



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Siamagka, N.T. & Balabanis, G. (2015). Revisiting Consumer Ethnocentrism: Review, Reconceptualization, and Empirical Testing. *Journal of International Marketing*, 23(3), pp. 66-86. doi: 10.1509/jim.15.0085

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/16332/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1509/jim.15.0085>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Revisiting Consumer Ethnocentrism: Review, Reconceptualization, and Empirical Testing

Nikoletta-Theofania Siamagka and George Balabanis

ABSTRACT

Prior research has suggested that many consumers prefer domestic to foreign products, even when the quality is lower and the price is higher. Such bias is attributed to consumer ethnocentrism. This study critically examines the current conceptualizations of consumer ethnocentrism and proposes an extension of its conceptual boundaries and measurement. It determines that consumer ethnocentrism is a multidimensional construct that encompasses five dimensions: prosociality, cognition, insecurity, reflexiveness, and habituation. Empirical evidence from the United Kingdom and the United States demonstrates that the extended measurement instrument better predicts consumers' preferences for local brands at the expense of foreign brands.

Keywords: consumer ethnocentrism, dimensions, conceptualization, measurement

The recent financial crisis revealed how enduring and widespread ethnocentrism is (Everret 2012). Ethnocentrism seems to act as a self-defense reflex of local economies, governments, organizations, and individuals against the threat of imports and foreign competition. Many countries around the world (e.g., Vietnam, South Africa, Indonesia, Australia, the United States) have launched government-sponsored “buy local” campaigns in an effort to curb imports, protect local jobs, improve trade balances, and defend national identities (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 2010). The popularity of such campaigns defies the economic advice of international organizations because of their distortive effects on international trade. In the private sector in 2013, companies such as Wal-Mart in the United States and John Lewis in the United Kingdom launched multimillion-dollar buy-local programs. Companies such as Jaguar and Lamb's Navy Rum in the United Kingdom; New Balance, Red Wing, Pendleton, and Made Movement in the United States; and ROM in Romania have also exploited ethno-

centrism in their promotional efforts to appeal to ethnocentric buyers. The sphere of influence of ethnocentrism not only includes firms or governments but extends to the consumer level as well, on which most scholarly research has focused. In the marketing literature, consumer ethnocentrism refers to consumer biases in favor of domestic over foreign products (Shimp and Sharma 1987). The concept is useful in predicting consumers' receptivity to foreign brands (Cleveland, Laroche, and Papadopoulos 2009) and is an important element of national identity (Keillor and Hult 1999; Keillor et al. 1996; Thelen and Honeycutt 2004). Assessing the levels of consumer ethnocentrism is fundamentally important to consumer and strategic decision making in the global marketplace in that it could provide decision makers with an “indication as to where standardization is possible and specialization necessary” (Keillor et al. 1996, p. 58). Consumer ethnocentrism is also important to global positioning (Magnusson et al. 2014; Nijssen and Douglas 2011; Westjohn, Singh, and Magnusson 2012), global branding (Alden et al. 2013; Guo 2013), market entry mode decisions (Fong, Lee, and Du 2014), and the

Nikoletta-Theofania Siamagka is Lecturer in Marketing, King's College London (e-mail: nikoletta.siamagka@kcl.ac.uk). George Balabanis is Professor of Marketing, Cass Business School, City University London (e-mail: g.balabanis@city.ac.uk). Bulent Menguc served as associate editor for this article.

Journal of International Marketing
©2015, American Marketing Association
Vol. 23, No. 3, 2015, pp. 66–86
ISSN 1069-0031X (print) 1547-7215 (electronic)

materialization of country-of-origin effects (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2008, 2011).

Despite its many theoretical and practical applications, and despite several calls for conceptual reassessment, the construct of consumer ethnocentrism remains unaltered since its inception in 1987. Several scholars have called for a conceptual reexamination of consumer ethnocentrism and for a review of its measurement (e.g., Cleveland, Laroche, and Papadopoulos 2009; De Cremer 2001; Hult and Keillor 1994; Lantz and Loeb 1996; Saffu and Walker 2005). The increased number of calls is a result of empirical evidence supporting the multidimensional structure of consumer ethnocentrism (e.g., Hsu and Nien 2008; Saffu and Walker 2005; Upadhyay and Singh 2006) and challenging the initial conceptualization as a unidimensional construct.

The operationalization of the construct is based on the widely used consumer ethnocentrism tendencies scale (CETSCALE; Shimp and Sharma 1987), which also raises significant concerns about the applicability and generalizability of the measurement. In addition to the dimensionality problem highlighted in extant literature, several scholars have associated the CETSCALE with social desirability bias and response style bias (De Ruyter, Van Birgelen, and Wetzels 1998; Hult and Keillor 1994).

The conceptual differences observed cross-culturally suggest that extant knowledge suffers from a narrow view of the constituent dimensions and highlights the need for further research to enhance the content validity of the construct of consumer ethnocentrism. A new conceptualization would inform a more extended operationalization of the construct and provide researchers with more accurate gradation and appraisal of ethnocentric biases.

Finally, the CETSCALE is not fully in line with consumer ethnocentrism's definition as "a trait-like property of individuals' personalities" (Sharma, Shimp, and Shin 1995, p. 27). Most of the items included in this measurement instrument capture general normative aspects (e.g., "A real American should always buy American-made products") and the consequences of purchasing foreign products (e.g., "Americans should not buy foreign products because this hurts American businesses and causes unemployment") but fail to tap personal values and belief systems. The inconsistency between the conceptualization and operationalization of the construct is a cause of validity concerns because such important elements are overlooked in the existing

measure. Research is necessary to address this inconsistency and to enhance operationalization of the construct through the inclusion of omitted facets.

This study endeavors to address these gaps by revisiting the conceptualization and operationalization of consumer ethnocentrism and by developing a new measurement scale. The research purposes therefore are twofold. First, we aim to enhance the conceptualization of consumer ethnocentrism and to assess the validity of previous suggestions that it is a multidimensional construct. Second, we strive to develop a new measure of consumer ethnocentrism. To achieve these objectives, we use qualitative research and three quantitative studies in the United Kingdom and the United States to validate the scale and establish superiority of the explanatory power of the new measurement instrument to that of the CETSCALE.

The study does not simply rely on existing conceptualizations but also is an attempt to identify pertinent dimensions inductively and through the use of qualitative research. The first contribution of the study is the conceptual extension of the consumer ethnocentrism construct and its dimensions. The new conceptualization goes beyond the patriotic duty to buy domestic products and incorporates new dimensions, such as the heightened perception of threat and distorted cognition, which can enhance understanding of the elements incorporated into consumer ethnocentrism and open new avenues for research. The extended concept of consumer ethnocentrism will provide new insights for current theories and serve as the theoretical groundwork for expanding and refining theories of domestic product bias and international consumer behavior.

Second, this study develops a reliable and panoptic measure of consumer ethnocentrism, which will provide additional granularity and accuracy for the empirical testing of hypotheses and theoretical models. The new measure will enhance the prediction of consumer attitudes toward and preferences for domestic or foreign products.

Third, the study provides a useful tool for practitioners to pinpoint the motivations and sources of consumers' reluctance to buy foreign products as well as help them segment their markets more precisely. The multiple dimensions of the new conceptualization of consumer ethnocentrism will better inform managerial decisions related to global positioning, branding, market entry mode, and the implementation of tactical programs to combat the adverse effects of consumer ethnocentrism.

CONSUMER ETHNOCENTRISM: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The literature describes the concept of consumer ethnocentrism as a means to understand the moral concerns arising from the consumption of foreign and domestic products. Consumer ethnocentrism is a derivative of the general concept of ethnocentrism first introduced in the sociology domain. Sumner (1906, p. 13) originally defined the concept of ethnocentrism as “the technical name for this view of things in which one’s own group is the centre of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it.” According to Sumner, the main features of ethnocentrism include pride in one’s own group and a perception of other groups’ inferiority. The “we” group is characterized by feelings of superiority and pride, while the “others” group is perceived as inferior. Adorno et al. (1950) provide an augmented overview and a scale to measure ethnocentrism, in which ethnocentrism serves as an expression of authoritarianism. According to Adorno et al.’s theory, ethnocentrism is a pervasive personality trait that is part of one’s ideological system (see also Forbes 1985). The “authoritarian personality” is grounded in Freudian psychoanalytic theory, and its emphasis is on early childhood experiences that shape personality development. LeVine and Campbell (1972) suggest that ethnocentrism is precipitated by social factors and competition of groups for scarce resources (e.g., jobs, economic resources), in what has become known as the realistic group conflict theory. Recent evidence from longitudinal research supports the view that ethnocentrism has the enduring nature of a personality trait and is not affected by social factors such as size and proximity of outgroups and ethnic diversity (Bircan 2010; Hooghe, Reeskens, and Stolle 2007).

Initial Conceptualization and Nature of Consumer Ethnocentrism

Shimp and Sharma (1987, p. 280) first defined consumer ethnocentrism, an offshoot of Adorno et al.’s (1950) view of ethnocentrism as a personality trait, as the “appropriateness, indeed morality, of purchasing foreign-made products.” According to them, to an ethnocentric consumer, purchasing imported products is immoral and unpatriotic, hurts the domestic economy, and leads to a loss of domestic jobs. Ethnocentric consumers tend to perceive domestic products as superior to foreign alternatives. This notion is in line with LeVine and Campbell’s (1972) view of ethnocentrism, in which domestic values and symbols are perceived with pride, whereas foreign ones are viewed with contempt. With

this perception, consumers exhibit a systematic preference for domestic goods, accompanied by a rejection of foreign alternatives.

Consumer ethnocentrism serves to provide people with a sense of belonging to a group as well as direction regarding what is appropriate or inappropriate purchasing behavior. Parallel to Smith’s (1992) view that ethnocentric sentiments are deeply rooted in human values, consumer decision making also includes strong moral and social considerations. The reason for this association with morality lies in the principles of moral values, or actions that are likely to be helpful or harmful to humans in the long run (McGregor 2006).

Shimp and Sharma (1987) use the general term “tendency,” rather than “attitude,” to describe consumer ethnocentrism. According to them, “tendency” captures the more general notion of a disposition to act in a consistent manner toward foreign products in toto. Sharma, Shimp, and Shin (1995, p. 27) later defined consumer ethnocentrism as “a trait-like property of individuals’ personalities,” emphasizing the enduring nature of ethnocentrism. Unlike attitudes, personality traits are not evaluative and descriptive response tendencies in a given domain (Ajzen 2005).

Extension of Consumer Ethnocentrism

Empirical evidence indicates that consumer ethnocentrism constitutes a form of altruism in the marketplace (Shimp and Sharma 1987), given that it serves as a means to support fellow workers and the national economy. Other scholars have suggested that consumer ethnocentrism is a type of prosocial behavior (Powers and Hopkins 2006) because consumers may need to make sacrifices in quality and price to favor domestic products.

The operationalization of consumer ethnocentrism, in the form of the CETSCALE (Shimp and Sharma 1987), has received criticism regarding the scale’s ability to fully capture the inherent multidimensionality of the domain. Some scholars have expressed concerns about the quality of the measure, in relation to social desirability bias and response style bias (e.g., De Ruyter, Van Birgelen, and Wetzels 1998; Hult and Keillor 1994). For example, some CETSCALE items are rather extreme and cannot elicit total agreement (e.g., “Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products on our markets”). Some strong, almost leading statements (e.g., “American products, first, last, and foremost”) can also introduce response bias.

Furthermore, various studies have found a dimensionality problem, illustrating that the CETSCALE taps more than one dimension (Acharya and Elliott 2003; Hsu and Nien 2008; Saffu and Walker 2005; Upadhyay and Singh 2006). For example, Acharya and Elliott (2003) suggest that this measure taps two dimensions, including emotional and rational ethnocentrism, whereas Upadhyay and Singh (2006) establish a four-dimensional structure, including nationalism, socioeconomic conservatism, protectionism, and ultranationalism. In a similar vein, Vida and Reardon (2008) argue that consumer ethnocentrism contains three attitude elements: affective (e.g., sense of belonging, love for one's country), cognitive (e.g., stereotype development, cognitive distortion), and normative (e.g., societal forces acting toward the common good).

We undertake a qualitative study (explained in the "Scale Development" section) to explore the existence of additional dimensions and unveil additional components of consumer ethnocentrism. We then explain the themes emerging from this stage through the established literature on ethnocentrism. The relevant literature provides support for five dimensions of consumer ethnocentrism: prosociality, cognition, insecurity, reflexiveness, and habituation. These dimensions are consumption specific and differ significantly from the dimensions identified in the existing scales of ethnocentrism developed in sociology and psychology (Adorno et al. 1950; Bizumic et al. 2009; Grant and Brown 1995). We conceptualize these dimensions as a reflection of the consumer ethnocentrism construct and as operating to varying degrees in tandem with one another.

Ethnocentric Prosociality. Ethnocentrism is linked with patriotic love and sacrifice for one's country (Balabanis et al. 2001; Han 1988; Lee, Hong, and Lee 2003; Sharma, Shimp, and Shin 1995; Wall and Heslop 1986). It is associated with a kind of prosociality, in which the country's interests take precedence over a person's self-interest. In general, prosociality refers to caring for the welfare of others, feeling concern and empathy for others, and acting in ways that benefit others. Several empirical studies have shown that ethnocentrics act beyond their self-interests and embrace a willingness to help their compatriots without expectation of reward (e.g., Powers and Hopkins 2006; Shimp and Sharma 1987).

Bénabou and Tirole (2004) argue that prosociality derives from a combination of altruism, material self-interest, social image, and self-image. All people construct certain moral self-images and desire to behave

accordingly (Caddick 1982; De Cremer 2001; Tropp and Brown 2004). Thus, people undertake prosocial activities "to self-signal their good traits" (Meier 2006, p. 12). In a consumption context, this ethnocentric self-image is enacted through engagement in prosocial behavior that protects local employment and industry from the threat of imports. In applying the same principles of prosociality to consumer behavior, ethnocentric consumers perceive the consumption of domestic products as a moral obligation to help their home country (e.g., Powers and Hopkins 2006). Consumers' prosociality can stem from both purely altruistic motives, such as helping the domestic economy without expecting something in return, and impure altruism, in which consumers show a preference for domestic goods to enhance their self-image.

Ethnocentric (Distorted) Cognition. By definition, ethnocentric people tend to interpret the world from their ethnic group's point of view (Applebaum 1996). Ethnocentrics tend to have biased beliefs and views about other countries and their products. In the original conceptualization of consumer ethnocentrism (Shimp and Sharma 1987), cognitive aspects, such as perceptions of domestic product superiority or foreign product inferiority, are prevalent dimensions.

Although products can be assessed on different grounds (e.g., country of origin, type, price range, quality, function), for ethnocentric consumers, the prominent means of categorizing products is through their status as domestic or foreign. Research on country-of-origin stereotypes (Hadjimarcou and Hu 1999; Hilton and Von Hippel 1996; Turner 1982) and "product stereotyping" (Reiersen 1966; Schooler 1965) also provides ample evidence of ethnocentric cognitive biases. Strong ethnocentric attachment to a country may distort cognitions about domestic and foreign products and encourage the perpetuation and persistence of false stereotypes (Tiedens and Linton 2001). For example, Liu, Johnson, and Johnson (2005) report that stereotypical beliefs are unintentionally and automatically activated when the origins of a product become known.

Ethnocentric Insecurity. An important element fundamental to consumer ethnocentrism is the heightened perception of threat from foreign products (Shimp and Sharma 1987). In general, consumers associate foreign products with threats to the domestic economy and to domestic workers. Although certain realities may trigger such perceptions, such as high unemployment, trade deficits, high debt, and other economic hazards (Lee, Hong, and Lee 2003; Olsen, Granzin, and Biswas 1993;

Sharma, Shimp, and Shin 1995), ethnocentrics tend to be more perceptive and sensitive than others to such threats. Ethnocentric consumers who feel threatened tend to increase their group identity and cohesion (Grant 1993) and respond with an intensified attempt to defend their in-group (Bizumic et al. 2009). Consistent with this notion, ethnocentric consumers who identify a threat might intensify their efforts to protect their domestic economy by supporting domestic products. We label this tendency as “ethnocentric insecurity.” Although a baseline level of insecurity may already exist, contextual factors, such as the level of a country’s economic development, increase ethnocentric insecurity (Mullen, Brown, and Smith 1992).

Ethnocentric Reflexiveness. As we mentioned previously, many ethnocentric tendencies tend to be unconscious and automatically activated (MacDonald 2006). Such automaticity is the product of a lifetime of repeated encounters with ethnocentrically biased information. For ethnocentric tendencies to be activated, learned ethnocentric associations need to already exist in one’s cognitive structure (Jo and Berkowitz 1994). Consistent with the theory of spreading activation of memory, when exposed to a stimulus (e.g., a foreign product), consumers tend to automatically activate concepts stored in long-term memory (e.g., learned ethnocentric attitudes) to recall information and evaluate the given stimulus. A two-stage processing model comes into play: in the first stage, the perceptual part is automatic (i.e., activation of ethnocentric memories), and in the second stage, ethnocentric behavioral response is controlled by conscious choice (Devine 1989). Ethnocentric buying behavior tends to be a conscious choice but is based on automatically activated tendencies. Fazio and Williams (1986) suggest that mental representations that become active automatically are more influential than consciously retrieved perceptions. As a result of such preconscious influences, the consumer is unaware of the interpretive bias of the information and therefore cannot try to change it to a more socially acceptable one (Bargh 1989).

Automatic ethnocentric trait activation is based on the mechanism in which activation is triggered by the mere presence of trait-relevant behavior. Ethnocentrism may be strongly established from an early age in children’s memories, well before they come of an age capable of critically evaluating and questioning its appropriateness (Allport 1954). With a longer presence and activation history, ethnocentric beliefs are likely to be more accessible than more recently acquired beliefs. Thus, when consumers must choose between foreign and domestic

products, relevant cues may activate unconscious ethnocentric beliefs to guide their conscious evaluation of the available options and their final purchase decision. Extant research has suggested that prolonged exposure to ethnocentric information (e.g., buy-local campaigns, information from family) facilitates retention in long-term memory, resulting in the automatic activation of ethnocentric tendencies (Hansen and Hansen 1988). We suggest that this type of preconscious, “waiting-to-be-activated” ethnocentrism constitutes an important dimension of consumer ethnocentrism, and we label this dimension as “reflexive ethnocentrism.”

Ethnocentric Habituation. The well-established link of ethnocentrism with morality emphasizes the need to incorporate habit into the core of ethnocentrism. Supporting evidence has indicated that morality inherently entails habit, in which a person develops the habit of “acting and thinking in common” (Durkheim 1893, quoted in Camic 1986, p. 1054). In addition, similar to general ethnocentrism, consumer ethnocentrism is learned from an early age (Shimp and Sharma 1987). Consumers become accustomed to ethnocentrism through frequent repetition of or prolonged exposure to ethnocentric behaviors, such as repeated buying practices. Everyday interactions in different contexts (i.e., family, school, and friends) are the main socialization routes through which consumers implicitly develop ethnocentric biases. Extant research indicates that biculturalism decreases the levels of ethnocentrism (Zolfagharian and Sun 2010). However, Poon, Evangelista, and Albaum (2010) show that immigrants who share similar cultural backgrounds to that of the host country have as equally high ethnocentrism scores as those locally born. Consistent with these findings, empirical evidence also indicates that the combination of two ethnic identities in the immigrant group does not eliminate the development of ethnocentrism (Zolfagharian, Saldivar, and Sun 2014). Similarly, Watchravesringkan (2011) shows that consumer ethnocentrism of immigrants to the host country (United States) was higher for those who had adopted a dual ethnic identity (Asian Americans) and for highly acculturated immigrants, regardless of their adopted ethnic identity.

Empirical evidence from sociology indicates that differences in the levels of ethnocentrism can be ascribed to different socialization experiences (Ryan et al. 2007). Corroborating evidence from Crisp and Turner (2011) illustrates that members can experience the increasing ethnic and cultural variation in modern societies differently. For example, immigrants who face discrimination are less likely to integrate or assimilate into that society.

Benet-Martínez, Lee, and Leu (2006) argue that ethnic and cultural diversity influences not only immigrants but also members of the majority group. Members of the majority group can use different strategies to deal with the ethnic or cultural groups in their society. For example, increased ethnic and cultural diversity may threaten their identity and lead to higher discrimination and ethnocentrism. Drawing from the categorization–processing–adaptation–generalization model (Crisp and Turner 2011), two conditions must be met for exposure to ethnic or cultural diversity to reduce prejudice or biases. First, cultural diversity must challenge stereotypical expectations (of the different ethnic/cultural groups), and second, the person must be motivated and able to try to resolve the conflicting stereotypical expectations of the different groups. For adaptation to take place, people must repeatedly experience stereotypically challenging diversity and engage in conflict resolution. If these conditions are not met, the existing stereotypes will guide their behavior and judgments.

Thus, the development of ethnocentrism at an early age depends on the surrounding conditions. In particular, the degree of ethnocentric habituation will depend on how diverse and challenging to the ethnic stereotypes the environment is and the motivations of the ethnic group to overcome and reconcile such stereotypes. Mezirow (1997, p. 6) defines ethnocentrism as “a habit of mind,” suggesting that ethnocentric feelings that develop at an early age are automatically activated and shape value judgments and attitudes.

Consistent with Shimp and Sharma (1987), we also define consumer ethnocentrism as a tendency and view tendencies as enduring general traits. Thus, we define consumer ethnocentrism as consumers’ tendency to favor domestic over foreign products—that is, as a form of prosocial behavior that can be reflexive or learned and is associated with feelings of insecurity and distorted cognition. In the following subsection, we focus on nomological and predictive validity and outline the process we followed to construct a valid consumer ethnocentrism measure.

Nomological Hypotheses

Research on morality highlights the different approaches that people adopt with respect to their moral judgments. These approaches focus on two main dimensions: relativism and idealism (Forsyth 1980). Ethical relativism refers to “the extent to which individuals reject universal moral rules or principles” (Barnett, Bass, and Brown 1994, p. 469). People with high

levels of ethical relativism are less likely to base their moral judgments on universal laws and tend to form judgments according to each unique situation. In contrast, those with high levels of ethical idealism tend to rely on universal laws and believe in moral absolutes. According to Forsyth, Nye, and Kelley (1988), moral idealists value the well-being of others and hold the view of protecting others from harm. Evidence from sociological research also shows that ethical idealism is related to authoritarianism (McHoskey 1996), a concept closely aligned with ethnocentrism. As such, because consumer ethnocentrism is based on the moral obligation to support the local economy and prevent harm, we conceptualize ethnocentrism as a defensive mechanism (from economic and job-loss threats), rooted in altruism and, thus, expect it to be in line with the values and beliefs of moral idealists. Thus:

H₁: Consumer ethnocentrism is positively associated with ethical idealism.

Many studies have discussed the role of social norms in prosocial behavior (e.g., De Groot and Steg 2009). Specifically, ethnocentric responses develop to ensure survival through an increase in solidarity and conformity with the group (Catton 1960). In line with Fishbein’s (1979) theory of reasoned action, subjective norms influence behavioral intent as people feel peer pressure to conform to existing norms. Subjective norms are a function of normative beliefs about what peers think people should do and people’s motivation to comply. Repeated normative pressures reinforce ethnocentrism and may lead to the internalization of ethnocentric beliefs. In that case, the level of a person’s susceptibility to interpersonal influence determines the degree to which he or she complies with the self-preservation and survival values of a social environment (Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel 1989) and accepts such justifications to adopt an ethnocentric stance. Thus:

H₂: Consumer ethnocentrism is positively associated with susceptibility to interpersonal influence.

People who interact with and experience other cultures are more appreciative of them and less likely to be ethnocentrically biased (Sharma, Shimp, and Shin 1995). Travel plays a key role in cultural openness, or cosmopolitanism, because it facilitates open-mindedness and leads to a more sophisticated stance toward the “exotic” (Belk 1998). Similarly, mixed marriages and intercommunication with the diaspora can also result in greater tolerance of foreign nations (Van Hear 1998). Migration can also increase hybridity in cultures in

which families and peers transcend national boundaries (Pieterse 1994) and reinforce cosmopolitanism (Holt 1998). Unlike ethnocentrics, cosmopolitans are less likely to view foreigners as inferior. Cosmopolitans are open to new ideas and evaluate products on their functional merits, regardless of tradition or social influence. Empirical studies have established a negative relationship between cosmopolitanism and ethnocentrism (Balabanis, Mueller, and Melewar 2002; Vida and Reardon 2008). Thus:

H₃: Consumer ethnocentrism is negatively associated with consumer cosmopolitanism.

Predictive Validity Hypotheses

Research has illustrated a significant relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and purchase intentions (Han 1988; Klein 2002; Klein, Ettenson, and Morris 1998; Suh and Kwon 2002; Wang and Chen 2004). Consumers with high levels of ethnocentrism tend to be unwilling to purchase foreign products (Klein, Ettenson, and Morris 1998; Suh and Kwon 2002) and want to prevent foreign firms from growing because they associate foreign products with threat (Shimp and Sharma 1987). Such consumers are likely to purchase (Good and Huddleston 1995; Wang and Chen 2004) and prefer (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2004) domestic goods, to strengthen the domestic economy and help fellow workers. In line with these findings, we hypothesize the following:

H₄: The more ethnocentric a consumer is, the stronger are his or her (a) preference for domestic brands and (b) reluctance to buy foreign products.

SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Before embarking on the scale development process, we needed to decide on the specification of the measurement model. Applying MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Jarvis's (2005) criteria, we checked whether the scale was formative or reflective and determined that a reflective model specification was more appropriate for ethnocentrism. The identified indicators for each dimension are manifestations of the ethnocentrism constructs. In addition, all indicators and identified dimensions share the common theme of consumer ethnocentric response. As we show subsequently, we expected the indicators to covary and to have the same antecedents and consequences as explained in the hypotheses.

Item Identification and Screening

We developed the first pool of items on the basis of a multidisciplinary theoretical background and qualitative findings, collected through 19 in-depth interviews with English consumers in the United Kingdom. We performed content analysis and established coding reliability using two pairs of independent coders.¹

This first pool of items consisted of 206 items and included the identified five dimensions: prosociality, cognition, insecurity, reflexiveness, and habituation. To assess content validity and reduce the initial pool of items to a more manageable number, we subjected them to expert rating. We assessed four key criteria at this stage: representativeness, relevance, specificity, and clarity (Haynes, Richard, and Kubany 1995). By calculating intraclass correlations among the judges, we drew safe conclusions for each of the four criteria from expert agreement. We eliminated items that performed poorly on any of the criteria. In total, 101 items survived the expert rating and were incorporated into a seven-point Likert scale. Finally, using convenience sampling, we recruited 12 English consumers to pretest the questionnaire through a think-aloud protocol and respondent debriefing process. These two methods are particularly useful for identifying possible semantic and general respondent task problems with the questionnaire (Presser and Blair 1994). In the think-aloud protocol, respondents read the questions and verbalized their thinking while selecting their answers. If respondents stumbled, we used probes to encourage further thought formation (Czaja and Blair 2005). Eleven questions needed to be rephrased, and 19 had problems related to comprehension, information retrieval, and insufficient knowledge. Because rephrasing would not have resolved the problems with those questions, we removed them from further analysis, which brought the total number of item of the first scale to 82. All the items were assessed on a seven-point Likert-type response scale.

Following standard procedures on scale development, we conducted four studies to establish the dimensionality of the extended consumer ethnocentrism construct, which addresses our first research objective, and to develop and validate the new scale (Studies 1–3), which satisfies our second objective. We provide further validation by testing the scale in an additional country (Study 4).

Study 1: Item Analysis and Scale Purification

We employed a mall intercept technique to collect data. In total, 2,400 people were approached to participate in

the study. The 1,133 people (47%) who agreed to participate were given the questionnaire with a self-addressed, prepaid envelope for mailing their answers. Ultimately, 206 completed questionnaires were received, two of which we eliminated because of extensive missing values (for an 18% response rate). Demographic characteristics of the samples appear in Appendix A.

As a preliminary step, we used item-to-total correlations per dimension and eliminated items that failed to meet the .30 cutoff point (Nunnally 1978). Sixty items survived this process and were subsequently subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA). We employed three statistical criteria for retaining items: (1) factor loadings greater than .40 (Hair et al. 1998), (2) eigenvalues greater than 1 (Kaiser–Guttman criterion), and (3) at least three significant loadings per factor (Comrey 1988).

Following a series of EFAs, we retained 33 items. Four items had high face validity and thus were retained, though they did not meet the specified criteria (Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose 2001). These items pertained to either previously established aspects of consumer ethnocentrism (e.g., prosociality) or novel aspects, identified through the multidisciplinary literature review (e.g., habituation), and were considered vital in capturing the contemporary content domain of consumer ethnocentrism. The results indicated a five-factor solution, explaining 61.8% of the variance. Cronbach's alphas were satisfactory: .93 for prosociality, .86 for cognition, .87 for insecurity, .80 for reflexiveness, and .79 for habituation.

Studies 2 and 3: Consumer Ethnocentrism Extended Scale (CEESCALE) Development and Validation

We then conducted two studies to develop (Study 2) and validate (Study 3) the scale. We collected data for both studies in England using online surveys. We employed stratified cluster sampling and divided the English regions into “wealthier” and “poorer” strata, according to their U.K. share of gross value added (Office for National Statistics 2010), which is now the preferred indicator of the Office of National Statistics for the overall economic well-being of an area.² We assigned five regions to the poorer stratum and four regions to the wealthier stratum. We then randomly selected three regions from each stratum. The resultant sampling frame consisted of the Southwest, West Midlands, and Northeast representing the poorer regions and the Southeast, Northwest, and East Anglia representing the wealthier regions. We then randomly selected one county per region.

A permission-based database of English consumers' e-mail addresses provided the sample frame. We contacted 5,000 e-mail addresses for Study 2 and 5,000 for Study 3. In total, we received 143 usable questionnaires for Study 2 and 110 for Study 3 (2.8% and 2.2% effective response rates, respectively). Sample characteristics appear in Appendix A.

We then performed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the data from Study 2. The five-factor, 33-item model suggested by the EFA produced unsatisfactory fit indices, signaling a poor representation of the data ($\chi^2(485) = 1,276.236$, $p < .01$; root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .08; goodness-of-fit index [GFI] = .75; comparative fit index [CFI] = .75; Tucker–Lewis index [TLI] = .84). Through iterative processes, a five-factor, 17-item confirmatory model was supported by satisfactory fit indices ($\chi^2(109) = 159.247$, $p < .01$; RMSEA = .06; GFI = .89; CFI = .96; TLI = .95). All item loadings onto their corresponding dimensions were high, ranging from .59 to .95, and the *t*-values were all above 1.96 (Table 1), indicating that the loadings were significant at the .05 level (Hair et al. 1998).

Internal consistency and construct reliabilities (Table 2) were all acceptable (Hair et al. 1998; Nunnally 1978). Internal consistency reliability for the CEESCALE was .93, with a mean score of 3.31 and standard deviation of 1.14.

The average variances extracted (AVEs) obtained for each of the dimensions were all within acceptable levels (Fornell and Larcker 1981), establishing convergent validity: .56 for prosociality, .75 for cognition, .54 for insecurity, .59 for reflexiveness, and .52 for habituation. Squared correlations ranged between .31 and .59 and were smaller than the AVEs of the individual dimensions, in support of discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker 1981).

To develop a psychometrically sound scale, we focused on replicating the results using a fresh sample (Study 3). We performed CFA on the final scale and again obtained satisfactory results ($\chi^2(109) = 162.215$, $p < .01$; RMSEA = .07; GFI = .86; CFI = .93; TLI = .92). Item loadings onto their corresponding factors were also satisfactory, ranging from .54 to .88. Internal consistency and construct reliabilities were again acceptable (Table 2). All item loadings were also high (Table 1). Internal consistency reliability of the CEESCALE was .90, with a mean score of 3.47 and standard deviation of .94. The AVEs were also within acceptable levels: .48 for prosociality, .75 for cognition, .57 for insecurity, .58 for reflexiveness, and .51 for habituation (Fornell and Larcker 1981).

Table 1. Item Loadings of the Five-Factor Measurement Model (Standardized Estimates)

Dimensions and Corresponding Items	Factor Loadings		t-Values	
	Study 2	Study 3	Study 2	Study 3
Prosociality				
1. Buying British goods helps me maintain my British identity.	.84	.67	10.69	9.24
2. I believe that purchasing British goods should be a moral duty of every British citizen.	.78	.73	a	a
3. It always makes me feel good to support our products.	.53	.62	6.30	8.56
4. A real Briton should always back British products.	.86	.81	11.08	11.20
5. British people should always consider British workers when making their purchase decisions.	.69	.60	8.53	8.21
Cognition				
6. When it comes to British products, I do not need further information to assess their quality; the country of origin is sufficient signal of high quality for me.	.81	.68	a	a
7. British goods are better than imported goods.	.95	.87	13.34	10.75
8. British products are made to high standards and no other country can exceed them.	.83	.81	11.43	10.23
Insecurity				
9. Increased imports result in greater levels of unemployment in this country.	.76	.79	a	a
10. Buying foreign products is a threat to the domestic economy.	.68	.69	7.29	9.58
11. Job losses in this country are the result of increased importation of foreign goods.	.78	.82	8.15	10.99
Reflexiveness				
12. I would be convinced to buy domestic goods if a campaign was launched in the mass media promoting British goods.	.80	.81	8.58	11.77
13. If British people are made aware of the impact on the economy of foreign product consumption, they will be more willing to purchase domestic goods.	.76	.82	a	a
14. I would stop buying foreign products if the British government launched campaigns to make people aware of the positive impact of domestic goods consumption on the British economy.	.74	.82	8.07	9.95
Habituation				
15. I am buying British products out of habit.	.59	.64	a	a
16. I prefer buying the British products because I am more familiar with them.	.81	.75	6.72	7.61
17. I am buying British because I am following the consumption patterns as these were passed to me by my older family members.	.74	.71	6.41	7.42

^aParameters fixed to the value of 1.

Nomological Hypotheses Results. Because of concerns with the length of the questionnaires, we split the nomological validity variables' scales into three large-scale

surveys (Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose 2001). In addition, we included a test in which respondents indicated their preference for six pairs of domestic and foreign

Table 2. U.K. and U.S. Reliability Estimates

	Internal Consistency Reliability (α)				Construct Reliability	
	United Kingdom		United States	United Kingdom		United States
	Study 2	Study 3		Study 2	Study 3	
Prosociality	.85	.81	.88	.86	.82	.88
Cognition	.89	.84	.84	.90	.84	.84
Insecurity	.76	.77	.87	.78	.80	.87
Reflexiveness	.81	.79	.83	.81	.80	.83
Habituation	.76	.76	.81	.76	.76	.81
CEESCALE	.93	.90	.94			

brands, across four product categories (white goods, small electrical appliances, clothing, and automobiles) in Study 2, to establish predictive validity. We used established measures from relevant studies to test for nomological relationships. The results appear in Table 3. All hypotheses (H_1 – H_3) are supported.

Investigation of Consumer Ethnocentrism Consequences. We chose Germany, a highly developed European country (gross domestic product per capita = 121), and Italy, a slightly less developed European country (gross domestic product per capita = 100) (Eurostat 2011), to measure the reluctance of English consumers to buy foreign (i.e., Italian and German) products. We selected Italy as a foreign country because it has not been included in extant studies to represent either the domestic or the foreign market. We measured reluctance to buy with a two-item scale adapted from Suh and

Kwon (2002). The internal consistency reliability of reluctance to buy Italian products was .83, and the respective estimate for German products was .81. We measured preference for domestic goods using six pairs of domestic and foreign brands from the four product categories specified previously. Four filler questions also appeared in this section, to suppress the real objectives of the study and to prevent any bias.

Our results indicate that consumer ethnocentrism has a positive and significant relationship to preference for local brands ($\beta = .23, p < .01$), thus confirming H_{4a} . In addition, and consistent with existing evidence, the overall consumer ethnocentrism score was significantly and positively associated with reluctance to buy either German or Italian products (German products: $\beta = .51$; Italian products: $\beta = .59; p < .01$), providing support for H_{4b} . The standardized regression coefficients indicate a

Table 3. Nomological Validity: Correlations with CEESCALE

	Study	Number of Items	α	CEESCALE	Hypotheses Testing Results
Ethical idealism (Forsyth 1980)	3	10	.87	.31**	H_1 supported
Interpersonal influence (Bearden, Netemeyer, and Teel 1989)	2	12	.90	.30**	H_2 supported
Cosmopolitanism (Riefler, Diamantopoulos, and Siguaw 2012)	3	12	.79	-.30*	H_3 supported

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

stronger reluctance to buy Italian rather than German products. One explanation for this result might be the mediating role of country-of-origin effects (Shankarmahesh 2006).

Comparing CETSCALE and CEESCALE. To establish incremental predictive validity of the CEESCALE over the CETSCALE, we performed two repeated measures multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs). The dependent variables were reluctance to buy Italian and German products, and CETSCALE and CEESCALE served as covariates. The results revealed a significant multivariate (between-subjects) main effect for CEESCALE ($F(1, 141) = 69.419, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .330$). The CETSCALE also has a significant effect on the two reluctance-to-buy variables, but the effect is significantly lower than that of the CEESCALE ($F(1, 141) = 31.969, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .185$). Thus, the CEESCALE effect sizes (i.e., partial η^2) are stronger than those of the CETSCALE. The variation of the effects of CEESCALE and CETSCALE (within-subject effects) on the reluctance to buy Italian or German products was marginal.

Social Desirability Bias. We used Ray's (1984) social desirability bias scale to investigate the relationship between social desirability and consumer ethnocentrism. The overall score was only weakly correlated with the social desirability scores ($r = .17, p < .01$). Previous tests of the relationships between the CETSCALE and social desirability indicate higher correlations; for example, De Ruyter, Van Birgelen, and Wetzels (1998) report a higher correlation of $r = .21 (p < .01)$. A low level of social desirability seems natural and not harmful, given the dominance of ethnocentric norms in society.

Demographic Variables. Finally, we tested for relationships between consumer ethnocentrism and the demographic variables. We found no significant relationship with age (Study 2: $r = .07, p > .05$; Study 3: $r = .06, p > .05$) but a significant relationship with education (Study 2: $r = -.24, p < .01$; Study 3: $r = -.14, p < .05$). Income was significant only in Study 2 ($r = -.21, p < .01$; Study 3: $r = -.03, p > .05$). Notably, gender was unrelated to consumer ethnocentrism (Study 2: $t(141) = -.341, p > .05$; Study 3: $t(108) = -.292, p > .05$).

Study 4: U.S. Replication

To replicate the results and establish the stability of the CEESCALE across cultures, we collected a new round of data in the United States. The questionnaire contained the CEESCALE, the CETSCALE, and several outcome

variables, including attitudes toward domestic brands, domestic brand ownership, and intentions to buy domestic brands. An online survey was launched, and data were collected through a permission-based mailing list of U.S. consumers (for the demographic characteristics of the sample, see Appendix B).

We again performed CFA to empirically establish the stability of the scale. The results reveal good model fit ($\chi^2(109) = 448.091, p < .01$; RMSEA = .07; GFI = .91; CFI = .95; TLI = .92). All loadings were above the suggested .60 threshold (Bagozzi, Yi, and Phillips 1991). Internal consistency and construct reliabilities of the individual subscales and the CEESCALE were all within acceptable levels (Table 2).

We established convergent and discriminant validities. All AVEs were above the suggested .50 threshold (Fornell and Larcker 1981): .62 for prosociality, .64 for cognition, .71 for insecurity, .64 for reflexiveness, and .59 for habituation, providing solid support for convergent validity. We then established discriminant validity by comparing alternative models, which involved collapsed dimensions. The five-factor model outperformed all alternative models with fewer dimensions (Table 4). We also tested for measurement invariance across the U.K. and U.S. samples, using established procedures (Steenkamp and Baumgartner 1998). The results provide support for full metric invariance. More specifically, although chi-square significantly increased when we imposed metric restrictions ($\Delta\chi^2(12) = 33.011, p < .05$), the fit indices remained within acceptable levels ($\chi^2(76) = 644.285, p < .01$; RMSEA = .05; GFI = .89; CFI = .94; TLI = .93). The next step involved establishing predictive validity.

Predictive Validity Measures. We measured intentions to buy domestic brands on a five-point Likert scale (1 = "definitely would buy," and 5 = "definitely would not buy"). We used domestic brands from various product categories, including cars (Chevrolet and Ford), sport shoes (Converse and Nike), beer (Budweiser and Pabst), motorcycles (Harley-Davidson), and casual clothing (Gap). The questionnaire tested respondents' perceptions of the origins of the chosen brands, and all respondents successfully identified the brands as domestic. Consistent with the work of Chattopadhyay and Basu (1990), we measured attitudes toward domestic brands on a three-item, five-point semantic differential scale ("very unfavorable/very favorable," "dislike a lot/like a lot," and "very poor/exceptional"). Similar to intentions, product categories included cars, sport shoes, beer, motorcycles, and casual clothing.

Table 4. Comparison of Alternative Models with the Five-Factor Model

Alternative Models ^a	χ^2	d.f.	$\Delta\chi^2*$	Δ d.f.	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
Five Factors	448.091	109			.95	.92	.07
Two Factors							
Cognition \times reflexiveness \times habituation, prosociality \times insecurity	884.041	112	435.95	3	.88	.84	.11
Three Factors							
Prosociality \times distortion \times reflexiveness, habituation, insecurity	706.885	111	258.794	2	.91	.89	.10
Four Factors							
Cognition \times habituation, insecurity, prosociality, reflexiveness	545.37	110	97.279	1	.93	.92	.09

*All $\Delta\chi^2$ are significant at the .01 level.

^aBest-performing models are shown.

Predictive Validity Results. To investigate predictive validity and establish CEESCALE's superior explanatory power in the United States, we ran a series of doubly multivariate analyses. More specifically, two separate doubly repeated measures MANOVAs tested the impact of CEESCALE and CETSCALE on favorability, likability, general attitudes, and purchase intentions, for all eight domestic brands (Table 5). The MANOVA results revealed a significant overall (all four variables) multivariate effect for CEESCALE (Wilks's $\lambda = .898$, $F(4, 424) = 12.102$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .102$). The CETSCALE also had a significant effect on the four dependent variables, though the effect was smaller than that of the CEESCALE (Wilks's $\lambda = .948$, $F(4, 424) = 5.767$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .052$). The univariate results indicated that most of the CEESCALE effect sizes

(i.e., partial η^2) were stronger than the respective CETSCALE effects, which were, according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines, at low levels. As expected, both analyses indicated strong brand effects (Wilks's $\lambda = .787$, $F(28, 424) = 3.865$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .213$) on the multivariate measures (i.e., favorability, likability, general attitudes, and buying intentions), reflecting a variation according to the strength of each brand.

Importantly, the analyses (within-subject effects) indicated that the effects (on all four measures) of both the CEESCALE (Wilks's $\lambda = .818$, $F(28, 424) = 3.188$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .182$) and the CETSCALE (Wilks's $\lambda = .823$, $F(28, 424) = 3.072$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .177$) varied across the eight brands assessed. Thus, ethnocentrism does not benefit all domestic brands

Table 5. Predictive Validity of CEESCALE and CETSCALE

	CEESCALE			CETSCALE		
	F	<i>p</i>	η^2_{partial}	F	P	η^2_{partial}
Favorability	40.275	.000	.086	19.739	.000	.044
Likability	45.989	.000	.097	21.729	.000	.048
General attitudes	41.940	.000	.089	19.712	.000	.044
Purchase intentions	14.457	.000	.033	6.728	.010	.016

equally, and some brands are considered more domestic than others.

In testing for consumer ethnocentrism's relationship with the demographic variables, we found that age and education were significantly related to consumer ethnocentrism (age: $r = .12, p < .01$; education: $r = -.19, p < .01$). Gender was also significantly associated with consumer ethnocentrism ($t(488) = -3.471, p < .01$).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

For a quarter of a century, marketing scholars have used and incorporated the construct of consumer ethnocentrism in their research. The original conceptualization suggests that consumer ethnocentrism has one dimension that taps the morality of purchasing foreign products. Since its development, there has been no systematic effort to reconsider and update Shimp and Sharma's (1987) conceptualization despite its significant impact on international consumer behavior. However, research on social ethnocentrism has advanced and suggests that ethnocentrism is a richer concept with more than one dimension (Bizumic et al. 2009; Devine 1989; Grant and Brown 1995). Corroborating these findings, marketing studies have revealed the multidimensional nature of consumer ethnocentrism (e.g., Hsu and Nien 2008) and called for a reconceptualization. Additional criticisms of the measure used include inconsistencies between the definition of consumer ethnocentrism as a trait and the items of the scale as well as issues regarding social desirability and response bias (De Ruyter, Van Birgelen, and Wetzels 1998; Hult and Keillor 1994).

This study addresses these limitations in an attempt to update the concept of consumer ethnocentrism. It incorporates the current theoretical advances in the field of social ethnocentrism and addresses scholarly concerns regarding the multidimensional nature of the construct and measurement quality issues. Overall, the study contributes to scientific marketing scholarship in two ways. First, it identifies new components of consumer ethnocentrism, including prosociality, reflexiveness, and habituation, and establishes five distinct dimensions. Second, it develops a robust scale to measure consumer ethnocentrism, the CEESCALE, to help researchers identify behavioral intentions more accurately.

The results establish the CEESCALE's superior predictive validity (to that of the CETSCALE) and offer more confidence to marketing scholars in identifying ethnocentric consumers and predicting their responses to for-

eign and domestic products. Use of the CEESCALE, together with other factors, such as country factors (e.g., cost of living, availability of domestic products in certain product categories) or other environmental factors (e.g., word of mouth, negative publicity), could provide scholars with a more robust model for explaining consumer attitudes toward foreign and domestic products.

The five dimensions could also help researchers understand the unique influence of each of the dimensions on consumers' perceptions and, ultimately, on their purchase behavior. This is of great importance, considering that consumers might be confronted with conflicting emotional, cognitive, and/or behavioral responses. For example, consumers might be emotionally driven to domestic products but might be cognitively discouraged from purchasing them because of concerns with quality or price. Similarly, consumers might be cognitively encouraged to buy domestic products, as they associate foreign products with economic threat, but might show a preference for foreign products as a result of learning from family and peers who purchase imported goods.

Theoretical Implications

The study highlights the reflexive nature of ethnocentrism, as mere exposure to external stimuli (i.e., foreign or domestic products) can result in an automatic activation of ethnocentrism (MacDonald 2006). Caution should be exercised, however, when assessing the impact of demographic variables on the dimensions of ethnocentrism. Consistent with prior research and some evidence from this study, ethnocentrism levels are significantly affected by age, gender, education, and income (e.g., Balabanis et al. 2001; Sharma, Shimp, and Shin 1995). For example, ethnocentric reflexiveness might depend on age. Older consumers, who tend to be more conservative (Tragos 1998), might be more receptive to messages that highlight traditions or emphasize the negative aspects of international competition on offshoring policies.

Relevant to the role of normative systems, we found that habituation is also a dimension of consumer ethnocentrism. Habituation suggests that ethnocentric feelings can be triggered from habit, familiarity, and intergenerational inheritance of consumption patterns. Although relevant literature views morality, which is at the core of consumer ethnocentrism, as a habit of mind (Camic 1986), studies have failed to address the need to incorporate habituation into the conceptual domain of consumer ethnocentrism.

In addition, our findings substantiate the relevance of prosociality within the consumer ethnocentrism conceptual domain (e.g., Sharma, Shimp, and Shin 1995). However, contrary to extant research on consumer ethnocentrism, which ascribes preference for domestic products to pure altruism (Powers and Hopkins 2006), the current study adds a new perspective by theoretically and empirically corroborating the role of self-enhancement aspirations in consumer ethnocentrism (Meier 2006).

The new conceptualization also recognizes insecurity as an important consumer ethnocentrism dimension, which taps perceptions of threat from domestic products competing with foreign alternatives. This dimension is theoretically justified with LeVine and Campbell's (1972) group conflict theory, which suggests that ethnocentrism is triggered by the competition for scarce resources. In line with existing findings that show a precedence for perceived threats over real threats regarding ethnocentric bias (Bircan 2010), the CEESCALE enables marketing scholars to incorporate the impact of such contextual factors in their studies.

Managerial and Policy Implications

Both the extended conceptualization and new measure of consumer ethnocentrism can help organizations gain more granular insights into their decision making, attain more accurate measurement, and achieve better prediction rates. The new measure enables managers to predict more accurately the acceptability of their products in different markets. In addition, the CEESCALE will allow organizations, policy makers, and market research agencies to monitor annual changes in consumer ethnocentrism in a more systematic manner as well as understand variations across countries. The CEESCALE also enables managers to identify country or regional variations and annual changes in the balance of the five components of consumer ethnocentrism, thus guiding their efforts and focus on specific dimensions of consumer ethnocentrism.

Research in marketing has already established that consumer ethnocentrism is managerially important in standardization/specialization decisions (Keillor and Hult 1996), market segmentation, global positioning (Magnusson et al. 2014; Nijssen and Douglas 2011; Westjohn, Singh, and Magnusson 2012), global branding (Alden et al. 2013; Guo 2013), market entry mode decisions (Fong, Lee, and Du 2014), and country-of-origin-related issues (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2008, 2011). Both the multidimensional nature and the

enhanced predictive validity of the CEESCALE can aid in the development of alternative (foreign or domestic) market segmentation schemes, as well as the selection of appropriate positioning themes.

Buy-local campaigns constitute an important tool for policy makers and governments aiming to promote domestic products. Most buy-local campaigns revolve around the ethnocentric sentiments of consumers, and their appeal emphasizes either the moral duty to buy local products or the threat from foreign products. The CEESCALE and its dimensions can help governments and organizations identify suitable message appeals. For example, CEESCALE results can assist managers in segmenting the market on the basis of scores obtained for the individual CEESCALE dimensions (e.g., the patriotic ethnocentric segment) and in adapting message appeals accordingly (e.g., focusing on moral obligation, to appeal to the patriotic segment).

Limitations and Further Research

A new operationalization offers research opportunities for replication in different contexts, as well as opportunities for further scrutiny using additional tests. This study has limitations, which present opportunities for further research. First, to establish predictive validity, we focused on only a few product categories (i.e., white goods, small electrical appliances, clothing and shoes, cars, beer, and motorcycles). Considering the impact of product categories on the predictability of consumer ethnocentrism levels (e.g., Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2004; Herche 1992; Leonidou et al. 1999), further research could incorporate a wider array of product categories as well as services to understand the consequences of consumer bias in favor of domestic products.

Second, as we noted, time is a critical factor that determines consumer ethnocentrism levels. Future studies might employ longitudinal research and identify changes in the levels of the five consumer ethnocentrism dimensions. Longitudinal research would help pinpoint which of the available social factors actually influence consumer ethnocentrism and the extent to which these effects are uniform across all CEESCALE dimensions. Furthermore, because ethnocentrism takes shape during early childhood socialization experiences (Adorno et al. 1950; Shimp and Sharma 1987), a longitudinal study would help analyze how variations in the prevailing conditions during that stage of individual life affect consumer ethnocentrism, enabling researchers to identify the sources of possible intergenerational differences in consumer ethnocentrism.

Third, we did not compare situations in which domestic products are widely available with those in which they are unavailable. The exploratory stage of the research indicated that English consumers are concerned with the unavailability of domestic goods across a wide array of product categories. Prior research has indicated that domestic product availability plays a moderating role (Nijssen and Douglas 2004), and thus further research is necessary to address the differences that might exist as a result of domestic product availability. In any additional research, the notion of domestic product availability should be broadened from a dichotomous variable to a continuous one to take into account the different degrees of availability and salience of domestic products in the market. Similar to the lack of availability, the strategic importance of certain imports to the local economy may mitigate or even cancel out the effects of

consumer ethnocentrism. Such research would facilitate better calibration of the consequences of the CEESCALE and its predictive validity.

Fourth, we developed and validated the scale in two economically developed countries with many cultural similarities (i.e., the United Kingdom and United States). For generalization purposes, further research should examine less developed countries and emerging markets in particular. Research could also test the arguments put forth regarding the effects of prevailing conditions and social factors on the activation of consumer ethnocentrism in different cultural and economically developed contexts. Such research would test the generalizability and validity of the CEESCALE across different cultures and delineate the impact of cultural and macroeconomic factors on the construct.

Appendix A. U.K. Sample Demographics

	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
Sex (%)			
Male	48.2	44.1	49.1
Female	51.8	55.9	50.9
Age (%)			
Under 18 years	2	0	.9
18–24 years	37.7	15.4	21.8
25–44 years	26	32.9	29.1
45–60 years	26	35	35.5
More than 60 years	8.3	16.8	12.7
Education (%)			
Primary school	2	1.4	0
Secondary school	20.7	30.8	28.2
Diploma	9.4	14	21.8
Undergraduate degree	32.5	19.6	18.2
Postgraduate degree	13.3	7.7	8.2
Professional qualification	22.1	20.3	14.5
Other	0	6.2	9.1
Income (%)			
Less than £10,000	37.9	29.4	36.4
£10,000–£30,000	36.4	46.9	45.5
£31,000–£50,000	13.6	14.7	11.8
£51,000–£70,000	5.1	6.3	.9
£71,000–£90,000	3.5	2.1	1.8
£91,000–£110,000	2	.6	.9
More than £110,000	1.5	0	2.7

Appendix A. Continued

	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
Region (%)	N.A.		
Northeast		7	4.5
Northwest		14	26.4
West Midlands		21.7	26.4
East Anglia		7.7	6.4
Southeast		33.6	27.3
Southwest		16	9

N.A. = not applicable.

Appendix B. U.S. Sample Demographics

Sex (%)		College (no degree)	20.4
Male	56.6	Bachelor's degree	34.7
Female	43.4	Master's degree	21.8
Age (%)		Professional degree	6.7
Under 18 years	2.2	Doctoral degree	4.4
18–24 years	7.1	Income (%)	
25–44 years	32.3	Under \$20,000	9.0
45–60 years	37.4	\$20,000–\$40,000	17.9
More than 60 years	20.9	\$40,001–\$60,000	16.0
Education (%)		\$60,001–\$80,000	17.7
Junior high school	.4	\$80,001–\$100,000	10.5
High school	11.5	More than \$100,000	29.0

NOTES

1. We presented independent coders with clear definitions of the codes and extensively trained them before independently implementing the coding. Consistent with Kolbe and Burnett's (1991) quality criteria, simple agreement and Scott's π reached satisfactory levels (simple agreement: .81–.88; Scott's π : .81–.87).
2. In line with empirical evidence that each country's economic development has a significant impact on consumer ethnocentrism levels (Kaynak, Kucukemiroglu, and Hyder 2000; Leonidou et al. 1999), we expected regional discrepancies in economic development to significantly affect consumers' responses to

the questions posed. We calculated the mean share of the regions and assigned those with gross value-added share above the mean to the wealthier stratum and those below the average share to the poorer stratum.

REFERENCES

- Acharya, Chandrama and Greg Elliott (2003), "Consumer Ethnocentrism, Perceived Product Quality and Choice—An Empirical Investigation," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 15 (4), 87–115.
- Adorno, T.W., Else Frenkel-Brunswi, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford (1950), *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper.

- Ajzen, Icek (2005), *Attitudes, Personality and Behavior*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Alden, Dana L., James Kelley, Petra Riefler, Julie Lee, and Geoffrey Soutar (2013), "The Effect of Global Company Animosity on Global Brand Attitudes in Emerging and Developed Markets: Does Perceived Value Matter?" *Journal of International Marketing*, 21 (2), 17–38.
- Allport, Gordon W. (1954), *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Applebaum, Barbara (1996), "Moral Paralysis and the Ethnocentric Fallacy," *Journal of Moral Education*, 25 (2), 185–99.
- Bagozzi, Richard, Youjae Yi, and Lynn W. Phillips (1991), "Assessing Construct Validity in Organizational Research," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36 (3), 421–58.
- Balabanis, George and Adamantios Diamantopoulos (2004), "Domestic Country Bias, Country-of-Origin Effects, and Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Multidimensional Unfolding Approach," *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 32 (1), 80–95.
- and ——— (2008), "Brand Origin Identification by Consumers: A Classification Perspective," *Journal of International Marketing*, 16 (1), 39–71.
- and ——— (2011), "Gains and Losses from the Misperception of Brand Origin: The Role of Brand Strength and Country-of-Origin Image," *Journal of International Marketing*, 19 (2), 95–116.
- , ———, Rene D. Mueller, and T.C. Melewar (2001), "The Impact of Nationalism, Patriotism and Internationalism on Consumer Ethnocentric Tendencies," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32 (1), 157–75.
- , Rene D. Mueller, and T.C. Melewar (2002), "The Relationship Between Consumer Ethnocentrism and Human Values," *Journal of Global Marketing*, 15 (3/4), 7–37.
- Bargh, John A. (1989), "Conditional Automaticity: Varieties of Automatic Influence in Social Perception and Cognition," in *Unintended Thought*, James S. Uleman and John A. Bargh, eds. New York: Guilford Press, 3–51.
- Barnett, Tim, Ken Bass, and Gene Brown (1994), "Ethical Ideology and Ethical Judgment Regarding Ethical Issues in Business," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13 (6), 469–80.
- Bearden, William O., David M. Hardesty, and Randall L. Rose (2001), "Consumer Self-Confidence: Refinements in Conceptualization and Measurement," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28 (1), 121–34.
- , Richard G. Netemeyer, and Jesse E. Teel (1989), "Measurement of Consumer Susceptibility to Interpersonal Influence," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15 (4), 473–81.
- Belk, Russell W. (1998), "Been There, Done That, Bought the Souvenirs: Of Journeys and Boundary Crossing," in *Consumer Research: Postcards from the Edge*, Stephen Brown and Daruch Turley, eds. New York: Routledge, 22–45.
- Bénabou, Roland and Jean Tirole (2004), "Incentives and Prosocial Behavior," *American Economic Review*, 96 (5), 1652–78.
- Benet-Martínez, Veronica, Fiona Lee, and Janxin Leu (2006), "Biculturalism and Cognitive Complexity: Expertise in Cultural Representations," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37 (4), 386–407.
- Bircan, Tuba (2010), "Diversity, Perception and Ethnocentrism: A Multilevel Analysis of Ethnocentrism in Belgian Communities," working paper, Leuven University.
- Bizumic, Boris, John Duckitt, Dragan Popadic, Vincent Dru, and Stephen Krauss (2009), "A Cross-Cultural Investigation into a Reconceptualization of Ethnocentrism," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39 (6), 871–99.
- Caddick, Brian (1982), "Perceived Illegitimacy and Intergroup Relations," in *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Henri Tajfel, ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 137–54.
- Camic, Charles (1986), "The Matter of Habit," *American Journal of Sociology*, 91 (5), 1039–87.
- Catton, William R. (1960), "The Functions and Dysfunctions of Ethnocentrism: A Theory," *Social Problems*, 8 (3), 201–211.
- Chattopadhyay, Amitava and Kunal Basu (1990), "Humor in Advertising: The Moderating Role of Prior Brand Evaluation," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27 (November), 466–76.
- Cleveland, Mark, Michael Laroche, and Nicolas Papadopoulos (2009), "Cosmopolitanism, Consumer Ethnocentrism, and Materialism: An Eight-Country Study of Antecedents and Outcomes," *Journal of International Marketing*, 17 (1), 116–46.
- Cohen, Jacob (1988), *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Comrey, Andrew L. (1988), "Factor-Analytic Methods of Scale Development in Personality and Clinical Psychology," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56 (5), 754–61.

- Crisp, Richard J. and Rhiannon Turner (2011), "Cognitive Adaptation to the Experience of Social and Cultural Diversity," *Psychological Bulletin*, 137 (2), 242–66.
- Czaja, Ronald and Johnny Blair (2005), *Designing Surveys: A Guide to Decisions and Procedures*. London: Sage Publications.
- De Cremer, David (2001), "Relations of Self-Esteem Concerns, Group Identification, and Self-Stereotyping to In-Group Favoritism," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141 (3), 389–400.
- De Groot, Judith I.M. and Linda Steg (2009), "Morality and Prosocial Behavior: The Role of Awareness, Responsibility, and Norms in the Norm Activation Model," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 149 (4), 425–49.
- De Ruyter, Ko, Marcel van Birgelen, and Martin Wetzels (1998), "Consumer Ethnocentrism in International Services Marketing," *International Business Review*, 7 (2), 185–202.
- Devine, Patricia G. (1989), "Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56 (1), 5–18.
- Eurostat (2011), "GDP per Capita in PPS," (accessed March 10, 2015), [available at <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tec00114>].
- Everret, Simon J. (2012), "Débâcle: The 11th GTA Report on Protectionism," (accessed March 1, 2013), [available at http://www.globaltradealert.org/sites/default/files/GTA11_exec_summary.pdf].
- Fazio, Russell H. and Carol J. Williams (1986), "Attitude Accessibility as a Moderator of the Attitude–Perception and Attitude–Behavior Relations: An Investigation of the 1984 Presidential Election," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (3), 505–514.
- Fishbein, Martin (1979), "A Theory of Reasoned Action: Some Applications and Implications," in *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Vol. 27, Herbert E. Howen Jr. and Monte M. Page, eds. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 65–116.
- Fong, Cher-Min, Chun-Ling Lee, and Yunzhou Du (2014), "Consumer Animosity, Country of Origin, and Foreign Entry-Mode Choice: A Cross-Country Investigation," *Journal of International Marketing*, 22 (1), 62–76.
- Forbes, Hugh Donald (1985), *Nationalism, Ethnocentrism, and Personality: Social Science and Critical Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fornell, Claes and David F. Larcker (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (February), 39–50.
- Forsyth, Donelson R. (1980), "A Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (1), 175–84.
- , Judith L. Nye, and Karl Kelley (1988), "Idealism, Relativism, and the Ethic of Caring," *Journal of Psychology*, 122 (3), 243–48.
- Good, Linda K. and Patricia Huddleston (1995), "Ethnocentrism of Polish and Russian Consumers: Are Feelings and Intentions Related?" *International Marketing Review*, 12 (5), 35–48.
- Grant, Peter R. (1993), "Ethnocentrism in Response to a Threat to Social Identity," *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 8 (6), 143–54.
- and Rupert Brown (1995), "From Ethnocentrism to Collective Protest: Responses to Relative Deprivation and Threats to Social Identity," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58 (3), 195–212.
- Guo, Xiaoling (2013), "Living in a Global World: Influence of Consumer Global Orientation on Attitudes Toward Global Brands from Developed Versus Emerging Countries," *Journal of International Marketing*, 21 (1), 1–22.
- Hadjimarcou, John and Michael Y. Hu (1999), "An Examination of Categorisation and Stereotyping Heuristics in Global Product Evaluations," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15 (5), 405–433.
- Hair, Joseph, Rolph E. Anderson, Ronald Tatham, and Bill Black (1998), *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New York: Macmillan.
- Han, C. Min (1988), "The Role of Consumer Patriotism in the Choice of Domestic Versus Foreign Products," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 28 (3), 25–32.
- Hansen, Christine H. and Ranald Hansen (1988), "How Rock Music Videos Can Change What Is Seen When Boy Meets Girl: Priming Stereotypic Appraisal of Social Interactions," *Sex Roles*, 19 (5/6), 287–316.
- Haynes, Stephen N., David C.S. Richard, and Edward S. Kubany (1995), "Content Validity in Psychological Assessment: A Functional Approach to Concepts and Methods," *Psychological Assessment*, 7 (3), 238–47.
- Herche, Joel (1992), "A Note on the Predictive Validity of the CETSCALE," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 20 (3), 261–64.

- Hilton, James L. and William von Hippel (1996), "Stereotypes," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47 (1), 205–235.
- Holt, Douglas B. (1998), "Does Cultural Capital Structure American Consumption?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (1), 1–26.
- Hooghe, Marc, Tim Reeskens, and Dietlind Stolle (2007), "Diversity, Multiculturalism and Social Cohesion: Trust and Ethnocentrism in European Societies," in *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada*. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 387–410.
- Hsu, Jane Lu and Hang Peng Nien (2008), "Who Are Ethnocentric? Examining Consumer Ethnocentrism in Chinese Societies," *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 7 (6), 436–47.
- Hult, G. Tomas M. and Bruce D. Keillor (1994), "The Impact of Social Desirability Bias on Consumer Ethnocentrism Research: A Cross-National Perspective," *Journal of Marketing Management*, 4 (2), 48–55.
- Jo, Eunkyung and Leonard Berkowitz (1994), "A Priming Effect Analysis of Media Influences: An Update," in *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. Jennings Bryant and Dolf Zillmann, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 43–60.
- Kaynak, Erdener, Orsay Kucukemiroglu, and Akmal S. Hyder (2000), "Consumers' Country-of-Origin (COO) Perceptions of Imported Products in a Homogenous Less-Developed Country," *European Journal of Marketing*, 34 (9/10), 1221–41.
- Keillor, Bruce and Tomas M. Hult (1999), "A Five-Country Study of National Identity: Implications for International Marketing Research and Practice," *International Marketing Review*, 16 (1), 65–84.
- , ———, Robert Erffmeyer, and Emin Babakus (1996), "NATID: The Development and Application of a National Identity Measure for Use in International Marketing," *Journal of International Marketing*, 4 (2), 57–73.
- Klein, Jill Gabrielle (2002), "Us Versus Them, or Us Versus Everyone? Delineating Consumer Aversion to Foreign Goods," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33 (2), 345–63.
- , Richard Ettenson, and Marlene D. Morris (1998), "The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China," *Journal of Marketing*, 62 (January), 89–100.
- Kolbe, Richard H., and Melissa S. Burnett (1991), "Content-Analysis Research: An Examination of Applications with Directives for Improving Research Reliability and Objectivity," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (2), 243–50.
- Lantz, Garold and Sandra Loeb (1996), "Country of Origin and Ethnocentrism: An Analysis of Canadian and American Preferences Using Social Identity Theory," in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 23, Kim P. Corfman and John G. Lynch Jr., eds. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 374–78.
- Lee, Wei Na, Gi Young Hong, and Si-Jin Lee (2003), "Communicating with American Consumers in the Post 9/11 Climate: An Empirical Investigation of Consumer Ethnocentrism in the United States," *International Journal of Advertising*, 22 (4), 487–510.
- Leonidou, Leonidas C., John Hadjimarcou, Anna Kaleka, and Gergana Stamenova (1999), "Bulgarian Consumers' Perceptions of Products Made in Asia Pacific," *International Marketing Review*, 16 (2), 126–42.
- LeVine, Robert A. and Donald T. Campbell (1972), *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Liu, Scott S., Keith F. Johnson, and Keith F. Johnson (2005), "The Automatic Country-of-Origin Effects on Brand Judgments," *Journal of Advertising*, 34 (1), 87–97.
- MacDonald, Kevin (2006), "Psychology and White Ethnocentrism," *Occidental Quarterly*, 6 (4), 7–46.
- MacKenzie, Scott B., Philip M. Podsakoff, and Cheryl Burke Jarvis (2005), "The Problem of Measurement Model Misspecification in Behavioral and Organizational Research and Some Recommended Solutions," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (4), 710–30.
- Magnusson, Peter, Vijaykumar Krishnan, Stanford A. Westjohn, and Srdan Zdravkovic (2014), "The Spillover Effects of Prototype Brand Transgressions on Country Image and Related Brands," *Journal of International Marketing*, 22 (1), 21–38.
- McGregor, Sue L.T. (2006), "Understanding Consumers' Moral Consciousness," *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30 (2), 164–78.
- McHoskey, John W. (1996), "Authoritarianism and Ethical Ideology," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 136 (6), 709–717.
- Meier, Stephan (2006), "A Survey of Economic Theories and Field Evidence on Pro-Social Behavior," Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Working Paper 06-6.
- Mezirow, Jack (1997), "Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice," in *New Directions in Adult and Continuing Education*, Patricia Cranton, ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 5-12.
- Mullen, Brian, Rupert Brown, and Colleen Smith (1992), "Ingroup Bias as a Function of Salience, Relevance, and Sta-

- ment: An Integration,” *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22 (2), 103–122.
- Nijssen, Edwin J. and Susan Douglas (2004), “Examining the Animosity Model in a Country with a High Level of Foreign Trade,” *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 21 (1), 23–38.
- and ——— (2011), “Consumer World-Mindedness and Attitudes Toward Product Positioning in Advertising: An Examination of Global Versus Foreign Versus Local Positioning,” *Journal of International Marketing*, 19 (3), 113–33.
- Nunnally, Jum C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Office of National Statistics (2010), “Regional GVA,” (accessed March 10, 2015), [available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Regional+GVA>].
- Olsen, Janeen E., Kent Granzin, and Abhijit Biswas (1993), “Influencing Consumers’ Selection of Domestic Versus Imported Products: Implications for Marketing Based on a Model of Helping Behavior,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21 (4), 307–321.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2010) “Trade Policy Response to the Global Economic Crisis,” (accessed March 10, 2015), [available at <http://www.oecd.org/trade/tradepolicyresponsetotheglobaleconomiccrisis.htm>].
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen (1994), “Globalisation as Hybridisation,” *International Sociology*, 9 (2), 161–84.
- Poon, Patrick, Felicitas Evangelista, and Gerald Albaum (2010), “Attitudes of Migrants Towards Foreign-Made Products: An Exploratory Study of Migrants in Australia,” *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 27 (1), 35–42.
- Powers, Thomas L. and Raymond A. Hopkins (2006), “Altruism and Consumer Purchase Behavior,” *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 19 (1), 107–130.
- Presser, Stanley and Johnny Blair (1994), “Survey Pretesting: Do Different Methods Produce Different Results?” *Sociological Methodology*, 24 (1), 73–104.
- Ray, John J. (1984), “The Reliability of Short Social Desirability Scales,” *Journal of Social Psychology*, 123 (1), 133–34.
- Reierson, Curtis C. (1966), “Are Foreign Products Seen as National Stereotypes?” *Journal of Retailing*, 42 (3), 33–40.
- Riefler, Petra, Adamantios Diamantopoulos, and Judy Sigauw (2012), “Cosmopolitan Consumers as a Target Group for Segmentation,” *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43 (3), 285–305.
- Ryan, Carrey S., Jennifer Hunt, Joshua Weible, Charles Peterson, and Juan Casas (2007), “Multicultural and Colorblind Ideology, Stereotypes, and Ethnocentrism Among Black and White Americans,” *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10 (4), 617–37.
- Saffu, Kojo and John Hugh Walker (2005), “An Assessment of the Consumer Ethnocentric Scale (CETSCALE) in an Advanced and Transitional Country: The Case of Canada and Russia,” *International Journal of Management*, 22 (4), 556–71.
- Schooler, Robert D. (1965), “Product Bias in the Central American Common Market,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2 (November), 394–97.
- Shankarmahesh, Mahesh N. (2006), “Consumer Ethnocentrism: An Integrative Review of its Antecedents and Consequences,” *International Marketing Review*, 23 (2), 146–72.
- Sharma, Subhash, Terence A. Shimp, and Jeongshin Shin (1995), “Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Test of Antecedents and Moderators,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23 (1), 26–37.
- Shimp, Terence A. and Subhash Sharma (1987), “Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE,” *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24 (August), 280–89.
- Smith, M. Brewster (1992), “Nationalism, Ethnocentrism, and the New World Order,” *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 32 (4), 76–91.
- Steenkamp, Jan-Benedict E.M. and Hans Baumgartner (1998), “Assessing Measurement Invariance in Cross-National Consumer Research,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (1), 78–107.
- Suh, Taewon and Ik-Whan G. Kwon (2002), “Globalization and Reluctant Buyers,” *International Marketing Review*, 19 (6), 663–80.
- Sumner, William Graham (1906), *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores and Morals*. Boston: Ginn and Co.
- Thelen, Shawn and Earl D. Honeycutt Jr. (2004), “Assessing National Identity in Russia Between Generations Using the National Identity Scale,” *Journal of International Marketing*, 12 (2), 58–81.
- Tiedens, Larissa Z. and Susan Linton (2001), “Judgment Under Emotional Certainty and Uncertainty: The Effects of Specific

- Emotions on Information Processing,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81 (6), 973–88.
- Tragos, W.G. (1998), “International Branding,” in *Brands: The New Wealth Creators*, Susannah Hart and John Murphy, eds. London: Palgrave, 123–34.
- Tropp, Linda R. and Amy C. Brown (2004), “What Benefits the Group Can Also Benefit the Individual: Group-Enhancing and Individual-Enhancing Motives for Collective Action,” *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 7 (3), 267–82.
- Turner, John C. (1982), “Towards a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group,” in *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Henri Tajfel, ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 15–40.
- Upadhyay, Yogesh and S.K. Singh (2006), “Preference for Domestic Goods: A Study of Consumer Ethnocentrism,” *Journal of Business Perspective*, 10 (3), 59–68.
- Van Hear, Nicholas (1998), *New Diasporas: The Mass Exodus, Dispersal and Regrouping of Migrant Communities*. London: University College London Press.
- Vida, Irena and James Reardon (2008), “Domestic Consumption: Rational, Affective or Normative Choice?” *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25 (1), 34–44.
- Wall, Marjorie and Louise A. Heslop (1986), “Consumer Attitudes Towards the Quality of Domestic and Imported Apparel and Footwear,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14 (2), 27–36.
- Wang, Cheng Lu and Zhen Xiong Chen (2004), “Consumer Ethnocentrism and Willingness to Buy Domestic Products in a Developing Country Setting: Testing Moderating Effects,” *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21 (6), 391–400.
- Watchravesringkan, Kittichai Tu (2011), “Exploring Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Ethnocentrism: Evidence from Asian Immigrants in the US,” *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 35 (4), 383–90.
- Westjohn, Stanford A., Nitish Singh, and Peter Magnusson (2012), “Responsiveness to Global and Local Consumer Culture Positioning: A Personality and Collective Identity Perspective,” *Journal of International Marketing*, 20 (1), 58–73.
- Zolfagharian, Mohammad Ali, Roberto Saldivar, and Qin Sun (2014), “Ethnocentrism and Country of Origin Effects Among Immigrant Consumers,” *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 31 (1), 68–84.
- and Qin Sun (2010), “Country of Origin, Ethnocentrism and Bicultural Consumers: The Case of Mexican Americans,” *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 27 (4), 345–57.

Copyright of Journal of International Marketing is the property of American Marketing Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.