

Cultural Identity, Consumer Ethnocentrism And Purchase Intentions: Mediating Role Of Brand Preference And Moderating Role Of Brand Equity

Muhammad Kalim Ullah Khan¹, Muhammad Ahmad-ur-Rehman*²

¹National Textile University Faisalabad, Pakistan.

²National Textile University Faisalabad, Pakistan.

*Corresponding author:mahmadurrehman@gmail.com

Abstract:

The objective of research is to examine the effect of cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism on brand preference. And also check their impact on the purchase intentions of consumers. And examines their distinctive effects on brand preference and purchase intentions with respect to domestic and imported apparel brands. Collecting data from 210 apparel consumers of Faisalabad, findings of this study demonstrate that, both cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism influence brand preference and purchase intention of consumers. When the level of cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism high then consumers prefer domestic brands and when it is low then consumers prefer imported brand. Results also show that brand preference partially mediates the relationship between cultural identity and purchase intentions. This study also verify the moderation role of brand equity between these variables. At the end managerial implication and theoretical contribution which are established on results also provided.

Keywords: Cultural identity, Consumer ethnocentrism, Brand equity, Brand preference, Purchase Intentions

1. Introduction:

International trade barriers has been broken down due to increased globalization, and this enable the brands to access the world market easily and inspiring them to the globally recognized existence. Now consumers have a lot of variety and number of established domestic and imported brands and now they are experiencing them (Bandyopadhyay, 2014). Previously studies show that, the domestic markets considered themselves freely and independent and they didn't worry about their foreign rivals. Due to globalization, now the market of most of countries are open and show no resistance towards foreign products and it brings foreign products, brands and competitors in front position, and providing the consumers a wide range of quality and variety of products and broad their choices (Kalicharan, 2014).

Previously studies indicates that, customer give more preferences to foreign apparel and clothing brands on local and domestic brands (Fischer & Byron, 1997; Patterson & Tai, 1991; Phau & Siew-Leng, 2008). Actually due to brand preference consumers mostly prefer to buy foreign made apparel, clothing brand and products rather domestic made apparel and clothing brands (Phau & Siew-Leng, 2008). Number of studies available with respects to the attitudes which are involved in the purchase of apparel and clothing brands. Previous studies which compare the attitudes of consumers towards domestic and foreign apparel brand purchase found that consumer tend to prefer foreign apparel rather than domestic apparel brands if these are luxury and expensive (Ahmad-Ur-Rehman, Haq, Jam, Ali, & Hijazi, 2010; Jam et al., 2011; Phau & Siew-Leng, 2008; Waheed, 2011b). So, brands play vital

role in preferences of consumers by making their place in consumers mind.

Brand name enable a consumer to distinguish a brand from other brands, it also enable to choose it easily in this busy life. Therefore companies give importance to create awareness about their brands and try to recall the brand name again and again to create important place in the mind of consumer which influence their selection and preference (Shehzad, Ahmad, Iqbal, Nawaz, & Usman, 2014). Firms use different ways like they give unique name, design, symbol and sometime blend of these to the product or brand to make good perception in the mind of consumer about a brand. So buying decisions influence by brand equity, and it is a tool which helps to get attention of consumers (Akhtar et al., 2016; Farooq, Akhtar, Hijazi, & Khan, 2010; Mazhar, Jam, & Anwar, 2012; Shahbaz et al., 2016; Waheed, 2011a).

Due to branding people focus more on quality products and in developing countries where the income of the people rising then there expectations regarding the products about its quality and durability also increase (Joshi, 2013). Combination of private and public attributes give motivation to buy local products (Fernández-Ferrín et al., 2015; García-Gallego et al., 2015; Onozaka & Mcfadden, 2011; Stere & Trajani, 2015; Thilmany, Bond, & Bond, 2008) provoke cultural identity. Its helps to accelerate and boost economy and generate employment. Besides this, national bias indicates the concept of ethnocentrism and it is easy to explain then recognize. And as a word its means that the feelings of group as centrality and superiority. This concept was originally gave by Sumner (Booth, 2014).

Many brands offer similar products with little changes in the product specifications, due to this consumers face difficulty and it is tough for consumer to make choice. And consumer brand preference can be influenced by brand equity. Therefore brand equity is important factor in purchase decision (Gunawardane,

2015; Khan, Jam, Shahbaz, & Mamun, 2018; Waheed, & Kaur, 2019; Waheed, Kaur, Ul-Ain, & Qazi, 2013). Purchase intentions is influence by brand awareness because when consumer is going to buy a product due to awareness that brand name comes in his or her mind, if this awareness is high then higher intentions to purchase the brand and more loyalty and market image. Therefore brand awareness also influence purchase decision (Chi, Yeh, & Yang, 2009). Companies use strategies to establish brands and infrequently use them as representative and experiential means, by help of this customers can associate themselves with culture (Aaker & Biel, 2013; Haq, Ramay, Rehman, & Jam, 2010; Khan, Akbar, Jam, & Saeed, 2016; Waheed, 2010).

Identity is an important factor that's plays a central and important part in work on nationalism and ethnic conflict (Horowitz, 1985; Ofcansky, 1996; Smith, 1991; Walter & Snyder, 1999). Identity define as the concepts of people's about who they are, and what kind of people, and how they relate to others (Abrams & Hogg, 2006). Pakistani firms infrequently use cultural identity to attract the consumers, one reason behind this, is the problem of low perceived quality of products and brand equity of domestic brands as compare to import brands in the mind of consumers (Akhtar et al., 2016). So, this study also elaborates weather or not such strategies and positioning helpful in motivating Pakistani consumers to buy national or domestic brands. This study will explain and overcome deficit of academic research how identity campaigns effect Pakistani consumers on their purchase intentions towards local and foreign products. When we talk about individual identity with its culture then it is important to distinguish cultural identity concept from consumer ethnocentrism concept. Consumer ethnocentrism make reference to moral duty to save the national companies from the multinationals companies and foreign rivals (Shimp & Sharma, 1987).

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Cultural identity

Cultural identity is defined as the feeling and identity of relating to a group, one's self-concept and its own perception and is linked to religion, nationality, ethnicity, generation, locality, social class or any type of social group that has its own different culture (Ennaji, 2005; Fischer & Zeugner-Roth, 2017; Wyrzten, 2016). If the consumers identify local traditions and customs and shows respect for it is cultural identity (He & Wang, 2017; Tu, Khare, & Zhang, 2012). There are variety of groups and different people belongs to different groups (Zeugner-Roth, Žabkar, & Diamantopoulos, 2015). Previous studies indicate that consumers tend to prefer to buy those products which reflect their own national and cultural heritage (Fournier, 1998; Sharma & Singh, 2017; Stayman & Deshpande, 1989; Strizhakova, Coulter, & Price, 2008).

Cultural identity also describes the extent to which the importance of feelings of people which they have to there norms and positive feeling of affiliation towards their culture and their attachment with it and also identify the people because of their culture (Fischer & Zeugner-Roth, 2017; Tajfel & Turner, 2004). With the help of different set of elements the cultural identity focus on a limited central point and enable to identify and distinguish the people in a culture (Clark, 1990; He & Wang, 2017; Seegebarth, Behrens, Klarmann, Hennigs, & Scribner, 2016).

Cultural identity is an important element which is mainly vital for individuals of aggregate societies, in light of this point and fact that individuals frequently distinguish his/her self-idea or self-plan in light of his/ her links with others. Individuals from a similar culture share their traditions, dialects, rehearses, abilities and perceptions about world that describe their group (Wang, Bristol, Mowen, & Chakraborty, 2000).

2.2. Consumer Ethnocentrism:

The bias preference of consumers towards their own country is consumer ethnocentrism (Al Ganideh & Good, 2016). Ethnocentrism also helps to secure the cultural norms, cultural identity, cultural values and more importantly own identity. It also protect and maintain group survival (Jiménez & San-Martin, 2016). According to the definition consumer ethnocentrism shows individual self-concept about the rightness and moral legitimacy of buying and giving preferences of domestic over imported products (Jam, Khan, Zaidi, & Muzaffar, 2011; Jam, Mehmood, & Ahmad, 2013; Shimp & Sharma, 1987; Waheed, Klobas, & Ain, 2020). Consumer ethnocentrism are the beliefs detained by the consumer about the suitability and morality of buying imported products and highly ethnocentrism consumers would think that it is unpatriotic and harmful for the domestic products and economy to buy imported products (Maison & Maliszewski, 2016; Shimp & Sharma, 1987). Consumer ethnocentrism refers to perception and views of consumers that if they buy imported brands then it will hurt local business and cause unemployment and it is also unsuitable and immoral to buy imported brands (Auruskeviciene, Vianelli, & Reardon, 2012).

Ethnocentric persons view themselves as better to others groups. So, they see other groups from their own point of view and accept those things which resemble with them and reject them which are different from them views (Maison & Maliszewski, 2016). The affinity of ethnocentrism is initiate high and to be related with conventional and patriotic consumers (Jam et al., 2010; Khan, Bokhari, Hussain, & Waheed, 2012; S. Sharma, Shimp, & Shin, 1994;). In other words, consumer ethnocentrism tend to effect the behavior of consumer to give preference to the domestic brand over the import brands. The economic and political environment factors effect that consumer ethnocentric affinities. Besides these demographic factors such as age, gender,

education and income also effect consumer ethnocentrism tendencies (Stere & Trajani, 2015).

2.3. Purchase Intentions

Consumer purchase intentions means try to purchase a product (Diallo, 2012). Consumer's affirmative attitude and feelings about a brand affect its purchase intentions (Diallo, 2012). It may be affected by some basic reasons like a need fulfillment, likeness satisfaction and giving the consumer a superior place (Luo, Chen, Ching, & Liu, 2011). It is also used as a sign of predicting consumer actions (Wu, Yeh, & Hsiao, 2011). Consumer purchase intentions also refer to the chance of consumer's willingness of buying some definite products (Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal, 1991; Jam, Donia, Raja, & Ling, 2017; Waheed, Khan, Khan, & Khalil, 2012; Waheed, Khan, & Ain, 2013; Ponte, Carvajal-Trujillo, & Escobar-Rodríguez, 2015). If brand image is lower, then the purchase intentions of consumer will also low. And if the image of brand is perceived as high quality then the purchased intentions will also high (Wang, 2006). Previous research indicates that the purchase intentions will be influenced by high perceived value and quality. So, the purchase intentions will be high if the perceived value and quality is high (Monroe & Krishnan, 1985; Wang, 2006; Waheed, Klobas, & Kaur, 2017).

Cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism also influence purchase intentions of consumers in different ways. When a shopper having high cultural identity then it has a tendency to truly accept and like a thing that is related with its cultural identity. As per the cultural identity model of inspiration, a customer's social self-personality is vital for the interest and accomplishment of personality related objectives in terms of one's social parts (Oyserman, 2007). A good picture of one's own national culture will influence its intentions of purchase and behaviour of buying. It is predictable that cultural identity will prompt an inward attitude toward picking local over import brands (Wang, Li, Barns, & Anh, 2012).

Consequently, following hypothesis are produced.

H1: There is a relationship between cultural identity and purchase intentions

Then again, for consumer ethnocentrism, it is important to note that when it is moral obligation for a consumer to buy a domestic brand rather than an imported brand then the relationship between brand preference and purchase intentions are less constant and less expectable because many other factors are also influencing purchase intentions. So following hypotheses are developed.

H2: There is a relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions

H3: There is a relationship between brand preference and purchase intentions

2.4. Brand preference

"Brand Preference is defined as the behavioral affinities which subjective and conscious which effect consumers tendency toward a brand" (Mohan Raj, 2016). Brand with cultural component will enhance identity (Aaker, Benet-Martinez, & Garolera, 2001; Matzler, Strobl, Stokburger-Sauer, Bobovnick, & Bauer, 2016). Therefore, companies use strategies to establish brands where consumers can associate their identity with culture and nation (Aaker et al., 2001. The knowledge of consumers about a specific culture will effect on their choice and preference to the brand and liking for products which link with their culture. Consumers who have solid sentiment towards cultural identity and have well knowledge towards tradition and norms then these provides meaning and symbolic value of individuals belonging to the other people of same culture (He & Wang, 2015). So, following hypotheses are developed.

H4: There is a relationship between cultural identity and brand preference

Previous research on consumer ethnocentrism indicates that the feelings of ethnocentric not only motivate the consumers to buy domestic brand as it's their moral obligation and duty, as well as an element of product perceptions (Pecotich & Rosenthal, 2001; Smaiziene & Vaitkiene, 2013). When the level on ethnocentrism is high in consumer then rating and preference of domestic products is also high (Acharya & Elliott, 2003; Carpenter et al., 2013). While in contrast the imported products are treated as products with low quality and less equity. (Shankarmahesh, 2006; Saffu et al., 2010). Sometime the strong feelings of ethnocentrism overestimate in the marketplace the quality of domestic products and underestimate the imported products (Šmažiene & Vaitkiene, 2014). If in a country where consumer's uses imported products and have majority, ethnocentric consumer even can exist there. (John & Brady, 2011). Many studies confirmed that these consumers also show their feelings and preference towards domestic products (Cleveland et al., 2009; Dmitrovic et al., 2009; Ferrín et al., 2015; Vida et al., 2008).

H5: There is a relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference

H6: Brand preference mediates the relationship between cultural identity and purchase intentions

H7: Brand preference mediates the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions

2.5. Brand equity

Brand equity consists of different components like brand association, brand awareness, brand loyalty and perceived quality in it and which are attached to symbol brand name (Aaker & Biel, 2013). Brand equity defined as, "it is the source of brand worth and additional value to a product or service in market" (Aaker, 2009; Aaker & Equity, 1991). The concept of brand equity has important place between marketing research

topics. And brand equity has many notions and models (Aaker, 2009; Aaker & Equity, 1991; Farquhar, 1990; Feldwick, 1996; Keller, 1993; Keller, Parameswaran, & Jacob, 2011). When a brand gives exceptional performance due its equity, and its equity is high then it can get high profit, competitive cost, high market shares, premium prices, inflexible price sensitivity and successful extension to new product categories (Masika, 2013). To measure the precious assets of brand equity researchers are observing different ways, because the firms get financial benefits from brand equity (Aaker & Equity, 1991; Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Keller, 1993; Shafir, Simonson, & Tversky, 1993). Cultural identity comes from familiarity and affection with the cultural. When an individual is familiar with cultural then it preference is also increases towards the domestic brand and it will select the domestic brands over imported brands. Its preference and intentions of purchase also increases towards the brand who has more brand equity than others. So brand equity enhance brand preference and purchase intention so moderation hypotheses are

H8: Brand equity moderates the relationship between cultural identity and brand preference

H9: Brand equity moderates the relationship cultural identity and purchase intentions

In a comparable manner, when the brand equity of a domestic brand is high, than it will improve the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference of domestic brand and increase its intentions of purchase. So hypotheses concerning about contact between consumer ethnocentrism and brand equity improve preference and purchase intentions are developed.

H10: Brand equity moderates the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference

H11: Brand equity moderates the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions

3. Methodology

Data was collected from Faisalabad city, Pakistan, through convenience sampling from 210 customers by using mall intercept survey. The data was collected by visiting brands outlets of selected apparel brand store. The research designed was selected from Mohan et al., (2013). The population was estimated on the basis of seasonal and non-seasonal months. In order to obtained the population size of apparel brands interviews were conducted with managers of the selected brands. And 316,800 is the six month population of 8 selected retail apparel brands in Faisalabad. Which also contained 3 seasonal and 3 off seasonal months. For data analysis SPSS. 21 used. This study selected eight apparel brands, four brand were domestic and four were imported apparel brands. These brands were famous apparel brand and were easily available and also high consumable. This study includes seven items of cultural identity and four items consumer ethnocentrism measured on 7-point Likert scale and taken from Keillor et al. (1996). The reported reliability of cultural identity is $\alpha=0.83$ and consumer ethnocentrism is $\alpha=0.80$ (He & Wang, 2015). Four items of brand equity adapted from Buil, Martínez, and de-

Chernatony (2013) and Yoo and Donthu (2001), and reported reliability is $\alpha = 0.91$ on a 7-point Likert scale (Zarantonello & Schmitt, 2013). Four items of brand preferences measured on 7-point scale and taken from Chen and Chang (2008) and reported reliability is $\alpha=0.86$ (Chen & Chang, 2008). purchase intentions was measured with four items scale adopted from Coyle & Thorson (2001).

4. Data Analysis and results:

The basic purpose of validity is to check whether the tool which is used, is it or not measure the data accurately (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008). The validity is also define as the scale or measures which are used accurately represents the concept and data. In social sciences the generally accepted modes are face, content and construct validity (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008). Following table 4.1 presents the estimated values of Cronbach's alpha of measures used in this study, internal consistency and reliability of measures also provide with its help. The values of Cronbach's alpha fluctuate from 0.77–0.87, which directs that each measure shows high reliability. Measures which have alpha value till .90 show very high reliability, and the range of high reliability is between 0.70–0.90. The reliability of Cultural Identity is ($\alpha = .87$), Consumer Ethnocentrism is ($\alpha = .87$), Purchase Intension is ($\alpha = .84$), Preference is ($\alpha = .77$), and Brand Equity is ($\alpha = .81$).

Table 4.1

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of items
Cultural Identity (CI):	.87	12
Consumer Ethnocentrism (CE):	.87	5
Purchase Intension (PI):	.84	4

Brand Preference (BP):	.77	4
Brand Equity (BE):	.81	4

The following table 4.2 results display the correlation for each measure. There is significant relationship between cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism ($r = .634, p < .01$). There is a significant relationship cultural identity and purchase intentions ($r = .343, p < .01$). There is a significant relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions ($r = .472, p < .01$). There is a significant relationship between cultural identity and brand preference ($r = .403, p < .01$). There is a significant relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference

($r = .382, p < .01$). There is a significant relationship between brand preference and purchase intentions ($r = .179, p < .01$). There is a significant, relationship between cultural identity and brand equity ($r = .172, p < .05$). There is a significant relationship correlation between consumer ethnocentrism and brand equity ($r = .210, p < .01$). There is a significant relationship between purchase intentions and brand equity ($r = .274, p < .01$). There is a significant relationship between brand preference and brand equity ($r = .551, p < .01$).

Table 4.2 Correlations

	CI	CE	PI	BP	BE
CI	1				
CE	.634**	1			
PI	.343**	.472**	1		
BP	.403**	.382**	.179**	1	
BE	.172*	.210**	.274**	.551**	1

“**”. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).”

“*”. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).”

4.3 Simple Linear Regression:

From following table, R^2 value between cultural identity and purchase intentions is .117 ($p=.000$) which means that 11.7 percent change in purchase intension is occurred by the cultural identity. So, the relationship between both

variable is also significant and positive. So, there is significant positive relationship between cultural identity and purchase intentions. So following hypotheses is accepted.

H1: There is a relationship between cultural identity and purchase intentions

From following table, R^2 value between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions is .223 ($p=.000$) which means that 22.3 percent change in purchase intention is occurred by the consumer ethnocentrism. So, following hypotheses is accepted.

H2: There is a relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions

From following table, R^2 value between relationship of brand preference and purchase intentions is .032 ($p=.000$) which means that 3.2 percent change in purchase intention is occurred by the brand preference, so, the relationship between both variable is also significant and positive. So following hypotheses is accepted.

H3: There is a relationship between brand preference and purchase intentions

From following table the direct relationship of cultural identity with brand preference is analysis. This relationship has .162 R^2 value

which means that 16.2 percent change in brand preference is occurred by the cultural identity and this value is significant as value of $P=0.000$ and is less than $\alpha=0.05$, so, the relationship between both variable is also significant and positive. So, there is significant positive relationship between cultural identity and brand preference and 16.2% change is occur in brand preference due to cultural identity. So following hypotheses is accepted.

H4: There is a relationship between cultural identity and brand preference

From following table, R^2 value between the relationship of consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference is .146 ($p=.000$) which means that 14.6 percent change in brand preference is occurred by the consumer ethnocentrism. So, there is significant positive relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference and 14.6% change is occur in purchase intentions due to cultural identity. So following hypotheses is accepted.

H5: There is a relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference

Table 4.3

Variables	Purchase intention			Brand preference		
	R^2	B	P	R^2	β	P
Cultural identity	.117	.343	0.00	.162	.403	.000
Consumer Ethnocentrism	.223	.484	.000	.146	.382	.000
Brand preference	.032	.179	.009			

4.4 Mediation regression analysis: Baron and Kenny:

Mediation I:

Mediation was check using Baron and Kenny (1986) method. This study checks all the conditions of defined by Baron and Kenny (1986) before executing the mediation test. The results shows that the value of R^2 change

approaches zero because it reduced from .333 to .005 which meets the first condition. And ($\beta=.582$ and $P=.210$) it shows that R^2 change value is insignificant which meets the second condition. So, results reveals that there is partial mediation and H10 is partially accepted which states that brand preference mediates the relationship between cultural identity and purchase intentions.

Table 4.5

Purchase Intentions				
	β	R^2	R^2 Change	P
Step-1 Brand Preference	.577 ^a	.333	.333	.000
Step-2 Demographics	.578 ^b	.334	.001	.586
Step-3 Cultural Identity	.582 ^c	.339	.005	.210

So, following hypothesis is partially accepted.
H6: Brand preference mediates the relationship between cultural identity and purchase intentions

Mediation 2:

After mediation analysis results shows that value of β is not reduced and value of R^2

change is also increased from .032 to .223 and that is not approaching to zero because it is increasing so mediation first condition is not fulfilled. And value of R^2 change is also significant at ($\beta=.472$ and $P=.000$) so, second condition for mediation is also not fulfilled therefore there is no mediation and H11 is not accepted which states that brand preference mediates the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions

Table 4.6

Purchase Intentions				
	β	R^2	R^2 Change	P
Step-1 Brand Preference	.179	.032	.032	.009
Step-2 Consumer Ethnocentrism	.472	.223	.191	.000

So, following hypothesis is rejected.
H7: Brand preference mediates the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions

4.5. Moderation

Moderation I (CI to BP)

From the following table the result show after moderation analysis and they indicated that the value of R square is changed from .402 to .423. And change in R square is .021 and it's occur on significance level and which is 2.1%. This is

great impact of brand equity on cultural identity and brand preference.

Table 4.7

Relationships	R ²	R ² Change	P
<u>Model 1</u>	.402	.402	.000
Cultural Identity to brand Preference			
<u>Model 2</u>	.423	.021	.006
Cultural Identity, brand Preference and interactive term			

So, following hypothesis is accepted, H8: Brand equity moderates the relationship between cultural identity and brand preference

Moderation 2 (CI to PI)

From the following table the result show after moderation analysis and they indicated that the value of R square is changed from .165 to .208. And change in R square is .043 and it's occur on significance level and which is 4.3%. This is great impact of brand equity on cultural identity and purchase intention.

Table 4.8

Relationships	R ²	R ² Change	P
<u>Model 1</u>	.165	.165	.000
Cultural Identity to Purchase Intentions			
<u>Model 2</u>	.208	.043	.001
Cultural Identity, Purchase Intentions and interactive term			

So, following hypothesis is accepted, H9: Brand equity moderates the relationship cultural identity and purchase intentions

Moderation 3 (CE to BP)

From the following table the result show after moderation analysis and they indicated that the value of R square is changed from .378 to .379. And change in R square is .001 and it's occur on significance level and which is .1%. This is

little impact of brand equity on consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference.

Table 4.9

Relationships	R ²	R ²	P
	Change		
Model 1	.378	.378	.000
Consumer Ethnocentrism to brand Preference			
Model 2	.379	.001	.000
Consumer Ethnocentrism , brand Preference and interactive term			

So, following hypothesis is accepted.

H10: Brand equity moderates the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and brand preference

Moderation 4 (CE to PI)

From the following table the result show after moderation analysis and they indicated that the value of R square is changed from .255 to .276. And change in R square is .032 and it's occur on significance level and which is 3.2%. This is great impact of brand equity on consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intention.

Table 4.10

Relationships	R ²	R ²	P
	Change		
Model 1	.255	.255	.000
Consumer Ethnocentrism to Purchase Intentions			
Model 2	.287	.032	.003
Consumer Ethnocentrism , Purchase Intentions and interactive term			

So, following hypothesis is accepted, H11: Brand equity moderates the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions

5. Discussion and conclusion:

Collecting data from the apparel customers of Faisalabad, this research uncovers that cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism have various impacts on purchase intention of

apparel brands. Our observational outcomes determine a few interesting findings that give understandings on existing writing. To start with, as foreseen, cultural identity was found to enhance effect on the purchase intentions of apparel brands (H1). The familiarity of consumer with its culture and attributes of the product effect and enhance its preference. Cultural identity (H4) was found to enhance effect on the brand preference. When the

preference of a brand by cultural identity then it tends the consumer to prefer that brand and enhance its intentions of purchase regarding that brand. Such results additionally exhibit that cultural identity is a decent indicator for purchase intentions of apparel brand because when consumer is familiar with the brands and it is symbolic attached with its culture then it impact on consumer to prefer one brand which is symbolic attached with its culture on the other brand which is not linked with its culture, therefore it enhance purchase intentions of consumer regarding that brand (Faber, 2012). Consumer ethnocentrism is found to effect on brand preference (H5). The biasness of consumer towards domestic product indicates ethnocentrism (Ganideh & Good, 2016) When the level of ethnocentrism is high then consumer tends to prefer the domestic brands (Carpenter et al., 2013). And when the level of consumer ethnocentrism is low then consumer tend to prefer the imported brand (Saffu et al., 2010). Consumer ethnocentrism is found to effect on purchase intention (H2). And even on high prices (Drozdenco & Jensen, 2009). When consumer ethnocentrism will high then the purchase intentions of consumer regarding the domestic products high. They give preference to domestic products (Ferrin et al., 2015). Therefore, it is identified that when the consumer ethnocentrism is high the customer tend to prefer the domestic brand and its purchase intentions is enhance regarding domestic brand. And it is found that the consumers which have low level of consumer ethnocentrism they tend to prefer imported brand over the domestic (Maison & Maliszewski, 2016). This study find out that when the level of consumer ethnocentrism is high the brand preference is also high towards domestic brand and it also increase the purchase intentions of consumer. Such outcomes propose that consumer ethnocentrism prompts a high inclination toward dismissing imported brands in their expressed inclination, however it is not necessary they really like domestic brands. Because buying a domestic brand is not indicating to hate or reject the imported brand.

Therefore preference and intentions of purchase is only due to ethnocentrism (García & Mera, 2016). Brand preference is positively affected by cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism in direct relationships but brand preference is not fully mediate the relationship between cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism towards purchase intentions. One mediation is partial accepted (H6) and one is fully rejected (H7). Therefore, it seems that brand preference has direct and strong link as compared it as a mediator. Consumers have high identity related to culture and ethnocentrism then there intentions of purchase regarding to brand enhance so at the level brand preference don't full mediate the relationship. The outcomes of this study additionally show the moderating effect of brand equity in the above relationships. Interestingly, when a brand is seen of high value, the effect of cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism is also enhanced towards brand preference which tends to increase its purchase intentions. The brand which have good brand equity, customers tend to prefer those brands. And the consumer of both countries may likely to perceive them as import brands. In the sense of consumer ethnocentrism when reject an import brand may be to protect the domestic industry and national economy but this factor not show essential reflection of one's behaviour to prefer the domestic brands (Šmaižienė & Vaitkienė, 2014).

6. Managerial Implications:

Contending in Pakistan and other developing markets, the managers of the domestic brands must comprehend the significance of the symbolic meanings that are related with the domestic brands by creating cultural identity awareness to claim customer's sentiments. As our outcomes proved, utilizing cultural identity campaigns would be more successful in developing customer's inclination for local brands than just motivating consumer ethnocentrism to dismiss import brands. Pakistani makers might be encouraged to utilize

cultural identity and social way of life as a promoting topic by adding Pakistani components to item configuration keeping in mind the end goal to get customers purchase intentions toward domestic brands. Such an accentuation on Pakistani components encourage customers to purchase the domestic brands. Consumer ethnocentrism also help local producers it give them assistance if they know about the needs of local consumer (Nadiri & Tümer 2010). While international manufacturers take an alternate approach, as they will probably encourage imported brands or "worldwide" brands, furthermore and they have to deal with domestic or local brands. And also face stiff competition with the local brands. In the meantime, international manufacturers wishing to be fruitful in winning sizable customers in nations where sentiments of cultural identity are solid may likewise consider adjusting to nearby social components or utilizing very much apparent national symbols to attract nearby customers.

So, the organizations have to make strategy to enhance cultural identity, which help it to remain competitive over its competitors and help it to make profits. Both domestic and imported brands can use symbolic meanings to enhance familiarity and symbolic meanings of their brands. For example, National Foods is one of most popular domestic brand related to food items launched a campaign with slogan "National ka Pakistan". This campaign is based on sense of pride to prefer their domestic brand over import brands and it also emphasize on Pakistani cultural elements. This theme help the customer to relate their feelings with the brand and feel patriotic and the familiarity of customer towards the brand is also increased. Second example is of Gourmet food products and beverages which also launched a campaign based on cultural identity which differentiate it from import brands also give newfound sense of pride in their national culture with slogan "Ahle Salam pa Salamti hu Ahle Pakistan pa Salamti hu". Consequently, there are many

brands which manufacturer in other countries. (e.g. Nike in China and Levi's in Pakistan).

7. Future Research direction and Limitations:

This study uses apparel brands to investigate the impact of cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism on brand preference and purchase intention. This study uses brand equity as moderator. It will intrigue and important to additionally examine whether and how product category may moderate the effect of cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism on preference to buy domestic versus import brands. This study uses apparel brands and Pakistan is good in textile, it may be possible that if the product category change it may produce different results, like skin care industry. So it is suggest to choose different product category to check the effect on other industries. Most important the perception of consumers regarding the effect of country of origin and country image of the product may effect on consumer ethnocentrism and cultural identity. So, it may be very interesting to see the effect of country of origin.

This study selected only one industry which was apparel industry and Pakistan is well developed in apparel and textiles so the results regarding other industries may produce different results. This study should not be generalized and the sample of this study was also geographically limited. It is quite interesting to evaluate the level and response of respondents regarding other industries as Pakistan is doing better in textile and apparel but not in other industries as good as it is performing in textile, therefore it is interesting to check the impact of consumer ethnocentrism on other industries Data collected in other areas may produce different results. Participants had time constraints. Since the survey was asked to be completed and to be returned immediately, so there is also the pressure of the short time. The research was industry specific and it was only conducts to those who were apparel customers.

References

1. Aaker, D. A. (2009). *Managing brand equity: Simon and Schuster.*
2. Aaker, D. A., & Biel, A. (2013). *Brand equity & advertising: advertising's role in building strong brands: Psychology Press.*
3. Aaker, D. A., & Equity, M. B. (1991). *The Free Press. New York, 206.*
4. Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 81*(3), 492.
5. Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2006). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes: Routledge.*
6. Acharya, C., & Elliott, G. (2003). Consumer ethnocentrism, perceived product quality and choice—An empirical investigation. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing, 15*(4), 87-115.
7. Ahmad-Ur-Rehman, M., Haq, I. U., Jam, F. A., Ali, A., & Hijazi, S. T. (2010). Psychological contract breach and burnout, mediating role of job stress and feeling of violation. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 17*(2), 232-237.
8. Akhtar, N., Siddiqi, U. I., Ashraf, A., & Latif, M. (2016). Impact of a Brand Equity on Consumer Purchase Decision in L'Oreal Skincare Products. *International Review of Management and Business Research, 5*(3), 808.
9. Al Ganideh, S. F., & Good, L. K. (2016). Nothing Tastes as Local: Jordanians' Perceptions of Buying Domestic Olive Oil. *Journal of food products marketing, 22*(2), 168-190.
10. Alamro, A. S. (2010). Branding and brand preference in the mobile phone service industry. Prifysgol Bangor University.
11. Alamro, A., & Rowley, J. (2011). Antecedents of brand preference for mobile telecommunications services. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, 20*(6), 475-486.
12. Amir, O., & Levav, J. (2008). Choice construction versus preference construction: The instability of preferences learned in context. *Journal of Marketing Research, 45*(2), 145-158.
13. APTMA. (2017). APTMA. Retrieved 12/5, 2017, from http://www.apتما.org.pk/pak_textile_statistics
14. Auruskeviciene, V., Vianelli, D., & Reardon, J. (2012). Comparison of consumer ethnocentrism behavioural patterns in transitional economies. *Transformations in Business and Economics, 11*(2), 26.
15. Bagozzi, R. P. (1982). A field investigation of causal relations among cognitions, affect, intentions, and behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research, 562-583.*
16. Bandyopadhyay, S. (2014). Country-of-Origin perceptions, consumer ethnocentrism, and product evaluations in the Indian market. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 5*(9).
17. Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 51*(6), 1173.
18. Bettman, J. R., Luce, M. F., & Payne, J. W. (1998). Constructive consumer choice processes. *Journal of consumer research, 25*(3), 187-217.
19. Bhatia, S. (2013). Associations and the accumulation of preference. *Psychological review, 120*(3), 522.

20. Biel, A. L. (1992). How brand image drives brand equity. *Journal of advertising research*, 32(6), 6-12.
21. Bither, S. W., & Wright, P. (1977). Preferences between product consultants: choices vs. preference functions. *Journal of consumer research*, 4(1), 39-47.
22. Booth, K. (2014). *Strategy and Ethnocentrism (Routledge Revivals)*: Routledge.
23. Buil, I., Martínez, E., & de Chernatony, L. (2013). The influence of brand equity on consumer responses. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30(1), 62-74.
24. Campbell, J. M. (2011). Locally produced food purchasing through retail grocery channels: an evaluation of relevant customer and store environment attributes.
25. Carpenter, G. S., & Nakamoto, K. (1994). Reflections on "Consumer Preference Formation and Pioneering Advantage". *Journal of Marketing Research*, 570-573.
26. Carpenter, J. M., Moore, M., Alexander, N., & Doherty, A. M. (2013). Consumer demographics, ethnocentrism, cultural values, and acculturation to the global consumer culture: A retail perspective. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(3-4), 271-291.
27. Caruana, A. (1996). The effects of dogmatism and social class variables on consumer ethnocentrism in Malta. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 14(4), 39-44.
28. Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. *Journal of marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
29. Chen, C.-F., & Chang, Y.-Y. (2008). Airline brand equity, brand preference, and purchase intentions—The moderating effects of switching costs. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 14(1), 40-42.
30. Chernev, A., Hamilton, R., & Gal, D. (2011). Competing for consumer identity: Limits to self-expression and the perils of lifestyle branding. *Journal of marketing*, 75(3), 66-82.
31. Chi, H. K., Yeh, H. R., & Yang, Y. T. (2009). The impact of brand awareness on consumer purchase intention: The mediating effect of perceived quality and brand loyalty. *The Journal of International Management Studies*, 4(1), 135-144.
32. Clark, T. (1990). International marketing and national character: A review and proposal for an integrative theory. *The Journal of Marketing*, 66-79.
33. 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.
34. Cobb-Walgren, C. J., Ruble, C. A., & Donthu, N. (1995). Brand equity, brand preference, and purchase intent. *Journal of advertising*, 24(3), 25-40.
35. Cook, D. A., & Beckman, T. J. (2006). Current concepts in validity and reliability for psychometric instruments: theory and application. *The American journal of medicine*, 119(2), 166. e167-166. e116.
36. Coyle, J. R., & Thorson, E. (2001). The effects of progressive levels of interactivity and vividness in web marketing sites. *Journal of advertising*, 30(3), 65-77.
37. Dhar, R., Nowlis, S. M., & Sherman, S. J. (1999). Comparison effects on preference construction. *Journal of consumer research*, 26(3), 293-306.
38. Diallo, M. F. (2012). Effects of store image and store brand price-image on store brand purchase intention:

- Application to an emerging market. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 19(3), 360-367.
39. Dinnie, K. (2015). *Nation branding: Concepts, issues, practice*: Routledge.
 40. Dmitrovic, T., Vida, I., & Reardon, J. (2009). Purchase behavior in favor of domestic products in the West Balkans. *International Business Review*, 18(5), 523-535.
 41. Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 307-319.
 42. Drozdenko, R., & Jensen, M. (2009). Translating country-of-origin effects into prices. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 18(5), 371-378.
 43. Ebrahim, R. S. (2013). *A study of brand preference: An experiential view*. Brunel University Brunel Business School PhD Theses.
 44. Ebrahim, R., Ghoneim, A., Irani, Z., & Fan, Y. (2016). A brand preference and repurchase intention model: the role of consumer experience. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32(13-14), 1230-1259.
 45. Ennaji, M. (2005). *Multilingualism, cultural identity, and education in Morocco*: Springer Science & Business Media.
 46. Erkan, I., & Evans, C. (2016). The influence of eWOM in social media on consumers' purchase intentions: An extended approach to information adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61, 47-55.
 47. Farooq, A. J., Akhtar, S., Hijazi, S. T., & Khan, M. B. (2010). Impact of advertisement on children behavior: Evidence from Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(4), 663-670.
 48. Farquhar, P. (1990). "Managing brand equity" *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 30, August-September, pp. RC7-RC12.
 49. Fearon, J. D. (1999). *What is identity (as we now use the word)*. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.
 50. Feldwick, P. (1996). What is brand equity anyway, and how do you measure it? *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 38(2), 85-105.
 51. Fernández-Ferrín, P., Bande, B., Calvo-Turrientes, A., & Galán-Ladero, M. M. (2017). The Choice of Local Food Products by Young Consumers: The Importance of Public and Private Attributes. *Agribusiness*, 33(1), 70-84.
 52. Fernández-Ferrín, P., Bande-Vilela, B., Klein, J. G., & del Río-Araújo, M. L. (2015). Consumer ethnocentrism and consumer animosity: antecedents and consequences. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 10(1), 73-88.
 53. Fischer, P. M., & Zeugner-Roth, K. P. (2017). Disentangling country-of-origin effects: the interplay of product ethnicity, national identity, and consumer ethnocentrism. *Marketing Letters*, 28(2), 189-204.
 54. Fischer, W. C., & Byron, P. (1997). Buy Australian made. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 20(1), 89-97.
 55. Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1977). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*.
 56. Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of consumer research*, 24(4), 343-373.
 57. García-Gallego, J. M., & Mera, A. C. (2016). The region-of-origin effect on the preferences of financial institution's customers: Analysis of the influence of ethnocentrism. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 19(3), 206-218.
 58. García-Gallego, J. M., Chamorro-Mera, A., & del Mar García-Galán, M. (2015). The region-of-origin effect in

- the purchase of wine: The moderating role of familiarity. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research*, 13(3), 0103.
59. Grimm, P. E. (2005). A b components' impact on brand preference. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(4), 508-517.
60. Gunawardane, N. R. (2015). Impact of Brand Equity towards Purchasing Desition: A Situation on Mobile Telecommunication Services of Sri Lanka.
61. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis (Vol. 5)*: Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.
62. Hakkak, M., Vahdati, H., & Nejad, S. H. M. (2015). Study the role of customer-based brand equity in the brand personality effect on purchase intention. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 5(7), 369-381.
63. Haq, I. U., Ramay, M. I., Rehman, M. A. U., & Jam, F. A. (2010). Big five personality and perceived customer relationship management. *Research Journal of International Studies*, 15, 37-45.
64. He, J., & Wang, C. L. (2015). Cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism impacts on preference and purchase of domestic versus import brands: An empirical study in China. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(6), 1225-1233.
65. He, J., & Wang, C. L. (2017). How global brands incorporating local cultural elements increase consumer purchase likelihood: an empirical study in China. *International Marketing Review*(just-accepted), 00-00.
66. Hellier, P. K., Geursen, G. M., Carr, R. A., & Rickard, J. A. (2003). Customer repurchase intention: A general structural equation model. *European journal of marketing*, 37(11/12), 1762-1800.
67. Hinton, P. R., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2004). *SPSS explained*: Routledge.
68. Hochman, O., Raijman, R., & Schmidt, P. (2016). 5 National identity and exclusion of non-ethnic migrants. *Dynamics of National Identity: Media and Societal Factors of What We Are*, 167, 64.
69. Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*: Univ of California Press.
70. Horsky, D., Misra, S., & Nelson, P. (2006). Observed and unobserved preference heterogeneity in brand-choice models. *Marketing Science*, 25(4), 322-335.
71. Hsee, C. K., Yang, Y., Gu, Y., & Chen, J. (2008). Specification seeking: how product specifications influence consumer preference. *Journal of consumer research*, 35(6), 952-966.
72. Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign affairs*, 22-49.
73. Ishii, K. (2009). Nationalistic sentiments of Chinese consumers: The effects and determinants of animosity and consumer ethnocentrism. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 21(4), 299-308.
74. Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size*: University of Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agriculture Sciences, EDIS Gainesville.
75. Jam, F. A., Akhtar, S., Haq, I. U., Ahmad-U-Rehman, M., & Hijazi, S. T. (2010). Impact of leader behavior on employee job stress: evidence from Pakistan. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, (21), 172-179.
76. Jam, F. A., Donia, M. B., Raja, U., & Ling, C. H. (2017). A time-lagged study on the moderating role of overall satisfaction in perceived politics: Job outcomes relationships. *Journal of*

- Management & Organization, 23(3), 321-336.
77. Jam, F. A., Khan, T. I., Zaidi, B. H., & Muzaffar, S. M. (2011). Political skills moderates the relationship between perception of organizational politics and job outcomes. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 1(4), 57-57.
78. Jam, F. A., Mehmood, S., & Ahmad, Z. (2013). Time series model to forecast area of mangoes from Pakistan: An application of univariate ARIMA model. *Acad. Contemp. Res*, 2, 10-15.
79. Jam, F. A., Sheikh, R. A., Iqbal, H., Zaidi, B. H., Anis, Y., & Muzaffar, M. (2011). Combined effects of perception of politics and political skill on employee job outcomes. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(23), 9896-9904.
80. Jameson, D. A. (2007). Reconceptualizing cultural identity and its role in intercultural business communication. *The Journal of Business Communication* (1973), 44(3), 199-235.
81. Jiménez, N., & San-Martin, S. (2016). The central role of the reputation of country-of-origin firms in developing markets. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 31(3), 349-364. doi: doi:10.1108/JBIM-02-2013-0045
82. Johnson, G., Scholes, K., & Whittington, R. (2008). *Exploring corporate strategy: text & cases*: Pearson Education.
83. Joshi, D. (2013). Effects of branding on buying behaviour. *The Macrotheme Review*, 2(7), 156-159.
84. Kalicharan, H. D. (2014). The Effect And Influence Of Country-Of-Origin On Consumers' Perception Of Product Quality And Purchasing Intentions. *The International Business & Economics Research Journal (Online)*, 13(5), 897.
85. Kamins, M. A., & Marks, L. J. (1991). The perception of kosher as a third party certification claim in advertising for familiar and unfamiliar brands. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 19(3), 177-185.
86. Kao, D. T., Wu, P.-H., & Yu, A. P.-I. (2017). The impact of construal level on brand preferences: Ad metaphors and brand biography as moderators. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 22(1), 52-59.
87. Keillor, B. D., Hult, G. T. M., Erffmeyer, R. C., & Babakus, E. (1996). NATID: The development and application of a national identity measure for use in international marketing. *Journal of International Marketing*, 57-73.
88. Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *The Journal of Marketing*, 1-22.
89. Keller, K. L., Parameswaran, M., & Jacob, I. (2011). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity*: Pearson Education India.
90. Khan, A. Z., Bokhari, R. H., Hussain, S. I., & Waheed, M. (2012). Realizing the importance of user participation and business process reengineering during ERP implementation. In *Proceeding International conference on information and knowledge management*, Singapore.
91. Khan, S., Jam, F. A., Shahbaz, M., & Mamun, M. A. (2018). Electricity consumption, economic growth and trade openness in Kazakhstan: evidence from cointegration and causality. *OPEC Energy Review*, 42(3), 224-243.
92. Khan, T. I., Akbar, A., Jam, F. A., & Saeed, M. M. (2016). A time-lagged study of the relationship between big five personality and ethical ideology. *Ethics & Behavior*, 26(6), 488-506.

93. Kimberlin, C. L., & Winterstein, A. G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, 65(23), 2276-2284.
94. Kohli, C., Suri, R., & Kapoor, A. (2015). Will social media kill branding? *Business Horizons*, 58(1), 35-44.
95. Laroche, M., Kim, C., & Zhou, L. (1996). Brand familiarity and confidence as determinants of purchase intention: An empirical test in a multiple brand context. *Journal of Business Research*, 37(2), 115-120.
96. Latif, T. (2016). Consumers' Purchase Intentions towards Global Brands: Psychological Underpinnings.
97. Li, D., Lu Wang, C., Jiang, Y., R. Barnes, B., & Zhang, H. (2014). The asymmetric influence of cognitive and affective country image on rational and experiential purchases. *European journal of marketing*, 48(11/12), 2153-2175.
98. Lu Wang, C., & Xiong Chen, Z. (2004). Consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy domestic products in a developing country setting: testing moderating effects. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21(6), 391-400.
99. Luo, M. M., Chen, J.-S., Ching, R. K., & Liu, C.-C. (2011). An examination of the effects of virtual experiential marketing on online customer intentions and loyalty. *The Service Industries Journal*, 31(13), 2163-2191.
100. Mai, J.-E. (2016). Looking for information: A survey of research on information seeking, needs, and behavior: Emerald Group Publishing.
101. Maison, D., & Maliszewski, N. (2016). "Worse but Ours," or "Better but Theirs?"—The Role of Implicit Consumer Ethnocentrism (ICE) in Product Preference. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7.
102. Masika, C. (2013). The influence of mobile marketing on brand equity a case study of safaricom limited. school of business, university of nairobi.
103. Matzler, K., Strobl, A., Stokburger-Sauer, N., Bobovnick, A., & Bauer, F. (2016). Brand personality and culture: The role of cultural differences on the impact of brand personality perceptions on tourists' visit intentions. *Tourism Management*, 52, 507-520.
104. Mazhar, F., Jam, F. A., & Anwar, F. (2012). Consumer trust in e-commerce: A study of consumer perceptions in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(7), 2516-2528.
105. Mohan Raj, P. (2016). Brand Preferences Of Newspapers-Factor Analysis Approach.
106. Monroe, K. B., & Krishnan, R. (1985). The effect of price on subjective product evaluations. *Perceived quality*, 1(1), 209-232.
107. Nadiri, H., & Tümer, M. (2010). Influence of ethnocentrism on consumers' intention to buy domestically produced goods: an empirical study in North Cyprus. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 11(3), 444-461.
108. Netemeyer, R. G., Durvasula, S., & Lichtenstein, D. R. (1991). A cross-national assessment of the reliability and validity of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 320-327.
109. O'Connor, P., & Sullivan, G. L. (1995). Market segmentation: A comparison of benefits/attributes desired and brand preference. *Psychology & Marketing*, 12(7), 613-635.
110. Ofcansky, T. P. (1996). *Deng, Francis M. War of Visions: Conflict of Identities in the Sudan*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1995.
111. Onozaka, Y., & Mcfadden, D. T. (2011). Does local labeling

- complement or compete with other sustainable labels? A conjoint analysis of direct and joint values for fresh produce claim. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 93(3), 693-706.
112. Overby, J. W., & Lee, E.-J. (2006). The effects of utilitarian and hedonic online shopping value on consumer preference and intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(10), 1160-1166.
113. Oyserman, D. (2007). Social identity and self-regulation. *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*, 2, 432-453.
114. Özsomer, A. (2012). The interplay between global and local brands: A closer look at perceived brand globalness and local iconness. *Journal of International Marketing*, 20(2), 72-95.
115. Patterson, P., & Tai, S.-K. (1991). Consumer perceptions of country of origin in the Australian apparel industry. *Marketing Bulletin*, 2, 31-40.
116. Payne, J. W., Bettman, J. R., & Johnson, E. J. (1992). Behavioral decision research: A constructive processing perspective. *Annual review of psychology*, 43(1), 87-131.
117. Pecotich, A., & Rosenthal, M. J. (2001). Country of origin, quality, brand and consumer ethnocentrism. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 15(2), 31-60.
118. Phau, I., & Siew Leng, Y. (2008). Attitudes toward domestic and foreign luxury brand apparel: A comparison between status and non status seeking teenagers. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 12(1), 68-89.
119. Ponte, E. B., Carvajal-Trujillo, E., & Escobar-Rodríguez, T. (2015). Influence of trust and perceived value on the intention to purchase travel online: Integrating the effects of assurance on trust antecedents. *Tourism Management*, 47, 286-302.
120. Posten, A.-C., & Mussweiler, T. (2017). That certain something! Focusing on similarities reduces judgmental uncertainty. *Cognition*, 165, 121-125.
121. Pratt, A. C. (2008). Cultural commodity chains, cultural clusters, or cultural production chains? *Growth and change*, 39(1), 95-103.
122. Prendergast, G., Ko, D., & Siu Yin, V. Y. (2010). Online word of mouth and consumer purchase intentions. *International Journal of Advertising*, 29(5), 687-708.
123. Quinton, S., & Smallbone, T. (2005). The troublesome triplets: issues in teaching reliability, validity and generalisation to business students. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(3), 299-311.
124. Rockafellar, R. T., & Wets, R. J.-B. (2009). *Variational analysis* (Vol. 317): Springer Science & Business Media.
125. Russell, G. J., & Kamakura, W. A. (1997). Modeling multiple category brand preference with household basket data. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(4), 439-461.
126. Saeed, F., & G. Grunert, K. (2014). Expected and experienced quality as predictors of intention to purchase four new processed beef products. *British Food Journal*, 116(3), 451-471.
127. Saffu, K., Walker, J. H., & Mazurek, M. (2010). The role of consumer ethnocentrism in a buy national campaign in a transitioning country: Some evidence from Slovakia. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 5(2), 203-226.
128. Samiee, S. (2010). Advancing the country image construct—a commentary essay. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(4), 442-445.

129. Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2000). *Consumer behavior*, 7th. NY: Prentice Hall.
130. Schoenfelder, J., & Harris, P. (2004). High-tech corporate branding: lessons for market research in the next decade. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 7(2), 91-99.
131. Seegebarth, B., Behrens, S. H., Klarmann, C., Hennigs, N., & Scribner, L. L. (2016). Customer value perception of organic food: cultural differences and cross-national segments. *British Food Journal*, 118(2), 396-411.
132. Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2006). *Research method for business*. Salemba Empat, Jakarta.
133. Shafir, E., Simonson, I., & Tversky, A. (1993). Reason-based choice. *Cognition*, 49(1), 11-36.
134. Shahbaz, M., Sherafatian-Jahromi, R., Malik, M. N., Shabbir, M. S., & Jam, F. A. (2016). Linkages between defense spending and income inequality in Iran. *Quality & Quantity*, 50(3), 1317-1332.
135. Shankarmahesh, M. N. (2006). Consumer ethnocentrism: an integrative review of its antecedents and consequences. *International Marketing Review*, 23(2), 146-172.
136. Sharma, A., & Singh, D. (2017). Brand attitude mediates the relationship between self brand connection and product involvement: A case of adolescent consumers. *International Education and Research Journal*, 3(5).
137. Sharma, S., Shimp, T. A., & Shin, J. (1994). Consumer ethnocentrism: A test of antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 23(1), 26-37.
138. Shehzad, U., Ahmad, S., Iqbal, K., Nawaz, M., & Usman, S. (2014). Influence of Brand Name on Consumer Choice & Decision. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 16(6), 72-76.
139. Shimp, T. A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer ethnocentrism: construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 280-289.
140. Siegert, G., Förster, K., Chan-Olmsted, S. M., & Ots, M. (2015). What is so special about media branding? Peculiarities and commonalities of a growing research area *Handbook of media branding* (pp. 1-8): Springer.
141. Sirgy, M. J., Grewal, D., Mangleburg, T. F., Park, J.-o., Chon, K.-S., Claiborne, C. B., . . . Berkman, H. (1997). Assessing the predictive validity of two methods of measuring self-image congruence. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 25(3), 229-241.
142. Smaiziene, I., & Vaitkiene, R. (2013). Country of origin effect in a Lithuanian market of vitamins and dietary supplements. *International Business Research*, 6(12), 118.
143. Šmaižienė, I., & Vaitkienė, R. (2014). Consumer ethnocentrism and behavior in a market of dietary supplements. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 156, 463-467.
144. Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity* London: Penguin Books Ltd.
145. Smith, A., & Smith, A. D. (2013). *Nationalism and modernism*: Routledge.
146. Sriram, S., Chintagunta, P. K., & Neelamegham, R. (2006). Effects of brand preference, product attributes, and marketing mix variables in technology product markets. *Marketing Science*, 25(5), 440-456.
147. Stayman, D. M., & Deshpande, R. (1989). Situational ethnicity and consumer behavior. *Journal of consumer research*, 16(3), 361-371.
148. Stere, S., & Trajani, B. (2015). Review of the theoretical and empirical

- literature of consumer ethnocentrism. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 2(1), 41-54.
149. Stokes, K. (2016). "Its a cultural thing." A comparison of cultural consumer behaviour in the fashion industry. Cardiff Metropolitan University.
 150. Strizhakova, Y., Coulter, R. A., & Price, L. L. (2008). The meanings of branded products: A cross-national scale development and meaning assessment. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 25(2), 82-93.
 151. Suh, T., & Kwon, I.-W. G. (2002). Globalization and reluctant buyers. *International Marketing Review*, 19(6), 663-680.
 152. Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, And Morals* (Boston, MA: Gin and Company, 1906), 12.
 153. Sussman, N. M. (2000). The dynamic nature of cultural identity throughout cultural transitions: Why home is not so sweet. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(4), 355-373.
 154. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). *The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior*.
 155. Tariq, B., & Iqbal, A. (2015). Factors Affecting Consumers Attitude and Purchase Intention towards Foreign Apparel Brands in Pakistan. *European Academic Research*, 10(2), 13797.
 156. Thilmany, D., Bond, C. A., & Bond, J. K. (2008). Going local: Exploring consumer behavior and motivations for direct food purchases. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 90(5), 1303-1309.
 157. Tu, L., Khare, A., & Zhang, Y. (2012). A short 8-item scale for measuring consumers' local-global identity. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 29(1), 35-42.
 158. Ulfat, S., Muzaffar, A., & Shoaib, M. (2014). To Examine the Application and Practicality of Aakers' Brand Equity Model in Relation with Recurrent Purchases Decision for Imported Beauty Care products (A study of female customers' of Pakistan). *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 120-133.
 159. Van Ittersum, K., Candel, M. J., & Meulenberg, M. T. (2003). The influence of the image of a product's region of origin on product evaluation. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(3), 215-226.
 160. Van Kerckhove, A., Geuens, M., & Vermeir, I. (2012). Intention superiority perspectives on preference-decision consistency. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(5), 692-700.
 161. Verlegh, P. W. (2007). Home country bias in product evaluation: the complementary roles of economic and socio-psychological motives. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(3), 361-373.
 162. Vida, I., & Reardon, J. (2008). Domestic consumption: rational, affective or normative choice? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25(1), 34-44.
 163. Vida, I., Dimitrović, T., & Obadia, C. (2008). The role of ethnic affiliation in consumer ethnocentrism. *European journal of marketing*, 42(3/4), 327-343.
 164. Waheed, M. (2010, October). Instructor's intention to accept online education: an extended TAM model. In *E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education* (pp. 1263-1271). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).
 165. Waheed, M. (2011). Integration of knowledge conversion process and electronic learning environment: Use of course management system. In

- Knowledge Globalization Conference, Boston, MA.
166. Waheed, M. (2011). Role of culture between influencing factors and student electronic learning satisfaction. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 1(3), 133-133.
167. Waheed, M., & Kaur, K. (2019). Students' perceptual quality standards for judging knowledge quality: Development and validation of a perceived e-learning knowledge quality scale. *Information Development*, 35(2), 319-332.
168. Waheed, M., Kaur, D. K., Ul-Ain, N., & Qazi, A. (2013). Influence of Moodle Module Features on Student Motivation to Use ELearning System. In *International Conference of Learning International Networks Consortium (LINC)* (pp. 1-13).
169. Waheed, M., Khan, A. Z., Khan, H. G. A., & Khalil, M. S. (2012). Creative Learning Environment and Knowledge Management. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 144.
170. Waheed, M., Khan, Q., & Ain, N. (2013). Role of Satisfaction, Security and Risk towards Customer's Turnover Intention from Traditional to Internet Banking. *Int. Arab. J. e Technol.*, 3(2), 83-89.
171. Waheed, M., Klobas, J. E., & Ain, N. (2020). Unveiling knowledge quality, researcher satisfaction, learning, and loyalty: A model of academic social media success. *Information Technology & People*.
172. Waheed, M., Klobas, J. E., & Kaur, K. (2017). The importance of actual use in defining and measuring innovative behaviour: Comparison of e-book reader users and non-users. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 49(4), 368-379.
173. Walter, B. F., & Snyder, J. L. (1999). *Civil wars, insecurity, and intervention: Columbia University Press*.
174. Wang, C. L., Li, D., Barnes, B. R., & Ahn, J. (2012). Country image, product image and consumer purchase intention: Evidence from an emerging economy. *International Business Review*, 21(6), 1041-1051.
175. Wang, W.-C. (2006). The effect of product knowledge and brand image on purchase intention moderated by product category. Unpublished master thesis, Tatung University, Taiwan.
176. WorldBank. (2017). WorldBank. 2017, from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/pakistan>
177. Worldmeter. (2017). Worldmeter. Retrieved 12/5/18, 2018, from <http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/pakistan-population/>
178. Wright, R. P., Paroutis, S. E., & Blettner, D. P. (2013). How useful are the strategic tools we teach in business schools? *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(1), 92-125.
179. Wu, P. C., Yeh, G. Y.-Y., & Hsiao, C.-R. (2011). The effect of store image and service quality on brand image and purchase intention for private label brands. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 19(1), 30-39.
180. Wyrzten, J. (2016). *Making Morocco: colonial intervention and the politics of identity: Cornell University Press*.
181. Xie, Y., Batra, R., & Peng, S. (2015). An extended model of preference formation between global and local brands: The roles of identity expressiveness, trust, and affect. *Journal of International Marketing*, 23(1), 50-71.
182. Yang, Y. (2009). A study of purchase intention behavior to consumers on innovation technology smart phone in technology acceptance model and

- theory of reason action. Unpublished master thesis, Nan Hua University, Taiwan.
183. Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2001). Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 52(1), 1-14.
184. Zafer Erdogan, B., & Uzkuurt, C. (2010). Effects of ethnocentric tendency on consumers' perception of product attitudes for foreign and domestic products. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 17(4), 393-406.
185. Zajonc, R. B., & Markus, H. (1982). Affective and cognitive factors in preferences. *Journal of consumer research*, 9(2), 123-131.
186. Zarantonello, L., & Schmitt, B. H. (2013). The impact of event marketing on brand equity: The mediating roles of brand experience and brand attitude. *International Journal of Advertising*, 32(2), 255-280.
187. Zenker, S., & Erfgen, C. (2014). Let them do the work: a participatory place branding approach. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 7(3), 225-234.
188. Zeugner-Roth, K. P., Žabkar, V., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2015). Consumer ethnocentrism, national identity, and consumer cosmopolitanism as drivers of consumer behavior: A social identity theory perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 23(2), 25-54.