

WEB APPENDIX

**Endorsement of Global Product Brands by Global Corporate Brands –
A Consumer Perspective across Nations**

Content

A. Common Method Variance (p. 2)

B. Endogeneity Test of Instrumental Variables (p. 3)

C. (Multilevel) Measurement Invariance (p. 4)

D. Split Half Test (p. 5)

E. Alternative Models (p. 7)

F. Country-Specific Reliability and Validity (p. 10)

References (p. 22)

Web Appendix A. Common Method Variance

First, we accounted for common method variance by calculating a single-factor test using confirmatory factor analysis. The results of the single-factor test showed that the models with all items loading on a single factor had a significantly worse fit than our proposed models did ($\Delta\chi^2(6) = 10,505.107, p < 0.001$). Second, the marker variable technique has been applied (Lindell and Whitney 2001). Table A.1 provides results of the first phase, indicating that correlations between the latent constructs are not biased by the marker variable occupation (phase I, see Table A.1). The results of the reliability decomposition (phase II) point out that the amount of method variance, which is associated with the measurement of the substantive latent constructs, is less than 2.0% (between 0.10% and 0.89%, see Table A.2). Previous studies have shown impacts of method variance above 12.5% (Williams et al. 2010), why we assume that the present results are not an issue. The results of the sensitivity analysis (phase III) indicate that marker-based method variance has a low effect on construct correlations (see Table A.3).

Table A.1
Results of Model Comparisons (Phase I)

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
CFA	501.547	38	0.991	0.987	0.040	0.013
Baseline	1,045.781	52	0.983	0.978	0.050	0.017
Method-C	1,036.781	51	0.983	0.978	0.050	0.015
Method-U	1,017.897	41	0.983	0.973	0.056	0.015

Chi-Square Differences of Model Comparison Tests		
Δ Models	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δ df p
Baseline with Method-C	9.000	1 **
Method-C with Method-U	18.884	10 *

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns = not significant.

Note: CFA = Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

Table A.2
Results of the Reliability Decomposition (Phase II)

Latent Variable	Reliability Baseline Model	Decomposed Reliability from Method-U Model		
	Total Reliability	Substantive Reliability	Method Reliability	% Reliability Marker Variable
CI	0.998	0.990	0.008	0.80%
PI	0.999	0.997	0.002	0.20%
PPI	0.999	0.998	0.001	0.10%
Occupation (Marker variable)	0.982	0.982		

Note: CI = Corporate Brand Image; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Table A.3
Results of the Sensitivity Analyses (Phase III)

Construct Correlations	CFA	Baseline	Method-U	Method-S (.05)	Method-S (.01)
CI with PI	0.736	0.743	0.742	0.742	0.742
CI with PPI	0.650	0.650	0.649	0.649	0.649
PI with PPI	0.874	0.874	0.874	0.876	0.876
Occupation with CI	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Occupation with PI	0.046	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Occupation with PPI	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns = not significant.

Note: CI = Corporate Brand Image; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Web Appendix B. Endogeneity Test of Instrumental Variables

To reveal bias from omitted variables, we have tested for endogeneity using the instrumental variable (IV) approach. The theoretically relevant IV perceived brand innovativeness of the corporation was chosen, based on one item: “To me, [MNC] is a leader in science and technology” (adapted from Shams et al. 2015). First, we have checked whether the IV is a strong predictor of corporate brand image (CI) across nations using *F*-tests (Stock and Watson 2019). As the calculated *F*-value has exceeded the recommended threshold of 10 ($IV = 540.338$), the IV can be considered as a strong predictor (Antonakis et al. 2014). Second, in addition to our efficient (i.e., proposed) model we have estimated a consistent model including the IV and have proved whether there was a change in path estimates using the Hausman (1978) test. None of the paths has significantly changed (see Table B), which indicates a reduced probability of CI’s endogeneity.

Table B
Comparison of Consistent and Proposed Model

	Random Intercept (Baseline) Model	
	Consistent Model	Proposed/Efficient Model
	bp	bp
<i>Direct Effects</i>		
CI → PPI	0.061***	0.062***
CI → PI	0.668***	0.668***
PI → PPI	0.904***	0.905***
IV → CI	0.657***	
<i>Indirect Effects</i>		
CI → PI → PPI	0.603***	0.603***
<i>Total Effect</i>		
CI → PPI	0.664***	0.665***
<i>Controls (Individual Level)</i>		
GEN → PPI	-0.055*	-0.056*
Age → PPI	-0.019*	-0.020*
BF → PPI	0.045***	0.044***
PC → PPI	0.055ns	0.047ns
<i>Control (Country Level)</i>		
CPC → PPI	0.015ns	0.016ns
Color → PPI	-0.142ns	-0.145ns
LG → PPI	0.029ns	0.029ns
LT → PPI	0.129ns	0.132ns
AIC	80,459.663	42,255.587
BIC (adjusted)	80,610.302	42,387.397

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns = not significant; b = Unstandardized coefficients

Note: BF = Brand Familiarity; CI = Corporate Brand Image; CPC = Consumer per Cluster; GEN = Gender; IV = Instrumental Variable; LG = Language; LT = Lettering; PC = Product Category; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Web Appendix C. (Multilevel) Measurement Invariance

Following Steenkamp and Baumgartner (1998), measurement invariance across nations was tested by considering differences in comparative fit indices (Chen 2007). First, significant factor loadings in each country ensured configural invariance in a freely estimated model. Second, a model with fixed factor loadings was applied to test metric invariance. Metric invariance were confirmed as differences in comparative fit indices were within the respective thresholds (see Table C).

Table C
Results of Measurement Invariance Test across 35 Countries

	CFI (Δ CFI)	TLI (Δ TLI)	RMSEA (Δ RMSEA)	SRMR (Δ SRMR)	χ^2/df (p-value)
Model 1: Configural Invariance	0.974	0.965	0.068	0.031	2,898.658/1,435 (***)
Model 2: Metric Invariance	0.971 (0.003)	0.967 (0.002)	0.066 (-0.002)	0.053 (0.022)	3,337.728/1,707 (***)

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns = not significant

Note: Scaling Correction Factor Model 1: 1.2636 and Model 2: 1.2141. χ^2 = Chi-Square; Δ = Difference; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; df = Degrees of Freedom; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index.

We have tested for multilevel measurement invariance following the procedure of Jak et al. (2013). Compared to traditional methods, this approach is suitable for a large number of groups (Byrne and Van de Vijver 2010; Selig et al. 2008). Multilevel measurement invariance treats group membership as random and tests for violations of measurement invariance across clusters ("cluster bias"). First, intra-class correlations (ICCs), a null and an independent model were conducted to prove the necessity of multilevel analysis. Second, a measurement model was specified, and third, cluster bias was tested. We have used robust maximum likelihood (MLR) estimation (asymptotically equivalent to the test statistic of Yuan and Bentler 2000). We have chosen RMSEA as an approximate fit index. Within (RMSEA_W) and between (RMSEA_B) RMSEA were assessed (Ryu and West 2009).

ICCs, null model, independent model, and measurement model

The ICCs are .103 (PPI₁), .101 (PPI₂), and .115 (PPI₃). A null model without specifying variances and covariances at the between level is not suitable for the data ($\chi^2(23) = 1,605.645$, $p < 0.001$; RMSEA = 0.095; RMSEA_B = 1.402). An independence model without covariances at the between level is neither appropriate for the data ($\chi^2(15) = 417.179$, $p < 0.001$; RMSEA = 0.059; RMSEA_B = 0.875). Thus, there are significant between-level (co)variances and multilevel modeling is highly appropriate. A one-factor model does fit the data ($\chi^2(41) = 775.534$, $p < 0.001$; RMSEA = 0.048; RMSEA_W = 0.048).

Cluster bias

The cluster invariance model with equally constrained factor loadings and no residual variances at the between level is not appropriate for the data ($\chi^2(101) = 2,576.405$, $p < 0.001$; RMSEA = 0.057). Modification indices indicate misfit due to PI₂'s and CI₂'s zero residual variance. We can assure good model fit when freeing their residual variance ($\chi^2(99) = 1,848.896$, $p < 0.001$; RMSEA = 0.048). Consequently, for item PI₂ 3.55% and for item CI₄ 3.43% of the total variance can be traced back to cluster bias. All factor loadings can be considered equal across levels. Thus, cluster bias is not an issue in this study.

Web Appendix D. Split Half Test

We have used a split half test to support the robustness of our results (e.g., Heller et al. 2009). The sample was split in two equally sized groups and multilevel reliability based on satisfactory level-specific values for multilevel alpha, composite reliability, and maximal reliability was assured (Geldhof et al. 2014, see Table D.1). Thus, split half test requirements were met (Warrens 2015). Results for the indirect and direct effect of corporate brand image (through product brand image) on product purchase intention remained stable (see Table D.2 and D.3).

Table D.1
Multilevel Reliability

	Alpha		Composite Reliability		Maximal Reliability	
	α_W	α_B	ω_W	ω_B	H_W	H_B
<i>Split Sample 1</i>						
CI	0.894	0.978	0.894	0.986	0.897	0.989
PI	0.938	0.970	0.932	0.990	0.933	0.996
PPI	0.947	0.992	0.947	0.991	0.949	0.997
<i>Split Sample 2</i>						
CI	0.882	0.975	0.883	0.987	0.885	0.990
PI	0.934	0.970	0.929	0.989	0.930	0.992
PPI	0.948	0.992	0.948	0.993	0.949	0.993

α = Alpha (≥ 0.8); ω = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.8); H = Maximal Reliability (≥ 0.8); w = Within (Individual) Level; b = Between (Country) Level.
Note: CI = Corporate Brand Image; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Table D.2
Results – Split Sample 1

	Random Intercept Model			
	Null Model	Baseline Model	Full Model	Baseline Model
	bp	bp	bp	bp
<i>Direct Effects</i>				
CI → PPI			0.068***	0.068***
CI → PI			0.666***	0.666***
PI → PPI			0.885***	0.884***
<i>Indirect Effect</i>				
CI → PI → PPI			0.589***	0.588***
<i>Total Effect</i>				
CI → PPI			0.657***	0.657***
<i>Diff. Test (Indirect vs. Direct Effect)</i>			0.520***	0.520***
<i>Controls (Individual Level)</i>				
GEN → PPI		-0.106*	-0.058*	-0.059*
Age → PPI		-0.040*	-0.007ns	-0.007ns
BF → PPI		0.337***	0.046***	0.045***
PC → PPI		0.098ns	0.107**	0.085*
<i>Controls (Country Level)</i>				
CPC → PPI				0.002ns
Color → PPI				-0.136ns
LG → PPI				0.067ns
LT → PPI				0.105ns
Residual Variance (Individual Level)	1.134	0.999	0.360	0.360
Residual Variance (Country Level)	0.129	0.078	0.006	0.005
Explained Variance (Individual Level)		11.9%	63.9%	0.0%
Explained Variance (Country Level)				16.7%
AIC	24,534.158	24,079.843	28,706.929	21,454.851
BIC (Adjusted)	24,580.255	24,138.231	28,802.195	21,562.409

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns = not significant; b = Unstandardized coefficients

Note: BF = Brand Familiarity; CI = Corporate Brand Image; CPC = Consumer per Cluster; GEN = Gender; LG = Language; LT = Lettering; PC = Product Category; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Table D.3
Results – Split Sample 2

	Random Intercept Model			
	Null Model	Baseline Model	Full Model	Baseline Model
	bp	bp	bp	bp
<i>Direct Effects</i>				
CI → PPI			0.055**	0.055**
CI → PI			0.674***	0.674***
PI → PPI			0.930***	0.929***
<i>Indirect Effect</i>				
CI → PI → PPI			0.626***	0.625***
<i>Total Effect</i>				
CI → PPI			0.681***	0.680***
<i>Diff. Test (Indirect vs. Direct Effect)</i>			0.570***	0.570***
<i>Controls (Individual Level)</i>				
GEN → PPI		-0.013ns	-0.059*	-0.058*
Age → PPI		-0.052**	-0.035**	-0.035**
BF → PPI		0.333***	0.045**	0.045**
PC → PPI		-0.059ns	0.002ns	0.011ns
<i>Controls (Country Level)</i>				
CPC → PPI				0.022ns
Color → PPI				-0.138ns
LG → PPI				-0.002ns
LT → PPI				0.138ns
Residual Variance (Individual Level)	1.136	1.019	0.332	0.332
Residual Variance (Country Level)	0.154	0.087	0.003	0.003
Explained Variance (Individual Level)		10.7%	67.4%	0.0%
Explained Variance (Country Level)				0.0%
AIC	24,490.272	24,088.583	28,322.741	21,424.760
BIC (Adjusted)	24,536.369	24,146.972	28,418.007	21,532.318

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001; ns = not significant; b = Unstandardized coefficients

Note: BF = Brand Familiarity; CI = Corporate Brand Image; CPC = Consumer per Cluster; GEN = Gender; LG = Language; LT = Lettering; PC = Product Category; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Web Appendix E. Alternative Models

To check the stability of our results, we have calculated four alternative models. First, we changed the dependent variable and analyzed consumers' purchase intention to the MNC: "In the future, I intend to use products/services from [company]; I will consider products/services from [company] for my next purchase; and I will definitely buy products/services from [company] in future (adapted from Putrevu and Lord 1994). The results support our theoretical rationale and show a positive indirect ($b = 0.138$, $p < 0.001$) and direct ($b = 0.735$, $p < 0.001$) effect of the endorser. The direct effect is significantly stronger ($b = 0.597$, $p < 0.001$).

Table E.1

Effects on Purchase Intention towards the MNC

	Random Intercept Model			
	Null Model	Baseline Model	Full Model	Baseline Model
	bp	bp	bp	bp
<i>Direct Effects</i>				
CI → CPI			0.737***	0.735***
CI → PI			0.669***	0.669***
PI → CPI			0.204***	0.205***
<i>Indirect Effect</i>				
CI → PI → CPI			0.138***	0.138***
<i>Total Effect</i>				
CI → CPI			0.875***	0.874***
<i>Diff. Test (Indirect vs. Direct Effect)</i>			0.599***	0.597***
<i>Controls (Individual Level)</i>				
GEN → CPI		0.015ns	0.017ns	0.016ns
Age → CPI		-0.035**	-0.012*	-0.012ns
BF → CPI		0.390***	0.076***	0.075***
PC → CPI		0.038ns	0.001ns	-0.001ns
<i>Controls (Country Level)</i>				
CPC → CPI				0.031ns
Color → CPI				0.051ns
LG → CPI				0.087*
LT → CPI				-0.053ns
Residual Variance (Individual Level)	0.893	0.732	0.220	0.220
Residual Variance (Country Level)	0.127	0.063	0.003	0.002
Explained Variance (Individual Level)		18.0%	69.9%	0.0%
Explained Variance (Country Level)				33.3%
AIC	51,819.944	50,386.043	58,874.335	44,237.552
BIC (Adjusted)	51,876.434	50,457.597	58,991.080	44,369.361

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns = not significant; b = Unstandardized coefficients

Note: BF = Brand Familiarity; CI = Corporate Brand Image; CPC = Consumer per Cluster; CPI = Corporate Purchase Intention; GEN = Gender; LG = Language; LT = Lettering; PC = Product Category; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Second, we test global corporate brand image as a mediator and product brand image as an antecedent. The results confirm our theoretical rationale (direct: $b = .903$, $p < .001$, indirect: $b = .045$, $p < .001$), supporting the assumption of corporate brand schemata being less important in product purchase situations. Model fit was worse than for our proposed model (based on comparison of AIC/BIC).

Table E.2
Revised Model

	Random Intercept Model			
	Null Model	Baseline Model	Full Model	Baseline Model
	bp	bp	bp	bp
<i>Direct Effects</i>				
CI → PPI			0.061***	0.061***
PI → CI			0.670***	0.670***
PI → PPI			0.903***	0.903***
<i>Indirect Effect</i>				
PI → CI → PPI			0.045***	0.045***
<i>Total Effect</i>				
PI → PPI			0.948***	0.948***
<i>Diff. Test (Indirect vs. Direct Effect)</i>			0.858***	0.858***
<i>Controls (Individual Level)</i>				
GEN → PPI		-0.058ns	-0.055*	-0.055*
Age → PPI		-0.043**	-0.019*	-0.019*
BF → PPI		0.334***	0.045***	0.045***
PC → PPI		0.013ns	0.060*	0.055ns
<i>Controls (Country Level)</i>				
CPC → PPI				.016ns
Color → PPI				-.139ns
LG → PPI				.028ns
LT → PPI				.124ns
Residual Variance (Individual Level)	1.136	1.011	0.345	0.345
Residual Variance (Country Level)	0.141	0.081	0.005	0.005
Explained Variance (Individual Level)		11.0%	65.9%	0.0%
Explained Variance (Country Level)				0.0%
AIC	48,913.512	48,066.421	77,281.897	62,653.234
BIC (Adjusted)	48,970.002	48,137.974	77,406.174	62,792.576

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001; ns = not significant; b = Unstandardized coefficients

Note: BF = Brand Familiarity; CI = Corporate Brand Image; CPC = Consumer per Cluster; GEN = Gender; LG = Language; LT = Lettering; PC = Product Category; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Third, we accounted for a possible feedback loop between product and corporate brand image. A non-recursive multilevel structural equation model was applied including appropriate IVs and a required disturbance correlation between the brand image constructs (Nagase and Kano 2017). Social and environmental responsibility (measured by three items: “[Company] seems to make an effort to create new jobs; [company] seems to be environmentally responsible; and [company] would reduce its profits to ensure a clean environment”, Walsh et al. 2009) was selected as the IV for corporate brand image and product attributes (two items: “[Product] is an innovative brand and [product] is a brand that has a good reputation”, Souiden et al. 2006) was selected as the IV for product brand image, as those are core antecedents of the respective constructs (e.g., Iglesias et al. 2019; Plumeyer et al. 2019). The results support our observations and show that global corporate and product brand image influence each other ($b_{CI \rightarrow PI} = 0.231, p < 0.001$; $b_{PI \rightarrow CI} = 0.374, p < 0.001$). Even when considering the reciprocal effects, product-related schemata are primarily relevant for product purchase intention (total effects: $b_{CI \rightarrow PPI} = 0.268, p < 0.001$ and $b_{PI \rightarrow PPI} = 0.929, p < 0.001$; direct effects: $b_{CI \rightarrow PPI} = 0.058, p < 0.001$ vs. $b_{PI \rightarrow PPI} = 0.907, p < 0.001$). This model has worse model fits than our proposed model (comparing AIC/BIC).

Table E.3
Reciprocal Effects of Product and Corporate Brand Image

	Random Intercept Model			
	Null Model	Baseline Model	Full Model	Baseline Model
	bp	bp	bp	bp
<i>Direct Effects</i>				
CI → PI			0.231***	0.231***
PI → CI			0.374***	0.374***
CI → PPI			0.058***	0.058***
PI → PPI			0.907***	0.907***
IV1 → CI			0.565***	0.565***
IV2 → PI			0.777***	0.777***
<i>Total Effect</i>				
CI → PPI			0.268***	0.268***
PI → PPI			0.929***	0.929***
<i>Controls (Individual Level)</i>				
GEN → PPI		-0.058ns	-0.055*	-0.055*
Age → PPI		-0.043**	-0.020*	-0.019*
BF → PPI		0.334***	0.045***	0.045***
PC → PPI		0.013ns	0.059*	0.054ns
<i>Controls (Country Level)</i>				
CPC → PPI				0.016ns
Color → PPI				-0.149ns
LG → PPI				0.030ns
LT → PPI				0.135ns
Residual Variance (Individual Level)	1.136	1.011	0.346	0.346
Residual Variance (Country Level)	0.141	0.081	0.005	0.005
Explained Variance (Individual Level)		11.0%	65.8%	0.0%
Explained Variance (Country Level)				0.0%
AIC	48,913.512	48,066.421	61,938.030	47,302.819
BIC (Adjusted)	48,970.002	48,137.974	62,062.307	47,442.160

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; ns = not significant; b = Unstandardized coefficients

Note: BF = Brand Familiarity; CI = Corporate Brand Image; CPC = Consumer per Cluster; GEN = Gender; LG = Language; LT = Lettering; PC = Product Category; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

Moreover, we have replaced values of the national cultural dimension embeddedness for two countries (Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates). Testing the robustness of replacing country data by neighboring countries yielded stable results (Steenkamp and Geyskens 2006). The degree of embeddedness positively moderates the indirect effect of corporate brand image through product brand image on product purchase intention ($b_{PI \times EMB-PPI} = 0.221$, $p < 0.001$), whereas the moderating effect on the direct effect is insignificant ($b_{CI \times EMB-PPI} = 0.005$, $p > 0.05$). Due to these results and for model identification reasons, we have included the two countries in the survey.

Web Appendix F. Country-Specific Reliability and Validity

Table F.1

Argentina – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.58/1.30	0.846		0.805				0.847
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.60/1.15	0.876		0.833				0.876
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	4.06/1.14	0.858	0.825	0.808	0.919	0.987	0.939	0.849
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.83/1.04	0.877		0.827				0.883
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.93/1.10	0.895		0.849				0.899
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.56/1.15	0.864		0.824				0.875
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.70/1.17	0.874	0.815	0.834	0.928	0.989	0.959	0.859
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.94/1.12	0.862		0.820				0.860
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.85/1.19	0.960		0.934				0.965
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.73/1.20	0.951	0.783	0.928	0.967	0.994	0.978	0.948
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.80/1.23	0.947		0.925				0.943

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.980; TLI 0.973; RMSEA 0.064; SRMR 0.026; $\chi^2(41) = 64.195$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1671. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention. FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.2

Australia – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.90/1.07	0.830		0.788				0.838
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.00/1.04	0.887		0.838				0.891
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.37/1.05	0.880	0.822	0.828	0.918	0.982	0.944	0.875
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.24/0.98	0.841		0.798				0.835
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.24/1.04	0.867		0.828				0.881
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.10/1.07	0.893		0.851				0.880
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.12/1.10	0.887	0.851	0.846	0.931	0.985	0.953	0.875
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.32/1.03	0.869		0.831				0.879
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.09/1.19	0.961		0.915				0.959
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.14/1.15	0.892	0.762	0.866	0.948	0.994	0.976	0.898
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.09/1.18	0.927		0.892				0.925

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.983; TLI 0.977; RMSEA 0.057; SRMR 0.030; $\chi^2(41) = 60.951$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2396. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention. FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.3

Belgium – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.82/1.10	0.746		0.682				0.753
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.00/0.911	0.820		0.751				0.811
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.33/0.973	0.850	0.779	0.765	0.864	0.980	0.947	0.838
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.39/0.951	0.736		0.669				0.754
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.38/0.989	0.901		0.846				0.890
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.14/1.02	0.843		0.802				0.849
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.21/1.05	0.864	0.820	0.820	0.919	0.990	0.969	0.871
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.47/0.920	0.835		0.792				0.835
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.12/1.14	0.957		0.923				0.954
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.09/1.14	0.924	0.775	0.898	0.957	0.996	0.985	0.927
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.12/1.16	0.937		0.908				0.938

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.972; TLI 0.962; RMSEA 0.068; SRMR 0.027; $\chi^2(41) = 110.882$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.3194. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention. FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.4**Brazil – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.63/1.12	0.808		0.737				0.834
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.69/1.09	0.838		0.762				0.834
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.94/1.03	0.768	0.805	0.707	0.873	0.977	0.925	0.755
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.83/1.07	0.765		0.704				0.753
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.89/1.04	0.908		0.868				0.905
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.72/1.10	0.880	0.860	0.846	0.938	0.988	0.961	0.885
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.76/1.05	0.912		0.873				0.906
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.98/1.05	0.860		0.827				0.866
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.71/1.20	0.929		0.870				0.933
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.67/1.15	0.848	0.754	0.812	0.925	0.991	0.966	0.849
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.73/1.17	0.914		0.860				0.910

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.999; TLI 0.998; RMSEA 0.014; SRMR 0.024; $\chi^2(41) = 42.206$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2417. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.5**Canada – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.13/1.20	0.862		0.823				0.852
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.38/1.03	0.874		0.833				0.875
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.50/1.08	0.923	0.846	0.871	0.926	0.984	0.939	0.920
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.35/1.08	0.833		0.797				0.847
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.71/1.00	0.905		0.847				0.903
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.44/1.05	0.794	0.809	0.757	0.916	0.978	0.934	0.821
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.53/1.05	0.875		0.827				0.852
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.78/1.05	0.847		0.798				0.849
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.59/1.11	0.978		0.946				0.972
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.50/1.13	0.930	0.766	0.911	0.965	0.993	0.978	0.934
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.58/1.07	0.941		0.918				0.946

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.979; TLI 0.971; RMSEA 0.068; SRMR 0.034; $\chi^2(41) = 61.986$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1927. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.6**Chile – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.28/1.37	0.768		0.727				0.760
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.53/1.25	0.876		0.811				0.850
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.79/1.27	0.854	0.831	0.794	0.903	0.989	0.954	0.869
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.64/1.21	0.876		0.806				0.874
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.96/1.17	0.915		0.888				0.918
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.73/1.27	0.939	0.834	0.912	0.955	0.992	0.965	0.934
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.87/1.24	0.929		0.903				0.925
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	4.08/1.06	0.894		0.870				0.903
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.76/1.35	0.959		0.935				0.958
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.77/1.29	0.932	0.777	0.914	0.967	0.995	0.977	0.939
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.85/1.31	0.967		0.940				0.964

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.968; TLI 0.957; RMSEA 0.087; SRMR 0.026; $\chi^2(41) = 89.129$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1977. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.7**China – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.92/.969	0.827		0.789				0.819
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.83/.909	0.859		0.816	0.924	0.979	0.949	0.870
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.95/.917	0.894	0.822	0.848				0.886
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.96/.927	0.891		0.841				0.895
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.87/.875	0.809		0.744				0.840
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.67/.953	0.774		0.716	0.880	0.966	0.930	0.786
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.77/.905	0.858	0.823	0.785				0.796
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.90/.855	0.779		0.718				0.794
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.80/.920	0.875		0.797				0.871
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.84/.950	0.841	0.747	0.774	0.888	0.978	0.960	0.850
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.83/.992	0.814		0.774				0.836

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.964; TLI 0.952; RMSEA 0.078; SRMR 0.029; $\chi^2(41) = 82.891$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2900. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α pl (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.8**Croatia – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.98/1.13	0.738		0.682				0.726
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.19/1.03	0.869		0.796	0.880	0.974	0.934	0.845
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.65/1.14	0.787	0.786	0.724				0.804
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.61/1.05	0.835		0.767				0.851
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.70/1.09	0.912		0.870				0.933
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.31/1.14	0.879		0.847	0.938	0.990	0.962	0.854
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.51/1.20	0.886	0.834	0.852				0.868
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.87/1.05	0.886		0.848				0.897
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.64/1.25	0.967		0.936				0.965
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.57/1.21	0.914	0.769	0.896	0.963	0.995	0.979	0.921
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.63/1.26	0.958		0.929				0.956

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.971; TLI 0.961; RMSEA 0.076; SRMR 0.029; $\chi^2(41) = 89.319$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1883. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α pl (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.9**Czech Republic – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.78/.838	0.582		0.498				0.690
	[MNC] is likeable.	2.99/.857	0.719		0.614	0.758	0.868	0.836	0.801
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.38/.858	0.691	0.636	0.563				0.575
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.41/.772	0.664		0.551				0.562
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.37/.987	0.896		0.834				0.880
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.14/.955	0.851		0.796	0.905	0.982	0.948	0.849
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.18/.926	0.829	0.801	0.778				0.831
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.63/.915	0.781		0.738				0.802
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.25/1.08	0.951		0.919				0.953
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.24/1.06	0.929	0.778	0.903	0.958	0.993	0.978	0.927
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.23/1.09	0.941		0.912				0.940

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.932; TLI 0.908; RMSEA 0.084; SRMR 0.054; $\chi^2(41) = 127.360$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1614. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α pl (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.10**Egypt – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.75/1.09	0.836		0.789				0.839
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.76/1.09	0.875		0.821				0.873
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	4.04/1.07	0.828	0.848	0.782	0.912	0.987	0.957	0.829
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.95/0.997	0.860		0.808				0.859
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	4.05/1.00	0.901		0.861				0.897
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.87/1.05	0.900		0.861				0.898
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.91/1.03	0.883	0.859	0.847	0.936	0.990	0.968	0.890
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	4.08/0.935	0.862		0.828				0.862
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.98/1.05	0.944		0.912				0.939
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.91/1.07	0.916	0.774	0.892	0.957	0.992	0.978	0.914
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.95/1.09	0.956		0.921				0.962

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.999; TLI 0.999; RMSEA 0.013; SRMR 0.017; $\chi^2(41) = 42.774$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.4784. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.11**Finland – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.94/1.01	0.723		0.656				0.742
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.15/0.884	0.859		0.770				0.850
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.41/0.988	0.777	0.776	0.706	0.857	0.968	0.932	0.774
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.35/0.892	0.751		0.680				0.746
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.40/1.06	0.879		0.832				0.877
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.27/1.05	0.864		0.821				0.876
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.22/1.07	0.867	0.835	0.823	0.923	0.989	0.963	0.861
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.49/1.01	0.853		0.811				0.848
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.21/1.12	0.856		0.656				0.910
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	2.95/1.11	0.888	0.598	0.672	0.736	0.977	0.936	0.837
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	2.61/1.27	0.417		0.388				0.501

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.975; TLI 0.966; RMSEA 0.061; SRMR 0.030; $\chi^2(41) = 72.809$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1200. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.12**France – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.43/1.19	0.728		0.674				0.749
	[MNC] is likeable.	2.79/1.07	0.883		0.802				0.876
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	2.96/1.15	0.832	0.814	0.761	0.875	0.983	0.949	0.818
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.14/1.09	0.762		0.700				0.769
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.04/1.11	0.932		0.891				0.925
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	2.94/1.07	0.876	0.853	0.844				0.877
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	2.96/1.12	0.910		0.873	0.941	0.992	0.969	0.912
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.11/1.05	0.856		0.827				0.860
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	2.79/1.22	0.965		0.941				0.966
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	2.70/1.23	0.947	0.783	0.927	0.969	0.996	0.985	0.946
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	2.80/1.19	0.956		0.934				0.955

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.986; TLI 0.981; RMSEA 0.053; SRMR 0.024; $\chi^2(41) = 71.036$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2189. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.13
Germany – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.77/1.21	0.738		0.681				0.762
	[MNC] is likeable.	2.98/1.08	0.842		0.780				0.841
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.50/1.13	0.758	0.739	0.688	0.875	0.968	0.898	0.769
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.32/1.06	0.871		0.792				0.844
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.32/1.00	0.901		0.850				0.891
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.20/1.07	0.841		0.799				0.845
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.22/1.09	0.907	0.841	0.854	0.919	0.987	0.960	0.902
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.49/0.998	0.791		0.755				0.808
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.31/1.25	0.938		0.910				0.940
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.19/1.25	0.924	0.775	0.899	0.958	0.994	0.976	0.925
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.26/1.25	0.959		0.925				0.957

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.924; TLI 0.898; RMSEA 0.123; SRMR 0.043; $\chi^2(41) = 157.915$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.0817
CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.14
Hungary – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.16/1.11	0.742		0.709				0.739
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.54/1.12	0.909		0.851				0.884
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.75/1.04	0.869	0.814	0.810	0.908	0.978	0.944	0.884
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.65/1.03	0.864		0.807				0.875
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.74/1.09	0.920		0.877				0.909
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.58/1.06	0.869		0.833				0.880
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.60/1.02	0.913	0.841	0.872	0.935	0.990	0.963	0.902
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.96/0.992	0.838		0.808				0.856
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.56/1.17	0.946		0.907				0.944
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.69/1.17	0.898	0.769	0.872	0.950	0.994	0.978	0.901
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.61/1.16	0.943		0.905				0.944

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.969; TLI 0.959; RMSEA 0.073; SRMR 0.030; $\chi^2(41) = 85.677$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2662.
CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.15
India – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.79/0.927	0.833		0.773				0.839
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.85/0.951	0.790		0.739				0.789
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	4.01/0.906	0.792	0.838	0.740	0.893	0.973	0.938	0.799
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.82/0.960	0.876		0.806				0.866
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.93/0.842	0.846		0.804				0.829
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.85/0.897	0.906		0.855				0.910
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.78/0.979	0.843	0.843	0.802	0.921	0.972	0.947	0.859
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	4.01/0.866	0.867		0.820				0.860
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.74/0.978	0.893		0.856				0.891
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.80/0.984	0.931	0.767	0.883	0.937	0.988	0.973	0.923
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.76/0.997	0.912		0.869				0.922

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.995; TLI 0.993; RMSEA 0.028; SRMR 0.031; $\chi^2(41) = 46.526$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.3340.
CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.16**Ireland – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.04/1.23	0.780		0.743				0.798
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.20/1.12	0.907		0.848				0.901
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.50/1.14	0.851	0.831	0.798	0.910	0.986	0.947	0.843
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.41/1.10	0.857		0.803				0.857
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.58/1.23	0.879		0.837				0.880
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.37/1.25	0.863		0.825				0.863
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.38/1.25	0.901	0.853	0.857	0.929	0.991	0.961	0.887
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.78/1.19	0.860		0.821				0.875
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.47/1.27	0.957		0.922				0.955
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.37/1.29	0.924	0.775	0.898	0.957	0.996	0.982	0.929
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.54/1.29	0.936		0.907				0.934

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.982; TLI 0.975; RMSEA 0.061; SRMR 0.033; $\chi^2(41) = 68.909$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2124. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.17**Italy – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.07/1.18	0.797		0.733				0.813
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.13/1.11	0.794		0.735				0.818
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.72/1.02	0.762	0.756	0.691	0.871	0.988	0.956	0.739
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.63/0.97	0.827		0.750				0.805
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.42/0.98	0.896		0.867				0.903
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.38/1.04	0.911		0.880				0.908
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.38/1.04	0.918	0.871	0.886	0.948	0.993	0.978	0.912
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.49/0.969	0.900		0.870				0.904
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.34/1.10	0.955		0.922				0.951
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.39/1.11	0.927	0.777	0.901	0.958	0.996	0.989	0.929
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.26/1.14	0.940		0.911				0.942

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.968; TLI 0.957; RMSEA 0.079; SRMR 0.031; $\chi^2(41) = 170.501$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.3549. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.18**Japan – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.00/0.767	0.787		0.722				0.805
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.24/0.863	0.873		0.792				0.861
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.55/0.868	0.749	0.801	0.696	0.877	0.959	0.940	0.751
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.15/0.757	0.804		0.742				0.799
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	2.95/0.967	0.925		0.883				0.932
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	2.83/1.01	0.856		0.822				0.905
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.11/0.951	0.881	0.803	0.841	0.934	0.989	0.965	0.847
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.17/0.921	0.872		0.834				0.838
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	2.66/1.09	0.967		0.947				0.965
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	2.69/1.11	0.963	0.786	0.944	0.974	0.995	0.984	0.964
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	2.58/1.08	0.956		0.939				0.957

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.950; TLI 0.933; RMSEA 0.094; SRMR 0.043; $\chi^2(41) = 133.266$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.3828. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.19**Malaysia – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.48/.902	0.754		0.700				0.754
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.53/.847	0.816		0.755				0.803
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.76/.893	0.832	0.794	0.759	0.880	0.969	0.944	0.832
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.66/.854	0.820		0.753				0.835
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.63/.922	0.894		0.858				0.899
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.54/.921	0.874	0.867	0.840	0.939	0.988	0.967	0.864
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.56/.975	0.871		0.839				0.885
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.60/.960	0.927		0.886				0.920
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.57/.993	0.920		0.880				0.928
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.59/.954	0.918	0.773	0.878	0.941	0.990	0.976	0.919
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.56/.960	0.916		0.877				0.906

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.978; TLI 0.970; RMSEA 0.059; SRMR 0.027; $\chi^2(41) = 79.780$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.3857. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.20**Mexico – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.61/1.19	0.845		0.789				0.830
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.78/1.00	0.854		0.805				0.856
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.91/1.01	0.839	0.857	0.793	0.912	0.984	0.941	0.856
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.80/.964	0.878		0.826				0.874
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	4.03/.908	0.906		0.863				0.912
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.86/1.03	0.839	0.818	0.807	0.933	0.986	0.962	0.835
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.94/.934	0.919		0.878				0.898
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	4.09/.916	0.871		0.829				0.888
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	4.09/.924	0.930		0.875				0.927
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	4.05/.973	0.845	0.751	0.814	0.929	0.982	0.962	0.855
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	4.05/.958	0.936		0.878				0.932

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.984; TLI 0.979; RMSEA 0.054; SRMR .034; $\chi^2(41) = 57.390$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2992.

CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.21**Netherlands – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.98/1.06	0.740		0.677				0.758
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.10/.919	0.870		0.793				0.853
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.30/.930	0.770	0.755	0.698	0.868	0.969	0.925	0.778
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.43/.906	0.788		0.720				0.784
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.28/.960	0.832		0.777				0.826
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.13/1.01	0.823	0.821	0.772	0.901	0.980	0.952	0.837
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.18/1.08	0.874		0.813				0.875
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.38/.951	0.807		0.756				0.797
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.02/1.17	0.946		0.908				0.944
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.09/1.20	0.906	0.772	0.879	0.951	0.993	0.976	0.908
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	2.06/1.17	0.943		0.906				0.943

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.961; TLI 0.948; RMSEA 0.078; SRMR 0.034; $\chi^2(41) = 98.639$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1946.

CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.22**New Zealand – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.71/1.06	0.690		0.619				0.708
	[MNC] is likeable.	2.89/.981	0.726		0.645				0.701
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.32/1.05	0.777	0.797	0.679	0.826	0.955	0.906	0.802
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.23/.894	0.764		0.670				0.741
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.41/1.11	0.920		0.863				0.907
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.23/1.13	0.874	0.846	0.828	0.917	0.987	0.949	0.856
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.25/1.18	0.849		0.807				0.877
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.67/.919	0.795		0.759				0.799
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.22/1.23	0.931		0.897				0.921
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.15/1.30	0.925	0.777	0.893	0.951	0.992	0.970	0.928
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.19/1.26	0.937		0.902				0.943

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.977; TLI 0.970; RMSEA 0.062; SRMR 0.043; $\chi^2(41) = 59.594$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1907. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α pl (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.23**Norway – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.67/1.26	0.748		0.699				0.774
	[MNC] is likeable.	2.92/1.17	0.867		0.802				0.869
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.41/1.14	0.824	0.787	0.753	0.885	0.984	0.941	0.804
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.27/1.08	0.817		0.752				0.810
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.18/1.09	0.890		0.835				0.875
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	2.76/1.22	0.831	0.836	0.791	0.916	0.990	0.964	0.843
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	2.85/1.24	0.886		0.837				0.890
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.40/1.06	0.822		0.777				0.822
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	2.78/1.34	0.937		0.892				0.936
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	2.75/1.34	0.889	0.767	0.857	0.924	0.995	0.975	0.894
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	2.84/1.32	0.929		0.886				0.927

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.954; TLI 0.938; RMSEA 0.092; SRMR 0.036; $\chi^2(41) = 122.773$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.0907. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α pl (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.24**Poland – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.07/1.12	0.759		0.707				0.778
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.23/.996	0.890		0.821				0.872
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.59/1.06	0.818	0.799	0.755	0.889	0.982	0.948	0.823
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.51/.986	0.811		0.753				0.812
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.46/1.05	0.917		0.874				0.912
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.33/1.04	0.897	0.848	0.858	0.936	0.991	0.968	0.894
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.27/1.08	0.876		0.839				0.875
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.62/1.05	0.855		0.821				0.866
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.42/1.11	0.958		0.934				0.960
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.44/1.14	0.942	0.782	0.922	0.967	0.995	0.983	0.939
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.42/1.15	0.958		0.934				0.959

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.990; TLI 0.986; RMSEA 0.044; SRMR 0.022; $\chi^2(41) = 61.555$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.3665. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's α pl (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.25
Portugal – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.14/1.22	0.850		0.793				0.833
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.04/1.05	0.854	0.817	0.795	0.899	0.987	0.948	0.854
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.56/1.11	0.709		0.674				0.729
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.24/1.10	0.920		0.849				0.922
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.70/1.02	0.911		0.874				0.910
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.48/1.20	0.900	0.831	0.868	0.941	0.987	0.956	0.908
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.45/1.11	0.928		0.892				0.922
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.71/1.06	0.849		0.820				0.848
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.38/1.23	0.952		0.919				0.948
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.31/1.27	0.910	0.771	0.888	0.957	0.994	0.974	0.911
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.38/1.23	0.954		0.920				0.959

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.980; TLI 0.973; RMSEA 0.062; SRMR 0.029; $\chi^2(41) = 66.135$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2707. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.26
Russia – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.45/1.09	0.804		0.750				0.809
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.65/1.01	0.817	0.812	0.761	0.892	0.980	0.941	0.831
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.90/0.98	0.852		0.785				0.844
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.71/1.01	0.815		0.756				0.803
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.73/1.08	0.943		0.910				0.944
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.63/1.10	0.931	0.819	0.902	0.952	0.993	0.970	0.919
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.64/1.15	0.892		0.867				0.899
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.71/1.01	0.885		0.858				0.890
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.70/1.14	0.949		0.923				0.946
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.75/1.09	0.935	0.780	0.912	0.963	0.993	0.978	0.944
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.64/1.17	0.957		0.928				0.952

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.970; TLI 0.959; RMSEA 0.079; SRMR 0.027; $\chi^2(41) = 82.943$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2906. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.27
Saudi Arabia – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.66/1.11	0.830		0.782				0.840
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.69/1.12	0.862	0.843	0.808	0.909	0.988	0.958	0.853
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.77/1.11	0.831		0.782				0.834
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.74/1.08	0.859		0.806				0.856
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.85/1.05	0.873		0.827				0.873
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.83/1.02	0.848	0.855	0.806	0.922	0.990	0.967	0.854
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.80/1.06	0.872		0.826				0.874
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.85/1.07	0.865		0.820				0.858
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.80/1.01	0.887		0.813				0.897
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.73/1.08	0.871	0.748	0.801	0.896	0.985	0.964	0.869
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.77/1.07	0.829		0.773				0.819

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.988; TLI 0.984; RMSEA 0.041; SRMR 0.022; $\chi^2(41) = 61.231$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.4214. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.28**Singapore – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.20/.825	0.816		0.733				0.805
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.34/.789	0.759		0.690				0.771
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.61/.789	0.764	0.808	0.692	0.857	0.956	0.925	0.774
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.41/.736	0.760		0.690				0.749
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.48/.836	0.852		0.789				0.853
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.26/.762	0.797		0.745				0.788
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.40/.761	0.799	0.825	0.746	0.894	0.971	0.944	0.806
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.49/.812	0.849		0.787				0.848
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.29/.940	0.921		0.862				0.917
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.33/.932	0.862	0.759	0.821	0.924	0.985	0.968	0.870
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.29/.946	0.903		0.850				0.901

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.976; TLI 0.968 RMSEA 0.057; SRMR 0.033; $\chi^2(41) = 67.618$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1985.

CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.29**Slovakia – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	2.97/1.05	0.702		0.641				0.706
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.29/.980	0.845		0.763				0.822
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.65/1.03	0.746	0.767	0.674	0.858	0.968	0.934	0.765
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.57/.958	0.823		0.741				0.826
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.41/1.01	0.910		0.844				0.914
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	2.86/1.08	0.734		0.705				0.739
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.21/1.07	0.890	0.806	0.840	0.910	0.988	0.961	0.874
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.59/1.01	0.865		0.806				0.875
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.20/1.21	0.965		0.933				0.958
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.21/1.20	0.926	0.775	0.905	0.962	0.995	0.982	0.929
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.19/1.19	0.947		0.920				0.952

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.950; TLI 0.933; RMSEA 0.094; SRMR 0.038; $\chi^2(41) = 140.415$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2269

CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.30**Spain – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.04/1.20	0.863		0.801				0.875
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.16/1.04	0.864		0.806				0.865
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.43/1.07	0.793	0.838	0.745	0.900	0.988	0.952	0.789
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.32/.999	0.816		0.766				0.804
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.44/1.06	0.902		0.860				0.897
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.30/1.07	0.837		0.808				0.838
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.35/1.06	0.890	0.854	0.853	0.936	0.990	0.966	0.901
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.57/.962	0.926		0.882				0.920
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.29/1.24	0.964		0.937				0.964
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.20/1.23	0.931	0.777	0.912	0.967	0.996	0.983	0.935
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.29/1.22	0.961		0.935				0.958

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.980; TLI 0.974; RMSEA 0.063; SRMR 0.026; $\chi^2(41) = 80.355$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1990.

CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.31
Turkey – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.60/1.16	0.810		0.764				0.802
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.56/1.13	0.824		0.776				0.812
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	4.07/1.05	0.803	0.803	0.748	0.901	0.990	0.965	0.830
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.88/1.07	0.903		0.832				0.898
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	4.11/.990	0.935		0.905				0.930
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	4.00/1.02	0.899		0.874	0.955	0.994	0.980	0.898
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	4.04/1.02	0.911	0.874	0.884				0.917
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	4.18/.956	0.924		0.895				0.925
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	4.12/1.03	0.955		0.921				0.954
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.99/1.09	0.923	0.776	0.898	0.957	0.994	0.984	0.923
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	4.08/1.05	0.941		0.911				0.944

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.983; TLI 0.977; RMSEA 0.055; SRMR 0.024; $\chi^2(41) = 99.712$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.4762. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.32
United Arab Emirates – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.61/1.06	0.806		0.750				0.799
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.66/1.04	0.804		0.749				0.794
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.84/1.06	0.845	0.836	0.780	0.892	0.986	0.960	0.855
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.83/1.01	0.827		0.767				0.832
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.79/.999	0.843		0.782				0.827
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.76/.989	0.830		0.772	0.896	0.987	0.965	0.829
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.75/.997	0.818	0.848	0.762				0.842
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.84/.977	0.813		0.758				0.803
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.79/1.04	0.915		0.850				0.900
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.78/1.01	0.852	0.755	0.806	0.915	0.990	0.975	0.859
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.82/1.02	0.887		0.831				0.896

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.997; TLI 0.996; RMSEA 0.020; SRMR 0.019; $\chi^2(41) = 47.169$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.4067. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.33
United Kingdom – Reliability and Validity

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.18/1.14	0.813		0.747				0.819
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.37/1.11	0.864		0.789				0.893
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.63/1.04	0.772	0.794	0.714	0.880	0.975	0.919	0.751
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.53/1.00	0.772		0.716				0.744
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.61/1.04	0.851		0.815				0.872
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.39/1.12	0.919		0.871	0.929	0.984	0.951	0.904
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.51/1.10	0.902	0.841	0.857				0.903
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.62/1.02	0.829		0.796				0.832
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.47/1.17	0.928		0.895				0.934
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.45/1.20	0.932	0.777	0.897	0.950	0.992	0.971	0.931
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.45/1.18	0.929		0.895				0.925

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.972; TLI 0.962; RMSEA 0.075; SRMR 0.031; $\chi^2(41) = 65.971$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.1920. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.34**United States – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	3.15/1.19	0.807		0.769				0.828
	[MNC] is likeable.	3.35/1.18	0.910		0.855				0.902
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	3.48/1.06	0.807	0.822	0.736	0.914	0.985	0.946	0.809
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	3.43/1.07	0.896		0.840				0.885
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	3.60/1.07	0.907		0.871				0.909
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	3.39/1.13	0.884		0.855	0.945	0.990	0.964	0.879
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	3.42/1.15	0.885	0.855	0.856				0.902
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	3.70/1.05	0.932		0.893				0.919
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	3.32/1.20	0.979		0.949				0.974
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	3.39/1.22	0.938	0.768	0.918	0.967	0.995	0.982	0.941
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	3.28/1.22	0.942		0.921				0.946

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.959; TLI 0.945; RMSEA 0.096; SRMR 0.032; $\chi^2(41) = 96.297$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2736. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

Table F.35**Venezuela – Reliability and Validity**

	Item	MV/Std	FL	KMO	ItTC	α	CR	AVE	λ
CI	I can better identify with [MNC] than with other companies.	4.30/1.01	0.740		0.690				0.743
	[MNC] is likeable.	4.41/.853	0.714		0.664				0.723
	As far as I know, [MNC] is respected worldwide.	4.61/.820	0.866	0.822	0.789	0.877	0.966	0.928	0.864
	I believe [MNC] performs at a premium level.	4.46/.837	0.912		0.824				0.908
PI	[Product] is a brand I respect and trust.	4.60/.801	0.929		0.906				0.928
	[Product] is a brand that cares for me.	4.49/.867	0.939		0.917	0.963	0.979	0.956	0.936
	[Product] is a brand that helps me live a better life.	4.45/.885	0.941	0.836	0.918				0.943
	[Product] is a quality product that works.	4.60/.780	0.921		0.899				0.923
PPI	In the future, I intend to use [product].	4.45/.866	0.916		0.865				0.907
	I will consider [product] for my next purchase.	4.35/.910	0.853	0.753	0.822	0.930	0.982	0.967	0.856
	I will definitely buy [product] in the future.	4.49/.857	0.945		0.885				0.952

Note: Confirmatory Model Fit: CFI 0.990; TLI 0.986; RMSEA 0.044; SRMR 0.031; $\chi^2(41) = 50.583$; Scaling Cor. Factor Maximum Likelihood = 1.2980. CI = Corporate Brand Image; MNC = Multinational Corporation; PI = Product Brand Image; PPI = Product Purchase Intention.

FL = Factor Loadings (Exploratory Analysis); KMO = Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Criterion (≥ 0.5); ItTC = Item-to-Total Correlation (≥ 0.5); α = Cronbach's Alpha (≥ 0.7); CR = Composite Reliability (≥ 0.6); AVE = Average Variance Extracted (≥ 0.5); λ = Standardized Factor Loadings (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)

References

- Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., & Lalive, R. (2014). Causality and endogeneity: Problems and solutions. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations* (pp. 93-117). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Byrne, B. M., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2010). Testing for measurement and structural equivalence in large-scale cross-cultural studies: Addressing the issue of nonequivalence. *International Journal of Testing*, 10(2), 107-132.
- Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(3), 464-504.
- Geldhof, G. J., Preacher, K. J., & Zyphur, M. J. (2014). Reliability estimation in a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis framework. *Psychological Methods*, 19(1), 72-91.
- Hausman, J. A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica*, 46(6), 1251-1271.
- Heller, R., Rosenbaum, P. R., & Small, D. S. (2009). Split samples and design sensitivity in observational studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(487), 1090-1101.
- Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., Singh, J. J., & Sierra, V. (2019). Do customer perceptions of corporate services brand ethicality improve brand equity? Considering the roles of brand heritage, brand image, and recognition benefits. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 154(2), 441-459.
- Jak, S., Oort, F. J., & Dolan, C. V. (2013). A test for cluster bias: Detecting violations of measurement invariance across clusters in multilevel data. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 20(2), 265-282.
- Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 114-121.
- Nagase, M., & Kano, Y. (2017). Identifiability of nonrecursive structural equation models. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 122(3), 109-117.
- Plumeyer, A., Kottemann, P., Böger, D., & Decker, R. (2019). Measuring brand image: a systematic review, practical guidance, and future research directions. *Review of Managerial Science*, 13(2), 227-265.
- Putrevu, S., & Lord, K. R. (1994). Comparative and noncomparative advertising: Attitudinal effects under cognitive and affective involvement conditions. *Journal of Advertising*, 23(2), 77-91.
- Ryu, E., & West, S. G. (2009). Level-specific evaluation of model fit in multilevel structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 16(4), 583-601.
- Selig, J. P., Card, N. A., & Little, T. D. (2008). Latent variable structural equation modeling in cross-cultural research: Multigroup and multilevel approaches. In F. J. R. van de Vijver, D. A. van Hemert, & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Multilevel Analysis of Individuals and Cultures* (pp. 93-119). New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Shams, R., Alpert, F., & Brown, M. (2015). Consumer perceived brand innovativeness. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(9/10), 1599-1615.
- Souiden, N., Kassim, N. M., & Hong, H. J. (2006). The effect of corporate branding dimensions on consumers' product evaluation: A cross-cultural analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(7/8), 825-845.
- Steenkamp, J.-B. E., & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(1), 78-90.
- Steenkamp, J.-B. E., & Geyskens, I. (2006). How country characteristics affect the perceived value of web sites. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(3), 136-150.
- Stock, J. H., & Watson, M. W. (2019). *Introduction to econometrics* (Vol. 4). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Walsh, G., Beatty, S. E., & Shiu, E. M. (2009). The customer-based corporate reputation scale: Replication and short form. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 924-930.
- Warrens, M. J. (2015). On Cronbach's alpha as the mean of all split-half reliabilities. In R. Millsap, D. Bolt, L. van der Ark, & W. Wang (Eds.), *Quantitative Psychology Research* (Vol. 89, pp. 293-300): Springer.
- Williams, L. J., Hartman, N., & Cavazotte, F. (2010). Method variance and marker variables: A review and comprehensive CFA marker technique. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(3), 477-514.
- Yuan, K.-H., & Bentler, P. M. (2000). Three likelihood-based methods for mean and covariance structure analysis with nonnormal missing data. *Sociological Methodology*, 30(1), 165-200.