

# CUSTOMER INTENTION TOWARDS GLOBAL BRANDS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF YOUTH

**Mansi Saini**

Student, Mittal School of Business, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, India

**AamerAlaflak**

Student, Mittal School of Business, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, India

**Asif Manzoor**

Student, Mittal School of Business, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, India

**Afrin James**

Student, Mittal School of Business, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, India

**Dr. Vikas Kumar**

Assistant Professor, Mittal School of Business, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, India

*Abstract - The main purpose of this study is to develop and empirically test a theoretical model of young consumers' perceived brand equity. The sample size was based on 320 youth respondents from five countries. The duration of collecting responses is 6 months and the technique used is exploratory multiple regression. Specifically, the model explores the interrelationships among acculturation to worldwide consumer culture, perceived brand equity, attitudes toward the brand, and brand resonance within the context of global brands. The current study also showed how attitudes toward global brands influenced the development of brand resonance; the highest stage of consumer brand discourse. The findings of the study provide both scholars and practitioners with an important contribution. Theoretically, the study offers empirical proof of the relationship between brand equity and brand attitudes. Therefore, the results support the youth consumer's affinity for self-identification with global consumer culture and their cosmopolitan openness to foreign cultures, managerially.*

**Keywords:** Purchase intention, Perceived uniqueness, Perceived Emotional values, Perceived brand quality, Perceived Cost

## INTRODUCTION

Globalization is now a prevalent phenomenon that has provided global companies and brands with many new opportunities (Arnould, Eric, Craig, &Thompson, 2005). As globalization has accelerated, consumers in many countries are being presented with an outsized number of brands. Both domestic, as well as international brands, are being provided to consumers. (Alden, Steenkamp & Batra,1999). So, there exists a competition between global and domestic brands not only in developed countries but also in newly industrialized economies (Cleveland, Mark, Michael& Laroche,2007). The process of globalization has brought a huge increase in competition and led to the diffusion of varied brands across national borders as well as cultures (Douglas, & Craig,2012). Global brands are defined as the brands that are recognized all over the globe. The companies which focus on making their brand global use similar marketing strategy everywhere to promote the brand, regardless of country or region (Hannerz,1990). This helps companies to ensure that their brand values are presented in a consistent and same manner in all the markets. The success of global brands depends upon the consumer's favorable attitude and positive behavioral response towards the brand (Hermans& Kempen, 1998). The companies that have tried to expand their markets globally have encountered challenges in building their brand equity in foreign markets. A research body has suggested that, within the increasingly competitive global marketplace, the event of strong brand

equity is critical for a firm's financial success (Alden, Steenkamp & Batra, 1999). By identifying the factors, that influence customer perceived brand equity will aid marketers and brand managers to possess a better understanding regarding a way to target their brands effectively within the global marketplace (Kim, Jae-On, Charles & Mueller, 1978). There prevail some differences between generations; modern generations are often associated with rapid cultural changes in particularly in terms of tastes, fashion, music preference, culture, and political orientations. Every generation has its trends and cultural impact (Ozsomer, Aysegul, 2012). Young people are more increasingly defined by the utilization of personal communication devices, like smartphones, instant messaging, e-mail, social networking, and therefore the results of all these were the creation of really inventive, private, and abbreviated written communication.

Today, young consumers have emerged as a lucrative market segment for several multinational corporations because of their growing acceptance of global brands (Townsend, Yeniyurt, & Talay, 2009). Young consumers mostly tend to share similar consumption patterns and leisure activities across national borders with similar brand interests (Kjeldgaard & Askegaard, 2006). Young consumers represent the second largest consumer group in the United States, accounting for 20% of the American population with the global purchasing power that is estimated at USD 180 billion in 2011.

Research has been conducted to identify various influencing factors of consumers perceived brand equity, e.g., brand image, brand awareness, and its consequences, (Haynes, Lackman, & Guskey, 1999), only limited research exists on how consumers' assimilation to a different culture to mainstream global consumer culture influences brand equity among young consumers. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to develop and empirically test a theoretical model of young consumers' perceived brand equity. Specifically, the model explores the interrelationships among acculturation to worldwide consumer culture, perceived brand equity, attitudes toward the brand, and brand resonance within the context of global brands. This research suggests marketers must understand young consumers' consumption of global brands in a better way.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC BEHAVIOR OF YOUNG PEOPLE TO THE GLOBAL BRAND CHANGE**

As young consumers have emerged as a lucrative market segment for numerous MNCs because of their growing acceptance towards global brands (Lu & Xu, 2015) the directional force behind their acceptance as well as a change in the preference have become very important. Though there are few differences among the behavior of the young people around the globe depending on the various socio-demographic aspects, yet these young consumers tend to share some kind of consumption patterns and leisure activities across the globe with the same brand interests (Kjeldgaard & Askegaard, 2006). Young consumers represent the second largest consumer group in the United States, accounting for 20% of the American population with a global purchasing power estimated at USD 180 billion in 2011 (World Population Foundation, 20 *et al.* 12). Global brands are able to create consumer perceptions of higher quality, social esteem, and an aura of connection with a global community (Steenkamp, 2003). Purchasing or using such global brands allows a consumer to participate in this prevalent global culture.

### **CONSUMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY AND PRICING**

Brand equity is a vital strategic planning tool for brand management as it aids in maximizing marketing productivity along with enhancing economic performance (Yoo and Donthu, 2001). Researchers have found that a product brand equity positively affects future profits as well as long-term cash flows (Srivastava & Shocker, 1991). For consumers, brand equity has been shown to affect a consumer's willingness to pay a premium price for a brand and to do business with a firm that they know as well as admire (Yoo & Donthu, 2001). Colgate-Palmolive has spent almost three years preparing its total anti-bacterial toothpaste which produces sales of \$ 150mn annually and is sold in 75 countries (Brandweek, 1994). Successful maintenance of worldwide image and recognition translates into hard cash in international business. The active marketing of global brands is as important for business-to-business products as for consumer products. (Hirsch, 1997).

## **PRODUCT PERCEPTION OF GLOBAL BRANDING**

At first glance, consumer perception could be a primary objective of the study where because it helps in explaining the various aspect of the customer thinking process, ideas, and knowledge. Although, it exists before 1980 for while in various forms (Dyer et al.,2004; Richardson, 2008). The most step to travel universal was to expand their b local business marketing strategy to the international market. Then, the local standardized brand became global (Hudak, 1988; Pitta & Franzak, 2008). Development within the world of world branding has taken place gradually over time (Kuhn, 1996). A product is a few things that are made in a very factory; a brand is some things that are bought by a customer. A product is often quickly outdated or depleted, but a successful brand is timeless' (King, cited in Aaker 1991, p. 1).

## **RESEARCH GAP**

According to (Johansson & Ronkainen, 2005), the more the scale and location of a brand the more the positive effect that it holds. The study involved eight countries and the relation in globality and esteem among these countries. The result showed that the higher the esteem more the reach of a brand. Further, (Han, 1989) view was the image of a country plays a major role in evaluating the consumers. He focused on two-point (1) the halo model effect of a country on the appraisal of a product. (2) That the nation image or goodwill operate as a summary construct. The results of this study explain the effect of consumption of a product from an unfamiliar country on the image of that nation and the opposite. However, our study differs from the others in location as well as the results. This study focuses on youth perception towards brands, furthermore, the needs of young people from such brands. This research study the changes in five countries and the effect of a different culture on the perception of the brand.

## **SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

- This study will provide valuable implications for both existing Indian businessmen who plan to enter into other countries with their brand as well as for countries like Syria, Ghana, Afghanistan, Canada, and America which plan to enter into another country.
- The businessman and retailers entering into another country can focus on the uniqueness and emotional aspects of the customers especially those who exhibit higher interest in global brands.
- Businesses entering into another country can know easily through this research that how their brand will be perceived by young people in another country.

## **OBJECTIVES OF STUDY**

- To investigate the impact of pricing and brand equity on young consumers' attitudes towards global brands.
- To analyze the differences in the perception of youth regarding global brand change based on education, age, and societal background.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The analysis was based on a sample size of 250 youth respondent students, graduate and postgraduate from five countries Syria, Ghana, Canada, Australia, and Afghanistan. Convenience sampling was used in the present study. Data was collected from the persons residing in different countries through a questionnaire. Data was descriptive in nature and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) has been used to examine the collected data.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

### **DEMOGRAPHICS RESULTS**

There were 320 respondents of different nationality, gender, occupation, age, and annual income. Out of 320 respondents, 48.8percent were female while the remaining 51.2percent were male. The majority were young aged between 18-24 years old that is 36.9percent, the second-highest percentage was 25-32 years old, which is 29.4percent, and however, the lowest percentage was the elders who are above 50 years i.e., 5percent. Further, a senior citizen was representing 7.5 percent of the respondent. More, the average age

was between 33-44 years old which 21.3percent. Determining Occupation one of the basic information to know. Students were on the top around 45.3percent out of 320 respondents, the next was professional about 28.7percent, while businesspeople were less by 10.1percent and finally few were doing different work which they represent 7.8percent. Annual income for the respondents varies according to occupation, age, and other factors. Despite, the idea of having respondent who is doing business, having profession there was low percent (7.8percent) who got high yearly income which is more than 20 lacs. However, as the peak percentage was 35percent that represents the low-class respondent who gets less than one lac, while almost the average 22.8percent were earning 1-5 lac per year, and 14.4percent were getting 6-10 lacs per annum.

**FACTOR AND REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

**RELIABILITY ANALYSIS**

The findings of reliability have been shown in table 1. The value of Cronbach alpha is 0.810, which is meeting the qualifying cut-off criteria of 0.6, and therefore it can be concluded that the data is suitable for further analysis.

**Table 1- Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.810	27

**Table 2- KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.810
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	12136.914
	df	351
	Sig.	.000

**PRINCIPAL COMPONENT METHOD**

The key component method of the factor analysis technique was used to classify the factors influencing the purchasing behavior of global brands by customers Tahir and Zulkifli (2012). A total of 27 elements were reduced to seven factors after applying exploratory factor analysis. The study of factors reduces many variables into a smaller number of constructs; it also shows which variables found are highly associated with each other (Hair et al., 2015). Things with loading variables equal to or greater than 0.50 were considered. Also, the rotation method of varimax was used to rotate the variables (Hair et al., 2006)

**THE KAISER-MEYER-OLKIN AND BARTLETT'S TEST**

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure is 0.810, shown in table 2 which indicates that the study's sampling is adequate and suitable for factor analysis (Kaiser, 1974). Additionally, the significance level of 0.000 implies that variables have good relationships with each other in the study (Schuessler, 1971). The results of the Bartlett sphericity and KMO tests are shown in the table below. The findings of Bartlett's Sphericity and KMO Test indicate that data is sufficient for factor analysis (Hair et al., 2015; Kaiser, 1974)

**COMMUNALITY**

The communal outcomes are shown in table 3. It is the sum of variance that a variable share with all the other calculated variables. This is also the percentage of variance explained by the common variables

(Keller, 1993;2004). (Phau and Cheong, 2009) indicated that variables with loads greater than 0.45 were important and those group outcomes were accompanied by appropriate levels, as seen in the table 3.

**Table 3- Communalities**

	Initial	Extraction
PEV3	1.000	.929
PEV1	1.000	.980
PC3	1.000	.898
PC1	1.000	.951
PC4	1.000	.772
PC2	1.000	.947
PSI3	1.000	.799
PSI1	1.000	.874
PSI2	1.000	.838
PSI4	1.000	.693
PI4	1.000	.800
PBQ2	1.000	.969
PI1	1.000	.960
PEV4	1.000	.906
PI3	1.000	.905
PI2	1.000	.935
PBQ4	1.000	.952
PEV2	1.000	.935
PBQ1	1.000	.967
PBQ3	1.000	.957
PU4	1.000	.837
PU3	1.000	.858
PU1	1.000	.954
PU2	1.000	.919
PBI2	1.000	.915
PBI3	1.000	.681
PBI1	1.000	.937

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**VARIANCE EXPLAINED**

The total variance explained is shown in Table 4. 27 elements were reduced to 7 factors after applying the factor analysis. The seven-factor rotated varimax, satisfactory results are shown in the table. Besides, Base (Haynes, Lackman, &Guskey, 1999) proposed that the heterogeneity of variables should be clarified by at least 50 percent of the variance. In the present analysis, 89.140% of the total variance, which is appropriate, was explained by seven factors. The table also explains that there are only seven variables that have more than one value. The overall variance clarified is 89.140 percent and only 10.860 percent of the information contained has been lost by the report (Steenkamp et al., 2003).

**Table 4- Total Variance Explained**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.383	19.938	19.938	5.383	19.938	19.938	3.863	14.308	14.308
2	4.590	17.002	36.940	4.590	17.002	36.940	3.776	13.984	28.292

3	3.535	13.092	50.032	3.535	13.092	50.032	3.589	13.291	41.584
4	3.491	12.931	62.963	3.491	12.931	62.963	3.573	13.232	54.815
5	3.173	11.751	74.714	3.173	11.751	74.714	3.540	13.112	67.927
6	2.214	8.198	82.912	2.214	8.198	82.912	3.240	11.998	79.925
7	1.682	6.228	89.140	1.682	6.228	89.140	2.488	9.215	89.140
8	.457	1.692	90.832						
9	.409	1.516	92.349						
10	.309	1.143	93.491						
11	.265	.983	94.474						
12	.228	.845	95.319						
13	.205	.760	96.079						
14	.187	.693	96.772						
15	.170	.629	97.401						
16	.126	.466	97.867						
17	.117	.433	98.300						
18	.099	.367	98.667						
19	.084	.310	98.977						
20	.063	.232	99.209						
21	.056	.207	99.416						
22	.039	.144	99.560						
23	.033	.124	99.684						
24	.026	.097	99.781						
25	.022	.082	99.863						
26	.020	.076	99.939						
27	.017	.061	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

### FACTOR NAMING AND SUMMARY

The factors have been categorized and named on the basis of item representation in each factor. The naming of the factors, variance, eigenvalues, loadings, and various statements under the seven factors with their respective labels have been summarized in table 5.

*Factor 1 Perceived Brand Quality:* The summarized results of factor analysis have been shown in table 5 which shows that the first dimension i.e., ‘Perceived Brand Quality’ comprises four items relating to the various aspects of brand quality. It explained 19.938% of the variation of the data, with an eigenvalue of 5.383. It contains four items namely ‘Global brands are reliable (.974)’, ‘Global brands are durable (.973)’, ‘Global brands are of high quality (.966)’, ‘Global brands are of superior quality (.964)’. Thus, the ‘Perceived Brand Quality’ dimension is considered as the most significant dimension in the current study, as consumers are inclined to choose products according to perceived brand quality as compared to other dimensions in regards to global brands because the quality is what matters a lot to the customer. (Yoo&Donthu, 2001)

*Factor 2 Perceived Emotional Values:* The second dimension, ‘Perceived Emotional Value’ explained a 17.002% variation in the data, having an eigenvalue of 4.59. It includes four items namely; ‘I enjoy buying global brands (.968)’, ‘Global brands make me feel good (.941)’, ‘Global brand image gives me pleasure (.941)’, ‘The influence of others makes me use these brands (.938)’. Previous studies have identified ‘Perceived Emotional Values’ as one of the important factors for buying global brands. The majority of people are interested to buy global brands just because of their perceived emotional values.

Young people require to induce something in reciprocally for his/her involvement. To them, the sole thing that matters is the emotional benefits that they can get within the community. (Kastanakis&Balabanis, 2012).

*Factor 3 Purchase Intention:*The third dimension, ‘Purchase Intention’ explained 13.092% variation in the data, having an eigenvalue of 3.535 and comprises of four items such as ‘I usually buy this brand once in a month (.978)’, ‘I’m willing to pay extra for global brands (.962)’, ‘I feel like the price of global brands is nominal (.947)’, ‘I prefer chosen brand over other brands (.889)’. Purchase intention makes a huge impact in buying global brands. In various studies, it is observed that people are usually into global brands and they like to buy these brands frequently. (Chang, His, &Liu, 2009).

*Factor4 Perceived Uniqueness:*The fourth dimension i.e., ‘Perceived Uniqueness’ also comprises four items relating to the uniqueness of global brands. It explained 12.931% of the variation of the data, with an eigenvalue of 3.491. The items this factor contains are ‘Global brands usually change personal image (.975)’, ‘Someone can easily change their personality using the global brand (.958)’, ‘I always buy global brands to create a unique image (.925)’, ‘I look for global brands which add into my style (.913)’. Thus, if the brand is somewhat unique people feel like that uniqueness is adding to their personal image and they prefer buying more of a global brand to create a unique image. (Johansson & Ronkainen, 2005)

*Factor5 Perceived Brand Interest:*The second dimension, ‘Perceived Brand interest’ explained 11.751% variation in the data, having an eigenvalue of 3.173. It includes three items namely; ‘I spend more money on global brands (.943)’, ‘Selecting global brands is my favorite activity (.932)’, ‘I always look for global brands whenever I go shopping (.782)’. Previous studies have identified ‘Perceived Brand interest’ also acts as an important factor for buying global brands. The majority of people are interested to buy global brands as they have a high brand interest which makes them spend more money on global brands. Young consumers mostly tend to share similar consumption patterns and leisure activities across national borders with similar brand interests. (Kjeldgaard & Askegaard, 2006).

*Factor6 Perceived Cost:*The sixth dimension, ‘Perceived Cost’ explained 8.198% variation in the data, having an eigenvalue of 2.214 and comprises of four items such as ‘Global brands are affordable (.938)’, ‘Global brands are valued for money (.937)’, , ‘Global brands offer a various discount to customers (.929)’, ‘I always prefer to buy global brands (.867)’. However, the cost is the major factor that can change the decision of the customer regarding the product but most people are of the view that global brands are affordable which is a good thing (Srivastava & Shocker, 1991).

*Factor 7 Perceived Social Influence:*The last dimension, ‘Perceived social influence’ explained 6.228% variation in the data, having an eigenvalue of 1.682 and comprises of four items such as ‘I’m using global brands because my friends are using it (.923)’, ‘I’m using global brands because my peers are using it (.899)’, ‘I’m using global brands because my family is using it (.889)’, ‘I’m using global brands because my relatives are using it (.821)’. However social influence doesn’t make much influence as compared to other factors but even then, it makes a huge impact on customer mind. The family and peers act as a great influencer on consumer behavior (Ali et al., 2012).

**Table 5- Factor Naming, Variance Explained, Eigenvalue**

Sr. No.	Factor name (Variance explained)	Eigenvalue	Loadings	Items
F1	Perceived Brand Quality (9.938)	5.383	0.974	Global brands are reliable
			0.973	Global brands are durable
			0.966	Global brands are of high quality
			0.964	Global brands are of superior quality
F2	Perceived Emotional Values (17.002)	4.59	0.968	I enjoy buying global brands
			0.941	Global brands make me feel good
			0.941	Global brand image gives me pleasure

			0.938	The influence of others makes me to use these brands
F3	Purchase Intention (13.092)	3.535	0.978	I usually buy this brand once in a month
			0.962	I'm willing to pay extra for global brands
			0.947	I feel like price of global brands is nominal
			0.889	I prefer chosen brand over other brands
F4	Perceived uniqueness (12.931)	3.491	0.975	The global brand usually changes the personal image
			0.958	Someone can easily change their personality using global brand.
			0.925	I always buy global brands to create unique image
			0.913	I look for global brands which add into my style.
F5	Perceived Brand Interest (11.751)	3.173	0.943	I spend more money on global brands
			0.932	Selecting global brands is my favourite activity
			0.782	I always looks for global brands whenever I go for shopping
F6	Perceived Cost (8.198)	2.214	0.938	The global brands are affordable
			0.937	Global brands are value for money
			0.929	Global brands offer various discounts to customers
			0.867	I always prefer to buy global brands
F7	Perceived Social Influence (6.228)	1.682	0.923	I'm using the global brands because my friends are using it
			0.899	I'm using the global brands because my peers are using it
			0.889	I'm using the global brands because my family is using it
			0.821	I'm using the global brands because my relatives are using it

### MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

In order to analyze the influence of variables on consumer purchasing behavior with the aid of seven dimensions, multiple regression analysis was used. The purchasing intention of customers was viewed as a dependent variable, while seven other variables were taken as independent variables. Consumer purchasing intention was analyzed by seven factors, namely brand equity, emotional values, purchasing intention, uniqueness, expense, social impact, and brand interest, which have a major impact on global brands' consumer purchasing behavior.

### REGRESSION RESULTS

#### MODEL SUMMARY

Table 6 represents the description of the outcomes of regression analysis. First, in the present analysis, R<sup>2</sup> accounted for 0.980, which indicates that seven different independent variables explained 98 percent of the heterogeneity of the dependent variable (consumer purchasing behavior). Secondly, the Modified R<sup>2</sup> value represents the value of 0.980, which accounted for 98 percent of the variance in the dependent variable of the present analysis, which is the most useful indicator of a model. The Durbin-Watson value is 1.644, which is closer to 2. This means that the sample does not have autocorrelation. The model fitness among dependent and independent variables is defined by the F value (2554.639). Moreover, the value of

R is 0.990 which shows that a significant relationship exists between dependent and independent variables, (Pak &Kambil, 2006).

**Table 6- Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.990 <sup>a</sup>	.980	.980	.10797	.980	2554.639	6	313	.000	1.644

a. Predictors: (Constant), PBI, PSI, PC, PU, PEV, PBQ

b. Dependent Variable: PI

*F Test*

The F-test is often used to know the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. This test is done with the help of the 20.0 version of SPSS software. ANOVA or F-test results have been shown in table 7 that describes the model's fitness. The significance value of the F statistic is lower than 0.05, which suggests that the variance in the dependent variable is clarified by independent variables.

**Table 7-ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	178.698	6	29.783	2554.639	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	3.649	313	.012		
Total	182.347	319			

a. Dependent Variable: PI

b. Predictors: (Constant), PBI, PSI, PC, PU, PEV, PBQ

**HYPOTHESES TESTING**

It is depicted from the summary that dimension ‘Purchase Intention’ was the foremost imperative predictor of consumer buying behavior of global brands. (Haynes, Lackman, &Guskey, 1999) Therefore, this dimension is the antecedents of consumer buying behavior of global brands. Table 8 represents that whether the hypothesis is rejected or accepted.

The dimensions Perceived brand equity, perceived emotional value, perceived cost, perceived social influence, and perceived brand interest are rejected as they have no impact on consumer purchase intention while the hypothesis of the dimension perceived uniqueness is accepted as it has an impact on the purchase intention of the customer (sig 0.191)

**Table 8- Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis	t	Sig.	Results
Perceived brand equity	3.988	.000	Rejected
Perceived emotional value	121.019	.000	Rejected
Perceived uniqueness	-1.311	.191	Accepted
Perceived cost	24.568	.000	Rejected
Perceived social influence	6.709	.000	Rejected
Perceived brand interest	-4.000	.000	Rejected

## CONCLUSION

This study is to explore the global consumer culture concept to predict young consumer's attitudes and perspectives towards global brands. Results show that young consumers have emerged as a lucrative market segment for several multinational corporations because of their growing acceptance of global brands (Lu & Xu, 2015). Research has been conducted to identify various influencing factors of consumers perceived brand equity, e.g., brand image, brand awareness, and its consequences, (Chang & Liu, 2009), only limited research exists on how consumers' assimilation to a different culture to mainstream global consumer culture influences brand equity among young consumers. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to develop and empirically test a theoretical model of young consumers' perceived brand equity. Specifically, the model explores the interrelationships among acculturation to worldwide consumer culture, perceived brand equity, attitudes toward the brand, and brand resonance within the context of global brands. This research suggests marketers must understand young consumers' consumption of global brands in a better way. The current study also showed how attitudes toward global brands influenced the development of brand resonance; the highest stage of consumer brand discourse. Brand resonance for young consumers served to indicate the close association they developed with global sportswear brands. Perceived Brand Quality' dimension is considered as the most significant dimension in the current study, as consumers are inclined to choose products according to perceived brand quality as compared to other dimensions in regards to global brands because the quality is what matters a lot to the customer (Yoo & Donthu, 2001). The majority of people are interested to buy global brands just because of their perceived emotional values. Young people require inducing something in reciprocally for his/her involvement. To them, the sole thing that matters is the emotional benefits that they can get within the community. (Kastanakis & Balabanis, 2012). Purchase intention makes a huge impact in buying global brands. In various studies, it is observed that people are usually into global brands and they like to buy these brands frequently. (Chang, Hsin & Liu, 2009). Thus, if the brand is unique people feel like that uniqueness is adding to their image and they prefer buying more of a global brand to create a unique image. (Johansson & Ronkainen, 2005). The majority of people are interested to buy global brands as they have a high brand interest which makes them spend more money on global brands. Young consumers mostly tend to share similar consumption patterns and leisure activities across national borders with similar brand interests. (Kjeldgaard & Askegaard, 2006). The findings of the study provide both scholars and practitioners with an important contribution. Theoretically, the study offers empirical proof of the relationship between brand equity and brand attitudes. The theoretical model guiding the current study reflects the notion of an emerging acculturation process among a segment of the world's population to a set of global consumer Preferences and ideals that are more and more embodied in international brands. The results support the youth consumer's affinity for self-identification with global consumer culture and their cosmopolitan openness to foreign cultures, managerially.

## REFERENCES

1. Alden, D.L., Steenkamp, J.B. & Batra, R. (1999) Brand positioning through advertising in Asia, North America, and Europe: the role of global consumer culture. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(1), pp.75–

87.

2. Anderson, James C. and David W. Gerbing, (1988), "Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 103 No. 3, pp. 411-423.
3. Arnould, Eric J. and Craig J. Thompson, (2005), "Consumer culture theory (CCT): Twenty years of research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 868-882.
4. Chang, Hsin H. and Ya M. Liu (2009), "The impact of brand equity on brand preference and purchase intentions in the service industries," *The Service Industry Journal*, Vol. 29 No. 12, pp. 1687-1709.
5. Cleveland, Mark, and Michael Laroche, (2007), "Acculturation to the global consumer culture: Scale development and research paradigm," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 60 No.1, pp.249-259.
6. Douglas, Susan P., and Samuel C. Craig, (2012), "The limits of global branding: The emerging market challenge. In *Handbook on Research in International Marketing*, (2nd Edition),
7. Subhash C. Jain and David Griffith (eds.), Edward Elgar Publishing Inc., North Hampton, MA: pp. 3-19.
8. Gereffi, Gary, and Susan Frederick, (2010), "The global apparel value chain, trade and the crisis: Challenges and opportunities for developing countries," In *Global Value Chains in a Post-crisis World: A Developmental Perspective*, Olivier Cattaneo, Gary Gereffi and Cornelia Staritz (eds.), World Bank, Washington, D.C. pp. 157-208.
9. Hannerz, U. (1990) *Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture*. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7(2), pp.237-251.
10. Hermans, H. & Kempen, H. (1998) *Moving cultures: the perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society*. *American Psychologist*, 53(10), pp. 1111-1120.
11. Kim, Jae-On, and Charles W. Mueller, (1978), *Factor analysis statistical methods and practical issues*. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA. Kjelgaard, D. and Soren Askegaard, (2006), "The globalization of youth culture: The global youth segment as structures of common difference," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 231-247.
12. Lu, J. and Xu, J. (2015). Chinese young consumers' brand loyalty toward sportswear products: a perspective of self-congruity. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 365-376.
13. McCracken, Grant (1986), "Culture and consumption: A theoretical account of the structure and movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 13 No.1, pp. 71-84.
14. Nelson, M. & Paek, H.J. (2007) A content analysis of advertising in a global magazine across seven countries: implications for global advertising strategies. *International Marketing Review*, 24(1), pp. 64-86.
15. Ozsomer, Aysegul (2012), "Adoption of global consumer culture: The road to global brands," In Shintaro Okazaki (ed.), *Handbook of Research on International Advertising*, Edward Elgar Publishing, North Hampton, MA. pp.42-55.
16. Pappu, R., Quester, P.G., and Cooksey, R.W. (2005). Consumer-based brand equity: Improving the measurement-empirical evidence. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2/3, pp. 143-153.
17. Piacentini, Maria (2010), "Children and fashion," In *Understanding Children as Consumers* David Marshall (ed.), SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA. pp. 202-127.

18. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), Common method biases in Behaviour research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.
19. Saran, A. and Morris Kalliny (2012), "Cosmopolitanism: Concept and Measurement," *Journal of Global Marketing*, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 282-291.
20. Schumacker, Randall C. and Richard G. Lomax, (2004), "A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
21. Shocker, A., Srivastava, R. & Ruekert, R. (1994) Challenges and opportunities facing brand management: an introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31, pp. 149–158.
22. Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E, Rajeev Batra, and Dana L. Alden, (2003), "How perceived brand globalness creates brand value," *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol 34 No. 1, pp. 53-65.
23. Townsend, J., Yenyurt, S. & Talay, M.B. (2009) Getting to global: an evolutionary perspective of brand expansion in international markets. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40, pp.539–558.
24. Wilk, R. (1995) Learning to be local in Belize: global systems of common difference, in Miller, D. (ed.) *Worlds Apart: Modernity through the Prism of the Local*. London and New York: Routledge.
25. Zhou, N. & Belk, R. (2004) Chinese consumer readings of global and local advertising appeals. *Journal of Advertising*, 33(3), pp.63–76.
26. Wang, Haizhong, Yujie Wei, and Chunling Yu, (2008), "Global brand equity model: Combining customer-based with product-market outcome approaches," *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 17 No. 5, pp.305-316.
27. Yoo, Boonghee and Naveen Donthu (2001), "Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 1-14.
28. Zhou, L., Teng, L. & Poon, P. (2008) Susceptibility to a global consumer culture: a three-dimensional scale. *Psychology and Marketing*, 25(4), pp. 336–351.