ETHNOCENTRISM AND BUYING INTENTIONS: DOES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MATTER?

RAMA YELKUR, University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire
SUBHRA CHAKRABARTY, Mississippi State University
SOUMAVA BANDYOPADHYAY, Lamar University

The purpose of this study was to investigate if the level of economic development of a country influences the effect of ethnocentrism on purchase intentions and to study country of origin as a product quality cue in the presence of other explicit measures of product quality using data from Australia. The hypotheses were tested by a series of OLS regressions. The results indicated that consumer ethnocentrism had a significantly negative effect on purchase intentions for products from developing countries and provided partial support for the hypothesis that the effect of COO on purchase intentions is independent of explicit product quality attributes.

INTRODUCTION

Among the key issues facing all countries is the increasing internationalization of the world economy. International competition is faced both in the domestic markets and in foreign markets as tariffs are reduced, markets are deregulated, and businesses transcend national borders (Wilkinson and Cheng 1999). The deregulation and restructuring of the Australian economy which started in the early 1980s and continued through the 1990s have laid the foundation for an aggressive and internationally competitive Australian industry. Following such economic liberalization in recent years, consumer products from many countries compete with each other in the Australian market.

The Australian economy grew by about four percent from 1997 to 2002, reflecting a strong increase in both domestic demand and business investment (Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs 2004). With a high and rising per capita income level, low unemployment (nearly five percent), and low inflation, today, Australia is fully integrated into the world economy and is a commercial and financial center for the region (US Department of Commerce 2005).

Australia is a country that is quite open to foreign products. It also has a small economy and population making it more vulnerable to foreign competition (US Department of Commerce 1999). One study compared consumer perceptions of ethnocentrism-pitched advertisements in Australia and India (Jo 1998). Australia and India were the countries chosen in this study specifically because the two countries differ greatly in terms of threat from foreign competition; Australia rates very high on level of foreign threat due to the openness of the market to foreign products (Jo 1998).

Australia is a culturally diverse country and is a part of the Oceanic continent. The Oceanic continent is the geopolitical region consisting of countries and territories in the Pacific Ocean, including Australia and New Zealand. Other than the territories of the U.S. where the currency is the U.S. Dollar, Australia and New Zealand have the strongest economies in the Oceanic continent (Wikipedia 2005). In 1999-2000, New Zealand was the fourth largest destination for Australian exports, and was the sixth largest source for Australian imports (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2005).

The Marketing Management Journal
Volume 16, Issue 2, Pages 26 - 37

The USA is Australia's largest source of imports. The ratification and implementation of the Free Trade Agreement between the U.S. and Australia (AUSFTA) in 2005 has made the Australian market even more rewarding and attractive for U.S. companies (US Department of Commerce 2005). The Australian economic future is also inextricably intertwined with the Asian region, which is the home of seven of Australia's export markets. The continuing growth of India and China, which in 2002 accounted for 38 percent of the world's population and India's emergence as a major economic player in the Asian region with a growth rate of over eight percent in 2004 - the second highest growth market in the region, after China - has resulted in increased bilateral trade between Australia and these two countries respectively (Australian High Commission New Delhi 2005).

Although the subject of ethnocentrism has been widely researched (Papadopoulous and Heslop 2003), estimate over 600 studies on the subject, little has been written on the relationship between ethnocentrism and purchase intentions (O'Cass and Lim 2002). Previous research has also stopped short of investigating if the level of economic development of a country is a factor in explaining the influence of consumer ethnocentrism on purchase intentions. Also, there is no evidence of the studies investigating the impact of country of origin as a product quality cue in the presence of explicit product quality evaluations. The purpose of this study is to investigate if the level of economic development of a country influences the effect of ethnocentrism on purchase intentions and to study country of origin as a product quality cue in the presence of other explicit measures of product quality. This study is expected to fill a void in the literature and provide managerial directions to international competitors seeking expansion into the Australian market.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ethnocentrism

The sociological meaning of ethnocentrism as defined by Sumner is: "the view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and related with reference to it .... Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts in its own divinities and looks with contempt on outsiders" (1906, p. 13). Shimp and Sharma (1987) define consumer ethnocentrism as the belief held by consumers about the appropriateness and morality of purchasing foreign-made products. Consumer ethnocentrism results first from the love and concern for one's own country and the fear of losing control of one's economic interests from the harmful effects of imports (Sharma, Shimp and Shin 1995). Consumers who are highly ethnocentric are unwilling to purchase foreign products and tend to look at the issue of buying foreign goods as a moral rather than just an economic problem. From a managerial perspective, ethnocentrism refers to consumers' preference for domestic products and prejudice against imports. Ethnocentric consumers tend to purchase domestic products even if the quality is lower than that of imports (Wall and Heslop 1986). However, high ethnocentrism scores found in developed countries may mean that consumers in these countries prefer domestically-made products first, followed by products from other highly developed countries, followed by products from less developed countries (Wang and Lamb 1980; Okechuku 1994). When ethnocentrism scores for a country are high, generally, consumers take country of origin into consideration when evaluating products (Ahmed et al. 2004). The construct of ethnocentrism prevails; consumers' patriotic emotions have an effect on purchase intentions and ultimately behavior.

Many country-of-origin studies conducted in various countries, such as the United States (Shimp and Sharma 1987), Canada (Hung 1989), France (Baumgartner and Jolibert 1977),

the United Kingdom (Bannister and Saunders 1978), and Korea (Sharma, Shimp and Shin 1995) have illustrated that consumers with ethnocentric tendencies have a proclivity to evaluate domestic products unreasonably favorably compared to imported products. This indicates a definite positive association between ethnocentrism and evaluation of products made domestically, and a negative association between ethnocentrism and evaluation of imported products.

Country of Origin

During the last three decades, numerous articles have examined various aspects of country-of-origin influence. Country of origin (COO) is an overall perception of a country (Nagashima 1977; Wall and Heslop 1986; Papadopolous and Heslop 2003). There is also evidence that COO is contingent on a specific product category (Gaedeke 1973; Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes 1982; Eroglu and Machleit 1988; Han and Terpstra 1988).

Consumers' judgments of product quality are thought to be influenced by the country associated with the product (Klein, Ettenson and Morris 1998). There is a substantial body of research on consumers' evaluation of products based on the country-of-origin (Papadopolous and Heslop 1993; Maheswaran 1994). People tend to have stereotypical notions concerning products and people of other countries, and real product evaluations are almost always influenced by country stereotyping (Bilkey and Nes 1982; Cordell 1992; Tse and Gorn 1993). Products from more developed countries are generally found to receive more positive evaluations from consumers than products from less developed countries (Gaedeke 1973).

THE CURRENT STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

The study of ethnocentrism and purchase intentions would be appropriate in a product market where fierce competition exists between domestic and foreign-made products. It is necessary to select an appropriate product category, in view of the previously documented relationship between the strength of COO effects and the nature of the product (Liefeld 1993). The textile, clothing, and footwear industry is undergoing significant restructuring in Australia. The government's target is to have complete free trade in this sector by the year 2010. As a result of the gradual phasing out of tariffs, domestic manufacturers are facing extreme competition from imports from Asian countries. The Australian government recently eliminated a number of existing taxes for consumers on textile products and added a ten percent goods and services tax (GST) on the reduced cost base instead. As a result, the retail prices of textiles and clothing are expected to rise (Ahern 2000). As a consequence of the reduction of tariffs for imports and the creation of the new GST, the demand for this product category is expected to slow down. The textile and clothing market in Australia is going to become a highly competitive one, with a large number of imports competing with domestic brands.

Level of Economic Development, Ethnocentrism and Purchase Intentions

Cordell (1993) studied the effect of country of origin based on the economic level of the producer country. That is, the economic level of the producer country was investigated as a determinant of consumers' value for the product from that country and it was concluded that consumers prefer products from highly developed countries over those from less developed countries. The few studies that specifically examined the effect of the level of economic development of a country on product quality judgments show that consumers derogate products from less developed countries (Gaedeke 1973; Cordell 1991; Cordell 1993; Heslop, Papadopolous and Bourk 1998), it is assumed that consumers lack confidence in product quality of goods originating from such countries. Along similar lines, as Okechuku (1994) and Wang and Lamb

(1980) demonstrated, consumers in highly developed countries prefer to purchase products originating from highly developed countries.

Research on ethnocentrism indicates that for a country with strong ethnocentrism, country of origin becomes significantly important when evaluating products (Ahmed et al. 2004). In addition, there is a definite positive association between ethnocentrism and evaluation of products made domestically, and a negative association between ethnocentrism and evaluation of imported products.

In summary, previous research on consumer ethnocentrism has focused on the impact of ethnocentrism on: attitudes and behavioral intentions (Shimp and Sharma 1987), beliefs about products (Netemeyer, Durvasula and Lichenstein 1991), product and behavioral attitudes (Durvasula, Andrews and Netemeyer 1997), product ownership (Nielsen and Spence 1997), brand preference and purchase intention (O'Cass and Lim 2002), and actual purchases (Shoham and Brenčič 2003). None of these studies investigated if the impact of ethnocentrism on purchase intentions is influenced by the level of economic development of the country. Therefore:

H_1: The effect of ethnocentrism on purchase intention varies by level of economic development of the competing countries.

Country of Origin and Purchase Intentions

There is a substantial body of research on consumers' evaluation of products based on the country-of-origin (Papadopolous and Heslop, 1993; Maheswaran 1994; Liefield 2004; Ahmed, d'Astous and Champagne 2005; Laroche, Papadopoulos, Heslop and Mourali 2005; Liu and Johnson 2005; Speece and Nguyen 2005). A product's COO is an informational cue which, like other informational cues such as price, brand name, etc., helps consumers evaluate products and develop attitudes towards them (Papadopoulos and Heslop 1993). The most direct way in which this cue can be given is through the product's "made in" label. In spite of the current proliferation of global brands, COO remains an important factor in consumer product evaluation (Laroche, Papadopoulos, Heslop and Mourali 2005). Consumers tend to exhibit "national stereotyping," which is a biased way of thinking about people and products from a country (Johansson and Thorelli 1985; Cordell 1992). Consumers' perceptions of a foreign country (economic prosperity, technological advances, etc.) are often translated into consistent perceptions regarding the quality of products from that country (Bilkey and Nes 1982). A consumer might be cognitive of positive characteristics of those countries towards which she has a positive attitude, and such positive cognition and attitude might well result in the consumer purchasing products made in those countries (Schooler and Sunoo 1969).

Country of origin studies continue to provide value for several reasons. Country of origin plays an important role in the perceptions of product quality and influence(s) consumers' choice of brands. COO research that provides generalizable strategic guidelines on how to successfully compete in a global market is especially useful (Kim and Chung 1997; Ahmed, d'Astous and Champagne 2005). Although country of origin is a widely researched subject, most published COO studies have been carried out in occidental countries (Ahmed, d'Astous and Champagne 2005); there is little known research conducted on the subject in the Australian continent.

Liefeld (1993) reviewed the results of experimental research on COO effects through a meta-analysis, and observed that, in the vast majority of experiments, there was a significant statistical relationship between COO and consumer product evaluations and choices. If the country of origin has a favorable image, that is, is viewed positively by respondents being surveyed, product quality has a significant impact on the purchase intention for products from that country. As proposed by Klein,

Ettenson and Morris (1998), a product's country of origin can affect consumer buying decisions independent of other product quality evaluations. It can be said therefore, that if the country of origin is viewed highly by consumers, product quality is used as a basis of judgment since the country of origin is no longer an issue. Does country of origin then serve as a product quality cue even in the presence of other explicit product quality measures? Therefore:

H_2: Country of origin as a product quality cue impacts purchase intention even in the presence of other explicit product quality measures.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The sampling frame for the study consisted of business students enrolled at two premier institutions in Southern Australia [1]. The students were citizens of Australia, and were expected to have variations in their product COO evaluations (Netemeyer, Durvasula and Lichtenstein 1991). Business graduates in Australia command some of the highest salaries of all professional occupations. They are more likely to be able to afford expensive foreign products when they enter the workforce, and hence are the target market for most foreign companies expanding into the Australian market.

The survey was distributed among 150 students at the two business schools. One hundred and one usable surveys were returned, representing a response rate of 67 percent. Of the 101 respondents, 45 (44.6 percent) were male, and 56 (55.4 percent) were female. The average age of the respondents was 20 years, with a range between 16 and 54 years. Twenty-nine (28.7 percent) of the respondents had high school diplomas, 62 (61.4 percent) were enrolled in an undergraduate program, 6 (5.9 percent) had completed their bachelor's degrees, 2 (2 percent) were working toward a master's degree, and 1 (1 percent) had a master's degree. One respondent did not indicate his/her level of education.

Measures of Constructs

The subjects in the sample were given a self-administered questionnaire that included two sections. One section consisted of Shimp and Sharma's (1987) 17-item CETSCALE to measure ethnocentrism (with references to the United States in the original scale replaced with references to Australia). The respondents were asked to indicate their extent of agreement with various statements describing ethnocentric proclivities on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The other section included a scale to measure respondents' general attitudes toward Australia, New Zealand, the United States, China, and India as countries (COO, 4 items) and scales to measure their attitudes regarding the quality (product quality, 3 items), value (i.e., price with respect to quality, product value, 2 items), and image (product image, 3 items) of clothing products originating from Australia, New Zealand, the United States, China, and India. The scales in the second section were adapted from the established country-of-origin measure by Pisharodi and Parameswaran (1992). Finally, the respondents were also asked how likely they were to actually buy clothing products from these five countries in question (measuring purchase intention), also on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all likely, 7 = very likely).

ANALYSYS AND RESULTS

The measures for COO, product quality, and consumer ethnocentrism were subjected to an item analysis. For each construct, items with less than 0.40 item-to-total correlations were eliminated. This resulted in 3-item scales for quality of clothing from all five countries, and 3-item scales for COO for China, India, and New Zealand. The COO measures for Australia and USA consisted of two items. Barring COO for India, the coefficient alpha for each of these scales exceeded 0.70. Thus, the measures were reliable.

The coefficient alpha values of the items measuring image of clothing from China, India,

and USA were less than 0.50. The coefficient alpha of the items measuring the value of clothing from Australia was less than 0.50. Therefore, the effects of image and value were omitted from further analysis. The scale items and coefficient alpha values of the constructs retained for analysis are displayed in Appendix 1.

The item analysis of the CETSCALE yielded a 16-item measure of consumer ethnocentrism. The unidimensionality of this measure was assessed by a confirmatory factor analysis of the covariance matrix of the scale items using LISREL 8.54. All items were specified to estimate a single factor (consumer ethnocentrism). The initial fit statistics revealed that the fit of the measurement model of CETSCALE can be improved by respecifications. Four items were deleted based on modification indices and standardized residuals. The fit of the resulting 12-item measure of consumer ethnocentrism was satisfactory (GFI = 0.84; CFI = 0.96; NFI = 0.93; SRMR = 0.06). The coefficient alpha of this scale was 0.93 (see Appendix I for the scale items). The descriptive statistics and correlations of all the variables studied are presented in Table I.

The research hypotheses were tested by a series of OLS regressions where purchase intentions were regressed on consumer ethnocentrism, COO, and quality of clothing. Collinearity statistics revealed that multicollinearity was unlikely to bias the results since the largest VIF value was 1.525. The regression results for each of the five countries are displayed in Table II.

As Table II indicates, consumer ethnocentrism had a significantly negative effect on purchase intentions of clothing manufactured in China and India. Consequently, ethnocentric Australian consumers were less likely to purchase clothing made in less developed countries such as China and India, but their purchase intentions were unaffected for clothing manufactured in their oceanic neighbor New Zealand, or in a highly developed country such as USA. H_1 predicted that the effect of ethnocentrism on purchase intentions varies by the level of economic development of the competing nations. The statistical significance of the negative effect of consumer ethnocentrism on purchase intentions for clothing made only in less developed countries (China and India) provides strong support for H_1.

H_2 predicted that the effect of COO on purchase intentions is independent of the availability of explicit product quality attributes. Meaning, COO itself will serve as a cue for clothing quality even when Australian consumers are able to judge the quality of the clothing they intend to purchase. As Table II shows, COO predicted purchase intentions for clothing products made in India, USA, and Australia. Consequently, H_2 was supported for these countries.

The relationship between COO and purchase intentions was not supported for clothing made in China and New Zealand. Ethnocentrism was found to be the only factor to have a significant (and negative) impact on the purchase intentions for Chinese-made clothing. This may be caused by Australia's huge trade deficit with China. In fact, China has recently overtaken the U.S. as the largest source of imports for Australia (Garnaut 2005). According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Australia's $2.7 billion monthly trade deficit in January, 2005 was its second-largest in history, exceeded only by a $2.8 billion deficit in April, 2003. This trade deficit was fuelled mainly by an increasing import of clothing and electronics from China. Fear of losing control of one's economic interests from the harmful effects of imports is a major cause of ethnocentrism (Sharma, Shimp and Shin 1995). Australian consumers who are alarmed by the country's rising trade deficit with China are likely to develop greater levels of ethnocentrism, and lesser intent to purchase clothing imported from China. On the other hand, Australian consumers may have different criteria for evaluating clothing made in their oceanic neighbor

TABLE I
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variable[1]	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Buy_{China}	4.541	2.136	1			
2. COO_{China}	3.149	1.516	0.305**	1		
3. $Quality_{China}$	2.348	1.510	0.353**	0.485**	1	
4. Ethnocentrism	2.911	1.224	-0.238*	0.135	-0.253*	1
1. Buy_{India}	4.229	2.110	1			
2. COO_{India}	2.656	1.148	0.370**	1		
3. $Quality_{India}$	2.691	1.380	0.284**	0.321**	1	
4. Ethnocentrism	2.911	1.224	-0.202	0.081	-0.257*	1
1. $Buy_{New\ Zealand}$	5.260	1.467	1			
2. $COO_{New\ Zealand}$	5.150	0.931	0.107	1		
3. $Quality_{New\ Zealand}$	4.829	1.211	0.361**	0.208*	1	
4. Ethnocentrism	2.911	1.224	0.052	-0.259*	-0.025	1
1. Buy_{USA}	6.142	1.226	1			
2. COO_{USA}	5.737	1.132	0.434**	1		
3. $Quality_{USA}$	5.646	0.805	0.076	0.261*	1	
4. Ethnocentrism	2.911	1.224	-0.003	0.073	-0.080	1
1. $Buy_{Australia}$	6.404	0.819	1			
2. $COO_{Australia}$	5.994	0.892	0.458**	1		
3. $Quality_{Australia}$	5.735	1.045	0.068	0.283**	1	
4. Ethnocentrism	2.911	1.224	0.068	0.106	0.090	1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.
[1] Buy = Buying Intentions, COO = Country-Of-Origin, Quality = Product Quality.

TABLE II
Standardized Coefficients of Predictors of Purchase Intentions[1]

Variable	China	India	New Zealand	USA	Australia
Ethnocentrism	**-0.19**	**-0.23**	0.11	-0.04	0.03
	(-1.70)[c]	**(-2.06)[b]**	(1.03)	(-0.42)	(0.28)
COO	0.18	**0.25**	0.06	**0.48**	**0.50**
	(1.45)	**(2.15)[b]**	(0.59)	**(4.67)[a]**	**(4.98)[a]**
Product Quality	0.19	0.05	**0.41**	-0.02	-0.06
	(1.47)	(0.39)	**(3.83)[a]**	(-0.19)	(-0.61)
Adjusted R^2	0.12	0.09	**0.15**	0.19	0.21
Model Fit	**$F_{3,77}$ = 4.64[a]**	**$F_{3,77}$ = 3.62[b]**	**$F_{3,76}$ = 5.73[a]**	**$F_{3,78}$ = 7.63[a]**	**$F_{3,79}$ = 8.61[a]**

[1] t-values in parentheses.
[a] $p < 0.01$
[b] $p < 0.05$
[c] $p < 0.10$

country, New Zealand. As Table II indicates, product quality explained 15 percent of the variance in purchase intentions for clothing made in New Zealand. This may be the result of Australian consumers' more definitive perceptions regarding the quality of clothing made in New Zealand, a country they are likely to be very familiar with due to the geographic and cultural proximities.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

As seen from the results of hypothesis H_1, Australian consumers' purchase intentions were negatively impacted by ethnocentrism for clothing made in the developing countries of China and India. Consequently, clothing exporters from less-developed countries might want to use consumer ethnocentrism as a psychographic segmentation variable while marketing their products in Australia. This strategy could yield good results since the overall level of ethnocentrism in Australian consumers was found to be low (only 2.91 on a 7-point scale), and the ethnocentrism had no effect on Australian consumers' purchase intentions of clothing made in Australia.

The significance of COO as a proxy cue for clothing quality also has managerial implications for foreign clothing manufacturers targeting the Australian market. Indian and American clothing exporters should include elements in their promotional campaigns that would project their respective countries in a more favorable light. This task would be more challenging for Indian exporters because of India's developing country status. To compete effectively against lower-priced imports, domestic clothing manufacturers in Australia would need to keep the image of the home country favorable too, as COO was found to be a strong influencer of Australian consumers' intentions to purchase domestically-made clothing. Clothing exporters from New Zealand should focus more on the quality aspects of clothing from that country in their promotional campaigns, since the quality perception of New Zealand-made clothing has a direct impact on Australian consumers' purchase intentions.

Chinese and Indian clothing exporters to Australia, in particular, might want to target risk-takers among Australian consumers. Targeting risk-takers (a psychographic segmentation approach) has been previously recommended as a market entry method for

exporters with unfavorable-image brands from unfavorable-image countries (Ahmed, d'Astous and Zouiten 1993). The promotional messages from these exporters should emphasize how such risk-taking might yield better value for money.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study tries to fill a void in the product-country images literature by investigating how ethnocentric effects on Australian consumers' intentions of purchasing products made in various countries are mediated by the economic development level of the source countries; and how such purchasing intentions might be affected by COO perceptions acting as a proxy for product quality. The study found that ethnocentrism did negatively impact the intention to purchase products from less-developed countries, while it did not have any significant influence on the intention to purchase products from economically advanced countries. Also, for some countries, COO perceptions, serving as a product quality cue, positively influenced purchase intentions.

Clothing was used as the product category in the study since it represented a heavily imported product into the Australian market. Caution should be exercised in generalizing the results across all product categories, as the product category is a salient factor in product COO evaluations (Wall, Liefeld and Heslop 1989). It will be interesting to see if the results in this study hold for other products as well, particularly products that have traditionally favorable associations with specific countries.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

The study has several limitations. The sample size needs to be increased, and non-student consumers need to be included in the sample to better represent the Australian population. The reliabilities of the measures should be improved by conducting more field studies, and refining the measurement scales in the process. Alternative measurement scales containing a greater number of items need to be developed particularly for the predictor variables that are likely to have an impact on consumers' purchase intentions. In the present study, the measures for product image and product value had to be deleted from the analysis because of inadequacies in the measures.

SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research on the impact of COO on purchase intentions should also include more demographic and psychographic variables. Variables such as age, gender, education, economic affluence, foreign travel, and political animosity toward specific countries have been found to significantly affect COO perceptions (Schooler 1971; Shimp and Sharma 1987; Schellinick 1989; Klein, Sharma, Shimp and Shin 1995; Ettenson and Morris 1998). The possible mediating effects of these variables on COO cues that ultimately influence purchase intentions should be covered in future extensions of this study.

[1] The authors would like to acknowledge Professor Stephen Holden at Bond University, Australia for his assistance with the data collection.

REFERENCES

Ahern, A. 2000. *National Trade Data Bank*, U.S. Department of Commerce [cited 21 June 2000). Available from http://www.doc.gov/; INTERNET.

Ahmed, S. A., A. d'Astous and C. Champagne. 2005. "Country Images of Technological Products in Taiwan," *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 17(2), 44-70.

Ahmed, S.A., A. d'Astous and S. Zouiten. 1993. "Personality Variables and The Made-in Concept," In *Product-country images: Impact and Role in International Marketing*, edited by E. N. Papadopoulos and L.A. Heslop. New York: International Business Press, 197-222.

Ahmed, Z.U., J. P. Johnson, X. Yang, C.K. Fatt, H.S. Teng and L.C. Boon. 2004. "Does Country of Origin Matter for Low Involvement Products?" *International Marketing Review* 21(1), 102-120.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2005. Available from http://www.abs.gov.au/Ausstats; INTERNET.

Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2004. "A Competitive Economy: Australia in Brief," Available from http://www.dfat.gov.au/; INTERNET.

Australian High Commission New Delhi. 2005. "Australia's Trade with India," Available http://www.ausgovindia.com/; INTERNET.

Bannister, J.P. and J.A. Saunders. 1978. "U.K. Consumers' Attitudes Towards Imports: The Measurement of National Stereotype Image," *European Journal of Marketing* 12: 562-70.

Baumgartner, G. and A. Jolibert. 1977. "The Perception of Foreign Products in France," In *Advances in Consumer Research*, Volume 5, edited by H.K. Hunt. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research, 603-05.

Bilkey, W.J. and E. Nes. 1982. "Country of Origin Effects on Product Evaluations," *Journal of International Business Studies* 1(Spring/Summer), 89-99.

Cattin, P., A. Jolibert and C. Lohnes. 1982. "A Crosscultural Study of 'Made in' Concepts," *Journal of International Business Studies* 2(Winter), 131-41.

Cordell, V.C. 1991. "Competitive Context and Price as Moderators of Country of Origin Preferences," *Academy of Marketing Science Journal* 19(2), 123-28.

Cordell, V.C. 1992. "Effects of Consumer Preferences for Foreign-Sourced Products," *Journal of International Business Studies* 23(2), 251-70.

Cordell, V.V. 1993. "Interaction Effects of Country of Origin with Branding, Price, and Perceived Performance Risk," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 5(2), 5-21.

Durvasula, S., J.C. Andrews and R.G. Netemeyer. 1997. "A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Consumer Ethnocentrism in the United States and Russia," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 9(4), 73-93.

Eroglu, S. and K.A. Machleit. 1988. "Effects of Individual and Product Specific Variables on Utilising Country of Origin as a Product Quality Cue," *International Marketing Review* 6(6), 27-41.

Gaedeke, R. 1973. "Consumer Attitudes Towards Products 'Made in' Developing Countries," *Journal of Retailing* 49: 14-24.

Garnaut, J. 2005. "China Goods Fuel Leap in Trade Deficit," *The Sydney Morning Herald* cited 1 March 2005. Available from http://www.smh.com.au/news/Business/China-goods-fuel-leap-in-trade-deficit/2005/1109546803553.html; INTERNET.

Han, C.M. and V. Terpstra. 1988. "Country-of-Origin Effects for Uninational and Binational Products," *Journal of International Business Studies* 19(Summer), 235-55.

Heslop, L.A., N. Papadapoulos and M. Bourk. 1998. "An Interregional and Intercultural Perspective on Subculture Differences in Product Evaluations," *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration Montreal* 15(2), 113-27.

Hung, C. 1989. "A Country of Origin Product Image Study: The Canadian Perception and Nationality Biases," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 13: 5-26.

Jo, M. 1998. "Contingency and Contextual Issues of Ethnocentricism-Pitched Advertisements: A Cross-National Comparison," *International Marketing Review* 15(6), 447-57.

Johansson, J.K. and H.B. Thorelli. 1985. "International Product Positioning," *Journal of International Business Studies* 16(3), 57-76.

Kim, C. K. and J. Y. Chung. 1997. "Brand Popularity, Country Image and Market Share: An Empirical Study," *Journal of International Business Studies* 28(2), 361-386.

Klein, J.G., R. Ettenson and M.D. Morris. 1998. "The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase: An Empirical Test in the People's Republic of China," *Journal of Marketing* 62(1), 89-100.

Laroche, M., N. Papadopoulos, L. A. Heslop and M. Mourali. 2005. "The Influence of Country Image Structure on Consumer Evaluations of Foreign Products," *International Marketing Review* 22(1), 96-115.

Leifeld, J. P. 2004. "Consumer Knowledge and Use of Country-of-Origin Information at Point of Purchase," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* 4(2), 85-96.

Leifeld, J.P. 1993. "Experiments on Country-of -Origin Effects: Review and Meta-Analysis of Effect Size," In *Product Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing*, edited by N. Papadopoulos and L.A. Heslop. New York: International Business Press, 117-56.

Liu, S. S. and L. A. Johnson. 2005. "The Automatic Country-of-Origin Effects on Brand Judgements," *Journal of Advertising* 34(1), 87-97.

Maheswaran, D. 1994. "Country-of-Origin as a Stereotype: Effects of Consumer Expertise and Attribute Strength on Product Evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research* 21(2), 354-66.

Nagashima, A. 1977. "A Comparative 'Made in' Product Image Survey Among Japanese Businessmen," *Journal of Marketing* 41(July), 95-100.

Netemeyer, R.G., S. Durvasula and D.R. Lichtenstein. 1991. "A Cross-National Assessment of the Reliability and Validity of the CETSCALE," *Journal of Marketing Research* 28(3), 320-27.

Nielsen, J.A. and M.T. Spence. 1997. "A Test of the Stability of the CETSCALE, a Measure of Consumers' Ethnocentric Tendencies," *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 5(4), 68-77.

O'Cass, A. and K. Lim. 2002. "Toward Understanding the Young Consumer's Brand Associations and Ethnocentrism in the Lion's Port," *Psychology and Marketing* 19(9), 759-75.

Okechuku, C. 1994. "The Importance of Product Origin: A Conjoint Analysis of the United States, Canada, Germany, and the Netherlands," *European Journal of Marketing* 28(4), 5-19.

Papadopoulos , N. and L.A. Heslop. 1993. *Product-Country Images: Role and Implications for International Marketing*. New York: International Business Press.

Papadopoulos, N. and L.A. Heslop. 2003. "Country of Equity and Product-Country Images: State of the Art in Research and Implications," In *A Handbook of Research in International Marketing*, edited by S.C. Jain. Cheltenham, U.K.: Eward Elgar, 402-33.

Pisharodi, R.M. and R. Parameswaran. 1992. "Confirmatory Factor Analysis of a Country-of- Origin Scale: Initial Results," In *Advances in Consumer Research*, edited by J. Sherry and B. Sternthal. Ann-Arbor, MI: 19.

Purnell, L. 1996. "Australian Industry Needs Globalization," *Asian Business Review* (June), 70.

Schellinck, D.A. 1989. "Determinants of Country-of-Origin Cue Usage," In *Marketing*, Volume 10, edited by A. d'Astous. Montreal, Quebec: Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, 268-75.

Schooler, R.D. 1971. "Bias Phenomena Attendant to the Marketing of Foreign Goods in the U.S.," *Journal of International Business Studies* 2(Spring), 394-97.

Schooler, R.D. and D.H. Sunoo. 1969. "Consumer Perceptions of International Products: Regional vs. National Labelling," *Social Science Quarterly* (March), 886-90.

Sharma, S., T.A. Shimp and J. Shin. 1995. "Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Test of Antecedents and Moderators," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 23(1), 26-37.

Shimp, T.A. and S. Sharma. 1987. "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE," *Journal of Marketing Research* 24(August), 280-89.

Shoham, A. and M.M. Brenčič. 2003. "Consumer Ethnocentrism, Attitudes, and Purchase Behavior: An Israeli Study," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 15(4), 67-86.

Speece, M. and D. P. Nguyen. 2005. "Countering Negative Country-of-Origin with Low Prices: A Conjoint Study in Vietnam," *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 14(1), 39-48.

Sumner, W.G. 1906. *Folkways: The Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals*. New York: Ginn and Co.

Tse, D.K. and G. Gorn. 1993. "An Experiment on the Salience of Country-of-Origin in the Era of Global Brands," *Journal of International Marketing* 1(1), 57-76.

U.S. Department of Commerce. 1999. "U.S. National Trade Estimate," National Trade Data Bank. Available from http://www.doc.gov/; INTERNET.

US Department of Commerce. 2005. "Doing Business in Australia," In *Australia 2005 Country Commercial Guide*. Available from http://www.buyusainfo.net/docs/x_369806.pdf; INTERNET.

Wall, M. and L.A. Heslop. 1986. "Consumer Attitudes Toward Canadian-Made versus Imported Products," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 14(Summer), 27-36.

Wall, M., J.P. Liefeld and L.A. Heslop. 1989. "Impact of Country-of-Origin Cues and Patriotic Appeals on Consumer Judgments:Covariance Analysis," In *Marketing*, Volume 10, edited by A. d'Astous. Montreal, Quebec: Administrative Sciences Association of Canada.

Wang, C.K. and C.W. Lamb Jr. 1980. "Foreign Environmental Factors Influencing American Consumers' Predispositions Toward European Products," *Academy of Marketing Science Journal* 8(4), 345-57.

Wikipedia. 2005. Oceania. Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oceania; INTERNET.

Wilkinson, I.F. and C. Cheng. 1999. "Perspectives: Multicultural Marketing in Australia, Synergy in Diversity," *Journal of International Marketing* 7(3), 106-25.

APPENDIX

Coefficient Alphas of COO

COO_{China} = 0.76; COO_{India} = 0.61; $COO_{New\ Zealand}$ = 0.76; COO_{USA} = 0.80[1]; $COO_{Australia}$ = 0.72[1]

Items Measuring Country of Origin

1. People of this country are well educated.
2. People of this country have a high standard of living.
3. People of this country have high technical skills.

[1] Item 3 excluded.

Coefficient Alphas of Product Quality

$Quality_{China}$ = 0.81; $Quality_{India}$ = 0.76; $Quality_{New\ Zealand}$ = 0.72; $Quality_{USA}$ = 0.73; $Quality_{Australia}$ = 0.83

Items Measuring Quality of Clothing Products

1. Clothing products from this country are of high quality.
2. Clothing products from this country are long-lasting.
3. Clothing from this country looks cheaply made (reverse scored).

Items Measuring Consumer Ethnocentrism in Australia (Coefficient Alpha = 0.93)

1. Australian people should always buy Australian-made products instead of imports.
2. Australian products first, last, and foremost.
3. Purchasing foreign-made products is un-Australian.
4. A real Australian should always buy Australian-made products.
5. We should purchase products made in Australia instead of letting other countries get rich off us.
6. There should be very little trading or purchasing of goods from other countries unless out of necessity.
7. Australians should not buy foreign products because this hurts Australian businesses and causes unemployment.
8. Curbs should be put on all imports.
9. Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products in Australian markets.
10. Foreign products should be taxed heavily to reduce their entry into Australia.
11. We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country.
12. Australian consumers who purchase products made in other countries put their fellow Australians out of work.