

*Full length Research Paper*

# Exploring the Moderating Effect of Consumers Animosity and Ethnocentrism on process of Accepting Foreign Products among Islamic Countries

Amir Abass Kaeni<sup>1\*</sup>

Department of business management, science and research branch, Islamic Azad University

## **Abstract:**

This study aims to explore the effective factors in accepting foreign products in two Islamic countries, using ethnocentrism and animosity as the moderating variables. This study uses survey approach with descriptive methods. The survey conducted via an online website and interview. In Iran, 548 and in Turkey 225 respondents were selected who were all over-18. To analyze data, structural equation models including confirmatory factor analysis and path analysis were used, interpreted by AMOS software. The results showed that effective factors in accepting foreign products in different countries are different. In Iran, country- of-origin image toward Korea had more importance in evaluating foreign products than Turkey. Also, ethnocentrism was a moderating factor between country- of-origin image and attitudes toward foreign products. This shows that separate actions should be done for identifying effective factors and strategies for encouraging consumers to buy foreign products in both countries. In this way, regarding country-of-origin image, marketers can indirectly increase shopping intention among Iranian buyers.

**Key words:** country-of-origin image, ethnocentrism, consumers' animosity

---

Corresponding Email Address: [a.kaeni@gmail.com](mailto:a.kaeni@gmail.com)

## ***Introduction:***

Success of each business depends on purchasing its products by the customers. Accessing global markets has increased the number of potential buyers from local to international levels. In developed countries, industrial units search for new markets overseas since their own markets have been saturated for high competition and diversity of the products. Internet spread allows internal and external consumers to access more services/products through Internet shopping (Pharr, 2005). One main duty of marketing managers is the exact evaluation of consumer perception about their receptivity for the products in arrival time to the market. Consumer purchase process includes consumer evaluation, consumer attitudes toward products, intention to buy, and actual buying (Carter, 2009). According to the knowledge of this paper's authors, there are three studies related to conceptual framework of this study. Samiee (1994), Janda and Rao (1997) focused on a specific stage of purchasing behaviors to represent a comprehensive framework for showing purchasing behaviors of foreign products in the customers. In 2009, Carter also cited these variables: country-of-origin image, consumer ethnocentrism, consumer animosity, product evaluation, and attitude towards foreign product, product price, specific product attributes, brand image, intention to buy, and perceived responsibility of helping to show the relationship between effective factors in purchasing foreign products. Accordingly, this study aims to explore the relationship between main variables including country-of-origin image, consumer ethnocentrism, and consumer animosity toward foreign products on their purchasing behaviors. This study is conducted in Iran and Turkey regarding Korean products as a foreign country. It also examines the effect of consumer animosity and ethnocentrism on country-of-origin image.

## ***Literature review:***

### ***Beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors formation***

Attitude is a tendency or readiness for desirable or undesirable response to people, concepts, or things. It is abstract, revealing itself in the behaviors. Attitude is a feeling about something. It shows our love or apathy to an object. Attitude is a conscious tendency to a behavior with a desirable or undesirable pattern for an object. In fact, based on Bagozzi et al. (1989), many people assume attitude as a measurement tool. It seems to be related to individual intentions which can predict human behaviors. According to *Theory of Moral Reasoning and Competency*, not only one's attitude toward a thing affects his intention, but also, one's perception from his reference group such as intellectual norms will matter (Matos & Ituassu Rossi, 2007). Since attitudes can't be directly observed, researchers should rely on identifying consumers' attitudes via measurements and researches. Attitudes and their relation with shopping intention have important effects on promotion strategy. The way the companies promote a business brand depends on the shopping process which target market uses for purchasing goods. Beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors can be formed indirectly through effects' hierarchy to control shopping

processes, executed hierarchially. Studying beliefs and attitudes and their relation with shopping behavior has important impacts on their promotion. The ways the companies improve a brand depend on the shopping processes which a target market uses for goods' shopping.

### ***Forecasting consumer attitudes via multi-attribute models***

Multi-attribute models show how consumers combine their beliefs about product features to explain the attitudes about replacing a brand, firms, or other things in high mental involvement situation. Different multi-attribute models exist. In 1975, Fishbein and Ajzen were the first who suggested that total attitude of a person to a phenomenon is formed by the frequency and strength of a person's belief in it, known as "Attitude-toward-the-Object Model". They classified salient beliefs, self-belief power, and good/bad evaluation of those beliefs. Studying *Belief Outputs* and *One-Dimensional Attitude Theory*, Lutz (1981) introduced beliefs as an important factor in forming attitudes and behavioral intentions of consumers. From the view of consumers' behavior, behavior results from the formation of specific intentions for actions. This theory was later named Behavioral Intentions Model or Theory of Reasoned Action. According to these models, 4 purchasing stages are explainable including, product evaluation, consumer attitude towards the product, intention to buy, and actual buying. This study will analyze consumer perception about foreign goods imported to a country or produced in it.

### ***Ethnocentrism and animosity to foreign products***

Ethnocentrism was first defined by Samner (1906) in the form of a common tendency in people to consider their group as the center of the world, interpreting other social units from their own group's view, and not accepting culturally different people with themselves; since, people naturally welcome the others who have cultural similarity with them. Thus, ethnic or national symbols and values of every person turn into high goals while others' symbols get humiliating. Every group is proud of its honors and supposes its superiority to the others. Shimp and Sharma (1987) offered measurement index of ethnocentrism which has been gauged and considered as reference in many studies. Ethnocentrism and animosity of consumers have been regarded as two factors in understanding consumers' behaviors in purchasing foreign products (Klein, Ettenson & Morris, 1998).

Ethnocentrism may show up itself significantly among consumers of wealthy countries. They assume that products made in developed countries have superiority to the products made in poor countries. This effect may develop into poorer countries. They may prefer the goods made in rich countries to their own nations' products. From the other hand, this doesn't mean that the consumers of rich countries don't want to buy any goods from poor countries. However, it seems that consumers prefer goods coordinated with their imagination from the producer country. International animosity refers to consumers' hatred toward a foreign country for its past or

present political, economic, or martial actions, affecting shopping intention of the consumers negatively (Klein, Ettenson & Morris, 1998). In the recent decade, consumer's animosity has created much attention in marketing literature as an introduction to shopping foreign products (Riefler & Diamontopoulos, 2007). Klein et al. (1998) were the first who related countries' conflicts to shopping behaviors of the consumers that in its conceptual form is the residuals of hostility related to past or present martial, political, or economic events. Animosity is a common debate in Islamic countries. Undoubtedly, there is a secret in global markets - increasing growth of Islamic economy's power, attempted to be concealed. Studies show that animosity is a determinant in purchasing intention of foreign products. Unlike ethnocentrism which evaluates consumers' beliefs in foreign products, animosity deals with his attitudes toward specific countries (Klein & Ettenson, 1999).

Researches on foreign products' reception are divided into 3 categories: 1. specific product group, 2. multiple group, and 3. all specific products of a country. The studies of first group deal with selecting a product group which is identified by a pretest. It examines the potential correlation between product type and the effects of the country-of-origin image. Papadopoulos and Heslop (1993) found that consumers select a product group such as automobile, PC, video, camera, and etc.

Studies of second group focus on several product groups the most common of which are automobiles, electronics, shoes, and clothes.

focused on the country of origins, studies of third group assess product evaluations in one or some countries. These researches focus on country-of-origin image compared with evaluating specific features of products. In 1998, Klein et al examined consumer ethnocentrism and animosity in purchasing intention of foreign products.

### ***Country-of-origin image***

Increasing the information about a product accessed by the consumers decreases the salience of country-of-origin image higher than the times consumers' information is low. This issue is not deniable while debating over consumer behaviors and it has devoted a rich literature to itself. In recent 40 years, over 300 papers have been published in this field (Nebenzahl et al., 2003).

Reviewing the literature, studies in this field are divided into 4 groups:

1. Single-cue studies
2. Progression to multi-cue studies
3. Hybrid/ Binational products
4. Globalization (Borderless world)

### ***Single-cue studies***

In single-cue studies, a cue is given to the respondent which is country-of-origin image used as an independent variable. Such studies were conducted in 1960s and 1970s. Early studies in this

field identified the concept and directed it toward consumer evaluations. Based on Table 2, two researchers divided 263 students randomly into 6 groups regarding the principal of single-cue studies. Each group was given 2 mugs one with made-in-America label and the other with made-in-Japan label while both were made at the same domestic factory. They found that many American consumers show bias against Japanese products for their origin. For overestimation of country-of-origin image and overemphasizing its role in shopping process, such studies were questioned and gave way to multi-cue studies (Table 1).

**Table1. Studies on country-of-origin image**

| <b>N</b> | <b>Author/Year</b>  | <b>Study type</b> | <b>Description</b>   |
|----------|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1        | (Schooler and Wildt, 1968)  | Single -cue       | <b>Firths Period</b> |
| 2        | (Schooler and sunoo, 1969; Schoor 1971; Gaedeke, 1973)              | multi-cue         | <b>Second Period</b> |
| 3        | (Ahmed and D' Astous, 1996 D' Astous & Ahmed, 1992; Ettenson, 1993) | Multi National    | <b>Third Period</b>  |
| 4        | (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999; Samiee et al, 2005)                     | Globalization     | <b>Fourth Period</b> |

***Progression to multi-cue studies***

Reviewing 25 experimental studies about country-of-origin image's effect on buyers' evaluation from 1965-1979, Bilkey and Nes (1982) found that only 28% of the studies are multi-cue type; Yoo (1998) did a similar work on 80 published paper from 1980-1991, 59 of which were multi-cues. This trend showed progression to multi-cue studies which were observable and objective and participants used real products in them (Table 2), or they were asked about awareness toward country-of-origin of the product they were buying in shopping centers. Using intangible cues, some researchers attached the picture of the products to the questionnaires as a visual cue during questionnaire distribution.

**Table2. Used cues in second study period of country–of-origin**

| <b>N</b> | <b>Author/Year</b>  | <b>Study type</b> | <b>Description</b>   |
|----------|---|-------------------|--|
| 1        | (Nes, 1981; Eroglu and Machlert, 1989; Davis Kern and Heslop, 1991; Tse and Gorn, 1993) | multi-cue         | <b>Tangible cues, observable and objective product usage by consumers</b>                |
| 2        | (Hester and Yuen, 1987)   | multi-cue         | <b>Tangible cues, asking consumers while seeing products in the location</b>             |
| 3        | (Brown.Light, and Gazda 1987; Landek, 1988; Magee and Spiro, 1991)                      | multi-cue         | <b>intangible cues, using picture for showing to consumers</b>                           |
| 4        | (Crawford, 1982)  | multi-cue         | <b>Economic development level and political freedom degree</b>                           |
| 5        | (Wang and Lamb, 1980; Crawford and Lamb, 1981; Wang and Lamb. 1983)                     | multi-cue         | <b>Economic and political environment</b>  |
| 6        | (Johansson and Nebenzahl, 1986; Ettenson et al., 1984; Chao, 1993; Tes and Gorn, 1993). | multi-cue         | <b>brand</b>   |
| 7        | (Papadopoulos et al., 1987).  | multi-cue         | <b>Emotional, cognitive, and behavioral segments of attitude toward foreign products</b> |
| 8        | (Ettenson et al. 1988)  | multi-cue         | <b>Quality &amp; price</b>   |
| 9        | (Thorelli et al, 1989)  | multi-cue         | <b>Countries, products guaranty, retailers image</b>                                     |
| 10       | (Khachaturian and Morganosky, 1990; Witt, 1990)   | multi-cue         | <b>Brand type and store</b>  |
| 11       | (Cordel, 1991)  | multi-cue         | <b>Price and financial risk</b>  |

|    |                                  |           |   |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------|---|
| 12 | (Stoltman, Lim and Morgan, 1991) | multi-cue | <b>Familiarity with product and ethnocentrism</b> |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------|---|

Source: Yoo (1998)

### ***Hybrid/ Binational products***

In this period, overseas products' manufacturing was considered for saving costs and being economical which paved the way for assembling or producing goods across the world. Complexity of identifying country-of-origin gave birth to the concept of multi-national products. Multi-dimensional perspective formed about effective factors in country-of-origin including, manufacture location, assembly location, design location, and part provision location. In this period, the necessity of a special look at country-of-origin of brand and its role in decision-making of the consumers gained importance.

### ***Globalization***

In this period, the researchers questioned the importance of country-of-origin of the products, replacing it with country-of-origin of the brand; because in globalization era, the latter is more significant than the former. The question here is about the correctness of understanding of previous researchers about country-of-origin. In globalization era, country-of-origin of the brand refers to the information about positive attributes of a brand, created in consumers' minds over times, affecting product selection behaviors by the consumers (Phau and Prender Gast, 2000). According to Aaker (1996), if the consumer trusts a brand's quality, he/she will always retain its image with primary form. Today's consumers are well-aware that a reliable brand is rarely produced in the country-of-origin. For example brand *Nike* which belongs to America originally is produced across the world now. So, a luxurious successful brand can utilize its own value rather than its country-of-origin to promote the country-of-origin of the brand.

### ***Hypotheses:***

According to literature review, 3 first stages of consumer purchasing include product evaluation, attitude to the product, and intention to buy. Product evaluation and intention to buy are correlated with mediation of attitude to the product (Carter, 2009). Formation of attitude in general with beliefs about a product (Erickson, Johansson and Chao, 1984) and positive relation of product evaluation and shopping intention have been examined in previous works (Orbaiz& Papadopoulos, 2003). Other studies have regarded attitude towards foreign products as an independent variable, probing its effects on shopping intention or real shopping behavior (Balabanis et al., 2001).

According to mentioned points, three hypotheses can be stated in the following forms:

*H1. Evaluating foreign products has a direct relation with consumer attitude towards them.*

*H2. Evaluating foreign products has a direct relation with intention to buy of them.*

*H3. Attitude towards foreign product has a direct relation with intention to buy of them.*

Several studies have examined country-of-origin image, the direct effect of product evaluation and attitude towards foreign products. Bilkey and Nes (1982) reviewed country-of-origin literature, finding that consumer perception is impressed by country-of-origin image. Some researchers suggested that country-of-origin image indirectly affects intention to buy through variables such as product evaluation, brand image, brand value, and perceived value (Parameswaran & Pisharodi, 2002).

According to mentioned points, the following hypotheses are posed:

*H4. Country-of-origin image has a direct relation with foreign product evaluation.*

*H5. Country-of-origin image has a direct relation with attitude towards foreign products.*

Consumer ethnocentrism returns to his beliefs, implying that purchasing foreign products leads to decreasing domestic employment and economic damage (Shimp & Sharma, 1987). Thus, consumer ethnocentrism has an adverse effect on evaluating foreign products by the consumer (Shimp & Sharma, 1987). Some studies have suggested that ethnocentrism is an introduction to evaluating country-of-origin (Samiee, 1994). Thus; increasing ethnocentrism index in a country enhances the importance of country-of-origin information for consumers. This factor increases the effects of consumer acceptance determinants about foreign products. Accordingly, the following hypotheses can be posed:

*H6. Increasing consumer ethnocentrism enhances the relationship of evaluating foreign products and intention to buy of them.*

*H7. Increasing consumer ethnocentrism enhances the relationship of evaluating foreign products and attitudes towards foreign products.*

*H8. Increasing consumer ethnocentrism enhances the relationship of attitudes towards foreign products and intention to buy of them.*

*H9. Increasing consumer ethnocentrism enhances the relationship of attitudes towards foreign products and country-of-origin image.*

Many studies have targeted Japan as a context for studying animosity. For example, Klein (1998) studied and measured animosity of Chinese consumers from military and economic views towards Japan. They concluded that although ethnocentrism has a direct effect on consumer evaluation and shopping intention, animosity only impacts shopping intention.

In 1988, Klein et al offered consumer animosity model in shopping foreign products in china. Despite Shimp and Sharma's study which measured consumer ethnocentrism, animosity model examined the adverse effect on shopping hostile country's products. This issue was examined independent from consumers' judgment about products' quality. Using convenience sampling method, 224 Chinese consumers were selected and 6 durable product groups including TV, radio, camera, refrigerator, stereo, and video were examined. Using structural equation models, the effect of animosity on the process of shopping was shown which was much higher than ethnocentrism (Klein et al., 1998).

Most studies on animosity are conducted at national level. Only Jung (2002) and Ang et al. (2004) have probed it in personal level. Most studies with war's centrism are ranked among permanent animosity, based on historical events of *World War II* (Klein et al., 1998; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004) or *Internal American War* in 19th century (Shimp et al., 2004). Also, the studies dealing with animosity from economic aspect are ranked in situational animosity group.

From the other hand, situational animosity which explores semi-military events affecting consumers' shopping intention is gaining much attention. Internal war in old Yugoslavia between Croats and Bosnians is another theme in this regard (Cicic et al, 2005; Kesic et al, 2005). Bahai and Pisani (2009) measured animosity index among Iranian consumers in America. Because, from one hand, both countries have had a long-term crisis in their relations and from the other hand, both of them accuse the other side to having nuclear weapons and supporting terrorism. 900 questionnaires were distributed in Tehran and Isfahan in main geographic locations in 3 months by which ethnocentrism and animosity indices were measured. Using a standard ethnocentrism and animosity questionnaires, the means of 49.28 and 35.16 were reported, respectively.

Funk et al. (2010) examined consumer animosity and its effects on shopping intention of international goods. This study used animosity model of Klein et al. (1998) to examine American consumers' apathy toward transferring Toyota production-line from Canada to either Iran or India. Confirming all hypotheses, American consumers' animosity toward Iran, India, and Canada were ranked.

Aiming to show the importance of sub-cultural attitudes for evaluating animosity of a nation against foreign products, Rose et al. (2009) examined American consumers' animosity toward foreign products, used by Jewish and Arabic citizens of Palestine. In this research, Second Intifada was used as a starting point for animosity feeling. Using convenience sampling method,

123 consumers were selected in purchasing centers of north Palestine from middle class. England and Italy were appointed as the countries of origin. Findings showed that animosity and ethnocentrism both decrease shopping intention of foreign products. Also, Arab citizens of Palestine showed more animosity toward English products compared to Jewish (Rose et al., 2009).

In another study, Carter (2009) examined the role of animosity in the animosity to the country-of-origin and ethnocentrism in America. After pretesting questionnaires among 103 consumers selected by Internet, the questionnaires were distributed among 900 Americans to evaluate their ideas about animosity, ethnocentrism, and product evaluation, the country-of-origin, shopping intention, and attitudes toward product in China, Japan, and South Korea. Using structural equation model, the variables of foreign products' acceptability by the consumers were identified, measuring their good fitness. Generally, analyzing consumer perceptions in a specific group, more focus was centered on analyzing consumer selection and developing managerial applications. But, many researchers agree that focus on dependent variables of the countries and their effects on the products of a country can be generalized into product groups of that country (Carter, 2009).

Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007) found that in most studies economic factors have been the first tension reasons compared to war factors by the researchers. The second reason was evaluating economic conflicts on buyers' behaviors rather than military disagreements; and the third reason was economic invasions among countries with similar reasons compared to military conflicts with historical reasons. In other words, unfair business with a country or distrust of business partners to each other or economic dominance of one country to another may lead to economic animosity. While military animosity has the factors which can't be generalized to other countries.

Animosity is an important variable that should be regarded in evaluating foreign products by the consumers (Nijseen & Dauglas, 2004). Then, different levels of ethnocentrism and animosity have direct effect on shopping behaviors. So the following hypotheses can be stated:

*H10. Increasing consumer animosity enhances the relationship of evaluating foreign products and country-of-origin-image.*

*H11. Increasing animosity enhances the relationship of attitude toward foreign products and country-of-origin-image.*

*H12. Increasing animosity enhances the relationship of evaluating foreign products and attitude toward foreign products.*

*H13. Increasing animosity enhances the relationship of evaluating foreign products and shopping intention of them.*

*H14. Increasing animosity enhances the relationship of attitude toward foreign products and shopping intention of them.*

*H15. Increasing animosity of the consumers enhances their ethnocentrism.*

## **Methodology**

This study uses survey approach with descriptive methods. It is cross-sectional with applied goals since its results can be used in the market. To gather data, field and library methods were used. In field method, a questionnaire was used whose validity and reliability were tested in previous studies. Meanwhile, its validity and reliability were gauged in this study as well. To test its validity, content validity and construct validity, and to test its reliability, internal consistency reliability and test-retest reliability were utilized. When a researcher uses a method with a number of independent variables or items which measures an attribute or phenomenon it should make sure about consistency of them. To measure internal consistency reliability, Chronbach Alpha coefficient and convergent and divergent reliability were used.

At the moment, 57 countries are the members of Islamic conference organization that makes 22.9% of the world's population. The whole Islamic world's population exceeds 1,571,198,000. On July 2000, a group called D8 including 8 powerful countries was founded by Turkey pioneering for that. This study selected Iran, Malaysia, Nigeria, and Turkey because all of them import Korean goods to their countries. Statistical population of the study included all over 18 Iranians and Turkish citizens since they have necessary independence in selecting and buying foreign products. This study compares the results of Turkey and Iran.

Selecting South Korea as the country of origin had two reasons: 1. South Korea is one of 10 top importers to Iran; and 2. Due to the high import rate of South Korea to other countries, consumers have higher perceptions toward these products. In this study, 6 variables of product evaluation, shopping intention, attitude toward products, country-of-origin image, ethnocentrism, and consumer animosity were examined.

*Product evaluation*-To assess foreign products, evaluation index of Klein et al. (1998) was used. It consists of 6 variables, 5 of which were taken from the study of Darling and Arnold (1988). A 7-point Likert scale from 1(very disagreed) to 7(very agreed) was also used.

*Shopping intention*- Shopping intention index includes 6 variables, using a 7-point Likert scale from 1(very disagreed) to 7(very agreed) from Klein (1998). Klein adopted one from these 6 variables from Darling and Wood (1990).

*Attitude toward products*-This index includes different boundary or dipoles for total measurement of the products. There are different copies of this index which measure attitude toward products in general rather than specific form. According to Bruner and Hensel (1998), summing up researches in this field, 41 bipolar adjectives were resulted in one word or short terms. But, the maximum usage rate belongs to the adjectives: good/bad, pleasant/unpleasant, desirable/undesirable, and positive/negative. There is no basic research in this regard. Instead, their replication frequency in different works is our measure.

*Country-of-origin image*- Many researchers suggested the index of country-of-origin image to have 3 compartments (Papadopoulos et al., 1989; Parameswaran & Pisharodi, 1994; Laroche et al., 2005):

-*Cognitive*. Consumer beliefs about industrial, technologic, and political records of a country

-*Affective*. Describing emotional values and symbols of the country-of-origin from consumers' view

-*Conative*. Consumer willingness to interact with the country-of-origin (Roth, 2006)

To measure this index, the study of Papadopoulos et al., (1988) was used. It includes 9 variables, marked through semantic differential with 7 continuums.

It includes 3 dimensions of beliefs about a country, feeling to the citizens, and interest in interaction with the country.

Laroche et al. (2005) regard beliefs about a country as the consumers' ideas about industrial and technologic advances of that country. They define feeling to the citizens as the response based on emotions of consumers to the country. They also identify interest in interaction with the country as a reflection of consumers' tendency in making close contacts with the target country.

*Consumer ethnocentrism*-This factor includes 17 items namely CETSCALE, using a 7-point Likert scale from 1(very disagreed) to 7(very agreed). Shimp and Sharma (1987) were the first who measured consumer ethnocentrism rate. Studying in Detroit, Denver, LA, and Carolina they introduced 17 variables.

*Consumer animosity*-According to Klein et al. (1998), animosity can be examined from 3 aspects:

1. General animosity, revealing total hatred to a country measured by one variable
2. Military animosity, revealing a military conflict in the past or present, measured by 3 variables.
3. Economic animosity, revealing economic conflicts between two countries, measured by 5 variables.

Since consumer countries in this study didn't have military conflicts with South Korea, economic animosity was adopted as animosity measurement index of consumers. To analyze data, structural equation models were used. Research hypotheses were tested once for Iran and once for Turkey and their results were compared.

**Validity and reliability**

To identify validity and reliability, first Chronbach Alpha of each variable was calculated. All variables had coefficient values over 0.7. Using good fitness index and the results from measurement model, convergent and divergent validity of the variables were calculated. Composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE) were calculated for all variables. They measured and confirmed high convergent validity of the study. AVE measures achieved variances by indices in relation with measurement errors and should exceed 0.50. Average variance shared (AVS) between each construct and its index should be more than shared variance between one construct and other constructs. If values of CR and AVE are larger than 0.60 and 0.50 respectively, they will be acceptable.

The results of testing CR and AVE are shown in Table 2 and 3. Based on the achieved values, all variables have acceptable quantities. Although some variables have AVE values smaller than 0.05, the model has convergent validity; because measurement error of all variables is under 0.05 and significant. Moreover, main criterion in identifying convergent validity is high factor load. Since CR of variables is larger than 0.6, their internal reliability is accepted (Janz & Prasarnphanich, 2003).

Discriminant validity of research tools was confirmed, using correlation values of variable indices in covariance matrix of AMOS software.

To measure constructs divergence, if average extracted variance of each construct becomes above correlation square of that construct with others, the divergent reliability will result.

**Table2. Factor load of the variables in Iran**

| <b>Factors</b>                | <b>Observer Variables</b> | <b>Factor Loading</b> | <b>C.R</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>CR</b> | <b>AVE</b> | <b><math>\alpha</math></b> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Consumer ethnocentrism</i> | <i>Item4</i>              | .717                  | 11.069     | 548      | .90       | .43        | .91                        |
|                               | Item5                     | .775                  | 12.720     | 548      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item6                     | .796                  | 11.402     | 548      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item7                     | .795                  | 11.341     | 548      |           |            |                            |

|                           |        |      |        |     |      |      |     |
|---------------------------|--------|------|--------|-----|------|------|-----|
|                           | Item9  | .676 | 10.521 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item10 | .735 | 11.243 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item11 | .548 | 9.486  | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item13 | .565 | 9.750  | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item16 | .559 | 9.567  | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item17 | .601 | 9.992  | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item2  | .533 | 11.336 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item3  | .502 | 12.543 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item12 | .640 | 10.521 | 548 |      |      |     |
| <i>Consumer animosity</i> | Item2  | .857 | 13.643 | 548 | 0.84 | .64  | .71 |
|                           | Item5  | .766 | 13.210 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item1  | .792 | 10.640 | 548 |      |      |     |
| COO                       | Item1  | .641 | 14.431 | 548 | 0.88 | 0.44 | .88 |
|                           | Item2  | .704 | 15.545 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item3  | .738 | 14.208 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item4  | .681 | 13.033 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item5  | .653 | 12.638 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item6  | .568 | 11.168 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item7  | .691 | 13.106 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item8  | .721 | 13.744 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                           | Item9  | .579 | 11.339 | 548 |      |      |     |
| <i>Product evaluation</i> | Item1  | .792 | 17.325 | 548 | 0.88 | 0.59 | .85 |
|                           | Item3  | .751 | 18.367 | 548 |      |      |     |

|                                 |       |      |        |     |      |      |     |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|--------|-----|------|------|-----|
|                                 | Item4 | .806 | 19.947 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item5 | .812 | 20.316 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item6 | .694 | 16.658 | 548 |      |      |     |
| <i>Attitude toward products</i> | Item1 | .873 | 31.421 | 548 | 0.95 | 0.82 | .94 |
|                                 | Item2 | .919 | 32.203 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item3 | .934 | 32.632 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item4 | .910 | 30.784 | 548 |      |      |     |
| <i>Shopping intention</i>       | Item2 | .612 | 13.654 | 548 | 0.84 | 0.58 | .79 |
|                                 | Item3 | .737 | 13.652 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item4 | .850 | 14.732 | 548 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item5 | .832 | 14.628 | 548 |      |      |     |

**Table 5. Divergent reliability of measurement model of Iran**

|  | <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b>   | <b>3</b>   | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   | <b>6</b>   |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>animosity</b>                         | <b>.80</b> |            |            |            |            |            |
| <b>ethnocentrism</b>                     | .106       | <b>.65</b> |            |            |            |            |
| <b>Attitudes toward foreign products</b> | -.113      | -.204      | <b>.90</b> |            |            |            |
| <b>Product evaluation</b>                | .068       | -.115      | .709       | <b>.76</b> |            |            |
| <b>Purchase intention</b>                | .244       | .325       | -.500      | -.406      | <b>.76</b> |            |
| <b>Country-of –origin image</b>          | -.082      | -.030      | .548       | .576       | -.493      | <b>.66</b> |

**Table3. Factor load of the variables in Turkey**

| <b>Factors</b>                | <b>Observer Variables</b> | <b>Factor Loading</b> | <b>C.R</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>CR</b> | <b>AVE</b> | <b><math>\alpha</math></b> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Consumer ethnocentrism</i> | <i>Item4</i>              | .745                  | 10.827     | 225      | 0.94      | 0.53       | .94                        |
|                               | Item5                     | .755                  | 10.219     | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item6                     | .834                  | 7.678      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item7                     | .812                  | 7.047      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item9                     | .792                  | 7.320      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item10                    | .624                  | 8.008      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item11                    | .791                  | 7.740      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item13                    | .785                  | 7.408      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item16                    | .813                  | 9.287      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item17                    | .583                  | 7.577      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item2                     | .647                  | 9.719      | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item3                     | .826                  | 10.431     | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item12                    | .505                  | 10.927     | 225      |           |            |                            |
| <i>Consumer animosity</i>     | Item2                     | .615                  | 9.322      | 225      | 0.64      | 0.49       | .75                        |
|                               | Item5                     | .812                  | 10.885     | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item1                     | .686                  | 10.120     | 225      |           |            |                            |
| COO                           | Item1                     | .800                  | 8.628      | 225      | 0.89      | 0.50       | .89                        |
|                               | Item2                     | .610                  | 10.928     | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item3                     | .658                  | 11.601     | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item4                     | .529                  | 17.842     | 225      |           |            |                            |
|                               | Item5                     | .606                  | 16.822     | 225      |           |            |                            |

|                                 |       |      |        |     |      |      |     |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|--------|-----|------|------|-----|
|                                 | Item6 | .747 | 13.452 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item7 | .627 | 13.085 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item8 | .687 | 12.649 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item9 | .838 | 12.236 | 225 |      |      |     |
| <i>Product evaluation</i>       | Item1 | .776 | 11.384 | 225 | 0.84 | 0.53 | .83 |
|                                 | Item3 | .728 | 12.280 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item4 | .753 | 12.136 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item5 | .651 | 12.509 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item6 | .761 | 11.784 | 225 |      |      |     |
| <i>Attitude toward products</i> | Item1 | .840 | 13.821 | 225 | 0.92 | 0.80 | .79 |
|                                 | Item2 | .620 | 12.791 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item3 | .858 | 7.822  | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item4 | .943 | 7.688  | 225 |      |      |     |
| <i>Shopping intention</i>       | Item2 | .883 | 7.499  | 225 | 0.91 | 0.71 | .88 |
|                                 | Item3 | .845 | 9.321  | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item4 | .802 | 11.522 | 225 |      |      |     |
|                                 | Item5 | .875 | 10.437 | 225 |      |      |     |

**Table6. Divergent reliability of measurement model of Turkey**

|                      | 1          | 2          | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------------------|------------|------------|---|---|---|---|
| <b>animosity</b>     | <b>.70</b> |            |   |   |   |   |
| <b>ethnocentrism</b> | .253       | <b>.72</b> |   |   |   |   |

|  |       |       |            |            |                  |
|--|-------|-------|------------|------------|------------------|
| <b>Attitudes toward foreign products</b> | -.289 | -.141 | <b>.89</b> |            |                  |
| <b>Product evaluation</b>                | -.349 | -.074 | .703       | <b>.72</b> |                  |
| <b>Purchase intention</b>                | .238  | .317  | -.608      | -.473      | <b>.83</b>       |
| <b>Country-of –origin image</b>          | -.125 | -.247 | .655       | .438       | -.520 <b>.70</b> |

### ***Results:***

Confirming research validity and reliability, the following results were achieved:

According to conceptual model of Figure1, In Iran and due to the significance of the test results for evaluating foreign products and attitude toward foreign products which was 1.96 and  $p < 0.0001$ , H0 is rejected and H1 is confirmed with the coefficient of 0.59. This hypothesis was tested in Turkey. With the  $t$  value of 8.138, evaluation affects attitudes with the coefficient of 0.54. Thus, evaluation forecasts attitudes. This result consists with previous studies (Carter, 2009). Due to the insignificance of  $t$ -test for H2, H0 can't be rejected for the direct relationship between evaluation and shopping intention in Iran and Turkey.

Due to the negative  $t$ -test value for H3, H0 can't be rejected and evaluation adversely impacts shopping intention of foreign products.

Due to the significance of  $t$ -test result (10.041) for H4 in Iran, H0 is rejected. Thus, country-of-origin can identify 0.57 of effects on product evaluation. In Turkey, due to the significant value for  $t$ -test of H4, H0 is rejected. Thus, country-of-origin can identify 0.42 of effect on product evaluation. As seen from the results; country-of-origin has higher effect on product evaluation in Iran compared with Turkey.

Due to the significance of  $t$ -test result (4.142) for H5 in Iran, H0 is rejected. Thus, country-of-origin can identify 0.20 of effects on attitudes. In Turkey, country-of-origin can identify 0.43 of effect on attitudes. This result was confirmed by Bilkey and Nes (1982).

About the effect of animosity on ethnocentrism of Turkish citizens, due to the significance of  $t$ -test result, H0 is rejected and H6 was confirmed. Therefore, animosity can identify 0.57 of effect on ethnocentrism. But, in Iran, this hypothesis was not confirmed for the low value of  $t$  statistics. So Iranians animosity toward foreign products doesn't impact on their ethnocentrism.

**Table7. The results of testing direct hypothesis in Iran**

| <b>Independent Variables</b>                                | <b>Dependent Variables</b>        | <b>C.R T-test</b> | <b>Effect coefficient</b> | <b>Confirmation or rejection</b> |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Product evaluation  | Attitudes toward foreign products | 11.574            | 0.586                     | <b>Supported</b>                 |
| Product evaluation  | Purchase intention                | -1.819            | -0.122                    | <b>rejected</b>                  |
| Attitudes toward foreign products                           | Purchase intention                | -6.085            | -0.418                    | <b>rejected</b>                  |
| Country-of – origin image                                   | Product evaluation                | 10.180            | 0.580                     | <b>Supported</b>                 |
| Country-of – origin image                                   | Attitudes toward foreign products | 4.421             | 0.213                     | <b>Supported</b>                 |
| animosity   | ethnocentrism                     | 1.989             | 0.101                     | <b>Supported</b>                 |
| <b>CMIN= 1804.780 ; DF= 645 ; CFI= 0.909 ; RMSEA= 0.057</b> |                                   |                   |                           |                                  |

**Table8. The results of testing direct hypothesis in Turkey**

| <b>Independent Variables</b>      | <b>Dependent Variables</b>        | <b>C.R T-test</b> | <b>Effect coefficient</b> | <b>Confirmation or rejection</b> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Product evaluation                | Attitudes toward foreign products | 8.126             | 0.546                     | <b>Supported</b>                 |
| Product evaluation                | Purchase intention                | 0.131             | 0.013                     | <b>rejected</b>                  |
| Attitudes toward foreign products | Purchase intention                | -6.210            | -0.630                    | <b>Supported</b>                 |

|   |                                      |       |       |                  |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|------------------|
| Country-of –<br>origin image                                | Product<br>evaluation                | 4.449 | 0.422 | <b>Supported</b> |
| Country-of –<br>origin image                                | Attitudes toward<br>foreign products | 5.093 | 0.427 | <b>Supported</b> |
| animosity   | ethnocentrism                        | 2.172 | 0.175 | <b>Supported</b> |
| <b>CMIN= 1264.766 ; DF= 645 ; CFI= 0.900 ; RMSEA= 0.062</b> |                                      |       |       |                  |

*1. Calculating the effects of moderating variable of animosity and ethnocentrism in Iran and Turkey*

To identify the moderating effect of animosity and ethnocentrism on shopping intention, mean of ethnocentrism is divided into lower and upper boundary by  $X^2$  test. If the result of  $t$ -test for path coefficient is significant, first the relationship between country-of-origin image and product evaluation is assumed to be free; then, it is supposed to be fixed and the model is exerted. Next, the difference of two models'  $X^2$  is achieved and if significant, the coefficients of two models are compared to identify moderating effect (Zhao & Cavusgil, 2006).

According to the mentioned approach, the moderating effect of consumer animosity on the relationship between country-of-origin image and product evaluation  $H_0$  is not confirmed for their insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Iran.

According to the significance of  $X^2$  results for moderating effect of animosity on the relationship between consumer attitudes and product evaluation in Iran, this hypothesis is confirmed. So, the relationship between consumer attitudes and product evaluation increases when consumers' animosity mediates between them. But, in Turkey, there is not such relation for the insignificance of  $X^2$ .

According to the insignificance of  $X^2$ , the moderating effect of consumer animosity on the relationship between consumer attitudes and product evaluation in Iran is not confirmed for their insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Turkey.

According to the insignificance of  $X^2$ , the moderating effect of consumer animosity on the relationship between consumer attitudes and shopping intention in Iran is not confirmed for their insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Turkey.

According to the insignificance of  $X^2$ , the moderating effect of ethnocentrism on the relationship between product evaluation and country-of-origin image in Iran is not confirmed for their

insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Turkey. So, citizens with high ethnocentrism have considered country-of-origin image as a strong predictor of product evaluation.

According to the insignificance of  $X^2$ , the moderating effect of ethnocentrism on the relationship between attitude and country-of-origin image in Iran is not confirmed for their insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Turkey. So, citizens with high ethnocentrism have considered country-of-origin image as a strong predictor of attitude toward foreign products.

According to the insignificance of  $X^2$ , the moderating effect of ethnocentrism on the relationship between attitude and product evaluation in Iran is not confirmed for their insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Turkey.

According to the insignificance of  $X^2$ , the moderating effect of ethnocentrism on the relationship between attitude and shopping intention in Iran is not confirmed for their insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Turkey.

According to the insignificance of  $X^2$ , the moderating effect of ethnocentrism on the relationship between product evaluation and shopping intention in Iran is not confirmed for their insignificant  $X^2$ . The same result holds true for Turkey. Thus, ethnocentrism is not a moderating factor in the relationship between product evaluation and shopping intention.

**Table 9a. Moderating effect of ethnocentrism and animosity among Turkish consumers**

| Independent variable              | Dependent variable                | Moderator variable | Path Coefficient | $X^2$ Different |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Country-of – origin image         | Product evaluation                | High ethnocentrism | 0.541**          | 0.412           |
|                                   |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.334**          |                 |
| Country-of – origin image         | Attitudes toward foreign products | High ethnocentrism | 0.464**          | 0.4             |
|                                   |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.363**          |                 |
| Product evaluation                | Attitudes toward foreign products | High ethnocentrism | 0.571**          | 1.1             |
|                                   |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.577**          |                 |
| Attitudes toward foreign products | Purchase intention                | High ethnocentrism | -0.733**         | 4.3             |
|                                   |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | -0.543**         |                 |

|  |                                   |                    |          |       |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------|-------|
| Product evaluation   | Purchase intention                | High ethnocentrism | 0.003    | 0.2   |
|  |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.029    |       |
| <b>CMIN= 649.504 ; DF= 390 ; CFI= 0.919 ; RMSEA= 0.055</b> |                                   |                    |          |       |
| Country-of – origin image                                  | Product evaluation                | High animosity     | 0.51**   | 0.123 |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | 0.318**  |       |
| Country-of – origin image                                  | Attitudes toward foreign products | High animosity     | 0.300**  | 3.8   |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | 0.416**  |       |
| Product evaluation   | Attitudes toward foreign products | High animosity     | 0.657**  | 0.31  |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | 0.575**  |       |
| Attitudes toward foreign products                          | Purchase intention                | High animosity     | -0.540** | 4.21  |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | -0.584** |       |
| Product evaluation   | Purchase intention                | High animosity     | -0.145** | 0.6   |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | 0.087    |       |

**CMIN= 679.182; DF= 388; CFI= 0.904; RMSEA= 0.058**

**Table 9b. Moderating effect of ethnocentrism and animosity among Iranian consumers**

| Independent variable      | Dependent variable                | Moderator variable | Path Coefficient | X <sup>2</sup> Different |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Country-of – origin image | Product evaluation                | High ethnocentrism | 0.726**          | 0.21                     |
|                           |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.455**          |                          |
| Country-of – origin image | Attitudes toward foreign products | High ethnocentrism | 0.420**          | 7.01                     |
|                           |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.102**          |                          |
| Product evaluation        | Attitudes toward foreign products | High ethnocentrism | 0.315**          | 6.612                    |
|                           |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.8.3**          |                          |

|  |                                   |                    |          |       |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------|-------|
| Attitudes toward foreign products                          | Purchase intention                | High ethnocentrism | -0.419** | 0.31  |
|  |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | -0.433** |       |
| Product evaluation   | Purchase intention                | High ethnocentrism | 0.133**  | 3.61  |
|  |                                   | Low ethnocentrism  | 0.033**  |       |
| <b>CMIN= 891.918 ; DF= 390 ; CFI= 0.937 ; RMSEA= 0.049</b> |                                   |                    |          |       |
| Country-of – origin image                                  | Product evaluation                | High animosity     | 0.598**  | 0.312 |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | 0.593**  |       |
| Country-of – origin image                                  | Attitudes toward foreign products | High animosity     | 0.060**  | 7.01  |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | 0.369**  |       |
| Product evaluation   | Attitudes toward foreign products | High animosity     | 0.697**  | 6.61  |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | 0.503**  |       |
| Attitudes toward foreign products                          | Purchase intention                | High animosity     | -0.454** | 0.23  |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | -0.361** |       |
| Product evaluation   | Purchase intention                | High animosity     | -0.105** | 3.61  |
|  |                                   | Low animosity      | -0.153** |       |
| <b>** p&lt;0.05</b>  |                                   |                    |          |       |
| <b>CMIN= 984.631 ; DF= 390 ; CFI= 0.927 ; RMSEA= 0.053</b> |                                   |                    |          |       |

### ***Conclusion:***

Due to the growth of international businesses and import/export of goods in the countries, the importance of examining effective factors in reception stages of foreign products by host country's consumers is growing. This study is an endeavor to examine effective factors in accepting Korean products among Iranian and Turkish consumers. In this paper, moderating effects of ethnocentrism and animosity on the relationship between country-of -origin image and product reception stages were examined. This is one of the few surveys in Islamic countries probing consumers 'animosity toward foreign products. This result revealed that country-of-

origin image of Korea has higher importance for Iranians than for Turkish consumers. Also, moderating effects of ethnocentrism on the relationship between country-of-origin image and attitude was proved in Iran while it had no such effect in Turkey. This confirms that increasing ethnocentrism in Iranians enhances the relationship between country-of-origin image and attitude toward foreign products. So, the higher ethnocentrism index in a country, the higher information importance about country-of-origin among consumers. This increases the effects of consumer reception determinants in foreign products. Consumer animosity toward a foreign country returns to past or present military, political, or economic events; increasing consumer animosity fortifies the relationships among product reception factors. This result is confirmed in the relationship between evaluating foreign products and attitudes towards them in Iranians. This result agrees with Klein et al. (1988). according to these findings, reception factors in different countries vary based on some situations and determinants. Since this study is cross-sectional, some further longitudinal surveys may be needed. Since ethnocentrism and animosity may directly affect on the product reception stages, further studies can concern it. In another finding, direct effect of consumer animosity towards foreign products on their ethnocentrism was significantly confirmed in both countries. Thus increasing animosity of consumers improves their ethnocentrism, decreasing products' reception in those countries. As a limitation, this study considered only Islamic countries. Thus, for probing higher external reliability, it should be examined in non-Islamic countries or decrease moderating factors such as religion with studying two countries with different religions. Another limitation was gathering information in Turkey by Internet while it was conducted personally and by Internet simultaneously.

## **References:**

- Bahaee, M. & Pisani, M. (2009), "The use of the consumer ethnocentrism and consumer animosity scales in Iran: A research note. *Thunderbid International Business Review*, Vol. 51, No. 2, Pp. 143-150.
- Balabanis, George, Adamantios Diamantopoulos, Rene Dentiste Mueller and T. C. Melewar(2001),"The Impact of Nationalism, Patriotism and Internationalism on consumer Ethnocentric Tendencies." *Journal of International business studies*, Vol.32, No.1, pp.157-175.
- Bilkey, Warren J. and Erik Nes (1982), "country of origin Effects on product Evaluations," *Journal of International Business studies*, Vol.13, No.1, pp.89-99.
- Bruner , Gorden C.II and Poul J. Hensel(1998), *Marketing Scales Handbook: A Compilation of Multi item Measures Volume II*. Chicago, American Marketing Association.
- Carter, Larry L. (2009), "Consumer receptivity of foreign product: the roles of country-of-origin image, consumer Ethnocentrism and animosity", Ph.D Thesis, Old Dominion University, USA.
- Erickson G. M., Johansson, J. K. and Chao, P.(1984), "Image variables in multi attitude product Evaluations: country-of-origin Effects." *Journal of consumer Research*, Vol. 11, September, pp.694-699.
- Fishbein, Martin and Icek Ajzen (1975), "Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to theory and Research." Reading, MA: Addison-wesley.
- Fornell, C., & F. Larcker, (1981). "Evaluating structural equation models with un-observable variables and measurement error". *J. Marketing Research*, Vol48, pp. 39-50.
- Funk, A. Charles., Arthurs, Jonathan D., Trevino, Len J. and Joirema Jeff (2010), "consumer animosity in the global value chain: the Effect of international production shifts on willingness to purchase hybrid products" *Journal of International Business studies*, No.41, pp.639-651.
- Janda, Swinder and C.P.Rao (1997), "The Effect of country of origin Related stereoTypes and personal Beliefs on product Evaluation." *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.14, No.7, pp.689-702.
- Janz, B., & Prasarnphanich, P. (2003). "Understanding the Antecedents of effective Knowledge Management: The importance of a Knowledge-centered Culture". *J. Decision Sciences*, Vol34, No 2, pp. 351- 385.
- Kesic, T., P. piri Rajh and G. Vlastic (2005), "The role of Nationalism in consumer ethnocentrism and the animosity in the post-war country", Paper presented at the 34<sup>th</sup> European Marketing Conference, May 24-27, Milan.

- Klein, jill G., Richard E.Ettenson. (1999), “consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism: an analysis of unique antecedents”. *Journal of International consumer Marketing*, Vol.11, No.4, pp. 5-24.
- Klein, jill G., Richard E.Ettenson and marlene D. Morris (1998), “The animosity model of foreign product purchase: an empirical test on the people’s Republic of China.” *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.62, No.1, pp.89-100.
- Lutz, R.J. (1981), “the Role of attitude theory in Marketing” in perspectives in consumer behavior, 3rd Ed. H. H. kassarjian and T. S. Robertson (Eds). Englewood cliffs, NJ: scott foresman: pp.233-250.
- Nebenzahl, Israel D., Eugene D.Jaffe and Jean-claude Usunier, 2003,” personifying country-of-origin Research. ”*Management International Review*, No.44, pp.383-406.
- Nijssen Edwin J. and Susan P. Douglas (2004), “Examining The Animosity Model in a country with a high level of foreign Trade” *International journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol.21, No.1, pp.23-38.
- Orbaiz, Luisa Villanueva and Nicolas Papadopoulos (2003), “Toward a Model of consumer receptivity of foreign and domestic products.” *Journal of International consumer Marketing*, Vol.15, No.3, pp.101-126.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas and Louise A. Heslop (1993), *Product country Image: Impact and Role in International Marketing*. New York, NY: International Press.
- Parameswaran, Ravi and Mohan R. Pisharodi (2002), “Assimilation Effects in country Image Research.” *International Marketing Review*, Vol.19, No. February/March, pp.259-278.
- Pharr, Julie M. (2005), “Synthesizing country-of-origin research from the last decade: is the concept still salient in an era of global brands?” *Journal of Marketing Theory and practice*, Vol.13, No.4, pp.34-45.
- Phau, Ian and Prendergast , Gerard. (2000), “Conceptualizing the Country of Origin of Brand” *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol.6, pp.159-170.
- Riefler, petra and Diamantopoulos, Adamantios. (2007), “consumer Animosity; a literature Review and a reconsideration of its measurement” *International Marketing Review*, Vol.24, No.1, pp.87-119.
- Rose, M., Rose, G and shoham, A. (2009), “The impact of consumer animosity on attitudes towards foreign goods: a study of Jewish and Arab Israelis” *Journal of consumer Marketing*, Vol.26, No.5, pp.339.

Roth, Katharina P.(2006), “The Impact of Consumer Ethnocentrism, Consumer Cosmopolitanism and National Identity on Country Image, Product Image and Consumers' purchase Intentions” EMAC Doctoral colloquium, university of vienna, Austria

Samiee, Saeed (1994),“Customer Evaluation of products in a Global Market” *journal of international Business studies*, Vol.25, No.3, pp.579-604.

Sharma, subhash, Terence A. Shimp and jeongshin shin (1995), “consumer Ethnocentrism: A test of Antecedents and Moderators.” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing science*, Vol.23, No.1, pp.26-31.

Shimp, Terence A. and subhash sharma (1987), “Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE.” *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.24, pp.280-289.

Yoo, Y. (1998). “Country of origin Effect: A Conceptualization and Test of Alternative Models of Attitudes Toward Foreign Countries and products”, PHD Thesis, university of south Carolina, USA.

Zhao, Y., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2006), “The effect of supplier's market orientation on manufacturer's trust”*Journal of Industrial Marketing Management*, 35, 405-414.