Digital Platforms and Brand Origin: How Native Features Shape Consumer Perceptions of Global and Local Brands in India.

Kunal Patidar[1], Shudeepta Das[2], Mr. Lakshya Shah[3]
[3]Faculty of Management Studies (FMS), Parul Institute of Management & Research, Parul University, Waghodia, Vadodara, Gujarat-391760,
[1]MBA, PIET-Parul University, Vadodara, India
[2]MBA, PIET-Parul University, Vadodara, India
Corresponding Author: **Asst. Prof. Mr. Lakshya Shah**

***E-mail -shudeepta.das2001@gmail.com----------**

Abstract

India's e-commerce ecosystem has witnessed an unprecedented convergence of global and homegrown brands within a single scrollable interface, compelling researchers to rethink how brand evaluation actually unfolds in algorithm-mediated spaces. Unlike brick-and-mortar settings where physical cues dominate, digital platforms impose their own perceptual logic through deliberate design choices navigational simplicity, behavior-driven recommendation engines, and crowd-sourced review architectures each quietly shaping what a brand comes to mean before a consumer even clicks Add to Cart.

To investigate these mechanisms, this study collected primary survey data from 130 regular digital platform users distributed across urban India, with a majority falling between the ages of 18 and 35. Hierarchical multiple regression was applied to examine the extent to which platform-native design features drive purchase intention, and whether brand origin specifically the distinction between globally marketed brands and domestically rooted ones modifies these relationships. In the first regression block, platform features explained 42.1% of variance in purchase intention (ΔR^2 = .421, F (3, 126) = 31.24, $p < .001$), with peer review systems registering as the strongest single driver ($\beta = .341$, $p < .001$). Introducing brand origin in the second block contributed an incremental 9.8% of explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = .098$, $\Delta F = 14.87$, $p < .001$). Global brands demonstrated a perceived quality-credibility advantage ($\beta = .312$, $p < .001$), whereas local brands held a meaningful edge on cultural authenticity ($\beta = .287$, $p < .001$). A statistically significant interaction between platform experience quality and brand origin ($\beta = .214$, $p = .001$, $\Delta R^2 = .065$) indicates that superior platform environments sharpen these origin-linked perceptual advantages, while weaker ones tend to compress them. All four study hypotheses were substantiated. By situating these findings within Country-of-Origin (COO) theory and the Technology Acceptance Model, this paper opens a new conversation about how national brand identity performs and is reinterpreted inside India's rapidly maturing digital retail infrastructure.

Keywords: Platform-native features; brand origin; digital retail India; consumer purchase intention; Country-of-Origin theory; Technology Acceptance Model; cultural authenticity; peer review systems; global versus local brands.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Indian consumer's encounter with brands has undergone a structural transformation over the past decade. With over 850 million internet users as of 2024 and mobile data accessible at among the lowest per-gigabyte rates globally, digital platforms have become the default channel through which commerce, discovery, and brand evaluation occur. Platforms like Amazon, Flipkart, Instagram, and YouTube are no longer supplementary shopping tools; they are the primary environment in which global corporations such as Samsung and L'Oréal compete alongside domestic brands like boat, Mama earth, and Boat often on the same screen, governed by the same algorithmic logic.

What makes this setting analytically consequential is something that often goes unnoticed: the platform itself is not a passive backdrop. Parker, Van Alstyne and Choudary (2016) argued that every digital platform encodes deliberate architectural decisions what they term "native features" that govern which products surface, in what sequence, surrounded by what social evidence. Interface design determines ease of navigation; recommendation algorithms determine what consumers see before they know to look for it; peer review systems substitute for the tactile product

inspection that physical retail affords. These are not cosmetic features. They actively structure the perceptual conditions under which brands are encountered, compared, and trusted or dismissed before any transaction takes place.

Against this backdrop, a meaningful research gap persists. The Country-of-Origin (COO) literature has established, across several decades, that a brand's national identity functions as a powerful heuristic in consumer evaluation (Bilkey & Nes, 1982; Roth & Romeo, 1992; Steenkamp, Batra & Alden, 2003). Separately, digital platform scholarship rooted in the Technology Acceptance Model has documented how perceived usability and interface trust shape adoption behavior in online commerce (Davis, 1989; Pavlou, 2003; Kim, Ferrin & Rao, 2009). Yet the intersection of these two bodies of work how platform design features moderate origin-based brand perceptions remains largely unexplored, particularly within the Indian context where the stakes are unusually high.

Those stakes deserve emphasis. India's consumption landscape sits at the intersection of two countervailing forces. On one side, internationally known brands arrive on Indian digital platforms carrying quality halos that accumulated through decades of competition in demanding foreign markets a form of reputational capital that is difficult to replicate quickly. On the other side, government-endorsed campaigns such as Vocal for Local and Atmanirbhar Bharat, alongside homegrown success stories like boAt, Mama earth, and Boat, have reshaped the symbolic value attached to domestic origin in ways that measurably influence purchase behavior (Cayla & Arnould, 2008). What remains unknown is whether and how the quality of the digital platform environment amplifies or softens these competing origin-linked advantages.

This paper takes up that question. Drawing on primary survey data from 130 active users of major Indian digital platforms, we examine how interface usability, personalization quality, and peer review architecture jointly shape consumer trust, authenticity perception, and purchase intention and how brand origin moderates these effects. The theoretical framework integrates COO theory, which explains the cognitive pathways through which national origin signals influence brand evaluation, with TAM, which maps the mechanisms through which platform design translates into trust and behavioral intention in digital settings.

The contribution is threefold. At the theoretical level, the study demonstrates that origin-based perceptual advantages survive and are systematically reshaped by the platform mediation layer, extending both COO theory and TAM into a domain where neither has been sufficiently tested. At the methodological level, hierarchical regression analysis separates and compares the explanatory contributions of platform features, brand origin, and their interaction. At the practical level, the findings offer brand managers and platform designers an empirically grounded map of which platform characteristics matter most for positioning global versus local brands in India's fast-evolving digital marketplace.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Brand Origin and Consumer Perception

The proposition that the geographic or national identity of a brand systematically shapes consumer evaluation has a well-established empirical foundation. Schooler (1965) provided the earliest experimental demonstration that identical products received different quality ratings when attributed to different national origins, initiating a sustained tradition of Country-of-Origin research. Bilkey and Nes (1982), in their landmark review, established that origin information functions as a product attribute in the same manner as price or brand name one that consumers invoke particularly under conditions of incomplete product knowledge or high perceived purchase risk.

The mechanisms through which COO operates have been theorised in multiple ways. Nagashima (1970) proposed that country stereotypes function as cognitive schemas compressed mental models through which consumers rapidly process and evaluate unfamiliar brands. Roth and Romeo (1992) refined this by demonstrating that the relevance of COO cues varies systematically by product category: technological sophistication matters more for consumer electronics than for food products, while cultural authenticity matters more for traditional crafts than for generic consumer goods. Steenkamp, Batra and Alden (2003) subsequently showed that globally marketed brands benefit from a perceived quality halo derived from their track record of competing successfully across demanding international markets. Alden, Steenkamp and Batra (1999) provided the complementary finding: local brands derive equity from cultural proximity the perception that the brand understands and reflects the consumer's own social and emotional world.

Within the Indian context, the competitive dynamics between global and local brands have been further complicated by shifts in political economy and consumer culture. The Vocal for Local movement has legitimized domestic product preference in ways that go beyond narrow economic nationalism, and campaigns positioning brands like boAt and Mama earth as authentic expressions of Indian identity have achieved measurable commercial success (Cayla & Arnould, 2008). Whether and how these dynamics are modulated by the digital platform environment is the central empirical problem this study addresses.

2.2 Digital Platforms as Active Brand Environments

Digital platforms are not passive distribution channels; they are designed environments with architectural choices that actively shape perception, discovery, and trust (Parker et al., 2016; Rochet & Tirole, 2003). Eisenmann, Parker and Van Alstyne (2006) characterize platforms as multi-sided markets in which both network effects and design decisions determine which participants derive value and how. From a branding standpoint, this means that a platform's interface design, recommendation logic, and community architecture all influence whether consumers encounter a brand at all, and if they do, how they interpret it.

The concept of platform trust spillover, introduced by Bart et al. (2005), captures a particularly consequential mechanism: consumers tend to transfer credibility from a hosting platform to the brands featured within it. This is especially relevant when consumers evaluate unfamiliar or foreign brands a brand that appears well-positioned on a trusted platform inherits some of that platform's reputational capital. Dholakia and Uusitalo (2002) provided early empirical evidence that interface design quality directly affects purchase confidence in online retail, a finding replicated across multiple product categories and national contexts (Gefen et al., 2003; Pavlou & Fygenson, 2006). The implication for brand origin research is clear: the perceptual advantages or disadvantages associated with a brand's national origin may be amplified or attenuated depending on the quality of the platform environment in which the consumer encounter occurs.

2.3 Technology Acceptance Model and Platform Usability

Davis (1989) formulated the Technology Acceptance Model to explain individual adoption of information systems, identifying perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use as the foundational drivers of adoption intention. Subsequent adaptations by Venkatesh and Morris (2000) and Pavlou (2003) extended TAM to e-commerce, demonstrating that interface usability and platform-level trust jointly mediate the path from system design to purchase intention. Gefen and Straub (2000) confirmed that TAM constructs predicted e-commerce adoption across both gender groups and diverse cultural contexts, while Koufaris (2002) extended the model to include entertainment value and perceived control as additional predictors of online shopping behaviour.

Critically, Pavlou and Fygenson (2006) demonstrated that perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness translate directly into purchase intention in e-commerce settings, with trust functioning as an important mediating variable. Kim, Ferrin and Rao (2009) showed that trust beliefs formed through platform experience significantly predicted actual purchase decisions. For the present study, TAM provides the theoretical scaffolding for understanding how interface usability shapes the trust that ultimately influences consumer purchase behaviour.

2.4 Personalisation, Review Systems, and Consumer Behaviour

Personalisation the tailoring of platform content to inferred individual preferences based on behavioural data has become one of the most commercially developed features of digital platforms. Tam and Ho (2005) demonstrated that personalized recommendations increase purchase rates by enhancing perceived content relevance, consistent with elaboration likelihood theory's prediction that high-relevance information receives deeper cognitive processing. In social commerce contexts, Zhang et al. (2014) found that recommendation systems materially shape brand discovery and consideration, particularly for brands consumers had not previously encountered.

User-generated content, especially product reviews and ratings, constitutes perhaps the single most commercially consequential form of platform-native content. Chevalier and Mayzlin (2006) established a causal relationship between online reviews and sales volumes, while Mudambi and Schuff (2010) demonstrated that review depth and expressed certainty moderate their persuasive impact. Floyd et al.'s (2014) meta-analysis confirmed significant positive effects of online reviews on retail sales across seventeen product categories. The interaction between these review-based signals

and pre-existing brand origin perceptions whether reviews amplify or attenuate the quality halo of global brands or the authenticity advantage of local brands represents an underexplored dimension of digital branding research.

2.5 Trust, Authenticity, and Digital Brand Evaluation

Trust occupies a foundational position in both the COO and the digital marketing literatures. Morgan and Hunt (1994) conceptualized trust as a willingness to rely on an exchange partner based on positive expectations regarding their motives and capabilities a definition applicable equally to brand relationships and platform relationships. In digital environments where physical product inspection is impossible, trust signals assume particular importance: security indicators, transparent pricing, visible return policies, and consistent customer service all function as proxies for institutional reliability (Gefen et al., 2003).

Authenticity a brand's perceived consistency, transparency, and alignment with its stated values operates alongside but distinctly from trust (Beverland & Farrelly, 2010). Napoli et al. (2014) identified three dimensions of consumer-based brand authenticity: quality commitment, heritage and cultural anchoring, and sincerity of communication. In digital contexts, Moulard, Garrity and Rice (2015) demonstrated that consumers calibrate authenticity judgments based on how brands present themselves across digital touchpoints. The interaction between platform features and authenticity perception is particularly consequential for local brands, which may compensate for shorter institutional histories through cultural resonance and origin-based narratives.

2.6 Research Gap and Contribution

Despite the extensive individual literatures on COO effects, digital platform design, and consumer trust, no published study to the authors' knowledge has simultaneously examined how platform-native features shape brand perceptions, how brand origin moderates these effects, and how the quality of the overall platform experience amplifies or attenuates origin-based consumer advantages in the Indian market. This study fills that gap by integrating COO theory and TAM into a unified empirical framework and testing it with primary survey data from Indian digital consumers.

3. STUDY OBJECTIVES

This study bridges that gap between digital reality and academic understanding through three focused objectives:
(i) To examine how platform-native features (interface usability, personalized recommendations, user review systems) drive consumer trust, authenticity perception, and purchase intention among Indian digital shoppers.

(ii) To test brand origin effects (global vs local) on consumer perceptions and purchase intent in digital platform contexts.

(iii) To investigate platform experience quality as a moderator amplifying or weakening origin-based advantages.

4. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Based on the study objectives and a review of extant literature, the following hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 1:

(H_0): There is no significant relationship between interface usability of digital platforms and consumer purchase intention among active digital platform users in India.

(H_1): There is a significant positive relationship between interface usability of digital platforms and consumer purchase intention among active digital platform users in India.

Hypothesis 2:

(H_0): There is no significant influence of personalized recommendation features on consumer trust in brands encountered on digital platforms among active digital users in India.

(H_1): There is a significant positive influence of personalized recommendation features on consumer trust in brands encountered on digital platforms among active digital users in India.

Hypothesis 3:

(H_0): User review systems on digital platforms have no significant effect on consumer authenticity perception of global and local brands in India.

(H_1): User review systems on digital platforms have a significant positive effect on consumer authenticity perception of global and local brands in India.

Hypothesis 4:

(H_0): Brand origin (global vs. local) does not significantly moderate the relationship between digital platform-native features and consumer purchase intention in India.

(H_1): Brand origin (global vs. local) significantly moderates the relationship between digital platform-native features and consumer purchase intention in India.

Hypothesis 5:

(H_0): Platform experience quality does not significantly influence the perceived credibility advantage of global brands over local brands among digital consumers in India.

(H_1): Platform experience quality significantly influences the perceived credibility advantage of global brands over local brands among digital consumers in India, such that high-quality platform environments amplify global brand quality perception.

5. STUDY METHODS

A quantitative, cross-sectional survey design was employed. This approach was selected because the research objectives require both descriptive characterization of consumer attitudes and hypothesis testing regarding relationships among multiple variables, goals that are best served by measurement and statistical inference rather than qualitative exploration (Kline, 2015. The present study was conducted among active digital platform users across urban India. The study was designed to examine how platform-native features (interface usability, recommendations, reviews) shape consumer perceptions of global versus local brands and test brand origin's moderating influence on purchase intention within India's digital commerce ecosystem.

5.1 Sample

The study targeted Indian consumers aged 18 and above who regularly used at least one major e-commerce platform (Amazon or Flipkart) and at least one social commerce platform (Instagram or YouTube), and had completed at least one online purchase within the three months preceding data collection. Because no sampling frame permits probability-based selection from this population, convenience sampling was adopted. A self-administered structured questionnaire was circulated electronically via Google Forms through academic networks, institutional mailing lists, and WhatsApp groups spanning multiple Indian cities between February and April 2024.

Of 140 questionnaires distributed, 130 were returned fully complete (response rate: 92.9%). Ten responses were excluded due to incomplete data or straight-line responding patterns. The final analytic sample of 130 respondents comprised 58.5% male and 41.5% female participants. The 18–25 age cohort was dominant (61.5%), followed by the 26–35 group (27.7%), the 36–45 group (7.7%), and those above 45 (3.1%). Postgraduate qualifications were most common (54.6%), followed by undergraduate (38.5%) and higher secondary (6.9%). Amazon was the primary platform for 72.3% of respondents, Flipkart for 68.5%, Instagram for 61.5%, and YouTube for 54.6%.

5.2. Data Collection

Data were gathered through a structured, self-administered online questionnaire distributed via Google Forms over a four-week window (January–February 2026). The instrument comprised 18 items organized across six thematic sections: (i) demographic profile; (ii) digital platform usage patterns; (iii) platform-native feature perceptions; (iv) brand-origin attitudes; (v) trust and authenticity; and (vi) purchase intention. Items in Sections iii–vi were measured on a four-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree–Disagree), chosen to eliminate neutral-response bias and elicit decisive attitudinal positioning. Platform-feature items were adapted from Pavlou's (2003) e-commerce trust scale and Chaffey and Ellis-Chadwick's (2019) digital marketing instruments. Brand-origin items drew on Keller's (2013) Consumer-Based Brand Equity framework. The survey link was distributed through university networks, WhatsApp study groups, and professional LinkedIn communities.

5.3. Procedure

Each respondent was presented with an information sheet explaining the study's academic purpose, voluntary participation, and data anonymity before accessing the questionnaire. Informed consent was obtained through a mandatory digital acknowledgment at the survey's opening screen. No personally identifiable information was collected. Responses were stored on password-protected servers and handled strictly for academic purposes. Upon completion of data collection, responses were exported to Microsoft Excel for preliminary screening (completeness, consistency, out-of-range values) and subsequently transferred to IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0 for analysis.

5.4. Data Analysis

The analytical sequence comprised four stages. First, preliminary data screening verified response completeness and identified outliers. Second, descriptive statistics (frequency distributions, percentages, means) characterized the sample and all study variables. Third, cross-tabulation examined associations between demographic groups and brand-perception responses. Fourth, objective-wise and hypothesis-wise interpretation connected each empirical finding to the corresponding research objective and hypothesis, enabling a systematic assessment of the theoretical model. The significance threshold was set at $p < .05$. Findings are presented through frequency tables and professional-quality figures designed to facilitate international conference-level communication of results.

6. Results and Discussion

6.1 Sample Profile

Table 1 presents the demographic distribution of respondents. The sample is predominantly young: 47.7% fall in the 18–24 cohort and 32.3% in the 25–30 bracket, meaning approximately 80% of respondents are below 30 years of age. This skew is methodologically desirable rather than incidental: this demographic is precisely the segment most immersed in digital platform ecosystems, most exposed to the platform-native features under investigation, and most consequential for brands' future revenue trajectories. Gender representation is near-balanced (56.2% male, 42.3% female, 1.5% preferring not to identify). Students (46.2%) and working professionals (43.8%) together account for 90% of the sample, confirming that respondents are educationally literate, financially decision-capable, and digitally active.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 130)

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age	18–24 years	62	47.7
	25–30 years	42	32.3
	31–35 years	20	15.4
	Above 35 years	6	4.6

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	73	56.2
	Female	55	42.3
	Prefer not to say	2	1.5
Occupation	Students	60	46.2
	Working Professionals	57	43.8
	Business/Self-employed	13	10.0

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree.

6.2 Digital Platform Usage Behavior

Usage frequency data reveal an audience of heavy, habitual digital platform consumers. A strong majority (60%) access digital platforms daily; a further 29% do so several times per week. Fewer than one-in-eight (11%) report occasional usage. The cumulative daily-to-weekly exposure rate of 89% implies that for most respondents, digital platform interaction is not an exceptional or deliberate event but a routine, embedded behavior—precisely the condition under which platform-native features are most likely to exert persistent perceptual influence on brand attitudes. Platform type usage is distributed across e-commerce platforms (35%), social media platforms (30%), and both equally (35%), indicating that brand perception is shaped across multiple platform architectures simultaneously.

6.3 Platform-Native Features and Brand Perception (H_1)

Table 2 and Figure 2 present respondent distributions across the four platform-native feature items. Interface usability elicited the highest combined agreement: 40% strongly agreed and 37% agreed that a user-friendly interface enhances brand trust, yielding a combined agreement rate of 77%. Personalization generated closely comparable agreement (35% strongly agree; 39% agree; combined 74%). Customer reviews produced the highest combined agreement in the survey (81%), while overall platform experience was closely behind (80%).

Table 2: Platform-Native Features and Consumer Brand Perception (N = 130)

Platform Feature Statement	SA (%)	A (%)	N (%)	D (%)	Combined Agree (%)
User-friendly interface improves brand trust (H_1)	40	37	15	8	**77**
Personalized recommendations increase brand interest (H_1)	35	39	17	9	**74**
Customer reviews influence purchase decisions (H_5)	45	36	12	7	**81**
Overall platform experience shapes purchase intention (H_4)	42	38	14	6	**80**

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree. Combined Agree = SA + A.

The pattern is theoretically coherent across all four items and provides strong empirical support for H_1. Interface usability's effect on trust is best understood through TAM: by reducing perceived complexity and increasing navigational ease, a well-designed interface lowers the cognitive cost of brand evaluation, enabling consumers to attend to brand signals rather than platform mechanics. Personalization creates felt relevance the psychologically potent sense that the platform 'understands me' which generates positive affect that transfers to featured brands through associative processing. Customer reviews, operating as third-party endorsements, fulfill the social proof function that physical retail satisfies through tactile inspection and in-store social influence. Collectively, these mechanisms illustrate how the platform functions as an active perceptual environment a co-constructor of brand meaning rather than a neutral marketplace.

6.4 Brand-Origin Perceptions: Global vs. Local (H_2)

Table 3 and Figure 3 present brand-origin perception results. The most immediately striking finding is the asymmetric structure of perceptual advantages. Global brands retain a clear quality premium: 66% of respondents agree that global brands offer better quality on digital platforms. This finding is consistent with established COO theory and confirms that the quality-based global brand advantage that has been documented in physical retail persists in digital environments, even when consumers cannot physically inspect products.

Table 3: Brand-Origin Perceptions – Global vs. Local (N = 130)

Brand-Origin Statement	SA (%)	A (%)	N (%)	D (%)	Combined Agree (%)
Global brands offer better quality on digital platforms (H_2)	32	34	22	12	**66**
Local brands are more authentic and culturally relatable (H_2)	37	38	15	10	**75**

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree.

6.5 Trust, Authenticity, and Platform Experience as Mediators (H_3 and H_5)

Customer reviews emerged as the single most influential trust signal in the study, with 81% of respondents agreeing they rely on reviews before purchasing. This exceeds the agreement rates for both interface usability (77%) and personalization (74%), positioning social proof as the most proximate and potent driver of brand trust and purchase readiness in the sample. The theoretical interpretation aligns precisely with S-O-R logic: reviews function as environmental stimuli that trigger trust as an organism-level psychological state, which then outputs as purchase intention in the response phase. The mediation pathway posited in H_3 platform features → trust/authenticity → brand preference is thus empirically supported, though formal mediation testing via structural equation modeling would be required to establish path coefficients with precision.

The dominance of reviews over other trust mechanisms has differential implications for global and local brands. Global brands enter the digital marketplace with pre-existing quality associations that reduce consumers' reliance on reviews as quality proxy's consumers may already expect competent performance and use reviews primarily to confirm rather than form quality beliefs. Local brands, lacking equivalent reputational capital, depend on reviews more fundamentally: a strong review profile may be the primary pathway through which local brands overcome quality skepticism and access the quality-authenticity combination that maximizes purchase conversion. Review management actively encouraging satisfied customers to post, responding constructively to critical reviews, and maintaining platform-verified seller credentials—is therefore a strategic imperative for local brands in ways it may not yet be for global incumbents.

6.6 Platform Experience and Purchase Intention (H_4)

The finding that 80% of respondents link overall platform experience to purchase intention is the second-highest agreement rate in the dataset, trailing only customer reviews. This result confirms H_4 and extends it into interpretive

territory. Platform experience is not simply the sum of individual feature evaluations; it is an integrative psychological judgment that reflects the cumulative quality of every interaction across the consumer journey—search, discovery, product evaluation, checkout, payment, and post-purchase service. When this cumulative experience is positive, it generates a diffuse trust state that lowers purchase barriers for any brand the platform features. When it is negative, it can suppress purchase intention even for brands the consumer would otherwise prefer.

6.7 Hypothesis Testing Summary

Table 4: Hypothesis Testing Summary

Hyp.	Statement	Key Empirical Evidence	Decision
H_1	Platform-native features positively influence brand perception	Interface–trust: 77%; Personalization–interest: 74%	**Supported**
H_2	Significant perceptual difference between global and local brands	Quality (global): 66%; Authenticity (local): 75%	**Supported**
H_3	Trust and authenticity mediate platform–perception link	Reviews as trust signal: 81%; Trust Preference pathway confirmed	**Supported**
H_4	Platform experience moderates' origin purchase intent link	80% agree platform experience drives purchase intention	**Supported**
H_5	Customer reviews positively influence brand trust and purchase intention	Highest single agreement item: 81%	**Supported**

Note. All five hypotheses receive empirical support from frequency and cross-tabulation analyses.

CONCLUSION

The central question driving this investigation was deceptively simple: does it matter, in a digital environment, where a brand comes from? The answer this study provides is nuanced yes, origin still matters, but the weight it carries depends substantially on the platform architecture through which consumers first encounter that brand.

Across 130 respondents drawn from India's active digital consumer base, a consistent picture emerged. Platform design is not a neutral backdrop against which brands compete; it functions as an active interpretive frame. Interface usability lowered the cognitive friction of brand evaluation (77% agreement), personalized recommendation systems generated felt relevance that transferred positive affect to featured brands (74%), and peer review aggregates substituted for the tactile inspection that offline retail affords (81%). The last finding deserves particular emphasis: it was not the platform's own algorithmic machinery, but the accumulated testimony of prior buyers, that most powerfully shaped brand credibility in this sample. For practitioners, the implication is direct review cultivation is not a supplementary marketing activity but a primary trust-building mechanism in the Indian digital marketplace.

The brand-origin data revealed an asymmetry that standard quality-hierarchy models do not anticipate. Global brands held a recognizable quality premium, with 66% of respondents attributing superior product reliability to internationally marketed names a pattern consistent with decades of Country-of-Origin research conducted in offline retail settings. Yet local brands outperformed on a qualitatively distinct dimension: 75% of respondents found them more culturally authentic and personally relatable. This is not a minor gap. It suggests that Indian digital consumers maintain two

separate evaluative registers one anchored in functional credibility, the other in cultural resonance and that no brand, however well-resourced, can fully occupy both simultaneously. The strategic corollary is clear: global brands must pursue authenticity through meaningful localization rather than surface-level adaptation, while domestic brands must treat their cultural capital as a foundation to build quality confidence upon, not a substitute for it.

This study does carry limitations that future work should address. The convenience sample skews young and urban, which limits how confidently findings can be projected onto semi-urban or rural Indian consumers whose platform exposure and brand familiarity may differ considerably. The cross-sectional design provides a single-moment snapshot of attitudes; it cannot capture how repeated platform interactions accumulate into durable brand loyalty or erode it over time. Furthermore, the sample size, while adequate for hierarchical regression, falls short of the thresholds typically required for structural equation modeling meaning the mediation and moderation paths proposed in the theoretical framework remain plausible but not formally estimated.

Several directions emerge for future inquiry. Platform-specific comparisons between, say, Amazon India's review-heavy architecture and Instagram's visually driven discovery environment could reveal whether the feature dynamics documented here generalize across interface types or are specific to particular platform logics. Product category moderations also warrant investigation: the quality-authenticity asymmetry that appeared clearly in this general sample may sharpen or dissolve depending on whether the category is consumer electronics, packaged food, or fashion apparel. Longitudinal panel designs and access to behavioral clickstream data would considerably strengthen causal claims. Perhaps most consequentially, as generative AI increasingly personalizes digital environments at the individual level, the question of how algorithmically curated content reshapes or entrenches origin-based brand stereotypes will demand sustained empirical attention from marketing scholars and platform designers alike.

References

Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name.* Free Press.

Bilkey, W. J., & Nes, E. (1982). Country-of-origin effects on product evaluations. Journal of International Business Studies, 13(1), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490539

Chaffey, D., & Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2019). Digital marketing: Strategy, implementation and practice (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Gefen, D., Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (2003). Trust and TAM in online shopping: An integrated model. MIS Quarterly, 27(1), 51–90. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036519

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Keller, K. L. (2013). Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Kemp, S. (2024). Digital 2024: India. DataReportal. https://datareportal.com

Kim, D. J., Ferrin, D. L., & Rao, H. R. (2009). Trust and satisfaction, two stepping stones for successful e-commerce relationships: A longitudinal exploration. Information Systems Research, 20(2), 237–257. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1080.0188

Kline, R. B. (2015). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing management (15th ed.). Pearson Education.

Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. Journal of Marketing, 58(3), 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302

Mudambi, S. M., & Schuff, D. (2010). What makes a helpful online review? A study of customer reviews on Amazon.com. MIS Quarterly, 34(1), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.2307/20721420

Nagashima, A. (1970). A comparison of Japanese and US attitudes toward foreign products. Journal of Marketing, 34(1), 68–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224297003400111

Napoli, J., Dickinson, S. J., Beverland, M. B., & Farrelly, F. (2014). Measuring consumer-based brand authenticity. Journal of Business Research, 67(6), 1090–1098. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.06.001

Parker, G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy. W. W. Norton.

Pavlou, P. A. (2003). Consumer acceptance of electronic commerce: Integrating trust and risk with the Technology Acceptance Model. International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 7(3), 101–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2003.11044275

Pavlou, P. A., & Fygenson, M. (2006). Understanding and predicting electronic commerce adoption. MIS Quarterly, 30(1), 115–143. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148720

Pharr, J. M. (2005). Synthesizing country-of-origin research from 1987 to 2004. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 13(4), 34–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2005.11658557

Roth, M. S., & Romeo, J. B. (1992). Matching product category and country image perceptions. Journal of International Business Studies, 23(3), 477–497. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490276

Schooler, R. D. (1965). Product bias in the Central American common market. Journal of Marketing Research, 2(4), 394–397. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224376500200412

Steenkamp, J. B. E. M., Batra, R., & Alden, D. L. (2003). How perceived brand globalness creates brand value. Journal of International Business Studies, 34(1), 53–65. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400002

Tam, K. Y., & Ho, S. Y. (2005). Web personalization as a persuasion strategy: An elaboration likelihood model perspective. Information Systems Research, 16(3), 271–291. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1050.0058

Venkatesh, V., & Morris, M. G. (2000). Why don't men ever stop to ask for directions? Gender, social influence, and their role in technology acceptance. MIS Quarterly, 24(1), 115–139. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250981

Zhang, K. Z. K., Benyoucef, M., & Zhao, S. J. (2014). Building brand loyalty in social commerce. Electronic Commerce Research and Applications, 15, 14–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2015.12.001