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Abstract

The effects of globalization has created a new global consumer segment known as Cosmopolitanism. It is a globally substantial segment that captures “open-minded individuals whose consumption orientation transcends particular cultures, localities or communities and who appreciates diversity including trying products and services from a variety of countries”. In the same sense have global brands grown to take a central place on both developing and developed countries, and their competition with local brands has substantially increased. The Cosmopolitan consumer segment hold major strategic importance for global brands, but the understanding of this new segment has been markedly limited, especially on consumption related behavioral outcomes such as brand loyalty. Taking on a cross-national, comparative approach, the purpose of this study was; to understand the association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty in developing and developed countries.

Collecting data through online questionnaires in Sweden and Syria, 341 respondents were included within the study, and with regression analyses were three proposed hypotheses tested. The results showed a significant, but arguably weak, association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty. On the other hand, upon introducing economic development status as a moderating variable, it was seen that the association differed between the sampled countries, with a considerably stronger association in Syria. Managerial implications are presented based on these findings, and the paper is finalized with some essential limitations and avenues for suture research.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

A continuously globalizing world has facilitated products and services, as well as ideas and values to flow across national borders (Steenkamp and Ter Hofstede, 2002; Holt et al., 2004; Özsomer and Simonin, 2004; Stremerch and Tellis, 2004; van Everdingen et al., 2005). This, together with the rise of Internet, growing world travel and mass media penetration has resulted in an increasing interest and awareness for other cultures and consumption styles among consumers worldwide (e.g. Nijssen and Douglas, 2008; Reifler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Saran and Kalliny, 2012). It has also produce an increasingly borderless world where the distinction between domestic and foreign is becoming less distinguishable (Cleveland et al., 2011b; Saran and Kalliny, 2012), and a marketplace with growing access to foreign commodities for consumers around the globe (Reifler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Tu and Hung, 2009; Cleveland et al., 2015).

Consequently, globalization is changing the ways consumers and markets integrate with each other (Hannerz, 1992; Arnett, 2002; Craig and Douglas, 2006; Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Merz et al., 2008) and through interaction with foreign cultures, consumers’ identities, values and attitudes become influenced (Lim and Park, 2013). This has resulted in a global consumer culture (Alden et al., 1999; Holt et al., 2004; Alden et al., 2006) that signifies shared preferences and behavior patterns along with growing openness and exposure to other countries and cultures among individuals from around the world (Davidson et al., 2009; Nijssen and Douglas, 2011). Rising from this is the concept of Cosmopolitanism that captures those individual who express high levels of cultural openness (e.g. Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Cleveland et al., 2014) with high tendencies for adopting lifestyles, cultures, and values from other countries without wholly abandoning their own (Yoon et al., 1996; Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002). In this paper, Cosmopolitans are defined as “open-minded individuals whose consumption orientation transcends particular cultures, localities or communities and who appreciates diversity including trying products and services from a variety of countries” (Reifler and Diamantopoulos, 2009, p. 415). The importance of Cosmopolitanism has increased with the emergence of global markets and transnational cultural diversity (Llopis-Goig, 2007; 2013) and is highly associated with the globalization process (Llopis-Goig, 2013; Cleveland et al., 2015). It is a new and ever growing global segment (Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Reifler et al., 2012) that enforce more and faster adoption of global consumption behavior of globally shared consumption-related symbols such as products, events and brands (Holt et al., 2004; Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Zhou et al., 2008; Bookman, 2013).
In addition to a rise of Cosmopolitanism have global brands taken a central position in the market place and within international marketing strategies (Askegaard, 2006; Özsomer and Altaras, 2008). Essentially, global brands are regionally and internationally widespread with global recognition, availability and demand often with standardized names under consistent positioning, personality and image (Holt et al., 2004; Johansson and Ronkainen, 2005; Dimofte et al., 2008; Özsomer and Altaras, 2008; Strizhakova et al., 2008a). Marketers are increasingly shifting their brand portfolios to global brands in response to local market saturation (Quelch, 1999; 2003; Steenkamp et al., 2003, Schuiling and Kapferer, 2004; Lury, 2004; Özsomer, 2012; Lim and Park, 2013). This strategy is agreed to be valuable for companies and their brands (Strizhakova et al., 2011) which is argued to relates to a number of beneficial factors (Alden et al., 1999; Riefler, 2012), such as the possibility to achieve economies of scale concerning R&D, marketing and production (Yip, 1995; Kapferer, 2002) and to create a global image (Hassan and Katsanis, 1994; Kapferer, 1997). Although, more central to the increase of global brands relates to the possibilities in foreign markets, especially in developing countries (Gillespie et al., 2002; Dholakia and Talukdar, 2004) with their positive projection concerning size of the consumer market and the economy (Dholakia and Talukdar, 2004; Lee et al., 2008; Özsomer, 2012). Yet, companies are experiencing an increasing surge to be successful in both developing and developed countries (Burgess and Steenkamp, 2006) and as a strategy of success, firms expand their global brands into these markets. (Özsomer, 2012).

1.2 Problem discussion

With the availability of brands on the global market accelerating as a result of globalization (Lee et al., 2008) consumers are now increasingly faced with the choice between local and global brands (Lee et al., 2008; Strizhakova et al., 2011; Winit et al., 2014; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). As such, an increased competition has risen between local and global brands in both developing and developed countries (Lee et al., 2008; 2010) where for example a steadily increasing market share among local brands in developing countries have put global brands at a disadvantage (Guo, 2013). As a consequence of this increased competition, it is now essential for companies operating with global brands to clearly understand what drives consumers choice of local versus global brands (Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). It has even been suggested that it is a matter of survival to understand targeted consumers in this now highly competitive global market environment (Vukasović, 2009; Mangnale et al., 2011; Cilingir and Basfirinci, 2014).

For globally competitive brands, targeting consumers on the basis of pure demographic variables is no longer a particularly useful approach (Schoefer and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Walsh et al., 2010; Riefler et al., 2012) but international market segmentation now requires careful consideration of similarities and differences among consumers (Cleveland et al., 2013). Therefore it
is essential to search for consumers of a global consumer culture (Westjohn et al., 2012) represented by Cosmopolitan consumers (Lim and Park, 2013; Tae Lee et al., 2014). Cosmopolitan consumers are an extremely important segment for global brands (Özsomer and Altaras, 2008) both in developing and developed countries, where Cosmopolitan tendencies are similarly extensive (Cleveland et al., 2011a; Khare, 2014b). Perhaps more important, they are essential to global brands as they are globally substantial, and their disposition is likely to influence consumption behavior, such as taste and preferences, on the global market with high accessibility to global brands (Cleveland et al., 2011b; Riefler et al., 2012). Therefore, identifying and targeting these consumers must be done uniquely from other segments (Riefler et al., 2012; Tae Lee et al., 2014), and in doing so, the Cosmopolitan consumer hold major value for firms operating in an international market environment (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Riefler et al., 2012) and for international marketers who have only recently have started to adopt the concept (Laroche, 2014).

Cosmopolitanism, as a basis for international market segmentation, has received recent attention within the marketing literature due to its theoretical and managerial importance (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Cleveland et al., 2014). However, most studies on Cosmopolitanism has been centered in the field of sociology (Cleveland et al., 2014; Tae Lee et al., 2014) while those in marketing have been almost exclusively conceptual or qualitative (Altintaş et al., 2013; Zeugner-Roth and Dimofte, 2013; Cleveland et al., 2014) where primary focus has been on clarifying the nature of Cosmopolitan consumers (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009). With the notable exceptions of quantitative studies of Nijssen and Douglas (2008; 2011) Carpenter et al. (2013) Khare et al. (2014) and Pandey et al. (2015), the research field in its embryonic stage with empirical examinations of the concept remaining scares (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Riefler et al., 2012; Carpenter et al., 2013; Cleveland et al., 2014; Laroche, 2014). In particular, it is argued that the research field of Cosmopolitanism is lacking understanding concerning its relation, and effect, with potential consumption behavioral outcomes (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Riefler et al., 2012) and contemporary studies on the topic (e.g. Tu and Hung, 2009; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Lim and Park, 2013) have encouraged future research to address this gap of literature. (See appendix A for a literature review). The importance of this understanding relates to the actionable possibilities of marketing practices in both local and geographically distant international markets, particularly relevant to brands and branding activities (Parts and Vida, 2011).

Relating to brands, an important behavioral outcome of consumption that hold great importance in marketing is loyalty (Makanyeza, 2015) where brand loyalty is a particular problem facing marketers (Kim et al., 2008; Jiang et al., 2014). This stems from companies’ desire to develop and maintain close relations with customers, which subsequently acts as a strategic objective that hinder switching behavior of brands (Phau and Cheong, 2009; Akdogan et al., 2012; Jiang et al., 2014). And
of particular importance is insight of the factors that drive consumers to be brand loyal and deviate from competing brands (Worthington et al., 2010; Jiang et al., 2014). Global brands are similarly faced with the challenge of reinforcing loyalty (Homburg et al., 2013), much perhaps due to the increased loyalty-switching behavior of global brand consumers (Kaltcheva et al., 2010; Reimann et al., 2012). And in the context of the increasing competition between local and global brands, brand loyalty is of great importance as it believes to be a major determinant of brand choice (Johansson and Ronkainen, 2005). Brand loyalty is generally argued to be a major asset for brands (Phau and Cheong, 2009) out of which companies can for example expect lower price sensitivity (Rowley, 2005; Bandyopadhyay and Martell, 2007; Horváth and van Birgelen, 2015) increased margins, more effective, and reduced cost for, marketing communication (Keller, 1998; Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Moisescu and Allen, 2010; Bhardwaj et al., 2011) increased profits (Bhardwaj et al., 2011) as well as greater market share (Assael, 1998). Illustratively, five percent increase of brand loyalty can heighten profitability from 40 to 95 percent, and one percent increase in brand loyalty decreases costs by ten percent (Reichheld and Teal, 2001). Consequently, brand loyalty has an impact on developing a maintainable competitive advantage (Bhardwaj et al., 2011; Akdogan et al., 2012; Kuikka and Laukkanen, 2012).

While brand loyalty has received much interest over the last decades (Worthington et al., 2010) most previous research have focused on variables of the marketing mix, while consumer-based research is still in an evolutionary stage (Ha et al., 2009) and brands in relation to Cosmopolitanism have had very little attention (Bookman, 2013). In fact, Parts and Vida (2011) argue that Cosmopolitanism and global brand consumption behavior have barely been studied at all. In addition, prominent studies on Cosmopolitanism (e.g. Cleveland et al., 2011b; Parts, 2013; Tae Lee et al., 2014) have encouraged future research to adopt global brands into studies on Cosmopolitanism. Similarly, they proposed future studies to adopt it is a context of developing and developed countries, and while this was accomplished by Jin et al. (2015) their study focused on country product image (PCI). Ultimately, with studies on global brands being scant (Özsomer and Altaras, 2008) and research on Cosmopolitanism with an explanatory approach are few (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009) this study sets out to fulfill this gap. And to extend the theoretical contributions (Deng et al., 2010) it includes country development status as the moderating variable.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to understand the association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty within developing and developed countries.
1.4 Research questions

How does country development status moderate the relationship between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty?

1.5 Research structure

This study will continue with the following structure. First, chapter two presents a literature review on Cosmopolitanism that covers the entrance of the Cosmopolitan concept into marketing, and then a description of how Cosmopolitanism could be identified in terms of their identity and various preconditions. Then, chapter three covers the key concepts Cosmopolitanism and brand loyalty with clear descriptions of their various components, and then also global and local brands. This is followed by three suggested hypotheses and a research model illustrating their directions. Chapter four, methodology, provide an overview of the approach and design taken herein, an overview for selecting appropriate developing and developed countries and product category. It also provide a motivation for the measurement scales utilized in the study as well as the data collection process and what analysis techniques were used to test the hypotheses. The fifth chapter, results and analysis, present descriptive statistics of the respondents, and the findings of the study related to the hypotheses proposed. Additional findings then providing more profound understanding, and demographic variables related to the Cosmopolitan segment are also presented. The results are subsequently analyzed and discussed in chapter six, followed by a conclusion with theoretical and managerial implications in chapter seven. The study is then finalized by a discussion of the most prominent limitation and suggestion for future research.
2. Literature review of Cosmopolitanism

2.1 Cosmopolitanism emerge as a concept

Originally, the term Cosmopolitanism emerged from Ancient Greece (Roberts, 2011; Lindell, 2012; Cleveland et al., 2014) where the two words “cosmos” meaning world and “politis” meaning citizen essentially described a world citizen (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009). In that time Cosmopolitanism was thought of as “(1) a disdain of patriotism, (2) a desire for harmonious international relations, [and] (3) an emphasis on the primacy of the individual” (Hill, 1998, p, 171). Yet, since then the concept has gone through much change (Roberts, 2011) where the deliberation regarding Cosmopolitanism was renewed in the sociology literature some 50 years ago (Tu and Hung, 2009). Merton (1957) is most recognized for that, and he described Cosmopolitanism by differentiating between two kinds of influential individuals; locals versus Cosmopolitans. He argued that Cosmopolitans are individuals whose orientation exceeds any specific culture or setting of the immediate community, so as to participate in an extended society. Local orientation was instead centered with an interest for the local community and a homogeneous cultural group. Later, the concept was extended by Hannerz (1990) who argued that Cosmopolitanism constitutes a willingness to participate with the “other” and consequently establish an openness toward broader and different cultural experiences. In recognition of the relevance for Cosmopolitanism within consumer behavior, Cannon and Yaprak (1993) have been credited by numerous academics (e.g. Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Tu and Hung, 2009; Altintaş et al., 2013; Cleveland et al., 2014) for introducing the concept into the marketing literature with their contingency model in which Cosmopolitanism is discussed as a potential segment for cross-national studies (Reifler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Altintaş et al., 2013). The marketing literature since then furthered the understanding of Cosmopolitanism from a consumer perspective, which is presented below.

2.2 Identifying Cosmopolitanism

2.2.1 Cultural orientation

The way to develop Cosmopolitan tendencies has been a central discussion in the literature (Cleveland et al., 2009), and while there are some exceptions (e.g. Beck, 2002) most researcher now approach Cosmopolitanism from an attitudinal perspective (Llopis-Goig, 2013; Cleveland et al., 2014). As such, it is believed that, rather than being born with trait of Cosmopolitanism or it being related to one’s personality, it is a learnable disposition that originates from the life experience of individual’s which enriches their viewpoints (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Cleveland et al., 2014). Ultimately, this enables Cosmopolitan consumers to hold a set of
cultural orientations (Cannon and Yaprak, 2002) that Cleveland et al. (2014, p. 269) describe to be “reflecting a set of values, opinions, and competencies held by certain individuals; specifically a genuine, humanitarian appreciation for, desire to learn from and ability to engage with, peoples of different cultures.” Concretely, the Cosmopolitan orientations entail an openness towards different cultural environments, including places and experiences, while simultaneously having the ability and willingness to do so (e.g. Tomlinson, 1999; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Szerszynski and Urry, 2002; Skrbis et al., 2004; Yeğenoğlu, 2005; Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Nijsen and Douglas, 2008; Altintaş et al., 2013; Lim and Park, 2013; Cleveland et al., 2014; Khare et al., 2014). Their lifestyles are influenced by the cultural diversity they come across (Khare, 2014a; 2014b) and promote a less provincial self-perception (Yeğenoğlu, 2005). Therefore, belonging to any superiority or uniformity is undesired (Skrbis et al., 2004) and they commonly regard themselves as citizens of the world rather than citizens of any specific country (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009). Although, while they are open minded and seek cultural diversity, Cosmopolitan consumers still hold on to the capacity for self-definition and advancements of their own purposes (Saran and Kalliny, 2012), exemplified by self-improvement and self-enhancement (Khare, 2014b).

2.2.2 Global and local identities

With the openness towards other cultures that Cosmopolitans exhibit, discussions have taken within the literature whether or not such an outwards orientation replaces a persons’ local orientations (Cleveland et al., 2014). Following this, Cosmopolitanism has been defined in terms of both global and local (Khare, 2014a). First introduced by Yoon et al. (1996), Cosmopolitanism was argued to exist in both global and local forms, and similar arguments were made later by Cannon and Yaprak (2002). The notable distinction of the two is that one anchors in local context, with more devotion to local heritage and values, while the other anchors in global context with a larger believe that global culture is greater than local. Yet, the more locally oriented Cosmopolitan consumers still have great appreciation for the diversity of other culture, and they are not expected to be more narrow minded or prejudice. Nor are they linked with an ethnocentric consumption, patriotic or conservative mindset, but they simply value local relationships, local cultures and local belonging more than global Cosmopolitans do (Yoon et al., 1996; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002). The concluding remark in this discussion has been that Cosmopolitanism and localism are likely two independent orientation, but not contradictory, as interest and openness to diverse cultures and products can exist simultaneously as one is embedded in the local environments (Yoon et al., 1996; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002). This has been supported by numerous studies (e.g. Caldwell et al., 2006; Nijsen and Douglas, 2008; Cleveland et al., 2011a; Cleveland et al., 2011b; Khare, 2014a) and concretely means that Cosmopolitanism does not restrict from attachment with ones’ heritage and traditions. Instead there
is room for embracing both local and global value and identities (Khare, 2014a; Cleveland et al., 2015).

2.2.3 Preconditions of Cosmopolitanism

The conventional Cosmopolitan population was consisted to be the global business elite, immigrants and expatriates (Skrbis et al., 2004) and it has been argued by for example Kanter (1995), Kirwan-Taylor (2000) and Calhoun (2002) that Cosmopolitanism is related to privileged actors with resources that enable mobility. Yet, being a member of these groups is no longer a precondition for Cosmopolitanism (e.g. Cleveland et al., 2009; 2011a). It is now argued that for Cosmopolitanism to take shape, first-hand experience with places, people and culture is not necessary (Cleveland et al., 2014). This due to global media that has enabled consumer to acquire a wider scope of view, and made consumers increasingly Cosmopolitan without ever having to travel outside their home countries’ boarders (Hannerz, 1990; Caldwell et al., 2006; Craig and Douglas, 2006; Gillespie et al., 2010; Cleveland et al., 2015). As such, the Cosmopolitan orientation is necessarily distinguished from tourists (Hannerz, 1992; Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Cleveland et al., 2015). Tourists more resemble spectators who see no personal relevance in host cultures, while Cosmopolitans act more as participants who seek to experience life from other cultural perspectives (Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Cleveland et al., 2009; 2015). They more actively consume cultural differences (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999) and as according to Hannerz (1992), Cosmopolitanism is more a matter of degree and situational, while tourism relate to a non dynamic trait.

Moreover, as Cosmopolitans tend to break away from national confines, they also clearly distinguish from Ethnocentric consumers (Roudometof, 2005; Nijssen and Douglas, 2008; Cleveland et al., 2009; Rybina et al., 2010; Steenkamp and de John, 2010) who instead see purchasing of foreign products as an unpatriotic action with negative economical ramification on the domestic market (Shimp and Sharma, 1987). While it was suggested by Nijssen and Douglas (2011) that these orientations exist simultaneously and may compete against, or even soften, each other, Cosmopolitanism as distinguished from Ethnocentrism has received much support (Riefler et al., 2012). Haubert and Fussell (2006) argues for example that Cosmopolitans reject the Ethnocentric world-view, and both Carpenter et al. (2013) and Cleveland et al. (2009) demonstrated a negative association between the two concepts.

Demographic variables have also been seen in recent empirical research to have a predictive power for Cosmopolitanism (Khare, 2014b). Age have thus far been exclusively found to be negatively associated with Cosmopolitanism (Cleveland et al., 2009; Carpenter et al., 2013; Gupta, 2013; Tae Lee et al., 2014) while education is positively related to Cosmopolitanism (Carpenter, 2013; Gupta, 2013; Khare, 2014b). Although, Cleveland et al. (2009) found it being the case in only
four (Greece, Hungary, Mexico, and Sweden) out of eight countries. Females are argued to have higher Cosmopolitan tendencies compared with men (Cleveland et al., 2009) and with rising income has ones’ Cosmopolitan orientation also been seen to increase (Cleveland et al., 2009; Cleveland et al., 2011b; Gupta, 2013; Khare, 2014b). Although, these two latter demographics have not been exclusively found to influence Cosmopolitan tendencies, with the finding of Carpenter et al. (2013) showing a non-significant relationship between gender and income with Cosmopolitanism.
3. Conceptual framework

3.1 Key concepts

3.1.1 Cosmopolitanism

In the marketing and consumer research literature, the concept has Cosmopolitanism been used rather loosely, both with different theoretical definitions and implications of its essential meaning. (Besnier, 2004; Zhou and Belk, 2004; Nijssen and Douglas, 2008). Following this, Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2009) argued that, based on existing literature, (e.g. Merton, 1957; Hannerz, 1990; Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Cole et al., 2005; Caldwell et al., 2006; Levy et al., 2007) Cosmopolitan consumers have three distinct characteristics in common. These are open-mindedness, diversity appreciation and consumption transcending borders. This conceptualization has particular relevance to marketing, and has received subsequent support from Riefler et al. (2012), and which is therefore applied in this study.

Open-mindedness

Openness towards other people and cultures has been identified as a significant characteristic of Cosmopolitanism (Yoon, 1998; Tomlinson, 1999; Urry, 2000; Skrbis et al., 2004; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009) and Riefler et al. (2012, p, 287) offers the following definition to the construct; “An unprejudiced disposition towards other countries and cultures as expressed in an interest in experiencing their authentic manifestations”. Cosmopolitan consumers’ openness indicate a desire and interest in other cultures (Skrbis et al., 2004) and as such, Cosmopolitan consumers consider the world as their marketplace and they actively seeking to consume products, services and experiences from diverse cultures (Urry, 2000; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002).

In the earliest discourse on Cosmopolitanism, Merton (1957) associated Cosmopolitan individuals as persuasive people who base decision on what they know (i.e. informational), instead of on who they know (i.e. normative). Recent literature supports such arguments and state that Cosmopolitan consumers tend to seek knowledge that would assist them to make objective decisions (Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Cleveland et al., 2011a). As such, instead of relying on local tradition, social influence or product origins for assessments, Cosmopolitans consumers evaluate products and service based on their capability to deliver required functions and features (Cannon and Yaprak, 1993; Cannon et al., 1994; Jaffe and Nebenzahl, 2006; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Altintaş et al., 2013; Tae Lee et al., 2014). Cosmopolitan consumer also favor new ideas and are more receptive to innovations, and are regarded as part of the minority segment who first adopt innovative products (Rogers, 2004; Lim and Park, 2013).
Diversity Appreciation

Cosmopolitan consumers do not only possess respect and understanding for others countries and cultures, but also possess a genuine appreciation for diversity and differences in the world (Featherstone, 2002; Riefler et al., 2012). Riefler et al. (2012, p. 288) define diversity appreciation as a “...positive disposition towards the diversity offered by the availability of goods and services from different national or cultural origins”. Due to their unique virtue of curiosity, and their ability to immerse within disparate societies, Cosmopolitan consumers are described as agents of cultural transmission and change (Hannerz, 1992). They do not value uniformity, but instead appreciate the accessibility to several diverse options (Hannerz, 1990; 1992; Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Featherstone, 2002; Holt et al., 2004; Caldwell et al., 2006). In other words, diversity appreciation constitutes a positive attitude towards the availability of diverse products and services from variety of cultures and countries (Hannerz, 1990; Featherstone, 2002; Riefler et al., 2012). Consequently, the higher tendencies of Cosmopolitanism, the more eclectic ones’ consumption becomes (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Skrbis et al., 2004).

Consumption Transcending Borders

The consumption transcending borders construct has been defined as a “...positive disposition towards consuming goods and services from foreign countries” (Riefler et al., 2012, p, 288). Similarly Holt (1997) described Cosmopolitans as seekers for multiplicity and sophistication in consumer goods, who avoid parochial culture by consuming goods from all around the globe. These goods can even be unfamiliar to the Cosmopolitan consumer (Hannerz, 1990). Cosmopolitans’ consumption tastes are not based merely on diversity appreciation, but they also actively consume goods for reasons such as experience (Riefler et al., 2012), to be members and beneficiaries of the globalized world (Skrbis and Woodward, 2007) or as symbols of social status (Skrbis et al., 2004). Özsomer and Altaras (2008) and Beverland and Farrelly (2010) also argue that it relates to acquiring cultural capital and authenticity that exist within products, and thus supporting the arguments of Holt (1997) and Thompson and Tambyah (1999). Previous studies indicate that Cosmopolitan consumers show greater tendency to consume international and foreign products rather than domestic ones in for example product categories such as alcohol, clothes, furniture (Parts, 2013), media (Hannerz, 1990, Beck, 2002), books, movies, music (Hannerz, 1990; Holt, 1997; Beck, 2002), ethnic food (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Warde et al., 1999) and other cultural commodities (Thompson and Tambyah 1999; Fine and Boon, 2007; Regev, 2007). Even so, Cosmopolitan consumers are not believed to be biased against any specific countries’ product, but instead purchase foreign products based on an active desire to consume cultural differences (Cannon et al., 1994; Thompson and Tambyah, 1999;
Cleveland et al., 2009; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Cleveland et al., 2011a). On other hand, the findings of Tae Lee et al. (2014) lead to the arguments that Cosmopolitan consumers might actually have a bias against their own domestic products, as opposed to only a low preference for them. Moreover, Cannon and Yaprak (2002) also found that Cosmopolitans are sophisticated consumers with multiple purchasing patterns which ultimately depends upon the specific situation and consumer.

3.1.2 Brand Loyalty

In generic terms, loyalty reflects consumers’ choices that are not singularly based on previous experience, but also relates to weighting competing attributes of a loyalty object (Clarke, 2001; Holland and Baker, 2001; Bhardwaj et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2012). These choices are based on perceived differences between for example brands (Odin et al., 2001) and in addition to physical and tangible features of a brand, the perceived differences associates to emotional and psychological rewards and values from the brand (Liu et al., 2012). As such, choices made emerge from a consumers preferences (Ailawadi et al., 2001; Clarke, 2001) and manifests in repurchasing of brands (e.g. Lazarevic, 2012). Although, while repurchasing of a brand is important to the understanding of brand loyalty, on its own it creates a simplified view of brand loyalty (Amine, 1998; Assael, 2004; Beerli et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2008; Lin, 2010; Venkateswaran et al., 2011; Makanyeza, 2015). Repurchasing of a brand to which a consumer has no commitment can stem from indulgence, availability, convenience or economic factors, and similarly can such factors affect the repurchase of brand to which a consumer is committed (Holland and Baker, 2001; Fitzgibbon and White, 2005; Venkateswaran et al., 2011; Makanyeza, 2015). This loyalty is characterized by prevailing behavioral influence (Fetscherin, 2014) and is referred to as spurious loyalty (e.g. Kim et al., 2008; Venkateswaran et al., 2011). What is required to achieve brand loyalty is an attitudinal component that determines the level of commitment towards a brand (Caruana, 2002; Baloglu, 2002; Quester and Lim, 2003; Knox and Walker, 2003; Beerli et al., 2004; Podoshen, 2008; Cox, 2009; Roy, 2011; Venkateswaran et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2012) and when taken together with behavior (repurchase) creates what is generally known as true loyalty (Kim et al., 2008; Podoshen and Andrzejewski, 2012; Makanyeza, 2015). The inclusion of both an attitudinal loyalty and behavioral loyalty component for the creation of brand loyalty has received some opposition (e.g. Ehrenberg et al., 1990; Ehrenberg, 2000; Sharp et al., 2002) but it is now widely recognized as a requirement by scholars within the marketing literature (Bandyopadhyay and Martell, 2007; Kuikka and Laukkkanen, 2012). The following sub-chapter will include a more comprehensive discussion around these.
Attitudinal loyalty and behavioral loyalty

Given the previously discussed literature, brand loyalty can be regarded as a complex and dimensional construct (Rundle-Thiele and Bennet, 2001; Knox and Walker, 2003) where the definition by Oliver (1999, p 34), which this study applies, captures the essence of both dimensions of brand loyalty (Ha et al., 2009).

“...a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviour.”

The attitude component of brand loyalty emphasizes consumers’ intentions to remain loyal to a brand (Pappu et al., 2007; Venkateswaran et al., 2011) towards which they have a specific empathy (Lin, 2010). This is a result of psychological commitment based on unique value associated with the brand (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Roy, 2011) and their overall satisfaction of the brand (Liu et al., 2012). Consumers can have either positive, negative or ambivalent (both positive and negative) attitudes towards repurchasing a brand (Russell-Bennett and Härtel, 2009). The behavioral loyalty relate to the act of repurchasing a brand (Chaudhuri and Holbrook, 2001; Pappu et al., 2007; Lin, 2010; Worthington et al., 2010; Roy, 2011; Liu et al., 2012) and can be expressed through the purchasing of a brand over time, or as the amount of spending of a brand within a given category of products (Worthington et al., 2010; Venkateswaran et al., 2011). It is within the attitudinal brand loyalty that the relationship and congruency between a brand and consumer is considered (Lazarevic, 2012) and through positive attitude (high attitude loyalty) towards the brand, repurchasing is ensured and consumers will stay loyal (Baldinger and Rubinson, 1996; Bandyopadhyay and Martell, 2007). As such, there exist an interplay between attitudinal loyalty and behavioral loyalty, in which attitudinal loyalty is a prerequisite of behavioral loyalty (Moisescu and Allen, 2010) that drive behavioral loyalty to ensure continuous consumption of a brand rather than simply one purchase (Bandyopadhyay and Martell, 2007). Thus, to be truly loyal to a brand it is required a “high relative attitude toward the brand which is then exhibited through repurchase behavior” (Venkateswaran et al., 2011, p, 22).

Based on shortcomings of attitudinal loyalty to adequately predict behavioral loyalty seen in studies by for example East et al. (2005) and Russell-Bennett et al. (2007), recent research (e.g. Russell-Bennett and Härtel, 2009; Worthington et al., 2010) has questioned the unidimensional approach to attitudinal loyalty of brands. As such, Worthington et al. (2010, p, 244) argued that “If attitudinal intentions are not able to effectively predict behavioural brand loyalty, then attitudinal loyalty in its current form is not helpful to marketing managers seeking to generate and increase
loyalty to a particular brand. It is perhaps timely that attitudinal loyalty in particular is reconceptualised to overcome some of the debated limitations and to enhance managerial relevance.”

Following, they argue that as attitudes are made up by emotional and cognitive components, attitudinal brand loyalty must be considered similarly. From this, Worthington et al. (2010) developed a tri-dimensional approach to brand loyalty (See Figure 1.) that has seen support by for example Roy (2011). It includes behavioral loyalty, and cognitive loyalty and emotional loyalty as the two components of attitudinal loyalty. Cognitive loyalty is based on observable information of a brand, including price and its features (Oliver, 1999) and according to Russell-Bennett and Härtel (2009) is a psychological preference that consumer tend to exhibit towards brands made up by positive beliefs and thoughts of repurchasing the brand. On the other hand, emotional loyalty is understood by the degree of positive feelings a consumer experience as a result of repurchasing a brand (Oliver, 1999). It does therefore constitute an attachment to repurchase the brand (Russell-Bennett and Härtel, 2009).

Note, emotional loyalty is on occasion termed as affective loyalty (e.g. Quester and Lim, 2003) and will from here on out be referred to as such.

![Figure 1](image.png)

**Figure 1. “A tri-dimensional approach to brand loyalty.” (Worthington et al., 2010)**

### 3.1.3 Global and local brands

Generally, global brands are not associated with just one certain foreign country (Alden et al., 1999; Batra et al., 2000), but represent a brand marketed effectively in several countries that incorporates relations with a broader global consumer culture (Alden et al., 1999; 2006). Local brands are commonly accessible and promoted in its local market (Strizhakova et al., 2011) and often associated with the local country or culture (Batra et al., 2000; Steenkamp et al., 2003; Swoboda et al., 2012). Despite these generic views on global and local brands, much of recent research argues that the definition of global and local brands is based upon the consumer perception perspective (e.g. Batra et al., 2000; Steenkamp et al., 2003; Eckhardt, 2005), where the global aspect of a brand relate how widely a brand is perceived as marketed and established in multiple foreign markets (Özsomer and Altaras, 2008). Following this definition, an increased perception of multinational reach of a
brand result in increased perception of brand globality (Ibid). Although, it is simultaneously believed by most researchers that the distinction between local and global brands is becoming more diminished among consumers (Punyatoya, 2013).

There is a plethora of research concerning the competition between global brands and their local equivalents in the international marketing literature (e.g., Steenkamp et al., 2003; Holt et al., 2004; Strizhakova et al., 2011; Özsomer, 2012; Xie et al., 2015) where it has been propose that global brands may be favored over local brands by some consumers across the globe (Alden et al., 2006; Roy and Chau, 2011; Alden et al., 2013; Gammoh et al., 2015). Such preference might be motivated by consumers’ higher perceptions of quality and stronger image (Holt et al., 2004; Zhou et al., 2008; Dimofte et al., 2010), and their capability to improve individual status and prestige (Hannerz, 1990; Kapferer, 1997; Alden et al., 1999; Batra et al., 2000; Steenkamp et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2008). Therefore, global brands are more appealing with higher aspirational value and association with modernity and technology (Batra et al., 2000; Zhou and Belk, 2004; Dimofte et al., 2008; Strizhakova et al., 2008a). Additionally, it has been established that positive consumer attitude toward global brands depend on enhanced class and status regardless of the quality and value superiority of the products (Steenkamp et al., 2003; Özsomer and Altaras, 2008). Consequently, local brands are put in a tough position to compete with high-resourced global brands (Ger, 1999).

Even with these recognized competitive advantages of global brands, studies have also argued that local brands have the power to stand against the threats posed by global brands (Ger, 1999; Dimofte et al., 2008) and that they are increasingly becoming more competitive alternatives (Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). This is achieved through their strong associations with the local culture and a native identity and heritage which enable them to capitalize on their profound understanding of local needs and desire, as well as greater flexibility in adjusting to local market requirements (Zambuni, 1993; Ger, 1999; Steenkamp et al., 2003; Dimofte et al., 2008; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). Additionally, several researchers have argued that consumers perceive local brands as more original, down-to-earth, unique and culturally representative than global brands (Schuiling and Kapferer, 2004; Swoboda et al., 2012; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015).

3.2 Research model and hypotheses

3.2.1 Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty

Upon reviewing the literature of Cosmopolitanism and global and local brands, two distinguishable arguments seem to exist, in which one counter the association between loyalty towards global brands by Cosmopolitans whilst the other argument promotes it.

As has been previously established in the conceptual framework, Cosmopolitan consumers have a tendency to seek for authentic cultural capital (e.g. Hannerz, 1990; Thompson and Tambyah,
1999; Özsomer and Altaras, 2008), and therefore does a Cosmopolitan orientations not necessarily promote a preference for global brands (Alden et al., 2013) but could instead challenge global brands (Thompson and Arsel, 2004). This argument stems from the fact that, as compared to local brands, global brands tend to be viewed as “overly standardized, uniform, boring, and, therefore, inauthentic by cosmopolitan consumers” (Özsomer and Altaras, 2008, p, 20). As such, is has been suggested that brands with higher levels of authenticity are more attractive for Cosmopolitan consumers, and that global brands are at a disadvantage compared to local brands (Ibid). The study of Thompson et al. (2006) showed results of resembling nature in which respondents had higher preferences for local coffee brands as compared to the global brand Starbucks. Correspondingly, they argued such results was an effect of the Cosmopolitan orientations of the respondents and that the local brands were better able to provide them with authentically distinctive experiences than global brands were. Although, it is necessary to note that authenticity is a situational and subjective term that would mean different thing depending on the person and the situation (Özsomer and Altaras, 2008). Similarly, Grayson and Martinéc (2004) argues that it is the consensus among researchers that authenticity is not an attribute concretely inherent in an object, but more links to an assessment by an evaluator in a certain context. As such, the disadvantage of global brands to local brands might be lesser if its authenticity is nurtured (Özsomer and Altaras, 2008).

It is generally argued that consumers choose brands that hold a congruent meaning to their self-concept (Escalas and Bettman, 2005). In other words, consumers would select brands that allow them to show others who they are, or to reinforce their view to themselves as who they are (Escalas and Bettman, 2005; Özsomer and Altaras, 2008; Fischer et al., 2010; Kuenzel and Halliday, 2010; Kapferer, 2012). As such, brands can fulfill a consumers’ need for a social identity (Ahearne et al., 2005). At a consumer level, global brands has, comparably to local brands, the ability to provide consumers with the opportunity to partake in and reinforce their membership within a global consumer culture (or global citizenship) (e.g. Holt et al., 2004; Strizhakova et al., 2008a; Steenkamp and de Jong, 2010). Global brands can thus help uphold an imagined global identity within a consumer they would share with like-minded people (Holt et al., 2004; Gammoh et al., 2015). In fact, Arnould and Thompson (2005) argued that within a world of increasing cultural assortment, global brands hold a major source of identity meaning. Strizhakova et al. (2011) argued that the use of global brands as a means for participating in global citizenship ought to be a strong enough reason for wanting to purchasing more global brands, and they demonstrated through their finding that “purchasing global brands for the sake of “citizenship in the global worlds” is not merely a theory, but rather a belief that young adults embrace to varying degrees worldwide” (p, 349). Similarly, Strizhakova et al. (2012) showed that global brands are clearly means for self-identifying within the global consumer segment, which consequently leads to an increased level of purchases of global
brands. Strizhakova and Coulter (2015) extended the understanding in showing that the more a consumer believe in the ability of global brands (compared to local brands) as an identity functions for global citizenship, the more likely is global brand consumption. On the other hand, it has been argued that there exist an increased tension between consumers’ preferences of either a local and global identity (Zhang and Khare, 2009) and while they might desire participation in a global consumer culture, nonlocal goods are examined with a local perspective (Zhou et al., 2015). It was also found by Steenkamp et al. (2003) that the identity ability of global brands was weak in explaining the preference of global brands. Despite such arguments and finding, the notion of global brands as identity sources linked with purchase has extensively been supported by academics (Strizhakova et al., 2008a). It has in addition also been noted that acquiring global brands as a gateway to a global citizenship is highly related to brand loyalty (Podoshen and Andrzejewski, 2012) where the identifying-capacity of a brand lead to decreased tendencies for switching brands, and thus creating a higher likeliness among consumers to be brand loyal (Sprott et al., 2009; Kuenzel and Halliday, 2010). In fact, Strizhakova et al. (2011) argues that a significant body of research has found support for the link between the self-identity abilities of a brand and brand loyalty.

Global brands as a basis for identity is furthermore highly related to Cosmopolitanism according to Alden et al. (1999), where a Cosmopolitan disposition constitute a higher acceptance of global brands (Sharma et al., 1995). Succeeding research has found support this notion. Initially, Batra et al. (2000) found that nonlocal brands are believed to uphold a Cosmopolitan image, and Alden et al. (2006) found that ethnocentrism, which has been established and previously argued herein as an opposing trait to Cosmopolitanism (e.g. Steenkamp and de John, 2010) led to more negative attitudes towards global brands, while openness towards a global consumer culture (that is, Cosmopolitanism) would promote a preference for global brand alternatives, thus supporting the findings of Parts and Vida (2011). Similarly, Cleveland et al. (2011a) argue that the brand choices made by Cosmopolitans are based on reinforcing their global consumer identities and connectedness. Building on previous literature, Gammoh et al. (2015) argued that consumers with a high cultural openness should have a higher positive attitude towards brands they perceived as nonlocal. Their findings reflected those arguments, and supported previous literature of Strizhakova et al. (2008a) that cultural openness leads to a greater appreciation for global brands compared to local brands. It also supported the arguments of Alden et al. (2006) Nijssen and Douglas (2008) Rybina et al. (2010), Riefler et al. (2012) and Cleveland et al. (2014) that Cosmopolitan consumers seems to have positive attitudes and perception toward global brands. And in the context of fashion clothing, Khare (2014a) further established that Cosmopolitans would purchase global brands as a means to partake in the global consumer culture, and that it was equally important for female and male segments of Cosmopolitans. To date, the only research within marketing to study Cosmopolitanism and loyalty,
to the best of our knowledge, is Khare et al. (2014) and Pandey et al. (2015). Their findings showed that Cosmopolitanism is not directly positively related to loyalty towards local stores, and Khare et al. (2014) saw instead that it was related through price and culture.

Conclusively, knowing that brand loyalty is made up by an attitudinal and behavioral (repurchase) construct which have both been separately reviewed herein to link with Cosmopolitanism in a global brand context, the following hypothesis is proposed.

\[ H1; \text{Cosmopolitanism is positively associated with global brand loyalty.} \]

3.2.2 Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty in developing and developed countries

Although Khare (2014a; 2014b) found that economic development and global economy integration were influencing factors to the development of a Cosmopolitan disposition, the common understanding in the literature suggest that the existence of a Cosmopolitan disposition does not differentiate between developing and developed countries (e.g. Hannerz, 1990; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Caldwell et al., 2006; Craig and Douglas, 2006; Strizhakova et al., 2008a) Much of which is due to the increased globalization and global branding strategies (Jin et al., 2015) but it does also relate to the underlying nature of Cosmopolitan consumers that draw them to consume products originating from foreign cultures (e.g. Caldwell et al., 2006).

On the other hand, evidence from cross-national studies reveal differences between developing and developed markets regarding local and global brands (Alden et al., 1999; Batra et al., 2000; Dholakia and Talukdar, 2004; Holt et al., 2004; Dimofte et al., 2008; Javalgi, et al., 2011; Özsomer, 2012; Jin et al., 2015; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). Important to the context is the integration of brands in the variously economically developed markets. More economically developed markets have experienced both global and local brands and branding strategies for decades (Fournier, 1998; Holt, 2002; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015) while consumers from developing markets merely recently are becoming exposed to branding (Coulter et al., 2003) and global brands have become a factor of consideration in developing markets only since the 90s’ (Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). Varying economic development background of the countries will result in different expectations of brands (Javalgi et al., 2011) and global and local brands does therefore exhibit unique meaning, glamor and status appeal for consumers depending on the level of economic development of their domestic markets (Alden et al., 2006; Üstüner and Holt, 2007; Han et al., 2010; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). Within developing countries, global brands are the focal sources of consumption due to their identity function (Elliott and Wattanasuwan 1998; Askegaard, 2006) and studies have indicate that consumers in developing countries select global brands not for their quality, features or attributes but for conspicuous consumption and aspirational reasons (Batra et al., 2000; Holt et al., 2004). In this sense,
it was found by Vaezi (2005) that consumers in a developing country (Mexico) exhibited global brand loyalty, which supported the findings of Bos (1994), Baik (1997) and Jin and Sternquist (2003). Although, Strizhakova et al. (2008a) argue that due to the volatile nature of the brand market in developing countries, consumers may use brands as consumption cues, but might not display loyalty towards brands. Comparing developing and developed countries, the study of Strizhakova et al. (2011) also showed that global brands as a mean for identity in a global consumer culture relate to percentage of consumption of global brands. Their study was conducted in one developing country (Russia) and two developed countries (U.S. and U.K.), and the resulted were solely evident in Russia.

As previously argued, global brands are associated with higher status, prestige, wealth and lifestyle, and in this sense, global brands allows consumer from developing countries to demonstrate a more Cosmopolitan identity (Tse et al., 1989; Friedman, 1990; Ettenson, 1993; Alden et al., 1999; Batra et al., 2000; Steenkamp et al., 2003; Holt et al., 2004; Jaffe and Nebenzahl, 2006). In fact, Strizhakova et al. (2008a) argued that these advantages of global brands are particularly evident in developing countries where they work as a pathway to the global consumer culture. Moreover, Gammoh et al. (2015) found that the Cosmopolitan disposition and belief in the global consumer culture was stronger in the developing country sample, leading to an argument that Cosmopolitanism is more influential in developing countries. This supports previous research such as Venkatesh and Swamy (1994) who argued that Cosmopolitan consumer want to partake in such a consumer community. Concretely, consumers with a Cosmopolitan perspective from developing countries are more interested in global brands than local ones (Alden et al., 1999; Batra et al., 2000; Kinra, 2006; Strizhakova et al., 2008a; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015). Meanwhile, other findings from emerging markets suggest that quality is perceived as a more vital consideration than personal identity (Strizhakova et al., 2008b; Özsomer, 2012) where consumers with high level of Cosmopolitanism have started to realize that their local brands are increasingly competitive or equivalent to global brands (Sharma et al., 2008; Jin et al., 2015).

Batra et al. (2000) found a direct association between the perceived non-localness of the brand and more positive attitude toward the brand among Cosmopolitan consumers in developed countries. Yet, consumers with Cosmopolitan disposition in developed countries are more likely to regard the local brands as part of the product range available for purchase (Jin et al., 2015), and even though they might distinguish between global and local brands they will appreciate and engage with both (Skrbis et al., 2004; Gammoh et al., 2015; Jin et al., 2015). They will not by certainty regard nonlocal brands as inherently more attractive, as in the case of developing markets (Sharma et al., 1995; Jin et al., 2015). Cosmopolitan consumers in developed countries also have a stronger relationship with their local images than do Cosmopolitan consumers from developing countries (Alden et al., 2013). Their concerns toward material needs are also lower and have they have broader horizons (Cleveland
et al., 2009) and therefore buy brands that correspond exactly to their specific needs (Kapferer, 1997) and are less concerned with brand origin, regardless if it is local or global (Jin et al., 2015).

Building on the literature reviewed herein, country development status does seem to moderate the relationship between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty, and the following is therefore hypothesized.

**H2: a) The association of Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty is different between developing and developed countries, b) with the association being stronger in developing countries.**

Building on these suggested hypotheses, the research model presented below illustrate the direction of which the concepts are believed to associate.

3.2.3 Research model
4. Methodology

4.1 Research approach

It is argued by Gratton and Jones (2004) that the nature of the purpose and research question must guide the research approach taken within any piece of research. If the study aims to measure concrete concepts then it constitutes as a quantitative study (Gratton and Jones, 2004; Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). Consequently, a quantitative research approach is taken herein due to the task of measuring both Cosmopolitanism and global brands loyalty and examine the association between them (Lakshman et al., 2000; Bryman and Bell, 2011). The study will therefore handle a high quantity of data which will then be statistically analyzed (Holme and Solvang, 1997; Lakshman et al., 2000; Malhotra and Birks, 2003), presented numerically (Lakshman et al., 2000) and is meant to represent a wider generalized population (Gratton and Jones, 2004; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Based on this, the study also take on a deductive approach as it builds on the previously presented theories from which three hypotheses are deduced that are to be tested and then confirmed or rejected (Malhotra and Birks, 2003; Gratton and Jones, 2004; Bryman and Bell, 2011).

4.2 Research design

Providing that this study utilizes two separate cases in the form of developing and developed countries, it constitute a comparative research design, common within cross-national studies that include at least two countries (Kumar, 2000; Bryman and Bell, 2011). In that sense, it will allow for a logical comparison resulting in deeper understanding of a phenomenon (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

4.3 Primary and secondary data

There are two different types of data collection; primary and secondary data (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Primary data is commonly collected with the specific purpose and hypotheses in mind (Saunders et al., 2007). It was necessary to collect primary data for this study as it means to measure two theoretical concepts within a developing and developed country. The research strategy used to collect the primary data was survey. Secondary data is collected and compiled by other parties other than the researchers, usually for another purpose (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011) and this deviating purpose of secondary data is usually regarded as a disadvantage (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011). On the other hand, this study required data on country development status, and such data is both highly available and commonly gathered through secondary sources such as governmental and organizational homages (Burgess and Steenkamp, 2006). Moreover, secondary data does also limit the time of collecting necessary
information, and became a vital aspect for this study. Similarly, secondary data was collected for selecting an appropriate product category around which this study will focus. Throughout the whole process of collecting secondary data, sources and content was examined in accordance with the arguments of Saunders et al. (2007) that it must allow fulfilling the purpose and research questions. The secondary data for distinguishing developing and developed countries was collected from World Bank reports, and regarding information on the product categories, various country market reports such as Euromonitor were used.

4.4 Research context

4.4.1 Country selection

To distinguish between developing and developed countries and ultimately find suitable countries to include in the study, economic and wealth related factors were used as indicators. This is according to World Bank (2010) the defining way of establishing a country’s development status, and has been used by Jin et al. (2015). As such, this study implements the World Development Indicators (WDI) based on GDP, GDP growth, GNI per capita, inflation, population and population growth and as such following the example of Lee et al. (2008). Ranking positions on most of these factors as well as purchasing power of the population were additionally included herein to establish a clearer picture of economic separation between countries. Resulting from the analysis, Syrian Arab Republic (Syria from now on) and Sweden was used as the developing and developed countries respectively. See appendix C for each indicators’ value on both countries, based on the values of World Banks (2012). Syria is additionally an appropriate country given that it has attracted very little attention within the marketing literature (Ibeh and Kasem, 2014).

Syria, a lower-middle class developing country (Ibeh and Kasem, 2011) has, as a result of government ideology with emphasize on central planning and restricted private sector activities, long been economically isolated from the world (CCG, 2002). Although, since around 1990, the economy has evolved due to investment laws encouraging investments in the private sector and a wider scope of economic participation (Ibid). And dating back fifteen years, a more social market economy has emerged with strategies to attract more foreign direct investment and increase liberalized international trade (Ibeh and Kasem, 2011). Sweden, a country classified with high level income (World Bank, 2015) has since the second half of the 1990s experiences great improvements of international investments and trade due to accelerating globalization and since entering into the European Union in 1995 (The PRS Group, 2015). As a constant and strong supporter for free international trade (Roseveare et al., 2004) is Sweden expected to have low trade and investment restrictions the coming years (The PRS Group, 2015). Sweden now exhibits among the lowest corporate taxes in Europe which increase the attractiveness of doing business in the country (Ibid). The Swedish consumers
have both high price awareness and purchasing power, and are used to a high standard of living and quality of products (Chamber Trade Sweden, 2015).

4.4.2 Product category

This study includes global brands as a generic term, and do not focus on any particular global brand when measuring brand loyalty. It is therefore essential to focus on a particular product category instead, to both reduce any potential confusing effects from making judgments of actual brands (Cleveland et al., 2009) and to eliminate any potential restrictions based on the varying availability of brands between Sweden and Syria (Alden et al., 2006). Apparel, and clothing in particular, was chosen for the current study. It was suitable due to being the likely most purchased non-food products among consumer which imply a highly demanded market (Moon et al., 2013). Additionally, it was revealed by Rathod and Bhatt (2014) that consumers are very conscious about the clothing category and clothing brands are important indicators for loyalty. It does consequently correspond well with the purpose of the study. In Syria, the market of apparel constitute 0.4 percent of the total market (Bisso, 2009). Textiles and clothing sector in Syria became subject to the general rules of the World Trade Organization from 2005 (WTO, 2015) which has opened the Syrian market to high diversification of products and brands from all around the world (Bisso, 2009). The market of apparel in Sweden constitute 3.5 percent of the total market, and is 100 percent free to competition (Roseveare et al., 2004). As such, it experiences high diversity and competitiveness with a multitude of both domestic and multinational (global) brands (Euromonitor, 2015).

4.5 Measurement of variables

This study handles one independent and one dependent variable together with a set of control variables. Below is first the scale, and the motivation for its use, of the independent variable in the form of Cosmopolitanism presented. Secondly, for the dependent variable, is the scale of global brand loyalty presented with arguments for its applicability. Lastly are the control variable used presented.

All items for Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty in the questionnaire were measured using a seven point Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘‘strongly disagree’’) to 7 (‘‘strongly agree’’). In accordance with the theory on global and local brands, and following the approach taken by Batra et al. (2000), Steenkamp et al. (2003) and Eckhardt (2005) were the respondent instructed to base their answers upon their own perception of what are global and local brands. Moreover, the questionnaires were adapted to the country in which they were conducted. As such, “SEK” was used to obtain the income data for Swedish respondent and “SYP” for Syrians, as well as different income brackets to match the character of each country building on the approaches of Cleveland et al. (2014) and Jin et al. (2015).
4.5.1 Independent variable

Within the marketing literature, there exist a number of measurement scales for Cosmopolitanism (e.g. Cannon et al., 1994; Cleveland and Laroche, 2007; Cleveland et al., 2009; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Riefler et al., 2012; Saran and Kalliny, 2012; Altintaş et al., 2013; Cleveland et al., 2014). The original scale by Cannon et al. (1994) is based upon general, and not consumer-specific, attitudes and behaviors (Nijssen and Douglas, 2008) and has been criticized for poor validity, unclear dimensionality and low internal consistency (Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009). Moreover, it has seen little adoption within research (Cleveland et al., 2014). The scale by Cleveland and Laroche (2007), with succeeding improvements by Cleveland et al. (2009) has been used in cross-national research (e.g. Lim and Park, 2013; Tae Lee et al., 2014). Although, it is not bound to any specific research context (Cleveland et al., 2014), and does not cover the theoretical dimensions of Cosmopolitanism from a consumer context (Riefler et al., 2012) which in this study is essential. Nor is the scale by Cleveland et al. (2014) focused on a consumption perspective. Similarly, Riefler et al. (2012) reviewed the C-COS scale by Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2009) and saw it was not applicable to measure all three dimensions of Cosmopolitanism. Thus, based on the conceptual structure of Cosmopolitanism presented in the conceptual framework, and due to heavy criticism towards alternative scales, this study utilizes the C-COSMO scale by Riefler et al. (2012) (See appendix B). It has seen appreciation within the literature (e.g. Lawrence, 2012; Parts, 2013) and has seen reliable Cronbach’s Alpha values (all three dimensions >.70), construct reliability, fulfilled the recommended limit for AVE values for new scales, been tested cross-nationally and is suitable for both testing theory and for identifying Cosmopolitan consumers (Riefler et al., 2012).

4.5.2 Dependent variable

As consumers’ loyalty tendencies are expected to differ between markets, it has been argued that the type of market (consumable goods, durable goods or services) must drive the choice of measurement of brand loyalty (Rundle-Thiele and Bennet, 2001). For example, in the context of consumable goods (such as clothing), only behavioral loyalty measurement is argued to be necessary to predict future loyalty tendencies (Rundle-Thiele and Bennet, 2001; Sharp et al., 2002). Yet, such exclusion of brand loyalty dimensions has been found to not always apply. Kuikka and Laukkanen (2012) found that attitudinal loyalty better predicted brand loyalty for consumable goods as compared to behavioral loyalty. Consequently, to capture a complete understanding of the association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty, this study include all dimensions of measuring global brand loyalty. The scale developed by Quester and Lim (2003) is suitable for that as it includes all three constructs of brand loyalty (cognitive, affective and behavior) and has been widely applied in
the marketing literature with adoption by e.g. Hochgraefe et al. (2012) and Fetscherin (2014). It was slightly altered to fit into a global brand perspective. See appendix B.

4.5.3 Control variables

To satisfy the segmentation criteria of distinctive, substantiality, accessibility, and implementation suggested by Wedel and Kamakura (1999) four of the most common demographic variables (age, gender, income, and education) used in domestic and international segmentation were used as control variables (Venkatesh and Davis, 2000; Venkatesh et al., 2008; Cleveland et al., 2011b). These have been extensively utilized in marketing research (e.g. Nysveen et al., 2005; Hong and Tam, 2006; Ha et al., 2007; Chang and Chen, 2008; Sanchez-Franco et al., 2009; Lu et al., 2010; Carpenter et al., 2013). Moreover, relating to the context of the study, frequency of traveling and clothing purchasing per year were also included as control variables.

4.5.4 Translation of scales

Given that the respondents of this study were of Swedish and Syrian descent, both English measurement scales were translated into Arabic, the official language of Syria (Ibeh and Kasem, 2014) and into Swedish. When translating a scale, the goal relate to obtaining a “conceptual equivalence” that allow respondents to perceive similar meaning in the items (Berry, 1980) and that hold the same connotative meaning as the original scale (Campbell, 1970). Consequently, it is essential to ensure a valid and acceptable translation of the items (Hunt and Bhopal, 2004; Ægisdottir et al., 2008). In achieving this, this study utilized the procedure of “double translation”, also known as back-translation (McGorry, 2000). It has been described as the most adequate translation processes (Marin and Marin, 1991) and building on the recommendations of McGorry (2000) the translation was initially conducted by two bilingual speakers (one Swedish/English and one Arabic/English) from English into the target language of Swedish and Arabic. The scales were then back-translated into English by a different bilingual to ensure construct equivalence. Only small wording differences arose, and were then weighted against each other. The procedure of back translation resulted in a few item revisions.

4.6 Sampling and data collection

4.6.1 Sampling

It is recognized that sampling has a major impact on the validity of the research results (Reynolds et al., 2003; Granberg-Rademacker, 2010) and it is therefore generally desirable to utilize random sampling. This as everyone in a population will have equal chance of inclusion in a study (Pruchno et al., 2008), it allows for sampling error estimation (Lohr, 1999) and results can be
generalized on a wider population (Barry, 2005; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Although, random sampling suffers from the disadvantage of often being economically demanding and heavy to accomplish, especially for multi-national studies (Cavusgil and Das, 1997; Emerson, 2015). Moreover, for international marketing research, a major challenge exist in balancing within-country representativeness and between-country comparability and it is therefore more common that such studies utilize non-probability sampling (Reynolds et al., 2003). Consequently, this study took on a non-probability sampling approach. Furthermore, as previously established, this study should be classified as a comparative design, and in such studies are non-probability sampling an acceptable approach (Ibid).

This study utilized dual sampling techniques in the form of convenience and snowball in an online setting. A virtual snowball sampling approach can expand the sample size (Benfield and Szlemko, 2006) and was used with the intention to complement the sample size accomplished by the convenience approach. This became necessary since extensive samples sizes are required for quantitative research (Noël, 2014) and increasing amount of respondent will reduce the risk of random error of uncontrollable influences (Emerson, 2015). In addition, with the reliability disadvantages of non-probability sampling (Reynolds et al., 2003) was is necessary to expand the sample size. In accordance with the proposed sample characteristics of future research from example Cleveland et al. (2009) and Nijssen and Douglas (2011) (see appendix A) and the previously limited scope of samples in studies of Cosmopolitanism, the targeted sample herein is not limited in a given sample. Instead, it targets the countries populations as a whole. Thus, it made no limitations to gender, income level or education. Only age was limited to 18 years old.

4.6.2 Pilot testing of questionnaire

This study fulfills the research strategy of survey by collecting primary data through questionnaires, and prior to initiating the data collection, a pilot testing was conducted. This was done to identifying potential problems and difficulties with the questionnaire (Weissman et al., 2012) such as confusion among the respondents while reading or filling it out (Bowden et al., 2002; Rosengren and Arvidson, 2002; Neuman, 2003; Aaker et al., 2011). It was also essential to conduct pilot testing since the brand loyalty scale (Quester and Lim, 2003) was altered as previously described. A total of six respondents were included in the pilot testing, three from each country, who were asked to control the wording, structure of sentences, and to point out ambiguities and report items to which they are were unwilling to answer (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). Resulting from this was a two item reduction (“Over the last few months I have always bought global brands of clothing because I really like global brands” and “I always find myself buying clothes of global brands over local brands”) from the questionnaire due to confusion, and small wording alterations of some items from the Swedish
version. Then, to achieve face validity, and to establish that the measurement items were in an understandable way replicating the content of the concepts of Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty (Bryman and Bell, 2011), the questionnaire was given to peers in the area of business and economics and to a marketing professor at Linnaeus university. Again, while the measurement instrument in the questionnaire had been used and validated in prior research, it was particularly essential for the scale of global brand loyalty.

4.6.3 Survey Implementation

The primary data was collected through online questionnaires using spreadsheets.google.com. It was available during one week in May 2015 and distributed by sending the URL’s to potential respondents via emails and various social media as conducted by Strizhakova et al. (2011). In marketing research, online questionnaires are presently the most frequently used approach (Hair et al., 2010) and was herein chosen for its efficiency to relatively easy collecting necessary data from large sample, especially on distance geographic scale (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Carpenter et al., 2013). Additionally, due to its recognized advantage to provide access to the “hard-to-reach” populations (Couper, 2000; Fricker and Schonlau, 2002; Heckathorn, 2011) which the Syrian consumers arguably are. Another advantage is that the respondent can be anonymous which leads to higher chances of honest responses with increased accuracy (Bryman and Bell, 2011) and collection of data with limited costs and time (Benfield and Szlemko, 2006; Brickman-Bhutta, 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2011). In both countries was the convenience sample made up of 65 individuals. For the snowball sample, some additional targeted respondents were asked to further distribute the link to others. Both countries held 10 people. Ultimately 355 responses were collected with 341 remaining after screening for irrelevant respondents in the form of non-clothing shoppers. The descriptive statistics of the respondent are accessible in Table 2.

4.7 Ethical considerations

Before starting in any research, the researcher must be entirely aware of their proficiency to carry out the research and possess comprehensive understanding of ethical guidelines of their research (Saunders et al., 2007). The ethical concerns of research are focused on treatment to those included within a study (Bryman and Bell, 2011), and when collecting primary data and upon handling private information of the respondent, this study utilized a few key ethical concerns. Initially, potential harm to participants was considered prior to initiating the data collection where neither physical nor personal damage was thought to arise. Although, private information provided upon answering the questionnaires was a key aspect for consideration as it could be regarded as sensitive. Thus, all the participants were thoroughly informed about the context of the study and ensured that private
information was only to be handled by the authors of this thesis. Participation was then completely voluntary.

4.8 Quality Criteria

4.8.1 Validity

It is of utmost importance to establish that the results of a study are accurate, or as commonly referred, valid (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005). Without it, generalizability and conclusions made could be flawed (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Apart from content validity previously accounted for, this study include both construct and internal validity measurement.

Construct validity can be described as the extent to which the operationalization actually measures the concept it is supposed to measure (Malhotra and Grover, 1998; Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005; Bryman and Bell, 2011). If the measurements do not reflect the intended concepts, then the applicability of the results should be questioned (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Malhotra and Grover (1998, p. 408) stated that “validated instruments of both independent and dependent variables can alleviate confounding effects in determining the true relationship among variables”. As previously argued, this study adopted already established measurement for the two concepts of interest. As such, the construct validity of the used scales have already been evaluated. Although, as no previous research had measured these two concept within the same study before, it was essential to evaluate whether the different constructs were not correlating too high with each other. One measureable factor for such validity is the Pearson’s correlation (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011) in which the correlation between the variables can range from 0 to 1. 1 supports an absolute correlation, but to discard the lack of discriminant validity, the correlation should not be higher than 0.9 (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The results of the Pearson’s Correlation used herein is presented in table 1.

With primary focus to a causal relationship between two variables, internal validity aims to establish whether a conclusion made about the relationship between independent and independents variables is true for false (Ghauri and Grønhaug, 2005; Zachariaidis et al., 2013), and lacking internal validity makes any study valueless (Barry, 2005). As such, it depends on a researcher’ capacity to determine that no intervening variables affect the relationship studied (Heiman, 1998; Barry, 2005) and if validity is established, it can confidently argued that the independent variable cause a change in the dependent variable. To ensure internal validity of the results produced herein, the control variables previously presented were introduced and tested for influence. Income was not included as a control variable. This due to the varying level of currency values in the sampled countries that could not produce a fair unified cluster of income into which the respondents in Syria and Sweden could be classified.
4.8.2 Reliability

Prior to testing the hypotheses, internal consistency reliability tests on both the C-COSMO and global brand loyalty scale was performed. This was performed based upon the arguments that reliability, together with validity, is the most important attribute to evaluate test scores upon (Gignac, 2014) and that these are issues of fundamental importance for research utilizing questionnaires (Granberg-Rademacker, 2010). Additionally, reliability is time and research context dependent (Moloney et al., 2012; Therrien and Hunslay, 2013) and ought to therefore require additional reliability-testing apart from what already has been established by the sources from which the scales originate. For this, Cronbach’s α was used in accordance with it being the most commonly used approach to measure scale reliability (Venkateswaran et al., 2011) and it being widely used for numeric measurements such as 7-point Likert (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Cronbach’s α was tested through SPSS (v.21).

The second step was performing an exploratory factor analysis to verify the proposed structure of the scales (Møller Jensen and Hansen, 2006) and to determine what factors were relevant for the study (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Since our sample size exceeded 100 (341) was an exploratory factor analysis applicable method (Hair et al., 2003). The results of the reliability tests are presented in chapter 5.1.

4.9 Data analysis technique

In conducting the hypotheses testing, this study used IBM SPSS (v.21), and given the nature of the hypotheses, multiple linear regression analysis method was undertaken as it relate well to the association between two (one independent and one dependent) variables (Hair et al., 2010). The ability of a regression analysis to determine the level of significant influence of an independent variable on a dependent one (Venkateswaran et al., 2011) further promote it as a suitable analysis technique to utilize herein. The level of Cosmopolitanism, the independent variable, was classified as a scale variable in SPSS. The dependent variable, global brand loyalty, was similarly classified as a scale variable in SPSS.

When testing H1 the entire sample was included in one unified group analysis, while the approach taken for H2a and H2b differed. For H2a, the moderating variable of country development status was computed by multiplying Cosmopolitanism with the country of the respondents, and H2a was then tested using a multiple group analysis on the two sub-data sets in accordance with the recommendation of Byrne (2010) and the approach of Jin et al. (2015). Hypothesis 2b was then tested by a data split based upon country of the respondents. In accordance with the recent emerge and limited understanding of Cosmopolitanism in marketing, this study further analyzed the influence of the age, gender, income and education on Cosmopolitanism. Upon doing so, the Cosmopolitan
variable was handled as a dependent variable and age, gender, education, income and travel as independent variables. It was similarly conducted in a regression analysis. While the independent and dependent variables were classified on a 1 to 7 scale, the control variables were classified as ordinal (age, traveling, clothing purchase) and nominal (gender, education) and coded in SPSS, as seen in appendix E. Country was classified as nominal, and coded to separate between the two samples in the study.
5. Result and Analysis

5.1 Measurement reliability

Cronbach’s $\alpha$ exceeded the minimum criteria of 0.7 (Hair et al., 2003; Venkateswaran et al., 2011) for the three dimension of Cosmopolitanism (open mindedness; 0.866, diversity appreciation; 0.852 and consumption transcending borders; 0.768). However, open mindedness and diversity appreciation both included an item with low total internal correlation loading, which was therefore removed in alignment with Churchill (1979). This lead to higher Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for open mindedness (.879) and diversity appreciation (.876). Even though some item in consumption transcending borders showed similar low internal correlations, removing them would not improve the general Cronbach’s $\alpha$, and were thus kept. Regarding global brand loyalty, the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ exceeded the minimum criteria of 0.7 for the three dimension (cognitive; 0.921, affective; 0.941 and behavior; 0.903). However, reviewing all the items in affective showed one item with low internal correlation loading, and upon removing it an increased Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was produced (0.948).

All items remaining after the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ reliability test for each scale were included. Only items with loadings higher than 0.4 were requested in the analysis. As can been seen in appendix D, only one item (question one of behavior) of global brand loyalty needed removing as its loadings were higher with the affective construct than with that of behavior. All items from the C-COSMO scale remained. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was then tested again for the behavior construct of brand loyalty, and once again loaded above 0.7 (.876).

Finally, Pearson’s correlation was used to statistically determine that the different constructs in the questionnaire are not correlating too high with each other (Saunders et al., 2007; Bryman and Bell, 2011). All the values that resulted from Pearson Correlation presented in table 1. are overall lower than 0.9 and therefore satisfying (Bryman and Bell, 2011).
Table 1. Pearson’s Correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open mindedness</th>
<th>Diversity appreciation</th>
<th>Consumption transcending borders</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open mindedness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.486**</td>
<td>0.567**</td>
<td>0.228**</td>
<td>0.230**</td>
<td>0.200**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity appreciation</td>
<td>0.486**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.527**</td>
<td>0.378**</td>
<td>0.376**</td>
<td>0.309**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption transcending borders</td>
<td>0.567**</td>
<td>0.527**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.207**</td>
<td>0.183**</td>
<td>0.165**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>0.228**</td>
<td>0.378**</td>
<td>0.207**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.850**</td>
<td>0.759**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.230**</td>
<td>0.376**</td>
<td>0.183**</td>
<td>0.850**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.796**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>0.200**</td>
<td>0.309**</td>
<td>0.165**</td>
<td>0.759**</td>
<td>0.796**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
### 5.2 Descriptive Statistics

Below are the demographic variables and the quantity of the respondents presented both in total, and separated between countries.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size (N)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Syria</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 25</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Income Syria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 20,000 SYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 40,000 SYP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 - 60,000 SYP</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001 - 80,000 SYP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 80,000 SYP</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Income Sweden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10,000 SEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000 SEK</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000 SEK</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000 SEK</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000 SEK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30,000 SEK</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of traveling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time per year</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 times per year</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 times per year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 times per year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of clothes purchasing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time per year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4 times per year</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 times per year</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 times per year</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Hypothesis Testing

First were the control variables tested against global brands loyalty. The model yielded non-significant value ($p = .337$) and so none of the variable, age, gender, education, traveling or clothing purchase influence global brand loyalty, as seen in table 3, model 1. Upon introducing the mean of Cosmopolitanism, the model yielded a significant level ($p < .001$) where the control variables again showed to be non-significant. On the other hand, Cosmopolitanism produced significant values ($p < .001$). Consequently, as can be seen below in table 3, model 2, H1 which propose that “Cosmopolitanism is positively associated with global brand loyalty” is supported with Cosmopolitanism explaining 11 percent (adjusted $R^2 = .110$) of the variation in global brand loyalty. Testing H2a, in which the country development status was used as a potential moderating factor, the model yielded a significant value ($p < .001$). As seen in table 3, model 3, country development status as the moderating variable proved significant ($p < .001$) and once again was Cosmopolitanism significant ($p < .001$). And so, H2a proposing that “the association of Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty is different between developing and developed countries” is supported. In this context, the variation in global brand loyalty created by Cosmopolitanism increased from 11 percent (adjusted $R^2 = .110$) to 23.2 percent (adjusted $R^2 = .232$).

Table 3. Hypothesis 1 and 2a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.851 **** (.302)</td>
<td>.642 **** (.445)</td>
<td>.024 (.422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.068 (.078)</td>
<td>-.039 (.074)</td>
<td>.026 (.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.115 (.181)</td>
<td>.155 (.171)</td>
<td>.123 (.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.168 (.075)</td>
<td>.133 (.071)</td>
<td>.002 (.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>-.029 (.090)</td>
<td>-.076 (.086)</td>
<td>.050 (.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchase</td>
<td>-.003 (.097)</td>
<td>-.045 (.092)</td>
<td>.127 (.089)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>.456 **** (.071)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.807**** (.081)</td>
<td>-.231**** (.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R^2</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2 Change</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.109****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>1.56238</td>
<td>1.47517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>8.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df) Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01; ****p<0.001, N: 341
S.E (standard error) is presented within parenthesis of each independent variable
For testing H2b, the data was split between Syria and Sweden. Again, both models for the control variables produced non-significant values (Syria; p = .169, Sweden; p = .250) and so for neither country did the control variables influence global brand loyalty, as seen table 4, model 1 and 2. When including Cosmopolitanism into the model, the countries separate models were significant, although, Syria (p < .001) at a higher level than Sweden (p = .016). Moreover, as can be seen in table 4, model 3 and 4, the variation in global brand loyalty caused by Cosmopolitanism is considerably stronger in the developing country (Syria; adjusted R² = .179, p < .001) than in the developed country (Sweden; adjusted R² = .067, p = .003). Building on these finding, H2b which proposes a stronger association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty in developing countries is thus supported.

Table 4. Hypothesis 2b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (Syria)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Sweden)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Syria)</th>
<th>Model 4 (Sweden)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.899 **** (.396)</td>
<td>2.005**** (.431)</td>
<td>.642 **** (.445)</td>
<td>.879 (.561)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.000 (.147)</td>
<td>-.032 (.076)</td>
<td>.090 (.135)</td>
<td>-.029 (.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.453 (.264)</td>
<td>-.348 (.211)</td>
<td>.333 (.242)</td>
<td>-.245 (.208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.036 (.117)</td>
<td>.118 (.091)</td>
<td>-.023 (.107)</td>
<td>.065 (.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>.113 (.131)</td>
<td>.027 (.114)</td>
<td>.073 (.119)</td>
<td>-.012 (.111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchase</td>
<td>.124 (.155)</td>
<td>.175 (.114)</td>
<td>.093 (.142)</td>
<td>.138 (.111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>.647 **** (.103)</td>
<td>.244*** (.081)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuster R²</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.165****</td>
<td>0.060***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>1.64493</td>
<td>1.19741</td>
<td>1.50087</td>
<td>1.16345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>1.574</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>2.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df) Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01; ****p<0.001, N: 341
S.E (standard error) is presented within parenthesis of each independent variable

The previously suggested research model is on the following page again included with illustrations of the significant level of the proposed hypotheses.
5.3.1 Research model sig.

![Research model diagram]

5.4 Additional findings

5.4.1 Constructs of global brand loyalty

Additional examination of the data was conducted by separating the three constructs (cognitive, affective and behavior) of global brand loyalty. Results showed that the strongest association of Cosmopolitanism is with the cognitive construct (adjusted $R^2 = .117$, $p < .001$) followed by affective (adjusted $R^2 = .111$, $p < .001$) and least with behavior (adjusted $R^2 = .065$, $p < .001$). No control variable was significant. Finally, the Cosmopolitanism mean on each dimensional construct of brand loyalty was also examined on each country separately. On all three constructs was country development status found as a significant moderator ($p < .001$) and all models proved significant ($p < .001$). Neither control variable was significant. Again, Cosmopolitanism was strongest associated with cognitive that increased to; adjusted $R^2 = .233$, $p < .001$. It was followed by affective; adjusted $R^2 = .219$, $p < .001$ and least with behavior; adjusted $R^2 = .156$, $p < .001$). To determine what country sample had higher predictive power, the data was then split. As could be expected, the developing country sample elicited higher levels for all three constructs of global brand loyalty. Cognitive, Syria; adjusted $R^2 = .195$, $p < .001$, Sweden; adjusted $R^2 = .06$, $p < .001$. Affective, Syria; adjusted $R^2 = .162$, $p < .001$, Sweden; adjusted $R^2 = .079$, $p < .001$. Behavior, Syria; adjusted $R^2 = .114$, $p < .001$, Sweden, adjusted $R^2 = .05$, $p = .012$. All these findings are illustrated in table 5 in appendix F.
5.4.2 Constructs of Cosmopolitanism

Moreover, a thorough examination was given to the C-COSMO scale to determine which construct of Cosmopolitanism (*open-mindedness*, *diversity appreciation* and *consumption transcending borders*) was strongest associated with global brand loyalty within the sample. The models for each construct were significant (*p* < .001). All constructs were by themselves significantly associated with global brand loyalty, but as can be seen in table 6, model 1, 2 and 3 in appendix F, *diversity appreciation* (adjusted $R^2 = .148$, *p* < .001) was considerably stronger to predict variation in global brand loyalty than *open mindedness* (adjusted $R^2 = .049$, *p* < .001) and *consumption transcending boarders* (adjusted $R^2 = .043$, *p* < .001). Additionally, when all constructs were tested together, the model yielded a significant level (*p* < .001), where this time only *diversity appreciation* was significant (adjusted $R^2 = .144$, *p* < .001) as seen in table 6, model 4 in appendix F.

5.4.3 Demographics and Cosmopolitanism

Tested over the entire sample, the model proved insignificant (*p* = .127) and so none of the demographic variables along with traveling frequency were significantly related with Cosmopolitanism. Nor was the model significant for the developing country sample (*p* = .234). However, the model for the Swedish sample was significant (*p* = .015), with education (*p* = .035) as the only significant predictors of Cosmopolitanism. When tested separately, it was seen that education determine 4.1 percent of Cosmopolitanism in Sweden. Income was tested as well, and it was found as a non-significant indicator for both countries with both models non-significant. See table 7 in appendix F.
6. Discussion

With a regression analysis, the data of 341 respondents was tested against the proposed hypotheses, and the findings indicated support for all three. H1 yielded significant result to the notion that a Cosmopolitan disposition would be positively associated with loyalty towards global brands. Although, resulting from the adjusted R$^2$ it could be seen, and must be noted, that the association is rather weak, with Cosmopolitanism being responsible for 11 percent of global brand loyalty. Therefore, it is likely that other factors interplay in the context to affect the loyalty of global brands. It could for instance be influenced by the competitive advantages of global brands over local brands in the form of higher perceptions of quality, a stronger image along with other factors (Steenkamp et al., 2003; Holt et al., 2004; Zhou et al., 2008; Dimofte et al., 2010). That aside, a detailed analysis show that when the three constructs of Cosmopolitanism was handled separately, diversity appreciation worked as the strongest influencer on global brand loyalty, by clearly surpassing open mindedness and consumption transcending boarders with an adjusted R$^2$ about three time as high. Therefore it is not surprising that it was the only significant predictor of global brand loyalty when the constructs were tested together. When regarded in its current form, and apart from the other two complementing construct of Cosmopolitanism, the significance of diversity appreciation is to be expected due to the characteristics of the construct. Suggested from the literature is that it is a genuine appreciation for diversity, differences and for the accessibility for various options from around the world (Featherstone, 2002; Riefler et al., 2012). Remarking on that, global brands with their multi-national reach and multi-cultural origin (Alden et al., 1999; 2006) as compared to local brands (Steenkamp et al., 2003; Strizhakova et al., 2011; Swoboda et al., 2012) are then likely seen by Cosmopolitan consumers as an obvious, and also perhaps easy, source for the chance to consume diversity. In the sense of what diversity is to them. The Cosmopolitan consumers’ tendencies for adopting innovation (Rogers, 2004; Lim and Park, 2013) together with the general idea that global brands are extensively more modern and technologically advanced (e.g. Zhou and Belk, 2004; Dimofte et al., 2008; Strizhakova et al., 2008a) could create an urge among Cosmopolitan consumers to continuously purchase global brands. And then in the sense that innovation could contribute to diversity they would become loyal. Comparably, the third construct of Cosmopolitanism, consumption transcending boarders, did not pose any significant associate positively with global brand loyalty when testing all constructs of Cosmopolitanism together. These findings could be regarded as rather surprising in the sense that the construct relates to positive orientation for consuming products from foreign countries (Riefler et al., 2012) and that is has been seen for Cosmopolitan consumers to rather buy foreign than domestic product in a wide range of categories (Hannerz, 1990; Holt, 1997, Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Regev, 2007; Parts, 2013). On the other
hand, it could perhaps be explained by the fact that the consumption transcending boarders construct is solely focus on direct consumption intentions of the Cosmopolitan consumers. As such, its applicability to the concept of global brand loyalty may be limited, as global brand loyalty not only constitutes of a consumption aspect (behavior), but also include two attitudinal component (cognitive and affective) (Bandyopadhyay and Martell, 2007; Worthington et al., 2010; Kuikka and Laukkanen, 2012), that furthermore are the perquisite of the behavioral loyalty (Moisescu and Allen, 2010).

It is also apt to argue for the characteristics of the association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty given that it herein was established that Cosmopolitanism is positively associated with each of the three constructs of global brand loyalty (cognitive, affective and behavior) separately. Seemingly, the association is not based on any kind of indulgence or convenience factors as is the case of solely behavioral loyalty (Fetscherin, 2014; Makanyeza, 2015) but Cosmopolitan consumers are instead actively engaged in loyalty towards global brands. In other words, the loyalty of Cosmopolitan consumers towards global brands should not be regarded as spurious loyalty, but instead as a true loyalty (Kim et al., 2008; Podoshen and Andrzejewski, 2012; Makanyeza, 2015) where both the intentions to remain loyal (attitudinal loyalty) and the actual tendencies of loyalty (behavioral loyalty) being transpired. Moreover, it was found that Cosmopolitanism and the cognitive component of global brand loyalty was strongest associated, followed by affective and lastly behavior. Remarking on this, the notion that Cosmopolitan consumers make brand choices based on their ability of reinforcing their identities and connectedness as a global consumer (Cleveland et al., 2011a) and that global brands provide consumers with the opportunity to partake in, and reinforce their membership within, a global consumer culture (or global citizenship) (e.g. Holt et al., 2004; Strizhakova et al., 2008a; Steenkamp and de Jong, 2010) offers further understanding. In essence, following the sequential strength of the association of Cosmopolitanism with the constructs of global brand loyalty, it would appear that Cosmopolitan consumers’ beliefs and thoughts (cognitive) of global brands to allow them to partake and reinforce their memberships in a global consumer culture is dominant over their actual experienced contributions of, and positive feeling from (affective), global brands to include them in such a community. Lastly, with the attitudinal loyalty working as a perquisite of behavioral loyalty, it comes not surprising that behavioral loyalty is least predictable by a Cosmopolitan disposition.

In supporting hypothesis H2a and H2b it became apparent that Cosmopolitan consumers in developing countries have a different association with loyalty towards global brands than what consumers of the same characteristics in developed countries have. It is a stronger association in developing countries. Consequently, the arguments of Strizhakova et al. (2008a) that consumers in developing countries might not elicit brand loyalty is in a sense challenged herein, even though only in the context of consumers with a more or less Cosmopolitan disposition, and concerning global
brand over local brands as generic concepts. Generally, a Cosmopolitan disposition is understood, apart from diversity appreciation and consumption transcending boarders as previously discussed, with an open-mindedness. Noting on that, it constitute a search for that which can deliver required functions and features rather than influences of local tradition or product origin (Cannon and Yaprak, 1993; Cannon et al., 1994; Jaffe and Nebenzahl, 2006; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Altintaş et al., 2013; Tae Lee et al., 2014). With an association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty different from, and stronger in, developing countries than in developed countries, it is likely that Cosmopolitan consumers in developing countries tend to elicit a more subjective evaluation of global brands. And/or perhaps have varying requirements of global brands than Cosmopolitan consumers in developed countries do. It is likely that with clear differences in level and history of global and local brand integration (Fournier, 1998; Holt, 2002; Coulter et al., 2003; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015) and with unique meaning for local and global brands (Alden et al., 2006; Üstüner and Holt, 2007; Han et al., 2010; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015) Cosmopolitan consumers in developing countries are more prone to believe in global brands as a source of integrating in the global consumer culture than Cosmopolitan consumers in developed countries. This is then not only determining a higher level of purchase of global brands as suggested by Strizhakova and Coulter (2015) but also a higher level of loyalty towards global brands. Comparably, for Cosmopolitan consumers in developed countries it could be that such factors have increased their requirements of authenticity within brands and has, as argued by (Zhou et al., 2015) developed a more local perspective and, thus downgrading the global brands. Although only to a lower level than that of Cosmopolitan consumers in developing countries as the association still proved significant. Building on this it is possible that the increased tension between consumers’ preference for a local or global identity as suggested by (Zhang and Khare, 2009) could be prevalent for Cosmopolitan consumers in developed countries. Additionally could it be illustrated by the Cosmopolitan dispositions’ competition and softening by a simultaneously existing ethnocentric traits suggested by Nijssen and Douglas (2008). More likely than that, this difference could be related to the fact that Cosmopolitan consumers are sophisticated consumers whose purchasing patterns depends upon the specific situation (Cannon and Yaparak, 2002) which in this case would be the economic development status of the countries. Nevertheless, the findings clearly provide support for the arguments of Gammoh et al. (2015) that the Cosmopolitan disposition is more influential in developing countries, and that Cosmopolitan consumers in developed countries are more interested in global brands than local brands (Alden et al., 1999; Batra et al., 2000; Kinra, 2006; Strizhakova et al., 2008a; b; Strizhakova and Coulter, 2015).

It was seen that the level of Cosmopolitanism exhibited in the developing and developed country were of equal, as has been previously established by Cleveland et al. (2011a) and Khare (2014b). The effect of the global media has been argued to create a wider scope of view and thus
contributing to Cosmopolitanism, (e.g. Hannerz, 1990; Caldwell et al., 2006; Cleveland et al., 2015) and in supporting the research of Cleveland et al. (2011a) and Khare (2014b) it does seemingly have a impactful effect in countries, regardless of economic development. This is further evident through the arguments that traveling is not a requirement for developing a Cosmopolitan disposition (e.g. Craig and Douglas, 2006; Gillespie et al., 2010), which this study found support for. On the other hand, the finding herein distinctively differs from that of previous research on the demographic variables. Exhibiting a higher level of Cosmopolitanism can be argued from the results to not be related to rising age, a notion that has thus far been exclusively supported by previous research (Cleveland et al., 2009; Carpenter et al., 2013; Gupta, 2013; Tae Lee et al., 2014). Nor was it evident that the finding support Cleveland et al. (2009) that gender matter in the context, and that rising income produce higher level of Cosmopolitanism (Cleveland et al., 2011b; Gupta, 2013; Khare, 2014b). Instead, the findings are aligned with those of Carpenter et al. (2013) as non-significant. Possibilities to such distinctive findings could relate to the scales used to measure Cosmopolitanism in the other studies or be a result of the geographic context in which these studies have been conducted. On the other hand, the results herein partially support the established relationship between an increasing education and the Cosmopolitan disposition (Cleveland et al., 2009; Gupta, 2013; Khare, 2014b) with the Swedish, but not Syrian, respondents exhibited such results. Ultimately, while most demographic variable herein were not supporting an increasing Cosmopolitan disposition, education partially did, which in a sense is to be expected. This as it is argued and well established that Cosmopolitanism is relate to an attitudinal perspective of individuals (Llopis-Goig, 2013; Cleveland et al., 2014) and is a learnable disposition (Thompson and Tambyah, 1999; Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Cleveland et al., 2014). Remarking on that, education is unsurprisingly a better indicator for learning and exhibiting cultural openness than is for example an increasing age or an individuals’ monetary resources. Moreover, in finding that income is not associated with a Cosmopolitan orientation, it support the contemporary consensus that Cosmopolitan individuals are not exclusively privileged actors with resources for mobility (Cleveland et al., 2009; 2011a).
7. Conclusion and implications

7.1 Conclusion

Cosmopolitanism has recently emerged as a critical international market segment as an effect of globalization, and is now a growing and globally substantial global segment. Similarly have global brands taken a central place on the global market with expansions into both developing and developed countries, which in extension have encouraged a growing competition with local brands in these markets. Therefore, understanding targeted consumers is of utmost importance, and for globally competitive brands are Cosmopolitan consumers central for survival. Yet, the understanding of Cosmopolitanism within the marketing literature has thus far been limited, and with just above 20 years of research most of it has been qualitative or conceptual. With a clear lack of knowledge concerning Cosmopolitanism from a consumer behavioral perspective, this study introduce global brands loyalty into the literature of Cosmopolitanism and extended it into the context of developing and developed countries. From this, the purpose of this study was “to understand the association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty within developing and developed countries.”

The results produced herein further the understanding in showing that Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty, a concept capturing both attitudinal and repurchasing constructs, are positively associated. The association is mostly defined by prevailing thoughts and beliefs of global brands over local brands, followed then by stronger emotional attachment for global brands, and least characterized by the intentions of actually repurchasing global brands instead of any competing local brands. While acknowledging this room of Cosmopolitanism in the context of global brand loyalty, the disposition of this new and ever growing global consumer segment do not have a considerably high impact in determining loyalty towards brands which are perceived as global. Particularly not if this consumer segment is regarded with homogeneity in the global consumer market. Ultimately, while it is apparent that Cosmopolitan consumer are an important segment for global brands, if distinctions of Cosmopolitan consumers are based upon the level of economic development of countries, then the importance for, and association with, global brands increases.

7.2 Theoretical implications

This study contributes to the recent emerging studies of Cosmopolitanism and does so with an extended understanding of the concept within the limited area of quantitative studies. In doing so, it answers to previous researchers’ proposed avenues to understand Cosmopolitanism in relation to consumption based outcomes, that herein was global brand loyalty. Ultimately, the theoretical implications evident herein should be regarded as two-fold.

Prior literature have offered an understanding that Cosmopolitan consumers have a positive
attitude and tendencies to purchase global brands compared to local counterparts. As such, the first
and primary theoretical contribution herein is the understanding that Cosmopolitanism associate with
both an increased *attitudinal loyalty* of global brands over local ones, and *behavioral loyalty* in the
form of repurchasing global brands over local ones. Resulting from this is a strengthened
understanding of previous research that is extended into the concept of global brand loyalty.
Moreover, considering the moderating variable, this study also imply a stronger influence of
Cosmopolitanism in developing countries as previous research had argued. Remarking on this, an
important contribution herein is that the Cosmopolitanism should be regarded with heterogeneity
across the global consumer market, although with the reservation that it perhaps solely apply in the
context of global versus local brands. Secondly, parts of the to date quantitative research on
Cosmopolitanism has noted the influence of demographic variables on the development of
Cosmopolitan tendencies. Seen from this study is that all of these previous findings, with the
exceptions of education, can be challenged.

7.3 Managerial implications

Given the limited understanding concerning Cosmopolitanism, and with brand loyalty seen as
one of the most predictive factors to influence consumer’s choice of brands, this study provide the
literature with new, and for marketers, promising understandings of the association between
Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty. First and foremost, the results transpired herein promote
for further emphasis on the importance of Cosmopolitanism as an important segment for global
brands. As such, this study strongly conceded with previous arguments made by Cleveland et al.
(2009) and Riefler et al. (2012). And when taking the extensive global versus local brand competition
into consideration, it is apparent that this segment provide global brands with a strategically
substantial advantage. Possibilities for global brands to effectively challenge local brands in
developed, and particularly in developing countries does seemingly exist, and should be improved
when targeting the Cosmopolitan consumer segment. Even so, targeting the Cosmopolitan consumer
segment is on the other hand perhaps much more challenging for marketers than what findings of
previous research would have indicated. If based upon research on Cosmopolitanism and its
preconditions such as Cleveland et al. (2009; 2011b), Gupta (2013) and Khare (2014b) then
segregating consumer upon demographics to identifying Cosmopolitans could have been done
confidently. Although, given the findings emerging in this study, with neither of the commonly
implemented demographics found to influence a Cosmopolitan disposition, such an approach is likely
to have been unwise. On the other hand, these finding also promote an extensive spread of the
Cosmopolitan consumer segment that would seem larger than previous have been acknowledged, and
thus offering an even more promising outlook for global brands.
A second recommendation for global brands managers is that emphasis must be laid upon the benefits of global brands relative to their local brand competitors given the already established appreciation for these benefits among Cosmopolitan consumers, but also due to the arguably weak association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty found herein. It will then likely uphold, and also strengthen loyalty among Cosmopolitan consumers, and companies should then ultimately enjoy more of the brand loyalty benefits. In hopes of accomplishing this, it will be essential to actively implement activities and strategies that can strengthen each of the loyalty components. With least influence of the Cosmopolitan disposition, behavioral loyalty ought to be regarded as the central component. Also, with its meaning in actual repurchasing is it the only brand loyalty components from which global brands will enjoy economic benefits. To uphold, and hopefully, increase the behavioral loyalty among Cosmopolitan consumers should accessibility, from planning to execution, be of central concern in marketing activities. For example, through advertising/communication must global brands become increasingly positioned as a part of the purchase possibilities among Cosmopolitan consumers to the same degree local brands are. More than in advertising/communication, is distribution also an essential consideration to regard, in which the actual position in advertising would transpired into repurchasing. Of course these activities will be of prevailing importance in developed countries, where Cosmopolitanism is less associated global brand loyalty, and where local brands are more regarded as the available range of brands (Jin et al., 2015). Additionally, with attitudinal loyalty as a prequisite of behavioral loyalty, consistent efforts should be made by global brand managers to strengthen the cognitive loyalty with emphasis on the psychological values of global brands over local brands. Again, the investments made into that should be separated between developing and developed countries. Associations with the global consumer culture should guide these activities in developing countries, while authenticity, despite its abstract meaning, should be pushed for in developed countries. In doing so, global brands can then perhaps deviate from the view as standardized and boring among Cosmopolitan consumer, and enjoy increased competitive strength to local brands. Comparatively, in developing countries, the overall globality of the brands should be of central concern. To sustain affective loyalty among Cosmopolitan consumers, global brand managers should provide additional values in their brands given the connection to positive feeling of repurchasing evident from affective loyalty. Illustratively, post-purchase activities could be implemented with the purpose of further provide Cosmopolitan consumers with the benefits the associate with global brands, and which make them purchase global rather than local brands. Conclusively, Cosmopolitanism must be considered as central in planning of marketing mix among companies of global brands, with distinctive strategies for developing and developed markets.
8. Limitation and future research

In this thesis, thoughtful efforts have been applied to promote an externally valid sample, reliable measures and relevant analytical methods to test the hypotheses. Nonetheless, some limitations still apply, which in turn suggest some directions for subsequent studies.

First, a convenience random sampling technique was used for data collection. So, future work can enhance the generalizability of the theories by drawing a larger random sample from the population. In particular, the sample has large representation from young group age, along with large representation from highly educated group, as 67 percent had bachelor degree or higher (80.2 percent in the Syrian sample). Therefore it’s recommended that future studies attempt to collect a broader demographic sample such as older consumers, and consumers with lower levels of education, to enhance the generalizability of the results.

Secondly, in regard to the countries selected herein, it is concede that only including two countries cannot be completely representative for all other developing and developed countries. Thus, the country inclusion of future research ought to extend the number of countries to achieve a better representation of developing and developed countries. In particularly would it be constructive to conduct comparison with the use of other country classification such as FTSE Classification Review, which provide more comprehensive classification of countries; Developed (e.g. Norway, South Korea, U.K.) Advanced Emerging (e.g. Brazil, Malaysia, Czech Republic) Secondary Emerging (e.g. China, India, UAE) and Frontier (e.g. Bangladesh, Estonia, Ghana). Furthermore, this study did not concern itself with within-country differences, such as urban and rural cities. As such, there exist an unexplored avenues of research to study the association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty between consumers of bigger and widely populated cities with those of rural descent, which could provide a profound understanding of the underlined relationship.

Thirdly, this study focused on a single product category and that might promote concern regarding the influence and attitudes toward this specific category. Thus, future research can replicate this study but overcome these limitations by including a variety of product categories with different use and meaning. For example luxury versus durable products, or products more loaded with hedonic values versus utilitarian values. Moreover, there could be great value in studying the association between Cosmopolitanism and global brand loyalty with further inclusion of other variables that might underlie loyalty toward global brands. For example, attention was not placed in this studys’ model to the moderating influence of price and the importance of self-identity. Nor was brand features such as authenticity, technological level and functionality accounted for.

Lastly, this study gave no attention to the context in which the shopping of clothing the respondents were considering when answering the questionnaires. It is possible that purchasing
clothing in a store compared with in an online store could affect loyalty as an effect of the possible accessibility differences of global brands within these types of stores. Therefore, future research must be can make explicit separation of the purchasing context, and also compare between these two alternatives as a moderating variable.
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## Appendix

### A. Literary review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Further research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland &amp; Laroche 2007</td>
<td>&quot;...Focuses on the development and validation of a multidimensional scale for the measurement of acculturation to global consumer culture.&quot;</td>
<td>The new scale had embed various drivers that reflect (COS), (IDT), (OPE), (ELU) and experiences (SIN), in addition to external elements (GMM) and the (EXM).</td>
<td>More cross-cultural study to validate the AGCC scale. With consideration to the unique special aspects of each cultures. Also incorporate countries geography, religion, and technological development statues in the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reifler &amp; Diamantopoulos 2009</td>
<td>Review the COS concept, analyze the CYMYC scale, highlight the need for a new COS scale in marketing context and offer conceptual guidance for developing a new scale.</td>
<td>The CYMYC scale suffers from unclear dimensionality, low internal consistency, and questionable nomological validity.</td>
<td>Develop and test item pools of the three consumer Cosmopolitanism aspects to reach a commonly accepted scale. Investigate the antecedents of COS, and create a greater understanding of consumer COS outcomes related to consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland et al, 2011a</td>
<td>&quot;(1) to verify the cross-cultural applicability of the COS construct, (2) to examine the relationships of Schwartz's (1992) motivational/cultural values and Hofstede's (1991) national cultural dimensions to COS, and, (3) to assess the consistency of these relationships cross-culturally.&quot;</td>
<td>Two Hofstede dimensions associate with COS (individualism and masculinity), however at the country-level these hold only for Canadians. The explanatory power of Hofstede's framework is very low (as with demographics) compared with Schwartz's dimensions. The relationships between Schwartz's values and COS are sensitive to national culture.</td>
<td>Research is needed to clarify the contexts wherein COS affects behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saran &amp; Kalliny 2012</td>
<td>&quot;Develop, purify, and validate a scale to measure the Cosmopolitanism construct and its implication for product acceptance.&quot;</td>
<td>Six COS item measurement has been developed, which reflect the openness of consumer to things such as (products, and services) from other nations.</td>
<td>Scale authentication with more diverse consumer types and in other country than U.S. Further constructs to measure (than the ones used) and analyze their associations with COS. Research the impact of COS on product sales in international context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altintas et al, 2013</td>
<td>Construct and examine a new scale that is more narrowed to three set of dimensions to measure consumer Cosmopolitanism.</td>
<td>Three set of dimensions that is constructed form 15 new scale items.</td>
<td>Test the scale on bigger sample size and more broadly demographic characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland et al, 2014</td>
<td>Assessing the stability of the Cosmopolitanism scale (Cleveland and Laroche, 2007) across a diverse set of five languages.</td>
<td>The Cosmopolitanism scale exerts cross-linguistic validity and is applicable across countries.</td>
<td>Understanding of local cultural values influence on Cosmopolitanism, as well as the influence of personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon &amp; Yaprak, 2002</td>
<td>Examine the concept of COS and propose various consumer behavior patterns.</td>
<td>Cosmopolitans are sophisticated consumers, as there are multiple possible patterns and not just one, which subsequently depends upon the situation and the consumer.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell et al, 2006</td>
<td>&quot;...increase our understanding of an under-investigated research area of consumption, that is, Cosmopolitanism as a consumer orientation.&quot;</td>
<td>Partial support for Thompson and Tannyah (1999) that the interviewees did show flexibility and a desire to fit into a new culture, but not in showing masculine tendencies to immerse into the local culture. Full support was found for Cannon and Yaprak (2002).</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijsen &amp; Douglas 2008</td>
<td>&quot;Examines whether consumers who are more open to other cultures also tend to be more socially concerned with regard to consumer decisions and how far these orientations affect attitudes toward retail store image&quot;</td>
<td>Int. travel had a significant impact on world-mindedness, which in itself impact social-mindedness. W-M also leads to a positive perception of fair-trade stores, and those stores with an international product section. Study other countries (Sweden &amp; Denmark) or USA. Study a older segment of consumers. See if store-image has a direct or indirect influence on store choice in relation to WM and SM. Introduce price, store loyalty etc. in the context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland et al, 2009</td>
<td>&quot;Seek a greater understanding of when and where the dispositions of MAT and COS are likely to favor consumer receptivity to global and foreign brands/products and identify where and when CET will be inauspiciously associated with the same.&quot;</td>
<td>According to the used sample age, education, and gender effect COS negatively and positively depending on the country. In addition, income has an effect on COS. Concerning the behavioral outcomes the study analyzed 48 behaviors and grouped them in categories. In summary, COS has been found to positively influence purchasing and predict behavior. Examine in what way MAT, COS, and CET are associated to cultural characteristics. Use broader cross-section of the population in the survey. And the use of broader product- and service-dominated categories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu and Hung 2009</td>
<td>&quot;...to examine Taiwanese consumers' cosmopolitanism characteristic and the relationship between cosmopolitanism and the behavior in choosing local or foreign bank service.&quot;</td>
<td>Travel tendencies influenced bank choice but expatriate experience did not, and nor does consumers COS tendencies. Investigate more factors in relation to COS. Such as service, product, company name, reputation etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland et al, 2011b</td>
<td>Examine the association between ethnic identity (EID) and (COS) and their roles in consumer behavior and IMS. In addition to observe their constancy across cultures, nations and consumption settings.</td>
<td>The finding suggest that COS identity complement consumers EID. Additionally, there exists a diversity in demographic and psychographic variables regarding product categories and across countries. Include more representative samples, and apply the study towards actual brands. And apply EID and COS with brand personality in relation to global and local brands. Lastly, investigate the property of which marketing mix features might be standardized, adapted, or globalized cross national markets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijsen &amp; Douglas 2011</td>
<td>Examine differences in consumer response to advertisements reflecting a global versus a foreign or local consumer cultural positioning (GCCP, FCCP, and LCCP respectively) and the relationship with consumer world-mindedness, international travel experience, and preference for authenticity.</td>
<td>Consumer world-mindedness have positive-significant impact on attitudes toward FCCP and GCCP. In addition, it lean towards negative attitudes to LCCP. On other hand, the hypothesis regarding Consumer world-mindedness preference for advertisements reflecting a GCCP over a FCCP, was not supported. The use of more broadly demographic characteristics, product categories, advertisements, and other countries. Furthermore, there is a need to investigative alterations in attitudes over time. Morover, incorporate world-mindedness studies with other variables affect product or brand choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riefler et al, 2012</td>
<td>&quot;...offers a conceptualization of the consumer cosmopolitanism construct by: (1) delineating its conceptual domain; (2) highlighting its key dimensions, namely open-mindedness, diversity appreciation, and consumption transcending borders; and (3) examining its links with theoretically relevant variables, specifically consumer ethnocentrism and global consumption orientation.</td>
<td>(1) COS is an enduring orientation with three dimensions and a key construct in consumer research domain. (2) The relationship between GCO and COS is weaker than previous research has suggested, COS and local orientation are not mutually exclusive, but there are degrees of with both are combined. (3) The C-COSMO scale is sound theoretically and related to consumer research. It is a strict, reliable and valid measurement of COS. Further investigations of how various antecedent variables (travels, expatriate stays, cross-cultural training, and social status seeking) shape COS orientations. Further understanding profiling variable of COS, e.g. Opinion leadership, price consciousness, brand switching tendencies, media use, channel preferences &amp; shopping habits. Lastly, how additional outcome variables (willignness to pay, purchase criteria, and company/brand image perceptions) relate to COS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Study/Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alden et al, 2013</td>
<td>&quot;Examines the role of GCA in a broader nomological net of antecedents that predict consumer global brand attitude (GBA).&quot;</td>
<td>COS and materialism are fairly manageable through marketing communications in developing countries, reducing the influence of the negative path from GCA to GBA. Also, recent developed country have significant positive linkages between PVBG and GBAs.</td>
<td>Apply measurements for brand purchase intentions or purchase frequency. In addition to the use of more represented sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter et al, 2013</td>
<td>&quot;...examing demographic and cultural drivers of AGCC and the impacts of global acculturation on ethnocentrism towards international retailers among a cross-section of US consumers...&quot;</td>
<td>Demographics and individualism (IND) affect four of the dimensions of AGCC. Furthermore, COS is negatively correlated to income and age, however it’s positively correlated with education. Moreover, Cosmopolitanism along with social interaction constantly decrease ethnocentrism towards retailers.</td>
<td>Improvements of the scale used to include moderators such as demographics to better capture the U.S population. Examine more dimensions of culture from Holstede and conduct a detailed study on cultures’ influence on AGCC in order to classify the raising of global consumer segments. Lastly, use a different sampling and data gathering method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts 2013</td>
<td>Examine the effects of Cosmopolitanism on consumers’ purchase behavior of foreign versus domestic products in Estonia and Slovenia on the example of alcohol products, clothes and furniture.</td>
<td>COS has a direct effect on FPB among both respondents from Estonia and Slovenia, but COS does not affect BOI</td>
<td>Include other product categories. Test the relationship between COS and BOI with a broader measure for BOI. Price influence on COS tendencies. Compare COS between developing and developed countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lim &amp; Park 2013</td>
<td>&quot;...investigate how national culture and individuals’ openness to global consumer culture influence the individuals’ innovativeness and adoption of globally diffused technology products.&quot;</td>
<td>The three dimension of ordinary COS (Symbolic, experiential, moral) does influence PC. The higher COS the higher PC. Although, moral dimension has less influence among the three.</td>
<td>Examine effects of COS on diverse consumer behavior in Western cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llopis-Goig 2013</td>
<td>&quot;...show whether these political consumers, particularly Spanish political consumers, could also be characterized by another element, cosmopolitanism.&quot;</td>
<td>With a heightened level of COS, a consumers image of COO will level out between countries and be more equal. Noted was that Ethnocentrism has a more descriptive power over image of COO than COS.</td>
<td>Both quantitative and qualitative research to determine the way this Cosmopolitanism could be encouraging behaviors like political consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zdravkovic 2013</td>
<td>&quot;...examine how members of American Generation Y cohort feel about the USA and the USA’s major trading partners. And find out if Gen Y consumers are influenced by a products COO in product evaluation.</td>
<td>COS does not influence local store loyalty, while price and cultural values do influence local store loyalty. COS values might inspire consumers to discover modern retail with latest global brands.</td>
<td>COS and their desire to access the latest global brands must be further examined to comprehend the relationship between COS and loyalty. Further studies on the effect of values and lifestyles on culture. Use of demographic factors in consumers’ classification and better representation from rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khare et al, 2014</td>
<td>&quot;… examining the influence of cultural values, cosmopolitanism, and low-pricing strategies on consumers’ loyalty to local stores.</td>
<td>COS values effect both female and male Indians consumers’ willingness to accept global fashion brands. Knowing that, local cultural values and COS values can coexist with each other. In addition, the demographics aspects have a moderated effect on normative values and COS.</td>
<td>Reduce age biasness in the sample, and conduct comparison between Indian and international fashions clothing to know Indian consumers preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khare 2014a</td>
<td>&quot;...examine affect of cosmopolitanism and consumers’ susceptibility to interpersonal influence on Indian consumers’ fashion clothing involvement.&quot;</td>
<td>COS has an influence on fashion clothing involvement.</td>
<td>Understand older consumers attitudes and beliefs of fashion clothing. Both fashion advertising and purchase involvement can be studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khare 2014b</td>
<td>&quot;...extend existing research into fashion clothing involvement in western countries... by examining the influence of cosmopolitanism, self-identification with global consumers and susceptibility to interpersonal influence (CSI) on fashion clothing involvement.&quot;</td>
<td>COS does not relate to a preference for domestic products in either countries. COS and EN are statistically unrelated</td>
<td>Test IF COS relate to domestic product bias, instead of foreign product preference. Replicate the study in developing and developed countries. Better understand the dynamic relationship between COS and EN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tae Lee et al, 2014</td>
<td>&quot;Investigate the differential influences of economic nationalism (EN) and cosmopolitanism (COS) on consumer behaviour, and how the two concepts are underpinned by different (normative versus informational) interpersonal influences.&quot;</td>
<td>The relationship between COS and product country image (PCI) and foreign product country image (FPPI) is moderated by the development status of the country. COS and home country product image (HPPI) is positively related for consumers from developed countries, but not for consumers from developing countries.</td>
<td>Consider other possible antecedents, such as Value Consciousness and create a deeper understanding of why and how the various antecedents interact with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin et al, 2015</td>
<td>&quot;...investigate the moderating role of country developmental status on PCI coupled with two antecedents of PCI, namely consumer ethnocentrism and cosmopolitanism.&quot;</td>
<td>Cosmopolitanism was not found to have direct effect on local store loyalty. Within cultural dimensions, masculinity emerged as the most dominating trait</td>
<td>To be validated on a larger sample, along with the use of deferent loyalty scale. Further research to discover masculinity dimension, understand influence of lifestyle and demographics on store patronage and loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandey et al, 2015</td>
<td>Test the effect of Cosmopolitanism, culture and pricing in context of loyalty towards local stores.</td>
<td>Culture and price affected local store loyalty directly. Cosmopolitanism was not found to have direct effect on local store loyalty. Within cultural dimensions, masculinity emerged as the most dominating trait</td>
<td>To be validated on a larger sample, along with the use of deferent loyalty scale. Further research to discover masculinity dimension, understand influence of lifestyle and demographics on store patronage and loyalty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Questionnaire measures

C-COSMO Scale (Riefler et al., 2012)

Open mindedness

- When traveling, I make a conscious effort to get in touch with the local culture and traditions. (Deleted from Cronbach’s Alpha)

När jag reser gör jag ett medvetet försök att komma i kontakt med den lokala kulturen och dess traditioner.

- I like having the opportunity to meet people from many different countries.

Jag gillar att ha möjligheten att träffa människor från många andra länder.

- I like to have contact with people from different cultures.

Jag gillar att ha kontakt med människor från andra kulturer.

- I have a real interest in other countries.

Jag har ett stort intresse för andra länder.

Diversity appreciation

- Having access to products coming from many different countries is valuable to me.

Att ha tillgång till produkter från många olika länder är värdefullt för mig.

- The availability of foreign products in the domestic market provides valuable diversity.

Tillgängligheten av utländska produkter på den inhemska marknaden skapar värdefull mångfald.

- I enjoy being offered a wide range of products coming from various countries.

Jag gillar att erbjudas ett brett utbud av produkter från olika länder.

- Always buying the same local products becomes boring over time. (Deleted from Cronbach’s Alpha)

Att alltid köpa samma lokala produkter skulle bli träktigt över tid.

Consumption transcending borders

- I like watching movies from different countries.

Jag gillar att se filmer från andra länder.

- I like listening to music of other cultures.

Jag gillar att lyssna på musik från andra länder.
- I like trying original dishes from other countries.

   أحب أن أتزور الأطباق الشعبية الأصلية من مختلف البلدان الأخرى.

   Jag gillar att prova originev mat från andra länder.

- I like trying out things that are consumed elsewhere in the world.

   أحب استخدام الأشياء التي يتم استهلاكها في أي مكان آخر في العالم.

   Jag gillar att prova saker som konsumeras på andra ställen I världen.

Brand Loyalty (Quester and Lim, 2003)

Cognitive component

- I put a great deal of effort into deciding to buy global brands of clothing among competing local brands.

   أضع قدراً كبيراً من الجهد والاهمية في اتخاذ قرار لشراء ألبسه من العلامات التجارية العالمية بدلاً من العلامات التجارية المحلية.

   Jag anstränger mig mycket i att välja kläder med globala varumärken jämfört med konkurrenderande lokala varumärken.

- When I consider buying clothes, I always think of global brands over other local.

   عندما أفكر في شراء الألبسة أفكر دائماً بشراء العلامات التجارية العالمية بدلاً من المحلية.

   När jag köper kläder så tänker jag alltid på globala varumärken istället för lokala varumärken.

- I consider global brands to be very important in choosing clothes.

   أعتبر أن العلامات التجارية العالمية عامل مهم في اختيار الألبسة.

   Jag anser globala varumärken vara viktiga när jag väljer kläder.

- Concerning clothing, I pay a lot of attention to global brands over local brands.

   أولي الكثير من العنايه و الانتباه للعلامات التجارية العالمية لألبسة أكثر من العلامات التجارية المحلية.

   När det kommer till kläder så uppmärksammar jag globala varumärken mer än lokala varumärken.

Affective component

- Over the last few months I have always bought global brands of clothing because I really like global brands. (Deleted from the pilot study).

   خلال الأشهر القليلة الماضية أشتريت دوماً الألبسة من العلامات التجارية العالمية لأنني أحبها.

   Under dem senaste månaderna har jag alltid köpt kläder med globala varumärken eftersom jag gillar sådana varumärken.

- If global brands of clothing were not available, I would be upset if I had to buy local brands. (Deleted from Cronbach’s ‘Alpha’)

   إذا لم تكن الألبسة من العلامات التجارية العالمية متوفرة، سأكون مستاء إذا اضطررت إلى شراء العلامات التجارية المحلية.

   Om kläder med globala varumärken inte fanns att tillgå skulle jag bli frustrerad om jag då behövde köpa lokala varumärken.

- I am excited about getting global brands of clothing instead of local brands.

   أتحمس عند الحصول على الألبسة من العلامات التجارية العالمية بدلاً من العلامات التجارية المحلية.

   Jag är exalterad över att köpa kläder med globala varumärken jämfört med lokala varumärken.

- I would continue to buy global brands of clothing because I like them very much.

   أود الاستمرار في شراء الألبسة من العلامات التجارية العالمية لأنني أحبها كثيراً.

   Jag skulle fortsätta att köpa kläder med globala varumärken eftersom jag för ett mycket att dessa.
Jag skulle fortsätta köpa kläder med globala varumärken eftersom jag gillar dem väldigt mycket.

- I feel good about global brands of clothing compared to local brands.
- Jag har en bra känsla gällande kläder med globala varumärken jämfört med lokala varumärken.

- I feel very attached to global brands of clothing compared to local brands.
- Jag känner mig väldigt fäst vid kläder med globala varumärken jämfört med lokala varumärken.

- I am interested in global brands of clothing compared to local brands.
- Jag är mer intresserad av kläder med globala varumärken än lokala varumärken.

**Behavior component**

- Buying global brands of clothing instead of local brands is very important to me. *(Deleted from Factor Analysis)*
- Att köpa köpa kläder med globala varumärken istället för lokala varumärken är väldigt viktigt för mig.

- Even though local brands of clothes would be on sale, I would still buy global brands.
- Även om kläder med lokala varumärken var prisnedsatta, så skulle jag fortfarande köpa kläder med globala varumärken.

- I always find myself buying clothes of global brands over local brands. *(Deleted from pilot study)*
- Jag kommer alltid på mig själv att jag köpar kläder med globala varumärken istället för lokala.

- Once I decide on global brands of clothing over local brands, I will stick by them.
- När jag har bestämt mig för lokala varumärken av kläder istället för lokala, så håller jag fast vid dessa.

- If global brands of clothing were unavailable at the store, I would not buy at all if I had to choose local brands.
- Om kläder med globala varumärken inte var tillgängliga i en butik så kulle jag hellre inte köpa kläder alls istället för att köpa lokala varumärken.
### C. Economic development Sweden and Syria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Syrian Arab Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Domestic Product</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>458.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross National Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI ($ US billion)</td>
<td>469.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI rank</td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>68th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI/capita ($ US)</td>
<td>50,100</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita rank</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (millions)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population growth</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchasing power parity GNI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER capita ($ US)</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflation</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Exploratory factor analysis

C-COSMO.

Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSopen2 I like having the opportunity</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSopen3 I like to have contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSopen4 I have a real interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSopen5 Having access to products</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSopen6 The availability of foreign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSopen7 I enjoy being offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSons1 I like watching movies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSons2 I like listening to music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSons3 I like trying original dishes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSons4 I like trying out things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Global brand loyalty.

Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att 3 I am excited about getting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att 4 I would continue to buy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att 5 I feel good about global brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att 6 I feel very attached to global</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att 7 I am interested in global brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahi 1 Buying global brands of clothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahi 2 Even though local brands of clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahi 3 Once I decide on global brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahi 4 If global brands of clothing were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog 1 I put a great deal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog 2 When I consider buying clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog 3 I consider global brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cog 4 Concerning clothing, I pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.
E. Coding scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Travel/year</th>
<th>Clothing purchase/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>0-20'</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>0-10'</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>10,001-15'</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2-3 times</td>
<td>2-4 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>15,001-20'</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>4-5 times</td>
<td>5-10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55</td>
<td>20,001-25'</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>&gt;5 times</td>
<td>&gt; 10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,001-30'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**F. Tables for additional findings**

**Table 5. Additional findings: Constructs of global brand loyalty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Syria</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.438 (.489)</td>
<td>1.113 *** (.360)</td>
<td>.978 (.644)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.032 (.081)</td>
<td>.219 (.145)</td>
<td>.024 (.085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.207 (.188)</td>
<td>.288 (.260)</td>
<td>-.154 (.239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.195 (.078)</td>
<td>-.002 (.115)</td>
<td>.131 (.104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>-.096 (.094)</td>
<td>.070 (.129)</td>
<td>-.080 (.128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchase</td>
<td>-.033 (.101)</td>
<td>.214 (.153)</td>
<td>.070 (.128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>.501**** (.078)</td>
<td>.706**** (.111)</td>
<td>.285*** (.093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuster R²</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>1.61993</td>
<td>1.61736</td>
<td>1.33647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>8.533</td>
<td>8.952</td>
<td>2.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df) Regression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Syria</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.938* (.497)</td>
<td>.157 (.707)</td>
<td>.664 (.653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.138 (.083)</td>
<td>.001 (.149)</td>
<td>-.127 (.086)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.306 (.191)</td>
<td>.523 (.268)</td>
<td>-.089 (.242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.120 (.080)</td>
<td>-.056 (.119)</td>
<td>.060 (.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>-.091 (.096)</td>
<td>.065 (.132)</td>
<td>-.001 (.130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchase</td>
<td>-.088 (.103)</td>
<td>.007 (.157)</td>
<td>.201 (.130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>.495**** (.079)</td>
<td>.666**** (.114)</td>
<td>.296*** (.094)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuster R²</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>1.64632</td>
<td>1.66302</td>
<td>1.35547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>8.086</td>
<td>7.335</td>
<td>3.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df) Regression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Syria</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.550 (.456)</td>
<td>.517 (.684)</td>
<td>.995* (.558)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.011 (.076)</td>
<td>.051 (.144)</td>
<td>.017 (.073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.047 (.175)</td>
<td>.188 (.259)</td>
<td>-.493 (.207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.083 (.073)</td>
<td>-.010 (.115)</td>
<td>.004 (.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>-.040 (.088)</td>
<td>.085 (.128)</td>
<td>.045 (.111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchase</td>
<td>-.014 (.094)</td>
<td>.070 (.152)</td>
<td>.142 (.111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>.374**** (.072)</td>
<td>.569**** (.110)</td>
<td>.153** (.081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuster R²</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>1.51066</td>
<td>1.6072</td>
<td>1.15762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>4.937</td>
<td>5.234</td>
<td>2.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df) Regression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01; ****p<0.001, N: 341

S.E (standard error) is presented within parenthesis of each independent variable
### Table 6. Additional findings: Constructs of Cosmopolitanism

**Additional findings: Constructs of Cosmopolitanism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.1435*** (.448)</td>
<td>1.113*** (.360)</td>
<td>1.635**** (.430)</td>
<td>.988*** (.447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.022 (.077)</td>
<td>-.087 (.072)</td>
<td>-.054 (.077)</td>
<td>-.078 (.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.159 (.177)</td>
<td>.006 (.168)</td>
<td>.206 (.179)</td>
<td>.011 (.172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.127 (.074)</td>
<td>.135 (.070)</td>
<td>.170 (.074)</td>
<td>.128 (.071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>-.049 (.088)</td>
<td>-.090 (.084)</td>
<td>-.050 (.089)</td>
<td>-.090 (.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing purchase</td>
<td>.002 (.095)</td>
<td>-.035 (.090)</td>
<td>-.053 (.096)</td>
<td>-.029 (.092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open mindedness</td>
<td>.258**** (.061)</td>
<td>.407**** (.053)</td>
<td>.255**** (.065)</td>
<td>.393 **** (.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons. Trancing board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuster R²</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>1.52498</td>
<td>1.44353</td>
<td>1.5302</td>
<td>1.44673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>3.939</td>
<td>10.856</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>8.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df) Regression</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01; ****p<0.001, N: 341
S.E (standard error) is presented within parenthesis of each independent variable

### Table 7. Additional findings: Demographics and Cosmopolitanism

**Additional findings: Demographics and Cosmopolitanism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.068 **** (.158)</td>
<td>5.203 **** (.189)</td>
<td>5.340 **** (.118)</td>
<td>5.051 **** (.287)</td>
<td>5.256 **** (.148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.069 (.057)</td>
<td>-.152 (.091)</td>
<td>-.016 (.078)</td>
<td>-.381* (.215)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.029 (.126)</td>
<td>.222 (.151)</td>
<td>-.381* (.215)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.072 (.055)</td>
<td>-.013 (.073)</td>
<td>.198** (.093)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>.132 (.063)</td>
<td>.075 (.079)</td>
<td>.182 (.116)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.047 (.049)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.036 (.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>1.14346</td>
<td>1.05154</td>
<td>1.05606</td>
<td>1.23154</td>
<td>1.27162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>1.807</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df) Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01; ****p<0.001, N: 341
S.E (standard error) is presented within parenthesis of each independent variable