GLOBAL BRAND PURCHASE INTENTIONS AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONSUMER

James Haefner, University of St. Francis, USA
Al Rosenbloom, Dominican University, USA
Margaret Haefner, North Park University, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the research findings of a global brand study conducted in South Africa. This empirical research sought to evaluate the relative contribution of the following eight constructs on global brand purchase intent: country of origin, brand familiarity, brand liking, brand trust, ethnocentrism, cosmopolitanism, global-local identify, global consumer culture and exposure to multinational advertising. Step-wise regression models were used for the study's ten brands. The regression models indicated that brand liking and brand trust were the most important predictors of global brand purchase intent in the studied sample of South African consumers.

INTRODUCTION

By all accounts, South Africa is the economic powerhouse of southern Africa. Not only is South Africa the largest economy in Africa, it also accounted for one-third of all African GNP between 2001-2008 on a purchasing power parity basis (Arora & Vamvakidis, 2009). Other indicators of South Africa's economic vitality include: a world class financial system, strong FDI growth, stability of the Rand, a rising middle class, a vibrant tourism sector, and an increasing per capita GDP. In the 20011/2012 *Global Competitiveness Report*, South Africa was ranked 50th about of the 142 countries profiled. The cumulative effect of South Africa's post-Apartheid (post-1994) development has seen a substantial increase in a black middle class. Yet, as the black middle class has grown, so has the disparity between affluent and poor South Africans. In 2010, South Africa had one of the highest Gini coefficients in the world at 0.67 (World Bank, 2011). This has led Joubert, Udjo and van Rensburg (2009) to describe the South African marketing environment as being "two tiered" (p. 40). South Africa thus presents an interesting environment in which to evaluate global brands.

The objective of this empirical study was to evaluate the relative contribution of eight constructs that influence global brand purchase intent. Those eight constructs were: country of origin, brand familiarity, brand linking, brand trust, ethnocentrism, cosmopolitanism, global-local identity, global consumer culture and exposure to multinational advertising. These eight constructs were chosen for various reasons. First, country of origin (COO) is foundational to global marketing. Every global brand has a COO. Second, brand familiarity, brand liking and brand trust influence global brand purchase intent, and purchase intent is an often used predictor in product demand forecasting. Third, ethnocentrism, cosmopolitanism, global-local identity and identification with a global consumer culture are other well-known consumer constructs that explain variations in international consumer behaviors. Finally, exposure to multinational advertising was a new measure developed to assess the degree to which media influence global brand purchase intent.

Country of origin

A special issue *of International Marketing Review* (Vol. 28, No. 5, 2011) highlights the ongoing debate surrounding country of origin (COO) in global marketing. Diamantoopoulos, Schlegelmich, Palihawadana's (2011) research with consumers in China and the United States suggests that COO influences brand perceptions and, thus, in turn, influences buying intentions – at least in the refrigerator product category. Samiee (2011), in contrast, concludes that COO is not as relevant in the consumer choice process as most research suggests. Magnusson, Westjohn and Zdravkovic (2011) argue that COO is still relevant to consumers even if consumers make inaccurate COO attributions. These three new articles continue to contribute to the voluminous literature on all aspects of COO (Pharr, 2005).

In addition to issue of the accurate identification of COO, marketing scholars have variously tried to understand how COO affects perceived product value (Cervino, Sanchez & Cubillo, 2005), brand image and brand equity (Lin & Kao, 2004; Pappu, Quester & Cooksey, 2007). Okechuku (1994) used conjoint analysis to study the effect of COO on product choice in consumers living in Holland, Germany, Canada and the United States and found that COO was one of the two most important attributes in purchase evaluation. Okechuku (1994) found that consumers had a distinct preference for domestic products over foreign ones, especially when the COO was from countries with developing or emerging economies. This finding seems consistent across much of the COO literature: That there is a strong domestic preference for many product categories when consumers in developing countries evaluate COO (Watson & Wright, 2000).

H1: The greater the importance of knowing a brand's COO, the greater will be its effect on brand purchase likelihood.

Brand Familiarity

Brand familiarity reflects "the extent of the consumer's direct and indirect experiences with the brand" (Campbell & Keller, 2003) and directly affects consumer knowledge structures. Consumers who are familiar with a brand have more elaborate, sophisticated brand schemas stored in memory than consumers who are unfamiliar with the brand (Kent & Allen, 1994; Low & Lamb, 2000). Research has demonstrated that brand familiarity yields more favorable brand evaluation (Janiszewski, 1993; Holden & Vanhuele, 1999). Increased brand familiarity means that consumers will process advertising messages quicker and with less effort because they already "know things" about the brand (Chattopadhyay, 1998). Ahmed and d'Astous (2008) concluded that for their sample of male consumers living in Canada, Morocco and Taiwan "familiarity has a significant and substantial impact on COO evaluations" (p. 96). Indeed, "familiarity, trust and liking are the three most important drivers of brand loyalty" (Franzen & Moriarty, 2009, pp.310-311).

H2: Greater familiarity with a global brand increases the likelihood of global brand purchase.

Brand Liking

While brand familiarity is predominantly a cognitive process, brand liking invokes an affective response within consumers. de Houwer (2008) stated, "A core assumption in marketing research is that consumers tend to buy brands and products that they like" (p. 151). Anselmsson, Johansson & Persson (2008) defined brand liking as the "evaluative and global measurement capturing how positive and strong the perceived brand assets are from a consumer perspective" (p. 66). Boutie (1994) extended the concept by noting that brand liking "seeks to build consumers' positive attitude toward a brand based on the belief that it cares about them (or addresses them) as individuals" (p. 4). While intuitively attractive, global brand liking is an underdeveloped area of market research. Few studies of both the general the construct of brand trust and/or its relationship to global brands exist. The research reported here contributes to the extant literature on brand liking.

H3: Stronger global brand liking increases the likelihood of global brand purchase intent.

Brand Trust

Delgado-Ballester, Munera-Alemain and Yague-Gullien (2003) defined brand trust as "The confident expectations of the brand's reliability and intentions in situations entailing risk to the consumer" (p. 37). Brand trust has also been defined as "the confidence a consumer develops in the brand's reliability and integrity" (Chatterjee & Chaudhuri, 2005, p.2). Brand trust has been linked with brand loyalty as well as increased market share and advertising efficiency (Chatterjee & Chaudhuri, 2005).

Of recent interest has been the question of whether brands vary in terms of trust. Romaniuk and Bogomolova (2005) studied this question by controlling for brand size effects when they assessed trust scores of 110 local brands in 13 markets in subjects living in the United Kingdom and Australia. They found little variation in brand trust scores when controlling for market share. They concluded that "trust is more like a 'hygiene' factor in that all brands have to have a certain level of trust to be competitive in the market" (Romaniuk & Bogomolova, 2005, p. 371). If brands do not vary greatly in terms of trust, would the same hold true when consumers were asked to evaluate specifically their trust in a global brand?

H4: Global brand trust increases the likelihood to purchase a global brand.

Ethnocentrism

There is an extensive literature on ethnocentrism primarily because it's a pervasive aspect of all global transactions – not just marketing transactions. Ethnocentrism is defined as "the local proclivity of people to view their own group as the center of the universe, to interpret other social units from the perspective of their own group, and to reject persons who are culturally similar while blindingly accepting those what are culturally like themselves" (Shimp & Sharma, 1987, p. 280). Shimp and Sharma (1987) developed the CET scale to measure consumer ethnocentrism and described the psychological and sociological roots of the phenomenon in succeeding research (Sharma, Shimp & Shin, 1995).

Empirical research has identified differences in domestic country bias between consumers living in developed versus developing countries (Batra, Ramaswamy, Alden, Steenkamp, & Ramachander, 2000; Upadhyay & Singh, 2006). The former clearly favored domestic over foreign products, while the latter favored the opposite. Research by Bawa (2004) indicated that, contrary to earlier findings, consumers from developing countries were biased toward imported over domestic products: "The label 'made in India' is not a liability. The Indian consumer will not lap up foreign goods merely because of their 'made in' tags" (p.43).

H5: Individuals with strongly held ethnocentric beliefs prefer to buy domestic brands over global brands.

Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism has its origin in sociology and cultural studies and refers to the fact that some individuals perceive themselves to be more "worldly" and less provincial than others. Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004) suggested that cosmopolitanism is "a conscious openness to the world and to cultural differences" (p. 117). Cleveland and Laroche (2007) included cosmopolitanism as a subscale in their research aimed at developing a composite scale assessing acculturation to global consumer culture. In their six-country study, cosmopolitanism was a positive predictor of owning a personal portable stereo, CD and DVD players, a television set, a digital camera, a computer, a mobile phone, ATM and computer usage, Web surfing and e-mail, and DVD purchasing. Additionally, cosmopolitanism influenced purchase of a washing machine, a hair dryer, a vacuum, a refrigerator, and a microwave oven (Cleveland, Laroche, & Papadopoulos, 2009).

H6: Individuals with strongly held cosmopolitan values prefer to buy global brands over domestic brands.

Global-Local Identity

Global-local identity extends the concepts of consumer self-identity. Zhang & Khare (2009) stated that individuals with local identities "have faith in and respect for local traditions and customs, are interested in local events, and recognize the uniqueness of local communities; broadly, being local means identifying with people in one's local community;" individuals with a global identity, in contrast, "believe in the positive effects of globalization, recognize the commonalities rather than dissimilarities among people around the world, and are interested in global events; broadly, being global means identifying with people around the world" (p. 525). Global-local identities are complex, since individuals can maintain both local and global identities without much cognitive dissonance. In the context of global brands, individuals with local identities would/should prefer local brands; while consumers with global identities would/should prefer global brands.

H7: Individuals with strong local identities prefer to buy local brands over global brands.

Global Consumer Culture

Robertson (1987) defined globalization as "the crystallization of the world as a single space" (p. 38). Robertson's definition fits well within the established conceptualization of globalization as a series of "flows" across transnational boundaries, "of virtually everything that characterizes modern life: flows of capital, commodities, people, knowledge, information, ideas, crime, pollution, diseases, fashions, beliefs, images and so forth" (Tomlinson, 2007, p. 352). These "flows" have enabled brands to travel the world. This tendency to homogenize markets has resulted in a global consumer culture.

A global consumer culture emerges not only because consumers' needs are convergent across national boundaries but also because firms intentionally maintain a consistent global consumer culture positioning strategy in all markets (Alden, Steenkamp, & Batra, 1999). Further, a global consumer culture positioning strategy can have either a local emphasis, defined as "a strategy that associates the brand with local cultural meanings, reflects the local culture's norms and identities, is portrayed as consumed by local people in the national culture," or a foreign emphasis, defined as "a strategy that positions the brand as symbolic of a specific foreign consumer culture; that is, a brand whose personality, use occasion, and/or user group are associated with a foreign culture" (Alden, Steenkamp, & Batra, p.77). These two global consumer culture positioning strategies dovetail with global-local identity discussed above.

H8: Individuals who strongly identify with a global consumer culture will prefer to buy the global brand over the domestic brand.

Exposure to multinational advertising

Closely linked with global consumer culture is exposure to multinational advertising. Consumers must be exposed not only to the global product but also to the global values which the product expresses. Frequently, but not exclusively, this exposure is through advertising (Arnould, 2011). Mertz, He and Alden (2008) note that "advertising cross-culturally creates desires for the advertised products or services – whether affordable or not – and, as such, becomes associated with the inherent symbolism of those offerings" (p. 172) – thereby simultaneously creating and reinforcing a global consumer culture.

> H9: Individuals exposed to multinational advertising will be more likely to identify with and buy global brands over domestic brands.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The following ten global brands were chosen for this research: Avon, BMW, Chanel, Colgate, Haier, HSBC, Levi's, Prada, Samsung, and Zara. These global brands were chosen to cover a wide variety of product categories (consumer electronics, fashion, banking, personal care products and automobiles). In addition, the global brands chosen included low involvement (Colgate) and high involvement (BMW, Prada) products. Four brands were specifically chose for their clear COO associations: BMW (Germany), Chanel (France), Haier (China) and Levi's (United States). Eight of the global brands were available in South Africa when the research was conducted (March-May 2010). Only Haier and Zara were not available.

Five point Likert-scales measured each construct. Importance of knowing a brand's COO ranged from "not at all important" to "very important." Global brand familiarity ranged from "not at all familiar" to "very familiar" on a 5-point scale. Global brand trust was scaled "no trust at all" to "total trust." Similarly, liking the brand ranged from "like nothing about the brand" to "like everything about the brand" on a 5-point scale. Finally, likelihood to purchase was a 5- point scale that ranged from "never purchase" to "always purchase." It should be noted that these questions about the brands were phrased with a caveat, "if you were able" to purchase the brand.

Five attitudinal scales were designed to tap various aspects of consumer decision making: ethnocentrism, cosmopolitanism, global-local identity, global consumer culture and awareness of multinational advertising. All the scales used were subsets of previously published and validated survey instruments. The global-local scale (adapted from Zhang & Khare, 2009) consisted of 3 items (α = .66), the cosmopolitanism scale (adapted from Cleveland, Laroche, Papadopolous, 2009) consisted of 3 items (α = .71), the ethnocentrism scale (adapted from Cleveland, Laroche, Papadopolous, 2009) consisted of 4 items (α = .67), the openness and desire to emulate global consumer culture scale (adapted from Cleveland & Laroche, 2007) consisted of 4 items (α = .71), and the exposure to multinational advertising scale (adapted from Cleveland & Laroche, 2007) consisted of 4 items (α = .70). A Principle Components Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation was utilized initially to screen the items in the scales.

Recruitment of Respondents.

Study participants were recruited through a major university in Johannesburg, South Africa. Respondents were invited to participate in the survey by their course professor. Students were told that the survey was completely anonymous, that there was no way to track individual responses and that there would be no impact on any individual's final grade because of nonparticipation. Two weeks after the initial invitation to participate, students were again encouraged to complete the online survey, if they had not already done so. The university from which respondent were drawn has a strong, national reputation and attracts a diverse study body from across the country. The university offers programs at the undergraduate, graduate and doctoral levels.

RESULTS

The majority of respondents were male (68.9%) while most (91.4%) had either a bachelor's or master's degree. Almost 53% were never married while 44.1% were married. Almost 98% of the sample was "fully employed." (See Table 1).

Table 1. Sample Demographics		
Demographic	Percentage (Mean)	Frequency
Gender:		
Male	68.9	122
Female	31.1	55
Education:		
Some college/university work	3.7	6
Bachelor's degree	45.1	74
Some graduate work	4.9	8
Master's degree	46.3	76
Marital status:		
Never married	52.5	94
Married	44.1	79
Divorced	2.8	5
Widow/widower	.6	1
Current Employment Situation:		
Unemployed	1.1	2
Employed part time	1.1	2
Fully employed	97.8	174
Age (mean)	31.3	

Respondents indicated they did feel a part of the global consumer culture with an average of 9.1 out of a possible 15 (See Table 2). South African respondents definitely felt more cosmopolitan in nature (13) and saw the presence of global / multinational advertising (12.0). In terms of their global-local identities, respondents felt more bound by local traditions and felt the local way of life was harmed by globalization. However, they were more ethnocentric having a mean of 8.0 out of 20. There was a disparity between their cosmopolitan views and their more inward leanings in terms of appreciating the local way of life and their more ethnocentric world view (8.3)

Table 2. Scale Means	
Scale	**Means**
Global Consumer Culture	9.1
Cosmopolitanism	13.0
Multinational Advertising	12.0
Global-Local	8.0
Ethnocentrism	8.3

Note. For global consumer culture, scores could have ranged from 3 to 15. For cosmopolitanism, scores could have ranged from 3 to 15. For multinational advertising, scores could have ranged from 4 to 20. For global-local, scores could have ranged from 2 to 10. For ethnocentrism, scores could have ranged from 4 to 20.

Means for Familiarity, Trust, Liking, COO, and Purchase Intent

For familiarity, South African respondents indicated the least familiarity with Haier (1.27), Zara (2.13), and Avon (2.85). The greatest level of familiarity was for BMW (4.84), Colgate (4.69), Levi's (4.66), and Samsung (4.57) (See Table 3). Concerning trust, the least trusted global brands were Haier (2.02) and Avon (2.89). The most trusted global brands were Colgate (4.46), BMW (4.38), Levi's (4.31), and Samsung (4.16). For liking, the least liked global brand was Avon at 2.58. The most liked global brands were BMW (4.09, Colgate (4.08), and Levi's (4.08). For country-of-origin, respondents felt it was most important for the brands BMW (3.32) and Samsung (3.05). The least need-to-know country-of-origin was HSBC 1.99. Finally for purchase intent, the brands most likely to be purchased were Colgate at 4.20 and Levi's at 4.06. The least likely brand to be purchased was Haier (2.13).

Table 3. Means for Familiarity, Trust, Liking, COO, and Purchase Intent					
	Means				
Brands	**Familiarity**	**Trust**	**Liking**	**COO**	**Purchase Intent**
Avon	2.85	2.89	2.58	2.09	2.34
BMW	4.84	4.38	4.09	3.32	3.88
Chanel	3.70	3.94	3.59	2.49	3.50
Colgate	4.69	4.46	4.08	2.63	4.20
Haier	1.27	2.02	2.36	2.37	2.13
HSBC	3.50	3.45	3.20	1.99	3.24
Levi's	4.66	4.31	4.08	2.73	4.06
Prada	3.97	3.93	3.70	2.74	3.61
Samsung	4.57	4.16	3.94	3.05	3.91
Zara	2.13	3.21	3.33	2.25	3.33

Regressions

Separate stepwise multiple regressions were run for the ten brands (See Table 4). The dependent variable was likelihood of purchase of the brand while the independent variables included: familiarity with the brand, degree of trust in the brand, degree of liking the brand, and importance of knowing the county-of-origin of the brand.   Most of the models were robust in their predictive ability. The exceptions were HSBC with an adjusted R^2 of .321 and Zara with an adjusted R^2 of .368. The most frequently occurring significant predictor across the ten models was global brand liking (8 times). The only brands where brand liking did not occur were Haier, and HSBC. Global brand familiarity was a predictor for Colgate, and Samsung. Trust was a significant predictor 3 times, Colgate, HSBC, and Prada. COO was a significant predictor for Levi's.

Table 4. South African Respondent Regressions (Familiarity, Trust, Liking, Importance of COO, Global Consumer Culture, Cosmopolitanism, Multinational Advertising, Global-Local, Ethnocentrism, Gender, Education, and Martial Status Regressed Against Likelihood to Buy)								
	Model Summary				**Coefficients (Standardized Betas)**			
Model/Brand	**F**	**Significance**	**R**	**Adjusted R^2**	**Variable(s)**	**t**	**Significance**	**Weight**
Avon	25.0	.00	.786	.593	Liking	6.5	.00	.732
					GCC	3.3	.00	.376
BMW	35.7	.00	.746	.541	Liking	8.4	.00	.764
					Ethnocentrism	2.6	.01	.241
Chanel	36.3	.00	.642	.400	Liking	6.0	.00	.642
Colgate	35.0	.00	845	.694	Liking	4.4	.00	.433
					Trust	2.9	.00	.299
					Age	2.6	.00	.200
					Familiarity	2.2	.03	.183
Haier	8.9	.00	.801	.569	Male	-2.9	.03	-.801
HSBC	9.9	.00	.597	.321	Trust	3.2	.00	.446
					Cosmo	2.3	.02	.318
Levi's	12.,3	.00	.648	.386	Liking	4.4	.00	.484
					COO	2.7	.00	.294
					Not Married	-2.0	.04	-.226
Prada	45.5	.00	.809	.641	Liking	6.3	.00	.589
					Trust	3.84	.02	.362
Samsung	61.0	.00	.837	.690	Liking	8.4	.00	.716
					Familiarity	2.5	.01	.218
Zara	9.1	.01	.642	.368	Liking	3.0	.01	.642

For the most part, the attitudinal scales that were used as predictors in the models had limited predictive ability. They appeared in only 3 of the models. Multinational advertising and Global-Local did not appear as a predictor in any of the

models. Cosmopolitanism appeared in one model, HSBC. Global Consumer Culture appeared in the Avon model while Cosmopolitanism appeared in the HSBC model. The only demographics to appear in the models were gender, age and marital status. Females were more likely to purchase Haier products than males while married respondents were likely to purchase Levi's. Older respondents were more likely to purchase Colgate toothpaste.

CONCLUSION

When judged against the "standard" constructs of ethnocentrism, cosmopolitanism, local identities, global consumer culture, and importance of knowing a brand's country of origin, this sample of South African consumers tends to confound. For example, the hypotheses concerning ethnocentric beliefs, cosmopolitan values, local identities, and global consumer culture were not confirmed. These constructs only appeared in one model each and always were the lower significant standardized beta weigh in the model. Similarly, the hypothesis for COO also was not confirmed as it appeared in only one model. Familiarity appeared in two models but had the lowest beta weight in both models and thus was not confirmed. There was some stronger evidence for trust being a positive predictor of purchase intention. Branding liking was the key variable in almost all of the models. Thus this hypothesis is confirmed.

The absence of brand familiarity as an independent predictor was somewhat surprising, since Table 3 suggests a moderately high level of brand familiarity with eight of the ten tested global brands. Mean scores ranged from 4.84 for BMW to 2.85 for Avon. As expected, the two brands not readily available in the South African market at the time of the research, Zara and Haier, had the two lowest brand familiarity scores, 2.13 and 1.27, respectively. Only Samsung and Colgate have brand familiarity in the regression model and in each case, the standardized beta weight indicates a relatively weak contribution. One explanation for the limited influence of global brand familiarity is that brand familiarity operates as a hygiene factor. All global brands must attain a certain level of familiarity for active consideration; otherwise they fall out of consumers' evoked sets (Romaniuk and Bogomolova, 2005). Familiarity may function more simply. Rather than being a truly continuous variable, familiarity may operate dichotomously. Either a consumer is or is not familiar with the global brand.

Table 4 suggests the much stronger influence of global brand liking and global brand trust in purchase decisions. Global brand liking appears in nine of the ten models, while global brand trust appears in three models (Colgate, HSBC, Prada). In this research, "liking" is a surrogate for "attitude." When viewed from this vantage point, the presence of global brand liking for Avon, BMW, Chanel, Colgate, HSBC, Levi's, Prada, Samsung, and Zara suggest strong attitude formation or a strong affective dimension within these South African consumers that influences purchase decisions. Furthermore, products themselves can be classified as to whether they deliver hedonic and/or utilitarian benefits. Hedonic benefits are emotive and cater to consumers' inherent need for sensual pleasure. In contrast, utilitarian benefits stress the functional and utilitarian aspects of products. "The different nature of utilitarian and hedonic products may affect the buying process, in that the buying process of utilitarian products will be driven mainly by rational buying motives. In the buying process of hedonic products, in contrast, emotional motives also play an important role" (Sloot, Verhoef, and Franses, 2005, p.22). All of the products in which global brand liking is the strongest independent predictor are hedonic: Fashion brands (Zara, Prada, Levi), cosmetic brands (Avon, Chanel), consumer electronics (Samsung), automobiles (BMW) and toothpaste (Colgate). Additionally, as the research literature on trust noted above suggests, trust is a cognitive evaluation. Trust therefore can be understood as embodying the cognitive, functional component of brand purchasing. This explains why HSBC, the global bank, is the only global brand in which trust is the sole independent predictor. Consumer purchasing decisions around banking should be highly rational, and this sample of South African consumers seems to confirm that. Lastly, Colgate and Prada have both liking and trust in their model. This, too, makes sense consumers purchase those products for their combined hedonic (look good, feel good, fresh breath) and functional (quality material, prevents cavities) aspects.

In striking contrast to the most recent discussions (Diamantoopoulos, Schlegelmich, Palihawadana, 2011; Magnusson, Westjohn and Zdravkovic, 2011), this research found no support for the relevance of COO in consumer decision making – at least in this sample of South African consumers. Country of origin might well have been, at one point in time, an important construct in global branding, but presently, these consumers suggest COO has lost its importance in terms of purchase decision influence.

This study has several limitations. Table 1 suggests that the sample might not be as representative of South Africa consumers as desired. South Africa a very detailed consumer classification system. The Living Standards Measures (LSM) identifies 10 socio-economic groups. LSM 1 identifies the poorest South Africans (regardless of race), while LSM 10 identifies the most affluent South Africans (regardless of race) (Joubert, Udjo and van Rensburg, 2009). Table 2 suggests this sample most likely captures LSM 7, 8 or 9. Further research should be conducted to select a sample more representative of South Africa. This is

especially important since respondents completed the survey online. Access to the Internet is not evenly distributed across the entire population, thus leading to some selection bias. Second, every brand tested in this research serves as both a corporate and a product brand. Follow-up research should be conducted to untangle the halo effect that the corporate brand might have from the specific product brand. Additionally, in an effort to manage the questionnaire length, shortened versions of the ethnocentrism, cosmopolitanism, global-local identify, global consumer culture and multinational advertising were used. Table 1 indicates that while the Cronbach alpha's were relatively strong, full versions of each scale might have produced more robust alphas. In all, this sample of South African consumers presents interesting findings since they seem to "contradict" some of the more common assertions about motivations for global brand purchase intent. Since most of the research hypotheses were not confirmed, more research, including the testing of local brands needs to be done.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S., & d'Astous, A. (2008). Antecedents, moderators and dimensions of country-of-origin. *International Marketing Review, 25*(1), 75-106.

Alden, D.L., Steenkamp, J.E.M., & Batra, R. (1999). Brand positioning through advertising in Asia, North America and Europe: The role of global consumer culture. *Journal of Marketing, 63*(1), 75-87.

Anselmsson, J., Johansson, U., & Persson, N. (2008). The battle of brands in the Swedish market for consumer packaged food: A cross-category examination of brand preference and liking. *Journal of Brand Management, 16*(1), 63-79.

Arnould, E. (2011). Global consumer culture. In J. Sheth and N. Maholtra (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of International Marketing*. London: Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved from http://www.uwyo.edu/sustainable/recent-research/docs/global%20consumer%20culture%20arnould.pdf.

Arora, V., & Vamvakidis, A. (2009). South Africa in the African economy: Growth spillovers. *Emerging Markets Forum*. Retrieved from: http://www.emergingmarketsforum.org/papers/pdf/2009-EMF-Africa-Arora_Vamvakidis_SA_Growth_Spillovers.pdf

Batra, R., Ramaswamy, V., Alden, D.L., Steenkamp, J.E.M., & Ramachander, S. (2000). Effects of brand local and nonlocal origins on consumer attitudes in developing countries. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9*(2), 83-95.

Bawa, A. (2004). Consumer ethnocentrism: CETSCALE validation and measurement of extent. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers, 29*(3), 43-57.

Boutie, P. (1994). Who will save the brands? *Communication World. 7*, 24-29.

Campbell, C., & Keller, K. (2003). Brand familiarity and advertising repetition effects. *Journal of Consumer Research, 30*, 292–304.

Cervino, J., Sanchez, J., & Cubillo, J. (2005). Made in effect, competitive marketing strategy and brand performance: An empirical analysis for Spanish brands. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 6*(2), 237-244.

Chattopadhyay, A. (1998). When does comparative advertising influence brand attitude? The role of delay and market position. *Psychology & Marketing, 15*(5), 461-75.

Cleveland, M., & Laroche. M. (2007). Acculturation to the global consumer culture: Scale development and research paradigm. *Journal of Business Research (Special Edition: The Impact of Culture on Marketing Strategy), 60*(3), 249!259.

Cleveland, M., Laroche, M., & Papadopoulos, N. (2009). Cosmopolitanism, consumer ethnocentrism, and materialism: An eight!country study of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of International Marketing, 17*(1), 116-146.

de Houwer, J. (2008). Conditioning as a source of liking: There is nothing simple about it. In M. Wänke (Ed.), *Social Psychology of Consumer Behavior* (pp. 151-166). New York: Psychological Press.

Delgado-Ballester, E., Munera-Alemain, J., & Yague-Gullien, M. (2003). Development and validation of a brand trust scale. *International Journal of Market Research, 45*(1), 35-53.

Franzen, G., & Moriarty, S. (2009). *The Science and Art of Branding*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

Holden, S., & Vanhuele, M. (1999). Know the name, forget the exposure: Brand familiarity versus memory of exposure context. *Psychology and Marketing, 16*(6), 479-496.

Hui, A. Y., Sui, N.Y.M., Wang, C.C., & Chang, L.M.K. (2001). An investigation of decision-making styles of consumers in China. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs, 35*(2), 326-345.

Janiszewski, C. (1993). Preattentive mere exposure effects. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20*(3), 376-92.

Johansson, J., & Ronkainen, I. (2005). The esteem of global brands. *Brand Management, 12*(5), 39-54.

Joubert, P., Udjo, E., & van Rensburg, M.J. (2009). The Southern African marketing environment. In J. Venter and M.J. van Rensburg (Eds.), *Strategic Marketing: Theory and Application for Competitive Advantage* (pp. 27-55). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Kent, R., & Allen, C. (1994). Competitive consumer interference effects for consumer memory in advertising: The role of brand familiarity. *Journal of Marketing, 58*(3), 97-105.

Lin, C., & Kao, D. (2004). The impacts of country-of-origin on brand equity. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*(1/2), 37-41.

Low, G., & Lamb, C. (2000). The measurement and dimensionality of brand associations. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 9*(6), 350-68.

Magnusson, P., Westjohn, S., & Zdravkovic, S. (2011). What? I thought Samsung was Japanese: Accurate or not, perceived country of origin matters. *International Marketing Review, 28*(5), 454-472.

Merrill Lynch. (2005). *Black Middle Class Research Report*. Johannesburg, Merrill Lynch.

Mertz, M., He, Y., & Alden, D.L. (2008). A categorization approach to analyzing the global consumer culture debate. *International Marketing Review, 25*(2), 166-182.

Okechuku, C. (1994). The importance of product country of origin: A conjoint analysis of the USA, Canada, Germany, and the Netherlands. *European Journal of Marketing, 28*(4), 5-19.

Pappu, R., Quester, P., & Cooksey, R. (2006). Country image and consumer-based brand equity: Relationships and implications for international marketing. *Journal of International Business Studies, 38*(5), 726-745.

Pharr, J. (2005). Synthesizing country-of-origin research from the last decade: Is the concept still salient in an era of global brands? *Journal of Marketing: Theory and Practice, 13*(4), 34-45.

Phau, I., & Suntornnond, V. (2006). Dimensions of consumer knowledge and its impacts on country of origin effects among Australia consumers: A case of fast-consuming product. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 23*(1), 34-42.

Robertson, R. (1987). Globalization and societal modernization: A Note on Japan and Japanese religion. S*ociological Analysis, 47*(Summer), 35-43.

Romaniuk, J., & Bogomolova, S. (2005). Variation in brand trust scores. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 13*(4), 363-373.

Samiee, S., Shimp, T., & Sharma, S. (2005). Brand origin recognition accuracy: Its antecedents and consumers' cognitive limitations. *Journal of International Business Studies, 36*(4), 379-397.

Sharma, S., Shimp, T., & Shin, J. (1995). Consumer ethnocentrism: A test of antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 23*(1), 26-37.

Shimp, T. A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing R*esearch, *24*, 280-289.

Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G., & Woodward, I. (2004). Locating cosmopolitanism: Between humanist ideal and grounded social category. *Theory, Culture & Society, 21*(6)**,** 115-136.

Sloot, L., Verhoef, P., & Franses, P. (2005). The impact of brand equity and the hedonic level of products on consumer stock-out reactions. *Journal of Retailing, 81*(1), 15-34.

Steenkamp, J.E.M., Batra, R., & Alden, D.L.. (2003). How perceived brand globalness creates brand value. *Journal of International Business Studies, 34*(1), 53-65.

Tomlinson, J. (2007). Cultural globalization. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization* (pp. 352-366). Madden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Upadhyay, Y., & Singh, S. (2006). Preference for domestic goods: A study of consumer ethnocentrism. *The Journal of Business Perspective, 10*(3), 59-68.

Watson, J., & Wright, K. (2000). Consumer ethnocentrism and attitudes toward domestic and foreign products. *European Journal of Marketing, 34*(9/10), 1149-1166.

World Bank. (2011). GINI Index. Retrieved from http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI.

Zhang, Y., & Khare, A. (2009). The impact of accessible identities on the evaluation of global versus local products. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *36*(October), 524-537.