

# **Mapping the Influence of Country-of-Origin Knowledge, Consumer Ethnocentrism, and Perceived Risk on Consumer Action Against Foreign Products**

Consumers in Western markets are often called against foreign-made products and their country-of-origin (COO), particularly against controversial COOs and products. As a result, Asian emerging countries and their manufacturing industries (e.g., apparel, toys, or chemicals) have become major targets of anti-consumption in the West, with criticism rooted in political-economic, social, and/or environmental issues. In addition, Western consumers' ethnocentric tendencies are often reinforced by campaigning for domestic product/service alternatives. This backdrop raises questions about the degree of consumers' macro COO knowledge and ethnocentrism, and of their importance as levers of consumer concern about (i.e., risk perceptions) and anti-consumption of foreign products from a controversial COO. This article thus sheds light on the extent to which COO knowledge (whether macro or based on usage experience), along with consumer ethnocentrism, can be considered antecedents of two risk perception types and, in turn, of country-driven anti-consumption (CDAC)—in the context of this work, Spanish consumers' reluctance to buy and (non-)ownership of Chinese apparel products. The findings reveal that consumer ethnocentrism heightens both psycho-social and performance risk perceptions and contributes to reluctance to buy. Macro COO knowledge affects CDAC only indirectly through performance risk perceptions. By contrast, usage experience attenuates both performance and psycho-social risk perceptions and directly affects foreign product ownership. Risk perceptions predict and mediate most of the effects of COO knowledge, consumer ethnocentrism, and usage

experience on CDAC outcomes. Implications for research, policy, and practice are also discussed.

Keywords: Anti-consumption, country-of-origin (COO), consumer ethnocentrism, perceived risk, subjective country knowledge, usage experience.

# **Mapping the Influence of Country-of-Origin Knowledge, Consumer Ethnocentrism, and Perceived Risk on Consumer Action Against Foreign Products**

## **INTRODUCTION**

US President Trump's trade war against China (Reuters, 2020; Swanson & Smialek, 2020) leading the revival of nationalism and protectionism in Europe (Rachman, 2018). Documentary films like *Fashion Victims* (Everett, 2013) and *The True Cost* (Morgan, 2015) that uncover the human and environmental cost of cheap clothes produced in Asian countries such as Bangladesh, China, India, or Cambodia. The European Confederation of the Footwear Industry (CEC) pressuring the European Commission to impose anti-dumping duties on leather shoes originating from China and Vietnam (Eckhardt, 2011). Greenpeace's requests upon the Chinese government to ban the use of hormone disruptors and chemicals that are toxic to the human reproductive system in children's wear sold internationally (Deans, 2013).

The phenomena described in the epigraph above illustrate the various calls on Western consumers to avoid or reject products from Asian emerging economies such as China, India, or Bangladesh (i.e., by either emphasizing their rejection or prioritizing domestic ones), for a variety of often contradictory reasons: from general nationalism/protectionism to more specific political, economic, social, or environmental concerns. Certainly, by appealing to the preference of domestic product/service alternatives, consumers' ethnocentric tendencies are reinforced (Wang, He, Sahadev, & Song, 2018). Likewise, by directing public attention to controversial country issues that negatively affect a specific country-of-origin (COO), consumer action against products/services from the target COO is campaigned for: that is, country-driven anti-consumption (CDAC) (Dickson, 2001; García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015).

China and the apparel sector, respectively, are controversial country and industry targets of CDAC in the West, with criticism rooted in the view of China as a threatening political and economic force (Rose, Rose, & Shoham, 2009); the offshoring of Western apparel manufacturing (Morgan & Birtwistle, 2009); irregular work conditions and exceptionally low wages; polluting, insecure, and unhealthy production methods; among other ‘unacceptable’ social and environmental practices in China (Kim, Choo, & Yoon, 2013). Consumers’ access to negative information (or subjective knowledge) may trigger risk perceptions regarding products from the controversial COO—i.e., greater perceived likelihood of negative outcomes from purchase (Sjöberg, Moen, & Rundmo, 2004)—which, in turn, could translate into CDAC (Olbrich, Jansen, & Teller, 2016). In fact, risk perceptions have been found among the motives for consumer avoidance of different controversial products, such as fast food (Khan et al., 2019), genetically modified food (Lee, Conroy, & Motion, 2012), or private labels (Nenycz-Thiel and Romaniuk, 2011). Consequently, a high level of public awareness of China’s political-economic power and unsustainable (apparel) manufacturing practices is likely to amplify consumer risk perceptions associated with this specific COO and its products. Consumers’ concerns about foreign-made products have been documented in the marketing literature (particularly in relation to controversial source countries, ethnocentric consumers, and/or uninformed consumers about COO issues and products), suggesting that risk perceptions associated with foreign-product purchases can lead to a reduced willingness to buy, boycotts, or other forms of anti-consumption (Dickson, 2001; Hampton, 1977; Lim, 2003; Wang et al., 2018). Recent evidence from COO studies also shows the tendency of cognitive factors such as consumer knowledge of the COO (García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015), and of individual normative dispositions such as consumer ethnocentrism (Wang et al., 2018), to indirectly affect consumers’ foreign-product (anti-)purchasing

behaviour through cognitive/affective factors such as perceived risk. Hence, as shown elsewhere (Agarwal & Teas, 2001; Kees, 2010; Paek, Oh, & Hove, 2016; Wang et al., 2018), perceived risk can be an important mediating factor for CDAC.

This study focuses on two interrelated research questions: First, does consumers' increased knowledge of macro country issues alter their risk assessments of products from a controversial COO? If so, how do the effects of macro COO knowledge on risk assessments compare to those of consumer ethnocentrism and direct usage experience with various products and/or services from the COO? Second, what is the mediating and predictive value of consumer perceived risk for CDAC? By addressing these questions, the authors seek to shed light on the utility of macro COO knowledge, consumer ethnocentrism, and micro risk perceptions as levers to encourage consumer action against products/services from a controversial foreign country.

In an investigation of Spanish consumers' anti-consumption of Chinese apparel, two types of risk perceptions (i.e., performance and psycho-social perceived risk) are therefore expected to mediate the influence of macro country knowledge, direct usage experience with various products and/or services from the COO, and consumer ethnocentrism on consumers' reluctance to buy and ownership of products from a specific product category (apparel) and foreign country (China). Figure 1 summarizes the conceptual framework.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

This study contributes to the extant literature on COO, especially from an anti-consumption perspective, by extending the available knowledge about CDAC in several ways. First, investigating both attitudinal and behavioural dimensions of CDAC allows a more complete understanding of this anti-consumption phenomenon. Second, although

the study of overall risk perceptions as antecedents of consumer behaviour is not new in COO research (i.e., Oberecker & Diamantopoulos, 2011), this work offers insights regarding the differential impacts of different risk perception subdimensions on CDAC, making them worthy of separate consideration. Third, the findings show how different types of COO knowledge (macro vs. usage experience) can have opposing effects and operate on distinct levels of the CDAC decision process. Finally, our study adds to the body of knowledge on consumer ethnocentrism, by considering both its direct and indirect contributions to CDAC through risk perceptions.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Country-Driven Anti-Consumption (CDAC)**

Anti-consumption has been conceptualized as conscious and self-expressive behaviour against consumption of a particular object (Chatzidakis & Lee, 2013; García-de-Frutos, Ortega-Egea, & Martínez-del-Río, 2018; Lee, Roux, Cherrier, & Cova, 2011). Accordingly, there are numerous potential targets of anti-consumption practices at different levels, including products/brands (Lee, Motion, & Conroy, 2009), specific events (Close & Zinkhan, 2009), companies (Thompson & Arsel, 2004), or even countries (Braunsberger & Buckler, 2011). The focus here is on CDAC, understood as consumer practices against the purchase of foreign products, such as consumers' reluctance to buy, avoidance, or rejection of foreign products (García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015). There is evidence that anti-consumption can be ethically-morally oriented toward the improvement of society and the natural environment, and/or self-oriented toward personal well-being (Iyer & Muncy, 2009). Thus, CDAC actions are an important means for consumers to pursue (and even reconcile) their desired societal and personal interests in relation to foreign countries and products.

There is a long tradition of studying COO effects in the consumer behaviour literature (Laroche, Papadopoulos, Heslop, & Murali, 2005). Several decades of research have informed our knowledge of whether and how individuals are affected by COO when facing purchase or consumption decisions (Pharr, 2005). COO has been considered a moral motive for product/brand avoidance (Lee, Motion, and Conroy, 2009), but a broader range of COO factors has been shown to affect consumer choices. These have been classified into three influence types: cognitive, normative—which fits the view of Lee and colleagues (2009)—, and affective COO influences (Pharr, 2005). Cognitive COO influences are rooted in beliefs about the foreign country in general (macro level), or about its products (micro level) (Laroche et al., 2005). Such cognitive factors are presumed to influence consumer behaviour indirectly through foreign product evaluations (Laroche et al., 2005). Following this, negative beliefs about a COO or its products should lead to a greater probability of CDAC (Alvarez, & Campo, 2014). Regarding the normative mechanism underlying COO influences, individuals may have personal rules or norms regarding the rightness of foreign product purchases (Vida & Reardon, 2008). Foreign products, thus, will be avoided or rejected to the extent to which consumers regard their purchase as morally wrong. Finally, consumers can develop (positive or negative) affective ties with a specific COO, with negative affect potentially leading to CDAC (Klein, 2002; Amine, 2008). Negative affect COO constructs (and their effects) have been widely researched in the COO literature, but predominantly from a consumption perspective. For instance, negative affect towards the COO has been shown to negatively affect consumers' intentions to purchase foreign products (Klein, Ettenson, & Morris, 1998) and visit the foreign country (Alvarez & Campo, 2014), and to positively affect consumers' preference for (Klein, 2002) and purchase of local/domestic products (Vida & Reardon, 2008). Exceptions to this trend (i.e., analysis of negative affect COO

influences on anti-consumption) can be found in García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, (2015); Nijssen & Douglas, (2004); or Shoham, Davidow, Klein, & Ruvio, (2006).

More emphasis on anti-consumption research seems warranted given the evidence that a consumer's motives for avoidance, reduction, and/or active rejection of products from a specific foreign country will most likely differ from their motives for the purchase and/or consumption of the foreign product (Chatzidakis & Lee, 2013). Further, studies that merge the COO and anti-consumption perspectives are needed to elucidate the role of micro and macro factors, for and against consumption, that concurrently shape consumers' foreign product (anti-)purchase decisions (Iyer & Muncy, 2016). A major research challenge is the difficulty of capturing and measuring anti-consumption behaviours (Chatzidakis & Lee, 2013; García-de-Frutos et al., 2018).

Two different measures are thus considered in relation to CDAC behaviour. The first, country-driven reluctance to buy, is a negative affective/conative construct defined as “perceived guiltiness and tendency to avoid buying foreign-made products” (Suh & Kwon, 2002: 669). In accordance to attitude-behaviour models (see Ajzen, 1991), country-driven reluctance to buy should be strongly associated with anti-consumption behaviour. The second, foreign product ownership, is not an anti-consumption behavioural measure per se, but should be reversely indicative of the extent of actual foreign product consumption avoidance and rejection (i.e., of foreign product non-ownership). Therefore, reluctance to buy and foreign product ownership (proxies for CDAC behaviour) are the two outcomes of interest in this study.

### **Risk Perceptions as Levers of CDAC**

Consumer risk perceptions are a function of consumer expectations and uncertainty about the purchasing outcomes. As such, perceived risk has been defined as consumers' “evaluations of the probability as well as the consequences of a negative outcome”



(Sjöberg, Moen, & Rundmo, 2004: 8). Perceived risk is a multifaceted concept covering a broad range of undesirable or negative expected outcomes (Campbell & Goodstein, 2001; Liljander, Polsa, & van Riel, 2009; Park & Tussyadiah, 2017), thus differentiating between: (1) product performance risk—i.e., the product may not perform as desired; (2) social risk—i.e., being negatively judged by significant others for using the product; (3) time risk—i.e., excessive investment of time during the purchase/consumption process; (4) financial risk—i.e., monetary losses due to price or short durability of the product; (5) psychological/self-image risk—i.e., using the product will weaken consumers' self-image; (6) physical risk—i.e., bodily harm caused by use of the product. The salience and importance of different risk facets depend on the sources of uncertainty in a specific decision (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Park & Tussyadiah, 2017).

The expected negative outcomes of buying foreign-made products predominantly involve below target returns from the purchased product, but also missed gains from not purchasing a competing one. Such risk perceptions can be exacerbated when the likelihood of negative outcomes is perceived to be high (e.g., when evaluating foreign-made products from a controversial COO), due to lack of information about the societal (political, economic, social, and/or environmental) and personal consequences of the foreign product purchase (e.g., uninformed consumers about COO issues and products), or among consumers negatively predisposed toward foreign products (e.g., ethnocentric consumers), among other risk triggers (Del Vecchio & Smith, 2005; Wang et al., 2018). Under such conditions, heightened risk perceptions may incline consumers to take self-conscious and protective measures against the purchase of foreign-made products with possible negative effects (Hassan, Shaw, Shiu, Walsh, & Parry, 2013).

In the current study, the sources of uncertainty and risk affecting CDAC are the controversial foreign COO (China) and product category (apparel) under investigation

(Dholakia, 2001). On the one hand, China is controversial on political-economic grounds (e.g., China's economic power is seen as a threat to the domestic economy), with social and environmental practices under strong criticism in many Western markets (Kim et al., 2013). On the other hand, the social visibility of apparel products and their ability to communicate consumers' self-image, coupled with strong criticism of China as a COO, suggest the significance of both social and psychological/self-image risks in CDAC (Del Vecchio & Smith, 2005; Liljander, Polsa, and van Riel 2009; Mandel, 2003). There is even evidence of the interrelation and tendency of the psychological and social risk facets to merge into a single psycho-social risk construct (Liljander, Polsa, & van Riel, 2009). Performance and financial risks appear to be less product-specific, and thus are presumed to be key risk dimensions across purchase/consumption domains (Agarwal & Teas, 2001; Liljander et al., 2009). The performance risk measures considered here will be indicative of functional risks (e.g., discomfort), and partly of financial and physical ones (such as concerns about the short durability and negative health effects of Chinese apparel products). Therefore, psycho-social and performance risks are deemed to have a bearing on CDAC.

Perceived risk has been shown to directly and negatively affect consumer intentions and behaviour (Oberecker & Diamantopoulos, 2011; Mitchell, 1999), particularly when purchase uncertainty exceeds a certain threshold (Dowling & Staelin, 1994; Klerck & Sweeney, 2007). Furthermore, perceived risk has the potential to mediate the relationships of various extrinsic cues (including COO ones) and of cognitive evaluations with consumer behaviour (Agarwal & Teas, 2001; Kees, 2010; Liljander et al., 2009; Paek, Oh, & Hove, 2016). Thus, if consumers are uncertain or believe that purchasing foreign-made (apparel) products from a controversial COO (China) will have undesirable

psycho-social and/or performance outcomes, such amplified risk perceptions should result in greater reluctance to buy and lower foreign-product ownership. Formally:

*H1a,b: Psycho-social (a) and performance (b) risk perceptions will be positively associated with reluctance to buy foreign-made products from a controversial COO.*

*H2a,b: Psycho-social (a) and performance (b) risk perceptions will be negatively associated with ownership of foreign-made products from a controversial COO.*

### **COO Knowledge and Experience Cues to Risk**

Consumer knowledge is recognized as a major influencer in the decision-making process, most notably in information search and processing (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999; Park, Mothersbaugh, & Feick, 1994). This is certainly the case for foreign-made apparel products, particularly those originating from a controversial COO, given the multitude of informative and normative influences *for* and *against* their purchase (Dickson, 2001; García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015; Mascarenhas & Higby, 1993). Following Brucks (1985), three main categories of consumer knowledge have been described: subjective (perceived) knowledge, objective (actual) knowledge, and prior experience (familiarity) with the purchase domain (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999; Raju, Lonial, & Mangold, 1995). This paper concentrates on the subjective and prior experience knowledge types, owing to their suggested importance in consumers' purchase decision-making, relative to objective knowledge (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999; Raju et al., 1995).

#### *Subjective Knowledge (About Foreign Country Issues)*

Subjective knowledge has been defined as a “consumer’s perception of the amount of information they have stored in their memory” (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999: 59). Past research shows that subjective knowledge, in general, is indirectly related to consumer purchase intentions and behaviour—that is, through the mediating influence of factors such as information search, product involvement, attitude, or perceived risk (Flynn &

Goldsmith, 1999; Klerck & Sweeney, 2007; Raju et al., 1995). Importantly, consumers who feel more knowledgeable in a specific consumption area are more likely to trust and act on their own judgments (Schaefer, 1995), and less likely to search for external information (Park et al., 1994; Raju et al., 1995).

The potential objects or targets of subjective knowledge range from specific products/services to broad country and transnational issues. COO research has mostly explored the effects of subjective knowledge about the product category or specific products (Lee & Lee, 2009). Little, however, is known about the effect of more general, subjective (perceived) knowledge about foreign country issues (e.g., social ones) on consumers' foreign-product (anti-)purchase decisions. Subjective knowledge about foreign country issues is of great interest from a policy standpoint, owing to its external malleability by means of information/knowledge provision (Sartzetakis, Xepapadeas, & Petrakis, 2012). This is particularly so for organizations seeking to increase public visibility of country issues negatively affecting controversial COOs as a means of encouraging CDAC (Dickson, 2001; García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015).

The media is a major source of people's perceptions about foreign countries, especially those that are strongly criticised (Kotler & Gertner, 2002), such as China. Contemporary Western media's representations of China often speak of a country with a hunger for economic domination, as well as with 'unacceptable' social and environmental practices (Kim et al., 2013). Accordingly, consumers' level of subjective knowledge about country issues negatively affecting the COO should increase their psycho-social and performance risk perceptions (i.e., should reinforce consumers' beliefs about negative foreign-product purchasing outcomes or their likelihood), thus leading to greater levels of CDAC. This suggests the following hypotheses:

*H3a,b: Subjective country knowledge will be positively associated with psycho-social (a) and performance (b) risk perceptions of foreign-made products from a controversial COO.*

*Usage Experience (With Products/Services From the COO)*

The second type of consumer knowledge considered here is prior usage experience with the purchase domain (Brucks, 1985; Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999; Raju et al., 1995). Formally, usage experience has been defined as “memory for relationships between the self and the product in terms of information search, product usage, and purchase experience” (Park et al., 1994). From this perspective, usage experience is viewed as consumer knowledge or familiarity that accrues over time with continued purchasing/usage of a specific product or product category (Brucks, 1985; Park et al., 1994; Raju et al., 1995). This paper goes beyond the focus on usage experience with a specific product or product category—also predominant in COO research (see, e.g., Josiassen, Lukas, & Withwell, 2008; Martin, Lee & Lacey, 2011)—to examine the role of the broader usage experience with various products and/or services from the COO. As with subjective knowledge, the effects of usage experience on CDAC are expected to be mediated by perceived risk (Brucks, 1985; Raju et al., 1995; Wang et al., 2018). However, greater usage experience with products and/or services from a specific COO is more likely a risk-reduction mechanism (than a risk-enhancing one) in the foreign-product purchase decision (Campbell & Goodstein, 2001; Sjöberg et al. 2004). Accordingly:

*H4a,b: Usage experience with products and/or services from the COO will be negatively associated with psycho-social (a) and performance (b) risk perceptions of foreign-made products from a controversial COO.*

### **Consumer Ethnocentrism to Risk**

Consumer ethnocentrism has been defined as “the beliefs held by consumers about the appropriateness, indeed morality, of purchasing foreign-made products” (Shimp & Sharma, 1987: 280). This construct, therefore, represents an individual’s normative orientation toward the preference for domestic products over foreign ones (Chryssochoidis, Krystallis, & Perreas, 2007; Cilingir & Basfirinci, 2014). As such, consumer ethnocentrism has been shown to positively affect consumers’ attitude, preference, and willingness to buy domestic products (Balabanis & Diamantopoulos, 2004; Dmitrovic, Vida, & Reardon, 2009; Shimp & Sharma, 1987), and to negatively affect their willingness to buy foreign products (Ettenson & Klein, 2005; Klein, Ettenson, & Morris, 1998; Shankarmahesh, 2006; Shimp & Sharma, 1987). Recent research calls for the study of ethnocentrism as a potential facilitator of anti-consumption (Makri, Schlegelmilch, Mai & Dinhof, 2020), and there is some evidence that ethnocentrism positively affects consumers’ reluctance to buy foreign products (García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004; Suh & Kwon, 2002).

Ethnocentric consumers view foreign and global brands suspiciously—that is, as posing economic, political, social, or even cultural threats to their country (Steenkamp et al., 2003). Hence, ethnocentric consumers perceive greater risks in purchasing foreign products. Although some evidence supports this general notion (i.e., Wang et al., 2018), the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and specific risk types has received little attention. Given the normative nature of consumer ethnocentrism (Chryssochoidis, Krystallis, & Perreas, 2007), it should relate more strongly to psycho-social perceived risk—which stems from a lack of fit between the purchase and the consumer’s personal values (Liljander et al., 2009)—, than to performance perceived risk.

*H5a,b: Consumer ethnocentrism will be positively associated with psycho-social (a) and performance (b) risk perceptions of foreign-made products from a controversial COO.*

## **METHOD**

Data for this study was obtained in two stages. The first was qualitative and consisted of 21 semi-structured face-to-face qualitative interviews with residents in the southeast of Spain. A mixture between convenience and snowball sampling was used to recruit interviewees. The qualitative interviews were used to:

(1) Evaluate the salience of CDAC among Spanish consumers and identify their targets.

To do so, interviewees were inquired about their felt animosity towards specific foreign countries. Next, they were asked about their active avoidance or rejection of products from the main country target of anti-consumption, the product category(-ies) involved (including intentions to visit the country), and the intensity of anti-consumption behaviour in terms of consistency (i.e., the steadiness of CDAC across different shopping contexts) and temporality (i.e., the stability of CDAC over time). Interviewees reported fairly consistent CDAC behaviours, with China being the most frequently mentioned country target of anti-consumption (both overall and for apparel products). These results justified the selection of China as the focal COO of interest in this study.

(2) Explore Spanish consumers' motives for CDAC. Our qualitative analysis revealed a broad array of reasons why some consumers adopt CDAC actions: from (a) macro reasons of political-economic (e.g., perception of China' economic power as a threat to the Spanish economy), social (e.g., perceived lack of individual freedom in China), and environmental nature (e.g., inadequate regulation about pollutant practices in China); to (b) micro reasons, such as subjective risk perceptions elicited from interviewees when asked about a specific product category (i.e., apparel products). Performance risks were

particularly associated with Chinese apparel products, given their perceived lower quality and security. The information gained from the interviews helped define the constructs and facets to be measured in the questionnaire used in the second, quantitative stage of the study.

(3) Compare the meanings and wordings used by interviewees with those of the scales identified in the literature. This helped revise and adapt the measures used in the quantitative questionnaire (when necessary) and ensure its adequacy to the CDAC research scenario. The interviews helped particularly in the translation of the scales into Spanish; that is, when different translations were possible, the ones closest to interviewees' own words were chosen to formulate the questions. More details about the qualitative interviews can be found in Ortega-Egea and García-de-Frutos (2016).

Second, a national survey drawing on the interview findings was conducted to investigate COO factors that can affect Spanish consumers' anti-consumption of Chinese-made and -sold apparel products (i.e., apparel made in China and distributed through Chinese-owned stores in Spain). The survey provided the main data for the study reported here—namely, the quantitative data used to test the hypotheses in the conceptual framework (see Figure 1). The questionnaire's focus on Spanish consumers, China (as a COO), and apparel products was deemed necessary, since COO effects tend to be specific to country dyads and product categories (Leonidou, Palihawadana, & Talias, 2007; Riefler & Diamantopoulos, 2007). After pretesting, telephone surveys were conducted with 400 adults using a stratified sampling procedure. Telephone numbers were randomly chosen from each Spanish province's listings (proportionate to its size). Eligible respondents were asked to participate and interviewed until the desired number of valid questionnaires per province had been achieved. On average, 15 calls were necessary to produce a completed interview, which equates to a response rate of 6.7%. Thus, a significant



challenge for the fieldwork in our study was the high non-response/refusal rate, calculated as the proportion of contacted people who did not answer the phone calls, declined to participate, or offered incomplete answers, in an attempt to achieve the goal number of questionnaires per province. Comparison with census data indicates that the final sample is highly representative of the Spanish adult population in terms of age, gender, and geographical location of residence (for details, see García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea 2015: 174).

Most of the constructs assessed in the survey (i.e., reluctance to buy, risk perceptions, subjective knowledge, and consumer ethnocentrism) were measured by multiple items taken or adapted from already-validated scales (see Appendix II for details). Six items (rated on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10) were used to measure consumers' reluctance to buy foreign products, five of them from Shoham et al. (2006) and the sixth item adapted from Darling and Wood (1990). Two product category-specific items (Klein, 2002) were used to measure consumers' actual ownership of foreign products: (1) the number of apparel items purchased by respondents in Chinese-owned stores in the past 6 months (continuous measure); and (2) the perceived share/percentage of clothing products owned by respondents, from Chinese apparel stores (with values from 1=0% to 5=100%). Performance risk perceptions were measured on the three-item scale (0-10) from Oberecker and Diamantopoulos (2011). A similar, two-item scale (0-10) was developed from Dowling and Staelin (1994) to measure psycho-social/self-image risk perceptions. Consistent with most existing measures (see Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999), subjective knowledge about COO issues was measured using three reflective indicators (0-10) of respondents' self-rated level of knowledge about China in political-economic, social, and environmental matters. Usage experience of Chinese products and/or services was measured by asking respondents to rate their purchase frequency (1=Never; 6=Once a

week) in Chinese-owned retail outlets, such as apparel stores, bazars, or restaurants (Josiassen et al., 2008; Raju et al., 1995). Finally, consumer ethnocentrism was measured on a shortened, seven-item (0-10) version of the CETSCALE (Nijssen & Douglas, 2004; Shimp & Sharma, 1987). All surveys were conducted in Spanish; thus, translation and back-translation were undertaken to ensure the understandability and functional equivalence of the Spanish and English versions of the questionnaire.

## **RESULTS**

A series of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (EFA and CFA) were conducted to investigate the dimensionality and psychometric properties of the latent factors. EFA and CFA results provided reasonable evidence of a 2-factor structure of (general and relative) reluctance to buy foreign products, (psycho-social and performance) risk perceptions, and (hard and soft) consumer ethnocentrism, and of a 1-factor structure of foreign product ownership and subjective knowledge. Internal consistency reliability was checked by computing Cronbach's alpha and Raykov's rho coefficients. Cronbach's alpha values were satisfactory for most scales ( $\alpha > 0.8$ ), except for the foreign product ownership ( $\alpha=0.46$ ) and psycho-social risk ( $\alpha=0.66$ ) constructs. However, all Raykov's rho coefficients, which correct for the underestimation of scale reliability, exceeded the acceptable cut-off point of 0.6 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998)—an indication of adequate levels of internal consistency. Discriminant validity was also assessed in two ways: confidence interval and chi-square difference tests (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Both analyses were supportive of sufficient discriminant validity between all pairs of latent factors.

Structural equation modelling (SEM) was applied to test the hypotheses involving direct and mediated effects on the CDAC dependent variables, reluctance to buy and foreign

product ownership (see Figure 1). Four different SEM models were performed to evaluate the differences between directly testing the effects of consumer subjective knowledge and usage experience on CDAC (Model 1A), compared to the posited mediating effect of perceived risk (Model 1B); and between the direct effects of subjective knowledge, usage experience, and consumer ethnocentrism on CDAC (Model 2A), compared to the posited mediating effect of perceived risk (Model 2B). See Table 1 for a summary of the findings obtained in each of the four tested models.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

The assessment of the different models began with an inspection of the scaled chi-square test for absolute fit, which was significant at  $p < .01$  in all models (non-desirable result). Given the sensitivity of chi-square to sample size (200 observations or greater), other fit indices were considered. As for absolute fit, RMSEA was always below the threshold level of 0.06; that is, it ranged between 0.055 (Model 1B) and 0.032 (Model 2A). Incremental fit measures were also indicative of good model fit for all models, with NNFI ranging between 0.947 (Model 1B) and 0.976 (Model 2A), and CFI ranging between 0.958 (Model 1A) and 0.980 (Model 2A) (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Recall that the first two hypotheses concerned the direct effects of psycho-social and performance perceived risk on consumers' reluctance to buy and ownership of foreign-made products from a controversial COO. In Model 1B, both types of risk perceptions were significantly and positively related to the reluctance to buy, with performance risk having a somewhat stronger effect (H1a: std.  $\beta = .499$ ,  $p < .01$ ) than psycho-social risk (H1b: std.  $\beta = .266$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Although Model 1B seems to corroborate hypothesis H1a, the link between psycho-social risk and reluctance to buy becomes non-significant when the

effect of consumer ethnocentrism on reluctance to buy is accounted for (Model 2B). Thus, there is only partial support for hypothesis H1a. However, the magnitude and significance of the hypothesized relationship between performance risk and reluctance to buy was robust across models, thus providing full support for H1b. In contrast, the posited effect of both psycho-social and performance risk perceptions on foreign product ownership was non-significant in all models, thus rejecting both H2a and H2b.

There was better prediction of CDAC outcomes when the predictor/mediating role of perceived risks and the antecedent role of consumer ethnocentrism were considered. For instance, the inclusion of perceived risks increases the variance explained in reluctance to buy from 0.051 to 0.382 in the models without consumer ethnocentrism (Models 1A and 1B), and from 0.358 to 0.579 in the models with consumer ethnocentrism (Models 2A and 2B). Overall, the results offer evidence that perceived risk—especially performance risk—mediates the relationship between usage experience and reluctance to buy. This notwithstanding, such a mediation is not found for the ‘usage experience-foreign product ownership’ link.

Hypotheses 3, 4 and 5 address the relative role of subjective COO knowledge, usage experience, and consumer ethnocentrism in eliciting psycho-social and/or performance risk perceptions in the mind of consumers. Contrary to the authors’ expectations, there was only evidence of a significant positive association between subjective COO knowledge and performance risk perceptions, thus providing support for H3b, but not for H3a. Stronger support was found for the effects of usage experience on both psycho-social and performance perceived risk of Chinese-made and -sold apparel products. More specifically, usage experience mitigates psycho-social and performance risk perceptions to a similar extent. These findings provide support for both H4a and H4b. However, the strongest predictor of both perceived risk types was consumer ethnocentrism, which had

stronger effects on psycho-social (H5a: std.  $\beta=0.388$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) than on performance risk (H5b: std.  $\beta=0.284$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). As a result, there was full support for hypotheses 5a and 5b.

## DISCUSSION

### Theoretical implications

This study sought to extend the existing literature on COO and anti-consumption (e.g., Dickson, 2001; García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015) by investigating the way and extent to which COO knowledge, consumer ethnocentrism, and perceived risk affect consumer action against foreign products (i.e., CDAC). Two controversial country and product category targets of anti-consumption in the West (i.e., China and apparel products, respectively) were selected as the sources of criticism, uncertainty, and risk affecting Spanish consumers' CDAC (the population and outcomes of interest here) (Dholakia, 2001; Kotler & Gertner, 2002; Park & Tussyadiah, 2017).

First, this study advances current knowledge on CDAC by shedding light both on intentional and behavioural outcomes (i.e., reluctance to buy and ownership of foreign products), which arguably gives a proper and fuller account of consumers' anti-consumption behaviour—a major challenge in anti-consumption research (Chatzidakis & Lee, 2013; García-de-Frutos et al., 2018). Our final models successfully explain around 58% of the variation in reluctance to buy foreign products, but less than 20% in foreign product ownership. Such differential prediction is consistent with the widely-documented gap from cognitive, affective, and normative constructs (e.g., knowledge, risk, or ethnocentrism) to behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Richetin et al., 2012). Overall, the findings support the contention that micro and macro COO factors, for and against consumption, concurrently shape CDAC decisions (Iyer & Muncy, 2016).

Second, an important contribution is made regarding the predictive and mediating value of consumer perceived risk. In contrast with past COO literature relying mostly on global measures of perceived risk (e.g., Oberecker & Diamantopoulos, 2011; Wang et al. 2018), risk perceptions were examined in a disaggregated manner so as to disentangle the roles of psycho-social and performance risk types. The findings emphasized the importance of performance risk (over psycho-social risk) as a pathway to CDAC (Klerck and Sweeney, 2007; Liljander et al., 2009), particularly to the affective/conative outcome of reluctance to buy products from the controversial COO. Arguably, the nature and measurement direction of perceived risk is better aligned with reluctance to buy than with foreign product ownership (not an anti-consumption behavioural measure per se) (Riefler & Diamantopoulos, 2007). The findings observed here contrast with Kim et al.'s (2013) fast-fashion avoidance study, where perceptions of product performance were less diagnostic of consumers' behavioural intention, compared with personality-related factors. This can be explained by differences between the outcome measures and COO of interest in Kim et al.'s study (i.e., intention to buy and various COOs) and our study (i.e., reluctance to buy and a single COO). Thus, different results can be expected depending on the number of focal product categories and COOs. Our findings revealed a significant but partial mediating role of perceived risk, which helped better understand the influence mechanism through which consumers' COO knowledge and ethnocentrism affect CDAC. Consequently, perceived risk can be considered an important mediator in anti-consumption models.

Third, this research helps answer the question of whether consumers' increased knowledge of macro country issues could alter their risk assessments of products from a controversial COO. This is important given the criticism surrounding China on political-economic, social, and environmental grounds in many Western markets. Our findings

support the idea that increasing visibility of macro issues affecting a controversial COO can heighten (micro, product-specific) performance risk perceptions, but not psychosocial ones. As hypothesized, subjective and cognitive macro COO knowledge effects on CDAC were fully mediated by perceived risk. The disaggregation of risk perceptions extends extant knowledge in the COO field, by showing the dependence of [macro COO knowledge → perceived risk] links on the specific risk subtype (i.e., performance vs. psychosocial risks). It appears that conceptual alignment affects the saliency and magnitude of effects of (macro) subjective COO knowledge on (micro) risk perceptions. The view of psychosocial risk as a mix of cognitive and affective evaluations, and of performance risk as a purely cognitive construct, suggest better alignment between performance risk perceptions and macro COO knowledge—both being cognitive in nature (e.g., Laroche et al. 2005; Alvarez & Campo, 2014). Thus, consumers' cognitive risk perceptions are more likely driven by country knowledge negatively affecting the COO and its products, than cognitive/affective risks. More broadly, these findings add weight to the notion—deserving further investigation—that halo, macro COO cognitions (e.g., country knowledge or images) will have a bearing on other cognitive, micro factors involved in foreign-product evaluation process (Oberecker & Diamantopoulos, 2011; García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015).

Fourth, the study adds to the consumer knowledge and COO literature by broadly looking at prior experience (familiarity) as usage experience with various products and/or services from the COO and exploring its contributions to CDAC. To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to go beyond the focus on usage experience with a specific product or product category, predominant in general consumer and COO research (Josiassen, Lukas, & Withwell, 2008; Martin, Lee & Lacey, 2011; Raju et al., 1995). Usage experience had a twofold negative influence on CDAC. On the one hand, the findings confirm the risk-

reduction role of usage experience with products/services from a controversial COO (Campbell & Goodstein, 2001; Sjöberg et al. 2004). That is, usage experience and macro COO knowledge appear here as opposing forces indirectly contributing to CDAC (i.e., reluctance to buy), through perceived risk (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999; Klerck & Sweeney, 2007; Raju et al., 1995; Wang et al., 2018). On the other hand, to our surprise, usage experience emerged as a non-mediated positive influencer of foreign product ownership. Again, these results could be attributed to the innate essence and measurement direction of usage experience and the two CDAC outcomes, given that usage experience (direct knowledge obtained from behaviour) is better aligned with foreign product ownership (behavioural outcome) than with reluctance to buy, which represents an anti-consumption attitude (Riefler & Diamantopoulos, 2007). There is indication here that, unlike macro COO knowledge—showing only ‘halo’ effects on other cognitive (micro) factors—usage experience knowledge has broader-ranging effects on major cognitive, but also affective and behavioural factors affecting consumers’ foreign product (anti-)consumption. Thus, COO researchers seeking to advance current understanding of consumer (macro and micro) knowledge in foreign-product (anti-)purchases should account for a specific knowledge type, or another, in light of the conceptual nature of the sought-after or expected consumer responses (e.g., cognitive vs. affective outcomes).

Fifth, the current research responds to recent calls for examining the effects of consumer ethnocentrism on anti-consumption (Makri et al., 2020), by addressing its potential direct and indirect effects on CDAC. In line with past research (Wang et al., 2018), consumer ethnocentrism heightened risk perceptions. This may indicate that ethnocentric consumers view the purchase of foreign products (particularly those from a controversial COO) as contrary to their personal norms, and thus as a threat to their self and projected image. The significance here of a risk-mediated path [consumer ethnocentrism →



perceived risk → CDAC] advances extant anti-consumption literature failing to support an indirect effect of consumer ethnocentrism on CDAC through (micro) foreign product judgments (García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015). As for the direct effects on CDAC, consumer ethnocentrism shows a strong positive effect on reluctance to buy (García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004), but not on foreign product ownership. These results are largely indicative of a norm-action gap (Ajzen, 1991; Richetin et al., 2012). In short, subjective (macro) COO knowledge, consumer ethnocentrism, and (micro) risk perceptions can be useful levers for consumer action against products/services from a controversial foreign country.

### **Managerial and policy implications**

In addition to the theoretical contributions, this study has interesting managerial implications. With direct and positive effects on CDAC, both risk perceptions and consumer ethnocentrism can harm product sales of companies from a controversial COO. Considering the risk-enhancing role of increased consumer knowledge about country issues (negatively) affecting a controversial COO, managers first need to understand the existing criticism of their COO. Communication campaigns could be then developed to break down such negative country stereotypes—for an example of how to counteract negative beliefs about a COO, see Martin et al. (2011). The results have also shown the role of usage experience with products from the same foreign country—not necessarily from the same category—as a mechanism for attenuating risk perceptions and increasing foreign product purchase/ownership. Managers of companies from controversial COOs could more easily target consumers who are more familiar or experienced with other products or services from the COO and promote their products through positive word-of-mouth. Finally, it is not easy to “fight the dragon” of consumer ethnocentrism for companies from controversial countries. In Western markets, ethnocentric customers are

usually concerned about the potential negative impact of foreign companies on the domestic economy and employment (Steenkamp et al., 2003). Thus, collaborating with local companies and hiring local people can be suitable means to counteract such negative views of foreign-made products, thus lowering consumers' risk perceptions and CDAC.

From a policy perspective, the results highlight the importance of consumers' knowledge, risk perceptions, and ethnocentrism as pathways for encouraging consumer action against products/services from a controversial COO. On the one side, different for-profit and non-profit organizations (e.g., local/domestic governments, or industry associations) may campaign against foreign products by increasing public visibility of political, economic, social, or environmental country issues negatively affecting the controversial COO (i.e., a knowledge enhancement strategy). On the other hand, local/domestic organizations may appeal to the preference for domestic product/service alternatives—thus reinforcing domestic consumers' ethnocentric tendencies. In light of the findings, an “offensive” knowledge enhancement strategy (Sartzetakis et al. 2012), combined with “buy local” campaigns, should be expected to moderately affect (encourage) CDAC.

This study also has broader implications for efforts aimed at modifying risk perceptions about foreign products. Importantly, the findings warn that external efforts to heighten risk perceptions of products from a controversial COO (e.g., negative, macro COO cues) may not offset the risk-mitigating effects of (more-direct) usage experience with products and/or services from the COO. This highlights a viable knowledge-enhancement strategy to counteract CDAC (e.g., for producers and sellers of foreign products targeted by anti-consumption) based on usage experience. Such knowledge may be hard to transfer, since usage experience develops from and requires direct interaction of consumers with products or services. Hence, “defensive” efforts by a controversial COO should be directed at promoting consumer access and trial of various products and services from the

foreign country (e.g., through governmental assistance to entrepreneurs to organize/participate in trade fairs and exhibitions in the target country, or even to develop digital simulations of actual product usage); rather than focusing on (i.e., trying to offset) macro issues potentially affecting consumer images of the COO. In the present study, the ubiquity of Chinese products and businesses in Spain is undoubtedly a major mitigating factor against domestic consumers' knowledge of political-economic, social, or environmental issues negatively affecting this controversial COO and its products.

### **LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH**

There were some limitations associated with the dependent outcomes of this study. First, the variance explained in CDAC (especially in foreign product ownership) could be increased by considering alternative affective/conative and behavioural measures of CDAC (e.g., boycott participation or actual changes in foreign product purchases). Second, COO effects different from those examined here may have an important bearing on CDAC outcomes and should not be overlooked. For instance, there is evidence of a contributing role of consumer animosity to consumers' reluctance to buy foreign products (García-de-Frutos & Ortega-Egea, 2015), whereas perceived warmth could be expected to facilitate the purchase of foreign-made products (Xun, Leung and Yan, 2013).

The second limitation of this study has to do with the research scenario (i.e., apparel made in China and distributed through Chinese-owned stores in Spain). Future research should extend the present study to alternative country settings and product categories (Roth & Diamantopoulos, 2009). Arguably, cultural differences should be accounted for both at the levels of end-consumers and of the COO of foreign products/brands. For example, consumers in countries with high levels of uncertainty avoidance (e.g., Spanish consumers) may be more prone—compared to consumers in countries with low levels of

uncertainty avoidance—to take risk-reduction strategies such as the avoidance of foreign products from a controversial COO.

A third limitation stems from the multidimensional nature of perceived risk and the two risk facets examined in this study. Psycho-social and performance risk perceptions were deemed important for the sources of uncertainty affecting CDAC—that is, the controversial foreign COO (China) and product category (apparel) under investigation—, and to be indicative of psychological, social, functional, and partly of financial and physical risk perceptions. More comprehensive and detailed analysis is warranted on the various types of risk perceptions and their separate contributions to CDAC. For instance, although merging the psychological and social risks into a single construct is consistent with past research (Liljander et al., 2009), these two risk subtypes may play differential (and potentially conflicting) roles in ‘COO knowledge-risk’ ‘ethnocentrism-risk’ and ‘risk-CDAC’ relationships. Likewise, future COO research should direct separate attention to functional, financial, physical, and even time risk facets.

A fourth and final limitation is the consideration only of macro COO knowledge that can heighten or attenuate risk perceptions of foreign-made products from a controversial COO (i.e., consumers’ knowledge about political-economic, social, and environmental country issues and their usage experience of various products and/or services from the COO). Not only macro-level COO knowledge, but also knowledge variables at industry, firm, and product/brand levels, can affect (differently) consumers’ perceived risks of foreign products. Arguably, the consideration of knowledge variables from different levels of analysis would improve the prediction of perceived risks. Future COO research should explore these possibilities and account for objective (actual) measures of COO knowledge, in addition to subjective (perceived) and prior experience (familiarity) knowledge variables and constructs (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999; Raju et al., 1995).

## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, S., & Teas, K. R. (2001). Perceived value: Mediating role of perceived risk. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 9, 1–14: 10.1080/10696679.2001.11501899
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
- Alvarez, M. D., & Campo, S. (2014). The influence of political conflicts on country image and intention to visit: A study of Israel's image. *Tourism Management*, 40, 70-78: 10.1016/j.tourman.2013.05.009
- Amine, L. S. (2008). Country-of-origin, animosity and consumer response: Marketing implications of anti-Americanism and Francophobia. *International Business Review*, 17, 402-422: 10.1016/j.ibusrev.2008.02.013
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modelling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 411–423:10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411
- Balabanis, G., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2004). Domestic country bias, country-of-origin effects, and consumer ethnocentrism: A multidimensional unfolding approach. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32, 80–95: 10.1177/0092070303257644
- Braunsberger, K., & Buckler, B. (2011). What motivates consumers to participate in boycotts: lessons from the ongoing Canadian seafood boycott. *Journal of Business Research*, 64, 96–102: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.12.008

- Brucks, M. (1985). The effects of product class knowledge on information search behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12, 1–16: · 10.1086/209031
- Campbell, M.C., & Goodstein, R. C. (2001). The moderating effect of perceived risk on consumers' evaluations of product incongruity: Preference for the norm. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 439–449: 10.1086/323731
- Chatzidakis, A., & Lee, M. S. W. (2013). Anti-Consumption as the study of reasons against, *Journal of Macromarketing*, 33, 145–147: 10.1177/0276146712462892
- Chrysochoidis, G., Krystallis, A., & Perreas, P. (2007). Ethnocentric beliefs and country-of-origin (COO) effect: Impact of country, product and product attributes on greek consumers' evaluation of food products. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41, 11/12, 1518–1544: 10.1108/03090560710821288
- Cilingir, Z., & Basfirinci, C. (2014). The impact of consumer ethnocentrism, product involvement, and product knowledge on country of origin effects: An empirical analysis on Turkish consumers' product evaluation. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 26, 284–310: 10.1080/08961530.2014.916189
- Close, A. G., & Zinkhan, G. M. (2009). Market-resistance and Valentine's Day events. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 200–207: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.027
- Darling, J. R., & Wood, V. R. (1990). A longitudinal study comparing perceptions of US and Japanese consumer products in a third/neutral country: Finland 1975 to 1985. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21, 427–450: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490827
- Deans, J. (2013, December 17). *Kid's wear made in China carry toxic substances*. Greenpeace. Retrieved from <https://www.greenpeace.org/usa/kids-wear-made-in-china-carry-toxic-substances/>

- DelVecchio, D., & Smith, D. C. (2005). Brand-extension price premiums: The effects of perceived fit and extension product category risk. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33, 184–196: 10.1177/0092070304269753
- Dholakia, U. M. (2001). A motivational process model of product involvement and consumer risk perception. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35, 1340–1362: 10.1108/EUM00000000006479
- Dickson, M. A. (2001). Utility of no sweat labels for apparel consumers: Profiling label users and predicting their purchases. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 3, 96–119: 10.1111/j.1745-6606.2001.tb00104.x
- Dmitrovic, T., Vida, I., & Reardon, J. (2009). Purchase behavior in favor of domestic products in the West Balkans. *International Business Review*, 18, 523–535: 10.1016/j.ibusrev.2009.05.003
- Dowling, G. R., & Staelin, R. (1994). A model of perceived risk and intended risk-handling activity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 119–134: 10.1086/209386
- Eckhardt, J. (2011). Firm lobbying and EU trade policymaking: Reflections on the anti-dumping case against Chinese and Vietnamese shoes (2005-2011). *Journal of World Trade*, 45, 965–991.
- Ettenson, R., & Klein, J. G. (2005). The fallout from French nuclear testing in the South Pacific: A longitudinal study of consumer boycotts. *International Marketing Review*, 22, 199–224: 10.1108/02651330510593278
- Everett, D. (Director) (2013, June 25). Fashion victims [TV series episode]. In S. Spencer (Executive Producer), *4 Corners*. Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Retrieved from <https://www.abc.net.au/4corners/fashion-victims-excerpt/4775116>

- Flynn, L. R., & Goldsmith, R. E. (1999). A short, reliable measure of subjective knowledge. *Journal of Business Research*, 46, 57–66: 10.1016/S0148-2963(98)00057-5
- García-de-Frutos, N., & Ortega-Egea, J. M. (2015). An integrative model of consumers' reluctance to buy foreign products — Do social and environmental country images play a role? *Journal of Macromarketing*, 35, 167–186: 10.1177/0276146714546749
- García-de-Frutos, N., Ortega-Egea, J. M., & Martínez-del-Río, J. (2018). Anti-consumption for environmental sustainability: Conceptualization, review, and multilevel research directions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148, 411–435: 10.1007/s10551-016-3023-z
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hampton, G. M. (1977). Perceived risk in buying products made abroad by American firms. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 5, 45–48: 10.1177/009207037700500113
- Hassan, L., Shaw, D., Shiu, E., Walsh, G., & Parry, S. (2013). Uncertainty in ethical consumer choice: A conceptual model. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 12, 182–193: 10.1002/cb.1409
- Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1–55: 10.1080/10705519909540118



- Hu, Y., & Wang, X. (2010). Country-of-origin premiums for retailers in international trades: Evidence from eBay's international markets. *Journal of Retailing*, 86, 200–207: 10.1016/j.jretai.2010.02.002
- Iyer, R., & Muncy, J. A. (2016). Attitude toward consumption and subjective well-being. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 50, 48–67: 10.1111/joca.12079
- Josiassen, A., Lukas, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (2008). Country-of-origin contingencies: Competing perspectives on product familiarity and product involvement. *International Marketing Review*, 25, 423–440: 10.1108/02651330810887477
- Kees, J. (2010). Temporal framing in health advertising: The role of risk and future orientation. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 32, 33–46: 10.1080/10641734.2010.10505273
- Khan, M. S., Kadirov, D., Bardakci, A., Iftikhar, R., Baran, T., Kantar, M., & Madak, N. (2019). Social media analysis of anti-consumption in Turkey. *British Food Journal*, 121, 22-34: 10.1108/BFJ-03-2018-0203
- Kim, H., Choo, H. J., & Yoon, N. (2013). The motivational drivers of fast fashion avoidance. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 17, 243–260: 10.1108/JFMM-10-2011-0070
- Klein, J. G. (2002). Us versus them, or us versus everyone? Delineating consumer aversion to foreign goods. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33, 345–63: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8491020
- Klein, J. G., Ettenson, R., & Morris, M. D. (1998). The animosity model of foreign product purchase: An empirical test in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 89–100: 10.2307/1251805

- Klerck, D., & Sweeney, J. C. (2007). The effect of knowledge types on consumer-perceived risk and adoption of genetically modified foods. *Psychology & Marketing*, 24, 171–193: 10.1002/mar.20157
- Kotler, P., & Gertner, D. (2002). Country as brand, product, and beyond: A place marketing and brand management perspective. *Journal of Brand Management*, 9, 249–261: 10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540076
- Laroche, M., Papadopoulos, N., Heslop, L. A., & Mourali, M. (2005). The influence of country image structure on consumer evaluations of foreign products. *International Marketing Review*, 22, 96-115: 10.1108/02651330510581190
- Lee, M. S. W., Conroy, D., & Motion, J. (2012). Brand avoidance, genetic modification, and brandlessness. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 20, 297-302: 10.1016/j.ausmj.2012.07.003
- Lee, J. K., & Lee, W.-N. (2009). Country-of-origin effects on consumer product evaluation and purchase intention: The role of objective versus subjective knowledge. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 21, 137–151: 10.1080/08961530802153722
- Lee, M. S. W., Motion, J., & Conroy, D. (2009). Anti-consumption and brand avoidance. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 169–180: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.024
- Lee, M. S. W., Roux, D., Cherrier, H., & Cova, B. (2011). Anti-consumption and consumer resistance: Concepts, concerns, conflicts and convergence. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45, 11/12, 1680–1687: 10.1108/ejm.2011.00745kaa.001
- Leonidou, L. C., Palihawadana, D., & Talias, M. A. (2007). British consumers' evaluations of us versus Chinese goods: A multi-level and multi-cue comparison. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41, 786–820: 10.1108/ejm.2011.00745kaa.001

- Liljander, V., Polsa, P., & van Riel, A. (2009). Modelling consumer responses to an apparel store brand: Store image as a risk reducer. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 16, 281–290: j.jretconser.2009.02.005
- Lim, N. (2003). Consumers' perceived risk: Sources versus consequences. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 2, 216–228: 10.1016/S1567-4223(03)00025-5
- Mandel, N. (2003). Shifting selves and decision making: The effects of self-construal priming on consumer risk-taking. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30, 30–40: 10.1086/374700
- Martin, B. A., Lee, M. S. W., & Lacey, C. (2011). Countering negative country of origin effects using imagery processing. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 10, 80–92: 10.1002/cb.351
- Mascarenhas, O. A. J., & Higby, M. A. (1993). Peer, parent, and media influences in teen apparel shopping. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21, 53–58: 10.1177/0092070393211007
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 709–734: 10.2307/258792
- Mitchell, V.-W. (1999). Consumer perceived risk: Conceptualisations and models. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33, 163–195: 10.1108/03090569910249229
- Morgan, A. (Director) (2015). *The true cost* [Film]. Untold Creative. Retrieved from <https://truecostmovie.com>

- Morgan, L. R., & Birtwistle, G. (2009). An investigation of young fashion consumers' disposal habits. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 33, 190–198: 10.1111/j.1470-6431.2009.00756.x
- Nenycz-Thiel, M., & Romaniuk, J. (2011). The nature and incidence of private label rejection. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 19, 93-99: 10.1016/j.ausmj.2011.02.001
- Nijssen, E. J., & Douglas, S. P. (2004). Examining the animosity model in a country with a high level of foreign trade. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 21, 23–38: 10.1016/j.ijresmar.2003.05.001
- Oberecker, E. M., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2011). Consumers' emotional bonds with foreign countries: Does consumer affinity affect behavioural intentions? *Journal of International Marketing*, 19, 45–72: 10.1509/jimk.19.2.45
- Olbrich, R., Jansen, H. C., & Teller, B. (2016). Quantifying anti-consumption of private labels and national brands: Impacts of poor test ratings on consumer purchases. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 50, 145-165: 10.1111/joca.12084
- Ortega-Egea, J. M., & García-de-Frutos, N. (2016). Exploring country-based motives for anti-consumption: A qualitative study. In Kirk Plangger (Ed.), *Thriving in a new world economy. Developments in marketing science: Proceedings of the Academy of Marketing Science* (pp. 168–171). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Paek, H.-J., Oh, S.-H., & Hove, T. (2016). How fear-arousing news messages affect risk perceptions and intention to talk about risk. *Health Communication*, 31, 1051–1062: 10.1080/10410236.2015.1037419
- Park, S., & Tussyadiah, I. P. (2017). Multidimensional facets of perceived risk in mobile travel booking. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56, 854–867. 10.1177/0047287516675062

- Park, C. W., Mothersbaugh, D. L., & Feick L. (1994). Consumer knowledge assessment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 71–82: 10.1086/209383
- Pharr, J. 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*, 13, 34-45:10.1080/10696679.2005.11658557
- Rachman, G. (2018, June 25). Donald Trump leads a global revival of nationalism. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.ft.com/content/59a37a38-7857-11e8-8e67-1e1a0846c475>
- Raju, P. S., Lonial, S. C., & Mangold, W. G. (1995). Differential effects of subjective knowledge, objective knowledge, and usage experience on decision making: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 4, 153–180: 10.1207/s15327663jcp0402\_04
- Reuters (2020, January 15). Timeline: Key dates in the U.S.-China trade war. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trade-china-timeline/timeline-key-dates-in-the-u-s-china-trade-war-idUSKBN1ZE1AA>
- Richetin, J., Perugini, M., Conner, M., Adjali, I., Hurling, R., Sengupta, A., & Greetham, D. (2012). To reduce and not to reduce resource consumption? That is two questions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 32, 112–122: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2012.01.003
- Riefler, P., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2007). Consumer animosity: A literature review and a reconsideration of its measurement. *International Marketing Review*, 24, 87–119: 10.1108/02651330710727204

- Sartzetakis, E. S., Xepapadeas, A., & Petrakis, E. (2012). The role of information provision as a policy instrument to supplement environmental taxes. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 52, 347–368: 10.1007/s10640-011-9532-4
- Schaefer, A. (1997). Consumer knowledge and country of origin effects. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31, 56–72: 10.1108/03090569710157034
- Shankarmahesh, M. N. (2006). Consumer ethnocentrism: An integrative review of its antecedents and consequences. *International Marketing Review*, 23, 146–172: 10.1108/02651330610660065
- Shimp, T. A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 280–289: 10.1177/002224378702400304
- Shoham, A., Davidow, M., Klein, J. G., & Ruvio, A. (2006). Animosity on the home front: The intifada in Israel and its impact on consumer behaviour. *Journal of International Marketing*, 14, 92–114: 10.1509/jimk.14.3.92
- Sjöberg, L., Moen, B.-E., & Rundmo, T. (2004). Explaining risk perception. In Torbjørn Rundmo (Ed.), *Evaluation of the psychometric paradigm in risk perception research* (pp. 1–33). Trondheim, Norway: Rotunde.
- Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., Batra, R., & Alden, D. L. (2003). How perceived brand globalness creates brand value. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 34, 53–65: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400002
- Suh, T., & Kwon, I.-W. G. (2002). Globalization and reluctant buyers. *International Marketing Review*, 19, 663–680: 10.1108/02651330210451962

- Swanson, A., & Smialek, J. (2020, January 3). U.S. Manufacturing Slumps as Trade War Damage Lingers. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/03/business/manufacturing-trump-trade-war.html>
- Thompson, C. J., & Arsel, Z. (2004). The Starbucks brandscape and consumers' (anticorporate) experiences of glocalization. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 631–642: 10.1086/425098
- Vida, I., & Reardon, J. (2008). Domestic consumption: rational, affective or normative choice?. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 25, 34-44: 10.1108/07363760810845390
- Wang, W., He, H., Sahadev, S., & Song, W. (2018). UK consumers' perceived risk of buying products from emerging economies: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 17, 326–339: 10.1002/cb.1714

**Table 1.** Overall fit indices and explanatory power of different models

	Model 1A	Model 1B	Model 2A	Model 2B
<b>Fit Indices</b>				
NNFI	0.966	0.947	0.976	0.965
CFI	0.974	0.958	0.980	0.970
IFI	0.974	0.958	0.980	0.970
RMSEA	0.050	0.055	0.032	0.036
<b>Path coefficients (t-value)</b>				
COO Knowledge → Reluctance to Buy	0.096 (1.372) n.s.	0.044 (0.674) n.s.	0.156 (2.434)	0.090 (1.486) n.s.
COO Knowledge → Foreign Product Ownership	-0.057 (-1.168) n.s.	0.020 (-0.396) n.s.	-0.081 (-1.694) n.s.	-0.043 (-0.841) n.s.
COO Knowledge → Psycho-social Risk	-	0.036 (0.448) n.s.	-	0.064 (0.929) n.s.
COO Knowledge → Performance Risk	-	0.204 (2.118)	-	0.152 (2.477)
Usage Exp. → Reluctance to Buy	-0.205 (-3.003)	-0.104 (-1.728) n.s.	-0.143 (-2.464)	0.101 (1.858) n.s.
Usage Exp. → Foreign Product Ownership	0.378 (6.062)	0.342 (5.454)	0.354 (5.636)	0.333 (5.200)
Usage Exp. → Psycho-social Risk	-	-0.181 (-2.433)	-	-0.149 (-2.212)
Usage Exp. → Performance Risk	-	-0.104 (-3.920)	-	-0.169 (-3.317)
C. Ethnocentrism → Reluctance to Buy	-	-	0.560 (5.678)	0.461 (4.484)
C. Ethnocentrism → Foreign Product Ownership	-	-	-0.132 (-2.063)	-0.071 (-1.296) n.s.
C. Ethnocentrism → Psycho-social Risk	-	-	-	0.388 (3.077)
C. Ethnocentrism → Performance Risk	-	-	-	0.284 (4.182)
Psycho-social Risk → Reluctance to Buy	-	0.266 (3.300)	-	0.084 (1.139) n.s.
Psycho-social Risk → Foreign Product Ownership	-	-0.126 (-1.677) n.s.	-	-0.088 (-1.146) n.s.
Performance Risk → Reluctance to Buy	-	0.499 (7.018)	-	0.408 (6.001)
Performance Risk → Foreign Product Ownership	-	-0.091 (-1.571) n.s.	-	-0.098 (-1.177) n.s.
<b>R-squared</b>				
Psycho-social Risk	-	0.034	-	0.177
Performance Risk	-	0.060	-	0.133
Reluctance to Buy	0.051	0.382	0.358	0.579
Foreign Product Ownership	0.146	0.171	0.149	0.166

Notes: Model 1A: Subjective COO knowledge and Usage experience are considered direct antecedents of CDAC. Model 1B: Psycho-social and performance risks added as mediators. Model 2A: Subjective COO Knowledge, Usage Experience, and Consumer Ethnocentrism are considered direct antecedents of CDAC. Model 2B: Psycho-social and performance risk are added as mediators.



## **Appendix I.** Interview guide

### *Opening:*

1. Welcome and thanks for agreeing to participate in this interview. I am going to ask you some questions. Please, answer as honestly as you can, and be aware that there are no right or wrong answers. Your opinions will be very useful for the purposes of the study.

### *Recording consent:*

2. Before we start, I would like you to know that I will be recording this interview for better transcription and analysis of your responses. Do you agree?

### *General CDAC:*

3. Do you hold animosity, hostility, or even hate towards any specific foreign countries? If so, which ones?

*(If more than country is identified, or in case interviewees cannot think of a “hated” country)* What is your most hated or disliked foreign country? Why?

4. What do you think of products coming from that country?

Do you avoid (or reject) their purchase?

Do you avoid all or only certain types of products? Why?

Since when? How often do you avoid their purchase?

### *Product category-specific CDAC:*

5. Do you deliberately avoid (or reject) any product or brand when you need to buy clothes? If so, which ones? Why?

Since when? How often do you avoid their purchase?

6. Do you avoid any specific type(s) of stores? If so, which ones? Why?

Since when? How often do you avoid such stores?

7. Do you avoid clothing (apparel) products from any specific foreign countries? If so, from which ones? Why?

Since when? How often do you avoid clothing products from such countries?

*(In case interviewees do not avoid clothing (apparel) products from any specific foreign countries) What sort of event, if any, could trigger such an avoidance or rejection response in you?*

*(The following question relates to the main country targets of anti-consumption mentioned by interviewees in previous questions, and China specifically.)*

*General (macro) country images:*

8. What image do you have of [*target countries, including China*], as a country, in general?

*(The following questions narrow the focus on China and apparel products.)*

*Product-category (micro) country images:*

9. What image do you have of China as a manufacturing country of clothing and other textile products? And of Chinese apparel stores?

*Chinese apparel consumption:*

10. Do you react differently to clothing products made in China, but marketed under a non-Chinese brand, than you do to clothing clothes made in China and sold in Chinese-owned stores (in Spain)? If so, how?

11. How do you feel when you buy clothes in Chinese-owned stores (here in Spain)?

12. What would others think of you if they knew that you buy Chinese apparel?

13. Which attributes are most important to you when evaluating the purchase of clothing products?

14. Do you care about the social and environmental conditions of the manufacturing country of clothing products? If so, to what extent?

*Closing:*

15. That was my last question. Before we finish though, is there anything you would like to add that I might have missed in my questions?

Thank you for your collaboration!

## Appendix II. Measurement items

Macro COO knowledge (Source: Adapted from Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999)	
I know a lot about China on...	
MCK-1	...political and economic issues.
MCK-2	...social issues.
MCK-3	...environmental issues.
Usage experience with various products and/or services from the COO (Sources: Adapted from Josiassen et al., 2008; Raju et al., 1995)	
UEX	How often do you purchase or consume products in Chinese-owned retail outlets (e.g., Chinese apparel stores, bazars, or restaurants)?
Consumer ethnocentrism (Source: Shimp et al., 1987)	
Regarding the purchase of products from foreign countries, you think that:	
CET-1	We should purchase products manufactured in Spain instead of letting other countries get rich off us.
CET-2	Purchasing foreign-made products is un-Spanish.
CET-3	It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts Spanish people out of jobs.
CET-4	We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country.
CET-5	Spanish products first, last, and foremost.
CET-6	Buy Spanish-made products. Keep Spain working.
CET-7	Foreign products should be taxed heavily to reduce their entry into Spain.
Performance risk perceptions (Source: Oberecker and Diamantopoulos, 2011)	
Regarding the purchase of Chinese apparel—that is, apparel produced in China, and sold in Spain through Chinese-owned stores—you think that it...	
PRI-1	...is risky.
PRI-2	...can have uncertain outcomes.
PRI-3	...can lead to bad results.
Psycho-social risk perceptions (Source: Adapted from Dowling and Staelin, 1994)	
Again, regarding the purchase of Chinese apparel—that is, apparel produced in China, and sold in Spain through Chinese-owned stores—you think that it...	
PSR-1	...would not fit in well with my personal values and/or self-image.
PSR-2	...can lead to a loss of social status.
CDAC: Reluctance to buy (Source: Adapted from Shoham et al. 2006; Darling and Wood, 1990)	
Regarding the purchase of Chinese apparel (i.e., apparel produced in China, and sold in Spain through Chinese-owned stores):	
RTB-1	Whenever possible, I avoid buying Chinese products.
RTB-2	I would feel guilty if I bought a Chinese product.
RTB-3	I do not like the idea of owning Chinese products.
RTB-4	I would never buy a Chinese product.

- RTB-5 If two products were equal in quality, but one was from China and one was from Spain, I would pay 10% for the product from Spain.
- RTB-6 In comparison to the products from other countries, as a general rule I do not like the products made in China.

---

CDAC: Foreign product ownership (Source: Adapted from Klein, 2002)

---

Regarding the purchase of Chinese apparel (i.e., apparel produced in China, and sold in Spain through Chinese-owned stores):

---

- FPO-1 Please, indicate the number of apparel items that you have purchased from Chinese-owned stores in the last 6 months.
- FPO-2 Approximately, what percentage of the clothing you own was purchased from Chinese stores?
-

**Figure 1.** Conceptual model

