw 1987), consumer goods managers appear to use a subset of those conditions, primarily cultural and socio-economic differences across national ***markets*** in setting ***brand*** image ***strategy***. P1 and P2 are therefore partially supported.

Moderating Effects of *Market* Conditions on the Success of *Brand* Image *Strategies*

P3 and P4 posit moderating effects of ***market*** conditions on the relationship between ***brand*** image customization/standardization ***strategies*** and ***market*** share. Because the success of ***brand*** image ***strategy*** is proposed to be contingent on the ***market*** conditions in which the ***strategy*** is implemented, main or direct effects of ***brand*** image ***strategy*** on ***market*** share are not anticipated to be significant. Rather, the effects on performance from the interaction between the ***market*** conditions and ***strategy*** are of interest. Such a contingency framework is necessary when combinations of exogenous variables are expected to affect an endogenous variable (e.g., Aiken and West 1991; Baron and Kenny 1986).

Table 4 reports the results from a multiple regression on ***market*** share in which the independent variables (***market*** conditions, image customization, and ***marketing*** implementation problems, with product category and ***brand*** covariates) were included in the model first, followed by the ***brand*** image customization by ***market*** condition interactions. With this technique, significant interaction coefficients indicate that the interaction terms explain significantly more variance in ***market*** share (i.e., they significantly increase R[sup 2]) than the main effects alone. As the results show, the model explains a significant amount of variance in ***market*** share (adjusted R[sup 2] = .411; F = 7.397, p < .001). Four of the five interactions were positive and statistically significant at p < .01. These results suggest that when managers customize their ***brand*** image in response to variation in cultural power distance (beta = .414), individualism (beta = .386), and variation in national (beta = .569) and intermarket socio-economics (beta = .286), their ***brand***'s performance will be enhanced.

Customizing in response to cultural uncertainty avoidance, however, does not appear to affect ***market*** share. Thus, P4 (socioeconomic conditions) is supported and P3 (cultural conditions) is partially supported.

To illustrate the significant image customization by ***market*** condition interactions, those relationships were decomposed by the procedure outlined by Aiken and West (1991). High, medium, and low levels corresponding to (1) one standard deviation, above the mean, (2) the mean, and (3) one standard deviation below the mean, respectively, were computed for each of the ***market*** conditions (Cohen and Cohen 1975). The high, medium, or low level represents the "conditional level" of the ***market*** condition variable (Darlington 1990). For each of the four ***market*** conditions, regression analyses were conducted in which the conditional level of the ***market*** condition was varied. The resulting ***brand*** image customization coefficients were then examined and t-tests were used to assess whether their slopes differed from zero, indicating whether the regression of ***market*** share on ***brand*** image was positive or negative at different levels of the ***market*** condition.

Table 5 gives the results of the interaction decompositions. At high conditional levels of the ***market*** condition variables (***market*** condition one standard deviation above its mean), ***brand*** image customization tends to be related positively ($p < .05$) to ***market*** share. These findings support the notion that when ***market*** condition variation is high, customizing ***brand*** image improves ***market*** share. At medium levels,***brand*** image customization coefficients are all lower than those found at high levels and customization is not significantly related to ***market*** share. At low conditional levels (***market*** condition is one standard deviation below its mean), ***brand*** image customization coefficients are all lower than those found at the medium level and are close to or less than zero. Furthermore, in three of the four equations, the ***brand*** image customization coefficient is negative and statistically significant ($p < .05$), indicating that when ***market*** condition variation is low, greater customization significantly reduces ***market*** share. These results suggest that under low ***market*** variation conditions (other than intermarket socio-economics), standardizing is more appropriate than customizing the pattern of ***brand*** images across ***markets***. Collectively, the results confirm that the success of pattern ***brand*** image customization is contingent on national and intermarket cultural and socioeconomic cross-***market*** variation.

Incremental Value of *Market* Conditions

P5 suggests that ***brands*** will have a smaller ***market*** share if managers who develop ***strategy*** fail to consider ***market*** conditions that affect performance. The results in Table 4 indicate that four ***market*** conditions--cultural power distance, individualism, and national and intermarket socio-economics--moderate the effects of ***brand*** image customization on ***market*** share. The results in Table 3, however, show that managers' use of a customization ***strategy*** is related to only two of those conditions (individualism and national socio-economics). Does incorporating information on the additional ***market*** conditions--cultural power distance and intermarket socio-economics--incrementally enhance the success of pattern ***brand*** image customization ***strategies***? A partial F-test (Kleinbaum and Kupper 1978) was used to determine whether ***market*** share is improved when, with all other significant interactions taken into account, the moderating effects of power distance or intermarket socio-economics are added to the model. The regression model in Table 4 was first constructed so that the customization by power distance interaction was entered last. The partial F-test showed that the interaction was significant (partial F[sub 1,233] = 7.03, $p < .01$), indicating that including the moderating effect of power distance improves R[sup 2] (explains variance in ***market*** share). The model was then constructed so that the customization by intermarket socio-economics interaction term was entered last, and the partial F-test showed that the moderating effect of intermarket socio-economics was also significant in explaining ***market*** share variance (partial F[sub 1,233] = 3.91, $p < .05$). Hence, P5 is supported--managers should consider cultural power distance and intermarket socio-economic variations when developing ***brand*** image ***strategies***.

Discussion and Implications

Marketing managers in consumer goods ***companies*** often customize ***brand*** image across international ***markets***. The study findings show that the extent to which managers customize versus standardize ***brand*** image is related to variations in national environmental ***market*** conditions. When ***markets*** differ in cultural uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and national socio-economics, managers tend to respond by using an image customization ***strategy***. When ***markets*** do not differ cross-nationally in those conditions, managers are much more likely to use an image standardization ***strategy***. Although these findings are consistent with prescribed

management ***strategy*** (e.g., Jain 1989; Onkvisit and Shaw 1987), ***brand*** image ***strategy*** does not appear to have been a response to other frequently mentioned ***market*** conditions. First, not all cultural conditions were equally valued by managers. Power distance, for example, was not related to managers' ***brand*** image ***strategy*** selection, but uncertainty avoidance and individualism were. Second, although the notion of targeting and developing ***strategies*** for intermarket segments has received both domestic and international attention (e.g., Douglas and Wind 1987; Kale and Sudharshan 1987; McKenna 1992; Mehrotra 1990), intermarket socio-economic differences do not appear related to selection of ***brand*** image ***strategy***. Hence, in developing and implementing their ***brand*** image ***strategies***, managers seem to be using fewer ***market*** indicators than previous research has recommended.

Such reliance on limited information may adversely affect ***brand*** performance. As the study findings show, consideration of cultural individualism and national socio-economics does in fact enable managers to enhance the effectiveness of their ***brand*** image ***strategies***. They can improve their ***strategy*** further, however, by also incorporating information on cultural power distance and intermarket socio-economics in decision making. Broadening the scope of information used to assess ***market*** variation would afford better insight into key cross-***market*** differences, thereby ensuring the selection of the most appropriate ***brand*** image ***strategy***. In short, managers can enhance ***brand*** performance by broadening the information they use in making global ***brand*** image ***strategy*** decisions.

Brand image ***strategies***, then, should be tailored to foreign ***markets***' cultural and socioeconomic conditions. When a firm's current ***markets*** are similar in terms of national and intermarket environmental conditions, a currently successful ***brand*** image theme may be standardized for use in the other global ***markets***. Managers can then consider what changes, if any, should to be made in the ***marketing*** mix to successfully implement the standardized ***brand*** image. Conversely, when international ***markets*** differ in national and intermarket environmental conditions, the pattern standardization ***strategy*** is not recommended. Rather, firms should strongly consider a customization ***strategy***. To customize ***brand*** image, managers will need to customize the ***marketing*** mix -- in particular the ***advertising*** campaigns that illustrate the ***brand***'s features, benefits, uses, and other characteristics, which in turn convey the desired image to target customers. Managers must remain aware, however, that once a ***brand***'s image has been customized (e.g., by shifting relative emphasis from social to more functional needs), environmental changes over time may necessitate further ***brand*** image adjustments. The conditions that moderate the success of ***brand*** image customization/standardization ***strategies*** are dynamic, not static, and therefore must be monitored on a regular basis.

Limitations and Future Research

The study findings provide a starting point for identifying the ***market*** conditions managers consider in forming their global ***brand*** image ***strategies***, and the relationships between various ***market*** conditions and the success of those ***strategies***. Because additional work is certainly needed, suggestions are offered for conceptual and methodological improvements and enhancements.

The findings can be generalized to some extent to consumer goods that can be positioned on a variety of consumer needs. The study examined ***strategies*** and performance measures for three product categories (athletic shoes, blue jeans and beer). Efforts were made to control for category effects, but additional work is needed to explore the generalizability of the results. ***Market*** condition effects on ***strategy*** selection and ***strategy*** success should be investigated across a wider

variety of consumer goods and services categories that differ in the ***brand*** image approaches used (e.g., shampoo, toothpaste, fast food franchises). Furthermore, although much of the research on ***brand*** image has pertained to consumer goods (e.g., Aaker and Keller 1990; Park, Milberg, and Lawson 1991), business revenue comes mostly from industrial goods and increasingly from services. How managers decide on image ***strategies*** for industrial goods and for services and the conditions affecting the success of those ***strategies*** are issues that should be addressed.

Further analysis is needed on potential moderators of ***brand*** image success. Jain (.1989) proposed other environmental (e.g., ***marketing*** infrastructure) and organizational (e.g, orientation, authority) factors that may moderate ***marketing*** program effectiveness. How firms allocate resources, especially across ***marketing*** tools and tactics that communicate ***brand*** image information, may affect ***brand*** performance (Szymanski, Bharadwaj, and Varadarajan 1993). Recent conceptual advances and measures from research on strategic and industry drivers (Szymanski, Bharadwaj, and Varadarajan 1993), ***marketing*** control systems (Jaworski 1988; Jaworski and MacInnis 1989), and ***market*** orientation (Kohli and Jaworski 1990; Narver and Slater 1990) may provide insights about possible antecedents of ***brand*** image ***strategy*** decisions and their moderating effects on product performance.

With any empirical study, measurement improvements are possible and important for future research. The survey-based data used in the study should be compared with other possible measures. The ***brand*** image data represented managers' assessments of the image intended to be perceived by consumers. The meaning consumers attach to a ***brand*** may differ from what managers intend. Any variance between what managers intend and what customers perceive is due to the development and execution of the ***marketing*** mix, ***advertising*** in particular. To address this validity issue, consumer perceptions of ***brand*** images and ***psychological*** meanings should be measured (Friedmann and Zimmer 1988). One data collection procedure would be to have consumers evaluate ***advertising*** content as a means of assessing perceived ***brand*** image. Content analysis of ***advertising*** has been used frequently in international ***marketing*** research (e.g., Mueller 1987; Tse, Belk, and Zhou 1989). Other approaches that take into account not just ***advertising*** but the entire ***marketing*** program should also be considered (see Dobni and Zinkhan 1990). They might include open-ended survey questions asking respondents to free-associate their thoughts and feelings about the ***brand*** (e.g., Broniarczyk and Alba 1994) and personal interviews that elicit detailed image associations (e.g., Blacksten 1992; Keller 1993; Levy 1985). Such approaches would provide richer ***brand*** meanings/images than can be obtained from managers.

In addition, the measure of ***marketing*** implementation problems consisted of items capturing the overall difficulties managers faced in implementing the four Ps. Other types of problems related to ***strategy*** development may also be important. For example, information about the ability to identify customer segments, the availability of competitive intelligence, and the presence of opportunities for differentiation may afford clearer insight about the types of barriers managers face in developing their global ***brand*** image ***strategies***. Finally, given the critical role of ***advertising*** in communicating ***brand*** images to consumers, specific problems in implementing communication campaigns might also be related to image ***strategy*** selection and subsequent ***brand*** performance, and hence warrant research.

The author thanks Kusum Ailawadi, Larry Feick, Rajiv Glover, Tim Heath, Gerald Zaltman, George Zinkhan and the reviewers for their helpful comments.

Table 1

Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

Legend of Chart:

A - ***Market*** Share
B - ***Brand*** Image Customization
C - Cultural Power Distance Variation
D - Cultural Uncertainty Avoidance Variation
E - Cultural Individualism Variation
F - National Socio-economic Variation
G - Intermarket Socio-economic Variation

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Brand Image Customization	.276	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cultural Power Distance Variation	.091	-.123	--	--	--	--	--
Cultural Uncertainty Avoidance Variation	-.131	-.224	.291	--	--	--	--
Cultural Individualism Variation	.136	.067	.375	.221	--	--	--
National Socioeconomic Variation	.172	-.072	.089	-.209	.478	--	--
Intermarket Socioeconomic Variation	.050	-.058	.016	-.074	.372	.594	--
Mean	11.04	210.72	116.62	109.49	248.81	20129629	.67
SD	6.32	447.38	118.52	160.54	333.75	25952378.4	1.14
Range-high	34	1948	436	545.29	1090	74339649	6.84
Range-low	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

n = 233

Table 2
Extent of ***Brand*** Image Customization/Standardization
Across ***Markets***

	Range of ***Brand*** Image Customization (a)	Frequency	Percent
Standardization	0	97	45.5
	1-25	35	16.4
	26-35	11	5.2
	36-50	12	5.6
	51-100	11	5.2
	101-250	4	1.9
	251-500	1	0.5
	501-700	6	2.8
	701-825	17	8
	826-1000	6	2.8
	1001-1500	7	3.3
Customization	1501-2000	6	2.8

(a) ***Brand*** image customization was computed by using the sum of three squared deviation scores whose ranges were all 0 to 100. Hence, the lowest possible ***brand*** customization score is 0, representing total ***brand*** image standardization, and the highest possible score is 20,000, representing total customization.

Table 3

Multiple Regression on ***Brand*** Image Customization

Legend for Chart:

A - Standardized Coefficient
B - t-Value

	A	B
Predictors		
Cultural Power Distance Variation	-.073	-1.209
Cultural Uncertainty Avoidance Variation	.086	2.07[*]
Cultural Individualism Variation	.142	3.421[**]
National Socioeconomic Variation	.276	5.460[**]
Intermarket Socioeconomic Variation	.066	1.636
Covariates		
Product Category Dummy 1	-.341	-7.401[**]
Product Category Dummy 2	.069	1.337
Brand Dummy 1	.153	2.685[**]
Brand Dummy 2	.112	1.708
Brand Dummy 3	-.070	-1.606
Brand Dummy 4	.003	0.066
Brand Dummy 5	-.045	-0.924
Brand Dummy 6	.076	1.290

Brand Dummy 7	.043	0.953
Brand Dummy 8	.059	1.033
Brand Dummy 9	-.064	-1.125
Brand Dummy 10	.084	1.538
Adjusted R-square	.395	
F-value	10.984[**]	
n = 233		

** p < .01

* p < .05

Table 4

Multiple Regression on ***Market*** Share

	Standardized Coefficient	t-Value
Interactions		
Customization X Power Distance Variation	.414	5.921[**]
Customization X Uncertainty Variation	.164	1.492
Customization X Individualism Variation	.386	4.459[**]
Customization X National Socioeconomic Var.	.569	7.014[**]
Customization X Intermarket Socioeconomic Var.	.286	3.216[**]
Main Effects		
Brand Image Customization	.167	1.533
Cultural Power Distance Variability	-.106	-1.088
Cultural Uncertainty Avoidance ariability	.104	0.987
Cultural Individualism Variability	.204	2.280[*]
National Socio-economics Variability	.258	3.091[**]
Intermarket Socio-economics Variability	.019	0.356
Covariates		
Marketing Implementation Problems	-.283	-3.035[**]
Product Category Dummy 1	.198	2.062[a]
Product Category Dummy 2	-.082	-1.007
Brand Dummy 1	-.071	-0.793
Brand Dummy 2	.068	0.875
Brand Dummy 3	.063	1.160
Brand Dummy 4	.293	3.463[**]
Brand Dummy 5	-.207	-2.284[*]
Brand Dummy 6	.511	6.913[**]
Brand Dummy 7	.062	1.092
Brand Dummy 8	.044	0.795
Brand Dummy 9	.059	0.882
Brand Dummy 10	-.103	-0.926

Adjusted R-square	.411
F-value	7.397[**]

n = 233
** p < .01
* p < .05

Table 5
Decomposition of Significant Interactions on ***Market*** Share:
Standardized Regression Coefficients and t-values

Legend of Chart:

A - High, beta
B - high, t-Value
C - Medium, beta
D - Medium, t-Value
E - Low, beta
F - Low, t-Value

	A D	B E	C F
Effect on ***Brand*** Image Customization at different levels of . . .			
Cultural Power Distance	.283	3.283[**]	.167
Variation (a)	1.533	-.186	-1.873[*]
Cultural Individualism	.256	3.002[**]	.167
Variation	1.533	-.333	-3.628[**]
National Socioeconomic	.401	5.557[b]	.167
Variation	1.533	-.174	-1.799[*]
Intermarket Socioeconomic	.244	2.834[b]	.167
Variation	1.533	.035	0.593

** p < .01
* p < .05
(a) Each line shows ***brand*** image customization coefficients for three regression equations. For example, the first line shows the coefficient when power distance variation is one standard deviation above its mean (high; beta=.283), the coefficient when power distance variation is at its mean (medium; beta=.167), and the coefficient when power distance variation is one standard deviation below its mean (low; beta=.186). All other main and interaction effects are included in each equation.

DIAGRAM: Figure 1: Relationships Among ***Market*** Conditions, ***Brand*** Image ***Strategy***, and ***Brand*** Performance

References

Aaker, David A. and Kevin Lane Keller (1990), "Consumer Evaluations of ***Brand*** Extensions," Journal of ***Marketing***, 54 (January), 27-41.

Acito, Frank and Ronald D. Anderson (1986), "A Simulation Study of Factor Score Indeterminancy," Journal of ***Marketing*** Research, 23 (May), 111-18.

Aiken, Leona S. and Stephen G. West (1991), Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Intercations, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Arrindell, Willem A. and Jan van der Ende (1985), "An Empirical Test of the Utility of the Observation-Variables Ratio in Factor and Components Analysis," Applied ***Psychological*** Measurement, 9 (June), 165-78.

Aulakh, Preet S. and Masaaki Kotabe (1993), "An Assessment of Theoretical and Methodological Development in International ***Marketing***: 1980-1990," Journal of International ***Marketing***, 1 (2), 5-28.

Aydin, N. and Vern Terpstra (1981), "***Marketing*** Know-How Transfers by MNCs: A Case Study of Turkey," Journal of International Business Studies, 12 (Winter), 35-48.

Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny (1986), "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social ***Psychological*** Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51 (6), 1173-82.

Belk, Russell W. (1988), "Third World Consumer Culture," in ***Marketing***'s Contribution to Development, Research in ***Marketing***, Supplement 4, E. Kumcu and A. F. Firat, eds., Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 103-27.

Blackston, Max (1992), "Building ***Brand*** Equity by Managing the ***Brand***'s Relationships," Journal of ***Advertising*** Research, 32 (May/June), 79-83.

Boote, Alfred S. (1983), "Psychographic Segmentation in Europe," Journal of ***Advertising*** Research, 22 (December/January), 1925.

Broniarczyk, Susan M. and Joseph W. Alba (1994), "The Importance of the ***Brand*** in ***Brand*** Extension," Journal of ***Marketing*** Research, 31 (May), 214-28.

Buzzell, Robert (1968), "Can You Standardize Multinational ***Marketing***?" Harvard Business Review. 46 (November-December), 102-13.

----- and Bradley T. Gale (1987), The PIMS Principles: Linking ***Strategy*** to Performance, New York: The Free Press.

Cohen, Jacob and Patricia Cohen(1975), Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cronbach, Lee J. (1987), "Statistical Tests for Moderator Variables: Flaws in Analysis Recently Proposed," ***Psychological*** Bulletin, 102 (3), 414-17.

Darlington, R. B. (1990), Regression and Linear Models, New York: McGraw-Hill Book ***Company***.

Dillon, William R. and Matthew Goldstein (1984), Multivariate Analysis: Methods and Applications, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dohni, Dawn and George M. Zinkhan (1990), "In Search of ***Brand*** Image: A Foundation Analysis," in Advances in Consumer Research, 17, M. Goldberg, G. Corn and R. Pollay, eds. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 110-19.

Douglas, Susan P. and Yoram Wind (1987), "The Myth of Globalization," Columbia Journal of World Business, 22 (4), 19-29.

Fireman, Paul (1991), "Four Essentials of Leadership," Directors and Boards, 16 (Fall), 29-30.

Friedmann, Roberto (1986), "The ***Psychological*** Meaning of Products: A Simplification of the Standardization vs. Adaptation Debate," Columbia Journal of World Business, 21 (Summer), 97-104.
----- and Mary R. Zimmer (1988), "The Role of ***Psychological*** Meaning in ***Advertising***," Journal of ***Advertising***, 17 (1), 31-40.
Hill, John S. and Richard R. Still (1984), "Effects of Urbanization on Multinational Product Planning: ***Markets*** in LDCs," Columbia Journal of World Business, 19 (Summer), 62-7.
Hofstede, Geert (1984), Culture's Consequences, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
Huszagh, Sandra M., Richard J. Fox and Ellen Day (1986), "Global ***Marketing***: An Empirical Investigation," Columbia Journal of World Business, 21 (4), 31-43.
Jaffe, Eugene D. (1974), Grouping: A ***Strategy*** for International ***Marketing***, New York: ***American*** Management Association.
Jain, Subhash C. (1989), "Standardization of International ***Marketing Strategy***: Some Research Hypotheses," Journal of ***Marketing***, 53 (January), 70-9.
Jaworski, Bernard J. (1988), "Toward a Theory of ***Marketing*** Control: Environmental Context, Control Types, and Consequences," Journal of ***Marketing***, 52 (July), 23-39.
----- and Deborah J. MacInnis (1989), "***Marketing*** Jobs and Management Controls: Toward a Framework," Journal of ***Marketing*** Research, 26 (November), 406-19.
Johansson, Johny K. and Reza Moinpour (1977), "Objective and Perceived Similarity of Pacific Rim Countries," Columbia Journal of World Business, 11 (Winter), 65-76.
Kale, Sudhir H. and D. Sudharshan (1987), "A Strategic Approach to International Segmentation," International ***Marketing*** Review, 4 (Summer), 60-71.
Keegan, Warren J., Richard R. Still and John S. Hill (1987), "Transferability and Adaptability of Products and Promotion Themes in Multinational ***Marketing***--MNCs in LDCs," Journal of Global ***Marketing***, 1 (Fall/Winter), 85-103.
Keller, Kevin Lane (1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based ***Brand*** Equity, Journal of ***Marketing***, 57 (January), 1-22.
Keyfitz, Nathan (1982), "Development and the Elimination of Poverty," Economic Development and Cultural Change, 30 (3), 649-70.
Kleinbaum, David G. and Lawrence L. Kupper (1978), Applied Regression Analysis and Other Multivariate Methods, Boston: Duxbury Press.
Klopp, Charlotte and John Sterlicchi (1990), "Footwear ***Companies*** Set Global Campaigns," ***Marketing*** News (December 4), 10, 14.
Kohli, Ajay K. and Bernard J. Jaworski (1990), "***Market*** Orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications," Journal of ***Marketing***, 54 (April), 1-18.
Kreutzer, Rail Thomas (1988), "***Marketing***-Mix Standardisation: An Integrated Approach in Global ***Marketing***," European Journal of ***Marketing***, 22 (10), 19-30.
Lastovicka, John L. and Kanchana Thamodaran (1991), "Common Factor Score Estimates in Multiple Regression Problems," Journal of ***Marketing*** Research, 28 (February), 105-12.
Levitt, Theodore (1983), "The Globalization of ***Markets***," Harvard Business Review, 61 (3), 92-102.
Levy, Sidney (1985), "Dreams, Fairy Tales, Animals, and Cars," Psychology and ***Marketing***, 2 (Summer), 67-81.
Lynn, Michael, George M. Zinkhan and Judy Harris (1993), "Consumer Tipping: A Cross-Country Study," Journal of Consumer Research, 20 (December), 478-88.

Marquardt, D. W. (1980), "You Should Standardize Predictor Variables in Your Regression Models," Journal of the ***American*** Statistical Association, 75, 87-91.
Martenson, Rita (1989), "International ***Advertising*** in Cross-Cultural Environments," Journal of International Consumer ***Marketing***, 2 (1), 7-18.
McKenna, Shawn (1992), The Complete Guide to Regional ***Marketing***, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.
Mehrotra, Sunil (1990), "Strategic Regional ***Marketing***: Two Plus Two Equals Six," Journal of ***Advertising*** Research, 30 (December/January), 9-17.
Mueller, Barbara (1987), "Reflections of Culture: An Analysis of Japanese and ***American Advertising*** Appeals," Journal of ***Advertising*** Research, 27 (June/July), 51-9.
Narver, John C. and Stanley F. Slater (1990), "The Effect of ***Market*** Orientation on Business Profitability," Journal of ***Marketing***, 54 (October), 20-35.
Nurske, Ragnar (1953), Problems of Capital Formation in Undeveloped Countries, New York: Oxford University Press.
Ogilvy, David (1963), Confessions of an ***Advertising*** Man, New York: Ballantine.
O'Guinn, Thomas, Wei-Na Lee, and Ronald J. Faber (1986), "Acculturation: The Impact of Divergent Paths on Buyer Behavior," in Advances in Consumer Research, 13, R. J. Lutz, ed. Provo UT: Association for Consumer Research, 579-583.
Onkvisit, Sak and John J. Shaw (1987), "Standardized International ***Advertising***: A Review and Critical Evaluation of the Theoretical and Empirical Evidence," Columbia Journal of World Business, 22(3), 43-56.
Parameswaran, Ravi and Attila Yaprak (1987), "A Cross-National Comparison of Consumer Research Measures," Journal of International Business Studies, 18 (Spring), 35-50.
Park, C. Whan, Bernard J. Jaworski, and Deborah J. MacInnis (1986), "Strategic ***Brand*** Concept-Image Management," Journal of ***Marketing***, 50 (October), 135-45.
-----, Sandra Milberg and Robert Lawson (1991), "Evaluation of ***Brand*** Extensions: The Role of Product Feature Similarity and ***Brand*** Concept Consistency," Journal of Consumer Research, 18 (September), 185-93.
Peebles, D. M., J. K. Ryans, Jr., and I. R. Vernon (1977), "A New Perspective on ***Advertising*** Standardisation," European Journal of ***Marketing***, 11 (8), 567-76.
Quelch, John A. and Edward J. Hoff (1986), "Customizing Global ***Marketing***," Harvard Business Review, 64 (May-June), 59-68.
Reynolds, Thomas J. and Jonathan Gutman (1984), "***Advertising*** is Image Management," Journal of ***Advertising*** Research, 24 (February/March), 27-37.
Roth, Kendall and Alien J. Morrison (1990), "An Empirical Analysis of the Integration-Responsiveness Framework in Global Industries," Journal of International Business Studies, 21 (4), 541-64.
Roth, Martin S. (1992) "Depth Versus Breadth ***Strategies*** for Global ***Brand*** Image Management," Journal of ***Advertising***, 21 (June), 25-36.
----- (1995), "The Effects of Culture and Socioeconomics on the Performance of Global ***Brand*** Image ***Strategies***," Journal of ***Marketing*** Research, 32 (May), 163-175.
Ryans, Adrian B. (1988), "Strategic ***Market*** Entry Factors and ***Market*** Share Achievement in Japan," Journal of International Business Studies, 19 (Fall), 389-409.
Samiee, Saeed and Kendall Roth (1992), "The Influence of Global ***Marketing*** Standardization on Performance," Journal of ***Marketing***, 56 (April), 1-17.

Schiffman, Leon G., William R. Dillon, and Festus E. Ngumah (1981), "The Influence of Subcultural and Personality Factors on Consumer Acculturation," Journal of International Business Studies, 12 (Fall), 137-43.
Sethi, S. Prakash (1971), "Comparative Cluster Analysis for World ***Markets***," Journal of ***Marketing*** Research, 8 (August), 348-54.
Shimaguchi, Mistsuaki and Larry J. Rosenberg (1979), "Demystifying Japanese Distribution," Columbia Journal of World Business, 14 (Spring), 32-41.
Simon, Carol J. and Mary W. Sullivan (1993), "The Measurement and Determinants of ***Brand*** Equity: A Financial Approach," ***Marketing*** Science, 12 (Winter), 28-52.
Sloan, Pat (1993), "Why Reebok Fired Chiat, Once and For All," ***Advertising*** Age, September 20, 3, 38.
Smith, Daniel C. and C. Whan Park (1992), "The Effects of ***Brand*** Extensions on ***Market*** Share and ***Advertising*** Efficiency," Journal of ***Marketing*** Research, 29 (August), 296-313.
Szymanski, David M., Sundar G. Bharadwaj and P. Rajan Varadarajan (1993), "Standardization versus Adaptation of International ***Marketing Strategy***: An Empirical Investigation," Journal of ***Marketing***, 57 (October), 1-17.
Tajima, Yoshihiro (1973), Outline of Japanese Distribution Structures, Tokyo: Distribution Economics Institute of Japan.
Thorelli, Hans B. and Gerald D. Sentel (1982), "The Ecology of Consumer ***Markets*** in Less and More Developed Countries," European Journal of ***Marketing***, 16 (6), 53-62.
Tse, David K., Russell W. Belk and Nan Zhou (1989), "Becoming a Consumer Society: A Longitudinal and Cross-Cultural Content Analysis of Print Ads from Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China, and Taiwan," Journal of Consumer Research, 15 (March), 457-72.
Wallendorf, Melanie and Eric J. Arnould (1968), "My Favorite Things": A Cross-Cultural Inquiry into Object Attachment, Possessiveness, and Social Linkage," Journal of Consumer Research, 14 (March), 531-47.
Walters, Peter G. P. (1986), "International ***Marketing*** Policy: A Discussion of the Standardization Construct and its Relevance for Corporate Policy," Journal of International Business Studies, 17 (Summer), 55-69.
Wells, Ludmilla Gricenko (1994), "Western Concepts, Russian Perspectives: Meanings of ***Advertising*** in the Former Soviet Union," Journal of ***Advertising***, 23 (March), 83-95.
Willigan, Geraldine E. (1992), "High-Performance ***Marketing***: An Interview with Nike's Phil Knight," Harvard Business Review, 70 (July-August), 91-101.
World Bank (1990), World Development Report 1990, Washington, DC: Oxford University Press.

~~~~~~~~

By Martin S. Roth
Martin S. Roth (Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh) is Associate Professor in the ***Marketing*** Department at the Carroll School of Management, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.

Source: Journal of ***Advertising***, Winter95
~~~~~~~~