Journal of Korea Trade Vol. 23, No. 8, December 2019, 89-109
https://doi.org/10.35611/jkt.2019.23.8.89
ISSN 1229-828X

Effects of Global Consumer Culture Positioning versus Local Consumer Culture Positioning in TV Advertisements on Consumers' Brand Evaluation and Attitude toward Brand

JKT 23(8)

Received 12 September 2019
Revised 13 November 2019
Accepted 15 December 2019

Chol Lee
College of Business, Sogang University, Seoul, South Korea

Gyoung-Gyu Choi†
Dongguk Business School, Dongguk University-Seoul, South Korea

Abstract

Purpose – We perform an empirical analysis of the effects of global consumer culture positioning (GCCP) in TV advertisements on consumer's brand evaluations (perceived quality, perceived price, and brand prestige) and attitude toward brand. Also, we analyze the moderating roles of consumer characteristics (ethnocentrism and level of product knowledge) in those effects.

Design/methodology – This research is based on a survey of 210 randomly-selected university students in Seoul, Korea. The participants in the survey were shown a total of 8 TV advertisements of consumer goods of nondurable goods (fast food and carbonated drinks), and durable goods (sports shoes and digital camera), which included two advertisements for each product where one uses GCCP strategy while another uses LCCP strategy. We estimate the structural model using the AMOS 18.0 computer program.

Findings – We find that GCCP has more positive effects on consumers' brand evaluations and attitude toward brand than LCCP in TV advertising. We also find that GCCP has stronger effects on brand evaluation and attitude toward brand in consumers with weak ethnocentrism and in those with a low level of product knowledge.

Practical implications - Using GCCP in an advertisement is an effective way of improving consumer's evaluation of the brand and attitude toward the brand mainly when cosmopolitan consumers and consumers with low knowledge levels are segmented as targets.

Originality/value – The study contributes to identify how and for what consumer groups' global brand positioning strategies in TV advertisements affect consumers' brand evaluations and their attitudes toward brands.

Keywords: Attitude Toward Brand, Brand Positioning, Ethnocentrism, Global Consumer Culture Positioning (GCCP), Global Consumer Culture Theory (GCCT), Local Consumer Culture Positioning (LCCP), Product Knowledge

JEL Classifications: F10, F14, F20, F23

1. Introduction

The most significant recent change in the market environment is the globalization of markets. The globalization of markets, or the integration of domestic and foreign markets, has accelerated and has led to a general preference for global brands and lifestyles. Given these

† **Corresponding author:** gchoi@dongguk.edu
© 2019 Korea Trade Research Association. All right reserved.

trends, global consumer culture theory (GCCT) argues that the globalization of markets has led to the existence of a global consumer culture in which many consumers share consumption values regardless of their residential countries (Taylor and Okazaki, 2015). Moreover, in each country, there is an increase in such a "global consumer class" that aims to participate in the global consumer culture (Dawar and Parker, 1994; Hassan and Katsanis, 1994). Consequently, GCCT has become influential in international marketing (Arnould and Thomson, 2005/2018). Zhou, Teng and Poon (2008) develop and validate a scale to measure consumers' susceptibility to global consumer culture (SGCC) across cultures, which is composed of three dimensions: conformity to consumption trend, quality perception, and social prestige. There has been an increase in a global consumer group in the Koran market as well, and as a result, there is a perception that utilizing GCCT is ever more effective.

On the other hand, there are consumer groups who oppose such globalization and aim to preserve local culture, tradition, and lifestyle. Anti-globalization consumer groups indeed exist in Korea as well. As a result, the choice of brand position strategy in order to enhance corporate brand image and brand power inside and outside Korea has become an important issue. In other words, international marketers must now optimally strategize between emphasizing local culture and tradition and stressing global culture and image. Moreover, it is crucial to analyze which brand positioning strategy should be utilized for what product group or target consumers.

Following this trend, international marketing scholars have shown interest in brand positioning strategy in the global market. Alden, Steenkamp and Batra (1999), for the first time, categorized brand positioning strategy in international advertisements into three groups - global consumer culture positioning (GCCP), local consumer culture positioning (LCCP), and foreign consumer culture positioning (FCCP) - and explored when each positioning strategy is commonly used. According to their study, GCCP is defined as the strategy of identifying a brand as a symbol of global culture, LCCP is the strategy of linking a brand with local cultures, such as local cultural norms and identity, and FCCP is the identification of a brand as a symbol of particular foreign consumer culture. There have been many follow-up studies on global positioning strategy (Akaka and Alden, 2010; Bartikowski and Cleveland, 2017; Gammoh, Koh and Okoroafo, 2011; Nijssen and Douglas, 2011; Westjohn, Singh and Magnusson, 2012; Zhou, Teng and Poon, 2008).

However, most past studies have measured consumers' responses or attitudes toward GCCP or LCCP strategies and identified variables affecting their responses or attitudes toward the brand positioning strategies. For example, Nijssen and Douglas (2011) examined differences in consumer responses to GCCP versus LCCP. Westjohn et al. (2012) found that consumer characteristics of global and national identities are strongly related to responsiveness to GCCP and LCCP, respectively.

Very few studies have analyzed the actual effects of brand positioning strategies in TV advertisements on consumer's brand evaluations and attitudes toward the brand. For example, Gammoh et al. (2011) also examined the impact of GCCP vs. LCCP on consumer's brand evaluation in a print advertisement. However, except for Jun et al. (2017) and Liu, Tao and Tsai (2017), those studies have not identified when global brand positioning strategy is more effective, specifically for which consumer group. Therefore, it is necessary to study how and for what consumer groups brand positioning strategy in TV advertisements affect consumers' brand evaluations and their attitudes toward brands. Recently, Steenkamp (2019), in a conceptual paper dealing with an overview of the theory and measurement of GCC and LCC, calls for an in-depth discussion of how international marketers have operationalized consumer attitudes toward GCCP and LCCP, and their individual-level and national-cultural correlates.

Given such research needs, therefore, we aim to examine the effect of GCCP on consumer's brand evaluation and attitude toward brand. In particular, we will examine how such an effect is differentiated based on consumer characteristics. In other words, the primary purpose of this study can be summarized into two points. First, this paper studies the effect of GCCP in TV advertising on consumers' evaluation of brand attributes and their attitude toward brands. Second, this study investigates what and how consumer characteristics moderates the effect of GCCP on consumers' attitude toward brand.

2. Literature Review

With the rapid integration or globalization of markets, many international marketers and scholars have noticed the strong influence of global consumer culture (Huang, 2016). Global consumer culture (GCC) was defined as a collection of common signs and symbols, such as brands, that are understood by significant numbers of consumers around the world (Alden, Steenkamp and Batra, 1999). Past studies on GCC showed that brands with a global image might derive their additional power and value from consumer attribution of enhanced self-worth and status through the purchase of the global brand. In other words, consumers may purchase certain brands to reinforce their membership in a specific global segment, such as teenagers, business, elite, and the like (Alden et al., 1999).

With the spread of global consumer culture, several researchers concluded that when consumers perceive a brand as more global, the overall brand value increases (Aaker, 1991; Kapferer, 1997). Researchers have also found that creating a global image is a powerful tool for increasing revenue and bringing more value to the brand (Shocker, Srivastava and Ruekert, 1994). It has been established that such value of the global brand is derived from consumers' feeling of being part of a global consumer class (Friedman, 1990).

Aaker (1991/1996) researched the characteristics of global brands and their benefits, citing benefits such as cost reduction from economies of scale, high brand awareness, and high brand prestige and trust. Moore (1993) found that the brand equity of global brands differed from country to country, and Roth (1995) suggested that the effect of global brand image strategy on products depends on a country's cultural, economic, and social characteristics. Also, Kapferer (1997) explained how to calculate and manage brand equity, which represents the value of a global brand. Finally, Steenkamp, Batra and Alden (2003) showed three pathways through which perceived brand globalness (PBG) influences the likelihood of brand purchase. They found on consumer data from the USA and Korea that PBG is positively related to both perceived brand quality and prestige and, through them, to purchase likelihood.

There have also been many studies comparing local brands and global brands (Aaker, 1991; Batra, 1995). The central theme of these studies is the comparison of local and global brands, their pros and cons, and factors to consider in the transition from local to global brands. Steenkamp et al. (2003) explored the effect of a global brand image on how consumers evaluate products and concluded that perceived brand globalness is positively related to the perceived quality and reputation of the brand.

Along with these studies on global brands, there have been a few studies on brand positioning in advertisements. To lay a foundation, Alden et al. (1999) categorized brand positioning strategies in international advertisements into three types: global consumer culture positioning (GCCP), local consumer culture positioning (LCCP), and foreign consumer culture positioning (FCCP). They defined GCCP as one that identifies the brand as a symbol of a given global culture. It does so by using meaning transfer, an advertising process through which the brand is associated with other signs which reflect cultural

orientation (Huang, 2016). The authors analyzed the actual use and frequencies of these strategies in the product advertisements from 7 countries, including the US, and concluded that the positioning in advertisements is a meaningful strategy. They also found that LCCP is used more often than GCCP in the advertisements, and GCCP is used more in durable goods with indirect and soft approaches, and LCCP is used more often in services and foods.

Following this study, there have been many follow-up studies on the three brand positioning strategies (Akaka and Alden, 2010; Amine, Chao and Arnold, 2005; Gammoh et al., 2011; Gartikowski and Cleveland, 2017; Hung, Gu and Tse, 2005; Nelson and Paek, 2007; Nijssen and Douglas, 2011; Tharp and Jeong, 2001; Westjohn, Singh and Magnusson, 2012; Zhou and Belk, 2004; Zhou, Teng and Poon, 2008). For example, Nelson and Paek (2007) and Tharp and Jeong (2001) suggested that GCCP is a useful global advertisement strategy. Amine, Chao and Arnold (2005) highlighted the role of GCCP strategy on brand quality. Hung, Gu and Tse (2005) and Zhou and Belk (2004) emphasized the role of GCCP strategy on brand prestige. Also, Nijssen and Douglas (2011) examined differences in consumer responses to GCCP versus LCCP. Westjohn et al. (2012) found that consumer characteristics of global and national identities are strongly related to responsiveness to GCCP and LCCP, respectively.

In Korea, Lee (2002) studied the status and characteristics of GCCP strategy in TV advertisements. Also, Lee and Kim (2011) explored the effect of GCCP in the advertisement on consumer's product evaluations and attitudes toward the advertisement, but not on the attitude toward the brand. Also, Rhee and Kim (2014) examined the brand positioning strategy of Hyundai Motor India (HMI) and concluded that the strategy targeting consumer segments enhanced its global competitiveness.

However, most past studies have measured consumers' responses or attitudes toward GCCP or LCCP strategies. They identified individual- and national-cultural correlates affecting their responses or attitudes toward the brand positioning strategies. Very few studies have analyzed the effects of brand positioning strategies in TV advertisements on consumer's brand evaluations and attitudes toward the brand. Gammoh et al. (2011) also examined the impact of GCCP vs LCCP on consumer's brand evaluation in a print advertisement.

Also, there have been few studies, except for Jun et al. (2017) and Liu, Tao and Tsai (2017), on when global brand positioning strategy is more effective, specifically, for what consumers and product groups. Jun et al. (2017) found the moderating effects of self-esteem on consumer responses to global positioning in advertising. Also, Liu, Tao and Tsai (2017) examined the moderating effects of ethnocentrism and cultural openness on the effectiveness of brand positioning strategies of high-tech products. Therefore, it is necessary to study how and for what consumer groups brand positioning strategies in TV advertisements affect consumers' brand evaluations and their attitudes toward brands.

3. Hypotheses

With the globalization of markets, global consumer culture has become prevalent around the world. Consumers believe that by consuming brands with global image, they become part of the global consumer class and thus perceive that there is an ascent of social status. As a result, the more marketers strengthen the global image of a brand by utilizing the GCCP strategy, the more consumers perceive the brand as global and prefer it over brands with a more local image. As consumer culture becomes more global, consumers have the desire to be part of the cosmopolitan culture, and global brands become a status symbol. This results in consumers favoring global products and brands. This means that the positive effect of

GCCP strategy in advertising on brand evaluation and attitude toward brand is greater when GCCP is used, compared to when LCCP is used.

GCCP is to position a brand as a globally used brand so that consumers recognize the brand as a global brand. According to Steenkamp et al. (2003), a brand's global image increases the perceived quality of the product. This is because consumers believe that a widely used product is more reliable, and therefore has better quality. If a brand is viewed as globally available, consumers may attribute the higher quality to the brand because such quality is likely to be thought of as critical to global acceptance (Kapferer, 1997; Keller, 1998).

Consumers prefer global brands because they also believe global brands have better quality control (Alden et al., 1999). Therefore, a globally positioned brand imprints the perception in consumers that the brand has higher quality compared to local brands and leads consumers to take pride in using the product. As such, by employing the GCCP strategy, consumers will perceive the brand as a global brand and have higher confidence in its quality. Therefore, the more GCCP strategy is employed, there is a more significant positive effect on a consumer's perceived quality, as opposed to when the LCCP strategy is used. Thus, we can suggest the following hypothesis:

H1: Using GCCP in TV advertising will have more positive effects on consumers' perceived brand quality than LCCP.

Brands that are globally positioned give more global images to the consumers, and consumers tend to trust them as globally renowned brands. Also, in general, consumers believe that a reliable brand is more expensive than a less reliable brand (Erdem, Swait and Valenzuela, 2006). In other words, the higher the quality, the higher the price believed by consumers. If the brand is perceived to be global, it is more likely to be a higher price than local brands. Despite exceptions (Coca-cola, for example), evidence indicates that global brands are typically more expensive than local brands (Batra et al., 2000).

As a result, if a brand employs the GCCP strategy, consumers will perceive the brand as a global brand, and in turn, associate the product as more expensive and of better quality. Thus, we can suggest the following hypothesis:

H2: Using GCCP in TV advertising will have more positive effects on consumers' perceived brand price than LCCP.

Some authors have asserted that consumers may prefer global brands because of the association of higher prestige (Kapferer, 1997). If global brands have a higher price than local brands, they will have higher prestige because higher price tends to create greater aspirational, prestige appeal (Bearden and Etzel, 1982).

Also, as the market becomes more global, consumer preference for global brands increases. This results in global consumer culture groups with similar consumption patterns. Globally positioned brands imprint a global image on consumers, which makes the consumers take pride in their use of the brand. When consumers purchase and use brands with a global image, they believe that their status and reputation increase by becoming part of a global consumer group (Steenkamp et al., 2003). Besides, some consumers are said to buy global brands to enhance their self-image as being cosmopolitan, sophisticated, and modern (Friedman, 1990).

Also, Steenkamp et al. (2003) provided empirical evidence that a brand's global image contributes to enhanced brand reputation. This is because consumers believe that global brands are widely used and, therefore, more reliable and reputable. Thus, we can suggest the

following hypothesis:

H3: Using GCCP in TV advertising will have more positive effects on consumers' perceived brand reputation than LCCP.

Attitude toward brand is defined as a predisposition toward a particular brand in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). The most crucial objective of an advertisement is to make consumers change their attitude toward the brand more favorably and derive the willingness to buy. Therefore, we need to study the effects of brand positioning strategies in an advertisement on the consumer's attitude toward brand.

It is known that the evaluation of the individual elements of a product determines the general attitude of consumers toward the product (Engel, Blackwell and Miniard, 1986; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Advertisements with GCCP employ global factors in the advertisements. For example, a brand's pronunciation and wording are in a global language, while globally well-known persons and locations are used in the setting, story character, and central theme of the advertisements. Brands using a global language such as English and advertisements using globally well-known models and locations are perceived as more sophisticated and modern. Therefore, consumers tend to think they can improve their status by purchasing a brand with a global image because they presume they belong to the global consumer class (Friedman, 1990).

From the global image of a brand, consumers perceive high brand prestige, and they are likely to believe the product possesses better quality and higher reliability (Alden et al., 1999; Erdem et al., 2006; Kapferer 1997; Keller 1998; Steenkamp et al., 2003). Kapferer (1997) concluded that consumers prefer global brands because of a strong association with brand prestige. Also, if consumers perceive the price level to be high, they will assume a high brand quality or high prestige in social status, and therefore will have a favorable attitude toward the brand (Geiger-Oneto et al., 2013). GCCP in advertising will positively affect consumers' attitudes toward the brand at a subconscious level because it provides consumers with the psychological satisfaction that they belong to the upper class or participate in a global consumer culture.

Thus, we can suggest that the positive effect of GCCP on perceived quality, perceived price, and brand prestige ultimately affects consumer attitude toward the brand. Thus, we can suggest the following hypothesis:

H4: Using GCCP in TV advertising will have more positive effects on consumers' attitudes toward the brand than using LCCP.

Consumers' cultural characteristics cause a difference in the attitude toward products and brands. According to the study by Kim, Mun and Kim (2012) that used the cultural characteristic variables in Hofstede (1998), Chinese consumers who are more group-oriented have a more favorable attitude toward foreign brands than consumer groups who are more individual-oriented. Ethnocentrism is defined as the tendency of evaluating outside groups using the cultural standards of his/her group, excluding outside groups, and blindly accepting inner groups (Booth, 1979; Shimp and Sharma, 1987). Ethnocentric consumers believe that consuming foreign goods is either unpatriotic or making the domestic economy disadvantageous (Shimp and Sharma, 1987). Similarly, consumers with a high level of nationalism tend to prefer local brands over global brands (Zambuni, 1983). Meanwhile, consumers with a low level of nationalism tend to have a higher level of cultural openness. And they tend to be less discriminatory toward global brands compared to local brands

(Baughn and Yaprak, 1996). Guo (2013) also shows that consumers' global orientation positively influences their attitudes toward global brands with the developed country origin, while ethnocentrism negatively influences their attitudes toward these brands, but this effect diminishes for consumers with a high global identity. In this context, Suh and Kim (2001) discuss the role of country image in developing global brands.

Therefore, consumer characteristics need to be factored out the effect of GCCP on consumer attitude toward brand, and the positive effect of GCCP on attitude toward brand will be higher with cosmopolitan consumers, who are more open and responsive to global trends, as opposed to ethnocentric consumers.

H5: The effects of using GCCP in TV advertising on consumer's attitudes toward brand will be higher for consumers with a low level of ethnocentrism than for those with a high level of ethnocentrism.

Consumer's knowledge about a product is defined as information, experience, and familiarity the consumer possesses regarding the product in issue (Duhan et al., 1997). The level of knowledge affects how consumers make a decision. Consumers with high levels of knowledge use both external and internal cues about the product in deciding while consumers with low levels of knowledge focus entirely on external clues because they have less knowledge to evaluate the internal characteristics of the product (Alba and Hutchinson, 1987; Johnson and Russon 1984; Rao and Sieben, 1992). For example, consumers with low levels of knowledge tend to use the brand or country of origin as essential factors in decision making.

In making a decision, consumers with high levels of knowledge use perceived quality, value, and other information. To consumers with low levels of knowledge, advertisements with global positioning can act as an external cue, and in turn, GCCP will give the impression that the product is used globally, has prestige, and has high quality. Therefore, to consumers with lower levels of knowledge, GCCP advertisements act as an external cue, and the effect of GCCP on consumer attitude toward brand will be higher.

H6: The effects of using GCCP in TV advertising on consumer's attitude toward brand is higher for consumers with a low level of knowledge than for those with a high level of knowledge about the product.

Previous research (Steenkamp et al., 2003) has also shown that "perceived brand globalness" has positive effects on consumer's perception of brand quality and brand prestige. Therefore, we used perceived brand globalness as a covariate in the analysis to analyze the pure effects of global consumer culture positioning on consumer's brand evaluations and attitude toward brand by controlling for the effects of the perceived brand globalness. Also, we added brand dummies to the analysis as another control variable to control for unobserved, brand-specific effects (such as objective quality, distribution coverage, and market share) and product category effects (such as differences in perceived risk) following Steenkamp et al. (2003).

4. Research Methodology

4.1. Sample and Data Collection

This research is based on a survey of 210 randomly selected university students in a private university in Seoul, Korea. We believe college students provide an appropriate sample given

the research objective of examining the effect of GCCP in TV advertising on consumers' evaluation of brand attributes and their attitude toward brands. College students are expected to have more knowledge about global consumer culture and be more aware of the globalization of a brand than a general population. For the reason above, there have been many studies using college students as a sample to test consumer behavior (e.g., Gammoh et al., 2011; Lee and Green, 1991; MacKenzie and Lutz, 1989; Michel and Olson, 1981; Tifferet and Herstein, 2010).

The participants in the survey were shown advertisements for consumer goods, which included nondurable goods (fast food and carbonated drinks), and durable goods (sports shoes and digital camera). A total of 8 TV advertisements, two advertisements for each product where one uses the LCCP strategy while another uses the GCCP strategy, were selected (See Table 1). Specifically, we found that global brands of McDonald, Sprite, Nike, and Nikon Camera used GCCP strategy in their TV advertising, while local brands of Lotteria, Chilsung Cider, Prospecs, and Samsung Camera employed LCCP strategy in their advertisements. Each advertisement was shown directly to the respondents, and then they answered the survey questions about it. After they finished answering the questions, they were shown the next advertisement with a different brand. In this way, they all finished answering questions about the eight different TV advertisements.

Table 1. TV Advertisements Used in the Survey

Product		GCCP Advertisements	LCCP Advertisements
Nondurable	Fastfood (burger)	McDonald	Lotteria
Nondurable	Carbonated Drink	Sprite	Chilsung Cider
Durable	Sports Shoes	Nike	Prospecs
Durable	Camera	Nikon	Samsung

We used a total of 200 responses in the analysis after excluding untrustworthy responses and responses with missing values. The demographic characteristics of the respondents are as follow and described in Table 2: there were 116 males (58%) and 84 females (42%). Also, 175 respondents (87.5%) were in their 20's, while 25 people (12.5%) were in their 30's. A monthly allowance of 500,000 won or above was most common at 45%, followed by 300,000~400,000 won (35%) and 100,000~200,000 won (2%).

Using data from a single survey might increase the common method bias (CMB), which is regarded as a potential limitation of survey-based designs (Chang, Witteloostuijn and Eden, 2010). So we used two different methods to control for the risk of biases in the survey. First, we reversed some of the questionnaire scales to diminish the risk of biases. Second, we performed the statistical analysis, a single unmeasured latent factor method recommended by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee and Podsakoff (2003) to assess the severity of common method bias. We estimated two models: M1, where items were allowed to load on their theoretical constructs (Chi-square=1274.164, df=365); and M2, where a latent CMV factor linking to all measurement items was added into M1 (Chi-square=1225.,083 df=347). We compared M1 and M2 and found that the change of the fit index was insignificant, indicating that the addition of a latent CMV factor does not significantly improve the fit of the measurement model over our measurement model without a CMV factor: hence the CMV issue is negligible.

Table 2. Sample Characteristics

Classification		Number (%)
Gender	Male	116 (58%)
	Female	84 (42%)
Age	20-29 years	175 (87.5%)
	30-39 years	25 (12.5%)
Allowance (Korean Won)	100,000 ~ 200,000	4 (2%)
	200,001 ~ 300,000	36 (18%)
	300,001 ~ 400,000	70 (35%)
	400,001 ~ 500,000	90 (45%)

4.2. Measures of Variables

We measured the degree of GCCP versus LCCP in advertisements based on the research done by Alden et al. (1999). Five measures were used in this research: the brand's pronunciation or spelling, the central theme, the background or setting of the advertisement, the main models, and the associated images. Specifically, unlike Alden et al. (1999), we used a 7-point semantic differential scale for respondents to measure the degree of how much global or local brand sounded, the setting of the advertisement seemed, the main models of the advertisements looked, and the central theme and images associated from the advertisements were. The higher the combined value of those five measures, we can judge that the more GCCP strategy the advertisement is employing. If the combined value is lower, we can assume that more LCCP strategy is employed in the TV advertisement.

Also, we measured brand evaluation factors such as perceived quality, perceived price, brand prestige, and attitude toward brand following past research carefully. Drawing on a study by Steenkamp et al. (2003), we measured consumer's perceived quality on four semantic differential scales in terms of overall quality. Also, following Goldsmith et al. (2005), we measured consumer's perceived price on two semantic differential scales in terms of consumer's perception about the level of the price, which asks whether it was higher or lower than the perceived average market price. Perceived brand reputation was measured on two semantic differential scales in terms of prestige and fame based on a study by Steenkamp et al. (2003). Also, following previous research (Lee and Green, 1991; Oliver and Bearden, 1985; Shimp, Terence and Alican, 1984), attitude toward brand was measured by using four semantic differential scales with adjectives of good-bad, beneficial-harmful, wise-foolish, and pleasant-unpleasant.

Also, we measured the consumer's level of ethnocentrism and product knowledge. Following Shimp and Sharma (1987), we measured the level of ethnocentrism on two factors using 7-point semantic differential scales, where "1" represents most cosmopolitan and "7" represents most ethnocentric. Also, drawing on Cowley and Mitchel (2003) and Pae, Samiee and Tai (2000), we measured knowledge about the product in terms of objective knowledge, subjective knowledge, and experience on 7-point semantic differential scales.

Finally, following Steenkamp et al. (2003), we measured perceived brand globalness as a covariate by using 7-point semantic differential scales. There were three factors: (1) This brand is a global brand or local brand to surveyee. (2) Consumers purchase this brand over the world or not. (3) This brand is significantly sold around the world or only in Korea. Also, brand dummy as another control variable was measured as seven dummies since eight brands were used in the analysis. All measures are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3. Measures of Variables

Variable	Measure
GCCP in a TV advertisement	How much global or local is the pronunciation or spelling of the brand name (X1)? How much global or local is a central theme (X2) How much global or local is background(setting) of the advertisement (X3) How much global or local is the appearance of the main model (X4) How much global or local is an image associated with the advertisement (X5)
Perceived quality	High or low on the overall quality of the brand (X6) Superior or inferior quality of the brand (X7) High or low trust in the quality of the brand (X8) High or low on manufacturing technology of the brand (X9)
Perceived price	High or low on the level of price of the brand (X10) Higher or lower than the average market price (X11)
Perceived brand reputation	Very prestigious brand - not a very prestigious brand (X12) Very famous brand - not very famous brand (X13)
Attitude toward brand	Very good – very bad (X14) Very beneficial – very harmful (X15) Very wise – very foolish (X16) Very pleasant – very unpleasant (X17)
Ethnocentrism	Purchasing domestic product is always desirable – not desirable (X18) I believe we should import only products that we cannot produce domestically (X19)
Product knowledge	Experience of buying the product (X20) Amount of knowledge about the product (X21) More - less knowledge about the product than other people (X22)
Perceived brand globalness	This brand is a global brand or local brand to surveyee (X23) Consumers purchase this brand over the world or not (X24). This brand is sold all over the world or only in Korea (X25).

5. Results of the Analysis

5.1. Reliabilities and the Validities of Measures

Before testing the hypotheses, we performed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to check the reliabilities and the validities of the measures of the variables. Only measures with factor loadings of 0.7 or higher were used in the analysis. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4. The CFA revealed an adequate model fit for the proposed measurement model (GFI=0.890, NFI=0.910, IFI=0.921, CFI= 0.921). Composite construct reliabilities (CCR) of all variables except are above 0.70, and all AVEs (average variance extracted) are above 0.50, which indicates adequate reliabilities of all measures used in the analysis. Also, convergent validity was established by examining AVEs on each variable. All AVEs above 0.5 in Table 4 present evidence for convergent validity.

Table 4. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Variables	Measure	Std. factor loadings	CCR	AVE
GCCP in a TV advertisement	X1	0.741	0.914	0.828
	X2	0.949		
	X3	0.952		
	X4	0.936		
	X5	0.954		
Perceived quality	X6	0.931	0.865	0.742
	X7	0.929		
	X8	0.767		
	X9	0.806		
Perceived price	X10	0.947	0.908	0.841
	X11	0.905		
Perceived brand reputation	X12	0.842	0.864	0.745
	X13	0.883		
Attitude toward brand	X14	0.933	0.863	0.733
	X15	0.954		
	X16	0.831		
	X17	0.680		
Ethnocentrism	X18	0.655	0.706	0.548
	X19	0.817		
Product knowledge	X20	0.712	0.853	0.664
	X21	0.909		
	X22	0.786		
Perceived brand globalness	X23	0.910	0.946	0.855
	X24	0.929		
	X25	0.935		

Also, we checked the discriminant validity of each variable using the method suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981). As shown in Table 5, the square root of the AVE is higher than all corresponding correlation, which indicated adequate discriminant validity.

Table 5. Correlation Coefficients and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Variable	Mean	S.D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. GCCP in a TV ad.	4.13	1.76	0.910							
2. Perceived quality	4.14	1.01	0.355	0.861						
3. Perceived price	3.68	0.98	0.343	0.480	0.917					
4. Perceived brand reputation	5.07	1.02	0.413	0.384	0.281	0.863				
5. Attitude toward brand	3.59	1.29	0.341	0.409	0.340	0.215	0.856			
6. Ethnocentrism	2.46	1.03	-0.024	-0.009	-0.003	-0.009	0.002	0.740		
7. Product knowledge	4.03	1.33	0.008	0.010	0.038	0.024	-0.025	-0.085	0.815	
8. Perceived brand globalness	4.16	1.65	0.138	0.218	0.250	0.486	0.101	-0.027	0.062	0.925

Note: Bold numbers in the diagonal indicate square roots of the average variance extracted, and the values below the diagonal indicate the correlation coefficients of the related latent variables.

5.2. Results of the Analysis

We employed structural equation modeling to test hypotheses by using the AMOS 18.0 computer program. Overall, the goodness of fit indices shows an acceptable level of fit for the model. Although the model's Chi-square(χ^2) is significant ($\chi^2(151) = 1654.678$, $p<.001$), other indices are within acceptable limits: The values of GFI, NFI, CFI and TLI all show satisfactory fit with the data (GFI=0.916, AGFI=.884, NFI=0.947, RFI=0.933, IFI=0.951, TLI=0.939, CFI=0.951, and RMSEA=.058).

5.2.1. The Effects of GCCP in TV Advertisement on Brand Attributes and Attitude toward Brand

The path coefficients of the structural equation model are shown in Table 6. The table indicates that the path coefficient from GCCP to perceived quality is 0.335 ($p<.001$), which is significant at the 99% significance level. This supports H1 that the more GCCP is used in TV advertisements, the more positive effect the advertisement will have on perceived quality. Also, the path coefficient from GCCP to the perceived price is 0.360 ($p<.001$), which is significant at the 99% significance level. This result supports H2. Finally, the path coefficient from GCCP to brand prestige is 0.276 ($p<.001$), which is also significant at the 99% significance level and supports H3. These results support all H1, H2, and H3. In other words, the higher the level of GCCP used in TV advertisements is, the higher the quality, price, and brand prestige consumers perceive.

We estimate the total effect of GCCP on attitude toward brand by adding all three effects of GCCP on perceived quality, perceived price, and brand's perceived prestige. The total effect of 0.252, which is significant at the 99% significance level, is obtained by adding up all three indirect effects: (1) The effect of GCCP on perceived quality (0.335) multiplied by the effect of perceived quality on attitude toward brand 0(.496), (2) the effect of GCCP on perceived price (0.360) multiplied by the effect of perceived price on attitude toward brand (0.081), and (3) the effect of GCCP on brand prestige (0.276) multiplied by the effect of brand prestige on attitude toward brand (0.205). The analysis results show that the higher the level of GCCP used in TV advertisements is, the more positive attitude toward brand consumers will have. Thus, we conclude that H4 is supported.

Table 6. Effects of GCCP on Brand Attributes and Attitude toward Brand

Path	(Standardized) Path Coefficient	*t*-value	*P*
GCCP ⋯› Perceived Quality	0.335	13.36	0.000
GCCP ⋯› Perceived Price	0.360	14.37	0.000
GCCP ⋯› Brand's perceived prestige	0.276	10.34	0.000
Perceived Quality ⋯› Attitude toward brand	0.496	13.03	0.000
Perceived Price ⋯› Attitude toward brand	0.081	2.52	0.012
Brand Prestige ⋯› Attitude toward brand	0.205	7.18	0.000
The total effect of GCCP on Attitude toward brand	0.252	10.50	0.000

5.2.2. Moderating Effects of Ethnocentrism and Product Knowledge

To examine the moderating effects of ethnocentrism and product knowledge, we used a median split method to divide the sample following past research to study moderating effects in structural equation modeling (e.g., Katsikeas, Skarmeas and Bello, 2009; Steenkamp et al.,

2003). Specifically, to test H5 about the moderating effect of consumer ethnocentrism, we split the total sample based on the median value of ethnocentrism into two groups: respondents with high ethnocentrism (n=904) versus respondents with low ethnocentrism (n= 696).

We then ran a two-group analysis of a structural equation model, and the results across the two groups are shown in Table 7. Overall, the goodness of fit indices shows an acceptable level of fit for the model. Although the model's χ^2 is significant ($\chi^2(308) = 1797.130$, $p<.001$), other indices are within acceptable limits: The values of GFI, NFI, CFI, TLI and RMSEA all show satisfactory fit with the data (GFI=0.910, AGFI=.877, NFI=0.942, RFI=0.929, IFI=0.952, TLI=0.940, CFI=0.951, and RMSEA=.050).

The effect of GCCP on consumer's perceived quality for consumers with strong ethnocentrism (or weak cosmopolitanism) is 0.279, compared to 0.374 in the case of consumers with weak ethnocentrism (or strong cosmopolitanism). The difference in the effect between the two groups is significant at the 95% significance level (one-side) since the t-value of the difference is 1.72. This means that the effect of GCCP on consumer's perceived quality is significantly higher for consumers with weak ethnocentrism (strong cosmopolitanism) than those with strong ethnocentrism (weak cosmopolitanism).

Also, the effect of GCCP on the perceived price for consumers with a strong ethnocentric tendency is 0.259, compared to 0.422 of consumers with a weak ethnocentric tendency. The difference in the effect between the two groups is significant at the 95% significance level since the *t*-value of the difference is 3.79. This means that the effect of GCCP on consumer's perceived price is significantly higher for consumers with weak ethnocentrism (strong cosmopolitanism) than those with strong ethnocentrism (weak cosmopolitanism). However, the effect of GCCP on the brand's perceived prestige is 0.238 for ethnocentric consumers and 0.318 for consumers with weak ethnocentric tendencies. The difference in the effect between the two groups is not significant since the t-value of the difference is 1.00. The results show that the effects of GCCP on the consumers' perceived quality and price are higher for less ethnocentric consumers (in other words, more cosmopolitan consumers) than for more ethnocentric ones. However, there is no significant difference in the effect of GCCP on brand reputation between the two groups.

Table 7. Two-Group Analysis: Ethnocentrism

Path	Group	Standardized Path Coefficient	*t*-value (the difference between the two groups)
GCCP ⇢ Perceived Quality	Strong ethnocentrism	0.279**	1.72*
	Weak ethnocentrism	0.374**	
GCCP ⇢ Perceived Price	Strong ethnocentrism	0.259**	3.79**
	Weak ethnocentrism	0.422**	
GCCP ⇢ Brand Prestige	Strong ethnocentrism	0.238**	1.00
	Weak ethnocentrism	0.318**	
The total effect of GCCP on Attitude toward Brand	Strong ethnocentrism	0.199**	64.85**(z-value)
	Weak ethnocentrism	0.303**	

Note: **: $p<0.01$; *: $P<0.05$.

Finally, the total effects of GCCP on brand attitude are found to be 0.199 (standard error of .034, $p<0.01$) for high ethnocentric consumers and 0.303 (standard error of .030, $p<0.01$) for low ethnocentric consumers. The difference in the total effects between the two groups is

significant at the 99% significance level (z-value is 64.85), which means that the positive effect of GCCP in television advertisements on consumer's attitudes toward brand is found to be significantly stronger for cosmopolitan consumers than for ethnocentric consumers. Therefore, H5 is accepted.

Also, to test H6, we split the total sample based on the median value of the respondents' knowledge level on products: consumers with a high level of product knowledge and consumers with a low level of product knowledge and then a two-group structural equation modeling analysis was performed. The result is shown in Table 8. Although the model's χ^2 is significant ($\chi^2(304) = 1881.468$, $p<.001$), other indices are within acceptable limits: The values of GFI, NFI, CFI, TLI and RMSEA all show satisfactory fit with the data (GFI=0.904, AGFI=.868, NFI=0.940, RFI=0.924, IFI=0.967, TLI=0.949, CFI=0.949, and RMSEA=.050).

According to Table 8, the effect of GCCP on perceived brand quality is 0.298 for consumers with more product knowledge, compared to 0.388 for consumers with less product knowledge. The difference in the effect between the two groups is significant at the 95% significance level (one-side) since the t-value of the difference is 1.87. Also, the effect of GCCP on perceived price is 0.331 for consumers with more knowledge about the product, compared to 0.389 for consumers with less knowledge. The difference in the effect between the two groups is significant at the 95% significance level (one-side) since the *t*-value of the difference is 1.86.

Also, the effect of GCCP on brand prestige is 0.275 for consumers with a high knowledge level, and 0.261 for consumers with a low knowledge level. The difference in the effect between the two groups is not significant since the t-value of the difference is -0.86. This analysis result indicates that the effects of GCCP on the perceptions of the brand's quality and price are significantly higher for consumers with less product knowledge than for more consumers with more product knowledge. However, there is no significant difference in the effect of GCCP on brand prestige between the two groups.

Finally, as shown in Table 6, the total effect of GCCP on attitude toward brand is 0.228(standard error of .026, $p<0.01$) for the group with more product knowledge, while 0.280(standard error of .037, $p<0.01$) for the group with less product knowledge. The size of the effect is larger for the less knowledgeable consumers than for the more knowledgeable consumers, and the difference is significant at the 99% significance level (z-value is 28.15). These results provide support for H6 and suggest that the less knowledge about product consumers have, the higher the positive effect of using GCCP in a television advertisement on their attitude toward the brand will be.

Table 8. Two-Group Analysis: Product Knowledge

Path	Group	(Standardized) Path Coefficient	*t*-value (the difference between the two groups)
GCCP ⇢ Perceived Quality	High level of product knowledge	0.298**	1.87*
	Low level of product knowledge	0.388**	
GCCP ⇢ Perceived Price	High level of product knowledge	0.331**	1.86*
	Low level of product knowledge	0.389**	
GCCP ⇢ Brand Prestige	High level of product knowledge	0.275**	-0.86
	Low level of product knowledge	0.261**	
The total effect of GCCP on Attitude toward Brand	High level of product knowledge	0.228**	28.15**(z-value)
	Low level of product knowledge	0.280**	

Note: **: $p<0.01$; *: $p<0.05$.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Findings and Implications

As globalization advances further, marketers have focused on the GCCP strategy in advertising as a way to enhance a brand's global image. Upon recognizing the importance of brand positioning strategy in a TV advertisement, this study performed an empirical analysis of the effects of GCCP versus LCCP on consumer's brand evaluation and attitude toward brand. We selected four product categories (hamburger, carbonated drink, sports shoes, and digital camera), each with two TV advertisements representing GCCP and LCCP strategies, respectively. We show these TV advertisements to the participants randomly selected as a sample of consumers to examine how these positioning strategies affect their brand evaluations and attitudes toward brand. We also investigated how ethnocentrism and level of product knowledge moderates the effects of GCCP in TV advertisement on consumer's attitudes toward brand.

There are several findings, as follows. First, a consumer's perception of a brand's quality, price, and brand prestige is more positive when GCCP is used in TV advertisements than when LCCP is used. This indicates that GCCP, as a positioning strategy in TV advertising, provides consumers with a perception that the brand possesses a higher brand quality, price, and prestige and affects consumer's evaluation of brand attributes positively.

Second, the total effect of GCCP on consumer's attitudes toward brand is significantly positive. This finding indicates that the more GCCP strategy is used in TV advertising, the more positive attitude toward the brand consumers have. TV advertisements employing GCCP as a positioning strategy, which place various signs of global consumer culture such as the brand's pronunciation or spelling, the central theme, the setting of the advertisement, and appearance of the main models would lead consumers to perceive the brand as having higher quality, price, and brand prestige, and to develop more favorable attitudes toward the brand. We can conclude that the more GCCP is used as a positioning strategy in TV advertisements, consumers will have more positive attitudes toward brands through its positive effects on perceptions of quality, price, and brand prestige.

These findings are particularly meaningful since GCCP as a positioning strategy in advertisement, separately from the perceived brand globalness, was found to affect consumer's perception of brand evaluations and attitude toward brand positively. The effects of perceived brand globalness, which has been found from the previous studies (e.g., Steenkamp et al., 2003), was controlled in the analysis of the study. In other words, this study found that, in addition to perceived brand globalness, GCCP as a positioning strategy in advertising also contributed to consumer's positive evaluation of brand attributes and attitude toward brand. These findings will provide useful business implications for global marketers. Based on the findings, we can suggest that even if a brand is not well known globally, marketers will affect consumers positively in forming perceptions of the brand's attributes (such as quality, price and brand prestige) and attitude toward the brand by using GCCP as a positioning strategy in TV advertisements.

Third, consumer's ethnocentrism and the level of knowledge about the product were found to moderate the effects of GCCP on the attitude toward brand. The effects of GCCP on consumer's attitudes toward brands were significantly different between the two groups divided based on ethnocentrism and level of product knowledge. (1) In the case of ethnocentrism, GCCP in TV advertisements has more significant effects on attitude toward brand in consumers with weak ethnocentrism than in those with strong ethnocentrism. Specifically, the effects of GCCP on the perceptions of a brand's quality and price are found

to be higher for less ethnocentric consumers (in other words, more cosmopolitan consumers) than for more ethnocentric ones. Thus, we can suggest that GCCP as a positioning strategy in TV advertising is more effective to consumers with weak ethnocentrism; in other words, keen global awareness, and cosmopolitanism.

(2) In the case of product knowledge, the effects of GCCP on consumer attitude toward brand are significantly higher with a low level of knowledge than with a high level of knowledge. Specifically, the effects of GCCP on the perceptions of the brand's quality and price are found to be higher in consumers with less product knowledge than in those with more product knowledge. This means that GCCP, as a positioning strategy in TV advertisements, is more effective to consumers with a lower level of product experience and knowledge. For consumers with a low level of knowledge, the global image of the brand portrayed by GCCP in TV advertising would act as a reliable cue in forming a more positive attitude toward the brand. Thus, we can suggest global marketers that GCCP as a positioning strategy in TV advertising is more effective to consumers with a low level of product knowledge and familiarity.

We hope the findings of the study will contribute to academic research on the topic of global positioning strategy in advertising in various aspects. Few empirical studies have been performed based on real consumers regarding the effects of GCCP and LCCP on the consumer's brand evaluation, and attitude toward brand since Alden et al. (1999) found GCCP, FCCP, and LCCP to be meaningful positioning strategies in TV advertising. This study performed an empirical analysis on a sample of consumers and found positive effects of GCCP strategy in advertisements on consumers' brand evaluation and attitude toward brand. It also examined the moderating roles of consumer characteristics (ethnocentrism and product knowledge) and found the two consumer characteristics moderated the effects of GCCP on consumer's attitudes toward brand. Based on these findings, we can conclude that using GCCP in an advertisement as a positioning strategy is an effective way of improving consumer's evaluation of the brand attributes and attitude toward brand. This is especially true when cosmopolitan consumers and consumers with a low level of product knowledge are segmented as targets. We expect these findings will provide a greater understanding of the effects of global positioning strategy in advertising and deserve more academic attention in future research.

We also hope the study will contribute to the improvement of measurement of global positioning strategies, GCCP, and LCCP. Alden et al. (1999), who first developed the concept of GCCP, FCCP, and LCCP as global positioning strategies, used nominal measures of classifying positioning strategies in TV advertisements into three categories of GCCP, FCCP, and LCCP based on coder's judgments about five signs of consumer culture positioning (pronunciation and spelling of brand name, symbol for brand logo, central theme, appearance of spokesperson) in TV advertisements. Advertisements with three or more of any single consumer culture positioning elements were classified as that position. Instead of following Alden et al. (1999) we developed a method of measuring the degree of GCCP versus LCCP by measuring the consumer's perceptions about the degree of global versus local nature of five indicators in TV advertisements (brand's pronunciation or spelling, central theme, setting of the ad, appearance of spokespersons, associated images) on semantic differential seven-point scales. For each TV advertisement, we calculated the total value of five indicators and used it as the degree of GCCP versus LCCP as the positioning strategy of the TV advertisement. If the total value is high, we can assume that the TV advertisement uses more GCCP strategy. We hope this perception-based method of measuring the degree of GCCP versus LCCP will be more useful in future studies to evaluate the elaborate effects of the global positioning strategy more precisely and clearly.

As Arnould and Thomson (2005) suggest, global consumer culture theory (GCCT) has become influential in international marketing. The existence of a global consumer culture makes it more feasible than in the past to engage in practices such as targeting market segments that cut across culture, offering similar products to such segments, and following similar strategies across markets. The findings of this study suggest that it is more effective for global marketers to use global positioning strategies in similar ways across markets (Taylor and Okazaki, 2015).

On the other hand, Lee et al. (2013) emphasized that an international market standardization strategy without differentiation in a brand image may lead to worse profitability of export sales, which implies that global marketers need to articulate optimal levels of GCCP and LCCP in advertisements according to the characteristics of local consumers. If they use the GCCP strategy as a positioning strategy in advertising properly based on the product characteristics, the foreign market environment, and the firm's entry stage to the foreign market, global companies will be able to improve their marketing power and brand power in the foreign market significantly.

6.2. Limitations

Despite all academic and practical contribution, this study has several shortcomings.

First, the most obvious limitation of this study is its focus on one country, Korea, and on a consumer base of college students, although they were randomly selected. Data have limitations in terms of generalizing the findings to a larger population. However, college students provide an appropriate sample given the research objective since it is possible to select products and brands which they have purchased and used. Also, they can be expected to have more knowledge about global consumer culture and be more aware of the globalization of a brand than a general population.

Second, it is also limited in the choice of products (fast food and carbonated drink for nondurable products, and shoes, and cameras for durable products). Generalizations to other countries, products, and audiences are not direct.

Third, we used TV advertisements of global brands (McDonald, Sprite, Nike, and Nikon) with GCCP strategy and TV advertisements of local brands with LCCP strategy as a stimulus in the survey, because it is almost impossible to find TV advertisements of the same brands utilizing both GCCP and LCCP strategies. Although we used brand dummies and perceived brand globalness as covariates in the analysis to solve the problem of using different brands, it is hard to be confident that we controlled the effects of different brands on consumer perception and attitude toward brand completely. If future researchers can design experiments by developing TV advertisements of the same brands using both GCCP and LCCP strategies, they would have more clear and precise findings on the effect of GCCP versus LCCP in TV advertising on consumer's brand evaluations and attitude toward brand.

We hope that all these weaknesses will be overcome by future research, and a more general and definite conclusion will be derived.

References

Aaker, D. A. (1996), *Building Strong Brands*, New York, NY: The Free Press.

Aaker, D. A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity*, New York, NY: The Free Press.

Ajzen, I. and M. Fishbein (1980), *Understanding Attitude and Predicting Social Behavior*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Akaka, M. A. and D. L. Alden (2010), "Global Brand Positioning and Perceptions: International

Advertising and Global Consumer Culture", *International Journal of Advertising*, 29(1), 37-56.

Alba, J. W. and J. W. Hutchinson (1987), "Dimensions of Consumer Expertise", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(March), 411-454.

Alden, D. L., J. B. Steenkamp and R. Batra (1999), "Brand Positioning through Advertising in Asia, North America and Europe: The Role of Global Consumer Culture", *Journal of Marketing*, 63(1), 75-87.

Amine, L., M. Chao and M. Arnold (2005), "Exploring the Practical Effects of Country of Origin, Animosity, and Price-Quality Issues: Two Case Studies of Taiwan and Acer in China", *Journal of International Marketing,* 23(3), 227-239.

Arnould, E. and C. J. Thomson (2005), "Consumer Culture Theory (CCT): Twenty Years of Research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(1), 868-892.

Arnould, E. and C. J. Thomson (2018), *Consumer Culture Theory: A Short History of a Young Subdiscipline (or the Tale of the Rebellious Offspring)*, Oxford, UK: Oxford Handbook of Consumption.

Bartikowski, B. and M. Cleveland (2017), "'Seeing Is Being': Consumer Culture and the Positioning of Premium Cars in China", *Journal of Business Research*, 77, 195-202.

Batra, R. (1995), "The Why, When, and How of Global Branding". In S. Sanjay (Ed.), *Brand Equity and the Marketing Mix: Creating Customer Value* (Conference Proceeding Report), Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute, 95-111.

Batra, R., V. Ramaswamy, D. L. Alden, J. B. Steenkamp and S. Ramachander (2000), "Effects of Brand Local and Nonlocal Origin on Consumer Attitudes in Developing Countries", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9(2), 83-95.

Baughn, C. C. and A. Yaprak (1996), "Economic Nationalism: Conceptual and Empirical Development", *Political Psychology*, 17(4), 759-778.

Beardon, W. O. and M. J. Etzel (1982), "Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decisions", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(2), 183-194.

Booth, K. (1979), *Strategy and Ethnocentrism*, New York, NY: Holmes & Meier.

Chang, S. J., A. V. Witteloostuijn and L. Eden (2010), "From the Editors: Common Method Variance in International Business Research", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 178-184.

Cowley, E. and A. Mitchell (2003), "The Moderating Effect of Product Knowledge on the Learning and Organization of Product Information", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(December), 443-454.

Dawar, N. and P. Parker (1994), "Marketing Universals: Consumers' Use of Brand Name, Price, Physical Appearance, and Retailer Reputation as Signals of Brand Quality", *Journal of Marketing,* 58(April), 81-95.

Duhan, D., S. Johnson, J. Wilcox and G. Harrell (1997), "Influences on Consumer Use of Word-of-Mouth Recommendation Sources", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(4), 283-295.

Engel, J., R. Blackwell and P. Miniard (1986), *Consumer Behavior,* New York, NY: The Dryden Press.

Erdem, T., J. Swait and A. Valenzuela (2006), "Brand as Signals: A Cross-country Validation Study", *Journal of Marketing*, 70(1), 34-49.

Fishbein, M. and I. Ajzen (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research,* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Fornell, C. D. and F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Errors", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(February), 39-50.

Friedman, J. (1990) "Being in the World: Globalization and Localization", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7, 311-328.

Gammoh, B., A. C. Koh and S. C. Okoroafo (2011), "Consumer Culture Brand Positioning Strategies: An Experimental Investigation", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*,

20(1), 48-57.

Geiger-Oneto, S., B. D. Gelb, D. Walker and J. D. Hess (2013), ""Buying Status" by Choosing or Rejecting Luxury Brands and their Counterfeits", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences*, 41(3), 357-372.

Goldsmith, R., D. Kim, L. Flynn and W. Kim (2005), "Price Sensitivity and Innovativeness for Fashion among Korean Consumers", *Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(5), 501-508.

Guo, X. (2013), "Living in a Global World: Influence of Consumer Global Orientation on Attitudes Toward Global Brands from Developed Versus Emerging Countries", *Journal of International Marketing*, 21(1), 1-22.

Hassan, S. S. and L. P. Katsanis (1994), "Global Market Segmentation Strategies and Trends". In S. S. Hassan and E. Kaynak (Eds.), *Globalization of Consumer Markets: Structures and Strategies*, New York, NY: International Business Press, 47-62.

Hofstede, G. (1998), "Attitudes, Values and Organizational Culture: Disentangling the Concepts", *Organization Studies*, 19(3), 477-493.

Huang, Y. (2016), "Global Consumer Culture Positioning (GCCP): Reviews and Conceptual Framework", *Journal of International Business Research*, 15(1), 56-62.

Hung, K., F. Gu and D. Tse (2005), "Improving Media Decisions in China: A Targetability and Cost-Benefit Analysis", *Journal of Advertising*, 34(1), 49-63.

Jeong, I. and E. Kim (2011), "An Empirical Study of Branding Strategy in International Market", *International Business Review*, 15(1), 99-123.

Jeong, I. and S. Xiao (2008), "Consumer Attitude toward Global Brands: The Perspective of Chinese Consumers", *International Business Review*, 12(1), 1-28.

Johnson E. J. and J. E. Russon (1984), "Product Familiarity and Learning New Information", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11(June), 542-550.

Jun, S., Y. Jeong, J. W. Gentry and Y. J. Hyun (2017), "The moderating effect of self-esteem on consumer responses to global positioning in advertising", *International Journal of Advertising*, 36(2), 272-292.

Jung, S. and W. L. Yuan (2013), "A Study on the Consumer Ethnocentrism Animosity and Product Judgment Effect on Foreign Products Purchase Intention: A Comparative Study between Korean and Japanese Electronic Products in China", *International Commerce and Information Review*, 15(1), 185-206.

Kapferer, J. N. (1997), *Strategic Brand Management* (2nd ed.), London: Kogan Page.

Katsikeas, C., D. Skarmeas and D. C. Bello (2009), "Developing Successful Trust-based International Exchange Relationships", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40, 132-155.

Keller, K. L. (1998), *Strategic Brand Management,* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kim, J., C. Mun and Y. Kim (2012), "A Study on Cultural Characteristic Differences and Brand Attitude of Chinese Consumers", *Journal of International Area Studies*, 16(3), 181-207.

Lee, C. and T. Kim (2011), "The Effect of Global Consumer Culture Positioning in TV Advertising on Product Evaluation and Attitude toward Advertising", *International Management Study*, 22(4), 25-51.

Lee, C. (2002), "Usage and Characteristics of Global Consumer Culture Positioning in TV Ads", *Journal of Consumer Study*, 13(4), 149-167.

Lee, C. and R. Green (1991), "A Cross-cultural Test of the Fishbein Behavioral Intention Model", *Journal of International Business*, 22(2), 289-305.

Lee, S., M. Kotabe, A. Yoon and K. Kwon (2013), "Export Strategies and Performance of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises: Evidence from Korean Manufacturing SMEs", *Journal of Korea Trade*, 17(1), 1-24.

Liu, Y., W. Tao and W. H. S. Tsai (2017), "Global versus Local Consumer Culture Positioning in a Transitional Market: Understanding the Influence of Consumer Nationalism", *International*

Journal of Strategic Communication, 11(4), 344-360.

MacKenzie, S. B. and R. J. Lutz (1989), "An Empirical Examination of the Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward the Ad in an Advertising Prestesting Context", *Journal of Marketing,* 53(April), 48-65.

Michell, A. and J. C. Olson (1981), "Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude", *Journal of Marketing Research,* 18(August), 318-332.

Moore, J. (1993), "Building Brands Across Markets: Cultural Differences in Brand Relationships With the European Community". In D. A. Aakeer and A. L. Biel (Eds.), *Brand Equity and Advertising: Advertising's Role in Building Strong Brands*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nelson, M. and H. J. Paek (2007), "A Content Analysis of Advertising in a Global Magazine across Seven Countries: Implications for Global Advertising Strategies", *International Marketing Review*, 24(1), 64-86.

Nijssen, E. J. and S. P. Douglas (2011), "Consumer World-mindedness and Attitudes toward Product Positioning in Advertising: An Examination of Global versus Foreign versus Local Positioning", *Journal of International Marketing*, 19(3), 113-133.

Oliver, R. L. and W. O. Bearden (1985) "Crossover Effects in the Theory of Reasoned Action: A Moderating Influence Attempt", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12(3), 324-340.

Pae, J. H., S. Samiee and S. Tai (2000), "Global Advertising Strategy: The Moderating Role of Brand Familiarity and Execution Style", *International Marketing Review*, 19, 176-189.

Podsakoff, P. M., S. B. MacKenzie, J. Y. Lee and N. Podsakoff (2003), "Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.

Rao, A. and W. A. Sieben (1992), "The Effect of Prior Knowledge on Price Acceptability and the Type of Information Examined", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(2), 256-270.

Rhee, J. H. and S. Kim (2014), "Brand Positioning and Global Competitiveness: The Case of Hyundai Motor India", *International Management Study*, 25(1), 59-87.

Roth, M. (1995), "The Effects of Culture and Socioeconomics on the Performance of Global Brand Image Strategies", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32(2), 163-175.

Shimp, T. and S. Sharma (1987), "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 290-288.

Shimp, T., A. Terence and K. Alican (1984) "The Theory of Reasoned Action Applied to Coupon Usage," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11(3), 795-809.

Shocker, A. D., R. Srivastava and R. W. Ruekert (1994) "Challenges and Opportunities Facing Brand Management: An Introduction to the Special Issue", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(2), 149-158.

Sichtmann, C., V. Davvetas and A. Diamantopoulos (2018), "The Relational Value of Perceived Brand Globalness and Localness", *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 597-613. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018. 10.025

Steenkamp, J. B. (2019), "Global Versus Local Consumer Culture: Theory, Measurement, and Future Research Directions", *Journal of International Marketing*, 27(1), 1-19.

Steenkamp, J. B., R. Batra and D. Alden (2003), "How Perceived Brand Globalness Creates Brand Value", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 34(1), 53-65.

Suh, Y. and J. B. Kim (2001), "The Role of Country Image in Developing Global Brands", *Journal of Korea Trade*, 5(1), 45-66.

Taylor, C. R. and S. Okazaki (2015), "Do Global Brands Use Similar Executional Styles "Across Cultures? A Comparison of U. S. and Japanese Television Advertising", *Journal of Advertising*, 44(3), 276-288.

Tharp, M. and J. Jeong (2001), "The Global Network Communications Agency", *Journal of*

International Marketing, 9(4), 111-131.

Tifferet, S. and R. Herstein (2010), "The Effect of Individualism on Private Brand Perception: A Cross-cultural Investigation", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 27(4), 313-323.

Westjohn, S. A., N. Singh and P. Magnusson (2012), "Responsiveness to Global and Local Consumer Culture Positioning: A Personality and Collective Identity Perspective", *Journal of International Marketing*, 20(1), 58-73.

Xiaoling, G., M. Heinberg and S. Zou (2019), "Enhancing Consumer Attitude toward Culturally Mixed Symbolic Products from Foreign Global Brands in an Emerging-Market Setting: The Role of Cultural Respect", *Journal of International Marketing*, 27(3), 79-97.

Zambuni, R. (1983), "Developing Brands Across Borders", *Journal of Brand Management*, 1(1), 22-29.

Zhou, L., L. Teng and P. Poon (2008), "Susceptibility to a Global Consumer Culture: A Three-dimensional Scale", *Psychology and Marketing*, 25(4), 336-351.

Zhou, N. and R. Belk (2004), "Chinese Consumer Readings of Global and Local Advertising Appeals", *Journal of Advertising*, 33(3), 63-76.