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ABSTRACT

Boycotting has been empirically proven to be damaging to business organisations, and there is compelling evidence to suggest that it is not only here to stay, but it is also on the increase. Brand loyalty is declining for many reasons including the effects of market competitiveness, the fading of brand differentiation and the ever-changing marketplace landscape.

Transnationality and its impact on consumer behaviour—despite the increase in the international human movements and border crossing—is still an understudied field. The conducted literature review suggests that little attention has been paid to explore the link between boycotting and brand loyalty from the transnational consumers perspective.

To achieve the research objective, which is to develop an understanding of the impact of boycotting on brand loyalty and the influence of transnationality on this relationship, a mixed methods approach was adopted. Thirty-five qualitative interviews were conducted with London-based Muslim Arabs and sequentially an online questionnaire that generated 537 responses.

This research has empirically revealed the negative impact of consumer boycotts on brand loyalty and highlighted the influential role that transnationality, social capital and demographics play in shaping the consumer boycotting and brand loyalty decision-making process.

This study also explored the role of religion on boycotting and the subsequent brand loyalty behaviour and empirically confirmed that religiously motivated boycotts are damaging for business firms as they have a sudden and long-term negative effect on loyalty. The study shows that religious denominations have a significant impact on both boycotting and loyalty behaviour.

Based on the study findings, implications, recommendations for management and consumers alike and suggestions for future research are presented.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

In this opening chapter of the thesis, the background context of this study is presented followed by a discussion of the research questions and the rationale behind them before presenting the research objectives and contributions. The final section of this chapter provides an outline of the thesis.

1.1 Background Context

Consumer behaviour is defined as “the activities people undertake when obtaining, consuming and disposing of products and services” (Blackwell et al., 2001, p. 6). Earlier studies show that consumer behaviour or purchase intention is influenced by many factors, which can be categorised as cultural, social, religious and other demographic factors (Ma et al., 2012; Darrat, 2011; Grant et al., 2007; Kin et al., 2002).

Cultural factors, for example, have been examined and studies have found that cultural differences can, according to Sung and Tinkham (2005) influence consumer opinion of products. Malai and Speece (2005) found that culture directly impacts on how consumers value a firm’s service quality and its brand name. Consumer values are the outcome of culture as well as the ethnicity of a society and its importance to consumers does vary depending on cultural and economic conditions (Kin et al., 2002) and as a result, its influence on purchasing behaviour differs from one country to another.

Kin et al. (2002) also suggested that these values also shape the needs of consumers as well as their choice of products or services. For firms operating internationally, understanding the effect of these values on purchase behaviour is important in constructing an effective, and more culturally-informed marketing strategy (Rose et al., 2009).

Socially, consumers purchase intention is influenced by their social ties, referred to as their social capital, which can be family, friends, neighbours or co-workers, etc. People also consume to create their personal identity (Richins, 1994), in fact, Belk (1988, p. 139) states that “we are what we have and possess”, thus, possessions do serve a social purpose, for example, belonging to a certain family, group, or even a community (Escalas and Bettman, 2005). Additionally, variations of social class can also lead to variations in consumer purchasing decisions as per Williams (2002).
According to Williams (2002), there is an association between group membership and brand usage, taking, for example, the Rose et al. (2009) study that examined the impact of Arab and Jewish consumers animosity towards foreign goods, she found that the feeling of an in-group or kinship between Arab Israelis and other Arabs may be a contributing factor in their feeling of hostility toward the UK. If the in-group feeling can trigger hostility toward a certain country, it may be possible to trigger animosity toward a product of that country too.

Religion has a long history of influencing the behaviour of consumers (Delener, 1990; Essoo and Dibb, 2004; Al-Hyari et al., 2012). Personal or demographic factors such as, age, gender and level of education are among many other demographic factors which also influence consumption behaviour. Taking gender, for example, a study carried out by Norris et al. (2004) suggested that more women engage in consumer politics than men, but whether this is the case for Middle Eastern female consumers it is not clear yet. However, a speech given in 2011 by UN Women’s executive director Michelle Bachelet for United Nation Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women on the subject of Middle Eastern women empowerment clearly states that the political participation of Middle Eastern females is on the rise, thanks to what is now called the Arab Spring (UN Women, 2011).

Boycotting and consumer loyalty are the two extreme ends of consumer behaviour. Animosity which is defined by Klein et al. (1998, p. 90) “as the remains of antipathy toward a particular country associated with previous or current military, political or economic actions that the consumer finds hard to forget and forgive” can potentially lead to such extreme behaviour.

According to the above definition, animosity has three dimensions; military, economic or political. However, Kalliny and Lemaster (2005) added two new dimensions to consumer animosity; cultural and religious animosity as shown in Figure 1.1.
Figure 1.1 Klein et al. (1998) and Kalliny and Lemaster (2005) animosity models (compiled by author)

Furthermore, Rose et al. (2009, p. 330) defined consumer animosity as “strong negative emotions toward purchasing products from a disliked nation or group”. Ang et al. (2004) suggested four types of consumer animosity; stable (e.g. Arabs and Israel) versus situational (Muslims and Danish products) and personal versus national as shown in Figure 1.2. Firms and governments alike need to understand to what extent animosity is harboured within their target audience and account for consumer anger when developing their marketing plan.

Figure 1.2 Ang et al. (2004) animosity model (compiled by author)

In recent years, Arab consumers have boycotted certain brands and countries in relation to cultural, religious and political incidents. As stated earlier, religion influences behaviour (Essoo and Dibb, 2004), so religious animosity is likely to influence individual’s behaviour towards targeted brands (Kalliny and Lemaster, 2005) and this may explain the Arab boycott of Danish brands in 2006 (Maamoun and Aggarwal, 2008).
The other extreme end is loyalty, hence, academics and marketers alike have shown an enormous interest in consumer brand loyalty not only because firms with more brand-loyal customers have larger market share that is directly linked to better return on investment (Jensen and Hansen, 2006), but also because loyal consumers are less expensive (Gounaris and Stathakopoulos, 2004; Shukla, 2004; Hu, 2011) and also because according to Dick and Basu (1994) consumers brand loyalty may initiate a positive word of mouth and therefore, loyal consumers are less likely to consider switching to a competitor’s brands.

Both Datta (2003) and Lien-Ti and Yu-Chungh (2006) argue that brand loyalty is based on a distinctive preference or liking for a particular brand were purchasing that brand becomes a habitual process. However, it is not clear yet how destructive all types of consumer boycotts are on brand loyalty and whether it impacts on this cycle of habitual purchasing (i.e. loyalty behaviour).

Doyle (1998, p. 165) stated that “Successful brands create wealth by attracting and retaining consumers” and it goes without saying that loyal customers are always an asset to any business organisation. However, marketers are rightly concerned with the increasing brand switching tendency as a result of price, product dissatisfaction or the availability of alternative or new products (Datta, 2003).

Moreover, Srivastava (2007) argues that brand loyalty has declined not only due to consumer’s tendency to try new brands but because quality has become the standard across all brands and is no longer a differentiation factor, therefore, switching brands encompasses low risk and finally because the young generation has a different conception of brands that is not built on quality and risk aversion alone.

Furthermore, as a result of globalisation, national boundaries continue to fade. Not only are more organisations are exploring business prospects overseas (Klein et al., 1998) but also a growing number of individuals—consumers—are pursuing a life outside their native land (Sirkeci, 2013). According to the latter, those are transnational consumers, and as far as this study is concerned, the behaviour of transnational London Muslim Arabs is an understudied field of research; hence, exploring this field may contribute to the marketing and consumer behaviour literature.
Moreover, in an increasingly global competitive market, consumers hold most if not all the power in today’s business world (Blythe, 2008) and it is needless to say that understanding their purchasing or consuming behaviour is central to organisations’ interest. Husted et al. (1996) argued that individuals from different countries operate at different levels of moral reasoning and the latter argument is very relevant to a world where movers and non-movers are connected and influence each other (Cohen and Sirkeci, 2011). Therefore, this study draws attention to an understudied behaviour of one of UK’s consumer segments, particularly the transnational Muslim Arabs in London.

1.2 Problem Statement and Research Rational

Boycotts pose a serious threat to business firms as it rattles the relationship between the boycotted businesses and their consumers. Hence, it impacts on consumer loyalty and ultimately the firms revenues, therefore, a boycott becomes a constraint on growth and has been an uncomfortable issue for multinationals (Smith and Li, 2010). Forty-two percent of the top Multinational Corporations (MNCs) and Fifty-four percent of top brands are facing consumer boycotts (John and Klein, 2003).

Klein et al. (2004) argue that despite the importance of consumer boycotts to management decision-making, there has been little research done on individual's motivation to boycott. Since then much more research has been done to explore the boycott as a consumer behaviour (Knudsen et al., 2008; Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala, 2009; Neilson, 2010; Al-Hyari et al., 2012).

Boycott as consumer behaviour is linked to brand loyalty; Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) argued that loyalty has been viewed from three dimensions; behavioural (i.e. repeated purchases), attitudinal (i.e. preference), commitment or intention to purchase and reasoned action (i.e. social influences).

The current marketing literature on boycotting and loyalty behaviour have not explored either transnationals' boycotting and loyalty behaviour or the impact of religion on consumers’ boycotting and loyalty behaviour.

The grim reality that a large percentage of corporations can potentially become a target of boycotting; its impact on the loyalty of these corporations’ hard earned customer base
clarifies the research problem and highlights the need to explore these fields from a transnational perspective based on the identified gaps in the literature rationalises this research.

Therefore, the above points became the basis for formulating the research questions that address transnational consumers’ boycott and loyalty behaviour, the influence of religion on their decision to boycott and on subsequent loyalty behaviour. It will be investigated by examining intentions and attitudes towards boycotting and also the duration of boycotting behaviour in relation to brand loyalty.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study aims to understand which factors influence the boycotting behaviour amongst London’s transnational Muslim Arab consumers and the impact of these factors on brand loyalty. A related objective is to explore the determinants of their brand loyalty and the impact of the religiously motivated boycott on brand loyalty.

The mass boycott of Danish brands following the Prophet Mohammad cartoon crisis in 2006 had a significant impact on some firms. This particular boycott is taken as a reference point so understanding the characteristics and dynamics of this boycott is one of the objectives of this study.

The transnational Arab Muslim population living in London was selected as the target consumer group because London is a home to a rich variety of Arab movers coming from different Arab countries and different walks of life.

The review of the related literature has identified many brand loyalty determinants. However, further analyses were carried out to explore these determinants from a transnational consumers’ perspective. For this particular objective, the study aims to explore relationships between brand loyalty and several variables identified in this research such as age, level of religiosity, education or income.

Religion influences behaviour (Esso and Dibb, 2004) and religious animosity can lead to boycott. However, the impact of religion on the behaviour of transnational Arab consumers and whether transnationality has any effect on the impact of religion on the boycotting and brand loyalty behaviour of this group remains unclear.
Therefore, this research examined consumer boycott history, types, triggers or motivations and their effect on brand loyalty among the targeted transnational population. Transnationals are “people who understand, perceive, and behave in a framework transcending the national and local reference points” (Sirkeci, 2013, p. 23).

Exploring the characteristics of boycotting consumers and the relationships between religiously motivated boycott and several other independent variables are also among the objectives of this study.

Consumers boycott brands to achieve certain objectives and the success or failure of a boycott action determines its duration. Brand loyalty changes over time (Corsi et al., 2011) and the impact of boycotts on brand loyalty is not known (Al Serhan and Boukrami, 2015). Furthermore, there are no studies on the boycotting behaviour of transnational consumers. Thus, this research is a pioneering study providing insights into this particular relationship between boycotting and loyalty.

This study offered insights and conclude with some recommendations for parties affected by boycotts—consumers, organisations, and countries—on how to deal with boycotts when and as they begin, before they begin, or even to be proactive and avoid them in the first place.

1.4 Thesis Contribution

The contributions of this study can be divided into three parts, firstly, it has assigned distinctive attributes to the boycotters within the studied population including demographics, transnationality, religion—in particular, religious denomination—and social capital. It is also believed that the proposed research model offers a valuable tool for researchers studying other transnational groups.

Secondly, this study paints a clear picture of the many factors that may determine their brand loyalty behaviour. These factors include those that are attributed to brands, for example, quality, taste or price and factors attributed to consumers themselves such as demographics or transnationality and those that are attributed to the social capital of the studied population such as social ties and connectedness are also examined.
Thirdly, this thesis contributes to our understanding of the influence of religiously motivated boycotts on consumer brand loyalty. The findings show the damaging and long-term effect of such behaviour when it’s motivated by religion.

As the findings of this study set distinctive attributes to boycotters, the factors that determine their loyalty behaviour and confirmed the negative impact of boycotting on the these consumers subsequent loyalty behaviour, it is believed that targeted organisations and interested parties have as a result of this study a clearer picture of what motivates those boycotters and what makes them loyal which may be valuable in dealing with future boycotting calls.

As for consumers, this study presented distinctive characteristics of this community which may assist in organising successful future collective boycotting actions.

1.5 Thesis Outline

This thesis consists of ten chapters. Chapter 1 sets the background context of the study by exploring consumption behaviour and the factors that play a part in influencing it, both from boycotting and loyalty perspectives. Hence, it covers aspects of consumers’ animosity that are caused by military, economic, political, cultural or religious factors and the importance of brand loyalty to business organisations.

This chapter outlines the research problem statement and research rationale including the challenges business organisations face as a result of globalisation, market competitiveness and the nature of transnationality as a direct result of the increasing human movement across borders. The final section of this chapter includes an outline of the objectives this study aims to achieve.

Chapter 2 is a context chapter which aims to explain and define some of the terms explored in this research and is divided into two main sections; one defines and explains each of the religious denominations within Islam and the second section sheds light on the 2006 Danish brands boycott.

The literature review begins in Chapter 3 and explores transnational Arab consumers, migrants’ background effect on behaviour and ends by presenting a review on transnational consumers.
Chapter 4 concerns consumer boycotts, types, motivations and a review of boycotts internationally. It also presents an evaluation of the conducted literature review on consumers’ boycotting. Chapter 5 concerns brand loyalty and its determinants, followed by an evaluation of the review of brand loyalty literature, then the final conclusions that summarise the presented literature reviews and outlines the gaps in this literature.

Research methodology is discussed in two chapters. Chapter 6 discusses the conceptual framework that is derived from the review. It is followed by the research questions which are formulated to fill the gaps identified in the relevant literature. In this chapter, a comprehensive justification for each question is also outlined.

The second part of the methodology is discussed in Chapter 7 and expands upon research methodology. This chapter presents the rationale for following a retrospective view of the Danish’s Prophet Mohammed cartoon crisis in 2006 followed by the research method choice that is set to be both qualitative and quantitative. This is followed by the sampling and population choice, for both methods, and the instruments used along with an outline of the pilot stage for each instrument. Finally, profiles of the interviewed participants are presented along with the measures chosen and the data analysis techniques are explained.

Chapter 8 presents the findings drawing on the qualitative interview data. The findings are related to the three research questions, which are the characteristics of transnational Arab boycotters, the factors that influence their brand loyalty and the impact of a religiously motivated boycott on consumers’ brand loyalty.

Chapter 9 is where the quantitative analyses based on the online questionnaire are presented. It covers the descriptive statistics and the factors analyses. The findings of the study are discussed in-depth and connected to the research questions. There are also discussions relating the quantitative results to qualitative findings.

In Chapter 10, the conclusions of this study are presented. The chapter begins with reflections on the major findings and continues with an outline of contributions to knowledge and management practice. In the penultimate section, the limitations of this study are discussed and some directions for future research are proposed.
Chapter 2 Study Context

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to explain and define some of the terms referred to in this research and is divided into two main sections. In the first section, each of the religious denominations within Islam including Sunnism, Shiaism, Sufism and Ahmadiyyaism are defined and explained as the reader may not be familiar with these divisions. In the second section, the 2006 Danish brands boycott is explained as it was an important reference point in this study. The second section includes a detailed history of that boycott, a timeline of its developments, and consumers and targeted organisations’ reactions to it.

2.2 Islam and Consumption Behaviour

Twenty three percent of the world population are estimated to be Muslims (Hosseini-Chavoshi, 2013). In the Arab world, Muslims constitute about 315 million of the total Arab population (Pew Research Centre, 2011). This population represent a substantial consumer segment that is characterised by religion.

The influence of religion on consumers’ behaviour is well documented in marketing literature (see for example, Delener, 1990; Essoo and Dibb, 2004; Al-Hyari et al., 2012). Islam, according to Al-Hyari et al. (2012, p.158) “defines and explains the values for life, which in turn are reflected in the values and attitudes of societies and human beings”.

Vitell (2009), Khraim (2010), Abedin and Brettel (2011) and Swimberghe et al. (2011) argued that research on the impact of religiosity on consumption is limited and most mainstream marketing research has focused mainly on Christian consumers despite the significant growing number of religious minorities living within these Christian majority countries particularly in Europe.

Cutler (1991) studied the number of papers were published on religion in the academic marketing literature between 1956 and 1989 and found only 35 academic articles that focused on religion within a marketing sphere. Only 6 of these articles discussed consumer behaviour from a religious perspective.

Furthermore, the differences in consumption behaviour – if any- within the main religious denominations in Islam is not well documented in the marketing literature (Farah and El
Samad, 2015), this lack of data on this topic can be attributed to the sensitive nature of this area especially in recent years due to the rising sectarian tension between the Sunni and Shiaa Arabs in many parts of the Arab world including Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia which are important source countries for many UK-based Arabs.

Muslim communities in general and indeed the Arab Muslim communities in particular cannot be viewed as a simple to define homogeneous group (Abuznaid, 2012); in fact, within Islam there are a number of religious denominations that have historic and deep divisions taking, for example, the Sunni-Shiaa divide which is more than a 1000 years old (Mcnish, 2006; BBC, 2016).

2.3 The Religious Denominations in the Arab World

The two main religious denominations in the Arab Muslim world are Sunni and Shiaa Muslims (Ameli and Molaei, 2012; Farah and El Samad, 2015; Bahgat, 2005). World-wide, the population of Sunni Muslims is approximately 1.4 billion compared to 211 million Shiaa (Pew Research Centre, 2011).

In the Arab World, Sunni Muslims are the majority in many countries, for example, they represent 90% of the Muslim population in Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia (BBC, 2016; Harvard Business Review, 2013).

Shiaa Muslims represent a larger percentage of the population in many other Arab countries; for example, in Iraq Shiaa represent approximately 70% of the Muslim population, 55% in Lebanon and 75% in Bahrain (Pew Research Centre, 2009; Harvard Business Review, 2013)

Ameli and Molaei (2012) argue that both Sunni and Shiaa are similar in believing in three main principles of Islam; these agreed upon principles are monotheism, the belief in Day of Judgment and Prophet-hood.

The disagreements and divisions within the Islam dates back to 632 when Prophet Mohammed passed away and his successor Abu Bakr was elected as the first caliph of Islam (Ameli and Molaei, 2012; Lust, 2011; Farah and El Samad, 2015; The Financial Times, 2016).
The election of Abu Bakr was supported by one group which thought that as Prophet Mohammed did not choose his successor, it was necessary for the Muslims to elect their leader, this group has been known as the Sunni group and they now make %85 of all Muslims (Farah and El Samad, 2015). This group was defined by the Free Dictionary (n.d) as a member of the branch of Islam that accepts the first four caliphs as rightful successors to Mohammad.

The second group was with the opinion that leadership should remain in the Prophet’s dynasty and it should be given to Ali Bin Abu Talib who is the cousin of the Prophet, this group has been known as the Shiaa and Shiaaism is practiced by %15 of the world’s Muslim population (Sanders, 1992; Bar-Asher, 2014; Farah and El Samad, 2015). The Free Dictionary (n.d) defined those as a member of Islamic branch that regards Ali as the legitimate successor to Mohammed and rejects the first three caliphs.

The conflict took a bloody path 50 years later in 680 between Sunni and Shiaa groups in the Battle of Karbala (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2015) and resulted in the killing of Imam Hussain, the son of Ali Bin Abu Talib and grandson of the Prophet Muhammad by the forces of the ruler Yazid son of Mu'awiya who is a Sunni (Al-Islam Org, 2014; Bokhari, 2015).

Therefore, there are agreements and serious divisions between these two main Muslim denominations and it was important in this study to define them and explore the causes of this divide to investigate whether it has any influence on their consumption behaviour as many studies argued that Muslim behaviour is influenced by religious affiliation, commitment, and also culture (Muhamad and Mizerski, 2010; Ogilvy Noor, 2010; Wilson and Liu, 2011, Mir, 2013).

A recent study by Farah and El Samad (2015) found significant differences between these two main religions denominations in Lebanon in relation to the advertising of controversial products where Sunnis found political and healthcare products advertising more offensive. Shiaa Muslims however, found that gender and sex-related products advertising to be more offensive.

Another study on the differences between Sunni and Shiaa came from Gallup (2014) which found differences in term of satisfaction with the Iraqi government in Shiaa and Sunni areas. The other survey was on women’s role in society and was also carried out by Gallup.
this latter survey found that Shí'a dominated areas favour a more traditional women’s role in society compared to Sunni-dominated areas.

These differences are worth investigating, hence, the inclusions of these religious denominations in this study.

The third religious denomination in Islam is the Ahmadiyya Muslims; this branch of Islam was founded by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, who was born in 1835 who is considered by the followers of Ahmadiyya as the messiah and a prophet (BBC, 2010).

Followers of Ahmadiyya believe that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was sent to Muslims by God as a result of decline in Islam in the 19th century (Juan Eduardo Campo, 2009), hence, unlike Sunni and Shí'a Muslims, they don’t regard Prophet Mohammed as the last messenger.

Ahmadiyya community website in London (www.alislam.org) estimates their population at around 10 million worldwide and promote their movement as revival movement within Islam that started in 1889 and is a dynamic, fast growing movement that spans over 206 countries and its current headquarters is in the United Kingdom.

Sufism is the fourth religious denomination included in this study, followers of this branch belief the Quraan and the Prophet guidance are the guide for all Muslims and since the Prophet Mohammed passed away, they believe that communication with his soul is possible (Kane, 2005), hence, this religious denomination of Islam puts larger emphases on the spiritual fulfilment and followers of Sufism believe that some individuals have mystical powers which allows them connect with the soul of the Prophet.

Ibn Khaldoun who is a North African Arab Muslim historiographer and historian described Sufism and his description was quoted in Heyden (2012, p. 272) as “dedication to worship, total dedication to Allah most High, disregard for the finery and ornament of the world, abstinence from the pleasure, wealth, and prestige sought by most men, and retiring from others to worship alone”.

Sufism differs from the Sunni, Shí’a and Ahmadiyya branches because it focuses on the spiritual side of religion; it sees no value in work, possessions, accumulation of wealth and seeking the pleasures of live, however, this belief conflicts with Belk (1988, p. 139) who
stated that “we are what we have and possess”. Hence, whether their Sufi beliefs impact on how they consume is still unknown.

2.4 Danish Trade and the 2006 Danish Brands Boycott

Denmark is known for its dairy brands, and exports its products world-wide (Danish Agriculture and Food Council, 2015; Danish Dairy Board, n.d). According to the Danish Dairy Board (www.danishdairyboard.dk), there are 28 companies and 54 production facilities in the dairy industry alone and they produce and process 4.9 billion kg of milk per year.

The Arabs are one of Denmark’s largest consumers base after the EU for Butter and Cheese brands (see Table 2-1) and it has been exporting dairy products to the Arab market for over 40 years taking the largest market share in the region (Abosag, 2010). In fact, Arla which is one of the largest Danish dairy companies has production facilities in 11 countries including Saudi Arabia (Abosag, 2010).

### Table 2-1 Danish butter and cheese export to the Middle East (Danish Agriculture and Food Council, 2015)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1,000 Metric Ton

The official website for the Danish Agriculture and Food Council has not published export figures for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 as seen in Table 2-2.

Despite the missing data between 2005 and 2009, the published figures show clearly the sharp decline in Danish exports to many Arab countries between 2004 and 2010. This can be attributed to the Danish brands boycott which will be discussed in the next section.

### Table 2-2 Danish butter and cheese export to selected Arab countries (Danish Agriculture and Food Council, 2015)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>4659</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>1714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.1 Background of The Danish Brands Boycott

In September 2005, a Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten reprinted 12 cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed including a cartoon depiction him with a bomb in his turban (Maher and Mady, 2010). These cartoons were illustrations drawn by many cartoonists and were published in a book about the life of Mohammed by the Danish writer and journalist Kåre Bluitgen (Jensen (2008).

These cartoons created animosity toward Denmark amongst Muslims including the Arabs because Mohammed is a sacred figure for Muslims and represents their religion, and insulting him is considered a serious crime from his followers’ point of view (Knight et al., 2009).

Jyllands-Posten refused to apologise stating that “printing those cartoons was a way to ensure freedom of speech in the face of intimidation from radical Islamists” (Copenhagen Post, 2005). In January 2006, Imams (religious clerics) including Yusuf Al Qaradawi, the head the International Union of Muslim Scholars urged Muslims to Boycott all Danish brands using Masjids (Mosques) in many Arab states as platforms to spread the boycott call (Washington Post, 2006).

The impact of this boycott was felt by all Danish exporters, especially those who export to Arab and Muslim countries. Their market share plummeted from 17% in January 2006 to less than 1% in February 2006 (Antoniades, 2013).

It is also important to mention that the boycott of Danish brands proved that Country of Origin (COO) can be a liability in certain religious and political turmoil situations. In this regard, Xuehua and Zhilin (2008) and Koschate-Fischer (2012) argued that if a firm has negative COO image, it is advisable for marketers not to emphasise the brand COO but highlight other product's attributes instead because the effect of negative stereotyping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheese</th>
<th>550</th>
<th>754</th>
<th>1.016</th>
<th>1162</th>
<th>1089</th>
<th>1101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>15043</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2643</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Metric Ton
towards a country comes in as an important factor in consumers buying decisions (Saeed, 1994).

Perhaps the most revealing information about the extent of the damage caused by the Danish brands boycott is Arla’s spokesman Louis Honore interview with BBC (2006) when he said that despite being in the Arab region market for many decades and having many local production facilities in many part of this region, this boycott ruined it all.

Putting Mr Honore statement into numbers, the Financial Times (2006) and BBC (2006) reported that Arla which was hit hard by this particular boycott was losing £1 million a day.

Arla seemingly sent home 170 of its employees as a result of decline in sales (BBC, 2006). This boycott also impacted on local staff, Arla cheese and yogurt production facility in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia sent 800 of its employees home as a result (Washington Post, 2006).

The Danish brands boycott lasted for a year and cost Danish firms dearly. It officially ended in August when Imam Yusuf Al Qaradawi called it off (Antoniades, 2013; Abosag, 2010). Timeline of this boycott events are shown in Table 2-3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month &amp; Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2005</td>
<td>30th: <em>Jyllands-Posten</em>, Denmark’s largest newspaper published 12 cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed (one cartoon depiction him with a bomb in his turban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2006</td>
<td>10th: Cartoons were reprinted by Magazinet, a Christian newspaper from Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th: Saudi Arabia calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th: Kuwait calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th: Saudi Arabia recalls its ambassador and initiates the boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27th: Thousands denounce the cartoons during Friday prayer in Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28th: Libya calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28th: Yemen calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>Syria calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>Palestine calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>Arla Dairy Group in Denmark places advert in Middle Eastern newspapers trying to stop the boycott of its brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>Bahrain calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>Qatar calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>UAE calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>EU warns it will take World Trade Organisation if the boycott persists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>Algeria calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>Jordan calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>Morocco calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>Tunisia calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>Danish Imams (religious clerics) accept statement from Jyllands-Posten and the Prime Minster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feb. 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Newspapers in Germany, Italy, Spain, Netherlands and Greece publish one or more of the cartoons. Syria also withdraws its ambassador to Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Oman calls for boycott of Danish brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gunmen repeat protests in Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mr. Rasmussen, the Prime Minister of Denmark from 2001 to 2009 appears on Al-Arabiya which is a well-known Saudi TV network to calm the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>A Jordanian newspaper Al-Shihan publishes Jyllands-Posten cartoons, the editor was sacked and ordered to apologise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Peter Mandelson, the EU commissionaire at that time warns that the boycott must end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Demonstrators set fire to the Danish embassy in Beirut and one protester dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Iran withdraws its ambassador from Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6th: Iran’s largest circulation newspaper launches Holocaust cartoon contest

7th: New York press editors resign after the newspaper refuses to publish the cartoons

7th: Danish Imams announced that they want to end the dispute

9th: Hundreds of thousands of Shiaa Muslims in Lebanon protest. Huge protest takes place in Malaysia too

13th: At least 3000 students demonstrate violently in the Pakistani city Peshawar

17th: Tanzania calls for boycott of Danish brands

2.4.2 The Nature of the Boycott

It is clear that the boycott of Danish brands was motivated by religious animosity that was caused by the publication of materials that many Muslims including the Arabs around the world found insulting. There is a strong link between religiosity and boycotting in Arab/Islamic societies and this link influences purchasing behaviour toward international brands (Al-Hyari et al., 2012).

The profound impact of Islam as a religion on consumption behaviour is well documented in the literature taking, for example, Al Serhan and Alobaitha (2013), Nawal (2009), Roald (2001), Al-Qaradawy (1995) and Maududi (1960).

In conclusion, insulting Prophet Mohammed was perceived as a threat to Muslims fundamental beliefs (Swimberghe et al., 2009). In fact, Islam has a deep influence not only on its follower’s consumption behaviour but also on all aspects of their life, and this includes values, culture and social aspects of their day-to-day activities (Roald, 2001; Al-Qaradawy, 1995). The overwhelming participation in this boycott can be explained by its religious nature.

Hirschman (1983) argued that individuals belonging to a particular religious group could have a similar rational that may influence their behaviour compared with groups of other faiths. Hence, this study focuses on the transnational Arab Muslims group and this consumer segment is explored in the next chapter.
Chapter 3 Transnational Arab Consumers

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into three main sections; the first section sheds light on many of the characteristics of transnational Arab consumers including the main destinations for those transnationals such as Germany, France and the United Kingdom. This section also presents data on the available population figures for those consumers and the countries they originated from. The second section discusses the impact of the migrants’ background on behaviour in general and on consumption in particular. The final section of this chapter offers a summary of the conclusions based on this transnational Arab consumers review.

Sirkeci (2013, p. 23) defines transnational consumers as “people who understand, perceive, and behave in a framework transcending the national and local reference points”. An earlier definition by Basch et al. (1994, p. 6) states that transnationalism is “the process by which trans-migrants, through their daily activities, forge and sustain multi-stranded social, economic, and political relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement, and through which they create transnational social fields that cross national borders”. According to Lichy and Pon (2013, p. 5), those “new arrivals in a host country can be described as a subgroup of consumers with different purchasing habits”.

Therefore, transnational consumers are individuals who hold distinctive characteristics that have been shaped by their mobility as well their sustained connectedness with their societies in their country of origin, countries of transit, if any, and country of current residence. These characteristics form a unique consumption behaviour that is influenced by values gained from both the countries they came from and the countries they currently reside in.

3.1.1 The Arabs

Asia’s total population according to the World Population Statistics (2013) is estimated to be around 4.3 billion. The Arab world, according to the World Bank (2012) consists of 22 member states of the Arab League, (see Table 3-1) and estimates the Arab world population to be around 362.5 million people who reside in those member states.
According to Deng (2011, p. 405), a commonly used definition of the Arabs is that "Arabs are those who speak Arabic, are brought up in Arab culture, live in an Arab country, believe in Mohammed's teachings, and cherish the memory of the Arab empire". Collins online English Dictionary (2003) defines Arabs as “Semitic people inhabiting Arabia, whose language and Islamic religion spread widely throughout the Middle East and northern Africa from the seventh century”.

It could be argued that the above definitions lack comprehensiveness since not all Arabs are Muslims (e.g. Arab Christians who speak Arabic, brought up in Arabic culture and live in an Arab country), however, these definitions are believed to be sufficient for the purpose of this study.

The importance of this region comes not only from its historical role as the birthplace of three of the major religions – Judaism, Christianity and Islam but also because of its youthful population and vast natural resources especially gas and oil.

The UN Population Division (2012) figures also show that Asia is the second largest source of migrants residing in Europe with a total of around 19 million people. The Arab migrant population in Europe is estimated to be at around 6 million (MEDEA Institute, 2010). Thus, they are a substantial and visible consumer group. Marketers and all interested parties including academics and policymakers should not ignore their visibility. In fact, Ben-Nun, Yigal (2013), a columnist at Haaretz newspaper said,

> Arabs in Europe are a fact of life. It’s time we started to accept that there’s no way to block the migration ... They will continue to arrive there for the foreseeable future, and there’s no point in burying our heads in the sand.

According to the United Nation Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) the term migrant means, "any person who lives temporarily or permanently in a country
where he or she was not born, and has acquired some significant social ties to this country". This definition includes students, children and family dependents as well as workers.

Germany hosts around 278 thousand migrants of Arab origin and the Arab population in Berlin alone is approximately 20 thousand (Al-Dajah, 2012; Irfaeya, 2008), however, these figures are set to increase sharply due to an influx of many Arab nationals from Syria and Iraq who are fleeing their homeland due to the on-going conflict and heading to Germany. It is expected that Germany alone will end up hosting around half million of them every year (The Independent, 2015; Yazgan et al., 2015).

Germany also hosts over 3 million immigrants of Turkish origin (Sirkeci et al., 2015; Sirkeci et al., 2012). Those minorities in Germany are seen as a niche market rather than a mainstream, potential revenue generating, segment of the German consumer population due to the paucity of accurate data (Erdem, 2008).

France is Europe’s third largest economy; it also hosts the largest sub-Saharan population (Bohlen, 2008), consisting mainly of Arabs from North Africa. However, population estimates vary; Tribalat (2009) estimated their number to be around 3.5 million whereas Crumley (2009) estimated the number between 4 to 7 million. Either estimate reveals a sizeable consumer base that has the potential to influence the market direction and business firms policies.

3.1.2 Middle Eastern and North African Arabs in England and London

The UK has a noticeable number of Arab migrants too; according to the UK’s Office of National Statistics (2011a) Figure 3.1, the number of Middle Easterners and Arabs from North Africa by country of birth in England was 414,643.

London alone has 137,253 residents born in the Middle East and North African Arab countries (MENA) (ONS, 2011a and 2011d). However, the actual figures could be much higher now due the date of the above data (i.e. 2011) and the escalating conflict in many parts of the Arab world including Syria, Iraq, Yemen and Libya.

The Arab population is becoming more significant in the UK, in fact, in Greater London, Arabic language is spoken by 17,310 pupils (Greater London Authority, 2011). Furthermore, a report published by the British Council (2013) predicts that the Arabic
language will be the second most important non-English language of future workers after Spanish.

**Figure 3.1 MENA non-UK born population in England and London (ONS, 2011a and 2011d)**

This migration creates ethnic communities; ethnicity is a “Language, customs, representations of the past, religious beliefs, a sense of common origin, rules of comportment, and behaviour” (Oswald, 1999, p.312). Ethnocentrism remains a challenge for business firms targeting minorities as Watson and Wright (2000) argued that ethnocentric consumers are more likely to buy products from culturally similar countries and that may explain why Middle Easterners, for example, form a noticeable entrepreneurial power among immigrants, particularly in the retail and catering business segment in the UK.

This research intends to study the Arab consumers’ behaviour toward the 2006 Danish brand boycott retrospectively. Therefore, a 25 year old respondent would have been 18 during the boycotting campaign and this age is the age of consent in the UK. Only those respondents who were of the age of consent in the UK at the time were included in the sample population.

The median age of the non-UK born residents, in general, was 37.3%. To calculate MENA population in London more accurately, the percentages shown in Figure 3.2 were calculated from the age group 25-29 until 70-74, the eligible population for this study becomes 39% from the female (39% X 137,253= 53,528) and 36% from the male population (36% X 137,253= 49,411). Based on the above calculation, this study’s total eligible population for sampling purposes is 102,939.
Islam is the dominant religion in the Arab region (Alahmad et al., 2015) so it should be safe to assume that the majority of the people represented in the above figures published by ONS are of a Muslim faith. Furthermore, those of a Muslim faith in the UK make their affiliation to their faith clear as a study on the Home Office’s citizenship survey 2001 by O’Beirne (2004) showed that 64% of Muslim participants aged Twenty-five to Forty-nine were happy to be affiliated with Islam followed by Sikh: 59% and Hindu: 54%).

Those Arabs residing in but not born in the UK are what Sirkeci (2013, p. 31) called “cross-border movers and commuters” and he suggested that this segment of consumers should be called ‘transnational’ consumers (Sirkeci, 2013, p. 23). These transnational Arab consumers are the target group of this research.

### 3.2 Migration and Consumer Behaviour

Hui et al., (1998) sees consumption as a cultural phenomenon. Moreover, Light (1972) thinks that tribal, clan or extended family groupings serve as an instrument in which ethnic honour is upheld and that these groupings set certain standards for members of their community to follow and these standards assist in directing members of a particular group or community how to conduct themselves. He also argues that ethnicity of family members does influence their orientation toward markets in their communities.

From a marketer’s perspective, migration creates communities that are connected by religious, cultural, language and/or social bonds, these bonds form a consumer market that is known as an ethnic consumer market and this transnational consumer market in UK
alone is estimated to be worth around £30 billion (Sirkeci, 2009). Hence, finding behavioural characteristics and attitudes of particular groups is important not only to marketers but also to other stakeholders such as academics and policy makers.

The positive contribution of migration was acknowledged by a study carried out by London School of Economics (LSE), it stated, “new migrants are believed to strengthen the economy and also provide a signal of the city’s global reach” (LSE, 2007, p. 6).

Migrants don’t live in isolation in this era of advanced communication platforms, which help to maintain connectedness between them and their family in their country of origin. Rosser and Harris (1965, p32) defined the extended family as “any persistent kinship grouping of persons related by descent, marriage or adoption, which is wider than the elementary family, in that it characteristically spans three generations from grandparents to grandchildren”. Therefore, this study looks into the wider meaning of family that includes immediate family members such as mother, father, brothers and sisters, as well as extended family members such as grandparents, cousins, uncles, aunts and so on.

Furthermore, the level of consumer connectedness is viewed by Sirkeci (2013) as an important variable that can impact on consumers’ behaviour as individuals around the world are connected by a variety of means such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and many more platforms and through these means they share information. In fact, Sirkeci believes that consumers through their connectedness, despite geographical distance, can “mobilise campaigns, petitions and even boycott” (Sirkeci, 2013, p. 25).

Consumers’ social capital can influence their behaviour too, Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, p.119) argue that social capital is "the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition". Hence, examining the influence of participants’ social capital and level of connectedness is believed to be a key factor when assessing the characteristics of this transnational group.

Moreover, evaluating the importance of social pressure on the success of a particular boycott campaign is recognised in the boycott literature (Klein et al., 2004; Friedman, 1999; Smith, 1990; Garrett, 1987). However, examining its impact on targeted population’s
boycotting characteristics is thought to offer a deeper understanding of this transnational segment of the UK’s population.

Transnationality is a result of migrants mobility and it creates challenges as well as opportunities and that perhaps explains why recent years have witnessed an increase in governmental interest in migration and ethnicity research because it is the most controversial and complex concept (Al-Dajah et al., 2012).

Exploring motivation for mobility in the first place is an important step toward understanding the behaviour of those consumers, an understanding that is essential to marketers and government policymakers to overcome the challenges and profit from the opportunities that human mobility brings.

3.3 Conclusion

It can be argued that transnationality is a complex phenomenon, and is difficult to interpret; transnational consumers build and sustain social, economic, and political ties that link them with two worlds (maybe more), a world representing their origin and another world they settle in. Moreover, figures show that the number of transnational consumers moving and settling abroad is on the increase and this can lead to two key conclusions from this research perspective:

Firstly, because their numbers are increasing for various reasons including globalisation, the fading of traditional borders and the impact of social media transnational consumers are no longer a niche market. They are a mainstream market that marketers and strategist need to pay attention to when designing new products, entering a new market or when faced with turbulent times such as consumer boycott campaigns.

Secondly, more research is needed to understand better this segment of consumers; a breed of consumers who are a mix of two or three worlds, therefore, typical consumer behaviour classifications may no longer apply to them which can only make devising marketing strategies more difficult for business firms.

Demographic variables have a long history in marketing research as they influence brand choice (Kalyanam and Putler, 1997). Therefore, income, marital status, number of children, educational level, age, gender, religion and country of origin of Transnational Arabs in
London and their consumer attitudes toward boycott are valuable variables to test and analyse.

Other important variables were identified in this chapter that are important to analyse: consumer connectedness, social capital and mobility. It is also important to understand how they interact and impact on transnational consumer behaviours.

The next chapter reviews the literature on the boycotting behaviour of consumers to complete the background and conceptual framework for this study.
Chapter 4 Consumer Boycotts

4.1 Introduction

This literature review chapter presents an overview of consumer boycotts based on the relevant literature. It is divided into an in-depth review of consumer boycotts including a summary of studies on this regard. This is followed by a discussion of types of boycotts, and then goes on to introduce boycotting motivations and ends with conclusions derived from the literature review.

Boycotts have been employed as a coercive strategy to promote change for centuries (Laidler, 1913) or to resist change that does not appeal to a certain group’s values; formally a boycott has been defined as “an attempt by one or more parties to achieve certain objectives by urging individual consumers to refrain from making selected purchases in the marketplace” (Friedman, 1985, p. 97).

Literature review suggests that Friedman’s definition of boycott is the most upheld definition in many studies discussing boycott such as John and Klein (2003), Knudsen et al. (2008), Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala (2009) and Al-Hyari et al. (2012) to name a few. Nevertheless, Garret (1987, p. 47) defined boycott as:

Concerted, but not mandatory, refusal by a group of actors (the agents) to conduct marketing transactions with one or more other actors (the target) for the purpose of communicating displeasure with certain target policies and attempting to coerce the target to modify those policies.

Black's Law Dictionary’s definition of boycotting which was cited in Garrett (1987, p 46-47) is more general as it defined boycott as “a concentrated refusal to do business with a particular person or business in order to obtain concessions or to express displeasure with certain acts or practices of person or business”. This later definition is a good example of what is known as a Micro-Boycott but cannot be applied to many boycott cases worldwide; American brands such as Starbucks, Levi’s and MacDonald’s were subject to anti-America and anti-war boycotts just because they were American brands (Al Shebil et al., 2011).

The Danish product boycott crisis is another example of a consumer boycott that was not created by Danish producers themselves but for a totally different reason. This boycott
started when a Danish newspaper published cartoons of Prophet Mohammad that was viewed by many Muslims as an insult from Denmark as a country to their religion. As a result, many parts of the world witnessed riots aside from the economic losses (Post, 2007). This relatively new form of consumer boycott is called Macro-Boycott (Abosag, 2010).

Consumer theory argues that the objective of this consumer behaviour is to achieve either a change in targeted company’s behaviour e.g. change in its marketing mix, or a comprehensive change in the whole system (Garrett 1987, Friedman 1991). However, according to Klein et al. (2004) boycotting requires a sacrifice from the consumer side; this can be by switching to alternative brands if substitutes readily available or complete abstention from buying.

It may be argued that consumer boycott and purchase refusal are two different consumer behaviours, however looking at the academic literature it can be seen that every definition of boycott encompasses the act of refusing to buy a certain brand or even in the case of macro boycott where consumers refuse to buy brands that are associated with one particular country.

Purchase refusal is part of the definition of consumer boycott, in other words, a consumer boycott is a continuous chain of actions which starts as shown in Figure 5 by a wrongdoing or unfavourable behaviour taken by an organisation or a country as a whole. When consumers consider this action as an attack on their values (e.g. social, economic, religious values, etc.), this triggers animosity toward that brand or country and the calls for boycott begin and the consumers who respond to this particular boycott call then refuse to buy the brand.

Boycott actions are different from someone’s decision to withhold consumption because it constitutes an organised, collective and non-mandatory refusal to purchase or consume a particular product (Akpoyomare et al., 2012). Furthermore, the factors underlying a person’s choice to take part in a boycott are similar to those underlying individual’s participation in labour actions or movements such as strikes (Gallagher and Gramm, 1997). Hence, purchase refusal is one action within the boycott chain as shown in Figure 4.1 below.
In most successful consumer boycotts, organisations were left with few choices and in many cases had to alter their unfavourable behaviour. Some examples of this are: Starbucks paid its Corporation Tax, the British goods boycott by Americans as a result of the Stamp Act of 1765 led the British Parliament to repeal it and the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955 which lead to the ending of segregation in buses.

From a civil rights activist view, Cesar Chavez, who was a founding member of United Farm Workers argued that boycott is a tool to take a cause to public arena when the legal system fails to do it justice (Klein et al., 2004). The word boycott itself was used first in 1780 by a group of Irish farmers who had a rent dispute with their British landlord Mr Charles Cunningham Boycott, who was one of the oppressing British estate managers and decided to boycott him (Friese, 2000).

Since the 70s the popularity of consumer boycotts has witnessed a huge increase (Garrett, 1987; Friedman, 1999; Heijnen and van der Made, 2009; Farah and Newman, 2010) therefore, all parties operating in the marketplace need to understand its causes and effects and how to deal with it. Most boycott studies were either conceptual or descriptive; for example, case studies concentrated on organisers, not consumers (Klein et al., 2004). Moreover, many studies have examined consumer boycott (Ili-Salsabila and Abdul-Talib, 2012) but limited studies focused on consumer boycott from Arab consumers perspective.

Boycott is interesting consumer behaviour and is consistent with the marketing notion itself (Klein et al., 2004). Buying behaviour is influenced by culture, politics, religion as well as environment (Al-Hyari et al., 2012). Therefore, asking the question of why the London's Arab Muslim consumers boycott would offer a new and interesting perspective on how to understand an ever-changing marketplace where revolutions in many of those
transnationals countries of origin are changing how people express themselves and voice out their thoughts as well as frustrations.

Boycotting is becoming an effective and powerful instrument of expressing consumer dissatisfaction in today’s marketplace (Sen et al., 2001). Corporations operating in the marketplace do have an impact on society and many consumers place considerable responsibility upon them.

Neilson (2010) thinks that consumers use their dollars as a vote to influence corporate behaviour, where consumers can place positive sanctions (boycotting firm’s products) or negative sanction (boycotting firm’s products) and this power is called Political Consumerism.

Political consumerism is also a collective action thus, its power lies according to Holzer (2006) not on the individual consumer, but on the power of social movement (e.g. NGOs or Labour Unions) which have sufficient credibility to influence many individual’s purchasing intentions and thus to influence their choices into a united statement or action, these social groups can transform consumers’ dollars into political power.

The studies on boycotting behaviour are listed by orientation, subject focus, methods and key findings in Table 4-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Year</th>
<th>Orientation/ Subject</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller and Sturdivant (1977)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour toward corporate questionable behaviour/boycott</td>
<td>Questionnaires during boycott to monitor attitude changes toward each of eight fast-food restaurants</td>
<td>Socially questionable behaviour by one component of a multi-unit firm may have a negative impact on sales of other components of that firm. Study did provide limited support for the argument that questionable corporate behaviour will influence consumer practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett (1987)</td>
<td>Marketing Management/ Strategy/ boycott effectiveness/Boycott</td>
<td>Telephone interviews with consumers or boycott leaders and media news reports</td>
<td>For boycott organisers, boycott should be used only in selected situations. For targeted firms, using optimal strategic response may minimize damage caused by boycott action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witkowski (1989)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/ Boycott Nonimportation movement against Britain</td>
<td>Historical research</td>
<td>America increasingly tied to a global marketing system; still imports more than they export. Political considerations can rapidly influence consumers’ preferences. Nationalism mixed with social or religious ideologies can provoke Third World consumers into rejecting foreign goods and adopting new patterns of consumption. Consumers’ values, behaviours, and contradictions are not a recent phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings/Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (1990)</td>
<td>Consumer policy and activism/ consumers boycott</td>
<td>Case studies based on interviews with boycott organisers and targeted firms and secondary data</td>
<td>Fudge/strategy is the most effective means of handling boycott action. Suggested a model of management response tactics according to the strength of the boycott campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozinets and Handlman (1998)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/boycotting behaviour/activism</td>
<td>Observed individual postings in eleven different Internet newsgroups for a two month period (from January to March 1997), these groups were chosen for their prevalence of boycott-related postings</td>
<td>Linked the concept of the sacred with the concept of morality moving the secularised theme closer to a religious orientation. Boycotters find the elimination of morally offensive production practices to sacralise consumer behaviour. Boycotts reconnect objects with people—the managers and executives who make and market them, the shareholders who profit from them and the labourers who toil to manufacture and harvest them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman (1985, 1995, 1999)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/consumer boycott</td>
<td>Historical research, secondary data and survey with boycott organisers</td>
<td>The appeal of the boycotts to the more powerless and unrecognised segment of society continues to be strong. Boycotts followed an escalating path of militancy. Strong emphasis on social and moral problems removed from workplace to marketplace. Boycott frequency is rising. Price-increase boycott appears to be vanishing. Consumer boycott is the economic mirror image of labour strike. Boycotts rarely succeeded in lowering prices beyond the short term. Boycott come in different types, instrumental, expressive, complete, partial...etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John and Klein (2003)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/boycott/ boycott participation</td>
<td>Dynamic model (a mathematical model)</td>
<td>Participation may be driven by individual motivation such as guilt or maintenance of self-esteem. Participation by others will affect an individual's incentive to participate in boycott; for instrumental motivations greater participation by others discourages individual's participation and for non-instrumental motivation it is influenced by social pressure and greater participation by others encourages individual participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/boycott/ boycott motivations/boycott</td>
<td>Empirical study of an actual and on-going boycott</td>
<td>The more egregious a consumer perceived the firm's behaviour, the more likely the consumer was to boycott. Consumers need to believe that boycotting is an appropriate and effective response (i.e. makes a difference). Boosting or maintaining self-esteem has a direct effect and moderates the effect of egregiousness on boycott participation. Cost of a preferred product, costs of boycott induced harms and doubts about whether participation is necessary also moderate the effect of egregiousness on boycotting. Consumers' estimates of support for a boycott influences participation directly. Women are more likely to boycott than men. Firm communications appeared to lower levels of perceived egregiousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delacote (2006)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/consumer boycott generated by environmental preferences</td>
<td>Dynamic model (a mathematical model)</td>
<td>The ability of the boycotting group to hurt the firm's profit enough is the main element determining the chance of boycott success. Boycott opportunity cost appears to make a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informing and educating consumers would induce a decrease in overall consumption and increase the population likely to participate in the boycott.

In a monopoly, the boycott is less likely to succeed, because there is no good substitute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neilson (2010)</td>
<td>Political consumerism/boycott</td>
<td>Analysis of 21,535 adults from the 2002/2003 European Social Survey (face to face interviews).</td>
<td>Political consumers are not all informed and motivated in the same way. Boycotting is linked with lower trust in institutions but buyotters (i.e. buying particular brands) are influenced by greater trust in institutions. Female buyotters are motivated by their trust in others and are more likely to boycott (i.e. buy the brand), but there is no gender differences associated with buyotting. Political consumerism appears to becoming a mainstream phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Shebil et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Consumer Boycott</td>
<td>Conceptual article</td>
<td>Modern communication technologies enhanced the power of groups to mobilise people and sympathisers to do lasting damage to a brand. Brand-country association and boycott intensity provide two powerful dimensions enabling analysis of boycotts and suggest possible coping strategies. Boycotts may open opportunities for small players and potential new entrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knudsen et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Product boycott</td>
<td>Analysis of secondary data from recent boycott movements against USA, UK, Denmark and Holland</td>
<td>International firms operating in the Middle East caught unprepared to deal with boycott. International firms operating in the Middle East should prepare a contingency plan. Any effective response to boycott requires a substantial knowledge of the region’s economic, political and religious situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen (2008)</td>
<td>Product boycott</td>
<td>Analysis of secondary data from Danish newspaper articles</td>
<td>Mohammed cartoon controversy and the boycott of Danish products is an example of what globalisation can lead to. The controversy showed the external clash between Islamic values and Western social ideals. Organised boycott of this region is an indication that consumers are using market mechanism as a supplement to other forms of political participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maher and Mady (2010)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour</td>
<td>Data collected using a snowball sampling technique</td>
<td>Negative emotions expected from buying the product and the positive emotions expected from not buying the product led to less willingness to buy Danish products. Social pressure was found to be the more important factor in consumers’ willingness to buy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abosag (2010)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/boycott</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews and survey) and secondary data</td>
<td>Come back strategy after boycott action worked reasonably for Arla Foods. Managing crisis such as the Mohammed cartoon crisis using a more relational approach is certainly plausible within the context of the Middle Eastern culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hyari et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Consumer behaviour/boycott</td>
<td>Qualitative (interviews)</td>
<td>Strong link between religiosity and boycotting. Arab/Islamic societies are collectively influenced also be the collective culture, which influences purchasing behaviour toward international brands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Types of Boycott

Following on from the summary in Table 4.1, it can be said that boycott research identified several types of boycotts, although there is not a single agreement upon categorization. Friedman (1999) argues that a boycott can be instrumental, “a consumer action that has a clear goal to achieve” or expressive, “a consumer action that expresses frustration and discontent with a firm’s or country’s actions”. A boycott can also be partial, “boycotting some of the firm’s products” or complete “by refraining from buying all products from a certain firm or a certain country”.

Surrogate boycott is where the boycotters target surrogates (e.g. its governments or suppliers) and not the action originator. A non-surrogate boycott is when consumers boycott the firm that caused the grievance, not its government or even its suppliers.

A boycott can also be either a governmental boycott, such as the European Union’s embargo on buying Syrian oil (The Guardian, 2011) or the US embargo in 1992 on Cuba (Garfield and Santana, 1997), which is a clear example of a boycott at its extreme form. It can also be a non-governmental boycott that is similar to boycotts initiated by individual consumers and organisations such as environmental or human rights organisations (Al Shebil et al., 2011).

Abosag (2010) divided consumer boycotts into two major sections; micro-boycott and macro-boycott. Micro-boycott occurs when consumers boycott certain firm’s products or services.

There are numerous examples of the micro boycott such as the European boycott of Shell as a response to its plan to sink the Brent Spar oil platform at sea (Klein et al., 2004), the boycott of Starbucks that was triggered by a remark made by the company CEO toward the Middle East (Fisk, 2002) and also the calls to boycott of Amazon.com in 2001 after it was discovered that the Jerusalem Post, an Israeli newspaper, was giving portion its profits from its partnership with Amazon.com to Israeli soldiers (Armbruster, 2002). The studies that
focused on this type of boycott include Garrett (1987), Friedman (1995) and John and Klein (2003).

As for the macro-boycott and according to Abosag (2010) it is directed at policies and actions of the governments of boycotted firms and it causes targeted organisations profound long-term effects, Abosag also argues that this type of consumer boycott is under-researched and not well explored.

The most relatively recent and publicised example of a macro-boycott is the Arab consumers boycott of Danish brands that started when the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* published on the 30th of September 2005 number of cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammad, who is a sacred figure for Muslims and represents their religion (Maher and Mady (2010).

Sen et al. (2001) distinguished between two types of boycott; economic boycotts which, for example, aim to lower the target firm’s prices or to express dissatisfaction with a decline in product’s quality and political or social boycotts that can be understood within the framework of expressive boycott as defined by Friedman (1999) earlier.

Figure 4.2 below provides a visual representation of the types of boycott identified in earlier studies; however, as discussed earlier, whatever form it comes in, dealing with boycotting remains a challenging task for business organisations.

**Figure 4.2 Types of boycott extracted from the literature review (compiled by author)**
4.2.1 Consumer Boycotts “As American as Apple Pie”

Friedman (1999) wrote extensively about consumers boycott in his published book *Consumer Boycotts: Effecting change Through the Market Place and Media*. He thinks that boycott is a distinctive consumer behaviour for two reasons: firstly because boycott targets businesses in the micro-boycott and countries in the macro-boycott, Friedman sees it as a more effective technique than other consumer movement techniques, secondly, boycott played an important role in social justice in American history where it was used to empower the powerless. But at the same time, Friedman also argues that awareness is very low for many boycotts.

However, Klein et al. (2004) suggest that despite the possibility of low public awareness of many boycotts, a targeted firm should act in a proactive manner and consider any boycott action as a warning signal and explore the allegedly questionable conduct. Therefore, boycotting calls against firms should not be ignored by these firms, especially in this digitally connected world where a word can travel and reach millions of people by a click of a button.

Consumer boycotts are far more established in America than in Europe (Vogel, 1978) and therefore, looking back on American boycott history, we can see the Stamp Act of 1765 as one of the earliest examples of boycotts in America. After winning the French and Indian war, Britain became an undisputed world power and it needed to raise income, so its parliament enacted a law that placed a tax on every paper document including newspapers, legal documents and even decks of cards.

Many sectors of American society, such as businesses, merchants, lawyers, journalists and other groups such as the Daughters of Liberty in New York, Philadelphia and Boston decided to stop importing British goods until the parliament of Great Britain revoked the Stamp Duty Act.

As a result of this boycott action, America’s trade with England fell by three hundred thousand pounds in the summer of 1765 alone (Thackeray et al., 1998). The boycott campaign succeeded in pressuring the British Parliament to repeal its Stamp Duty Act in 1766 and was a good example of what could be argued as the first well-documented macro-
boycott in the literature, it also illustrates what Friedman (1999, p.33) called an “Instrumental Boycott”.

Moreover, the cause of this boycott represents a purely traditional economic motive since it was about protesting the introduction of a new tax that was certain to harm businesses. It can be argued that it also represents a boycott with political roots as the action was ultimately targeting the policy of the lawmakers in the British parliament. Additionally, this particular boycott can be set as an example of a surrogate boycott where the boycotters target (British producers and exporters) not the real target, the British parliament in this case. Al Shebil et al. (2011) argue that for consumers who have grievances against a country, targeting its firms is easier than targeting the government of that country.

A relatively more recent example of consumers boycott in America is the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which lasted from 1st of December 1955 to 20th of December 1956. This collective action was organised as a result of bus seating segregation between black and white Americans where the first row of seats were reserved for whites and the rear seats were for blacks. It was an effective action that saw participation by 90% of the city’s blacks and almost bankrupted the bus company (Thornton, 2006).

This boycott is well-documented in the literature, especially the American literature (Garrow, 1989; Stuttaford, 1995; Burns, 1997) and it is suggested by Friedman (1999) that this boycott was the most significant boycott campaign in American history as it marked the beginning of civil rights movement action for African Americans.

The Montgomery boycott ended successfully when the Federal Supreme Court affirmed an earlier ruling by the lower court (Browder V. Gayle) that seating segregation on buses was unconstitutional and, as a result, buses were integrated.

Looking at the motivations of this boycott, it can be argued that it was not motivated by economic motivations such as product or service price reduction, quality issues nor environmental reasons, rather this boycott is what (Freidman, 1999, p.33) called an “Expressive Boycott” where African Americans expressed their frustration and discontent with racial segregation on public transport. Moreover, we can also safely say that this
boycott was motivated by ethical, social as well as political reasons. This boycott is also another clear example of consumer micro and non-surrogate boycott.

A recent boycott campaign in America was in 2010 and was directed against Israel by Olympia Food Co-op (Hallward and Berg, 2014). This boycott was a response to the killing of Rachel Corrie by an Israeli bulldozer while she was defending a Palestinian home in the Gaza Strip.

4.2.2 Boycotts in Europe

European history witnessed many boycott campaigns of all types, from consumer economic boycott in its most simple form to group boycotts such as unions and NGOs to government boycotts at its most extreme form, the embargo. The 1848 Milanese tobacco boycott that was an Austrian state monopoly and was the reason for declaration of independence of Milan and Venice in Italy is one example (Waller, 1990), the boycott of German imports in 1933 by Jewish Americans which targeted Nazism policies against the Jewish is another example of boycott in Europe (Berman, 1990).

The most recent and on-going boycott is the European Union Boycott of Syrian oil as a result of the popular uprising in Syria that started on the 15th of March 2011 and developed into an armed conflict between government forces and rebels demanding the overthrow of President Assad’s regime. The conflict has claimed thousands of lives from both sides of the conflict.

4.2.3 Boycotts in Africa

The Anti-Apartheid Boycott is one of Africa’s well-known boycott campaigns that had international participation, many states, groups and individuals opted not to have business relations with South Africa when its racist discrimination policy called “apartheid” was in place. This boycott was not only of a commercial or financial nature, but it also included sport boycott, academic boycott (McFarland and Totten, 1996) and even music boycott (Drewett, 2008) where several countries refused to play against South African teams and many global music bands refused to perform in venues that were open to whites only such as Sun City.
4.2.4 Boycott in the Arab World

The Arab world has witnessed many boycott campaigns. Historically, the first documented boycott in the Middle East occurred in 617 when the tribe of Banu Quraysh in the holy city of Makka decided to boycott Prophet Mohammed, his tribe Bani Hashim and Banu Muttalib and his followers (Momen, 1987). This boycott dictated that nobody was permitted to have any kind of relations with them. Buying and selling were not allowed and even inter-marriage was banned. This boycott lasted over two years and boycotted parties suffered great hardship until it was annulled as a result of pressure from sympathisers from within the boycotters; the Quraysh tribe (Brown, 2011).

In the more recent Arab history, boycotts began by the dawn of the 20th century as a form of resistance to the expansion of the Israeli movement in Palestine and it demonstrated itself in boycotting British and Jewish businesses. After the founding of the state of Israel in 1948, the Arab League established the Central Boycott Office (CBO) (Weiss, 2006). The CBO goal was not only to boycott Israeli goods but also all companies and individuals who dealt with or supported Israel economically.

Three kinds of boycotts were established: Primary (e.g. boycott of Israeli goods or services), Secondary (e.g. boycott of any company or individual doing business in Israel) and Tertiary (e.g. boycott of American companies). These multiple-types of boycott (micro, macro, instrumental, expressive, surrogate and non-surgeon) did hurt many local Israeli firms as well as consumers.

Arab boycott of companies dealing with Israel led to a per-unit price increase of $2343 for cars sold in Israel (Fershtman and Gandal, 1998). International companies have also taken the hit; Coca-Cola, for example, tried for many years to avoid the boycott by not doing business in Israel using the small size of the Israeli market as an excuse (Mardelli, 2010) but the pressure in the USA grew dramatically and forced it to open a bottling plant in Israel in 1968. In response, the Arab League blacklisted Coca-Cola for more than twenty years until 1991 (Tagliabue, 2002).

4.3 Motivations for Boycott

Consumers’ decision to boycott depends on many factors; some are personal factors such as the individual evaluation of the boycott operation and organisation, for example, the
perceived likelihood of boycott success or the perceived publicity of the boycott campaign (Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala, 2009). Furthermore, consumers will participate in a boycott if they believe that the boycott is likely to succeed and this believe is likely to attract a large number of participants (Sen et al., 2001; Braunsberger and Buckler, 2011; Balabanis, 2013).

Individual judgement is another factor that influences boycotting decision. Consumers judge the seriousness and awfulness of an act or behaviour committed by firms before making a decision to boycott (Klein et al., 2004; Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala, 2009).

Additionally, because boycott is associated with lower trust in institutions (Neilson, 2010); consumers see boycott participation as an intrinsic value in which they can express their rage or frustration toward targeted firm to force-change its practice and this call for change could be of pure economic value such as reducing prices (Friedman, 1999) or of social, political, environmental and ethical values (Smith, 1990). Garrett (1987) believe that the more serious and credible the accusations against a firm the more likely consumers will join the boycott.

The fundamentals in which individuals are motivated to use the marketplace for civic expression is complex (Neilson, 2010) taking boycott participation on the individual level one may participate to express outrage with targeted firm or for even a boost of self-esteem (Brewer and Brown, 1998) or to preserve the individual participant’s sense of belonging (Sen et al., 2001).

Going back to historical as well as recent consumer boycotts—and since boycott is consumer behaviour in its extreme form—it’s clear that the broader reasons for boycotting can be complex and interrelated. For the purpose of this research, consumer boycott motivations (triggers) will be divided into five broad sections: Religious, War, Economical, Cultural and finally Environmental and Ethical boycott triggers.

4.3.1 Religiously Motivated Boycott

Many studies have recognised the influence of religion on individuals’ consumer behaviour (Delener, 1990; Delener, 1994; Essoo and Dibb, 2004; Al-Hyari et al., 2012). Religious animosity is defined as an individual’s intolerance and hostility toward another individual or nation because of religious differences (Kalliny and Lemaster, 2005). The consumption
habits of individuals are influenced to some extent by the level of their religiosity (Salzman, 2008); this approach has been embraced earlier by McMurry (1978) who believed in the influence of religion on individuals.

Hirschman (1983) argued that individuals belonging to a particular religious group could have a similar rationale that may influence their behaviour in comparison to groups of other faiths. For example, Wiebe and Fleck (1980) found that highly religious individuals are more disciplined and responsible in their behaviour and this can be used to understand people’s consumption behaviour and, therefore, their decision to boycott. McNichols (1985) found significant correlations between the strength of individuals’ religious orientation and their attitude toward the ethicality of different questionable behaviours.

Ili-Salsabila and Abdul-Talib (2012) argues that animosity is a universal cause by nature but at the same time unique to certain circumstances due to the fact that Muslim population is scattered worldwide and, therefore, any act that is considered offensive by Muslims can trigger religious animosity whether this act is made by business firms or government.

Religious individuals tend to consider attacks on religious beliefs not only very stressful but also threatening (Swimberghe et al., 2009); Jerry Springer the Opera in the UK was boycotted by some Christians and its DVD was withdrawn from Woolworths and Sainsbury because it portrayed Jesus as a homosexual (BBC, 2005).

Moreover, individuals who hold religious animosity against a certain country are more likely to refrain from buying products of that country (Kalliny and Lemaster, 2005). Despite the fact that Muslims make up one-third of the world’s population, Al-Hyari et al. (2012) argue that there are limited number of attempts to construct a conceptual model for Muslim consumers behaviour toward foreign products, therefore, the development of such a model would come in handy as Kalliny and Lemaster (2005) think that foreign firms were targeted during the conflict in Iraq not only because of war or cultural animosity but also due religious animosity between the USA and the Muslims of Iraq.

This also means that religious animosity can lead not only to boycott but also to violence, a recent example of that was the violence that was triggered as a result of releasing the *Innocence of Muslims* film trailer in September 2012 on YouTube; Nineteen people died in Pakistan, three American diplomats killed in Libya, the American Embassy attacked in
Egypt and thousands demonstrated in Bangladesh setting a symbolic coffin for President Obama on fire (The New York Times, 2012).

Therefore, religious animosity that may trigger boycott is a result of an attack by a firm (micro-boycotting) or by a government (macro-boycotting) on a consumer’s fundamental belief system and that explains why consumer boycott triggered by religious animosity is more effective and has a longer lasting result than other animosities (Abosag and de Villegas, 2011).

4.3.2 Economically Motivated Boycott

Economic events can considerably form consumer animosity against a certain country (Matić and Puh, 2001), as it is a result of commerce and political dealings between two countries (Klein et al., 1998). As a result of economic crises, consumers from a particular country may dislike products from another country, an example of economic animosity is the Asian economic crisis in 1997, Ang et al. (2004) think that this crisis may have caused animosity towards countries that are thought to have had a hand in causing it.

Economic sanctions are another cause of economic animosity; economic sanctions against Syria, Korea, and Iran may be viewed by many citizens of these countries as a hit against their economic progress and therefore, may impact on their purchasing intentions and ultimately trigger boycott action.

4.3.3 War as Motivation for Boycott

War or military conflict plays a significant role in causing animosity, Shoham et al. (2006) have studied the impact of the on-going conflict between Arab and Jewish Israelis on Jewish Israeli consumer behaviour, and they found that animosity caused by this conflict has negatively impacted on Jewish Israelis’ willingness to buy products produced by Arabs.

On the other hand animosity harbour by Arabs in many Arabic countries toward Israel as a result of its military action against Palestine has led to the establishment of Central Boycott Office which maintains a collective, national and macro-boycott of goods produced by Israel (Weiss, 2006).
4.3.4 Culturally Motivated Boycott

Culture influences individuals purchasing behaviour, animosity is a consumer behaviour that can potentially lead to boycott, cultural animosity is defined by (Kalliny and Lemaster, 2005, p. 20) as “one's intolerance of and antipathy toward another person, country or nation because of cultural differences” and only counts for one dimension of consumer anisomisties that can lead to boycott and like economic, religious and war animosity is a threat to firms operating internationally, simply because it does according to Klein et al. (1998) and Nijssen and Douglas (2004) have an effect on consumers' purchasing intentions.

Kalliny and Lemaster (2005) also argue that if cultural or political differences can lead to war, it is then possible for cultural animosity to impact on how overseas businesses are viewed and evaluated. In other words, if this kind of animosity can cause armed conflict between two nations it may lead to boycott as well.

Cultural and political divide between the West and Arab is widening, this divide is termed according to Darrat (2011, p. 6) the “Clash of Civilisation”. Darrat argues that the low ranking of American products compared to German, British or even Swedish products is a result of profound resentment toward American foreign policy, and this animosity is a clear example of national animosity as termed by Ang et al. (2004) in the Arab world toward the USA.

Al-Hyari et al. (2012) argue that the nature of Arab culture is very collective; this means it can potentially affect their purchasing intentions or choices either through friends or family circle. However, a conflicting view came from Darrat (2011, p. 11) who studied the effect of cultural animosity on Arab consumers purchase intention and found that “Middle Eastern consumers’ strong negative beliefs about US foreign policy...may not have effect on purchasing behaviour”, he also suggested that “consumers group beliefs and values do not necessarily impact their actual purchase intention” (Darrat, 2011, p. 11). Therefore, understanding the level of cultural animosity of the country these international organisations doing or intending to do business with is an important factor in their success (Kalliny and Lemaster, 2005).
4.3.5 Environmentally and Ethically Motivated Boycott

Activist groups are becoming more sophisticated in organising boycott actions (John and Klein, 2003). Their strategies whether in the form of protest or boycott can also influence consumers purchasing behaviour (Lenox and Eesley, 2009).

There are numerous examples of boycotts that were motivated by environmental and ethical violations committed by business firms or countries; the Australian boycott of French products as a result of France’s nuclear testing activities in the Pacific is one example, Nestle’s aggressive baby formula advertisements in third world countries that were deemed unethical by activist groups is another example, the firm’s action sparked a boycott campaign that lasted for years and cost Nestle dearly (Boyd, 2012).

Figure 4.3 Motivations for boycott

Figure 4.3 above presents the various motivations for boycotting and the scholars who contributed to this segmentation, whereas, Table 4-2 below presents a list of boycott campaigns that were identified from the literature review; it shows the various motives that sparked these boycotts, the location and duration of each of these boycott campaigns.

Table 4-2 List of well-known boycott campaigns (Al Serhan and Boukrami 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycott</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Motive</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makkans tribes boycott of the Hashemites (Prophet Mohammed and his tribe)</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2 years (617-618)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp duty act boycott</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1 year (1774-1775)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boycott of Austrian Gambling and tobacco products by the Milanese

- **Country**: Europe
- **Category**: Political
- **Duration**: 3 months (1848) boycott then popular uprising which led to liberation of Lombard and Venetic territory from the Austrian

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycott Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish Land League (Mr. Charles Boycott) boycott</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Prolonged campaign from 1870s-1890s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian Tobacco Protests</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1890-1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab League boycott</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Religious &amp; War</td>
<td>1948 on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery bus boycott</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>1955-1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Apartheid Boycott</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>1960s-1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestlé boycott</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>1977- on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish products boycott</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks boycott</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Conclusions

People participate in boycotting campaigns for several reasons and their participation level is influenced by many factors; ultimately a boycott is a consumer behaviour at its extreme level and, therefore, it remains complex phenomena and difficult to predict.

Literature review on consumer boycotts suggests a number of conclusions that are worth considering; firstly, consumer boycott poses a serious risk to business organisations, secondly, the advancement in social media and communication technology has made it easier for boycott campaigns to gain momentum from the boycotters’ perspective and made it harder for business firms as well as countries (e.g. Denmark) to deal with. Thirdly, boycott is motivated by different reasons Table 3 and Figure 7, and comes in different forms, Figure 6, nonetheless, whatever form it comes in it can potentially cost targeted organisations money, reputation and market share.

Due to the Prophet Mohammed cartoon crisis the Danish company, Arla Foods saw its sales decline to zero in many Arab countries in 2006 and it lost millions of dollars and market share and as a result, it took the company years to recover 70% of its market share (Abosag, 2010). This was confirmed by Arla’s spokesman Louis Honore, who stated: “We have built up our business in the Middle East countries for forty years, and have had production in Saudi Arabia for twenty years, and then within five days or so this is all in ruins” (BBC, 2006).
A more recent example is the Starbucks boycott in 2013 where a boycott action forced the company to pay millions of pounds to the UK’s Revenue and Customs Office (HMRC). Not only that, the review also confirms that boycott can be costly for targeted organisations not only in financial terms, in fact it can cause fundamental changes to the boycotted target; 1848 Milanese tobacco boycotts led to the declaration of independence of Milan and Venice in Italy (Waller, 1990) and Montgomery Bus Boycott marked the beginning of civil rights movement action for African Americans.

For transnationals, understanding, let alone predicting their boycotting behaviour remains an understudied territory, therefore, it can be argued that any contribution to explore this ever-increasing consumer segment would add a valuable contribution to the existing consumer boycott literature.
Chapter 5 Consumer Brand Loyalty

In this chapter, the first section presents an introduction to the literature on consumer brand loyalty, which is then followed by an in-depth literature review of the determinants of brand loyalty. It also provides an evaluation of the relevant literature on brand loyalty and in the last section discusses the final conclusions and gaps in the literature based on the discussion of transnational consumers in Chapter 3 and consumer boycott in Chapter 4.

5.1 Introduction

A brand according to Kotler et al. (1999, p.571) is a “name, term, sign, symbol or design or a combination of these intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or a group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors”. This differentiation aims to convey and deliver certain brand attributes to buyers such as value or quality. Brand differentiation by business organisations is essential for any marketing strategy, a strategy that needs to consider the cultural, political, and religious dimensions of the region they sell to.

The brand concept according to Torelli et al. (2012) reflects the tangible aspects such as what it does and the intangible aspects such as what people think of it. Hence, satisfied consumers are more likely to re-purchase the brand because their cumulative contentment, brand commitment and trust placed on the brand lead them to resist competing brand’s products or services (Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala, 2009).

Brands are a key tool for marketers to create a product differentiation (Kotler and Gertner, 2002). Brands also have human-like characteristics and personality reflecting characteristics such as values, power, tradition, security or achievement; they speak for the user (Kotler and Gertner, 2002; Torelli et al., 2012) and, therefore, relating these values to consumers may form a consumer preference over other brands.

Branding offers organisations many advantages in this competitive world; it helps protect them from competition, offers them better understanding when designing a marketing strategy and also helps in attracting loyal customers (Datta, 2003).

Dick and Basu (1994, p. 102) defined customer loyalty as “a relationship between relative attitude and repeat patronage”. Salegna and Fazel (2011, p. 43) defined brand loyalty as
“commitment, behavioural intent and behaviour to repurchase a particular brand”. Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) argued that brand loyalty has been viewed from three dimensions; a behavioural dimension demonstrated by repeated purchases, an attitudinal dimension manifested by preference, commitment or intention to purchase and a reasoned action dimension affected by social influences that can be derived from many factors such as cultural, religious or political factors.

Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) potential drivers’ model for brand loyalty shown in Figure 5.1 consists of three drivers; consumer drivers, brand drivers and social drivers. These drivers offer a different view on how brand loyalty can be assessed and understood. These drivers were categorised as drivers that are attributed to consumers (risk aversion and variety seeking), brand drivers (brand reputation and the availability of substitute) and social drivers (social group influences and peer’s recommendations).

These drivers lead to three types of loyalty, first is a premium one that is achieved through building an emotional and habitual attachment between consumers and brands. Inertia loyalty according to the above authors is the loyalty that does not discourage consumers from buying substitute brands that could be available while making the purchasing decision. The third type of loyalty in Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) is formed as a result of financial or social motives which is the covetous loyalty.

**Figure 5.1 Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004, p. 288) potential drivers of loyalty**

![Diagram of Gounaris and Stathakopoulos's model](image)

Worthington et al. (2010) however, viewed brand loyalty from three dimensions as shown in Figure 5.2: cognitive loyalty, behavioural loyalty and emotional loyalty. Their view of the
dimensions of brand loyalty is slightly different from Gounaris and Stathakopoulos, as Worthington didn’t include the social influence on consumer brand loyalty. Cognitive loyalty is based on price, brand’s features or positive beliefs about the brand, whereas, behavioural loyalty is the psychological commitment to particular brands and finally the emotional loyalty dimension which represents the positive feelings resulting from repurchasing certain brand.

**Figure 5.2 Worthington et al. (2010) dimensions of brand loyalty (compiled by author)**

Ultimately, as mentioned earlier, consumer loyalty is a consumer behaviour that can be influenced not only by a firm’s actions, whether positive or negative but also by factors such as the consumer’s culture, political situation, religion as well as the environment.

Consequently, in the event of a boycott for particular reasons such as those mentioned above, do consumers forgive or forget brands? Chung and Beverland (2006) argue that no studies have explicitly explored the issue of how consumers forgive brands that commit wrongdoing or violate relationship norms. Will this violation drive them away from being brand-loyal whether they are micro-boycotting or macro-boycotting? For example, in the case of the French nuclear testing issue in the Pacific despite the fact that France stopped, Australians continue to avoid buying French products (Ben Mrad, 2008).

When Arla Foods lost the market lead in the Arab world in 2006 due to the Prophet Mohammed cartoon crisis, it took the company years to recover 70% of its market share (Abosag, 2010). However, contrary to the above, Darrat (2011) found that Arab consumers negative feelings against American policy in the Arab world may not have an effect on their purchasing behaviour thus, they may remain brand loyal to products that originated from America.
Micro-loyal consumers are loyal to the brand and little attention is paid to its origin, in regional or international crisis this assumption can be a great relief to other brands from a particular country, taking for example, the case of Starbucks boycott call in the Arab world, although, it was a micro-boycott to an American brand but consumers called for boycott because of the brand’s CEO remarks about the Arab world (Fisk, 2002) not because its American origin hence, other American brands were not subject to that boycott call.

Macro-loyalty, on the other hand, is when consumers are loyal to brands of a particular country, for example, buying a Mercedes Benz, home furniture or even a pen because it’s ‘Made in Germany’. Country image becoming not only a public policy matter but a source of revenue because according to Kotler and Gertner (2002) countries compete with each others and endeavour and develop sources to stay competitive and that explains why countries spend millions on advertising to attract tourists or foreign investments.

The case of the Prophet Mohammed cartoon crisis is a clear example of both macro-boycott and macro-loyalty, despite consumers’ loyalty to Danish brands (mainly dairy products), the publishing of these cartoons instigated animosity toward all brands originated from Denmark and sold in many countries including the Arab countries. Macro-loyal Arab consumers to Danish brands boycotted all products from Denmark and the country as a brand became a liability for firms originating from it, as in the case of Denmark’s largest company Arla, it lost millions of dollars and its market share lead as a result of this boycott (Abosag, 2010).

5.2 Determinants of Brand Loyalty

The business world is a competitive place and consumers have access to a large number of brands. Furthermore, this increased competition leads to erosion of a particular firm’s market share as more alternatives become available on offer in the marketplace (Kotler and Armstrong, 2008).

For most business organisations, their success relies on their capacity to sustain long-term relations with customers who buy their brands repetitively (Reinartz et al. 2005; Rust et al. 2004). Hence, keeping those customers coming back is a challenge in today’s market.

In fact, according to Shukla (2004), businesses lose half of their customers every five years. Therefore, understanding why consumers become loyal and what makes them switch to
other brands is vital in shaping any firm’s marketing strategy. This strategy should take into account not only why consumers are loyal, and why others stopped buying the brand, but also how to attract new loyal consumers and win back those who lost faith in the brand and are no longer purchasing it whether as a result of decline in quality, increase in the price or because of an action or a behaviour taken by particular firm or country that is deemed offensive by consumers from a certain religious, cultural or social background.

The main determinants of brand loyalty that were identified using existing academic literature (Allenby and Lenk, 1995; Papatla and Krishnamurthi, 1996; Datta, 2003; Ahmed et al., 2011, Nandamuri and Gowthami, 2012, Malik et al., 2012, Allender and Richards, 2012) are discussed below in order to try to link some of these factors to consumers boycott.

5.2.1 Perceived Quality

Many studies discussed the importance of perceived quality as a determinant of brand loyalty (Saliba et al., 2005, Sirgy et al., 2009, Malik et al., 2012). In fact, Sirgy et al., (2009) argued that the perceived quality of a brand has a considerable and predictive impact on consumers’ loyalty. Moreover, in their discount store retailing study, Ha and John (2009) found a strong relationship between a brand’s perceived quality and brand loyalty.

5.2.2 Price

Price influences consumer behaviour (Ahmed et al., 2011, Nandamuri and Gowthami, 2012) and organisations are under constant financial pressure arising from many factors such as material costs, taxation, labour costs that make sustaining profit margins difficult and therefore, brand re-pricing becomes necessary on a regular basis. With the price increase comes the challenge of retaining loyal customers as they differ in how much they are prepared to pay for particular brands, Jensen and Drozdenko (2008) found that consumers with brand preferences were willing to pay up to 15% premium to purchase their preferred brand.

Krishnamurthi and Raj (1991) and Yoon and Thanh (2011) confirmed the conventional wisdom that sees loyal consumer as a less sensitive to price than others; however, comparing the effect of price on consumer purchasing, Sivakumar (1997) argues that price reductions for high-quality brands encourage consumers to buy more and when these high-
quality brands increase their prices the decline in consumer purchases is less than the decline in purchase when low-quality brand raise their prices.

Despite the argument that price is not a part of the product attributes and not directly related to the performance of the brand (Datta, 2003 and Yoon and Thanh, 2011) it still represents a monetary association with the brand that may influence consumer’s loyalty in the form of what was categorised earlier as the economic boycott.

Barda and Sardianou (2010) researched consumer activism in Greece during a period of rising prices and found that 49% of the respondents responded favourably when asked if they would participate in an economic boycott.

5.2.3 Sales Promotions

Highly competitive markets force organisations to re-think their marketing strategy and employ sales promotion as a technique to win new customers, retain loyal ones and win back the once loyal customers who switched to other brands due to a variety of reasons. Blattberg and Neslin (1990) estimated that 50% of sales are generated through sales promotion. Sales promotion is being used according to Papatla and Krishnamurthi (1996) and Allender and Richards (2012) to reap higher profit margins, bring consumers’ attention to a particular brand and to influence the purchasing behaviour of the targeted audience.

Allenby and Lenk (1995) think that brand promotion adds value to the product and it influences sales during the promotion period and also has its effects on consumer repurchases that may last longer than the initial promotion.

Additionally, sales promotion is used by businesses as a strategy to connect with the communities where they operate in to offset the impact of boycott calls from angry consumers taking for example McDonald’s Egypt reaction to boycott calls by designing a menu that is tailored to local taste which included the Mc Falafel sandwich (The Telegraph, 2001) or by designing sales promotions where a certain percentage of sales is donated to good causes in the local communities (McDonalds Arabia Website).

5.2.4 Advertising
Unlike sales promotion, advertising aims to influence attitude not behaviour and therefore, its effect on consumers’ attitudes may not reap immediate results whereas sales promotion outcome can be measured by observing the increase of particular brand sales. Advertisement is also influential on brand switching as Allenby and Lenk (1995) found that in-store displays and advertisements were as influential on consumer brand-switching as a 15% - 30% price drop. Moreover, Hong-Youl Ha (2011, p. 687) stated that advertising is key to “enhancing brand loyalty indirectly via influencing store image, satisfaction and perceived quality”.

From a boycotted firm’s point of view, advertising can be used not only to introduce or promote brands and influence attitude but also it is used to fight back when boycott action becomes hard to ignore or to deny rumours.

Arla Foods advertised in twenty-five Arab newspapers denouncing the publishing of the caricatures of the Prophet Mohammad and distancing itself from it (Knudsen et al., 2008) and despite all advertising efforts, it took Arla Foods years to regain 70% of its market share in the region (Abosag, 2010). This leads to arguing the effectiveness of advertising when firms face a similar type of consumer boycott.

Advertising is one the component of marketing strategy, localising this essential component is an important factor in delivering the intended message, there are clear religious and cultural differences between East and West; sexy advertising is considered offensive by Muslims and as mentioned earlier a firm's offensive action can trigger a boycott.

However, in the West, Lysonski (2005) argues that boycotting does not seem to be the main consequence of sexy advertising. But from both religious and cultural perspectives and due to the conservative religious nature of the Arab Muslim societies, it could be safe to argue that David Beckham’s H&M underwear advertisement would stand little chance of appearing on an Arab TV or newspaper for now at least.

5.2.5 Brand Names

Brands are used to distinguish firms’ products or services (Hishamuddin et al., 2006 and Nguyen et al., 2011). Businesses spend billions on advertising to reinforce their brands in marketplace. Brand marketing results in quicker brand recognition and can influence
consumer behaviours that may lead to purchase decisions. Brand marketing also leads to brand loyalty that in turn leads to greater market share (Chaudhuri and Morris, 2001 and Datta, 2003).

Brands also stimulate a positive emotional reaction on consumers as a result of its use (Chaudhuri and Morris, 2001). Furthermore, brand awareness plays an important role while deciding to purchase a particular product and may impact on the consumers' evaluation of perceived risk (Muhammad et al., 2013).

Brands also can fuel resentment; taking, for example, American brands, which have been perceived as cultural imperialism enforcement and resulted in a backlash against American brands not only in the Muslim world but Western Europe too and is also pushing other international consumers away from these brands (Quelch, 2003). Brand names, therefore, should be local, not universal (Alhabeeb, 2005) and that is why Coca-Cola's Douglas Daft announced the company's 'think local, act local' marketing strategy (Quelch, 2003).

5.2.6 Demographics

As mentioned earlier, a consumer purchasing decision is a process that can be influenced by many demographics and socioeconomic factors such cultural, social, personal and psychological factors (Ma et al., 2012; Darrat, 2011; Grant et al., 2007). The personal factors are the demographics of a particular consumer such as age, gender, ethnicity, religion and marital status.

Nandamuri and Gowthami (2012) found that demographics like age, education, income and occupation influence consumers purchasing intentions. Age-wise, a study by (Edelman, 2010) on 3,100 participants born between 1980-1995 found that they were considerably brand loyal as 70% of participants stated that once they find a brand they like, they would keep coming back to it.

From a Muslim population perspective, the growth in Muslim population increases the demand for brands that are Halal (Razali, 2015). Hence, many Muslims would opt for Halal food stores when buying meat for example and therefore, they may be loyal to certain brands that cater for their shopping needs. Ethnicity also influences brand loyalty; Hispanic consumers are loyal to Goya brand (Datta, 2003).
5.2.7 Brand Performance and Satisfaction

The quality management’s key aim is to satisfy consumers and win their loyalty. Since brand performance is linked positively to consumer satisfaction (Datta, 2003), many companies offer customers the chance to evaluate the quality and performance of its brands (Selnes, 1993).

Satisfaction leads to trust in the brand (Alhabeeb, 2005) and according to Alhabeeb, brand trustworthiness means being operationally competent in serving consumers, whereas, operational benevolence means putting consumers’ interests first before the firm’s self-interest and finally, problem-solving orientation is by listening to them and offering solutions to their problems.

Trust leads to loyalty (Chaudhuri and Morris, 2001) and consumers who don’t trust the brand are unlikely to commit to a relationship with it (Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala, 2009), additionally, in the event of boycott the latter author argues that trust in the brand should limit the effect of consumers’ boycott calls. However, Shukla (2004) suggested that consumers’ satisfaction cannot guarantee their loyalty or commitment to particular brands.

5.2.8 Level of Involvement

Involvement is a consumer’s concern and contribution to a brand. According to Park and Young (1983) involvement is the interest intensity that a particular consumer shows toward a brand, this also means that marketers can use the level of involvement to assess the significance of certain brands to the consumer (Guthrie and Kim, 2009).

Involvement is linked to satisfaction (Shukla, 2004). This involvement according to Hishamuddin et al. (2006) has a substantial influence on brand loyalty. Long-Yi and Chen (2006) also found that involvement has a considerable positive influence on purchase behaviour.

5.2.9 Risk Aversion

A risk is the uncertainty of outcome and consequences severity (Matzler et al., 2008). Risk-aversion explains why consumers may repurchase the same brand again to reduce risk. It can be financial, related to brand performance or social risk and each of them can influence consumer-buying behaviour.
Additionally, an unfavourable attitude by peers or social group toward a brand may influence others to refrain from purchasing that brand to reduce social risk (Gounaris and Stathakopulos, 2004).

5.2.10 Variety Seeking

Hoyer and Ridgway (1984, p. 115) defined variety seeking as “the desire for a new and novel stimulus”. Others such as Kahn et al. (1986) and Bawa (1990) argued that variety seeking is a mere buying of variety of brands. However, both definitions above seemed too simplistic to define complex consumer behaviour such as variety seeking. A more inclusive definition came from Beldona et al. (2010) as they saw variety seeking as a tendency of consumers to look for diversity in their buying decisions.

Hence, variety seeking is an act of exploratory behaviour that encourages consumers to seek new varieties. According to Shirin and Puth (2011, p. 11902), this behaviour results from the “discrepancy which may exist between the actual stimulation level that an individual experiences, and the optimum stimulation level that such individual possesses under particular circumstances”.

5.2.11 Brand Usage History

Consumers differentiate a product by its name through the usage of the brand (Hishamuddin et al., 2006). Despite the fact that many authors like Bird et al. (1970), Datta (2003) and Romaniuk et al. (2012) mention brand usage as a determinant for brand loyalty, Shukla (2004) argues that brand usage level has no direct effect on consumers’ brand switching behaviour.

5.3 Brand Loyalty Review Conclusions

Loyal customers are an asset to any business organisation. This review has the identified the main determinants that influence brand loyalty such as quality, price, sales promotion, advertising, brand names, variety seeking, demographics, product performance and satisfaction, the level of involvement, risk aversion and brand usage history.

The importance of this review can, to some extent, be summed up by a quote taken from Reichheld et al. (2000, p. 135) where they argued:
Loyalty initiates a series of second order economic effects which cascade through a business system as follows:

1. Revenues and market share grow as the best customers are swept into the company’s book of business, building repeat sales and referrals.
2. Costs shrink as the expense of acquiring and serving new customers and replacing old ones declines.
3. Employee retention increases because job pride and job satisfaction increase, in turn creating a loop that reinforces customer retention through familiarity and better service to the customers. Increased productivity results from increasing employee tenure.

This review also suggests that loyalty as a behaviour is an understudied area when it comes to transnational consumers, and that their loyalty behaviour in this regard is as unclear as their boycotting behaviour which is the focus of this research.

The following and the final section of this chapter provides the final conclusions based on the conducted literature review of transnational consumers, consumer boycott and brand loyalty literature that was presented in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. It also identifies the gaps in the reviewed literature which this research is aiming to address and fill.

5.4 Final Conclusions and Gaps in the Literature

Despite transnational groups importance as an ever-growing consumer segment, the marketing literature currently available on boycotting and loyalty behaviour have not explored the impact of boycotting on the loyalty behaviour of this important emerging segment.

After reviewing the relevant literature, a number of gaps have been identified in relation to this research. Despite the fact that there are numerous studies on consumer boycott such as Garrett, 1987; Friedman, 1999; John and Klein, 2003; Heijnen and van der Made, 2009; Al-Hyari et al., 2012) to name few, no studies have yet connected boycott to brand loyalty. Hence, there is a lack in our understanding of the impact of boycott action on consumer brand loyalty.
The review also suggests a clear gap not only in relation to the impact of the religiously motivated consumers’ boycott on consumer brand loyalty, in general, but also on transnational consumers’ loyalty behaviour too.

Moreover, much of the boycott literature has been conducted in a Western setting taking for example (Garrett, 1987; Friedman, 1999; John and Klein, 2003; Klein et al., 2004; Delacote, 2006; Heijnen and van der Made, 2009; Neilson, 2010), and the literature that did study boycotts in the Arab world and among Arabs such as (Knudsen et al., 2008; Jensen, 2008; Maher and Mady, 2010; Abosag, 2010; Al-Hyari et al., 2012; Ili-Salsabila and Abdul-Talib, 2012) did not relate boycott to brand loyalty.

Additionally, the existing literature suggested that consumer boycotts can be triggered by factors such religious, war, economic, cultural or environmental and ethical factors, however, no research has attempted yet to empirically test the most influential factors that contribute to boycotting choice; for example, would a religiously motivated boycott be more damaging to targeted organisations than an economic or politically motivated boycott? Finding the answer to this question is essential as the review suggests that most boycott campaigns that attracted Arabs were found to be either motivated by religion (e.g. Mohammed cartoon crisis) or war (e.g. Arab-Israel conflict).

The above also raises a question as to whether a particular brand boycott duration can be predicted as the literature review showed that some consumer boycotts lasted months, others for years and many went unnoticed and failed to attract consumer participation. It is evident that the literature review shows a clear lack of focus on this area.

Moreover, there is no single study yet about the boycotting or loyalty behaviour of London’s transnational Arabs. Therefore, this research aimed to produce valuable analyses of why this consumers segment boycott and how boycott impacts on their brand loyalty.
Chapter 6 Research Methodology: Concepts and Research Questions

The methodology adopted in this study is explained in Chapters 6 and 7. The research questions and conceptual model are presented and discussed in this chapter. The methodology, instruments choice, sampling, pilot study and ethical concerns along with limitations are presented in Chapter 7.

6.1 Research Questions

After addressing the gaps in the boycott and brand loyalty literature, this research aims to understand the impact of consumer boycotts on brand loyalty amongst transnational Arab population in London. In other words, what is the effect of a boycott action on those consumers’ brand loyalty?

The propositions of this research can be listed in the form of the following questions:

- What are the characteristics of the boycotting population?
- What determines this segment’s brand loyalty?
- How does a religiously motivated consumer boycott impact on the brand loyalty of this transnational segment?

Each of these research questions has been derived from the literature review and the identified gaps were taken into consideration while formulating these questions. The following sections address the justifications for formulating these research questions.

6.1.1 What are the Characteristics of Boycoters?

Consumer behaviour is part of human behaviour that is concerned with buying/boycotting and consuming a product or a service. Klein et al. (2004) argued that boycotting behaviour has intrinsic moral characteristics that reflect on boycotters’ evaluation of the morality of the behaviour of the targeted party.

In this first research question, the aim is to explore several variables that may influence boycotting characteristics of the population sample; hence, a number of questions were put forward to selected participants that had been formulated using some of the variables Klein et al. (2004) used. Other variables were added following the comprehensive literature review to examine the effect of various variables on those consumers’ boycotting
characteristics. These questions include (1) demographics and socioeconomic, (2) knowledge of targeted brands, (3) knowledge of boycott, (4) readiness to sacrifice and questions related to (5) connectedness and social capital and (6) assessing the impact of social pressure.

Demographic and socioeconomic variables were included in both the face-to-face interviews (see Appendix 2, Interview Schedule and Table no. 7.3 ) and the online questionnaire (see Appendix 2, Q no. 8 of the online survey) because they have long history in marketing research and they influence brand choice (Kalyanam and Putler, 1997), these variables were regularly used by official UK population surveys such as the Office of National Statistics surveys (2007, 2010 and 2011c) and the Labour Force Survey (2013). Therefore, income, marital status, number of children, educational level, occupation, age, gender, and country of origin of transnational Arabs in London and their consumer attitudes toward boycott are part of this question’s structure.

However, for the face-to-face interviews, demographic and socioeconomic questions were asked at the end of the interview due to issues related to sensitivity (e.g. age, income, educational level) therefore, it was left to the end where the rapport is believed to be stronger with each participant.

Consumer knowledge of particular company or brand can impact on their reaction toward its products (Brown and Dacin, 1997). Moreover, brand awareness plays an important role while purchasing a particular brand and may impact on the consumers’ evaluation of perceived risk (Muhammad et al., 2013).

The above also applies to consumers’ knowledge of boycotts and as Klein et al. (2004) rightly suggested that despite the low awareness for many boycott campaigns, targeted firms should perceive these campaigns as a warning signal and explore the allegedly questionable conduct that triggered such action. Therefore, assessing knowledge of a particular boycott is seen as an important variable that can enhance our understanding of the boycotting characteristics of the targeted sample population.

As for consumers’ readiness to sacrifice, by boycotting, consumers aim to achieve either a change in targeted company’s behaviour (e.g. make a change in its marketing mix) or a comprehensive change in the whole system (Garrett 1987, Friedman 1991). However, this
behaviour comes at a cost, not necessarily in monetary terms but as Klein et al. (2004) suggested that boycotting requires a sacrifice from the consumer side; this can be by switching to alternative brands if substitutes are readily available or complete abstention from buying a particular brand.

Consumers’ connectedness is viewed by Sirkeci (2013) as an important variable that can impact on consumers’ behaviour since individuals around the world are connected by a variety of means such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn along with many more platforms and through these they can instantly share information. In fact, Sirkeci asserts that consumers through their connectedness, despite geographical distance, can “mobilise campaigns, petitions and even boycott” (Sirkeci 2013, p. 25).

Participants’ social capital questions were adapted from Klein et al. (2004) as examining participants’ social capital and level of connectedness is believed to be a key factor when assessing the influence of these aspects on the characteristics of the targeted population.

Moreover, evaluating the importance of social pressure on the success of a particular boycott campaign is recognised in the boycott literature (Klein et al., 2004; Friedman 1999; Smith 1990; Garrett 1987). Therefore, both the face-to-face interviews and online surveys included questions, which attempt to evaluate and assess the impact of this pressure on participants. Hence, examining its impact on the targeted population's boycotting characteristics is thought to offer a deeper understanding of this segment of the UK’s transnational population.

The study by Klein et al. (2004) pointed out the issue of its result generalisation and recommended future research on boycotts in other countries and Husted et al. (1996) argued that individuals from different countries operate at different levels of moral reasoning.

The Klein et al. (2004) study also did not differentiate between transnational and non-transnational consumers while collecting data, which is a limitation considering Sirkeci’s (2013) definition of transnationals.

Therefore, transnationality-related factors such as the factors that may influence boycott participation or even brand loyalty were also explored including country of origin, motivation to come to the UK, duration of stay, family ties and the impact of
transnationality on participation decision. Hence, the questions used in the face-to-face interviews and the online questionnaires were adapted from official UK population surveys such the Labour Force Survey (2013) and academic authors such as Sirkeci (2013).

Finally, determining not only the characteristics of an understudied segment of the UK’s consumers but also their boycotting behaviour characteristics is perceived to be a positive contribution to transnational marketing literature.

**6.1.2 What are the Determinants of London Arabs brand loyalty?**

The business world is a more competitive place thanks to globalisation, communication technologies and social media platforms that has provided consumers with increased access to a wide variety of brands.

According to Shukla (2004), businesses lose half of their customers every five years. Leelakulthanit and Hongcharu (2011, p.2) rightfully say, “*A faithful customer will generate more income than a customer that abandons the relationship*”. A loyal customer is also likely to accept paying a higher price for the brand, be less price-sensitive and less expensive too (Gounaris and Stathakopoulos, 2004; Shukla, 2004; Hu, 2011). Thus, loyal customers are a valuable asset for any business organisation.

In this second question, the study aims to explore Arab consumers’ brand loyalty behaviour to investigate which factors have the most impact on their brand loyalty. The marketing literature has identified the main determinants which influence brand loyalty such as price, sales promotion, advertising, brand names, demographics, product performance and satisfaction, level of involvement, risk aversion and brand usage history (Datta, 2003; Allenby and Lenk, 1995; Barda and Sardianou, 2010; Allender and Richards, 2012).

The Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) potential drivers model for brand loyalty that was introduced in Chapter 5 (see Figure 5.1) consists of three drivers; consumer drivers, brand drivers and social drivers have been adapted and developed further by adding new proxies to each of their model sections as seen in Figure 6.1, these proxies were adapted from many studies including Datta (2003), Klein et al. (2004) and Sirkeci (2013).
6.1.3 How does a Religiously Motivated Consumer Boycott Impact on Brand Loyalty

What makes this research question unique is that it aims to explore not only the religiosity of participants who are of an Arab origin, a mostly Muslim minority and living in a Non-Arab and Non-Muslim country but also aims to investigate how those participants’ boycott action particularly their boycott of Danish brands, which is a religiously motivated boycott, impacts on their brand loyalty toward this country’s brands.

For this study, it is believed that examining participants’ religiosity (both commitment and behaviour) is an important factor in understanding the effect of their religiosity level not only on their decision to boycott but also most importantly on their brand loyalty behaviour toward a particular brand.

6.1.3.1 Exploring Religiosity

The interest in the impact of religion and religiosity is increasing, see, for example (Al-Khalifah; 1994; Sood and Nasu, 1995; Wilde and Joseph, 1997; Worthington et al., 2003; Mokhlis, 2006; Tiliouine and Belgoumidi, 2009; Swimberghe et al., 2011). Many scales and models were developed, as we will see later in this research, attempting to assess religiosity and its impact on consumption and consumers’ behaviour. However, Khraim
(2010) believes that the function of religion as a variable in consumer behaviour models is still not well recognised.

Moreover, Krauss et al. (2007, p. 151) stated, “Poll data on religious behaviour and practice are notoriously unreliable” hence, assessing the spiritual side of the participants is expected to be difficult.

No consensus has yet been reached amongst researchers relating to the definitions of religion or religiosity; the available definitions are either confusing or unclear (Emmons and Paloutzian, 2003; Hill et al., 2000). Khraim (2010, p. 56) also argued that “there is no consensus among experts as to the number of dimensions that make up the religiosity construct”. It is also suggested that researchers differ to some extent in their definition of religiosity (Cem et al., 2004) and this might be due to what Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1997, p. 18) said when they described religiosity as a “continuous rather than a discrete variable”.

Vitel (2009, p. 602) defined religiosity as “the degree to which an individual is a religious person apart from his/her particular religious beliefs and the way that those beliefs are manifested”. However, this is a generic definition and it is hard to see how it can apply to believers of other faith groups such as Muslims, Hindus or Jewish who have different beliefs, social norms, religious practices and unique values (Cohen, 2009).

Religiosity according to O’Connell (1975) consists of different elements of religion including belief, practice, knowledge, experience and the effects of those elements on daily activities and these elements were used by McDaniel and Burnett (1990) when they defined religiosity as “a belief in God accompanied by a commitment to follow principles believed to be set by God”.

Perhaps the McDaniel and Burnett perspective of religiosity is more inclusive where they saw religiosity as one’s belief in God and a commitment, where belief is an intrinsic value and commitment is extrinsic value that comes in form of actions religious people do that is essentially the practical side of their intrinsic values, for example, attending prayers at Church, Masjid or Temple.

The challenge from an Islamic perspective, however, is that both belief (i.e. intrinsic values) and practice (i.e. extrinsic values) are inseparable and are viewed jointly as an Islamic
religious obligation and when they are together they indicate a good religiously level. For example, secular Muslims and devoted Muslims may show similar level of Islamic belief but may be different when assessing other characteristics of religiosity from an Islamic point of view; both may hold same religious beliefs but one would practice these beliefs and the other wouldn’t.

After reviewing what the literature had to say about religiosity definition, it becomes clear that religiosity is hard to assess despite many attempts by many scholars. Jones (2005, p. 8) argued, “There is a very wide spectrum of opinions as to the most serviceable definitions of religion”. And this is not only due to the very wide spectrum or opinion about it only but also due to the difficulty in gathering data from consumers relating to their religious beliefs and how they apply their belief in their daily life which is considered not only personal but also, it is regarded as confidential information to many.

The definition of Muslim religiosity this research suggests is taken from the Muslim holy book, the Quraan, and it encompasses both sides of the formula i.e. intrinsic values and practice i.e. extrinsic values; A religious person can be defined as being someone who believes in God and practises the testimony of faith, perform prayers, give Zakat, fast in Ramadan, and makes the Hajj pilgrimage to Makkah once in a lifetime when and if able to do so.

It is also worth visiting the work of many scholars who have attempted to develop scales to measure the various components or often called dimensions or domains of religiosity. Some scales were based on Christian believers such as Lenski (1961), Allport and Ross (1967), King (1967), Himmelfarb (1975), Hill and Hood (1999) to name a few. Vitell (2009) argues that the Allport and Ross (1967) Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) is widely used scale in business literature. This scale puts forward two dimensions of religiosity, extrinsic (i.e. religious behaviours) and an intrinsic dimension (i.e. spiritual objectives).

Many other scholars also (both Muslims and Non-Muslims) tried to measure and explore religiosity from an Islamic perspective such as Al-Khalifah (1994), Wilde and Joseph (1997) who developed a Muslim Attitudes Towards Religion Scale (MARS) and Tiliouine and Belgoumidi (2009) who introduced their Comprehensive Measure of Islamic Religiosity
CMIR) which was applied to a sample of 495 Muslim students (330 females, and 165 males) from Algeria.

CMIR scale, table 6-1 involves four domains namely, Religious Belief, Religious Practice, Religious Altruism and Religious Enrichment domain and is thought by Saleh (2012) to be more appropriate than conventional scales when measuring Muslims religiosity.

However, after reviewing Tiliouine and Belgoumidi’s CMIR model despite its comprehensiveness to a large extent in incorporating behavioural and spiritual aspects of Islamic teachings, it seems that their scale design was neither driven by the desire to understand consumption behaviour nor was intended to assess religiosity from transnationals perspective. Additionally, the CMIR model had been developed and tested on Algerian students in Algeria, which is an Arab and a Muslim country. Therefore, their CMIR scale may not be the best suited for the purpose of this study.

**Table 6-1 Comprehensive measure of Islamic religiosity- CMIR (Tiliouine and Belgoumidi, 2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Religious domains</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | Religious Belief - (17 items) | 1. I believe in God  
2. Prophets’ life stories inspire me in my life  
3. Life events strengthen my belief in Destiny  
4. Rewards of Paradise encourage me to do good doings  
5. Existence of Hell leads me to avoid wrong-doings  
6. I often forget the punishment of Hell  
7. I often remember the Judgment Day  
8. I believe in Apocalypse Signals  
9. I love the Prophet Mohammed  
10. I take the Prophet as a model in life  
11. The Prophet Companions’ way of life inspires me  
12. I rely on God’s help in hard times  
13. I see marriage as a religious duty  
14. I fear all that offend God  
15. I feel discomfort when missing worship time (such as prayers)  
16. Qur’an relieves pain and disease  
17. Feel God’s presence on my side |
| 2.  | Religious Practice - (20 items) | 1. Dress in accordance with religion  
2. Physical apparel (hair style…) in accordance with religion  
3. Say Shahada before going to sleep  
4. Imitate the Sunna in food and drinks taking  
5. All possessions Halal (acquire properties in a religiously legal way)  
6. I take Alcoholic drinks for fun  
7. I do not take others’ property without permission even close relationships  
8. Ask God’s pardon for wrong sayings or lies  
9. Do not gamble even for fun  
10. Choose my words in order not to be impious (bad)  
11. Recite some traditional prayers  
12. Avoid sexual relationships out of marriage  
13. Begin work on the name of God  
14. Average no. of voluntary prayers  
15. Average no. of prayers on time  
16. Committed to prayers in groups or Mosque  
17. Weekly hours studying Koran  
18. Voluntary fasting other than Ramadan  
19. Mecca pilgrimage |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religious Altruism - (12 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1. Obedient to parents (for religious reasons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pay visits to relatives as a religious duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Avoid mixing with opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Avoid swearing by God’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Prefer to deal with people whose religious commitment high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Care about neighbours and their wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Advise others to do good and avoid sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Give away Charity as religious duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Tolerate others for God’s sake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. „Spy” others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Greeting others even strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Help people in their difficulties for God’s sake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religious Enrichment - (11 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. Read/Listen to Prophets’ biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Watch/ listen or attend religious meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Read/ listen to Koran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Recite some Koranic verses when beginning work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Try to learn by heart some Koranic verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Read Prophet’s Sayings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Avoid listening to songs written in impious words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Weekly time watch/read/listen religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Seek relief from God when anxious/sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Ask for advice or read religious books in order to clarify matters in my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Enjoy listening to Koran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, scholars such as Wilkes et al. (1986), Hill and Hood (1999) and Worthington et al. (2003) have acknowledged two main constructs to measure individuals’ religiosity; religious affiliation and religious commitment and these two domains were adopted while formulating the interview questions.

The Wilkes et al. (1986) scale of religiosity measured four items; mosque, church or temple attendance, the importance of religious values in participants life, self-assessment of religiousness from participants point of view and the importance of religious beliefs. These items also were used while developing the face-to-face interviews.

Wilkes et al., (1986) found that religiously committed consumers are more likely to favour domestic brands. On the contrary, Sood and Nasu (1995) and Mokhlis (2006) found that highly religious consumers were more flexible to purchase foreign brands when compared to less religious individuals. This example of conflicting findings clearly shows that religiosity is a complex and multi-dimensional construct. Therefore, the Khraim (2010) and Saleh (2012) argument relating to the difficulty of creating a good measurement of Islamic religiosity remains a valid argument.

Swimberghe et al. (2011) developed a model shown in Figure 6.2 relating to consumer’s judgement of a seller’s potentially religious objectionable business decision. Their model
tried to assess the impact of religion on consumers’ brand judgement and brand loyalty intentions that may potentially lead to boycotting.

Figure 6.2 The impact of religious commitment on loyalty intentions (Swimberghe et al., 2011, p. 586)

Understanding Society (2012) is a UK organisation that carries out The UK Household Longitudinal Study. They collect statistics on religion as part of their work and asked questions related to religion: What religion respondents were brought up in, How often, if at all, do participants attend religious services or meetings? These questions were incorporated within this research’s face-to-face interviews.

6.2 Conceptual Model

The goals of this research are to shed light on boycotting behaviour and its impact on brand loyalty. Both boycott and brand loyalty are of a behavioural nature and therefore, to construct a conceptual model that will assist in understanding this behaviour, its determinants and how it develops from non-existence to intentions then to decision might be best explained by using relevant variables, namely the demographic factors referred to as social factors from the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) as seen in Figure 6.3 when developing not only the model itself but also this project’s research methodology.

This view is shared by authors such as Sommer (2011) and Dawkins (2005) who both also believe that TPB is a powerful tool in explaining human behaviour. TPB was proposed by Acek Ajzen in 1985 and assumes that humans do behave sensibly. According to Ming-Shen (2007) TPB is a cognitive and social psychology theory that aims to explain people’s
decision-making process. In fact, TPB is considered to be the best social psychology theory in predicting human behaviour (Sommer, 2011).

TPB suggests that people's decision-making behaviour is only partially controlled by the people concerned and added what is called by Ming-Shen (2007, p. 297) the "uncertain time and uncertain opportunity" this, in turn, influences intentions and intention influences behaviour indirectly. The theory also suggests that behavioural intention is the most influential factor that determines decision-making process, whether buying, boycotting or repurchasing particular brands.

Other theories such as Means-End Theory by Gutman (1982) were also developed to understand human behaviour and the consumption choices that are part of this behaviour. Both extreme ends of this behaviour such as being loyal to brands or boycotting them can be partially explained by applying these above theories.

The Means-End Theory is more explicit in addressing loyalty as a behaviour, according to this theory, consumers' knowledge of certain brands is kept in their memory and this information is organised by cognitively linking the information into three categories, namely, benefits, attributes and motivational values.

TPB aims to explain people's decision-making process and Means-End Theory offers a rationalisation for why consumers purchase certain brands or services in addition to their repurchase choices (Overby et al., 2004) and since this study aims to understand the decision-making process of transnational Arab Muslim consumers, the choice was made to use the social factors from the TPB as these factors thought by Ajzen (2005, p. 134) to be the background factors which may "influence behavioural, normative or control beliefs".

The conceptual model also used the brand loyalty model developed by Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) by adding additional variables to its consumers' driver and brand drivers sections.

Transnationality variables that derived from Sirkeci (2013) and Basch et al. (1994) definition of transnational consumers were neither part of TPB nor the model developed by Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004), hence, they were added to the conceptual model along with a number of relevant variables that were also added to brand drivers section in the proposed model, see Figure 6.4.
Social capital variables were adapted based on the study by Klein et al. (2004), along with other relevant variables such as knowledge of targeted brands.

**Figure 6.3 Theory of Planned Behaviour (Acek Ajzen, 2005)**

It is needless to say that consumers’ behaviour intentions do change over time and this change of intention triggers change in behaviour too; this change could be a result of both internal and external factors. Internal factors such as, consumer’s personal attitude, for example, a person’s intention toward the possible outcome of following or not following a particular behaviour whether positive or negative. External factors such as subjective norms, for example, perceived social pressure of undertaking or not undertaking the behaviour and finally the perceived behavioural control such as whether the person feels in control of the action in question.

Therefore, the importance of understanding consumers’ purchase intentions and the factors that influence these intentions is essential and according to Ming-Shen (2007) knowing these intentions and factors may assist in changing consumers’ behaviour.

Ming-Shen’s argument can be true in a typical consumer behaviour scenario but as suggested earlier that boycott is not a regular consumer action; it is an extreme form of consumer behaviour that is taken to deliver a message to firms and countries alike to alter their practices (Braunsberger and Buckler, 2011). These unfavourable practices can be price hikes, quality issues, war activities, religious or cultural insensitivities, or political conflict.
Brand loyalty is at the opposite end of the model, from the brands point of view—and in all business aspects whether cost, market share or future prospects—loyalty represents the best form of consumer behaviour whereas, boycott represents the worst form of that behaviour. Hence, the proposed framework shown in Figure 6.4, taking into account the potential effect of transnationality, would capture both extreme ends of this consumer behaviour.

Figure 6.4 Research conceptual model
Chapter 7 Exploring Available Research Methodologies

This chapter describes the available research methods and designs to choose an appropriate approach that can facilitate achieving the aim of this research. It illustrates the understanding of various approaches available, not only to clarify the path embraced while doing the research but also to assist in answering the research questions.

7.1 Introduction

The methodology according to Strauss and Corbin (1998) is the way of thinking when researching a social phenomenon or a social reality. In other words, it’s a discussion on how the research is carried out (Blaiki, 2000) and is an assumption on how a particular researcher views the world (Saunders et al., 2007).

Constructionism (also referred to as subjectivism) views social phenomena as a consequence of social actor’s actions thus, to understand the actions of those actors it is necessary to research the subjective meanings that motivate those social actors actions. According to Crotty (1998, p. 8) Constructionism “rejects the view of human knowledge, meaning is not discovered, but constructed”. This approach has been adopted to explore the behaviour of the targeted population.

According to Holloway (1997), research paradigm is a philosophical approach that comes from either the belief system or worldview. It is concerned with whether the researcher intended to follow a deductive or inductive approach. Deductive is used for testing a theory by developing a hypothesis about the relationship between a set of variables identified by the researcher while investigating a social phenomenon (Saunders et al., 2007).

The inductive approach is used by researchers who collect data to develop or build a theory. Hence, it starts by investigating a phenomenon, collecting, analysing data and ends with developing a theory.

Grounded Theory is a method developed by Glaser and Strauss in 1967 (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Grounded Theory is defined by Bryman and Bell (2007, p. 585) as “a theory that derived from data, systematically gathered and analysed through the research process”. Therefore, Grounded Theory is a data driven method for generating new theory through the use of iterative or recursive approach. Furthermore, Grounded Theory is an inductive
testing of qualitatively gathered data to develop initial hunches, concepts, models, categories representing the real life phenomena.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998), Charmaz (2000) and Creswell (2009) Grounded Theory is a qualitative process for generating new theory grounded in the views of participants. Furthermore, Henwood and Pigeon (1992) argued that Grounded Theory is a method that offers the opportunity to create a theory where other methods can be challenging or problematic, or when little is known about a phenomenon being studied (Flint et al. 2002).

However, this study used a mixed method approach starting with the face-to-face interviews with 35 participants and the main objective of conducting these interviews was to test and formulate the instrument, i.e. the online questionnaire. This is explained by the use of the Sequential Exploratory Design in this study as an approach for data collection and analysis.

Furthermore, this research is drawing upon existing theories (e.g. Theory of Planned Behaviour, brand loyalty, transnational consumers, and consumer boycott theories) and not creating a new theory. The literature review clearly covered studies relating to behaviour in general where the TPB considered one of the best social psychology theories in predicting human behaviour (Sommer, 2011).

The literature review also explored in-depth the studies related to brand loyalty and drawn upon the finding of academic researchers in this field such as Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004), Worthington et al. (2010) and many others. This also applied to transnational consumers’ literature and consumer boycott literature such as Cayla (2008), Sirkeci (2013, 2009), John and Klein (2003), Klein et al. (1998, 2004), Friedman (1999) to name a few.

The social phenomena explored in this research is seen as a consequence of social actor’s actions (i.e. transnational boycotters and targeted firms) thus, to understand the actions of those actors it is necessary to research the subjective meanings that motivate those social actors actions. The above mentioned literature review has explored many aspects of this social phenomena, hence, the subjective meaning of their action is not to be discovered but to be constructed based on what has been done in previous studies (Crotty, 1998).
7.2 Consumer Behaviour from a Retrospective View

Since brand loyalty is a relationship between the brand and consumers which is built over a period of time, measuring the effect of consumers boycott on loyalty is thought to be best captured by adopting a retrospective view of the Prophet Mohammed cartoon crisis in 2006 where most Danish companies were boycotted by many Muslims around the world. To date, there are no published studies that examine the impact of that particular boycott on transnational Arab Muslims’ brand loyalty (including transnational Arabs in the UK and elsewhere).

At the time of the crisis, there were many Danish companies operating worldwide, including in the Arab World. This research will focus on Arla Foods, which was the market leader in many Arab countries in the dairy products sector before the crisis and was hit hard as a result of this consumer boycott as explained earlier in the literature review.

Arla is the owner of a number of internationally known brands such as Lurpak and Anchor and in the UK the company markets itself as the UK’s No. 1 in dairy products. Therefore, this study will deal with Arla’s brands in the UK, in particular, its Lurpak product as a well-known brand that was one of the products targeted by Muslims in many countries outside the Arab world.

7.3 Research Method Choice

Research choice aims to assist in answering research questions thus; exploring the available choices would assist in choosing an appropriate approach (e.g. single quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods design). The quantitative method is often associated with data collection techniques such as questionnaires or data analysis procedures such as statistics (Saunders et al., 2012).

The qualitative method, on the other hand, is regularly used to collect or generate data using, for example, interview as a technique and it analyses data using different procedures than the quantitative method, for example, data categorisation rather than graphs or statistics. The qualitative method also generates non-numerical data.

Researchers who see themselves as independent from those being studied use quantitative design. As discussed earlier, quantitative studies are more often but not exclusively
deductive; that is, qualitative data can also be associated with deductive approach according to Saunders et al. (2007). Researchers who adopt this approach tend to use the collected data to test existing theory and in some cases, it may be used to develop a theory. This approach is concerned with examining relationships between predetermined variables by using a questionnaire for example. These variables are measured numerically using a set of statistical techniques.

The qualitative design, however, is an approach that assumes that the social world is continuously changing and researchers who adopt this approach see themselves as part of this constant change. Those researchers are also getting “out into the field and see what people are doing and thinking” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 11). This method is usually inductive where it develops a new theoretical perspective using the generated data, which can be obtained by conducting in-depth interviews for example.

Mixed methods research is when a researcher uses a mixture of approaches, especially when collecting and analysing data (Collis and Hussey, 2009), Table 7-1. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, p. 17) defined mixed methods research as the “class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study”. Furthermore, Cameron (2011, p. 246) argued that a “mixed method research is a growing area of methodological choice for many academics and researchers from across a variety of discipline areas”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Implementation Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal status</td>
<td>QUALITATIVE + QUANTITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Status</td>
<td>QUALITATIVE + quantitative quantitative QUALITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUANTITATIVE + qualitative QUANTITATIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many authors (Collis and Hussey, 2009; Saunders et al., 2012; Bryman and Bell, 2007) agree that mixing research methods allows researchers to get a broader view of the researched phenomena. This use of mixed research methods according to Collis and Hussey (2009) helps researchers overcome the possible bias that the use of a single method may bring.
This approach is supported by (Bazeley, 2008, p. 135) who argued that “mixed methods are typically employed in applied settings where it is necessary to draw on multiple data sources to understand complex phenomena, and where there is little opportunity for experimentation”.

In this approach, a researcher can collect data one after another (Sequential choice) or simultaneously (Concurrent) as shown in Table 7-1 above. However, it is essential for the researcher to decide which of these two approaches will have precedence in the study.

According to Bryman (2004) and Kroll and Neri (2009) the research design approach offers a structure for data collection and analyses. Hence, the preference of the most suitable design depends largely on the objectives of the research. The mixed methods approach implemented in this study was sequential and priority was given to the qualitative approach. Subsequently, eight stages of data collection and analyses were followed as seen in Table 7-2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7-2 Stages of data collection and analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Development of interview questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Qualitative data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Qualitative data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Qualitative findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Development of instruments (online questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Quantitative data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Quantitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Overall results and interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study examines London’s transnational Arab consumers boycott phenomenon using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods not only for the above justifications but also because this research aimed to study a complex phenomena in which the literature review suggests that little has been done to explore and understand.

Furthermore, it is worth visiting the work of other authors to learn what methods they used in their research. This research has identified a number of earlier academic studies that examined consumer boycott from different aspects; eleven studies were about boycotting in non-Arab countries.
Klein et al. (2004) used telephone interviews and surveyed 1216 adult consumers who participated in a study on an actual on-going boycott of a European-based multinational firm that sells consumer food products through grocery outlets.

The Neilson (2010) study was conducted on twenty-two European countries using data that was collected by the European Social Survey (ESS) who surveyed 21535 individuals from 2002-2003.

In America, Friedman (1985) examined ninety consumer boycotts; he used both historical secondary data collected from major American newspapers, magazines, social science and business periodicals of boycotts from 1970-1980 and a mail survey using a daily newspaper.

However, out of the six studies conducted on boycotting in the Arab world, Knudsen et al. (2008) used boycott case studies of multinational organisations in the Arab world and Jensen (2008) analysed Danish newspaper articles on the Danish boycott subject. Ilisi-Salsabila and Abdul-Talib (2012) study was limited to the conceptual background of boycotts.

The Abosag (2010) study was based in Saudi Arabia and used both secondary and primary data, for the primary data he used qualitative (i.e. interviews with senior managers) and quantitative by using a survey to collect data from Saudi consumers. Maher and Mady (2010) used a survey to collect data from students attending a Kuwaiti university.

One of the issues with the Arab world based consumer boycotts research is that all boycott cases in that region were either as a result of war (Israel and the Arabs) or were religiously motivated (Arab boycott of Danish products) hence, the researcher believes that the Arab countries macro-boycott of Israeli or Danish products boycott research lacks a what might be called the free choice for the following reasons:

Firstly, Israeli brands have been prohibited in the Arab world since 1948 by the Arab League, which is an organisation that consists of 22 Arab states (Kontorovich, 2003). This boycott was imposed upon consumers by laws and regulations. Therefore, the consumers did not have free choice in the matter and as result of the Arab League ban, Israeli brands are largely unknown in most of the Arab countries including Saudi Arabia, UAE, Syria, Lebanon and many more hence, the determinants of brand loyalty stated earlier do not
apply to Israeli brands, in other words, this research argues that consumers can’t be brand loyal if they don’t know the brand, don’t have access to it and have never used it.

Secondly, similarly, in the case of the Danish brands boycott it didn’t pick-up its momentum until Imams (religious clerics) called for it in Masjids in many Arab states, therefore, especially in socially connected societies and relatively conservative region that is dominated by Islam, it would be fair to assume that some of those consumers who boycotted did so as a result of social or religious pressure, not as a result of personal choice.

Al-Hyari et al. (2012) used primary sources to collect data from students using a face-to-face interview approach with Saudi students studying in the UK. Therefore, the only UK-based study relating to Arab consumers boycott is the study conducted by Al-Hyari et al. (2012) where they explored the links between religious beliefs and consumer boycott by interviewing fifteen Saudi postgraduate students at Cardiff University using the Danish company Arla Foods as a case study.

Although their study shed light on how religious beliefs are linked to boycott the research did not relate consumer boycott to brand loyalty nor did it capture the views from other migrant categories as defined earlier (workers, spouses, etc.) and other consumers who came from less conservative countries such as Egypt, Jordan or Lebanon. Moreover, the research sample focused on Saudi students doing higher education degrees and aged between twenty-four and twenty-eight and missed other important age and education level groups, for example, older consumers as well as consumers with less education or no education at all.

7.4 Ethical Considerations

Each research project has to take into consideration the ethical concerns that accompany it, especially for research that involves businesses or individuals from the community where their rights and interests may be affected as a result of the interaction (Kakabadse et al., 2002). This interaction can be through interviews, questionnaires and focus groups or even through mere observation such as the case of using social networking sites like Facebook or Twitter.
This interaction brings the prospect of causing unintentional harm; this can be manifested in a form of physical harm, financial harm or social harm. Many scholars proposed ethical codes for researchers; Glass (1966) ethical code consisted of four points; complete truthfulness, avoiding self-aggrandisement at the expense of fellow researchers, defending the freedom of scientific inquiry and opinion and communicating research findings through publications. Cournand and Meyer (1976) proposed a five-point code of ethics for researchers consisting of objectivity, honesty, tolerance, doubt of certitude and finally self-lesson.

Educational institutions that conduct or support student’s research do provide guidelines for conducting ethical research (Polonsky, 1998). For example, University of Wales Institute (Cardiff Metropolitan University, 2014) set out its ethical research guidelines as Cardiff Code of Practice for obtaining informed consent with respect to research study participation. Therefore, it is important to design a set of procedures that need to be followed to produce a successful research outcome. In this section, a description of the five identified ethical considerations is provided and the practice followed to overcome them.

Cardiff Metropolitan University’s Code of Practice proposed five ethical considerations: voluntary involvement, informed consent, privacy, the potential for harm and communicating the results.

Firstly, individuals in both interviews and online questionnaires were made aware that their participation was voluntary and that they were free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason, thus assurance was provided in the consent from, which each interview participant read and signed. As for the online questionnaire, the same assurance was given, as once they clicked the link to the questionnaire, they were asked to whether they agreed to take part or not.

As for providing the informed consent (see Appendix 2) for each of the interview participants, this consent set out six points that needed to be agreed upon by the participants before conducting the interviews, these points were:

- I confirm that I have read and understand the Participant Information Sheet for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.
I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason.

I agree to take part in the above study.

I agree to the interview being audio recorded.

I consent the interviewer to write down notes during the interview.

I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications.

As for the privacy considerations, each participant was provided with participation information sheet (see Appendix 2), the privacy section reads:

*Your privacy will be respected by everyone in the research team. We have taken very careful steps to make sure that your personal data is going to be completely anonymous and that no uniquely identifiable information is going to be collected. Date collected from this interview will be stored securely away from the consent form you signed and at the end of this research project it will be destroyed. However, as required by the university, only the consent form you signed will be retained and kept for ten years.*

As for the potential for harm, the researcher thought that this study involves neither physical nor financial harm, however, social harm is one possible harm that was anticipated, this could be due to the nature of the questions which may be perceived as embarrassing (e.g. how religious are you), insensitive (e.g. what is your age, or what is your religious denomination), worrying or upsetting and this can potentially hinder the progress of interviews. However, this was thought to be avoided by assuring participants that they reserve the right to decline to answer any question without any justifications, and this assurance was given on the participants information sheet.

Finally, participants of both interviews and online questionnaire were informed about the use of the research outcome. The information sheet read:

*The outcome of this interview will be submitted to Cardiff’s Metropolitan University’s School of Management as a requirement for a Ph.D. degree and the researcher may also use this study outcome to write academic papers for the purpose of publication in academic journals.*
The consent form also contained a paragraph about the publication of anonymised quotes from participants, and it read: “I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications”.

7.5 Sampling and Population

The following sections present the sampling process that was carried out to collect the data from the targeted population for both qualitative and quantitative stages of this study. They also include a description of the tools used for the data collection, the outcome of the pilot interviews and the piloting of the online questionnaire, the measures taken to ensure a better understanding of both instruments’ questions, the variables used, and the justification for the use of Facebook and Twitter for data collection.

7.5.1 Qualitative Stage

Because there is limited research relating to consumer boycotts and their impact on brand loyalty in general and among London-based Arab consumers in particular and since there is no sampling frame available for this segment of consumers, a convenience sampling approach was adopted in the form of conventional snowball sampling technique for the qualitative stage of this study (i.e. the Face-to-Face interviews) and a virtual snowball sampling technique for quantitative stage of the research (i.e. the online questionnaires).

Conventional snowball sampling technique is known as a technique where one person provides a researcher with the name of another person to take part in the research and this latter person, in turn, provides the name of a third person to the researcher, and so on (Vogt, 1999).

A hard to reach population according to Marpsat and Razafindratsima (2010) is the population that is hard to identify, has no sampling frame and its behaviour is unknown. The combination of these may lead to a poor selection of participants or places to approach them.

This sampling technique is a non-probability sampling technique in which research participants are identified and recruited by identifying a few individuals from the research population, and then asking those individuals to refer other qualified individuals, see Figure 7.1. To minimise bias in this stage of the data collection (i.e. Face-to-Face
interviews), the researcher's first contacts were not interviewed; however, they were asked to refer qualified subjects to participate.

**Figure 7.1 How Face-to-Face interview subjects were recruited for interviews**

The qualitative part of the research was designed to find out what those consumers do, think and feel. The quantitative part, however, aimed to find associations and relationships between various variables that are important to this research such as, age, religiosity, education, quality, commitment to the brand, transnationality, connectedness, social ties, etc.

The total Arab population in London is estimated at around 137,253. As mentioned earlier the data collection will target age groups twenty-five years old and above because this research intends to study consumer behaviour related to the 2006 Danish products consumer boycott. A twenty-five-year-old respondent would have been eighteen in 2006 corresponding to the age of consent in the UK.

Participants of Arab origins are known to live in a number of areas in London, some of these areas were identified after informal discussions with a number of Arabs who have been living here for more than twenty years, many agreed that Westminster and around the Edgware Road area are the main locations where many Arabs reside. In fact, Westminster is ranked first in terms of its non-UK born Arab residents according to (ONS 2011a).
The above information was also confirmed in a report by the BBC (2008) where it states that the Borough of Westminster has the highest density of Arabs living within its towns particularly around the area of Edgware Road. Therefore, the face-to-face field research focused on the Westminster area where there was a considerable opportunity to target Arab consumers in orders to collect data relevant to this study.

It might be argued that the sample of thirty-five participants is not a representative of the total Arab population in London; however, obtaining a representative sample in qualitative research can’t be always reached and according to Marshall (1996) the aim of qualitative research—in this case through face-to-face interviews—is to allow us understand or improve our understanding of a complex human phenomena and not to generalise research findings.

In fact, Gummesson (2005, p. 311) defined qualitative research as “a conscious search for meaning and understanding”. Moreover, what this study seeks here is not very much about getting it right or finding the ultimate answer (Richardson, 1994) but to understand the boycotting phenomenon of transnational Arab consumers living in London and its impact on their loyalty to brands. In other words, the nature of the qualitative part of this research is what DeRuyter and Scholl (1998, p. 8) describe as “diagnostic exploratory nature”.

7.5.1.1 Qualitative Tool: Face-to-Face Interviews

The qualitative part of the research aims to find out what those consumers do, think and feel. Face-to-face interviews with thirty-five participants who are the unit of analysis for this research were arranged. These interviews are thought to be a powerful tool to use in qualitative research to understand people’s thoughts and feelings (Fontana and Frey, 2003 and Bryman, 2004).

Moreover, Jacobsen (2002) argues that a personal meeting is an ideal interview technique when conducting qualitative research as it does not only facilitate the reduction of risk originating from misinterpretation but also enhances the quality of the collected data. However, this method has its negative aspects such as the risk of the interviewer’s influence on participants for example by her/his body language, how the interview questions are put forward or even the selection of words used.
These thirty-five face-to-face interviews, which target the selected sample of transnational Arab consumers, were held between Aug - Nov 2014. The interview questions were designed taking into consideration that the themes that were put forward to each interviewee were closely related to the objectives of this research.

**7.5.1.2 Qualitative Tool Pilot Study: Testing the Waters**

Based on the literature review, a preliminary interview schedule was piloted on five participants who were approached and interviewed at different locations including a coffee shop in Edgware Road and a restaurant in Maida Vale during July 2014.

Participants who agreed to be interviewed at this stage were aged between 30-43, some had been living in London for over five years and others for over twenty-three years; by country and gender they were a Moroccan, two Jordanians, a Palestinian and a Lebanese, two females and three males. Each interview was digitally recorded and lasted for an hour on average and each participant were given the choice of either speaking in Arabic or English therefore, some interviews were conducted in Arabic and others were in English.

The question testing procedure as Belson (1986) called it was carried out to assess how interviewees interpreted the interview questions and whether any of these questions were irrelevant, misleading or would cause a misunderstanding or sensitivity especially with the personal faith practising questions. In fact, piloting the interviews also helped in estimating the time each interview needed and worked as rehearsing technique for the interviewer before starting the final interviews.

The pilot interviews were valuable in developing the final interview schedule not only by adding important questions which were not on the original sheet or by removing questions which were found to be irrelevant to the research objectives but also helped in rephrasing some terms or expressions that found to be confusing or misleading by the participants during these pilot interviews.

The initial questions related to brand loyalty determinants were constructed to ask participants directly about selected determinants from brand loyalty literature that is brand reputation, price, sales promotion, advertising, brand name, the availability of a substitute brand and product performance, however, the construction of these questions
were of a suggestive nature that didn’t allow participants to think freely and come up with what is important in a brand from their perspective. Hence, amendments were made so that the interviewer did not mention these determinants during the interview to let participants freely decide and talk about what is important to them and what is not.

Additionally, the questions related brands’ country of origin effect on the brand loyalty of participants and the possibility of being loyal to all brands from a single country was found to be confusing by some participants as they thought it refers to brands from their country of origin, these questions were amended so that they distinguished between a participant’s country of origin and a participant’s potential loyalty to brands from a single country.

It also proved valuable in improving and ensuring the adequacy of the research tools, assisting in the validation of the appropriateness of the chosen sampling technique, estimating the resources needed (i.e. time and money) and also in collecting preliminary data from participants.

As for research tools, the initial instrument, which was face-to-face interviews with thirty-five participants in a public place of their own choice, would remain unchanged as it seemed adequate and appropriate and, therefore, could assist achieving the objectives of this part of primary qualitative data collection. In fact, participants who were approached to take part in the interview were not only happy to participate and be interviewed in a public place but also offered to refer their friends to take part also which made the recruitment process smoother than initially expected.

As for the resources needed (i.e. time and money), each pilot interview took between 50-70 minutes which was close to what was expected, however, it was noted that during these interviews that the longer the interview lasts, the shorter the answers given by participants, this can be avoided by making the questions put forward to participants more engaging and rephrasing them to be more interesting, for example, relating some questions to participants daily life, their travel plans, kind of food they like, etc.

Each research project involves financial resources too, however, for this part of data collection the only money spent was for transportation and coffee at the meeting location. No money was paid in exchange for participation.
7.5.2 Quantitative Stage

As for the sample selection in the quantitative stage of this research, a virtual snowball sampling technique was selected as it is thought to offer a more suitable approach to this primary data collection method (i.e. online questionnaire). Virtual snowball sampling technique is a technique that enables access to hard-to-reach populations, expands the research scope and sample size, lowers costs and time (Benfield and Szlemko, 2006).

Brickman-Bhutta (2009) argued that online social networking sites (SNSs) do present new choices to conduct surveys more quickly and in a more cost-effective manner. These choices require less work especially, when researchers are required to build snowball samples of hidden or hard to reach population. According to Gregori and Baltar (2013, p. 133) collecting empirical data from such population is “a huge methodological challenge for researchers”.

Hence, the snowball technique whether conventional or virtual can be used when it is hard to identify participants from the desired population (Bryman and Bell, 2007; Heckathorn, 2011) or when the desired population is concealed or hard to reach (Faugier and Sargeant, 1997).

However, despite the mentioned above advantages of collecting quantitative data using virtual snowball sampling, it has many disadvantages too as put forth by Rhodes et al., (2003), Mathur (2005), Baltar and Brunet (2012).

- Selection bias originating from the targeted online population (e.g. age, gender, education level, etc.). This was addressed by urging respondents to forward the survey link to a wider circle of their friends.
- Responding is voluntary; hence, only interested and proactive respondents will respond. The post on both Facebook and Twitter asked respondents to urge their friends who are less active on social media platforms to participate.
- Online illiteracy, for example, some people are unable to use these new technologies including emails, Facebook, Twitter, etc. This was also addressed as the above.
- Online questionnaires are self-administered hence answering instructions are absent. This was addressed by putting the researcher’s contact details on the
opening page of the online survey and respondents were urged to contact the researcher if they require any additional information relating to the questionnaire.

- Lacks human-to-human contact. This was addressed by making the researcher’s contact details available for respondents should they need any clarifications.
- Ethical considerations including privacy related concerns originating from the way data is collected, handled and used as well as issues related to providing and validating the informed consent form. This was addressed by providing informed consent form to all respondents before reaching the actual survey questions.

The objective of a sample size determination in quantitative research is to assist in offering conclusions that are generalisable and to keep bias to a minimum, even though as stated earlier that this is an exploratory study and generalisation is not the main goal as much as the desire to offer an understanding of this segment of transnational consumers.

Sample size determination can be calculated using various formulas. Once the variance in the population, the maximum desirable error and the amount of uncertainty that can be tolerated (e.g. confidence level) is determined then, a representative sample size that is also statistically significant can be calculated.

The calculation of the required sample size of this population is based on the targeted population size. Hence, the total population of people aged 25 and above is 102,939. The margin of error is 5% and the confidence level is 95%.

The sample size for transnational Arabs residing in London population is 384 responses, which is the minimum sample size needed for this study (calculators are available on online survey sites such as surveymonkey.com). In this study, it was decided to oversample to capture 500 responses to allow for non-completed or invalid responses.

This research intends to be inclusive in which it would consider (according to Sirkeci, 2013 and the UNESCO definition of mobile consumers and immigrants) the views of religious and non-religious Arab transnationals, educated and non-educated, wealthy and deprived ones, politically involved and those who are less politically involved too.
7.5.2.1 Quantitative Tool: Online Questionnaire

As for the online questionnaire, Saunders et al. (2007) and Rowley (2014) rightly argue that questionnaires have become part of our daily life and the most common tool for collecting data whether by distributing it to potential respondents by post, email, by hand or using the internet in the form of an online questionnaire where they need to answer questions related to facts such as age, income, marital status, education level, etc. as well as questions related to attitude such as experience, beliefs, attitude or behaviour toward certain topics that are put forward to them.

We often participate and fill in questionnaires without considering the efforts that were put into their design. It is important to make them as short as possible to increase respondent understanding of the topics involved (Lietz, 2009) and minimise grammar complexity to reduce cognitive demand on respondents (Dörnyei, 2003).

It is also important to try to avoid socially desirable responses, for example, the selection of a response that the respondent feels is favoured by society (Foddy, 1993) and to avoid questions that have two different concepts or verbs that can potentially lead to inaccurate responses (Brislin, 1986).

Online questionnaire design needs to be cost-effective, efficient (i.e. getting the right information) and time-bound (i.e. has a start and end date), Vriens et al. (2001) argues that this is a conflicting combination. Therefore, this conflict creates the challenge of harmonising these three goals and getting a quality outcome.

Therefore, while the designing of survey questions, additional attention has been paid to the following issues, which were suggested by many authors such as Lietz (2009), Saunders et al. (2007), Rowley (2014) and Bryman and Bell (2007):

Ambiguity has been avoided as much as possible; terms such as “often” or “regularly” have been avoided as the respondents “operate with different frames of reference when employing them” (Bryman and Bell, 2007, p. 267). Long questions have also been avoided when possible to “increase respondents’ comprehension” Lietz (2009p. 250).

Questions that have two different questions, concepts or verbs have been avoided as it “leaves respondent unsure about how best to respond” (Bryman and Bell, 2007, p. 267).
There were no leading questions within the survey as they can potentially lead respondents to a particular direction and, therefore, create bias.

No technical terms were used as the questionnaire targeted a sample of population that born outside the UK, come from different backgrounds and have different attributes (e.g. age, occupation, education level etc.).

Saunders et al. (2007) argued that many people use quantitative methods to collect data without looking into other available methods such as observation, examination of secondary data or even interviews. However, this study combines face-to-face interviews and online questionnaires as it, according to Collis and Hussey (2009) helps researchers overcome possible bias that a single method may bring. Many authors such as Saunders et al. (2007), Rowley (2014) and Bryman and Bell (2007) see this choice as a widely used option for social science.

Bryman and Bell (2007) listed a number of advantages that are associated with using questionnaires as a data collection tool; they are cheaper to administer, especially the online questionnaires, also quicker to administer as it only takes seconds to send by email to thousands of potential respondents, eliminates the interviewer effect, interviewer variability and is also more convenient for respondents to fill out during their free time.

The main disadvantages of questionnaires according to Rowley (2014) are related to the fact that researchers cannot verify whether respondents understood the questions put forward to them or not, whether they were genuine in their responses to these questions and gave accurate data or not and whether they were able to answer all questions especially if the questionnaire was lengthy and complex, that is aside from a number of other disadvantages Bryman and Bell (2007) identified such as researcher inability to probe or to prompt respondents and the inability to collect additional data.

### 7.5.2.2 Questionnaire Design

When it comes to designing the individual questions that are going to generate the data needed to answer the research questions, it is believed that researchers can adopt, adapt or develop their own set of individual questions (Bourque and Clark, 1994) and (Saunders et al., 2007).
This questionnaire included both adopted and adapted questions that were previously used by other authors or major surveys taken in the UK, for example, some of the questions used by Klein et al. (2004) which were related to respondents opinion of a particular firm on a three-point scale beginning with poor and ending with very good were adapted, another example was about the motivation behind moving to the UK which was adapted from the Office of National Statistics (2010b).

Additionally, in order to allow respondents to provide the answers the way they find suitable for them (Fink, 2003) some of the questionnaire’s questions were left open-ended, while others were made close-ended questions, as Dillman (2000) called them, which are easier to answer by ticking the box that applies to the respondent’s situation or choice. This type of questions generates data that need no coding and is easier to analyse using readily available statistical software packages such as the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Furthermore, closed questions come in a number of forms in this questionnaire, some were in the form of a list that offers respondents a number of choices and they need to tick the appropriate box that applies to them (e.g. when asking about respondent’s religion). Other closed questions come in the form of a category that is thought to offer good insight into the behaviour or attributes (Saunders et al., 2007), for example, in this questionnaire respondents were asked how often they do shopping and asked to select one of the choices presented to them.

Some of the questions in this questionnaire come in the form of ranking, where respondents were asked to rank their relative importance to a particular case, for example, respondents were asked to rank how important social ties to them and the options presented to them were from extremely important to not important all. Other questions were rating questions using the Likert scale.

**7.5.2.3 Quantitative Tool Pre-testing**

Piloting a research instrument as mentioned earlier was like a rehearsal before the distribution of the final questionnaire. Piloting the questionnaire on six Facebook contacts was helpful in finding construction issues that may have resulted from complex wording
which could lead to misunderstandings, identify weak constructs in the proposed measurement scales or even questions that could be irritating for some.

In fact, one of those chosen in the piloting stage showed his unwillingness to participate due to his sensitivity to the proposed religious questions, mainly, the religious denominations question, he replied to the survey link which was sent to him via Facebook messaging “Well I did read the questionnaire... I didn’t feel comfortable to continue as it contains some religious sectarian questions. As liberal British from Arab roots I dont get involved in neither religious nor politic questionnaires. I wish you all the best in your project”

Even though the religious denomination question could not be removed or altered due to its relationship with Muslim faith which is an integral part of this study, but it was a motive to re-visit the participants’ information sheet and provide an extensive reassurance in relation to the privacy and the use of the information provided. However, his reply shows the importance of testing the research tool before final distribution.

7.5.2.4 Variables Used

There are three types of variables this study aimed to explore. The first are opinion variables that is, how respondents believe, feel or think about the various topics presented to them within this particular questionnaire (e.g. how they feel about their participation in the Danish brands boycott in 2006). The second type of variables this questionnaire aimed to test is the behaviour variables, that is recording what respondent did, do or would do in certain situations (e.g. whether they boycotted the Danish brands in 2006 or not). Thirdly, the attribute variables, which are the demographic variables such as age, gender, marital status, education level and so on.

First and second are dependent variables, they change when changes in other variables occur such as feeling or behaviour of respondents. The third encompasses independent variables that cause changes on the dependent variables, for example, age or education level of respondents may result in a change in some of the respondents’ behaviour or attitude.

It is thought that relationships do exist between many of the above variables and the literature review has already identified many such relationships, for example, Nandamuri and Gowthami (2012) found that demographics like gender, age, education, income
ethnicity and occupation influence consumers purchasing intention. Bajtelsmit and Bernasek (1996) found that females are not keen on taking risk.

### 7.5.2.5 Virtual Online Questionnaires Using Social Networking Sites (SNSs): Facebook and Twitter

Boyd and Ellison (2008, p. 1) define Social Networking Sites (SNS) as:

> “Web-based services that allow individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system”.

Those users create virtual communities that gather (also virtually) their families and friends based on common interests such as shared interests, values, religion or ethnicity (Damian and Ingen, 2014), hence, SNSs seems to offer potential results improvement in business surveys (Gregori and Baltar, 2013). Therefore, data collected using questionnaires via SNSs can generate valid and rigorous data.

Moreover, SNSs are not only a tool to gather data about a particular population but can be a useful means for this transnational population as they enable establishing and maintaining social ties between immigrants in the country where they reside and their country of origin (Damian and Ingen, 2014).

There are ample studies that have researched and discussed the use of online data collection tools such as online questionnaires and online interviews; Ilieva et al. (2002); Wilson and Laskey (2003); Benfield and Szlemko (2006) to name few, nevertheless, using virtual snowball sampling as a tool to collect data from a hard to reach population in business studies is limited (Ilieva et al., 2002; Burns and Bush, 2006). However, since 2000, suggestions have emerged urging researchers to master innovative tools and integrate new technologies in data collection (Craig and Douglas, 2001; Ilieva et al., 2002).

### 7.5.2.5.1 The Case for Utilising Facebook and Twitter as a Data Collection Tool

SNSs such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and many other platforms have connected millions if not billions of users around the world (Boyd and Ellison, 2008). The number of Facebook users alone according to Statista (2015a) has reached 1.5 billion, which makes up
around 20% of the world’s seven billion population, as shown in Figure 7.2. The same Figure also shows the number of users for many SNSs; LinkedIn, for example, has 347 million users and Twitter has 288 million users. In 2015 there were 32.2 million Facebook users in the UK alone (Statista, 2015b).

Businesses are active users of SNSs too; Webs Small Business Digital Usage Survey (2014) found that 88% of Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) owners with social profiles list Facebook as a top social media platform for marketing their brands and services, LinkedIn comes in second at 39%, and Twitter comes in third at 31%.

This enormous virtual users figure is a suitable instrument to apply the snowball sampling technique that can also offer a better representation of the research results (Baltar and Brunet, 2012). The authors think “the emergence of the SNSs has transformed the Internet into an efficient tool for snowball sampling” (Baltar and Brunet, 2012, p. 58).

Thomson and Naoya (2014) also agreed with Baltar and Brunet as they see Facebook's large-scale usage as a potential not only for reaching respondents but also to gather objective behavioural data too.

Figure 7.2 Global social networks ranked by number of users 2015 (Statista, 2015a)
Baltar and Brunet (2012) used Facebook in their research on Argentinean immigrant entrepreneurs in Spain and put forward justification relating to the nature of the researched population and how hard is it to identify and reach them due to the unavailability of statistics because they have double nationality (non-EU and EU). They claim that their study is the first study that uses Facebook as an instrument to study immigrants.

Baltar and Brunet (2012, p.66) explained the steps they followed using Facebook and stated:

“We explored 52 virtual groups of immigrants living in Spain (e.g. “Argentineans in Madrid”, “Argentineans in Barcelona”, etc.). Inside each group we contacted their members sending them private messages and asking if they were Argentineans and if they had started a firm up in Spain. Furthermore, we tried to extend the sample size, asking each member if they knew anyone else (online or offline contact) who could meet the sample criteria and participate in the study.”

However, they also discussed a number of challenges they faced especially with the security features that Facebook has in place to prevent spam messaging in what they called technical barriers to sending mass e-mails as users can be blocked for a certain period of time for doing so. They overcame this barrier by creating many accounts to contact hundreds of these group members individually via Facebook. These problems were due to the fact that Facebook was not designed for emailing.

However, despite all these limitations, Baltar and Brunet (2012) suggested that for better utilisation of Facebook as a tool to collect data using snowball sampling it is advisable to contact administrators of these pages or groups and request permission from them to post your questionnaire so it can be seen by all of the group or page members. Interested members of these groups can then click on the posted link to complete the questionnaire.

Moisescu (2012) also used Facebook to study tourism preferences of young Romanian Facebook users; he used a mixed empirical procedure including snowball sampling, and used Facebook, as a tool to post his survey link and inviting users to complete the questionnaire explaining the survey’s objectives to his audience. However, he acknowledged the limitations such a sampling technique create and suggested that
collecting data from respondents using a single SNS (i.e. Facebook) limited the possibility of generalising his findings in a marketing strategy that aims at winning other SNSs users.

Thomson and Naoya (2014) used—aside from Facebook paid advertisement and Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT)—virtual snowball sampling where the lead researcher requested his 1,400 Facebook friends to share the questionnaire link on their Facebook walls as well as asking administrators of particular Facebook groups to share the online questionnaire link on these groups walls. They found the virtual snowball technique to be more effective than using Facebook paid advertising and AMT.

At this stage of data collection, the steps suggested by Baltar and Brunet (2012) were followed and their advice was taken by contacting particular Arabs in London groups and pages administrators, namely: Arab Society of London group with 4974 members at the time of posting, ARABS in LONDON group with 6148 members at the time of posting, and Arab Londoners group with 383 members at the time of posting to post the questionnaire link on their pages and groups and invite their member to complete it by following the link which will take them to the online questionnaire which was designed using the Survey Monkey website.

Moisescu (2012) regularly posted participation invitations to users on Facebook to voluntarily complete his questionnaire and this was also followed during data collection. Invitations were regularly posted on these selected Facebook groups/pages to attract new respondents and remind others to follow the questionnaire link and voluntarily complete it.

In addition to Facebook, the questionnaire link was also tweeted on two popular Twitter accounts, the first belongs to @Bo_stars and has 1.3 million followers and the second belongs to @Fnyees and has 12k followers. Their owners were contacted and they agreed to tweet the invitation and the link on their Twitter page.

This inclusion of additional SNS (i.e. Twitter) was also suggested by Moisescu (2012) as he thought that not including additional SNSs in his study was a limitation other researchers should avoid when possible. The survey went live on the 17th of March 2015 and was closed on 1st of May 2015 lasting for 45 days.
7.6 Participant Profiles

7.6.1 Face-to-Face Interview Participant Profiles

As seen in Table 7-3 below, the thirty-five individuals who participated were from different Arab countries. Twenty-five of them were men and ten women. All individuals who took part were of Arabic origin. The youngest of them was twenty-six years old and the oldest was forty-eight. The interviews took place between Aug 2014 and Nov 2014.

Table 7-3 Demographics of all participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>No. Of Children</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>No. of yrs in UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20K</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Ex-Journalist</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10-12K</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Unemployed/Carer</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Unemployed/Housewife</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20-25K</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Scientific Researcher</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35-40K</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Media Professional</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22K</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38K</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Event Manager</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>BD manager</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6K</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Student/Ex-Teacher</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-15K</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21K</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>BD manager</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15-20K</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20-24K</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Sales Executive</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17K</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Taxi Driver</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15K</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Unemployed/Disabled</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12K</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10K</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Unemployed/JSA</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13K</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Unemployed/Disabled</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10K</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Hair Dresser</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24K</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18K</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34K</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10-20K</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15K</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Taxi Driver</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20K</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25K</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Letting Agent</td>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19K</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Sales Executive</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31K</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Police Man</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Web Developer</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12K</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Letting Agent</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-four of the thirty-five participants stated that they boycotted the Danish brands in 2006. Out of the twenty-five men who took part in the interviews ten were working in different sectors; five were unemployed and were either looking for work or receiving a disability payment from the Department of Work and Pension.

Additionally, out of the ten women who were interviewed two were unemployed due to caring for their children. Participants NS-SEC was distributed across the categories from category 1 (i.e. Higher managerial and professional) to category 8 (i.e. Never worked and long-term unemployed).

As for marital status, two men were divorced one boycotted and the other didn't, fourteen were married and out of those only four said they did not participate in the 2006 Danish brands boycott. Nine single respondents were also interviewed and only two of them did not participate in this particular boycott.

Among women who were interviewed three were divorced and two of these did not participate in the boycott of Danish brands in 2006, two were married and both boycotted in 2006 and five were single and two of these did not participate in this particular boycott. Only two of the married participants did not have children; the highest number of children among married participants was five children and the lowest was only one child.

The highest level of education amongst participants was a Ph.D. degree and the lowest was a Secondary School Certificate. Participants’ annual income ranged from 6K to 50K. Gender-wise, women interviewees’ annual income ranged from 6K to 40K and for men it ranged from 10K to 50K. As for participants’ religious denomination, ten were Shiaa Muslims and twenty-five were Sunni Muslims.
7.6.2 Analysing the Qualitative Data

As explained earlier, an inductive approach is adopted for the qualitative data since this is an exploratory stage and it aims to identify themes that could emerge from the data collected from interviews. Thematic analyses were conducted using NVivo10 software while analysing the collected data.

According to Boyatzis (1998), thematic analysis is a process used to encode qualitative data where participants’ verbal statements are structured and summarised before describing the data. Moreover, in this qualitative part, individual cases and special characteristics of participants are explicitly considered while moving from data analyses to data interpretation as it can be seen later in this section. In other words, it is a method for identifying and analysing patterns in qualitative data.

Guest et al. (2012, p.10) have identified the analytical steps in this regard and suggested that it starts by focusing on “identification and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data, that is, themes. Codes are then typically developed to represent the identified themes and applied or linked to raw data as summary markers for later analysis”. Therefore, this research interview analyses followed these steps: firstly, as all interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed verbatim into written texts and read line by line; interviews that were conducted in Arabic were translated to English using a professional translation firm based in Jordan to eliminate potential bias, coding into (Nodes) themes using Nvivo software and finally code interpretation.

Open coding as proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1998) was used to aid this stage of interview texts coding; this open coding process aimed at producing initial concepts (Nodes) from data gathered from participants and it consists of labelling the emerging concepts, defining and building-up categories based on their properties.

Therefore, at first, scripts of each interview were examined and each emerging main theme that was related to transnationals’ brand loyalty and boycotting was encoded. Under each of these main themes, some sub-themes such as demographics, connectedness, the level of religiosity, brand awareness, knowledge of boycott and mobility were connected to each of the main themes.
In the second stage, these themes were organised into various groups following the Selective Coding approach as proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1998) and were categorised into different groups in Nvivo. Themes were categorised based on the research questions discussion from Chapter 6, which was identified and developed based on the literature review in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. Identified themes were placed into three groups as described in the following three paragraphs.

The first group includes the characteristics of the Arabs living in London; which included mobility, connectedness and social capital, knowledge of boycott, brands and the readiness to sacrifice.

The second group is related the brand loyalty drivers, which include consumer drivers, brand drivers and social drivers, these drivers were developed from the Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) model. New proxies were added to their model, shown in Figure 10. These new proxies are thought to offer a better understanding to those transnationals’ brand loyalty behaviour.

Connectedness as a social driver was not included in the Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) model. It was thought to influence behaviour including loyalty behaviour so it was added to our model with the aim of exploring its influence on the behaviour of those consumers.

The third group included an assessment of religiosity to explore participants’ religiosity using their self-assessment responses in addition to other questions that covered both belief (i.e. intrinsic values) and practice (i.e. extrinsic values) and how it would impact on their boycotting as well as brand loyalty behaviour.

The influence of religion and religiosity level were explored in various parts of this research (e.g. Chapters 4, 5 and 6) including its impact on loyalty and boycott behaviour, therefore, attempting to assess its impact on those transnational consumers was a key component of this research.

The third stage of thematic analyses involved interpreting the codes to assess the impact of consumer boycotts on brand loyalty amongst the targeted population.
The data collection plan was to interview thirty-five participants from the targeted population and targeted areas of London or until saturation is reached and this number of interviews was thought to be a valuable mean at this stage of data collection to explore how those participants feel and think about the issues presented to them during the interviews.

However, when the number of interviews reached twenty-five, there was a sense coming from the data that many of the responses were relatively similar and no significant new data was coming from these interviews.

The first twenty-five interviews were uploaded to NVivo software and the word frequency test shown in Figure 7.3 was carried out and saved. It was then decided that doing ten more interviews, uploading them into NVivo and then re-doing a word frequency test would confirm whether new data was coming from these new interviews or not.

![Figure 7.3 Word frequency of 25 interviews using NVivo](image)

The final word frequency test shown in Figure 7.4 confirmed that doing more interviews is not going to reap any more significant data and that saturation has been reached at thirty-five interviews.
7.6.3 Reliability and Validity of Qualitative Data

According to Bryman and Bell (2007), the reliability and validity are important to assess the quality of research. They also argued that qualitative researchers “have tended to employ the terms of Reliability and Validity in very similar ways to quantitative researchers” (Bryman and Bell, 2007, p. 410). In other words, reliability and validity are assessed by looking into internal reliability (i.e. consistency of the used measures), content validity (i.e. the degree of coverage the questions can provide) and external validity (i.e. ability to generalise research findings).

However, external validity does create a challenge for qualitative researchers as qualitative research is usually based on a small sample, which is one of the shortcomings of qualitative research that were discussed earlier in this chapter.

Bryman and Bell (2007) also discussed alternative measures to assess reliability and validity in qualitative research; namely, credibility that combines qualitative and quantitative methods to check findings, transferability that refers to the possible transferability of findings to other settings, dependability which is the ability of peers who act as auditors to ensure valid processes have been followed while conducting the research.
and finally confirmability, that is the ability of the researchers to show that they acted in good faith while carrying on their research.

To ensure the most possible validity in this qualitative part of the research, additional care was taken to ensure that the face-to-face questions were valid, communicated smoothly and offered an accurate representation the social phenomena this study aimed to explore. Participants were also given the option as to whether they wish to converse in Arabic or English as offering this option was thought to enable better communication during each interview.

Additionally, the interviewer purposely explained to interviewees that the intended interviews were for academic purposes only, no personal identity information would be collected and no official government bodies are involved in this research, this was done to ensure participants who might be worried about the research’s purposes and the institutions involved.

To support the above statements, a casual interviewer image was portrayed by dressing smart casual for each interview to eliminate any misinterpretations that may concern participants as a result of not knowing the purpose and the nature of the research or the institutions involved. See Table 7-4 for additional measures that were taken to improve the interviews’ validity and reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>For Data Collection</th>
<th>For Data Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced Communication:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- The option to speak in either Arabic or English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Purpose and academic nature explained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Institutions involved made clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- No identity information were collected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- Casual interviewer image was portrayed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>For Data Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced Consistency and Objectivity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- Leading questions avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Participants encouraged to freely express their perspective on the topics presented to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Researcher’s personal values were not presented i.e. was a listener only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixed methods approach

Minimum inference strategy was followed

Hammersley (1992, p. 69) argued that research validity is assessed based on “on the basis of the adequacy of the evidence offered in support of them”, this indicates that the more evidence a researcher can offer to support her/his findings the more valid these findings are, hence, a mixed methods approach was used to enhance the validity of the research
findings where face-to-face interview data analysis were contrasted with the statistical analysis originating from the online questionnaires to support the research findings.

As for reliability, which refers to consistency and objectivity of the research, the topics of these interviews were designed to ensure that there were no leading questions. Additionally, during data analyses a minimum inference strategy as proposed by Seale (1999) was followed also to eliminate possible bias originating from interviewer’s own assumptions of participants’ point of view of the issues presented to them. In fact, Silverman (2010) suggested that a detailed data presentation with minimal inferences is preferable to their own account of the collected data.

7.6.4 Analysing the Quantitative Data

As the intention of data analyses is to produce a meaningful interpretation of the data collected from the online questionnaires, the latest available version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (SPSS20) was utilised and Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) and logistic regression were used for interpreting the collected data.

Bartholomew et al. (2011) argued that EFA is based on the view in which variables (measurable and observable) can be decreased to fewer latent variables which have a common variance but are unobservable, this is called reducing dimensionality. Thus, this statistical tool is applied when there is a need to determine the number of factors influencing the research variables; furthermore, this tool is also used to investigate the variables that go together (DeCoster, 1998), for example, income, occupation, age or marital status may go together in influencing purchasing preference.

EFA is thought to be appropriate for achieving the objectives of this study. However, for assessing the suitability of the collected data for factor analysis and to verify the suitable number of variables to keep it is important to determine the suitable statistical tests in this regard. Therefore, a number of tests were utilised including Cross-tabulation, Pearson Chi-square, Correlation, Independent Samples T-Test, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, Scree Test, Logistic Regression and Multiple Correspondence Analyses (MCA).
7.6.4.1 Measures Used in the Quantitative Analyses

Based on the literature review, the following measures have been used which include demographics including socioeconomic variables and the measures shown in Table 7-5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Related Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Used in numerous studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationality</td>
<td>Basch et al., 1994; Sirkeci, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Allenby and Lenk, 1995; Papatla and Krishnamurthi, 1996; Datta, 2003; Ahmed et al., 2011, Nandamuri and Gowthami, 2012; Malik et al., 2012; Allender and Richards, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Religiosity</td>
<td>Delener, 1990; Delener, 1994; Essoo and Dibb, 2004; Mokhlis, 2006; Tiliouine and Belgoumidi, 2009; Abosag and de Villegas, 2011; Al-Hyari et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>Klein et al., 2004; Escalas and Bettman, 2005; Gounaris and Stathakopoulos, 2004;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6.4.2 Analytical Steps

To answer the three research questions, the following steps were followed:

- The initial variable selection, pre-processing and data reduction in the selected groups of variables.
- The modelling with the application of logistic regression.
- The analysis of the results of logistic regression.
- The use of MCA to explore relations between attitudes and behaviours in regard to the impact of religious boycott on loyalty.

7.6.4.2.1 Survey Data Processing and Analysis Approach

This section provides more explanation and justifications on how the questionnaire data from the survey has been converted into data suitable for parametric tests. The intent is not to summarise the analysis, as this is done in later sections. Instead, this section present the general approaches followed to process the data which are categorical (nominal or ordinal), therefore not appropriate for typical parametric tests.

In all three research questions the intention was to build classification models explaining dichotomous “yes”-“no” variables (did you boycott the Danish brands, are you loyal to any
brands), therefore inflexible parametric models with many assumptions (for instance multiple regression with ordinary least squares) is not applicable. Similarly, non-normality due to categorical independent variables ruled out the discriminant analysis approach to classification (Press and Wilson, 1978).

The solution was to use models from the family of Generalized Linear Models (GLM) which according to (Agresti, 2013, p. 116) extends ordinary regression models to encompass non-normal response distributions and modelling functions of the mean. GLM have additional parameters, that are much more flexible and are robust to non-normality, namely Logistic Regression ones, this method assumes a linear relationship between the log of odds of an “outcome” (having participated in the boycotting, being loyal to brands) and the predictors (the drivers), and is widely used in social research, see for example (Morrow-Howell and Proctor, 1993).

In this technique, as in all methods generalising multiple regression, categorical variables are encoded by 0-1 “dummy” variables, each one representing one category (If a variable has n categories, one of them is used as the reference category and has no associated dummy variable, the n-1 dummy variables for the remaining categories then represent the effects relative to the reference one). This way, nominal variables can also be used as independent variables circumventing the interval measurement assumption. A very detailed treatment of the use of dummy variables in regression can be found in a dedicated book written by Hardy (1993).

The assumptions for the applicability of logistic regression are tested together with the examination of the results, with diagnostics and, importantly, the examination of the classification accuracy, that is, the comparison of the actual outcomes with the ones predicted by the model. Models which did not pass these diagnostics were avoided. For instance, the classification accuracy in all models produced was 70-80% which is considered quite satisfactory (see for example Tables 9-14, 9-16, 9-26), given the variety of personal and attitudinal characteristics. Good classification accuracy is a de facto proof of both the quality of the data and the suitability of a classification approach.

Of course, the inputs to the models had to be pre-processed. The existence of categorical variables as independent variables meant also that the models could potentially have many
“cells” – combinations of categories. The validity of the models would be questionable if these cells were too many (and many of them were empty).

To address above problem many variables were re-coded, merging categories to reduce the number of cells, concatenate very similar replies and also to eliminate categories with small counts and make the distributions more balanced. To mention just a few examples, many demographic and socio-economic variables were re-coded because they had categories with small counts (larger ages, infrequent marital and employment statuses, higher incomes etc.). Similarly, educational qualifications were re-coded as “Degree”/ “No degree”. Other variables were excluded from the analysis because they were nominal with too many categories (e.g. the country of origin) and these could not be merged.

These procedures were followed together with a preliminary univariate analysis where each potential predictor was tested for association with the dependent dichotomous variable. Only those variables which showed, alone, a statistically significant association with the dependent variable were included in the initial models. Then “variables selection” was applied simultaneously with categories (cells) reduction, a procedure which is considered a best practice in similar situations (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 2004). The association tests were Chi-square ones which do not have distributional requirements and have minimal assumptions.

Correlation aspects in the independent variables were also examined, to avoid collinearity problems in the models. When necessary, the non-parametric Spearman’s rho coefficient was preferred to Pearson’s. For example, the number of children was found to be correlated with age, therefore we avoided including both variables in the models. Or, the number of years living in London was very highly correlated with the number of years outside the country of origin. In such cases, the variable which had the fewest missing values were preferred.

A common case in the analysis was the treatment of groups of several questions which addressed the same theme and were therefore highly correlated with each other. In such cases it was not possible to include all these variables together in the model. Dimensionality would increase and severe collinearity problems would be encountered. This was the case of questions reflecting abstract concepts – drivers, such as the measures examined in this thesis, i.e. transnationality, brand loyalty, social capital, religiosity etc.
The solution was to pre-process the original variables as described before, verify their association with the dependent variable and then construct from them composite continuous indices by factor analysis as inputs to the logistic regression models (Aguilera et al., 2006).

In the terminology of factor analysis, the measures were considered latent factors and were approximated by factor scores. This technique can be applied in the case of ordinal variables, ideally in Likert scales, but also in cases with heterogeneous scales, for instance if dichotomous variables are also present, provided the analysis is based on correlations and the standardised factor scores are used (DiStefano and Mindrila, 2009).

Nominal variables with more than two categories were either recoded as 0-1 dummy variables or were excluded from the factor analysis and entered the logistic regression model independently when it was considered that the study of their separate effects was of much importance. For example, religious denomination was a most important variable and it was decided to leave it out of the factor analysis with other religiousness and religiosity variables, to study its effect explicitly.

The use of factor analysis in surveys similar to the present one is wide and discussed in many texts in the literature (De Vaus, 2013). Factor score coefficients in particular are commonly used to construct composite indices in social research (Alwin, 1973). The key benefit is the large dimensionality reduction and the replacement of several categorical variables in the model with only a few continuous ones. The success of the method is again estimated by diagnostics, by the clarity of the interpretation of the factors and the percentage of variability explained by the factors extracted.

For the applications used, the factors were clearly interpreted and the percentage of variance explained was high enough, typically between 60% and 75%, except from two cases where too many variables with few factors had to be summarised to avoid too many independent variables and the difficulties in the interpretation of factors (and then this percentage was still above 50%).

It should be noted that the choice of factors to extract is a multi-criterion decision. Sometimes it is better to sacrifice accuracy (i.e. extract fewer factors and reduce the variance explained by them) if the results are more meaningful, i.e. the factors have a
clearer interpretation (Velicer et al., 2000). The flowchart in Figure 7.5 below presents a diagrammatic representation of the above mentioned approach.

Finally, in the third research question, a technique which is specifically designed to addresses the problem of quantifying proximities ("distances") between categorical variables, namely Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) was applied. This method was selected because it matched the nature of the data collected and it was suitable to investigate the attitudes of religiously motivated boycotters and explore their intentions about future events.

MCA is the proper method to analyse the pattern of relationships of several categorical variables and create attitudinal profiles (Abdi and Valentin, 2007). The variables selected were pre-processed in the same way as in the previous models.

**Figure 7.5 Diagrammatic representation of the approach used for the processing of categorical independent variables**

![](flowchart.png)

**7.6.5 Reliability and Validity of Quantitative Data**

Internal reliability is of paramount importance as it indicates the capability of the questionnaire in term of measuring what this study aims to measure and the consistency of these measures, Bryman and Bell (2007, p. 163) think that reliability in quantitative studies (i.e. the online questionnaire in this study) can be established by examining "whether or not the indicators that make up the scale or index are constant".
The consistency of the measures used (Table 7-5) were tested using Cronbach’s Alpha, the highest value was 0.802 and the lowest value was 0.626 which is acceptable and sufficient value for the research purpose (Sekaran, 2003) and (Nunnally, 1978). It is also important to mention that a lower Cronbach’s value is acceptable in exploratory research (Johnson and Wichern, 2007).

Content validity refers to the degree of coverage the questions in the questionnaire can provide. Predictive validity is the ability of the questions to make accurate predictions (Saunders et al., 2007). Content and predictive validity were both assured by the extensive literature review which looked into not only major UK surveys including Census but also the work of other authors, the type of questions they used and the gaps they left behind in the marketing literature and the boycott and brand loyalty literature in particular. External validity refers according to (Saunders et al., 2007) to the ability of the research finding to be generalised.

7.7 Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Data Analysis: Sequential Exploratory Design

Sequential exploratory design as a mixed methods approach (Creswell, 2003) was adopted during the final incorporation of both data sets. This design has three basic steps as shown in Figure 7.6. In this study, stage 1 was related to the qualitative face-to-face interviews with thirty-five participants to determine the main themes of the study such as main characteristics of this segment of society, factors that influence their loyalty and religion influence on boycotting behaviour.

Figure 7.6 Mixed methods data analysis design
Stage one, which is the face-to-face interviews facilitated the development of stage two which is the online questionnaires that offered a larger scale representation of the targeted population. Finally, after analysing the data from both tools, findings of data sets were interpreted and an overall interpretation of data analysis was constructed.

The rationale behind using sequential exploratory design is that quantitative findings can facilitate informing, clarifying or constructing upon qualitative findings (Creswell et al., 2003; Greene et al., 1989), furthermore, according to Saunders et al. (2012) this approach allows researchers to get a broader view of the research subject, Collis and Hussey (2009) argued that by using this approach researchers overcome possible bias that a single method might bring.

However, having said so and despite its being common practice in recent years according to Bryman (2006), it is considered a more complex approach than just selecting a single qualitative or quantitative approach (Maxwell and Loomis, 2003) and this can potentially multiply the possibility of unexpected outcomes (Bryman, 2006).

A sequential exploratory approach was adopted in this study for the following reasons:

- Measures or instruments were unavailable for this transnational segment, for example, how to measure the effect of transnationality on their behaviour whether buying or boycotting or what measures to use to assess the impact of religion on those transnational boycotting behaviour, therefore, starting qualitatively was important in developing such measures.
- Despite partially relying on TPB theory which sets general framework—not specified to transnationals—to understand behaviour, there was a lack of specific framework or theory that could apply to those consumers’ boycotting or loyalty behaviour, therefore, this approach was thought to be more appropriate for exploring the studied phenomenon (i.e. the behaviour of transnational Arab Muslims in London).
- Studying this segment of society qualitatively only was not going to offer generalisation for the findings of this study (Morse, 1991), therefore, to generalise this research finding, it was thought that this approach would facilitate this generalisation requirement.
Chapter 8 Findings: Motives and Processes

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analyses of the qualitative data collected from interviewing thirty-five participants. It starts by exploring the characteristics of those boycotting transnationals, including their demographics, transnationality characteristics, their knowledge of the boycott and boycotted brands, their readiness to sacrifice and finally their social capital characteristics. It also explores the factors influencing those consumers brand loyalty behaviour and then goes on to investigate the impact of the religiously motivated boycott on brand loyalty and ends by presenting conclusions of this stage of analysis.

8.2 Boycotting Participants Profiles

Before delving into the boycotting behaviour and processes involved, it is important to describe the boycotting population. Table 10 below summarises the background characteristics of boycotters who took part in the interviews (for a profile summary of all participants, i.e. both boycotters and non-boycotters see Table 7.

8.2.1 Participants Demographics

Boycotters were educated, especially female participants who all held degrees (BA and Masters). Their annual income ranged from 6K to 50K, and many were economically active (i.e. working). Many were married with children, and many have been in the UK for many years. Their duration of stay in the UK spans from one to thirty-five years.

All participants identified themselves as Muslims. As for participants’ religious denomination, analyses suggested that Shiaa were more likely to participate in boycotting than Sunnis, see table 8-1.

Table 8-1 Boycoters profile: Characteristics of boycotting participants - Overall mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Boycotters</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of boycotters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>3 single 2 married 1 divorced</td>
<td>7 single 10 married 1 divorced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.2.2 Transnationality

Participants came from different backgrounds and were influenced by different cultures and values as a result of their settlement here in the UK. They stated various reasons for their move to the UK, some for political reasons, others for economic reasons such as looking for better life standards, some came for family reasons and others moved here for educational reasons. Their duration of stay in the UK spans from one to thirty-five years.

Most participants thought that living abroad has changed them in many ways, one participant (2-35) responded when asked how living abroad influenced his consumption behaviour “I am generally an open minded person and living abroad has developed my understanding of other cultures and also influenced the way I shop or consume things”. Many participants said that living abroad exposed them to different cultures, faiths, and people from different backgrounds; another participant (8-35) added “Living abroad has also enlightened me about my power as a consumer especially when you live in a free economy like the UK”. Therefore, living abroad has influenced their way of thinking and made them more
open-minded compared to their peers who have not had the chance to travel and live abroad.

The above is in line with transnational literature particularly the Basch et al. (1994), Sirkeci (2009) and Sirkeci (2013) definitions of transnationality as both see it as an influential factor on consumption behaviour and this influence is a result of living in one country with its values, culture and being connected to their country of origin with its own values and culture too. This mix contributed to those transnationals’ knowledge not only in relation to different cultures, values or faiths but also exposed them to various brands that were not available in their country of origin.

8.2.3 Knowledge of Boycott and Knowledge of Targeted Brands

All participants were aware of what a consumer boycott is about. Social media is used at different usage levels by all participants but apparently it was effective tool in spreading the news about current affairs as one of the participants (1-35) stated “I also use Facebook, and I consider it to be part of my life and the first thing I do when I wake up I check my Facebook to read news”.

As for the Danish brands boycott, in particular, TV stations and Masjids were influential in spreading the boycott call news, one participant (7.35) stated:  

I heard about it on TV; it was about a Danish newspaper that published cartoons about the Prophet that was insulting, and people started spreading the news through Masjids and other public places. We started to hear in Masjids that as Muslims we should boycott Danish products.

Another participant (10-35) said “I participated myself in this boycott, it was the result of publishing cartoon portraying Prophet Mohammed, one of the brands I boycotted was Lurpak”. Hence, participants showed considerable awareness of the cause of this particular boycott. Masjids were an influential communication platform; Imams (people who preach in Masjids) were instrumental in contributing to peoples’ awareness of this particular boycott (Washington Post, 2006; Antoniades, 2013). Furthermore, consumers’ decision to boycott is influenced by the perceived publicity of the boycott campaign (Cissé-Depardon and N'Goala, 2009).
However, there seems to be a disagreement on how they viewed it; one participant (17-35) stated, “I think consumer boycott is effective especially when consumers take a collective action to boycott”. This participant based his point of view of consumer boycotts on political and religious reasons because she thinks that boycotting Israeli brands helps the Palestinian cause while another participant (7-35) said “I heard boycott has some effects on companies, but my personal opinion is that boycott effectiveness is limited”. Acknowledging the influence of religion on the effectiveness of boycotting action, one participant (30-35) said: “I do believe that boycotting is an effective tool for consumers to use if they feel that the behaviour of targeted company is violating their religion”.

Another participant (12-35) raised the issue of the small Arab population in London which may not have such a powerful impact on targeted firms, she said “for boycott to be effective it needs to be followed by many people and participation level needs to be high but we Arabs in the UK are a very small population and our effect is therefore minimal”.

The above disagreement is inevitable; people view things differently (firms’ action or behaviour in this case) because as Kozinets and Handelman (1998) suggested boycott participation represents a multifaceted emotional expression of peoples’ personalities.

This latter participant thinks that the difficulty in finding a suitable substitute was the reason behind his point of view of the effectiveness of consumer boycotts. Another participant (33-35) said that “it was very effective, although the wrong people suffered from it” mentioning the Muslim labour force working for the boycotted companies which he estimated at around 25-30%.

Sen et al. (2001) argued that boycott participation has a cost, one of these costs is the access to suitable substitute, interestingly, the other cost mentioned by this latter participant is worth paying attention to as a decline in sales in a large retail unit as a result of boycott is likely to cause staff layout in the medium, if not in the short term.

Many participants regularly use butter as a Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) item, and Lurpak seems a brand that is known by many of them. This knowledge was a result of being present for so many years in the market, Arla’s spokesman Louis Honore put it this way: “We have built up our business in the Middle East countries for 40 years, and have had
production in Saudi Arabia for 20 years, and then within five days or so this is all in ruins” (BBC, 2006).

Therefore, boycotting participants were brand-aware when it comes to identifying Danish brands particularly Lurpak. However, the brand owner Arla Foods (http://www.arla.com) is not as famous as its brand Lurpak; the majority of participants were not familiar with the Arla Foods Company.

Participants shop mainly by going in person to stores on a regular basis, mainly once a week, which could be a factor in explaining their high level of brand awareness as going to stores could be interpreted as a learning process that enhances their brand knowledge. This might also explain why many participants were loyal to brands and sensible shoppers too, for example knowing how to get the best value for their money by following sales promotions that many of them feel can save them money.

However, some stated that they shop online, as it is cheaper and easier than physically going to stores. Internet shopping could be a result of the price factor, which can potentially determine how people shop nowadays. The influence of this factor is well documented in the marketing literature (Ahmed et al., 2011; Nandamuri and Gowthami, 2012).

Participants seemed familiar with what being a loyal consumer means; in fact, most of the boycotters are or were loyal to one brand or more at some point of their life (see Table 10). It seems that loyalty has no expiry date; it can last a lifetime as one participant said she has been loyal to Twinings tea for over ten years, and another has been loyal to Lurpak butter for over eighteen years.

8.2.4 Readiness to Sacrifice

Easily available substitutes offered by today’s’ saturated market seemed to be a factor in many boycotters readiness to sacrifice as many boycotters stated that they can easily sacrifice buying their favourite brands and switch to available substitute brands if they had some reason to switch from a brand they were currently using, see Table 10.

Boycotters stated reasons some of which were purely economical as well as noble political, religious or ethical reasons; one participant (3-35) responded when asked whether it is
easy or hard for her to find a substitute “it is very easy to find a substitute, the market is full of alternative brands. I would switch if I find a good quality, healthier, easier to find and reasonably priced similar brand” and this saturated market might support Shukla (2004) point of view when he argued that businesses lose half of their customers every five years.

Six out of the eleven non-boycotters who were interviewed stated that it is not easy for them to find a suitable substitute to their preferred brand; one participant (18-35) said “The problem with switching is that you will have to try many brands till you reach to a brand that can be a suitable substitute to the brand you used to”. Some participants find it particularly hard to replace a brand which they have used since childhood, and others stated that the inconvenience of trying another brand is what makes them wary of making such purchase sacrifices. Others like routine in their life and changes to this routine do not appeal to them.

One of those six has been loyal to his preferred brand which was Lurpak for over eighteen years, the other was loyal to Feta cheese for over ten years and the remaining four have been buying their same favourite brands for over five years which might indicate not only that the longer the loyalty to particular brands, the harder it becomes to switch but also the longer duration of loyalty, seemed to make it harder for those participants to join a boycott campaign that targets their favourite brands.

The success of business organisations depends on their ability to sustain lasting relationships with their customers who purchase their brands on a repeated basis (Reinartz et al. 2005; Rust et al. 2004), hence, loyalty in this sense provides firms with a trading leverage not only against their competitors as Aaker (1991) suggested but also potentially against more extreme market situations such as boycotting.

8.2.5 Assessing the Impact of Social Capital

Participants were well connected with their families in their country of origin and this included parents, brothers and sisters and extended family members, they all have friends, some have a large circle of friends scattered around the world, and others have a selected few friends.

Participants communicate regularly with their families who reside in their country of origin. Many of the participants stated that they communicate with their families on a
weekly basis and some stated that they communicate on a daily basis using various communication platforms such as direct phone calls, Skype, Viber, Facebook and other available software applications. One participant (3-35) said, “I keep in touch with them (family) almost on a daily basis using new communication technologies such as Skype, Viper, Tango and Whatsapp.”

Many participants recognised the role their family plays in influencing their consumption behaviour not only when making buying but also boycotting choices, in fact, one participant (5-35) was very clear in this regard, when asked whether his family, which as part of his social capital, is influential on his purchasing decisions he responded, “They are very important; they can influence my buying behaviour.”

Ioanâs and Stoica (2014) argued that the internet and virtual communities have not only transformed consumers and societies but also businesses, in fact, it has contributed to effective social connectedness and improved users communication capabilities (Kucuk and Krishnamurthy, 2007)

Friends come second in terms of communication frequency. However, they still seem to have a role as an important social capital as one participant (27-35) responded when asked how influential his friends on his consumption behaviour “I am very attached to my close friends and to be honest, sometimes they have more influence on me than my own family”.

Connectedness and social capital seem to work both ways for boycotting and non-boycotting participants and impacts on both sides of the relationships despite geographical distance. Connectedness allows participants to get a close look at the daily life of their families and friends whether in their country of origin or elsewhere, but this means that despite living far from each other geographically they are still very much part of their communities in the non-virtual sense.

This non-virtual presence created social pressure which according to boycotters can influence not only the way they consume but also whether they participate in a boycott campaign or not. As one boycotting participant (32-35) put it when asked how influential his social ties on his boycotting behaviour “if they ask me to boycott a brand for good reasons then I would”. The importance of this pressure that social capital and
connectedness creates is also documented in the boycott literature such as Klein et al. (2004); Friedman (1999); Smith (1990); Garrett (1987).

Even though there seems to be a consensus on the impact of social pressure on boycotting and non-boycotting participant’s behaviour, not everyone shares the same opinion as some non-boycotting participants stated that boycotting or buying a particular brand is a personal choice for the individual himself/herself. As one participant responded when asked how would he feel if he is buying a brand that is boycotted by his family "I think everyone is entitled to have his personal perspective, and I appreciate this is the same for my family". This point view was shared by many other non-boycotters who also believed that boycotting or buying a particular brand is a purely personal choice and should not be influenced by family or friends or social network.

8.3 Factors Influencing Brand Loyalty

The first section of the analysis explored the characteristics of the interviewed boycotting transnationals; it discussed their demographics, their transnationality characteristics, their knowledge, readiness to sacrifice and their social capital and its impact on their consumption choices. The following sections shed light on the drivers that influence their brand loyalty. It was divided into three sections: consumer drivers, brand drivers and social drivers.

8.3.1 Consumer drivers

Consumers’ drivers as suggested in the proposed model that was adapted from Gounaris and Stathakopoulos’ (2004) potential loyalty driver model, the new model developed consisted of six drivers; risk aversion, variety seeking, demographics, the level of involvement, religion and transnationality.

8.3.1.1 Risk Aversion

Many participants thought that switching from their favourite brands to new FMCG brands that they have not tried before entails minimal or no risk at all due to the low monetary value of these brands. This tendency was more pronounced in older participants’ responses than the younger ones, and it was also a clear trend for the five divorced participants. Thus, risk aversion is a consumer’s behaviour that can be predicted by age among other variables
such as social status (Bigne et al., 2005). Furthermore, Du Plooy and Roodt (2013) argued that marital status might have an impact on how individuals choose a course of action when faced with particular circumstances based on their various responsibilities and commitments.

One participant who thought that switching entails no risk connected his decision to switch to knowing more about the new brand that he had not tried yet before making his choice whether to buy the new brand or stay with the brand he knows. Another participant linked the degree of risk to the person’s financial status.

Knowledge of new, untried brands and consumer’s financial status influenced the level of risk a particular participant would take. In fact, Kaur and Singh (2006, p. 1) stated that parents “buying patterns are affected by prior knowledge of the tastes and preferences of their children”. Furthermore, Nandamuri and Gowthami (2012) and Kalyanam et al. (1997) found that demographics including income do influence consumers purchasing intention and brand choice.

8.3.1.2 Variety Seeking

Many participants thought that sticking with what they know is a safe course of action when confronted with situations that have degree of uncertainty or complexity. Some thought that seeking a new variety is a personal choice while others thought that their age was a factor that makes them become more attached to what they know and have tried before.

Other participants said that sales promotions and advertising were factors that encouraged them to seek new varieties and buy brands that they never tried before. As one participant (2-35) responded when asked if she likes to try brands that she hasn’t tried before “I may try brands that I have not tried before during sales promotion or as a result of an advert about a particular new brand”.

The above statement indicates that seeking new varieties or sticking with they already know and tried for those participants was either a personal choice, due to demographic factors, for instance, age or as a result of promotions and advertising which influenced them to seek and try brands that they have not tried before.
Retaining loyal consumers is a prime responsibility of businesses as Doyle (1998, p. 165) stated that “Successful brands create wealth by attracting and retaining consumers” because they are an asset to any business organisation. Seeking variety could be the first step to switching that many marketers are concerned with, primarily, due the availability of alternative or new products (Datta, 2003).

### 8.3.1.3 Demographics

Many participants are or were loyal to particular brands at a certain stage of their lives, the very few participants who stated that they never been loyal to any brands were male participants only, see Table 8-1. Even though this conflicts with Serenko et al. (2006) who found no difference between males and females in relation to brand satisfaction and retention intentions, gender differences should not be ignored especially when many other scholars suggested that gender does influences consumption behaviour (Ahmed et al., 2011; Kaynak et al., 1991; Bajtelsmi and Bernasek, 1996).

Income also played role, one participants (9-35) said “I think I don’t like to try brands that I haven’t tried before simply because my finances are not great since I came here so I always try to budget and for the things I don’t need or haven’t tried before I wouldn’t buy them”. Marital status seemed to be an important driver for loyalty, which was attributed to the pressure the family unit (i.e. spouse or children) puts on the decision-making process. This pressure was acknowledged by Du Plooy and Roodt (2013) who argued that various responsibilities and commitments influence decision making process within families.

Ahmed et al. (2011) found no significant association between age, consumer satisfaction and retention however; in contrast, Bigne et al. (2005) argued that consumer behaviour can be predicted by age and Butler et al. (1996) found that age influences perceived quality.

Women were more likely than men to remain loyal to their favourite brands as many of them viewed switching as a difficult choice for reasons such as a taste which they are used to, quality or the inconvenience of looking for substitute brands. This difference between male and females in terms of risk taken is in line with the previous findings of Bajtelsmi et al. (1996) who found that females also are not keen on taking risk.
8.3.1.4 Level on Involvement

There was a mixed reaction amongst participants when asked if they give feedback to the brands that they are loyal to; some said that they tend to give feedback in stores, others said they would provide their feedback online, and other participants said they would respond to surveys sent to them by the brands to which they are loyal also. However, some participants said they would only give feedback when a brand they bought malfunctions or if they feel that it is quality is not the same. The above indicates a reasonable level of involvement that is a determinant of loyalty, according to many authors (Shukla, 2004; Hishamuddin et al., 2006; Long-Yi and Chen, 2006).

Participants who said they do not give feedback to their favourite brands cited several reasons for not doing so; their point of view is not important to manufacturers of these brands, they do not have time to give feedback or due to their satisfaction with these brands hence, they do not feel the need to interact with them.

Another non-feedback giver (31-35) was on the extreme side of the relationship between himself and the brands he is loyal to as he responded when asked if he gives feedback “No, I don’t and even if the brand I bought was not good I won’t give feedback I would only stop buying it anymore”.

This latter statement clearly shows the importance of getting consumers involved with the brand. It also suggests that businesses that do not pay attention to this matter can potentially lose good, loyal consumers who are just not interested in giving feedback for whatever reasons they have. The importance of this involvement was advocated by Hishamuddin et al. (2006) who argued that brand involvement has a substantial influence on brand loyalty and Long-Yi and Chen (2006) who found that product involvement has a considerably positive influence on purchase behaviour.

8.3.1.5 Religion

Religion, as expected was instrumental in influencing loyalty; for food brands, religious requirements (i.e. Halal food), as shown in Figure 8.1, was a must for them even for the participants said that they are not loyal to any particular brand. One participant (19-35) stated, “I don’t think I am loyal to any brands, but I always buy brands that are Halal like Shazans chicken at Tesco”. Another participant (8-35) stated “I am only loyal to food brands
that are Halal like meat and chicken because of my religion” and both of the above statements show clearly how religion impacts on individuals’ purchasing choices and this conforms with the findings of many authors (Delener, 1990; Essoo and Dibb, 2004; Al-Hyari et al., 2012).

Additionally, religious denomination within Islam seemed to play a part in loyalty intentions; analysis suggested that Shiaa tend to be more loyal than Sunnis; religious denomination seemed to influence not only boycotting as stated earlier but also loyalty to brands. There is little available academic literature on the effect of the religious denomination on consumption behaviour in general and on loyalty behaviour in particular (Farah and El Samad, 2015) and this can be explained by the sensitivity of the issue, which might have caused many academics to avoid exploring this area.
Figure 8.1 Impact of religious requirement (Halal food) on loyalty - Text search query
It can be argued that these above resources are not closely relevant to this debate on the role of religious denomination on consumption choice, but it still not only highlights some differences among these two major religious denominations within the Arab Muslim communities but also might ignite others interest in exploring this area as it appears that this is the first study that not only explored the consumption behaviour among these religious denominations within Islam but also the first to investigate them from a transnationality perspective.

8.3.1.6 Transnationality

Similar to the earlier section concerning the characteristics of transnational Muslim Arab boycotters, living abroad seemed to offer participants new perspectives on consumption. Participants’ duration of stay outside their country of origin appeared to enhance their level of knowledge for many brands, and this has a potential influence on loyalty.

Living in a multicultural, multi-faith country like the UK has helped in knowing not only many cultures and faith groups but also in exposing them to many new brands. In fact, this was the response of one participant (7-35) when she was asked about whether living abroad has changed her consumption behaviour, she said “people’s exposure to brands is limited and most people consume local brands for its price and conformity with local culture and customs. I would like to think that I am now more brand-aware, and my options are unlimited when it come to buying goods of any type”.

Another participant (4-35) thought that living abroad made here aware of the ethical attributes of brands, she said that living abroad “made me more ethically aware; however, in Egypt you don’t question where brands come from because of the limitation of brands. So living here made me more brand-aware and how ethical or unethical brands are. Therefore, this knowledge according to many resulted in many cases in making an informed choice in buying and then re-buying brands that they liked after the first trial.

By re-visiting the definition of transnationalism produced by Basch et al. (1994) it can be seen that transnationality is not only mere mobility from one country to another, but also, it means a blending process of two or more cultures and this blend enhances knowledge in general and brand knowledge in particular. This argument can be supported by the views
of those participants who thought that living abroad exposes them to a larger variety of brands that may influence their buying and re-buying habits.

However, these habits are the mixture of both cultures, the culture they live in, and their country of origin's and this mixture creates according to Lichy and Pon (2013, p. 5) a “subgroup of consumers with different purchasing habits”.

8.3.2 Brand Drivers

There were eight loyalty factors that appeared as brand drivers during the thirty-five face-to-face interviews; quality, price, taste, sales promotion, brand names being the main factors, followed by Country Of Origin (COO), the availability of substitute brands and advertising. These factors could potentially influence loyalty toward particular brands. Quality and price were the most important factors as seen in Figure 8.2. Quality influence on brand loyalty is well documented in the literature as explained earlier in Chapter 5 but whether it is the most important factor or not is still disputed.

Figure 8.2 Quality as a driver of loyalty among participants

Females differ slightly on what attributes their preferred brands should have, see Figure 8.3; male participants rated quality first then price second as the most important attributes then other attributes such as taste (which refers to brand usage history in the case of this study), brand names, etc. to different degree of importance as one participant (2-35) quoted “I think quality is the most important factor, I also buy according to brand reputation
and sales promotion sometimes influences me to buy brands I never tried before”. Female participants gave both quality and price equal importance in their ratings.

Figure 8.3 Quality and price were of the same importance as drivers for loyalty among females

These differences are not new to marketing literature and many studies including Kalyanam and Putler (1997), Williams (2002) and Norris et al. (2004) have found that demographic variables are well known to influence consumers’ purchase intentions.

Moreover, brand names, advertising and sales promotion were more important for female than male participants, see Figure 8.3 to Figure 8.4.

Figure 8.4 Quality first then price as loyalty drivers among males

Moreover, the brand’s COO seemed to be an important loyalty factor for participants and many connected COO to quality. The influence of COO is not new to brand loyalty literature; in fact, there are ample studies on the effect of COO on consumer’s purchasing decisions.
(Xuehua and Zhilin, 2008; Brodowsky, 1998; Piron, 2000; Bluemelhuber et al., 2007) which indicates the importance of COO not only to marketers but to academics too.

### 8.3.3 Social Drivers

Most participants agreed that social and group pressure (i.e. family and friends) plays an important role in influencing their consumption behaviour, and this influence includes brand loyalty intentions, one participant (19-35) stated, “My family has a huge influence on my purchasing choices”.

In fact, for many participants, family influence can extend beyond routine consumption behaviours or patterns to more extreme behaviour (i.e. loyalty or even boycotting) as one participant (12-35) responded when asked if she was ever encouraged by her family to boycott “I was encouraged by my family to boycott the Danish brands, Coca-Cola and Marks and Spencer and I did listen to their advice”. Many authors such as Friedman (1999), Garrett (1987) John and Klein (2003) and Maher and Mady (2010) acknowledged the relevance of social pressure as a driver not only for loyalty but also for boycott participation.

Many participants thought that despite the fact they boycotted the Danish brands in 2006 they still think that their action might have been more extreme if they had been living in their country of origin as a result of the anticipated social pressure from their communities there.

One participant (26-35) said when asked if his action would be different if he was living in his country of origin at the time of the Danish brands boycott:

> I think I would be more extreme and influenced by the community I am living in.... and if something like the Danish brand boycott in 2006 happens again while I am in Iraq, then I would have to go with the flow without any questioning even why.

This pressure that can potentially lead to boycotting is well documented in the marketing literature and the consumer boycott literature in particular as discussed earlier.

Connectedness is irregular with peers (i.e. friends) according to many participants and occasionally happens using social media platforms such as Facebook, and this is the same for extended family members and friends living abroad, additionally, peer’s recommendation did not have as much impact as the family recommendation or
encouragement on those participants’ consumption behaviour. However, some other participants stated that their friends could influence their consumption behaviour especially when they go shopping together.

8.4 Religiously Motivated Consumer Boycotts Impact on Brand Loyalty

This section discusses the impact of boycotts that are motivated by religion on brand loyalty, in the pursuit of a better understanding of the role of religion on consumption, boycotting and loyalty, this section starts by exploring religiosity from the participants perspective, the factors that influence boycott participation and finally how influential religious boycott on participants’ brand loyalty.

8.4.1 Exploring Religiosity

Eleven questions were put forward to participants aiming to examine their religiosity such as attachment and practice of Islam to explore how religion can influence their brand loyalty and boycotting intentions.

As mentioned earlier all participants associated themselves with Islam; some participants were Sunni while others were Shiaa Muslims. Many of the interviewed Sunni and Shiaa boycotted mainly because they considered insulting the Prophet Mohammed to be an attack on their core religious beliefs.

The Sunni boycotters shared a similar stance with the Shiaa boycotters. However, Sunni non-boycotters didn’t think that the Danish brands boycott was a justified action, and hence, they didn’t participate in it for a variety of reasons such as the perceived participation level or because they question the real reasons behind this boycott. As one participant (35-35) said “I do respect people’s choices to do that, but I would question the effectiveness of that approach”.

The thirty-five participants also answered a number of questions relating to their belief and commitment to their religion. Religion appeared to be important to most of them. Only two participants said they were not very much into religion and the reasons they gave were because living in the UK and being exposed to different religions and cultures has made them less religious or because they cannot feel the closeness to God all the time.
All interviewees understand and appreciate the importance of Muslim’s five prayers a day and many of them shared similar views about its importance as a means to keep connected with God as one of the participants (7-35) said “It is a way of communicating with God that is why Muslims pray 5 times to keep close to God”. However, despite their recognition of prayers importance, there were a few male participants who were not doing it, however, all female participants said that they do regularly pray either at work or at home.

Giving Zakah (charitable donations) is a routine practice among Muslims. All participants stated that they do it for many reasons mainly because it is a religious obligation placed upon them by God, some others said that they give Zakah as they consider it as a way to establish harmony in society and break the barriers between the rich and the poor. Others mentioned an interesting reason that makes them give Zakah such as seeing it as a contributor to individual’s wealth as when you give God gives you back more.

One participant (13-35) voiced his concern about the institutions that collect Zakah and said when asked what he thinks of giving Zakah “Money paid for Zakah is now being paid to wage wars and conflict in the Muslim world”. This raised a trust issue with the institutions that collect Zakah and how, where and what they spend Zakah money on.

Connectedness with God is also made by reading the Quraan which many participants stated that they do either listen to or read the Quraan on regular basis and doing so makes them feel safe as one participant (12-35) put it when asked whether she reads or listens to the Quraan “I read the Quraan every night, and it makes me feel safe, and it calms me down”. However, very few were interested in reading religiously oriented textbooks for reasons such as the lack of free time in their busy life or because they do not trust the ideas these books are trying to promote.

They all want their children to learn Islam at a young age as they want them to grow up as Muslims, some said that they do so as a parental duty, while others said that they want to teach their children the moderate Islam so they protect them from being vulnerable to radicalisation when they grow up “I always worry that nowadays there are many radical ideas ... and I certainly don’t wish my kids to carry such ideas” one participant (22-35) responded when asked whether she would encourage her children to practice Islam and why. Another participant thought of Islam, as a direction therefore, she wants to give her children a direction in life.
Many authors have attempted to define religiosity and in this research the literature review discussed many definitions such as O’Connell (1975), Vitel (2009) and McDaniel and Burnett (1990) however, this study sees a religious person as being someone who believes in God and practises the testimony of faith, do prayers, give Zakah, fasts during Ramadan, and does the Hajj journey to Makkah once in a lifetime when and if able to do so.

However, despite all the differences in participants’ level of intrinsic and extrinsic values, the majority of participants stated that they see themselves as a moderate Muslims when asked about how religious they think they are.

8.4.2 Factors Influencing Participation

Participants were asked about the reasons that would make them boycott; there were a number of factors that contributed to their boycotting choice. These factors were divided into six categories; namely economic (i.e. price, quality, taste), religious, political, conflict (war), ethical and environmental reasons as seen in Figure 8.5 below. Generally, economic reasons were the most important factors for those transnational consumers.

Understandably, as the relevant marketing literature suggested, people boycott for various reasons; some discussed pure economic factors such as price and quality (Friedman, 1999) others discussed non-economic factors such as religious, social, political, environmental, or ethical factors (Smith, 1990; Garrett, 1987; Kalliny and Lemaster 2005; Swimberghe et al. 2011). Authors such as Sen et al. (2001) and Brewer and Brown (1998) also argued that people participate to preserve their sense of belonging.

Figure 8.5 Economic were first then religious reasons among all participants

Religion was the second most important factor (see Figure 8.6.) and all participants who boycotted the Danish brands in 2006 associated their choice to boycott with the religious
nature of that boycott because they thought that allowing the publication of such insulting cartoons were an attack on their fundamental religious beliefs, in fact, one participant (21-35) said when asked whether an attack on his religious beliefs would be a motive to boycott certain brands: “Yes, religion is important in my life as a Muslim and this would constitute enough reason for me to boycott”.

It is argued in relevant social science literature that religion has a profound influence in all aspects of Muslims life, and this includes values, culture as well as behaviours including consumption behaviour (Nawal, 2009; Roald, 2001; Al-Qaradawy, 1995; Maududi, 1960).

The political reasons shown in Figure 8.7 were also important factors for many participants that can potentially contribute to their choice to boycott; one participant (4-35) responded with the following when asked about the reasons that would make him boycott:

*I am a fan of German brands, and I think highly of the quality of their brands, but I may consider boycotting them if they start supporting the Saudi Arabia regime by giving them arms that can assist the regime in killing or oppressing protesters.*

This was the argument of Witkowski (1989) who thought that political considerations could rapidly influence consumers’ preferences.
Figure 8.6 Religious reasons as a motive for boycotting
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Figure 8.7 Political reasons as a motive for boycotting
Conflict was an important factor too on many participants’ choice to boycott, as shown in Figure 8.8, interestingly, most participants associated their reason to boycott Israel with the ongoing conflict in Palestine between the Arabs and the Jewish, and the majority of participants have been boycotting Israeli brands for many years as a result of this conflict.

One participant (25.35) from Jordan said when asked about the reasons that motivated him to boycott “I have always boycotted Israeli brands because of their occupation to Palestine”. Many participants shared this participant’s opinion also; another Moroccan participant went even further by boycotting companies that allegedly support Israel.

Conflict as a boycott motivation was also documented in the consumer behaviour literature; Shoham et al. (2006) argued that the Israeli-Arab conflict have negatively impacted on Jewish Israelis willingness to buy products produced by Arabs and Weiss (2006) also found Israeli military action against Palestine has led to a collective, national and macro-boycott of goods produced by Israel.

Ethical and environmental reasons were also mentioned by small number of participants as reasons that may influence them to boycott especially mentioning what is known now as ‘sweatshops’ in some Asian countries where labourers working for big Western corporations are not provided with the minimum accepted working conditions.
Figure 8.8 Ongoing Arab-Israel conflict as a motive for boycotting
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8.4.3 Religious Boycott Impact on Participants’ Brand Loyalty

Participants were asked about whether they boycotted Danish brands in 2006 and how long they boycotted these brands and due to the religious nature of that boycott most of them said that they boycotted since 2006 and had not considered going back to buying Danish brands, one participant (27.35) said, “Up to date I don’t buy any Danish brands as they insulted my religion which is very important to me”. Another participant (2.35) responded, “I am still boycotting Danish brands, and I don’t think of going back to buying their brands as I have now settled with good quality substitutes which I am happy with”.

The above statements which were shared by many participants show the strong effect of religion on the duration of the boycott which seemed to be influenced by participants’ level of religiosity that is, the more religious they are, the longer their boycotting duration is.

Other boycotters stated that they boycotted for various periods of time one said he stopped boycotting after three years because the boycotting campaign intensity faded away; another participant (10.35) responded, “My family and I boycotted for over three years but our boycott faded with time now, and we do buy some Danish brands occasionally”. These statements can be connected to Sen and Morwitz (2001) and John and Klein (2003) studies which argued that people perceptions of estimated participation level impacts on boycott participation.

Many boycotters of Danish brands in 2006 stated that they felt happy for doing something in support of their religion; Islam, others were proud to do so as one participant (6.35) stated when asked about how she feels about her participation in the Danish brands boycott in 2006 “I am still proud of what I did, and it is a duty on me as a Muslim to defend my faith”, this boycotter point of view was shared by many other boycotters who took part in these interviews.

The literature on the influence of Islam on behaviour was discussed in earlier sections. Furthermore, to show how religious influence is deeply profound amongst follower of this faith, a shopkeeper stated that he regrets boycotting at that time as this lost him business, but he did it for religious reasons only.

Non-boycotters had mixed emotions relating to their choice not to boycott at that time, some said they are confident that they made the right choice; one said (29.35), “I am
satisfied with the decision I made not to boycott”. However, some other non-boycotters were not happy about their choice not to boycott putting the blame on their lack of awareness of the cause of that boycott.

However, when participants were asked whether they think remarks or insult against their faith would constitute a reason for them to boycott, many participants (boycotters and non-boycotters) stated that insulting their religion in any way or form would constitute a reason for them to boycott.

Other non-boycotting participants saw boycott as a wrong course of action for various reasons; some think boycotters targeted the wrong companies, others said boycotting is not the best solution, and a civilised dialogue is the right course of action which should have been taken at that time and others thought that boycotting meant a loss of jobs and income for many Muslim families that were dependent on because they were working for the boycotted companies at that time.

Finally, the analysis clearly showed the influence of religion on boycotters’ choice to boycott, how it influenced their loyalty, and the expected negative long-term impact religious boycotting can have on brand loyalty.

8.5 Conclusions

Analysis showed that many of those consumers were young, educated and working. It also showed that due to living in a non-Muslim country and because eating Halal food is a religious requirement, those consumers developed an awareness of brands, and the habit of reading brand labels and ingredients information became part of their shopping practice. The majority despite differences in their denominations (i.e. Sunnis and Shiaas) made their association to their faith as moderate Muslim clear.

However, their level of religiosity in both terms belief and commitment varied from one to another, but the main theme was that they are committed practising Muslims, which entails belief in God, the Prophet, praying, fasting during Ramadan, going to Hajj and aiming to rise their children according to Islamic values and beliefs.

Duration of stay seems to influence how participants viewed the environment around them, being transnational meant learning new values, knowing new cultures and most
importantly being exposed to many brands that many of them haven’t tried in their country of origin either because they are not available or because they are too expensive.

Those consumers are E-connected and have large family and friend networks not only in their country of origin but in many parts of the world. They are active users of many social media platforms which they utilised to keep them close to their social circle. However, being an active user of the internet technology did not have an impact on how they shop as the majority shop for household goods including foodstuffs by physically going to stores not by ordering online.

Connectedness played a considerable role also in spreading the news of boycotts when they start; when those transnationals learn about boycotts via various communication platforms they then share it with their social network and this may explain why they were well aware of the Danish brands boycott in 2006.

Connectedness seemed to have both a negative and positive impact on them; it works both ways, for example, keeping them close to their loved ones, but this closeness also creates a social pressure and makes them feel that they are still living in their communities in a non-virtual sense which may play a considerable role in influencing their boycott or purchase choices. Additionally, social pressure appeared in three forms for those transnationals, one was the feeling of guilt, the second was to avoid negative criticism and third was the worry of being left out.

Not only that, their connectedness, transnationality nature and exposure to new cultures, language, environment and markets made them aware of brands and brands’ country of origin too, so it made it easy to make a choice when it comes to boycotting particular brands.

Furthermore, those transnationals do value and favour quality brands and, therefore, can potentially be loyal to these brands with a commitment that can last a lifetime too. However, the availability of suitable substitutes appeared to impact on their loyalty especially in today’s saturated market. Moreover, switching seemed an easy a course of action that they can opt for, not only for pure economic reasons but also for non-economic reasons such as political, religious or ethical reasons.

As for the factors influencing their brand loyalty, risk aversion was not a major loyalty factor for many of those transnationals, this was either due to the low monetary value of
FMCG including foodstuffs or due to demographic factors such as financial status, gender or age. With regard to age, this tendency was clearer in older participants’ responses than the younger ones, and this supports the argument of (Edelman, 2010) who found that the younger generation was considerably more brand loyal compared to the older generation. Furthermore, it seemed that females see switching as a difficult choice more so than male participants for many reasons including taste, quality or inconvenience.

As for variety seeking, a connection was made between seeking new varieties of brands, sales promotion and advertising; those last two factors contributed to the desire of many participants to explore new varieties. As for demographics, males seemed less loyal to brands than females, married seemed to be loyal more than singles due to the involvement of children in the decision-making process.

Participants’ low level of involvement was either due to the irrelevance of giving feedback, the lack of time or due to their satisfaction with their favourite brands, consequently, this low involvement may be also linked to the low monetary value of the FMCG brands particularly foodstuff and can potentially contribute to low brand attachment, which might explain why the earlier two factors (i.e. risk aversion and variety seeking) were insignificant to many participants.

The usage history of the brands which in this research is referred to as brand’s taste appeared to have an important influence on brand loyalty for many participants; this was mainly due to early exposure to a particular brand’s taste usually since childhood.

Quality, price, sales promotion, advertising, brand names, country of origin and the availability of substitute brands appeared as important factors for those transnational participants. Quality ranked first amongst them, and these factors were all identified as brand drivers that can potentially influence brand loyalty.

Social pressure is classed in this research as a social driver for brand loyalty, it is a consequence of consumers’ social capital which seemed to have a considerable influence on those transnationals consumption behaviour. However, the degree of influence varies depending on how close the relationship is and how often connectedness occurs; families seemed to have more influence than peers.

Religious denomination and the attribute of the brand (i.e. being Halal) seemed important in influencing brand loyalty as a consumer driver. Seeking Halal food is a religious
requirement that cannot be ignored because it contradicts with the fundamentals of the Muslim faith. Religious denomination appeared as a new understudied contributor to loyalty which seemed to differentiate Shiaa from Sunni in terms of loyalty behaviour.

As for the impact of the religiously motivated boycott on brand loyalty, analyses suggested that many factors influence boycott participation namely: economical, religious, political, conflict (war), ethical and environmental factors. Religion appeared as an important factor as most of them seemed religiously committed in terms of belief and practice. For them, religion works as a way of life, and it seems to govern many aspects of their daily activities. Not only that, religion was the motive for them to participate in the Danish brands boycott in 2006 and that made them feel proud and happy to serve a cause that is connected to their faith.

The implication of such commitment showed clearly on most participants who boycotted in 2006 and didn’t consider going back to the boycotted brands only because the insult to their religion was too much to forgive, this resulted in finding substitutes which served their desire whether in taste, price or quality. The difficulty with religiously motivated boycotts is the forgiveness part, which clearly, made those transnationals forget about the brands they once loved and were loyal to, and in the end, switched for good. Hence, regaining loyalty again from consumers who have boycotted on religious grounds seems a hard task for brand owners.

Many of the boycott campaigns this research has analysed were ended when boycotters demands were met by boycotted party, some boycott calls never gathered momentum and failed to attract consumers’ attention, nonetheless, the successful ones were active for months and some for couple of years, however, religiously motivated boycott such as the 2006 Danish products boycott seemed to have a long lasting effect on not only the boycotting behaviour but also the brand loyalty of participants.

Many of those consumers couldn’t forgive Denmark as a country nor the brands that it produces for insulting Prophet Mohammed who in their point of view represents Islam. This is contrary to the economically motivated boycott which is based on economic demands by consumers such as price drops or paying taxes that seem to end when the boycotted party meets them.
Chapter 9 Quantitative Analyses

9.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the descriptive analysis of the online questionnaire, then goes on to explore the characteristics of the sampled population using Factor analyses, the data produced were then analysed and a logistic regression model with the significant variables that shaped the characteristics of those boycotters is presented.

This chapter also presents analysis of the determinants of brand loyalty including consumer drivers, brand drivers and social drivers and modelling the significant variables using logistic regression. This is followed by analysis of the impact of religiously motivated consumers boycott the on the brand loyalty of those transnational consumers. This chapter also discusses the factors determining boycott participation and finally presents an integration of both qualitative and quantitative data analyses.

9.2 Descriptive Analyses: Respondents Profiles

The questionnaire collected 537 responses in total. In the following, eighty-one cases were excluded because they did not have gender information. Many categories were re-coded, for reasons of economy of space. For example, age categories were re-coded into “55 and above” instead of 55-64 then 65-74. Similarly, the marital status where divorced, widowed and separated were re-coded into “Other” category and similar re-coding process was applied to income, employment, qualification, religious denominations and the reason for coming to the UK. Table 9-1 below provides a summary of each variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9-1 Summary of sampled population demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No of children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=421</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry &amp; Level 1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 5-9 &amp; Prof.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=421</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious denomination</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shiaa</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=421</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for coming to the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for coming to the UK</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For employment</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For study</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=416</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Men were 55% of the sample and women were 45%. Most of the respondents were in the age segments 25-34 (42%) and 35-44 years old (31%). The lowest representation was in the late middle aged and the elderly (9%). An estimate of the median age was obtained by taking into account the age distribution of non-UK born nationals from the 2011 Census (Office of National Statistics, 2011b). The result was 37 years, which matches the official statistics that was 37.3%, see Figure 4 in Chapter 2.

Gender was almost equally distributed in the more populated age categories, 25-34 and 35-44 years old. The large majority of the respondents were married (49%) or single (43%). Those who were divorced, separated or widowed did not exceed 9% of the sample.

Of the (261) respondents who reported having children or not; more than 70% of those who have children had two or more children.

Gross annual income from all sources was reported by 421 people, which was 78% of the respondents. Despite the high number of people in the ‘Less than £10000’ category (which could be explained by the reported higher number of respondents working on part-time basis- see employment and income sections in Table 9-1 above. The income distribution is typical of similar distributions with a large value at the less than £10000 category, a “plateau” in the middle and a small value in the higher income category.
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Almost 40% of the respondents had a university degree. Only six respondents mentioned that they did not have any qualifications.

More than three out of four respondents (78%) were part-time or full-time employees, or self-employed. The rest were mostly unemployed, either looking for work or not, and few unable to work or retired. There were notable differences between men and women in the full-time employment category (2.5 times more men) and in the unemployed where the reverse held. This difference could be explained by the nature of this population where work and earning a living is a key men’s value.

There was a wide variety of job titles stated by the respondents. The most common answers were students (62) and teachers (43), and then sales (26) and marketing (19). The large majority of the respondents were Shiaa and Sunni. Sunnis were the largest population within the sampled respondents at 74%, Shia made 24% and the remaining were from other religious denominations i.e. Ahmadiyya, Sufi. The ratio between these religious denominations was 1:3. There were also a very limited number of Ahmadiyya and Sufis.

It is important to mention that according to Sanders (1992), Bar-Asher (2014) and Farah and El Samad (2015), Sunnis make between 85-90% of the world’s Muslim population and Shiaa make around 15%.

The difference between the world’s and London Shiaa and Sunni Muslims average could be contributed to the migration of Shiaa Muslims from many Arab countries including Iraq and Bahrain who fled due to war as in the Iraqi Shiaa case or persecution and civil unrest as in the Bahraini Shiaa case.

Conflict-induced migration is acknowledged by many scholars (see Sirkeci, 2006; Wahlbeck, 1999; Demir, 2012; Sirkeci, 2009; Cohen and Sirkeci, 2011; Sirkeci et al., 2012; Sirkeci and Cohen, 2016; Sirkeci et al. 2016). In fact, Sirkeci et al. (2012) who proposed the the conflict model of migration argued that conflict played a role in the migration flow of Turkish nationals of Kurdish origin to Germany.

The following is a heat map (which is a graphical representation of data where the individual values are represented as colours) in Figure 9.1 shows the distribution of respondents’ countries of origin. Darker colours correspond to more respondents from a country.
The countries with the highest number of respondents were Egypt, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon with more than 40 respondents each. The United Arab Emirates ranked last, with only two respondents.

The reasons for coming to the UK were primarily for study (34%) and (25%) for employment. Most of the respondents (85%) had lived outside their country of origin more than three years and more than half of them five years or more.

The distribution of time living in London is quite similar to the one for the time living outside the country of origin which suggests that most of the respondents left their country of origin and came to London, without staying for some time in a transit country.

The vast majority of the respondents (94%) have family in their country of origin. They mostly (75%) communicate with them on a daily or weekly basis. This communication is very frequently carried out using modern technological platforms. Specialised applications such as Viber and Skype were the most used platforms, chosen by 57% of the respondents and social media the third one, chosen by 39%.

The majority of the respondents (77%) have friends in their country of origin. They mostly (61%) communicate with them on a weekly or monthly basis. This communication is
similarly (as with the family) very frequently carried out using modern technological platforms. Specialised applications were again the most used and first selected by 41% of the respondents and social media came second, selected by 37%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9-2 Summary of sampled population transnationality and social capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time living outside country of origin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family in the country of origin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology platform used</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct phone calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sections and tables above presented descriptive analysis for the collected data including demographics, religious denominations, transnationality, and data related to respondents social capital which are all part of the measures used in the factors analysis process. The following sections explore in depth the characteristics of those boycotting transnationals.
9.3 Boycotters Characteristics

This section examines boycotters’ characteristics, the quantitative analyses painted a rather clearer picture of what shapes the characteristics of those transnational boycotters including demographics, transnationality, brand loyalty, religion and social capital characteristics. These measures were the constructs of the logistic regression model, which included all significant variables.

9.3.1 Initial Variables Selection, Pre-processing and Data Reduction

The first step was to remove the incomplete 125 cases out of 537 where the dependent variable that is the answer to “Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?” was missing. These included incomplete responses and responses from respondents aged 18-24 years. Hence, the remained final sample total was 412 cases. The dependent variable was recorded into 0=“No”, 1=“Yes”.

9.3.2 Demographics Impact on Boycotting Behaviour

The following independent variables were used, as they all were significantly associated with the dependent variable which means that a significant relationship exists between those variables and the boycotting of Danish brands, see Appendix 1, Table 2 for the significance of each of the independent variables with the dependent variable:

- For age as ordinal, the last category was merged (“65 to 74”) which has only one observation with the “55 to 64” one, into a new category with value “55+”. The χ2 test with dependent variable resulted to p=0. In the category of younger respondents (“25 to 34”), those who boycotted the Danish brands in 2006 were almost 40%, while in the other categories this proportion was between 62% - 68%,

- Gender as nominal, the result of the χ2 test with dependent variable was p=0.007. Males were more likely to have boycotted the Danish brands in 2006. The contrary was observed in females.

- Marital status as nominal, the categories “Divorced”, “Separated” and “Widowed” were merged as they all had very small counts. The χ2 test with the dependent variable resulted to p=0.005. Married respondents were more likely to have boycotted the Danish brands in 2006 than those in the other categories.

- The number of children was dropped as a variable, for reasons soon to be discussed.
- Annual income as ordinal, the higher income categories 9 (£30,000-39,999), 10 (£40,000-49,999), 11 (£50,000-59,999) and 12 (£60,000 and over) were merged into a category “£30,000 and over” as they all had small counts and the first category “nil” and the second “Less than £6,000” were re-coded into “Less than £10,000” category. The χ2 test gave p=0. Respondents on lower incomes were less likely to have participated in the boycotting than those on higher incomes.

- As for qualifications a binary variable was created “Degree/ No degree” (as “Degree” was the most frequent value). The new variable showed a strong association with boycotting of Danish brands as p=0. Those with a degree were less likely to have boycotted the Danish brands in 2006, contrary to those without a degree.

- Employment as nominal, the χ2 test gave p=0. The category with only three counts (“disabled”) was left as is. Employed respondents were much more likely to have boycotted the Danish brands in 2006.

It should be noted that the number of children also has a high association with boycotting Danish brands (cases with only one or many children were more likely to have participated in the boycotting). However, it is also highly correlated with age, as shown by Spearman’s correlation analysis (rho = 0.418), see table 13 below. This variable also has many missing values (44.4%), therefore, it was decided to keep the age variable and drop the ‘number of children’ variable.

Other variables were dropped for other reasons: religious denomination-other, country of origin because it is a nominal variable with too many values and country of origin-other because these were mostly blank. Socio-economic Groups (SEG) and later known as the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SEC) was also dropped from the factor analysis for the following reasons.

NS-SEC is “an occupationally based classification but has rules to provide coverage of the whole adult population, including students and those who have never worked or were long-term unemployed” (Hall, 2006, p. 8). Occupation according to the ONS (2005, p. 3) is important in “showing the structure of socio-economic positions in modern societies and helping to explain variations in social behaviour and other social phenomena”.

NS-SEC has 8 classifications, namely, 1- Higher managerial and professional 2- Lower managerial and professional occupations 3- Intermediate occupations 4- Small employers
and own account workers 5- Lower supervisory and technical occupations 6- Semi-routine occupations 7- Routine occupations 8- Never worked and long-term unemployed.

This classification is not only important in the improvement of national schemes for comparative analysis (Savage et al., 2013), but also in providing summary of data that are relevant to social variations analysis which is important for policy makers in government departments (Hall, 2006).

However, because NS-SEC is an occupation-based measure, it has attracted much criticism; for example, Savage (2000) argues that this measure falls short of explaining other cultural and social activities as well as identities, hence, a new culturally and socially sensitive mode of analysis is thought to be more appropriate. From a theoretical perspective, Socioeconomic Index (SEI) developed by Duncan’s (1961) was constructed to connect occupation, income and education, where occupation is the social part of this index and income and education is the economic side of this construct.

Cambridge Social Interaction Scale (see Prandy, 1999) also opposes the use of occupation as the only measure for SEC. To measure SEC, this scale uses the patterns of social interaction, in other words, it uses network relationships to assess people’s SEC. This scale also takes employment status into account when assessing SEC (Rose, 2008).

Furthermore, this study is about transnationals who are immigrants in the first place and non-UK born and those immigrants according to Ainslie (2009, p. 1) “travel with their social context” and this context includes their social class. In fact, they bring with them more than that, they bring their values, languages and practices (Starbuck and Lundy, 2016). The above is also supported by the of French Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1984) who argued that social grade is not only based on occupation but also encompasses individuals’ social and cultural capital. In fact, the latter argued that the “influence of social origin is the strongest” in assessing class (p, 1).

Savage et al. (2013) developed a model for social class which is based on Bourdieu (1984) sociological theory, Savage et al. (2013, p. 223) model includes individuals’ economic capital which is a result of employment, wealth and income, cultural capital which is the outcome of cultural engagements and activities and finally, social capital which is a result of connectedness and network relationships.

The above sets the theoretical perspective for the non-inclusion of NS-SEC. From the empirical perspective, firstly, this study is of an exploratory nature (i.e. exploring the
boycotting and loyalty behaviour of the Arab immigrants). Secondly, a correlations test for reasons of completeness was conducted. The correlations, results in Table (9-3) show that income, employment status and NS-SEC are all correlated, and this guides us to proceed to a selection of variables to avoid collinearity problems in the modelling.

**Table 9-3 Correlations between income, employment status and NS-SEC class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>-.422**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS_SEC</td>
<td>-.420**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Income and employment status we selected as they were much more informative and accurate (especially after their recoding and the reduction of their categories). Furthermore, the NS-SEC would have to be recoded to be useful (to avoid too many “cells” in the models), at the cost of increasing the ambiguities. Therefore, in what follows the NS-SEC was left out of factor analysis.

Additionally, the Spearman’s correlation analysis between ordinal and binary variables also showed a high correlation between age and income (rho = 0.514), as shown in Table 9-4 below. However, because of the importance of these variables, it was decided to keep them both for the time being, but bearing this in mind when building the logistic regression model.

**Table 9-4 Correlations among demographic variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of children</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r-Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-Income</td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-Qualification</td>
<td>-.295**</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>-.205**</td>
<td>-.268**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No. of cases 412

“r” before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.
9.3.3 Transnationality

For the transnationality measure, the following independent variables were selected, all were also significantly associated with the dependent variable. Hence, a significant relationship exists between those variables and the boycotting of Danish brands, see Appendix 1, Table 2 for the significance of each of the independent variables with the boycotting of Danish brands:

- The number of years living outside country of origin as ordinal. The first two categories with small counts were merged with the third, into a category “Less than 3 years”. The $\chi^2$ test with the boycotting of Danish brands resulted to $p=0.015$. The longer the stay outside country of origin, the larger the proportion of those having taken part in the boycotting.

- The main reason for coming to the UK as nominal. For this variable, a new nominal variable with categories “Employment”, “Study”, “Asylum” and “Other” was created. The $\chi^2$ test with the boycotting of Danish brands resulted to $p=0$. Students were much less likely to have boycotted the Danish brands in 2006.

- The number of years living in London as ordinal (but see below – this variable was eventually dropped). As with the number of years living outside country of origin variable, a category of “Less than 3 years” was created. The $\chi^2$ test with the boycotting of Danish brands resulted to $p=0$. Hence, a significant relationship exists where the longer the stay in London, the larger the proportion of those having taking part in the boycott.

- The variable relating to whether living abroad changed respondents’ consumption behaviour as ordinal variable has 21 missing cases. The $\chi^2$ test with the boycotting of Danish brands gave $p=0$. Therefore, a significant relationship exists between those two variables. Those who agreed with this statement mostly took part in the boycott. The contrary applies with those who disagreed.

- The last option (i.e. other) for the question relating to the main reason for coming to the UK was dropped because it mostly had blanks.

A most significant (and obvious, see Table 9-5 below) correlation was found between the number of years living outside the country of origin and the number of years living in London (Spearman’s rho = 0.86). It was therefore decided to keep one variable, namely the
one referring to the number of years living outside country of origin as it was thought that it was conceptually closer to the transnationality measure.

### Table 9-5 Correlation among transnationality variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of years outside country of origin</th>
<th>No. of years living in London</th>
<th>Living abroad impact on consumption behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r-No. of years outside country of origin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.859**</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-No. of years living in London</td>
<td>-.210**</td>
<td>-.332**</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living abroad impact on consumption behaviour</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Although the two remaining ordinal variables (the number of years living outside country of origin and whether living abroad changed respondents’ consumption behaviour) have different scales, factor analysis can be applied to replace them by one, provided this is based on correlations and the standardised factor scores is used. This analysis was applied and extracted one factor with a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy of 0.5, which is marginally acceptable. However, a reduction by only one variable is not worth the loss of variance, therefore, it was decided to leave those two variables out this variable reduction analysis.

### 9.3.4 Brand Loyalty

For this measure, the following ordinal independent variables were used, all of which were significantly associated with the boycotting of Danish brands. Hence, a significant relationship exists between those variables and the boycotting of Danish brands, see Appendix 1, Table 2:

- Repeat purchasing of particular FMCG brands.
- Loyalty to brands.
- The importance of the brand’s country of origin.
- Shopping according to the knowledge of particular brands. In this variable, the four cases in the first category “Hardly ever” were merged with the second category “Occasionally”.
- A new variable was created which derived from 11 variables from the question related to factors influencing brand loyalty, see Q33 of the online questionnaire, Appendix 2 (i.e. avoiding risk of trying new brands, taste, sticking with the familiar, quality, price, sales promotion, advertising, brand names, brands’ country of origin,
availability of substitute and family and friends influence except variable 3 - religious requirement ‘Halal food’ which is more related to religiousness) counting the total number of responses to them. The new variable was therefore in a scale of 0-11.

Three factors were extracted from the aforementioned variables, through inspection of the Scree-Plot, Figure 9.2 below (the first steep change in the slope is at 3).

![Figure 9.2 Factor analysis with brand loyalty variables – Scree Plot](image)

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.662 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity gives a significance of practically 0 rejecting the null hypothesis of identity. The 3 factors extracted explain some 73% of the total variance, Table 9-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.836</td>
<td>36.725</td>
<td>1.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>15.256</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>14.511</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>12.298</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Hence, an interpretation of these factors by inspection of the results (see Table 9-7) is as follows:

- **Factor 1 (BRAND1)** involves people who are not loyal to brands, does take many criteria into account and in particular, the respondents are influenced by the country of origin. These are “loyal to countries rather than brands”.
- **Factor 2 (BRAND2)** involves people not at all loyal to brands, who decide (and change their opinions) based on knowledge of the various brands. They could be called the “rational market watchers”.
- **Factor 3 (BRAND3)** involves people loyal to brands, who do repeat purchasing of certain brands, based on certain criteria. Based on the comparison of this factor across 11 variables in the question related to factors influencing brand loyalty except for variable 3- Religious requirement (i.e. Halal food) as mentioned earlier, it can be concluded that these are “loyal consumers avoiding the risk of the unfamiliar”.

**Table 9-7 Factor analysis with brand loyalty factors - Rotated Component Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of brand’s country of origin to you?</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. r- Reasons for loyalty (except religious requirement, i.e. Halal food reason)</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. r- Shopping according to knowledge of particular brands?</td>
<td>-0.439</td>
<td>-0.567</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loyalty to any brands?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Repeat purchasing of particular FMCG brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.
*r* before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-codded.

Furthermore, a comparison of the means of factor 3 in brand loyalty (BRAND3) across the two levels of variable 1 (see option 1 of Q33 of online questionnaire) which is related to avoiding risk of trying new brands (Table 9-8) and variable 4 (see option 4 of Q33 of online questionnaire) which is relating to sticking with brands they know well (Table 9-9) as both show that this factor indeed concerns “loyal consumers avoiding the risk of the unfamiliar”. These means also differ significantly between the two groups (0 = not selected, 1=selected). Indicative tables for the interpretation of factor 3 are shown in the tables below.

**Table 9-8 Comparison of the means for loyal consumers avoiding the risk of the unfamiliar - Avoiding risk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for loyalty to particular brands (avoiding the risk of trying new brands)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAND3 REGR factor score 3 for analysis</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>-2.070314</td>
<td>.86426013</td>
<td>.05183488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 To avoid the risk of trying new brands</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.5093340</td>
<td>112.545,963</td>
<td>.10587434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 9-9 Comparison of the means for loyal consumers avoiding the risk of the unfamiliar - Sticking with brands they know well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for loyalty to particular brands (sticking with brands they know well)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAND3 REGR factor score ,00</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-1.1867566</td>
<td>0.92717175</td>
<td>0.05492091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 I like to stick with what I know</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.021286</td>
<td>101.977,483</td>
<td>0.09904929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9.3.5 Religion and Religiosity

The relevant independent variables used in this section are listed below, all were significantly associated with the boycotting of Danish brands. Hence, a significant relationship exists between those variables and the boycotting of Danish brands, also see Appendix 1, Table 2:

- Religious denomination as nominal. The very small counts in Ahmadiyya and Sufism (3, 2 respectively) were merged in a category named “Other”. The p-value of the χ² test was practically 0. Shiaa respondents were more likely to have taken part in the boycott than Sunnis.

- The reason for loyalty - religious requirement, (i.e. Halal food option 3 in the question related to factors influencing brand loyalty- selected or not as a reason for loyalty) as binary. The χ² test with boycotting of Danish brands resulted to a p-value of 0.002. Those who selected this reason were more likely to have participated in the boycotting.

- The importance of religion as ordinal. The first category “Not important”, which had only 4 cases was merged with the second. The p-value of the χ² test was practically 0. In the re-coded variable, the greater the importance of religion to respondents, the more the likelihood of the respondents having participated in the boycott.

- Religiosity level based on the supplied definition of religiousness as ordinal. The results were the same as with the previous variable.

- Whether questionable religious behaviour of companies is a factor that changes the attitude toward brands as ordinal. The cross-tabulation with the dependant variable showed some inconsistencies but still a clear association, with p=0 in the χ² test.

The last option “other” of the religious denomination question and the option “other” in religiosity level both had mostly blank responses and therefore were dropped. Next step was to apply factor analysis with the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th variables (as variable 1 is a nominal variable). Two factors were obtained from these variables, as can be seen
through inspection of the Scree-Plot, Figure 9.3 below. (The first steep change in the slope is at 2).

**Figure 9.3 Factor analysis with Religion and Religiosity variables – Scree Plot**

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was acceptable at (0.58), and the significance of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was 0. The two factors explain almost 69% of the variance. Their interpretation is clear: Factor 1 (RELIG1) concerns religiousness, the importance of religion and religiosity level based on the definition of religiousness, contrary to Factor 2 (RELIG2) which concerns a rather indifferent stance. Note that variable 4 in Table 9-10 below which is related to questionable religious behaviour and remarks by brand owners as motives for boycotting is in reverse religiousness order (i.e. 1 corresponds to “Strongly Agree”).

**Table 9-10 Factor analysis with religion and religiosity - Rotated Component Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reasons for loyalty (religious requirement, i.e. Halal food)</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. r-Importance of religion</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. r-Religiosity level based on the supplied definition of religiousness</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Questionable religious behaviours constitute a motive to change attitude toward brands?</td>
<td>-0.855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
"r" before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.

Both factors means (RELIG1 and RELIG2) differ significantly across the two categories of the dependent variable as verified by independent sample T-tests.
9.3.6 Social Capital

For this measure, the following independent variables were used; as they were significantly associated with the boycotting of Danish brands, see Appendix 1, Table 2:

- The frequency of communication with family in the country of origin, as ordinal. The one case in the “Never” category was merged with the “Occasionally” category. The p-value of the $\chi^2$ test was practically 0. Respondents who frequently communicate with their families were more likely to take part in the boycotting.

- The frequency of social media usage - Facebook, Twitter, etc. as ordinal. There was a clear association with the boycotting of Danish brands with a p-value practically 0 in the $\chi^2$ test, because direct communication, that is not through social media platforms seemed to have favoured participation in the boycotting (with the proviso of some inconsistencies in the cross-tabulation).

- The influence of family on consumption behaviour, as ordinal. The $\chi^2$ test with the boycotting of Danish brands resulted to a p-value of practically 0. Clearly, the more the influence of the family, the more the likelihood of having participated in the boycott.

- The influence of friends on consumption behaviour, as ordinal. Here the few (6) cases in the “Very high” category were merged with the “High” category. As with the previous question, the greater the influence of the friends, the greater the likelihood of having participated in the boycott. The $\chi^2$ test with the dependent variable resulted to a p-value of practically 0.

- The important of social ties (family and friends) as ordinal. We merged the few (2) cases in the “Not important” category with the “Somewhat important” category. Again, the more important the social ties, the more the likelihood of having participated in the boycott. The p-value of the $\chi^2$ test with the dependent variable was again practically 0.

After proceeding to factor analysis with the above variables (the Scree-Plot, Figure 9.4, which shows the first steep change in the slope is at 2) suggested two factors, see Table 9-11:
The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was acceptable (0.577) and the Bartlett's Test rejected the identity hypothesis at a significance of practically 0. The two factors explain 57% of the variance and their interpretation is easy: Taking aside the frequency of communication with family, Factor 1 involves close social ties and Factor 2 concerns "networking on the internet", Table 9-11.

Table 9-11 Factor analysis with social capital - Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. r-Frequency of communication with family</td>
<td>-0.575</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Frequency of social media usage (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Influence of family on consumption behaviour</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. r-Influence of friends consumption behaviour</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. r-Importance of social ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
“r” before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.

In fact, if the analysis is repeated without the frequency of communication with family in country of origin variable, better results can be obtained, with 65% of the variance explained and an even more clear interpretation of the factors as shown in Table 9-12 below:
Table 9-12 Factor analysis with social capital (repeated without frequency of communication with family in country of origin variable) - Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency of social media usage (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Influence of family on consumption behaviour</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. r-Influence of friends consumption behaviour</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. r-Importance of social ties</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
"r" before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.

The latter were the factor scores that were used in the modelling stage.

9.3.7 The Logistic Regression Model

Table 9-13 summarises the independent variables used in the logistic regression model. To reduce the number of combinations of levels of categorical variables, it was decided to exclude age and income that were both highly correlated with the number of years living outside country of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9-13 Summary of independent variables used in the logistic regression model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model fit was good, it is noted in particular the good value of Nagelkerke’s pseudo-$R^2$ (.534) and the Hosmer and Lemeshow Tests gave a significance value well above 0.05.

The classification of actual vs. predicted (by the model) values is quite good, with 19% error, shown in Table 9-14, especially given the relatively small size of the sample.

| Table 9-14 Classification accuracy of the model with the brand drivers only |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Observed | Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006? | Percentage Correct |
| Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006? | Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006? | .00 No | 1.00 Yes |
| Step 1 | .00 No | 142 | 38 | 78.9 |
|         | 1.00 Yes | 36 | 174 | 82.9 |
| Overall Percentage |        |        | 81.0 |
Appendix 1, Table 1 shows all variables included in the regression model where the predictors that are significant at 95% level are in bold. The variables with a parenthesis in that table are the dummy variables derived from the categorical variables.

It is recalled that Exp(B) gives the size of each effect, in the case of categorical variables as the odds ratio. For the factor scores, the size of the effect is better shown by B, which is of the logit function, see Table 9-15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9-15 Summary of the significant effects</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B) for categorical variables or B for factor scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status (overall significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employed, working 1-39 hours per week vs. employed, working 40 or more hours per week</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unemployed, looking for work vs. employed, working 40 or more hours per week</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Loyalty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand Loyalty Factor 2: Rational market watching</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brand Loyalty Factor 3: Loyal consumers avoiding the risk of the unfamiliar</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion and Religiosity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious denomination (overall significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other vs. Shiiaa</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Religion and Religiosity factor 2: Questionable religious behaviours of companies as a motive to change attitude toward brands</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social Capital Factor 1: Close social ties</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social Capital Factor 2: Networking on the Internet</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-0.377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for demographics, from the above table, the first comment is on the effect of employment that is the only remaining significant predictor among the demographic variables; see Appendix 1, Table 1 (although gender is also significant at the 90% confidence level with males participating more than females). Compared to the full-time employed respondents, the odds of participating in the boycotting were lower among unemployed (and looking for work) and part-time employed respondents, this effect is visualised in Figure 9.5.

The difference is larger between those who are employed on a full-time and unemployed and this suggests there is an effect. A possible explanation is that unemployed respondents are somewhat isolated and too burdened to take part in what is essentially a community
(collective) action and this is in line with the importance of the social capital as discussed below.

**Figure 9.5 Differences among employment status groups**

![Graph showing differences among employment status groups.](image)

Transnationality is not represented strongly in the model, although the significance of whether living abroad changed consumption behaviour option (2-agree) and option (4-disagree) at the 90% confidence level as shown in appendix 1, table 1 should be noted.

Respondents who were undecided or strongly disagreeing had between 3 out of 10 and 4 out of 10 odds of participating in the boycotting than the ones who replied that they strongly agree. This can be better seen in Figure 9.6 below.

**Figure 9.6 Respondents’ view of the effect of living abroad on consumption**

![Graph showing respondents' view of the effect of living abroad on consumption.](image)
It seems that brand loyalty did have an effect, as two out of the three factors were included in the significant predictors as shown in Table 9-15. “Rational market watchers” were more likely to participate in the boycotting, whereas “loyal consumers avoiding the risk of the unfamiliar” were less likely to do so. This seems reasonable and was evident in the conducted T-test. BRAND2 was positively associated with participation and its mean value differs very much between participants and non-participants.

BRAND3 was negatively associated with participation and its mean also differs very much between participants and non-participants.

Religion and Religiosity certainly has an effect: The questionable religious behaviours of companies as a motive to change attitude toward brands, as represented by the factor RELIG2 was positively associated with participation in the boycotting.

As for the difference between “Other” and Shiaa, the respondents in “Other” are too few (9 cases only) to draw conclusions. Religious denomination was significant and for clarity, this significance is visualised in Figure 9.7 showing the difference in boycotting choice between Shiaa and Sunnis.

![Figure 9.7 The significance of religious denomination on boycotting](image)

Social Capital has a clear effect. Both factors SOCIAL1 and SOCIAL2 were significant: SOCIAL1 which concerns “close social ties” were positively associated with participation while SOCIAL2 “networking on the Internet” was negatively associated.

**9.3.8 A Logistic Regression Model with Only the Significant Variables**

Finally, to verify the explanatory power of the identified effects and comment more reliably on their strengths, the focus was on the significant variables of the earlier logistic
regression model that was discussed previously and outlined in Table 9-15. Therefore, the following independent variables were used:

- Employment status, which was overall significant.
- Brand Loyalty factors BRAND2 and BRAND3, corresponding to “rational market watching” and “loyal consumers avoiding the risk of the unfamiliar”, respectively.
- Religious denomination, which was overall significant.
- Religion and Religiosity factor RELIG2 was correlated with indifferent stance.
- Social Capital factors SOCIAL1 and SOCIAL2, corresponding to “close social ties” and “networking on the Internet”, respectively.

The fit statistics for the model with the significant variables only remained good. In particular, Nagelkerke’s pseudo-\(R^2\) decreased only slightly (.476). Also, the classification error increased only by 4% (i.e. from 81% to 77%), see Table 9-16 below, mainly due to some more false negatives, that is a few more non-participants predicted as having participated in the boycotting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>.00 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00 No</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9-17 shows the variables in this model, those variables that contributed significantly to the predictive ability of the model are in bold.

A comparison with the variables in the previous model (Appendix 1, Table 1) shows only one difference, in the employment status where the significance of the unemployed, looking for work became 0.033 which was 0.192 therefore was not significant in the previous model.
### Table 9-17 Variables in the final model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I.for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Employed, working full time 40hr/week or more(1)</td>
<td>-1.058</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>17,978</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.172, .703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed, working 1-39hr/week(2)</td>
<td>-5.05</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.294, 1.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed(3)</td>
<td>-1.738</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>12,573</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.067, .460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not employed, looking for work(4)</td>
<td>-1.144</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.111, .910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not employed, not looking for work (5)</td>
<td>-2.643</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.003, 1.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r- Religious denomination</td>
<td>-.521</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.307, 1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r- Shiaa(1)</td>
<td>-2.927</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>5,304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.004, .647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r- Sunni(2)</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>10,568</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>1.193, 2.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRAND2</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>12,402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.429, .786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRAND3</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>24,489</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>1.534, 2.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RELIG2</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>37,792</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.573</td>
<td>1.904, 3.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL1</td>
<td>-.424</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>8,753</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.494, .867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL2</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>13,780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the stronger effects are seen in the categorical variables. A strong effect is the one seen in those unemployed compared to those employed. Among the factors that are classified as continuous variables, the stronger effects are in SOCIAL1 (close social ties) with a coefficient 0.9 and RELIG2 (questionable religious behaviours of companies as a motive to change attitude toward brands) with 0.7. However, the strength sizes of the other factors are not much less in terms of absolute value.

### 9.3.9 Discussion

This part of the analysis examined the characteristics of boycotters, in terms of demographic characteristics, both extreme ends of their consumption behaviour, their loyalty and boycotting characteristics, religious characteristics, social capital and transnationality nature and how all these factors interact and influence their boycotting choice.

Notwithstanding the other demographic factors that were found to have a significant relationship with boycotting choice see Appendix 1, Table 2; employment status remained the only significant demographic predictor of boycotting choice for London's transnational Arabs. Marketing literature acknowledged the influence of employment status on consumers' behaviour (Martin and Ramsaran-Fowdar, 2013; Nandamuri and Gowthami, 2012; Pillai et al., 2011; Ziol-Guest, 2006; Lee and Beatty, 2002).
Nandamuri and Gowthami (2012), for example, found employment to be highly significant to various levels of consumption decisions, namely, purchasing preference, recommending brands to others and brand loyalty. Pillai et al. (2011) also found that employment status among other factors does influence product usefulness and shopping convenience.

However, contrary to the findings of this study, Klein et al. (2004) found gender to be the only significant demographical predictor of boycotting. In fact, even though, gender in this study was not found to be a significant predictor of boycotting, it was significantly associated with boycotting but males (60%) were more than female boycotters (46%) and this contradicts the findings of Klein et al. (2004), which reported that 19% of women boycotted compared with 13% of men.

The contradiction in both studies in terms of the predictive power of gender and employment status as a demographic factors can be attributed not only to the cultural and ethnicity differences between both studies’ sample population where the male role in Muslim Arab families is dominant, but also to the targeted population sample, this study focused on transnational Muslim Arabs in London, whereas, transnationality was not represented in the Klein et al. (2004) population sample.

Nonetheless, as the analyses suggested that the employed are more likely to boycott than the unemployed, if full-time employed respondents were merged with those who are working part-time and self-employed, the total percentage of economically active transnational Muslim Arabs in London reaches 78% of respondents which forms an important demographical characteristic of those respondents that is a community of mostly economically active members.

As for transnationality, even though it was not represented in the logistic regression model, the duration of stay outside country of origin, the duration of stay in London and the reason for coming to the UK were all statically significant with regard to boycotting and played a part in respondents’ choice formation process. It is an indication that the nature of transnationality influences consumption behaviour that is in line with earlier transnationality literature including Basch et al. (1994), Sirkeci (2009) and Sirkeci (2013).

The majority of boycotters (64%) have been living outside their country of origin for more than five years which forms the second important characteristic of those transnational respondents, and analyses showed clearly that the longer the transnationality duration is,
the more it impacts on the boycotting decision-making process. Hence, it is not surprising that this transnationality phenomenon is seen as a complex one, but however complex, it is still perceived by Sirkeci (2009) as an opportunity as he argued that this migration forms a consumer market that is known as an ethnic consumer market and the value of this transnational consumer market in UK alone is estimated to be around £30 billion.

Brand loyalty was well represented in this model; knowledge of brands and the avoidance of the unfamiliar were significant predictors. Those two were influential on the boycotting decision-making process. Transnationals who were knowledgeable about various brands were more often participants of boycotting compared to others who based their purchasing choices on the repeat purchasing of certain brands to reduce the risk of trying untried brands. The behaviour of the latter can be understood based on the argument set forth by Klein et al. (2004), which sees boycotting and looking for alternative brands as a sacrifice that those risk avoiders were not willing to make.

The knowledge of various brands, through a variety of means, led to the knowledge of actions (e.g. boycott calls), also through a variety of means, that may be carried against these brands. This knowledge contributed to boycotting choice and this confirms the Klein et al. (2004) study that found knowledge of boycott to be an important factor that facilitates the success of a boycotting campaign. This finding is also in line also with Cissé-Depardon and N’Goala (2009) who found that the consumers’ decision to boycott is influenced by the perceived publicity of the boycott campaign.

It is not surprising that religion was influential on boycotting choice; respondents’ assessment of questionable religious behaviour was a significant predictor of boycotting. This is consistent with the literature that highlights the influence of religion on consumption behaviour, and argued of its importance in influencing consumption and the decision-making process of individuals. (Bahn 1986; Delener, 1990; Essoo and Dibb, 2004; Al-Hyari et al., 2012).

For example, Bahn (1986) argued that an individual’s religious orientation may impact on the early adoption of particular beverage brands, thus, this could explain why religious attribute of the brand (i.e. being Halal) was significantly associated with boycotting. Additionally, Al-Hyari et al. (2012) suggested that consumption behaviour is influenced by culture, politics, religion as well as the environment.
Religious denomination was the second significant predictor within the religion section and *Shiaa* respondents were more likely to have taken part in boycotting than *Sunnis*, and this forms another characteristic of this population, however, as for religious denominations influence on boycotting in particular and consumption behaviour in general, it appeared that resources exploring these religious denominations within Islam are scarce.

As discussed earlier, there were studies about the political involvement of *Sunni* and *Shiaa* Muslims (Gallup, 2014) and *Sunni* and *Shiaa* women’s role in society (Gallup, 2004). Hence, it appears that this is the first study that not only explores the consumption behaviour of these religious denominations within Islam but also investigates them from transnationality perspective.

Two social capital factors were significant predictors in influencing boycotting among respondents; close social ties was one social predictor of boycotting choice. This is consistent with literature that advocates the pressure social capital and connectedness puts on consumers’ boycotting choices and its role in the success of particular boycott campaigns (Sirkeci, 2013; Klein et al., 2004; Friedman, 1999; Smith, 1990; Garrett, 1987).

For this segment of transnational consumers, the very collective nature of Arab culture (Hyari et al. 2012) and social risk reduction (Gounaris and Stathakopoulos, 2004) potentially affected their boycotting choice either through friends or family circle, hence, the positive association this study found between close social ties and boycotting choice.

The second significant social predictor is Internet usage and networking which has a negative association with boycotting. This is not surprising as the earlier analysis confirmed that younger transnationals are less likely to boycott than older transnationals especially when this is linked with earlier studies about age and internet usage, in fact, Statista (2014) found that the highest percentage of internet users were aged between 25-34. These figures matched this study figures in relation to age and boycotting choice. This gap in internet usage between age groups was also confirmed by the UK’s Office of National Statistics (2014) report.

However, this is in line with previous research which suggested that internet and virtual communications have not only transformed consumer behaviour and societies, but also
businesses and contributed to effective social connectedness (Ioanăs and Stoica, 2014; Kucuk and Krishnamurthy, 2007; Mangold and Faulds, 2009).

9.4 Determinants of Brand Loyalty

This section of quantitative analysis paints a picture of brand loyalty determinants for those Arab transnational consumers residing in London. These determinants were divided into consumer drivers of loyalty, brand drivers of loyalty and social drivers of loyalty.

Based on brand loyalty literature review, a brand loyalty conceptual model for the potential loyalty drivers was developed (Figure 6.1). This section tested the proposed model to validate or invalidate it.

A separate model was built for each set of drivers and to verify the effect of each set. Then, all predictors were included from all sets into a full model, to see to what extent each effect weakens. If the effects from any set of drivers diminish considerably, the proposed model would be problematic and weak. But as it will be seen, several key effects from all sets remain at the final model, leading to the conclusion that this model is an adequate approximation of reality.

The dependent variable (Are you loyal to any brands?) was re-coded by merging the “Yes” and “Somewhat” responses into a new “Yes” category. The reason was the very subjective nature of “Yes” and “Somewhat”. In the re-coded variable, 0 corresponds to “No” and 1 corresponds to “Yes”, respectively. The valid cases were 395 out of 537. There were 142 cases where the value of this variable was missing so these incomplete cases were removed from the dataset.

9.4.1 Consumers’ Drivers of Loyalty

Based on the proposed potential drivers of loyalty model, the following sections present an analysis of the consumer drivers of that model which are risk aversion, variety seeking, demographics, level of involvement, transnationality and religion.

9.4.1.1 Risk Aversion

The independent variable relating to the respondents’ assessment of switching to substitute brands was chosen to represent risk aversion. This variable was re-coded by putting together the few (10) values “Very Hard” with “Hard” and by merging “Easy” with
“Very easy” and creating a third category “indifferent” to make the distribution more balanced. This variable was significantly associated with brand loyalty: the χ2 test gave a p-value of 0.009. Although there was some inconsistency in the middle value, those who found switching “Hard” or “Very hard” were much more likely to belong to the “loyal to brands group” than those who found “Easy” or “Very Easy”.

### 9.4.1.2 Variety Seeking

Variety seeking was closely represented by the responses in the independent variable relating to respondents’ repeat purchase behaviour that is whether they repeat purchasing particular FMCG brands. The thirteen cases in the category “Hardly ever” were put together with the ones in category “Occasionally”, creating a new re-coded variable. Again there were some inconsistencies but there was still a clear differentiation: the maximum percentage of those belonging to the “loyal to brands group” was observed in those who repeat purchasing particular FMCG brands on a frequent basis. The p-value was practically 0.

### 9.4.1.3 Demographics

For this set of independent variables, almost all of them were included in the beginning (age, gender, marital status, the number of children, income, degree or not, employment status), as in the previous section. The pre-processing was very much alike. The only difference was the re-coding of age and income into fewer categories to avoid small counts in cells in later stages of the analysis and also to make the distributions more balanced.

Age was re-coded into 18-24 years old (this group did not have values in the dependent variables as this age group was disqualified due to age), 25 to 34 (the “least loyal” group), 35-44, 45-54 and 55 and above while income was grouped into less than 10k, less than 20k, less than 30k and 30k and over. The lowest income category consisted of respondents who were much less likely to belong to the “loyal to brands” group.

After these re-codings and checking for correlations, it was decided to keep the income, marital status and employment status variables. The other binary and ordinal variables were significantly correlated with income, as shown in Table 9-18 below.
### Table 9-18 Correlations between some demographic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of children</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender?</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td>.240**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.327**</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.217**</td>
<td>-.298**</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Finally, to reduce the number of independent variables, dummy variables from the nominal variables were created: marital status “1” for single and “2” for married and for employment status “1”, “2”, “3” and “4” corresponding to the most frequent values “Employed - working 40 or more hours per week”, “Employed - working 1-39 hours per week”, “Self-employed”, “Not employed - looking for work” and then factor analysis was applied. The reason this exclusion of the less populated categories in these variables was to reduce the loss of variance (and also, one of them in each set is redundant).

Based on the Scree Plot (Figure 9.8) two factors were extracted: DEMOG1 and DEMOG2 that were clearly interpreted in Table 9-19. High values in the first factor correspond to married respondents, working full-time. Singles have low values in this factor. High values in the second factor correspond to working part-time. Low values in either factor indicate low income.

**Figure 9.8 Factor analysis with demographic variables – Scree Plot**
Table 9-19 Factors loading for demographic factors- Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Income</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. r-Marital status (1)</td>
<td>-.866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. r-Marital status (2)</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employed - working 40 or more hours per week (1)</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>-.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employed - working 1-39 hours per week (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-employed (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Not employed - looking for work (4)</td>
<td>-.448</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser
"r" before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.

These factors explain 51% of the variance that is considered good given the number of variables (7). Sampling adequacy is not very good at 0.3 (the sample size is rather small for this number of variables), but the identity hypothesis is rejected with the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity at a significance that is practically 0.

The two factors were different between the two groups of the dependent variable, Figures 9.9 and 9.10 visualise this difference; the first factor differs significantly and is larger for the loyal group.

Figure 9.9 Comparison of the mean for (DEMOG1) between the two groups of the dependent variable
9.4.1.4 Level of Involvement

Level of involvement as an independent variable was represented by whether respondents interact with the brands which they are loyal to (i.e. give feedback), it was decided not to use it due to the fact that it has neither significant relationship nor significant correlation with the dependent variable (i.e. loyalty to brands), as shown in Table 9-20 and Table 9-21 below.

Table 9-20 Chi-Square Tests for level of involvement and loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.966a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.818</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9-21 Correlations between level of involvement (giving feedback) and loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loyalty to brands</th>
<th>Giving feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty to any brands</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving feedback</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4.1.5 Transnationality

As for transnationality, the main reason for coming to the UK was re-coded, with categories “Employment”, “Study”, “Get married/as spouse” and “Asylum” kept as variables and the
For the main reason coming to the UK, two dummy variables were created for the categories which were found to be associated with the dependent variable, for study “2” and to get married/as a spouse “3”.

All these independent variables were significantly associated with the dependent variable: Students, respondents living less than three years outside their country of origin and respondents disagreeing that living abroad has changed their consumption behaviour were much less likely to be in the loyal group. The respondents, who came to the UK to get married or as spouses, were much more likely to be in the loyal group.

Then factor analysis was applied and extracted, again based on the Scree Plot in Figure 9.11, two factors TRANS1 and TRANS2 explaining 68% of the variance, see Table 9-22, with very good reliability measures: The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.64 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity rejected the identity hypothesis at a significance of practically 0.

Figure 9.11 Factor analyses with transnationality variables – Scree Plot
Table 9-22 Factors loading for transnationality factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>45,585</td>
<td>45,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>22,708</td>
<td>68,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>18,617</td>
<td>86,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>13,090</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 9-23 Factor analysis with social capital variables - Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- r-Reason for coming to the UK (2)</td>
<td>-.805</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- r-Reason for coming to the UK (3)</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- r-No of years living outside your country of origin</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>-.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Living abroad impact on consumption behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.a
aRotation converged in 3 iterations.
‘r’ before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.

As shown in Table 9-23 above, the first factor is positively correlated with brand loyalty and clearly concerns respondents who came to the UK to get married or as spouses vs. students (the latter taking a negative value) and the number of years living outside country of origin.

The second factor is negatively correlated with brand loyalty and concerns change of consumption behaviour as a result of living abroad along with the number of years living outside country of origin (negative values).

Change of consumption behaviour as a result of living abroad is shown in positive values of the second factor. This variable takes large values if a respondent disagrees that living abroad has changed his/her consumption behaviour, and indeed these high values lead to a lesser likelihood of belonging to the brand loyalty group. The means of both factors (TRANS1 and TRANS2) differ significantly between the two groups of the dependent variable, and this is clearly visualised in Figure 9.12 and Figure 9.13.
9.4.1.6 Religiosity / Religious Denomination

For this set of drivers, almost the same selection and pre-processing procedures as in the previous section were applied. Religious denomination was re-coded into Shiaa, Sunni and Other, the importance of religion was re-coded to “Not important to somewhat”, “Indifferent”, “Important”, “Very important”. The level of respondents’ religiousness was
re-coded too by merging the first two categories (i.e. ‘Not religious at all’ category and ‘Somewhat religious’ category) into the “Not at all to somewhat” category.

Furthermore, the categories in the question relating to whether a questionable religious behaviour of companies is a factor to change the attitude toward brands were re-coded by merging “Disagree” category with “Strongly disagree” category).

The importance of religion and the level of respondents’ religiousness were more associated with loyalty to brands, as was disagreement with whether a questionable religious behaviour of companies is a factor to change the attitude toward brands and finally being Shia rather than Sunni was also associated with brand loyalty.

Dummy variables were then created from the nominal variables in the religious denomination and only the first two of them, “1” for Shia and “2” for Sunni, were used together with the ordinal variables, after which factor analysis was applied.

Two factors were extracted (RELIG1, RELIG2) representing 73% of the total variables as shown in Table 9-24. This time, the criterion was Eigen value ≥ 1 (Figure 9.14). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.5 and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity rejected the identity hypothesis with a significance of practically 0. Both factors were positively correlated with loyalty to brands.

### Table 9-24 Factors loading for religiosity / religious denomination factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.124</td>
<td>42.489</td>
<td>42.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>30.253</td>
<td>72.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>17.964</td>
<td>90.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>8.263</td>
<td>98.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
As for the interpretation of these factors, as one can see in Table 9-25 below, the first factor clearly differentiates the *Shiaa* from the *Sunnis*. The second factor concerns general religiosity and takes negative values for respondents who disagreed that questionable religious behaviours by brand owners influenced their brand loyalty.

The mean value of RELIG1 differs significantly between the two groups of the dependent variable. However, RELIG2 did not; see Figure 9.15 which shows only RELIG1.

### Table 9-25 Factor analysis with religiosity variables- Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. r-religious denomination (Shiaa)</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. r-religious denomination (Sunni)</td>
<td>-0.980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Importance of religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. r-Religiosity level based on the supplied definition of religiousness</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. r-Religious behaviour of companies/brands</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. *a*

"r" before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.
9.4.1.7 The Model with Only the Consumers’ Drivers

The logistic regression with independent variables from the consumers’ drivers, as described above, resulted in a classification accuracy of 74% (see Table 9-26 below).

Table 9-26 Classification accuracy of the model with consumers’ drivers only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Loyalty to brands</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00 No</td>
<td>1.00 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Loyalty to brands</td>
<td>.00 No</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cut value is .500

Table 9-27 at the end of this section shows all variables in this model. The more significant effects are bold and are the following:

- Risk aversion was a clear factor in brand loyalty for respondents who found it hard to switch to substitute brands, those who were relatively indifferent to brand substitution having almost half the odds of being loyal to brands than the ones much more sensitive to risk due to brand substitution (level 2- indifferent vs. level 1- hard, at 5% significance level.

- Variety seeking with the respondents who frequently do repeat purchase of FMCG brands having twice the odds of being loyal to brands than the ones hardly or occasionally engage in repeat purchasing of FMCG brands (level 3- frequently vs. level 1- hardly or occasionally, almost at 5% significance level.
The first factor in demographics (DEMOG1) has a significant (almost at 5% level) positive effect to brand loyalty. This means more loyalty to brands from married respondents working full-time. Low-income respondents and singles are less likely to be loyal to brands.

The first factor in transnationality (TRANS1) having a significant (almost at 5% level) positive effect to brand loyalty. These means more loyalty to brands from respondents who came to the UK to get married or as spouses and have been living outside their country of origin for many years.

The first factor in religiousness/ religiosity (RELIG1) has a strongly significant (p = 0.008) positive effect on brand loyalty. More loyalty is expected from Shiaa and much less from Sunnis.

### Table 9.27 The variables in the model with consumers' drivers only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I for EXP(B)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r-Switching to substitute brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard(1)</td>
<td>-.675</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>4.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent(2)</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-Repeat purchasing of FMCG brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly or occasionally(1)</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>3.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes(2)</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>3.746</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>2.201</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>4.894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (3)</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOG1</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>3.601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOG2</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS1</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS2</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIG1</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>6.937</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIG2</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>5.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>2.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Variable(s) entered on step 1: r-Assessment of switching to substitute brands, r-Repeat purchasing of FMCG brands, DEMOG1, DEMOG2, TRANS1, TRANS2, RELIG1, RELIG2.

"r" before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.

### 9.4.2 Brand drivers

The proposed brand drivers of loyalty consisted of quality, price, sales promotion, advertising, brand names, brand’s usage history, country of origin and the availability of substitute brands.

The importance of the country of origin was used, which is also strongly associated with brand loyalty (p-value = 0): the more importance given to the country of origin, the greater the likelihood of a respondent belonging to the loyal to brands group.

Relevant variables from the group of the variable relating to the reasons that would make respondents loyal to particular brands were used and in particular the ones corresponding
to options 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 (taste- represented by brand usage history, quality, price, sale promotion, advertising, brand names, brand’s country of origin and availability of substitute brands), see Q33 of the online survey in Appendix 2.

Taste and quality were selected as standalone predictors, as they were both strongly associated with the dependent variable (those respondents who selected these options were more likely to be in the loyal group). For the rest (6 to 11) a variable counting the number of selections was created, taking values in 0 to 6. The created variable “brand other” was associated with the dependent variable (p-value=0.032)

The factor analysis with all the above drivers resulted in two factors explaining 56% of the total variance, Figure 9.16 and Table 9-28, and very good reliability measures (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy equal to 0.66, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity significance practically 0).

Figure 9.16 Factor analysis with brand variables – Scree Plot

Table 9-28 Factors loading for brand drivers’ factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>37.079</td>
<td>37.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>17.023</td>
<td>72.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>15.497</td>
<td>88.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>11.820</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
As it can be seen in Table 9-29, taste (which represents brand usage history in this study) was clearly positively correlated with the second factor and all other variables (notably quality) with the first. The first factor also concerns brand knowledge and country of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- The importance of brand’s country of origin</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Taste as loyalty driver</td>
<td></td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Quality as loyalty driver</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- r-Brand_other (price, sales promotion, advertising, brand names, availability of substitute)</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.a
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
"r“ before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.

Both factors were significantly differentiated between the levels of the dependent variable; see Table 9-30 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loyalty to brands</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score</td>
<td>BRAND1 for analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-.332403</td>
<td>0.99254758</td>
<td>0.08986104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.1507553</td>
<td>0.96815559</td>
<td>0.05902949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score</td>
<td>BRAND2 for analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-.1368884</td>
<td>1.02915906</td>
<td>0.09317568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>.0620832</td>
<td>0.98214987</td>
<td>0.05988273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.4.2.1 The Model with the Brand Drivers Only

The logistic regression with the two factors verified their significance, especially of the first one that includes most of the brand drivers. The classification accuracy was 70% as shown in Table 9-31 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty to brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The significances of the two factors; BRAND1 and BRAND2 in this model are shown in Table 9-32 below.

**Table 9-32 The significance of variables in the model with Brand drivers only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% CI for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND1</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>18.350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND2</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>53.700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a.Variable(s) entered on step 1: BRAND1, BRAND2.

### 9.4.3 Social Drivers

The social drivers’ section of the proposed loyalty driver model consisted of three drivers, social and group influence, peer’s recommendations and connectedness. The following analysis presents a picture of their significance in influencing loyalty using factor analysis as discussed earlier.

#### 9.4.3.1 Social Ties

For the social and group influence, option 12 “Family and friends' influence” of the question related to the reason that may influence respondents’ loyalty to particular brands was selected which showed strong association with loyalty to brands. Those who selected this option were much more likely to be loyal to brands. The p-value of the χ2 test was practically 0.

Furthermore, an interesting and strong relationship between the frequency of communication (with family and with friends) and brand loyalty was found; the more the frequency of communication, the more the likelihood of belonging to the loyal group, at a level of significance very close to 0; the χ2 test was 0.006. Therefore, it was decided to include these variables temporarily and check the influence of the missing values at a later stage. Only frequency of communication with family was re-coded into categories “Daily”, “Weekly”, “Monthly” and “Less”, and the same re-coding was done with the frequency of communication with friends.

#### 9.4.3.2 Peer's Recommendation

As for the influence of social circle, it was represented in family and friends influence consumption behaviour, the first was re-coded by merging the few cases (16) in “Very high” with “High”. It is evident that the more the influence of the family, the more the...
likelihood of belonging to the loyal to brands group. The $\chi^2$ test with loyalty to brands resulted to a p-value of practically 0.

The second, ‘friends influence on consumption behaviour’ was also used, with the same re-coding and this was also significantly correlated with the dependent variable, the $\chi^2$ test with loyalty to brands resulted to a p-value of 0.016.

### 9.4.3.3 Connectedness

Connectedness was measured by the frequency of social media—Facebook, Twitter, etc. — usage. This variable was re-coded; all small counts in “Hardly ever”, “Occasionally” and “Sometimes” were gathered in a new category “Up to sometimes”. There was a clear association between the usage frequency and loyalty to brands with a p-value 0.011 in the $\chi^2$ test, and very frequent use of social media was associated with less brand loyalty.

Because the social drivers were fewer, a factor analysis with all variables was conducted, and finally excluded the frequency of communication with family and frequency of communication with friends' variables that were deteriorating the analysis due to the many missing values. This way two factors were extracted (SOCIAL1, SOCIAL2, Figure 9.17 and Table 9-34) which explained 65% of the total variance, shown in Table 9-33, with good reliability measures (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy equal to 0.6, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity significance practically 0).

**Figure 9.17 Factor analysis with social variables – Scree Plot**

![Scree Plot](image-url)
Table 9-33 Factors loading for social variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>40.695</td>
<td>40.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>24.395</td>
<td>65.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>21.405</td>
<td>86.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>13.505</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 9-34 Factor analysis with social variables - Rotated Component Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family and friends’ influence on loyalty</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family influence on consumption behaviour</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Friends influence in consumption behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frequency of social media usage</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>-0.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Both factors were positively and significantly correlated with brand loyalty. As shown in Table 9-34 above, factor 1 was characterised by the influence of family and friends in consumption. Factor 2 also represented family's influence but, indirectly, as a potential driver of loyalty, through option 12—which represents family and friends as a reason that may influence respondents’ loyalty to particular brands—and, with negative values, the use of social media.

9.4.3.4 The Model with the Social Drivers Only

The logistic regression with the factors from the social drivers, as described above, resulted in a classification accuracy of 68% (see Table 9-35 below) and showed both factors being most significant predictors, as shown in the results in Table 9-36. The effect of family clearly visualised in Figure 9.18 (friends have a similar effect as explained earlier) and the negative effect of much use of social media on loyalty to brands is also visualised in Figure 9.19.

Table 9-35 Classification accuracy of the model with the social drivers only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty to brands</td>
<td>Percentage Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00 No</td>
<td>1.00 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Loyalty to brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9-36 The significance of social drivers variables in the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I.for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1a</td>
<td>SOCIAL1</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>14.734</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL2</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>12.521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>55.328</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.18 Family influence on loyalty

Figure 9.19 Social media usage influence on loyalty

**9.4.3.5 Full Model of the Determinants of Brands Loyalty**

The logistic regression with all drivers resulted in a classification accuracy of 75% as shown in Table 9-37 below.
The conducted diagnostics on the model show that the model fit is good. Omnibus tests indicated a good model fit. Nagelkerke's pseudo-$R^2$ also resulted in acceptable value. Also, Hosmer and Lemeshow test gave a significance of 0.946, well above 0.05.

The variables, their coefficients and their significances are given in Table 9-38 below. Variables that were significant at 10% level or less (or very marginally so) are in bold.

Next step was to proceed to a comparison of the results with the separate models for each set of drivers with the full one. The significances in the separate models are given in Tables 9-27, 9-32 and 9-36. The significances in the full model were those shown in Table 9-38. Most of the effects mentioned in the consumers' drivers remained, although some of them weakened:
Risk aversion with those relatively indifferent to brand substitution having much lower odds of being loyal to brands than the ones much more sensitive to risk due to brand substitution: Significance up to 0.105 from 0.042, meaning that the effect remained, although marginally significant in the full model.

Variety seeking among the respondents who frequently repeat purchasing of FMCG having more odds of being loyal to brands than the ones hardly or occasionally repeat purchasing of FMCG: this effect was hidden by other drivers, as the significance increased from 0.053 to 0.187.

The first factor in demographics (DEMOG1) had a significance of 0.053 that stayed almost the same, 0.078. This effect of more loyalty to brands from married persons working full-time and less loyalty from low-income respondents and singles remained significant, almost unchanged.

The first factor in transnationality (TRANS1) had a significance of 0.066 that stayed the same (0.065). This effect of more loyalty to brands from respondents living many years outside their country of origin or respondents who came to the UK to get married or as spouses remained significant, almost unchanged.

The first factor in religiousness/religiosity (RELIG1) had a significance of 0.008 that was very slightly increased to 0.021. The effect of more loyalty expected from Shiaa and much less from Sunnis remained significant, almost unchanged.

The effects of the social drivers also remained:
- The influence of friends and family remained most significant.
- The negative effect of the frequent use of social media on loyalty to brands remained, although marginally (at a significance 0.135, while it was practically 0 in the separate model).

The effects of the brand drivers also remained almost unchanged and both were significant (in fact, the effect of the second factor became more significant and its coefficient increased). Both taste and all the other brand drivers (quality, brand awareness, country of origin, price, sale promotion, advertising and brand names) are well represented in the model.

As a result, severe changes from the separate models to the full model (which would lead to re-examining the proposed model) were not noticed, but only the expected weakening of some effects due to the obvious correlations between consumers, social and brand drivers. All proposed sets of drivers take a significant part in the full model.
9.4.3.6 Discussion

As discussed in the literature chapters, an extended model of loyalty drivers from Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) potential loyalty driver model (consumer drivers, brand drivers and social drivers) was developed and tested using factor analysis.

Transnational respondents’ loyalty was first determined by brand drivers, notably taste, quality, brand’s COO. Price, sales promotions, advertising and brand names were also represented as significant predictors of loyalty from a brand perspective.

As for taste (brand usage in the case of this study), this finding lends support to the arguments of Bird et al. (1970), Datta (2003) and Romaniuk et al. (2012) that suggested brand usage history influences brand loyalty intentions.

In the case of quality as a determinant of loyalty for those transnational respondents, studies such as Sirgy et al. (2009) and Ha and John (2009) generated similar findings related to the impact of quality on brand loyalty. Likewise, the studies by (Klein, 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Saeed, 1994) found links between loyalty and brand’s COO.

However, the combination of these brand drivers offers new perspectives on the loyalty behaviour of those transnationals, especially if we take into account the Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) model of loyalty drivers which not only considered brand reputation and the availability of substitute brands as the sole brand drivers for loyalty but also was not intended to explore transnational consumers loyalty, and this may explain why both of the brand drivers they proposed were insignificant in this study.

Social drivers were mainly concerned with the influence of friends and family. These were a significant social predictor of loyalty among respondents, based on the analyses, social capital played a significant role in influencing those transnationals’ brand loyalty. This is consistent with the studies that highlighted the influence of social capital on individuals’ consumption behaviour (Gounaris and Stathakopoulos, 2004; Maher and Mady, 2010).

Even though Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) brand drivers section was found insignificant for this segment of consumers, their social drivers part of the model is supported by this study’s findings and as mentioned above, social capital (family and friends) do play an important role in influencing loyalty to brands, particularly because the
nature of Arab culture is very collective (Al-Hyari et al., 2012) so the friends and family circle can potentially influence purchasing intentions.

As for consumers’ drivers, religion was also a strong determinant of brand loyalty, mainly the religious denomination factor (as Shiaa respondents were more loyal than Sunnis). It is evident that within Islam itself, religious denomination plays an undisputable role in shaping those respondents’ consumption behaviour.

The analysis of the previous section relating to the characteristics of transnational boycotters showed clearly the impact of the religious denomination on boycotting choice where the Shiaa respondents were more inclined to boycott than Sunni respondents, and this role was also clear in shaping their loyalty behaviour too.

Somewhat less significant but still important were the demographic determinants, especially the combined family and employment status (with relatively high income married respondents working full-time being more loyal to brands).

Employment and marital status were the most influential demographic predictors that determined respondents’ brand loyalty, this is consistent with earlier studies that highlighted the influential role of employment status and marital status on consumption behaviour including loyalty behaviour (Nandamuri and Gowthami, 2012; Pillai et al., 2011; Du Plooy and Roodt (2013).

Loyalty is a commitment and behavioural intent to repeat the purchasing of particular brands (Salegna and Fazel, 2011), this commitment requires financial means that in the case of those transnational consumers comes from a stable source of income as a result of full-time employment, and this explains why fully employed respondents were more loyal than those on low income.

However, this demographic predictor coupled both employment and marital status as a significant factor for loyalty, and this is explained by the economic status of this transnational population where the largest percentage of married respondents found to have full-time employment. This lends support to the Diaz-Giménez et al. (2011) and Wilmoth and Koso (2002) argument related to the positive relationship between individuals’ marital status and financial status.
Even though other demographic factors were not represented in the model, it is worth mentioning the role of age on loyalty amongst those consumers; younger (25 to 34 years old) were less loyal than older respondents which is in line with the findings of other studies such as Srivastava (2007) and Shukla (2009) who both argued that younger consumers are less loyal. But it contradicts the study by Edelman (2010) who found younger individuals to be considerably brand loyal than others and Ahmed et al. (2011) who found that age has no significant association with consumer satisfaction and retention (i.e. loyalty).

Transnationality factors were also important in the consumers’ drivers of the brand loyalty construct, respondents living many years outside their country of origin or respondents who came to the UK to get married or as spouses were more loyal to brands. This lends support to other studies that found links between transnationality and the change in consumption behaviour such as Basch et al. (1994), Sirkeci (2009) and Sirkeci (2013).

However, the analysis suggested a new dimension of transnationality that was significant in predicting loyalty as a consumer driver which is related to the reasons behind respondents movement to the UK, respondents who came here get married or as spouses were more loyal to brands than others, such as, those who came to study.

This can be explained from transnational perspective by the settlement mind-set that respondents have when coming here for marriage or to join their spouses, unlike students who come here for a temporary purpose such as studying and are not permitted to work on a full-time basis which may limit the financial resources needed to make commitment to certain brands.

9.5 The Impact of Religiously Motivated Consumer Boycotts on Brand Loyalty

In this third research question, the factors determining participation in boycotting were investigated, by testing the questions that specifically asked respondents for the reasons that made them boycott, against the actual participation in the 2006 boycotting to Danish brands. The focus then was on religious boycotting (i.e. boycotting which was motivated by religious reasons), its impact on brand loyalty and examining issues of feelings, attitudes and stances among respondents.
9.5.1 Factors Determining Participation in Boycotting

The dependent variable of interest in this section was whether respondents boycotted Danish brands in 2006 or not. The 125 cases out of 537 that had missing values were removed from the dataset and analyses were applied to the remaining 412 complete cases. The dependent variable was re-coded into 0="No", 1="Yes".

The independent variables relating to the motivation behind boycotting in general that were used are: (1) Economic reasons (i.e. price, quality or taste), (2) Religious reasons, (3) Political reasons, (4) Conflict (war) reasons, (5) Ethical reasons, (6) Environmental reasons. The possible replies in these questions are shown in Table 9-39 below, together with their association with the dependent variable.

A positive and significant association was found in “Religious reasons” and “Ethnical reasons”, where those who selected these reasons were more likely to have participated in the Danish brands boycotting than those who did not make these selections (especially in the case of religious reasons). To the contrary, in the negatively associated variables, those who selected these reasons were less likely to have participated in the Danish brands boycotting than those who did not make these selections.

| Table 9-39 Reasons for boycotting and association with actual participation |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Motivation behind boycotting                  | Association with the dependent variable |
| 1- Economic reasons (i.e. price, quality or taste) | Negative, significant (p=0) |
| 2- Religious reasons                          | Positive, significant (p=0) |
| 3- Political reasons                          | Negative, significant (p=0.011) |
| 4- Conflict (war) reasons                     | Negative, significant (p=0.021) |
| 5- Ethical reasons                            | Positive, significant (p=0.064) |
| 6- Environmental reasons                      | No association |

The most notable contrast was between economic reasons and religious reasons, as also visualised in Figures 9.20 and 9.21 below. Among those who selected economic reasons, 40% had participated in the boycotting, while from those who did not make this selection participation amounted to 65%. And from the respondents who selected religious reasons, 69% had participated in the boycotting, while among those who did not make this selection only 23% had taken part in the boycotting.
Environment as a motivation for boycotting was not associated with the dependent variable and hence, it was decided to exclude it from the set of explanatory variables. With the remaining five variables, which differ significantly between participants and non-participants, a factor analysis was conducted. The diagnostic tests were good (KMO measure of sampling adequacy 0.569, Bartlett’s test of sphericity – significance was practically 0 and the Scree-Plot (Figure 9.22) suggested the extraction of 2 factors PARTIC1 and PARTIC2, as shown in Table 9-40.
As shown in Table 9-40 above, the first factor, PARTIC1 mainly concerns economic, political and conflict motivations, respectively) which were negatively associated with participation in the boycotting. Religious and ethical motivations, which were positively associated with participation, correspond very clearly with large values in the second factor, PARTIC2.

Interestingly, economic reasons led to negative values in the second factor, reflecting the fact that these reasons seemed somewhat contradictive to the religious and ethical ones.

As expected, both factors were found to be significantly different between the boycotting and non-boycotting respondents, as shown in Table 9-41. Again it is also shown in this table that the first factor is larger in the non-participants while the second is larger in the participants.
### Table 9-41 Comparison of the means for PARTIC1 and PARTIC2 factors between the groups of the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score 1 for analysis No</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,1524720</td>
<td>1,11726358</td>
<td>0.08084236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>-1.1317744</td>
<td>0.86746583</td>
<td>0.05835207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGR factor score 2 for analysis No</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-0.3881174</td>
<td>0.90944597</td>
<td>0.06580520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.3354318</td>
<td>0.95397618</td>
<td>0.06417138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A logistic regression was then conducted with the dependent variable and the two factors PARTIC1 and PARTIC2 as the independent variables. This resulted in a classification accuracy of 68, as shown in Table 9-42.

### Table 9-42 Classification accuracy of the model with PARTIC1 and PARTIC2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1a</td>
<td>Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both factors were in the model, at significance levels of practically 0, as shown in the final model in Table 9-43. In absolute terms, the size of the effect of the second factor is more than twice that of the first one, as shown by the coefficients B in Table 9-43.

### Table 9-43 The variables in the model with PARTIC1 and PARTIC2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1a</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I.for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTIC1</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>9.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTIC2</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>48.360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: PARTIC1, PARTIC2.

The logistic regression model was also tested with the initial variables, (i.e. without the intermediate factor analysis), to compare the strengths of the individual effects. As expected, this model had a greatly improved accuracy of 78.2% (Table 9-44).
Table 9-44 Classification accuracy of the model with the original variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results are shown in Table 9-45 where the coefficients in column Exp(B) give the odds ratio of a selection compared to the non-selection. Those who selected religious reasons have ten times the odds of participating in the boycotting than those who did not select these reasons, and this is by far the stronger effect.

The ones who selected political reasons have half the odds of participating in the boycotting than those who did not make this selection. In this model, conflict (war) as a reason does not result to a significant effect (p=0.134) and ethical reasons were marginally significant at the 90% confidence level (p=0.116).

Table 9-45 The variables in the model with the original variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1a</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I. for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic reasons</td>
<td>-1.031</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>17,908</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious reasons</td>
<td>2.361</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>76,963</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.600</td>
<td>6.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political reasons</td>
<td>-.610</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict (war) reasons</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical reasons</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.678</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>7,571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, religious reasons have the most significant and strongest effect on boycott participation. Also most significant, but weaker in terms of strength are the negative effects of economic and political reasons.

Ethical reasons have a marginal positive effect, which were much weaker than the religious ones. Conflict reasons did not have a significant effect and the environmental reasons as stated earlier did not have any effect at all.
9.5.2 Religious Boycotting: Feelings, Attitudes and Stances

In this section, the focus was on those who participated in the 2006 Danish brands boycotting for religious reasons to explore some links between their feelings and stances at the time and the present, and their intentions for the future.

Causes and effects have been sufficiently explored in the previous sections, therefore, instead of providing an additional regression model (which would not offer additional insights), it was decided to examine in detail the key attitudinal profiles – combinations of opinions, stances and attitudes which were formed in this group of participants for religious reasons. To this end, the replies of respondents to questions regarding the following issues were considered in the analyses:

- The duration of their boycotting.
- Their feelings about their decision to boycott.
- Their intentions for the future.
- Their overall stances on similar scenario.
- The three possible reasons that would make them abandon the boycotting (i.e. an official apology, when targeted brands alter their behaviour or nothing would make me abandon boycotting).

More specifically, the objective was to quantify these responses, in the sense of optimal scaling, that is, in a way best differentiates the respondents into homogeneous subgroups. This quantification will give geometric distances between attitudinal elements in a mathematically very precise 2-dimensional space, see for example, Greenacre et al., (2006). This, of course, is reminiscent of factor analysis, and in fact, the analytical technique used here is MCA, which is quite similar to factor analysis, but more preferable when the objective is not to reduce the dimensionality but to present quantification and visualisation of categorical values and examining of their proximities.

Therefore, those respondents who participated in the 2006 Danish brands boycotting and their participation was due to religious reasons were selected. Then, the two respondents who replied inconsistently regarding the duration of their boycotting, as they said that they did not participate, were excluded and a subset of 197 respondents remained. The duration
of boycotting was then re-coded by merging the few (10) cases who replied “Months” with the cases who responded “Over a year”.

In the question concerning their feelings about their choice (which now referred only to respondents having participated in the boycotting), the first 3 categories were merged with few counts “Very unhappy”, “Unhappy” and “Neither happy nor unhappy” into a new category “Unhappy to indifferent”, and a new re-coded variable was created.

By examining variables that referred to the future behaviour of respondents in the case of recurrence of a similar scenario, the very few (3) respondents who replied that they would not boycott were excluded from the dataset. The MCA analysis worked with those who said they would boycott (with certainty) and those who replied that they might boycott (therefore, essentially expressing less certainty). This differentiation of attitudes towards a future eventuality is considered sufficient for the analysis.

Finally, the three possible replies to the question related to what would make respondents abandon boycotting, that is, “An official apology”, “When targeted brands alter their behaviour” and “Nothing would make me abandon boycotting”, respectively were used. The responses in each of these variables were adequate for the analysis. Only their underlying values were changed to 1 if the response was selected and 2 if not, for reasons of conformance with the other variables.

The application of MCA with these variables resulted in a quantification of their categories, as point coordinates on a plane. These are shown in the tables that follow (tables 9-46 to 9-52), under Dimensions 1 and 2. This part of the analysis was not interested in the interpretation of these dimensions, but rather in the closeness of the categories in the geometric sense. The goodness of fit value is also acceptable (0.64).

**Table 9-46 Coordinates of the categories of duration of boycotting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Centroid Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dimension 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months to over a year</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still boycotting</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable Principal Normalization.
### Table 9-47 Coordinates of the categories of respondents feelings about their choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling about choice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Centroid Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy to indifferent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-0,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable Principal Normalization.

### Table 9-48 Coordinates of the categories of respondents’ stance if a similar scenario happens again with a brand, a company or a country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you do if a similar scenario happens again with a brand, a company or a country?</th>
<th>Points: Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centroid Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would boycott</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may boycott</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable Principal Normalization.

### Table 9-49 Coordinates of the categories of whether questionable religious behaviour of companies is a factor to change attitude toward brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionable religious behaviour of companies</th>
<th>Points: Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centroid Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable Principal Normalization.

### Table 9-50 Coordinates of the categories of the possible reasons which would make respondents abandon boycotting: An official apology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>what would make respondents abandon boycotting</th>
<th>Points: Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centroid Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An official apology</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable Principal Normalization.

### Table 9-51 Coordinates of the categories of the possible reasons which would make respondents abandon boycotting: When targeted brands alter their behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>what would make respondents abandon boycotting</th>
<th>Points: Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centroid Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When targeted brands alter their behaviour</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable Principal Normalization.
Table 9.52 Coordinates of the categories of the possible reasons which would make respondents abandon boycotting: Nothing would make me switch back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Centroid Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing would make me switch back</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.934, .383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-.699, .287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable Principal Normalization.

Excluding the coordinates for the variables relating to what would make respondents abandon boycotting for reasons of clarity, all the rest of variables are overlaid in Figure 9.23 below. Again, this part of the analysis was not interested in the interpretation of these dimensions, but rather in the proximity of the categories.

Figure 9.23 The categories of the above four variables as points in a plane

One can clearly see that high satisfaction from the decision to participate in the boycotting (red dots), continuation of the boycotting now (green dots), strong agreement with the question on whether questionable religious behaviour of companies constitutes a motive to change attitude toward brands (brown dot) and intention to boycott in the future if similar scenario happens again (blue dots) are all represented by points very close together (green circle). This is the main attitudinal profile, being quite numerous.
Another (much less numerous) attitudinal profile is formed by respondents who are not satisfied with their participation in the boycotting and disagree or are undecided with the question on whether a questionable religious behaviour of companies constitutes a motive for them to change their attitude toward brands (shown as a blue circle).

However, these categories are not so close with the other reply for the duration of the boycotting (“Months to over a year”) or the other answer for future intention (“I may boycott”). This is not a cohesive profile based on the variables selected. In fact, these other replies can be considered an extension of the main profile (dotted ellipsis, Figure 9.23). Figure 9.24 below shows respondents as points in the same plane. One can verify the cohesiveness and size of the main profile.

**Figure 9.24 The cases as points in the same plane**

Variable Principal Normalization.

Figure 9.25 below shows the coordinates for the three variables in the question related to what would make respondents abandon boycotting. If Figure 9.25 is compared with Figure 9.24 (taking into account the differences in scale), it can be seen that the reply “Nothing would make me abandon boycotting”, the non-selection of the official apology are clearly added to the main attitudinal profile along with high satisfaction from the decision to participate in the boycotting, continuation of the boycotting now, strong agreement with the question on whether a questionable religious behaviour of companies constitutes a motive to change attitude toward brands and intention to boycott in a future if similar scenario happens again.
In this search for structure in the subset of 167 participants for religious purposes, the most discernible profile consists of respondents:

- Still continuing the 2006 boycotting of Danish brands,
- High satisfaction from participating in the boycotting,
- Intention to participate in boycotting if similar scenario happens in future, and
- Strong sensitivity to questionable religious behaviour or remarks by companies.

In other words, the above replies show the highest correlation among all possible ones in the variables examined. In fact, among respondents who participated in the boycotting for religious reasons, forty-eight of them had exactly this combination of replies.

On the contrary, the other relatively high concentration of categories which includes:

- Insensitivity to questionable religious behaviour by companies and
- Dissatisfaction or indifference by the participation in the boycotting, consisted of only ten respondents, and furthermore, it is a much less cohesive profile, not being associated for example with the intention for a future repetition of the boycotting (four said they would boycott and six said they might boycott).
9.5.3 Discussion

The third research question was concerned with the impact of religiously motivated boycotting on brand loyalty; the first part of this analysis explored the factors determining boycotting participation. The second part was for analysing the impact of religiously motivated boycotting on brand loyalty.

9.5.3.1 Factors Determining Boycott Participation

Analysis clearly showed that religious reason had the strongest representation on the model; it is not surprising that this factor was positively associated with boycotting, not only because previous sections of this study showed the influence of religion and religiosity on both boycotting and loyalty choices but also because these findings are supported by the ample studies on the influence of religion on consumption behaviour.

Hence, the above supports not only Salzman’s (2008) argument in relation to the influence of religiosity on individuals’ consuming habits but also Swimberghe et al. (2009) who found that religious individuals tend to consider attacks on religious beliefs not only very stressful but also threatening. The fact that individuals’ consuming habits are influenced to some extent by the level of their religiosity is well established in consumer behaviour literature (Delener, 1990; Essoo and Dibb, 2004).

Even though ethical reasons were positively associated with boycotting but in the model it was not significant at 0.95% confidence level, this can be explained by the subjective interpretation of ethicality among consumers, unlike religious interpretation (Islam in this research), which is relatively rigid in its scope of interpretation. In other words, some may think that publishing insulting cartoons of Prophet Mohammed is ethically wrong and some may think otherwise, but the religious interpretation of the same case has limited or no scope for flexibility in this matter.

Other significant factors of boycotting among those transnationals were economic and political reasons. Economic reasons had a stronger effect than the political reasons; however, both factors were negatively associated with boycotting, that is those respondents who selected those factors as motivators for their boycotting were less likely
to have participated in the Danish brands boycotting. Understandably, this boycott was religiously motivated and respondents who were not interested in such motivation for boycotting were less likely to participate.

The above distinguishes between religious boycotting that is not motivated by pure material possessions and economic boycotting which is motivated by pure economic values, for example, reducing prices or reacting to poor brand quality (Friedman, 1999; Barda and Sardianou, 2010).

The fact that conflict, ethical and environmental reasons were not significant factors for those transnationals draws a clearer picture of what is more important for them before considering participation in a boycott action.

9.5.3.2 Religious Boycott Impact on Participants’ Brand Loyalty

The MCA results showed clearly the effect of the religiously motivated boycott on brand loyalty; these analyses showed not only the impact of boycotting on loyalty but also the damaging long-term effect on it. This is consistent with the findings by Al Shebil et al. (2011) and Abosag and de Villegas (2011) who argued that boycotting has a long-lasting damaging effect on targeted brands.

No doubt, boycotting is a tool which consumers use to express their dissatisfaction with targeted brands (Sen et al., 2001), but analyses found that religiously motivated boycott, unlike economic boycott, is a damaging course of action to brand loyalty and has long-term negative effects. This potential long-term effect is demonstrated by the nature and size of the largest visible boycotting respondents profile that the MCA produced, those who were represented in this profile have continued to boycott since 2006, were highly satisfied with their choice, intend to boycott in the future if similar scenario occurs again and finally were sensitive to questionable behaviours or remarks against their religion.

It can be easily seen that all the aspects of this profile are connected to religion; duration of boycotting is attributed to the religious nature of that boycott (i.e. insulting the Prophet of their faith), the high satisfaction of the course of action taken that is boycotting is a religious duty and fulfilling it led to satisfaction. The profound impact of Islam as a religion was discussed earlier and these findings are in line with previous social science literature such as Nawal (2009), Roald (2001), Al-Qaradawy (1995) and Maududi (1960).
Furthermore, their intention to boycott in the future if a similar scenario occurs can be explained by considering that insulting their Prophet is a threat to their fundamental beliefs (Swimberghe et al., 2009) hence, their rationale to participate in similar boycotts in the future can be based on the findings by Hirschman (1983) who argued that individuals belonging to a particular religious group could have a similar rational that may influence their behaviour compared with groups of other faiths.

And finally, respondents’ sensitivity to questionable behaviours or remarks against their religion can be explained by the significant correlation McNichols and Zimmerer (1985) found between the strength of individuals’ religious orientation and their attitude toward the ethicality of different questionable behaviours.

9.6 Integration of Both Data Analyses

This section integrates both data analyses, the analyses of the qualitative date collected from the thirty-five interviews and the quantitative data collected from the online survey. This integration follows the sequential exploratory design discussed in Chapter 6 of this study.

9.6.1 Characteristics of Boycotters

The qualitative part of this study explored the boycotting characteristics of participants; their demographics, transnationality, loyalty, religious, and social capital characteristics were investigated. The quantitative part investigated the relationship between all these characteristics and respondents’ boycotting and loyalty choices.

As for boycotters’ demographics, qualitative analyses suggested that many of those transnationals were educated and married. Male boycotters were more than females, they were relatively young and the majority were employed. However, due to the explanatory nature of the qualitative part, investigating the relationship between these demographic variables and the boycotting choice was not possible, hence, came the role of the the quantitative analysis of the online survey.

Age, gender, marital status, income, number of children, qualification and employment status were related significantly to boycotting choice, but the most significant predictor was respondents’ employment status for the reasons discussed in quantitative analysis
section. This clearly indicates that from demographics perspective, boycotters were economically active and participation in boycotting is to be expected more from the employed than the unemployed.

Unemployment means less or no financial resources and may lead to poverty and social exclusion, Atkinson and Hills (1998, p. 20) argued that poverty may also lead to social exclusion and as a result “people are unable to participate in the customary consumption activities of the society in which they live”. Hence, this may explain why employment stood out as the main positive predictor of boycotting choice for those transnationals as the unemployed were burdened and somewhat isolated, to take part in what is essentially a collective action (i.e. boycotting).

As for transnationality characteristics, the qualitative analysis suggested that participants’ duration of stay was influential in shaping participants’ consumption behaviour by being exposed to different cultures, faiths and people from different backgrounds and this has influenced their way of life in many aspects including consumption. However, transnationality was not represented as a significant predictor for boycotting but its duration had a relationship with boycotting and the longer the duration of transnationality the more it influences boycotting choice.

As for the effects of brand loyalty, based on the analysis of the interviews, the majority of participants were knowledgeable about various brands and they were or still loyal to some brands at some point of their life, in fact, the Lurpak butter brand was more known by participants than the brand owner Arla Foods.

Hence, those transnationals were brand-aware and this awareness was according to the interviews analyses attributed not only to advertising, sales promotion, or social media but also to the fact that they mostly shop in person (rather than online shopping) which gave them the physical knowledge and experience of various brands.

As for transnationals’ readiness to sacrifice buying their favourite brands, interviews showed a mixed reaction on this issue, some suggested that it is risky to try new brands after using particular brands for many years and hence, they preferred the safe option by sticking with what they know and buy on regular basis to avoid the unfamiliar while others attributed their relaxed attitude toward switching to the saturated market place.
However, the quantitative analysis showed a clear association between repeat purchasing of particular brands and boycotting choice. Hence, avoidance of the unfamiliar was a significant predictor of boycotting choice, where transnationals who had shown repeat purchase behaviour of particular brands were less likely to boycott than others, hence, it can be said that their loyalty (behavioural loyalty- buying the brand and commitment- re-buying the brand) made them avoid the risk of the unfamiliar and this worked as a shield against entering the boycotting or not boycotting choice dilemma.

Religion was central to most participants argument while discussing boycotting during the interviews, and it was clear that many participants boycotted and would boycott in the future for religious reasons, furthermore, a new aspect of religiosity was emerging during the analyses of these interviews; that is religious denominations which appeared to differentiate between not only participants’ boycotting behaviour but also loyalty behaviour as it will be explained in the brand loyalty determinants section later, that is despite the fact they both belong to the same faith. Shiaa participants were more likely to boycott than Sunnis.

The importance of religion was confirmed by the quantitative analysis and religious denominations appeared as a significant predictor of boycotting among those transnationals where Shiaa were clearly keener on boycotting than Sunnis, hence, transnational boycotters were also characterised by their religious denominations.

As for Social capital, analyses of the interviews showed clearly the level of close virtual connectedness those transnational consumers formed with their social circle (i.e. family and friends) in their country of origin via a variety of means including new communication platforms such as Viber, Skype or traditional platforms such as direct calling and emails as well as social media such as Facebook.

Furthermore, qualitative analysis showed that participants despite their absence in the physical terms from their country of origin and hence their social circle, they were very much part of their communities in the non-virtual sense, in fact, many recognised the role their social circle plays in creating a social pressure which played a role in influencing their consumption behaviour whether when making buying or boycotting choices. However, there was some disagreement on the influence of social capital, as some considered buying or boycotting as a personal choice.
The quantitative analysis supported the argument of the many who acknowledged the impact of social capital on their boycotting choice, two significant social predictors of boycotting appeared, the first was close social ties which was positively associated with boycotting and this can be explained by the high connectedness level those transnational consumers enjoy with their social circle and the social pressure this connectedness creates.

The second significant predictor was the usage level of internet and networking which had a negative association with boycotting; this can be explained by linking the usage level of internet and networking (usage level is higher among younger than older) with one of the demographic characteristics of boycotters, namely age where the younger found to be less likely to boycott than the older transnationals.

9.6.2 Determinants of Brand Loyalty

This section of the analysis concerns the determinants of brand loyalty of transnational Muslim Arabs living in London. As seen in the literature review of brand loyalty, these determinants were divided into three categories: brand drivers, social drivers and consumers’ drivers.

As for brand drivers, the qualitative part of this study suggested that for those transnationals, quality and price were the most important determinants of loyalty from the brand perspective, followed by taste, sales promotion, brand names, country of origin, the availability of substitute brands and advertising.

However, the quantitative analyses of the survey showed that taste, quality, brand’s COO and brand knowledge were significant predictors of loyalty among those transnationals; moreover, price, sale promotion, advertising and brand names were also influential brand attributes.

The difference in the hierarchy of these attributes between the qualitative and quantitative parts can be explained by the nature of each tool where in the first, participants were left to think what were the most important attributes to them in brands without options to choose from, unlike the second tool where these attributes were options embedded within the survey.

Nevertheless, these brand attributes, despite the hierarchical differences between both qualitative and quantitative tools; they painted a clear picture of what those transnationals
look for when making buying decisions and most importantly their repeat buying decisions.

As for consumers’ drivers, interviews suggested that participants saw little to no risk in switching to substitute brands and this was attributed to the low monetary value of FMCGs. Hence, risk aversion was not an important loyalty driver for the transnationals who participated in these interviews.

As for variety seeking, qualitative analyses suggested that the behaviour of participants whether to seek new varieties or to stick with what they already know was either a personal choice, attributed to demographic factors (e.g. age) or was a result of advertising campaigns run by companies.

The interviews found a mixed response in relation to participants’ level of involvement with their preferred brands, but the general attitude was that giving feedback is not a priority and is subject to various factors such as the availability of time to give feedback or participants’ assessment of the importance of doing so, that is, whether these companies would value their feedback or not.

Interviews also explored the demographic factors that played role as consumers’ drivers of loyalty. Age, gender, income and marital status seemed to be influential on the loyalty behaviour of those transnational consumers.

*Halal* food appeared as an instrumental attribute for loyalty among the interviewed consumers, and this can be understood from the Muslim perspective as a religious requirement. There was also a difference among *Shiia* and *Sunni* participants in relation to their loyalty to brands; hence, not only *Halal* food but also religious denomination played a part in loyalty among participants.

Transnationality as a consumer driver was influential not only on consumption behaviour, brand knowledge and potential loyalty but also on participants’ general knowledge. Accumulation of knowledge seemed to be connected to the duration of transnationality.

However, quantitative analysis using factor analysis showed that demographics, transnationality and religion as consumers’ drivers were the only significant variables that can predict respondents’ loyalty.
For demographics, marital status coupled with employment status was found to be a significant predictor; married respondents working full-time were more loyal to brands than respondents who were in the categories of low income and single.

As for transnationality, the main factors were: respondents’ transnationality duration and respondents’ reason to come to the UK. Both were significant predictors of loyalty as consumer drivers, where transnationals who have been outside of their country of origin longer were more loyal than those with less time outside their country of origin and the second predictor where transnationals who came to the UK to get married or as spouses who were found to be more loyal than those who came to study.

Religious variables only concerning transnationals religious denomination were a significant predictor in this section where Shiaa found to be more loyal than Sunnis.

Religious Requirement (Halal food) was not a significant predictor of loyalty even though, it is a sign of the level of religiosity which has a significant relationship with loyalty and most importantly it is still part of their fundamental religious beliefs (eating non-Halal food is prohibited in Islam). The explanation for this is that for FMCG and non-Halal food brands, in particular, are not consumed in the first place therefore, the question of buying non-Halal food brands let alone becoming loyal is not even considered until these brands become Halal.

Risk aversion, variety seeking and level of involvement were not significant consumers’ drivers of loyalty. Even though, risk aversion and variety seeking were significantly associated with brand loyalty but failed the logistic regression test. Level of involvement had no significant relationship to brand loyalty.

Social drivers also influenced consumption behaviour according to the analysis of the interviews; family and friends appeared to play an important part in influencing loyalty. The transnationals who were interviewed were closely connected to their social capital back home thanks to the advances in communication technologies. However, this close connectedness also created a pressure that was powerful not only in shaping boycotting decisions as explained in the previous section but also in influencing brand loyalty behaviour.

Quantitative analysis confirmed links between social capital and brand loyalty, however, despite the significant relationship between other social variables such as the frequency of
communication and the usage level of internet, the only significant social predictor of loyalty among respondents was found to be family and friends, hence, social capital played significant role in influencing those transnationals' brand loyalty.

9.6.3 Religiously Motivated Consumer Boycotts Impact on Brand Loyalty

The third research question was concerning the factors that can potentially determine boycott participation among the sampled population and how a religiously motivated boycotting impacts on brand loyalty.

Qualitative analysis suggested that economic reasons were the most important reasons for boycotting followed by religious reasons and all participants who boycotted Danish brands in 2006 stated religion as their reason for participating in that boycott.

Political reasons were also frequently mentioned during interviews which suggest that these reasons have a role in shaping those interviewees boycotting decision-making process. Conflict also was an influential reason that those interviewees mentioned during the interviews, with a clear link made several times between conflict and Israel as a result of the on-going conflict between the Palestinians and Israel.

Even though ethical and environmental were mentioned by some interviewees as reasons that may influence their boycotting choice, these two reasons didn't appear to be highly important for many of them, which suggests that their boycotting choices were more influenced by the earlier mentioned reasons rather than these.

As for the impact of a religiously motivated boycotting on brand loyalty, religion was an influential reason for many to participate in boycotting campaign. The duration of boycotting varied among interviewees, however, the greater share of the participants who boycotted couldn’t forgive due to the religious nature of that boycott, so they boycotted for good, settled with alternative brands and were also happy with their choice. Doing so appeared as a religious duty (i.e. defending their faith) according to some participants.

Quantitative analysis supported the finding of the qualitative analysis in many aspects, it found that economic and religious factors to be the most influential boycotting motivators followed by political reasons, however, religious reasons were the strongest and were positively associated with boycotting unlike economic and political reasons which were
also less stronger in term of their effect. This clearly shows the strong effect religion has on the boycotting participation decision-making process.

Furthermore, similar to the qualitative finding, the quantitative analysis found that ethical and environmental reasons had no significant relationship with boycotting and hence, have no effect on the boycotting participation decision-making process.

As for the impact of religiously motivated boycotting on brand loyalty, MCA, which was used in the quantitative analysis painted a clear and rather alarming picture of the long term damaging effect of boycotts that are motivated by religious reasons on brand loyalty. The largest and most visible profile was for boycotters who are (1) still boycotting since 2006, (2) happy with their choice, (3) would do it if similar scenario occurs again and (4) those who were sensitive to such kind of questionable behaviours or remarks.
Chapter 10 Conclusions

10.1 Introduction

Chapter 10 presents the conclusions of this research by summarising the major findings, then based on these findings, pays a re-visit to the original conceptual model this study proposed at the beginning, presents its contribution to knowledge, practice, and finally presents the study limitations and the path to future research.

The migration trends in many developed countries send clear economic, political and environmental signals, transnationality by its nature can be a result of one or all of these trends, hence, as international mobility is increasing, transnationality from a consumption perspective is slowly but surely is changing the market environment. Hence, understanding transnationality and its impact on consumption was the main motive behind this research.

This study concluded that transnational boycotters have many characteristics that had a major effect on their boycotting behaviour. The study also proposed a new perspective on brand loyalty determinants among those consumers. Another key conclusion was empirically confirming the long-lasting damaging effect of boycotting on brand loyalty and, in particular, the religiously motivated boycott on brand loyalty.

10.2 Boycotters Characteristics

Assigning distinct characteristics for this segment of consumers is significant as it exposes essential aspects of the boycotting puzzle for marketers who may be faced with challenging times and can potentially find themselves among the 42% of the top Multinational Corporations brands that are facing consumer boycotts. Boycotting is one of the extreme ends of consumption behaviour and is here to stay. Hence, to be effective in dealing with such behaviour, companies need to understand what shapes this behaviour in the first place.

Those consumers were characterised from demographics perspective as older, male, married, on higher income, and finally and most significantly economically active. In fact, one can see the clear association between all these demographic characteristics, for example, it is safe to argue that the employed are better off financially than the unemployed and earlier studies found that marriage is also associated positively with better financial status.
As for transnationality, the evidence which suggested that boycotting of Danish brands was characterised by transnationality nature and its duration was not strong. However, its contribution in shaping the behaviour of those transnationals should not be ignored. Transnationality contributed not only to the exposure to different cultures and values but also to brand knowledge and this knowledge was influential in the decision-making process for those transnationals.

Additionally, those who were familiar with too many brands were easy switchers and their loyalty can easily be diminished unlike those who regularly repeat purchasing the same brands. Those who repeat purchasing same brands also seemed to be an uneasy target to boycotting campaigners.

From a religious perspective, this study was the first to explore the influence of religious denominations on consumption behaviour, and in particular, boycotting and brand loyalty; it found significant differences that are still unexplored in the marketing literature.

Social ties were also an important characteristic of boycotters, they were closely connected with their social capital which was found to be positively instrumental—through the pressure it creates—in shaping boycotting choice.

**10.3 Brand Loyalty Determinants**

Loyalty is the other extreme end of this relationship between brands and consumers. This research painted a clear picture of the factors that determine the brand loyalty of this consumers segment.

**10.3.1 Brand Drivers**

This study offered an enhanced understanding of the most important brand attributes from a transnationals’ perspective and presented a rather different view on the ranking of these brand attributes; taste, quality and COO and brand knowledge which is a result of advertising and promotions.

Those consumer loyalty behaviours were based not only intrinsic brand values but also extrinsic. This is evidenced by the importance placed on taste, quality as intrinsic values and COO as an extrinsic value, and both of these values are attributed to brand knowledge amongst those transnationals.
10.3.2 Consumer Drivers

The first challenging part is that FMCGs are perceived as low-value items by those consumers. Therefore, they see no risk in switching to substitute brands, the challenge here is keeping them loyal when they can easily find substitutes. Hence, the traditional attribute of loyalty which is related to risk aversion is no longer usable as a driver for loyalty.

And this leads to the next point; variety seeking, as in the current market, for many FMCG brands quality became a standard and not a differentiation factor, since those consumers are characterised by their good knowledge of many brands, exploring and seeking the experience of trying brands has become the norm. Loyalty in its three dimensions: behavioural, attitudinal, reasoned action is difficult to maintain in such market conditions, putting, even more, pressure on brands not only when attempting to attract new consumers but also when trying to keep loyal consumers loyal.

However, other factors were more important, namely, demographics, transnationality and religious factors. From demographics perspective, understandably, loyalty is commitment and such commitment is attached to financial cost, hence, as stated earlier, marriage and employment are correlated with better financial status, and this influences loyalty behaviour.

The duration of transnationality contributed to brand loyalty and this sets another milestone in transnationality literature as it confirms empirically the argument of Sirkeci (2013) and Basch et al. (1994) in relation to the effect which transnationality have on behaviour. Additionally, because the longer duration of transnationality is associated with loyalty, it can be linked to demographic factors such as age, employment, hence, could be safe to assume that those who are veterans transnationality-wise are older, more fluent language-wise, and hence, are more employable and have a better chance of better financial stability than newcomers.

Once again, the religious denomination was not only instrumental in boycotting behaviour but also loyalty behaviour. There is no contradiction here between the effect of the religious denomination on both ends of this extreme behaviour; the first effect was only related to participants of the Danish brands boycott in 2006, which was a religiously motivated boycott, however, the second effect concerns transnationals who were loyal to particular brands.
The above offers marketers and interested parties not only a clearer picture of the factors that determined loyalty among those transnationals but also confirms that Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) potential loyalty driver model in its consumers drivers part, might be suitable for mainstream but not transnational consumers. The model which this study developed based on Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) is thought to be more suited for this segment of consumers as evidenced by the outcome of this research.

10.3.3 Social Drivers

Social ties had an unmistaken influence, and it proves that some parts of the Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) model were valid, mainly the part related to social drivers. Social ties were enhanced by the virtual connectedness those transnationals have with their social circle and this connectedness created pressure that influenced their decision-making process in relation to brand loyalty.

Technological advances of communication platforms were a contributing factor in social connectedness, however, such advancement is a sword with two edges, one edge that influences boycotting and the other that influences brand loyalty. These are not contradictory statements as explained earlier where the first effect was only related to participants of the Danish brands boycott in 2006 whereas, the second effect concerns transnationals who are or were loyal to particular brands. In fact, it is evident that social ties have a certain effect on consumption behaviour whether boycotting or loyalty.

10.4 Religious Boycott Impact on Brand Loyalty

It was clear that religious reasons were the strongest positive motivator for participating in a boycott campaign; this also supports TPB in its social factors component shown in Figure 12 as well as the earlier literature that explored its effect on consumption and also supports this study findings in relation to the effect of religion on consumption behaviour and boycotting, in particular.

This study showed that transnational Muslim Arabs, despite living in multi-faith open society, their religion still plays a central role in their day-to-day behaviour and activities. Therefore, this role needs to be fully appreciated when marketers are faced with challenging times such as boycotting.
The other vital piece of evidence which showed that religion is a major influence on behaviour is the long term effect of boycotting when it is motivated by religious reasons, even though many of those transnationals were loyal to Danish brands, they boycotted these brands already, and the analysis suggests that the majority of them are still boycotting.

This indirectly suggests that brands and companies may get away with economically, politically, ethically or environmentally motivated boycotts if the wrongdoing is corrected, but, they may not have even the opportunity to say sorry when the boycott is religiously motivated.

### 10.5 Conceptual Framework Revisited

As the findings suggested, the original framework was a good representation of the transnational consumers’ motivation for boycotting as well as the factors that drive their loyalty. The analysis also confirmed the role transnationality plays in influencing both loyalty and boycotting behaviour.

However, a new sub-factor emerged during analyses and some factors were not significant, firstly, even though religion itself is a significant contributor to consumption behaviour, within Islam, the religious denomination namely Sunni and Shiaa emerged as a differentiating factor in both boycotting and loyalty behaviour.

Secondly, the analysis found that not all suggested drivers; mainly consumers’ drivers were influential on loyalty behaviour. Variety seeking and risk aversion were not as influential as religion and demographics as consumers’ drivers, in fact, the level of involvement was not significant at all.

Furthermore, not all boycott motivations were important to those transnationals, conflict, ethical and environmental motivations had little or no influence in their boycotting decision-making process. Hence, these effects were reflected in the amended model, Figure 10.1.
10.6 Contribution to Knowledge

This research aimed to explore boycotting and loyalty behaviour of a segment of consumers that was largely understudied, hence, it was important to develop a working model that includes the relevant variables to provide an understanding of the behaviour of a particular transnational segment of consumers - i.e. Arab Muslims who are resident in London.

The Theory of Planned Behaviour was an important and useful guiding theoretical model to explain consumer boycotting behaviour whilst not accommodating the transnationality variable which was a key concern in this research. Similarly, the model provided by Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) - i.e. potential drivers of loyalty model- was useful in this study as it allows in social drivers whilst not including the impact of transnationality.

As argued by Sirkeci (2013), transnationality in terms of connectedness and multiple reference points for consumption behaviour is important to understand groups such as Arab Muslims in London. These groups either have international migration experience or somehow connected with people who have migration experience and therefore their choices are influenced by these experiences and connectedness (Sirkeci, 2013). Hence, the model developed for -and based on- this research includes a comprehensive representation of brand loyalty determinants as well as integrating the transnationality in this model,
hence, variables reflecting the transnationality dimension were selected and added following the definitions by Sirkeci (2013) and Basch et al. (1994).

The final model consisted of four measures: transnationality, religious denomination, social capital and demographics; which analysis found to be a valid representation of the boycotting and loyalty behaviour of London-based Muslim Arab transnationals.

Hence, this research's contribution to knowledge and literature are fivefold; first, this research expanded the application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to transnational consumers by adding the transnationality to the list of variables.

Transnationality variables were found to have predictive power in explaining those consumers' boycotting behaviour. Number of years living outside respondents' country of origin, reasons for migrating to the UK and number of years living in the UK were all significantly associated with boycotting decision.

The duration of transnationality was influential on respondents' brand loyalty behaviour as those who have been living outside their country of origin for many years were more likely to be brand loyal than others. Therefore, this addition to the Theory of Planned Behaviour is thought to be a small but noteworthy contribution.

Secondly, this study contributed to the literature by extending the potential drivers of loyalty model of Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004) to include additional variables that were necessary to explain the loyalty behaviour of those transnational consumers.

Based on the analysis, the developed model was found to have predictive power in explaining the loyalty behaviour of this consumer segment. In this model, demographics, religion, transnationality, taste, quality, brand's COO, Price, sales promotions, advertising and brand names were represented as significant predictors of loyalty. Hence, this addition represents an expansion of the model by Gounaris and Stathakopoulos (2004).

Thirdly, this research provided empirical evidence to the conceptualisation of transnational (mobile) consumers by Sirkeci (2013). It has provided evidence that transnationality does have a statistically significant impact on boycotting behaviour. This study also puts forward an empirically-tested model for assessing the impact of boycotting on brand loyalty, where demographics, religion, transnationality and social capital were all found to be valid measures in assessing such impact.
Fourthly, a unique demographic and socio-economic dataset has been created in this study on Arabs living in London. This data – in conjunction with available official data- will be useful for analysing and understanding Arab consumer behaviour in London and will shed light on consumer behaviour among other transnational consumer groups. Particularly the religious denominations identified in the data can be helpful for further analysis of the impact of religious denominations in consumer behaviour.

Most studies, as discussed in chapter 2, estimated the percentage of Sunni Muslims worldwide to be around %85 and the Shiaa around %15. This also varies from one Arab country to another, however, the collection of the data related to respondents’ religious denomination helped in understanding, for the first time, the percentages of the Sunni and Shiaa Arabs in London; Sunni Arab Muslims in London constituted 74% while, Shiaa Arabs made 24% of the sampled population.

The difference between this study's statistics in regard to Sunni and Shiaa percentages compared to earlier literature (see chapter 2) provided empirical evidence to the conflict model of migration (Sirkeci, 2009; Cohen and Sirkeci, 2011; Sirkeci and Cohen, 2016; Sirkeci et al. 2016). The model suggests that ethnic or religious minorities are likely to be overrepresented in migration from conflict areas such as Iraq, Syria, or Turkey. The Shiaa migration from countries like Iraq, Bahrain and Syria due to the ongoing conflict and civil unrest can explain the higher percentage of Shiaa among Arabs in London.

The final contribution of this study is about the impact of consumer boycott on brand loyalty. The study has provided empirical evidence showing the negative long-term impact of religiously motivated boycotting on brand loyalty. This may warrant different business and marketing strategies for companies to avoid such damaging effects.

10.7 Implications for Management and Consumers

The review on the relevant boycotting and brand loyalty literature shows clearly the gaps relating to understanding the behaviour of transnational consumers, despite the figures which suggest that migration rates are rising and, as a result, transnational communities are ever expanding.
International firms were often caught unprepared to deal with boycotting actions. And many of them including top brands are facing consumer boycotts and the uncertainty it brings with it in terms of its long-term negative impact on loyalty.

Additionally, loyalty is a complex behaviour and keeping loyal consumers loyal in today’s saturated market is not an easy task, which explains why businesses lose half of their customers every five years. Therefore, understanding why consumers become loyal and what makes them switch to other brands is not only important to social scientists; this understanding is essential for marketers when shaping their marketing strategy.

This study offers marketers an empirically tested insight into boycotting and loyalty behaviours for this segment of the UK’s transnational consumers, and those consumers are characterised by their demographics, religion, transnationality and social capital.

The implications for consumers is also believed to be valuable as shedding light on what motivates them to boycott and what are the factors that shape their brand loyalty behaviour as a minority community in London. Furthermore, understanding the consumption behaviour of this segment could provide the basis for successful future collective actions as a successful boycotting action requires organised and collective efforts in order to create the desired impact on targeted organisations.

10.8 Limitations

As for all research projects, data collection methods are expected to have some limitations. For the qualitative part, the advantages of conducting face-to-face interviews were explained. However, this chosen instrument also has its disadvantages:

First of all, it is prone to bias as participants were from a socially connected society, which may raise concerns related to the potential impact social pressure can have on them as it is known to influence behaviour.

Furthermore, the technique itself—snowball sampling—is prone to bias too; participants may only refer potential participants who share similar views on the research area. However, all possible efforts were made while formulating the interview questions to keep bias minimal, and these efforts included explaining the academic purpose of the research, its ethicality, the privacy of participants and most importantly, avoiding leading questions that can potentially bias participants’ responses.
As for the use of SNSs for the distribution of the online questionnaire and with an approximate number of 102,939 eligible Arabs living in London, population representation and hence generalisation is another disadvantage of this method. However, this quantitative instrument provided important insights into respondent’s feelings and attitudes toward boycott and its impact on brand loyalty. It is thought that the mixed method approach that is the combination of face-to-face interviews with the online questionnaire using sequential explanatory design has hopefully helped in overcoming this weakness.

The findings generalisation in this study is another limitation. This study focused on the Arab population in London who are one of many different minority groups living in the UK; therefore, it would be valuable to do further research to explore the behaviour of other transnational minority groups to be able to compare and contrast with the findings of this study.

**10.9 Directions for Further Research**

This study is the first to address this transnational population and both extreme ends of their consumption behaviour, which is a noteworthy contribution. Furthermore, even though it was an exploratory study the validity and the reliability of the quantitative instrument using factors analysis implies its applicability (Bornstedt, 1977; Ratray and Jones, 2007) along with the developed research model that can be built upon to further future studies that concern transnationals consumption behaviour with minor changes depending on the area of their research.

From brands perspective, future research can expand the consumption behaviour literature by exploring transnationals loyalty behaviour toward durable goods or services. From a population perspective, it would be valuable to explore others transnational populations; Turkey, for example, has a large population in many European countries including the UK, and Germany. Poland, Romania, India, Pakistan, etc. all have a large populations living in Europe who are transnationals by definition.

Another important future research path would be the role of religion within other transnational populations such as Indians, Romanians and so on, it would be interesting to map the degree of religious influence on these transnational communities and how it impacts on their decision-making process.
Furthermore, within Islam, the religious Sunni-Shiaa divide which surfaced more clearly and aggressively in the last two decades was found to be influential not only on mere religious practices but most importantly on consumption behaviour, more empirical research is needed to explore many other aspects of consumption of both sides of the Shiaa-Sunni divide and not only with regard to boycotting or loyalty behaviour.

As for methodology, more studies are needed on the use of SNSs as a data collection tool and more efforts are needed to structure this relatively new path and utilise such a powerful people connector.
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### Table 1. All variables in the logistic regression model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1a</th>
<th>Gender (1)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I.for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-Marital Status</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.479 1.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-Single (1)</td>
<td>-.421</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.196 2.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-Married(2)</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.380 1.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>12.407</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used, working full time 40hr/week or more(1)</td>
<td>-1.142</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>8.753</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.150  .680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used, working 1-39hr/ week(2)</td>
<td>-.445</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.292 1.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed(3)</td>
<td>-1.363</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>6.155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.087  .751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not employed, looking for work(4)</td>
<td>-.818</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.129 1.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not employed, not looking for work (5)</td>
<td>-2.031</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>1.762</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.007 2.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-No. of years living outside country of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-Less than 3 years(1)</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.297 1.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-3 years but less than 5 years(2)</td>
<td>-.709</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.186 1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-5 years but less than 10 years(3)</td>
<td>-.477</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.235 1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-Reason for coming to the UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-For employment(1)</td>
<td>-.424</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.295 1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-For study(2)</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>.366 3.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-For asylum(3)</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>.609 2.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether living abroad changed consumption behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree(1)</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.396 1.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree(2)</td>
<td>-.849</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>3.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.166 1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided(3)</td>
<td>-.470</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.206 1.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree(4)</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.081 1.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>.857 1.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>4.242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>1.015 1.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>8.326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.444  .856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-Religious denomination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-Shia(1)</td>
<td>-.490</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.289 1.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r-Sunni(2)</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>6.470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.003  .472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIG1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>.948 1.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIG2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>16.965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>1.394 2.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>21.964</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.285</td>
<td>1.617 3.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.377</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>5.657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.503  .936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>6.582</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>7.142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Gender, r-Marital Status, r-Qualification, Employment status, r-No. of years living outside country of origin, r-Reason for coming to the UK, Whether living abroad changed consumption behaviour, BRAND1, BRAND2, BRAND3, r-Religious denomination, RELIG1, RELIG2, SOCIAL1, SOCIAL2.

*r* before the name of a variable indicates that the original variable was re-coded.
Table 2 Relationship between the dependent and independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycotting Relationship with Demographics</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>7.475</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your age? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>25.814</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your marital status? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>10.508</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total gross annual household income? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>17.779</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>26.606</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycotting relationship with Transnationality</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years living outside your country of origin? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>10.480</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main reason for coming to the UK? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>23.534</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time living in London? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has living abroad changed your consumption behaviour? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>64.792</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycotting relationship with Brand Loyalty</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you repeat purchasing particular FMCG brands? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>58.158</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you loyal to any brands? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>26.465</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important the brand’s country of origin to you? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>24.486</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you shop according to your knowledge of particular brands? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>24.172</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycotting Relationship with Religion and Religiosity</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious denomination? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>16.765</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for loyalty- religious requirement, i.e. Halal food? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>10.199</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is religion in your life? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>42.845</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity level based on the supplied definition of religiousness? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>66.287</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable religious behaviour of companies? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>55.735</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycotting Relationship with Social Capital</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you communicate with your family? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>32.820</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you use social media - Facebook, Twitter, etc.? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How influential is your family on your consumption behaviour * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>59.176</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How influential your friends are on your consumption behaviour? * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>40.005</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important are social ties (family and friends) to you * Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?</td>
<td>41.426</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05 level
**APPENDIX 2**

**Interview Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>No. of Children</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Empl. status</th>
<th>Income £</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Religious denomination</th>
<th>COO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Can you tell me for how long you have been living in the UK?
- Why did you leave your country of origin?
- Do you have a family in your country of origin?
- How often do you communicate with them?
- What about relatives living abroad?
- What about friends in your country of origin?
- What about friends living abroad?
- What do you know about consumer boycott?
- Are you a heavy user of social media?
- What is your knowledge of the Danish product boycott in 2006 and what do you recall from that event?
- Can you tell me how do you shop?
- Do you buy a particular brand regularly?
- Have you ever boycotted a brand and why?
- Would you have a certain reasons to buy a particular brand all the time and what would be these reasons?
- Do you think switching to another brand is hard?
- How influential your family on your consumption behaviour?
- Would you encourage your family to boycott?
- Were you ever encouraged by your family to boycott?
- How would you feel if you are buying a brand which is boycotted by your family?
- What would be your feeling if your family is buying a brand that you are boycotting?
- Did you participate in the Danish product boycott in 2006 and how did you feel about it?
- Did you encourage friends to boycott the Danish product boycott in 2006?
- Are you loyal to particular brands?
- Would you be loyal to a country as a whole?
- Do you interact with the brand which you are loyal to?
- Is it risky to try another brand?
- How important country of origin to you?
- What are your thoughts about British brands?
- What about Danish brands?
- What are the most important factors that would make you loyal to certain brands, if any?
- Do you know Arla Foods?
- Would you recognise this image?
- How important religion to you?
- What do you think of the Muslims 5 prayers a day?
- Do you pray?
- What do you think of the Zakah?
- Do you fast?
- Do you look forward to Ramadan every year?
- Have you done Hajj?
- Do you read or listen to Quraan regularly?
- Do you read religiously oriented books?
- Would you encourage your children to practice religion?
- How religious are you?
- Are your social ties important to you?
- Do you shop according to your knowledge of brands?
- Do you think living abroad changed your consumption patterns?
- Considering the 2006 Danish products boycott, if you were living in your country of origin at that time would your action be different?
- For how long you boycotted the Danish products?
- How did you feel at that time?
- If a company or a country made remarks against your religion or insulted your faith, do you think this would constitute a reason for you to boycott?
- What would make you switch back?
- Would you like to add anything else?

**Participant Consent Form**

Reference Number: London/2014

Participant name or Study ID Number: 20035472

Title of Project: The Impact of Consumers Boycott on Brand Loyalty towards FMCG Amongst Arab Muslims in London

Name of Researcher: Omar Al Serhan

__________________________________________________

**Participant to complete this section:**

**Please initial each box.**

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the Participant Information Sheet for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason

3- I agree to take part in the above study

4- I agree to the interview being audio recorded

5- I consent the interviewer to write down notes during the interview
6- I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications

__________________________________________  ___________________
Signature of Participant                        Date

__________________________________________  ___________________
Name of person taking consent                   Date

Signature of person taking consent

1 copy for participant and 1 copy will be kept in the researcher's file

**Participant Information Sheet**

Reference number: London/2014

Title of Project:

The Impact of Consumers Boycott on Brand Loyalty toward FMCG Amongst Arab Muslims in London

Background

As part of a doctoral academic research, this project aims to explore Arab consumers boycotting and loyalty behaviour and the impact of religion on their boycotting and loyalty behaviour. It attempts to develop a model for transnational consumers’ boycotting and brand loyalty behaviour.

It focuses on London-based Arab consumers’ boycotting and loyalty behaviour, the influence of religion on their boycotting decision and on subsequent loyalty behaviour. It will be investigated by examining potential consumers’ intentions, attitude towards boycotting and the duration of boycotting behaviour in relation to loyalty.

You were selected as a possible participant because you are an Arab, you are 25 and above years old and you reside in the targeted area of London.

There are four areas that the interview will examine:

The characteristics and boycotting behaviour of London-based Arab consumers?

The determinants of brand loyalty amongst London-based Arab consumers?
How a religiously motivated consumer boycott impacts on the brand loyalty of London-based Arab consumers?

What would happen if you agree to participate?

If you agree to participate, three main things will happen?

A convenient time will be arranged for you to meet with the interviewer at a convenient location of your choice and once agreed,

The interviewer will meet with you and provide you with:

Participant Information Sheet, which we will ask you to read, or it can be read to you if you wish the interviewer to do so.

Consent Form which we will ask you to read or it can be read to you if you wish the interviewer to do so and if you agree to its terms, you will be asked to sign and date this particular form.

If you have no objections, the interview will start and it will be recorded using an audio recording device.

Are there any risks?

We do not think there are any significant risks. You should not do anything that you do not want to do and if you are feeling uncomfortable at any time during the interview and you want to discontinue just inform your interviewer.

What happens to the results of the interview?

You will have the right to review the results of the research if I wish to do so. A copy of the results may be obtained by contacting Omar Al Serhan at the address listed below.

Your personal data is going to be completely anonymous and no uniquely identifiable information is going to be collected and you will not be identifiable in this part of the research either.

The outcome of this interview will be submitted to Cardiff’s Metropolitan University’s School of Management as a requirement for a Ph.D. degree and the researcher may also use this study outcome to write academic papers for the purpose of publication in academic journals.

Are there any benefits from taking part?

Yes, as this research focuses on Arab consumers’ boycotting and loyalty behaviour, the influence of religion on their boycotting decision and on subsequent loyalty behaviour it is expected that your participation can offer you a new perspective on who you are as transnational consumer (opposite to mainstream consumer) and how trans-nationality and
religion can potentially impact on your buying and consumption behaviour. Additionally, you can request to obtain a copy of this Ph.D. thesis after the researcher’s graduation.

What happens next?

This is a face-to-face interview and is going to be carried out by Mr Omar Al Serhan. If you agree to take part you will be asked questions that are related to the research problem. Each interview will take approximately 60 minutes and will be recorded using an audio recording device. And because your responses are important to this research, notes will also be taken during the interview.

If you do not wish to be audio recorded, your answers will only be written down on the interviewer’s notebook and will be read to you at the end to obtain your approval. A consent form to confirm that you are willing to take part needs to be completed, signed and dated by you.

How we protect your privacy:

Your privacy will be will respected by everyone in the research team. We have taken very careful steps to make sure that your personal data is going to be completely anonymous and that no uniquely identifiable information is going to be collected. Date collected from this interview will be stored securely away from the consent form you signed and at the end of this research project it will be destroyed. However, as required by the university, only the consent form you signed will be retained and kept for ten years.

Further information

If you have any questions about the research or how we intend to conduct the study, please contact us.

Ph.D. Candidate: Omar Al Serhan

125 Braodley Street, London NW1 6TD, United Kingdom

E-mail address: omar.alserhan@yahoo.com.

Director of Study (DoS): Prof. Ibrahim Sirkeci

E-mail: sirkeci@yahoo.com.

Supervisor: Dr. Elias Boukrami

E-mail: lboukrami@hotmail.com.

Any questions about this research can be directed to Mr. Al Serhan, his DoS or his supervisor.

**Online Questionnaire**

1. What is your age?
18 – 24, 25 – 34, 35- 44, 45- 54, 55- 64, 65 and older

2. What is your gender?

Male Female

3. What is your marital status?

Single, Married, Divorced, Separated, Widowed

4. How many children do you have?

0, 1, 2, 3, 4+

5. From all the sources of income, what is your total gross annual household income (Pound Sterling)?

Nil, Less than 6,000, 6,000 to 7,999, 8,000 to 9,999, 10,000 to 14,999, 15,000 to 19,999, 20,000 to 24,999, 25,000 to 29,999, 30,000 to 39,999, 40,000 to 49,999, 50,000 to 59,999, 60,000 and over

6. Which of these qualifications do you have?

1 - 4 O levels / CSEs / GCSEs (any grades), Entry Level, Foundation or Diploma.

NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ, Basic Skills.

5+ O levels (passes) / CSEs (grade 1) / GCSEs (grades A*- C), School Certificate, 1 A level / 2 - 3 AS levels / VCEs, Higher Diploma.

NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ, City and Guilds Craft, BTEC First / General Diploma, RSA Diploma Apprenticeship.

2+ A levels / VCEs, 4+ AS levels, Higher School Certificate, Progression / Advanced Diploma.

NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ, City and Guilds Advanced Craft, ONC, OND, BTEC National, RSA Advanced Diploma.

Degree (for example BA, BSc), Higher degree (for example MA, PhD, PGCE).

NVQ Level 4 - 5, HNC, HND, RSA Higher Diploma, BTEC Higher Level.

Professional qualifications (for example teaching, nursing, accountancy).

Other vocational / work-related qualifications.

Foreign qualifications.

No qualifications.

7. Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?
Employed, working 40 or more hours per week.

Employed, working 1-39 hours per week.

Self-employed.

Not employed, looking for work.

Not employed, NOT looking for work.

Retired.

Disabled, not able to work.

8. What is/ was your main job title (example, Teacher, Marketing Manager, Sales Executive, etc.)?

Open question

9. What is your religious denomination?

Ahmadiyya, Shiaa, Sufism, Sunni, Other (please specify)

10. What is your country of origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algeria</th>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
<th>Mauritania</th>
<th>Somalia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)

11. For how many years you have been living outside your country of origin?

Less than 12 months.

12 months but less than 2 years.

2 years but less than 3 years.

3 years but less than 5 years.

5 years but less than 10 years.

10 years or more.

12. What was your main reason for coming to the UK?

For employment.

For study.

To get married or form a civil partnership in the UK.
As a spouse or dependent of a UK citizen or settled person,

As a spouse or dependent of someone coming into the UK for work or study reasons or as a spouse or dependent of someone already in the UK.

Seeking asylum.

As a visitor

13. For how long you have been living in London?

Less than 12 months.

12 months but less than 2 years.

2 years but less than 3 years.

3 years but less than 5 years.

5 years but less than 10 years.

10 years or more.

14. Do you have family in your country of origin? (Family includes your immediate family members such as mother, father, brothers and sisters, as well as your extended family members such as grandparents, cousins, uncles, and so on).

Yes or No.

15. How often do you communicate with them?

Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Less frequent, Occasionally, Never

16. Which technology platform do you use when communicating with them (please tick all that applies to you)?

Direct phone calls, Emailing, Texting, Social Media (Facebook, Twitter etc.), Other available applications (Viber, Skype, Tango, etc)

17. Do you have friends in your country of origin?

Yes, No

18. How often do you communicate with them?

Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Less frequent, Occasionally, Never

19. Which technology platform do you use when communicating with them (please tick all that applies to you)?

Direct phone calls, Emailing, Texting, Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.), Other available applications (Viber, Skype, Tango, etc)
20. Were you aware of the 2006 Danish brands boycott?
Yes or No

21. Did you boycott Danish brands in 2006?
Yes, No

22. How often do you use social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)?
Hardly ever, Occasionally, Sometimes, Frequently, Almost always

23. Do you repeat purchasing particular FMCG brands (FMCG defined as the frequently purchased essential or non-essential goods such as food, toiletries, soft drinks and so on)?
Hardly ever, Occasionally, Sometimes, Frequently, Almost always

24. How hard is it for you to switch to substitute brands?
Very hard, Hard, Neither hard nor easy, Easy, Very Easy

25. How hard is it for you to find a substitute?
Very hard, Hard, Neither hard nor easy, Easy, Very Easy

26. How influential your family is on your consumption behaviour?
Very low, Low, Moderate, High, Very high

27. How influential your friends are on your consumption behaviour?
Very low, Low, Moderate, High, Very high

28. Are you loyal to any brands?
Yes, Somewhat, No

29. For how long have you been loyal to your preferred brands?
Less than 12 months.
12 months but less than 2 years.
2 years but less than 3 years.
3 years but less than 5 years.
5 years but less than 10 years.
10 years or more.

30. How often do buy these brands (brands which you are loyal to)?
Hardly ever, Occasionally, Sometimes, Frequently, Almost always

31. Do you interact with those brands manufacturers e.g. give feedback?
Hardly ever, Occasionally, Sometimes, Frequently, Almost always

32. Would you switch to other brands that you have not tried before?
Yes, Maybe, No

33. What would make you loyal to particular brands (Please tick all that applies to you)?
   - 1-To avoid the risk of trying new brands
   - 2-Taste
   - 3-Religious requirement i.e. Halal food
   - 4-I like to stick with what I know
   - 5-Quality
   - 6-Price
   - 7-Sales promotion
   - 8-Advertising
   - 9-Brand names
   - 10-Brands country of origin
   - 11- Availability of substitute brands
   - 12-Family and friends’ influence

34. How important the brand’s country of origin to you?
Not important, Somewhat important, Neither important not unimportant, Important, Very important

35. What is your knowledge of Danish brands?
Very poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very good

36. How important is religion in your life?
Not important, Somewhat important, Neither important nor unimportant, Important, Very important

37. A religious person is someone who believes in God and practises the testimony of faith, prayers, Zakat, fast in Ramadan, and Hajj to Makkah once in a lifetime when and if able to do so. According to this definition how religious do you consider yourself to be?
38. What are the reasons that would make you participate in a boycott campaign against particular brand (Please tick all that applies to you)?

Economic reasons (i.e. price, quality or taste), Religious reasons, Political reasons, Conflict (war) reasons, Ethical reasons, Environmental reasons

39. How important social ties (family and friends) to you?

Not important, Somewhat important, Neither important nor unimportant, Important, Very important

40. Considering the 2006 Danish product boycott, would your action (whether you boycotted or not) be the same if you were living in your country of origin?

Yes, Maybe, No

41. Do you shop according to your knowledge of particular brands?

Hardly ever, Occasionally, Sometimes, Frequently, Almost always

42. Has living abroad changed your consumption behaviour?

Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

43. If you participated in the 2006 Danish brands boycott, what were the reasons for your participation?

Economic reasons (i.e. price, quality or taste), Religious reasons, Political reasons, Conflict (war) reasons, Ethical reasons, Environmental reasons

44. If you participated in 2006 Danish brands boycott, can you tell us for how long you boycotted?

Months, Over a year, Still boycotting Danish brands

45. How do you feel about your choice (whether boycotted or not)?

Very unhappy, Unhappy, Neither happy nor unhappy, Satisfied, Highly satisfied

46. What would you do if a similar scenario happens again with a brand, a company or a country?

I would boycott, I may boycott, I wouldn't boycott

47. Do you think that questionable religious behaviours or remarks by brand owners, companies or countries representatives against your religion constitute a strong motive for you to change your brand loyalty towards them?

Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
48. What would make you switch back after boycotting?

An official apology, When targeted brands alter their behaviour, Nothing would make me switch back.

End of Survey

**Online Survey Consent Form**

This research is part of an academic study which aims to understand the boycotting and loyalty behaviour towards FMCG among Arab Muslim consumers living in London. FMCG are the frequently purchased essential or non-essential goods such as food, toiletries, soft drinks and so on.

The survey is in English and an Arabic version of it is available upon request. It includes questions covering consumption preferences, consumption patterns, cultural characteristics and participants’ life style. No personal data will be asked for and your responses will be recorded as anonymous.

Arabs living in London aged 25 and over are invited to take part in this questionnaire survey. You will have the option to view the results of the research if you wish to do so.

A copy of the results may be obtained by contacting the research team at the addresses below. Findings of this research will be used in academic manuscripts such as journal articles, books, and doctoral thesis to be submitted to Cardiff’s Metropolitan University’s School of Management.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or require further information about this study. Your participation is crucially important for this research and we would like to thank you for your time and effort in advance.

Do you agree to take part?

Yes, No

**Contacts:**

Omar Al Serhan, PhD. Candidate
Cardiff Metropolitan University, School of Management
E-mail: omar.alserhan@yahoo.com.

Under supervision of:

Prof. Dr. Ibrahim Sirkeci
Regent’s University London, Faculty of Business and Management
E-mail: sirkecii@regents.ac.uk.

Dr. Elias Boukrami
Regent’s University London, Faculty of Business and Management
E-mail: boukramil@regents.ac.uk