

Do Rumbings Lead to Real Action? A Case of Animosity and Boycott in China

Selima Ben Mrad
Barry University

Shirley Ye Sheng
Barry University

Laura K. Hart
Barry University

First and foremost, consumers are citizens of a country who become offended when they perceive that their country's interests have been affronted. At times, consumers signal their discontent with an offending country through boycotting its businesses or products. In fact, when consumers feel discontented, they may feel disloyal toward their own country and feel guilty if they do not take action to try to punish the "offending country." Using a case from China, this paper examines three mediators to determine the relationship between animosity, a feeling of hostility, and consumers' boycott participation.

INTRODUCTION

The "world is flat" is a statement that is used worldwide to signify that geographic and cultural boundaries no longer present a problem for trade. Indeed, businesses from countries such as China and India now compete head-to-head with US' and European companies in a variety of industries, including technology, automotive, and consumer products. It is generally accepted that, the "playing field has been leveled," which is terminology from Thomas Friedman (2005).

However, despite a vast reduction of formal tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade in numerous countries around the world, consumers' feelings often impact the success or failure of a company's sales efforts; thus affecting trade between nations. In fact, when customers are not happy with the actions of a particular country, they may even boycott products "made in" that country. Indeed, the acts of nations, when perceived negatively by another country, may affect products originating from that country. Consumers will boycott products from the "offending country" because they believe that such an action will punish the offending country and change its politics towards their nation. However, boycotts do not generally end up in changing nations'

political actions. Thus, the question that arises is what motivates a consumer to be a part of a boycott?

Boycotts are defined by Friedman (1985, p.97) as, “an attempt by one or more parties to achieve certain objectives by urging individual consumers to refrain from making selected purchases in the marketplace.” Boycotts are usually driven by consumers’ feelings of anger and animosity towards the “offending country” or an “offending company.”

Consumer boycotts have been prevalent for centuries and have also been used in efforts to change companies’ policies. Boycotts have targeted companies such as Nike for labor conditions overseas, Adidas for their use of kangaroo skin, Texaco for contaminating Ecuadorian land, and Wal-Mart for their treatment of their employees, among others. Boycotts have also been used to emphasize opposition to a country’s policies. For example, in 1920, Ghandi asked Indians to boycott British salt and linen products as a means of expressing their resistance to the British colonization of their land (Klein, Smit, & John, 2004). In 1930, Jewish Americans tried to boycott German products because of dissatisfaction with German policies (Varlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). These examples reflect the attitudes of consumers toward foreign countries’ governments. However, consumers may also mount boycotts to demonstrate outrage and resistance toward their own government. For instance, rage and anger among African Americans at rampant racial discrimination in the United States was reflected in the Montgomery bus boycott (Friedman, 1985).

Research has shown that there are two types of consumer willingness to participate in a boycott: instrumental and non-instrumental (Ettenson & Klein, 2005). Instrumental boycotts are usually targeted toward a company or a country with the objective of making a change in the company’s or the country’s actions (Friedman, 1985). Non-instrumental (or expressive) boycotts; however, are meant to express consumers’ anger and hostility about the actions of the offending party (Friedman, 1985; Ettenson & Klein, 2005; Klein, Smith & John, 2004).

Typically, in a boycott situation, consumers feel animus toward either the targeted country or targeted company. Thus, consumer animosity is an important construct that should be considered in the event of a boycott. At the individual level, consumers feel hostility towards the offending party (country or company) when they decide to participate in a boycott. Animosity toward a nation has been defined as, “the remnants of antipathy related to previous or ongoing political, military, economic or diplomatic events” (Klein, Ettenson & Morris, 1998, p.90).

In several studies, animosity was found to be negatively related to consumers’ willingness to purchase foreign products from the “offending” country (Klein, et al., 1998). Klein, Ettenson and Morris (1998) found that, although Chinese consumers typically did not denigrate the quality of Japanese products, nevertheless many of them refused to purchase Japanese products because of their feelings of antipathy about the Japanese-led massacre that had occurred decades earlier in the city of Nanjing. Similar sentiment was expressed by Arab-American consumers, who, although convinced of the superior quality of Israeli products, were still unwilling to buy them (Obermiller & Spangenberg, 1989).

Existing literature about animosity has examined the antecedents of animosity (Shoham, et al., 2006), the effect of animosity on willingness to buy (Klein & Ettenson, 1999) as well as the effect of animosity on boycott participation (Ettenson & Klein, 2005). However, no single study has included both antecedents of animosity and the effect of animosity on boycott participation. Most published research has focused on either the antecedents or effects of animosity within a particular context such as Chinese animosity towards Japan, Arab-Israeli animosity in light of the Intifada, and Australian animosity towards France.

In this article, we contribute to the literature by examining the antecedents of animosity, the effect of animosity on willingness to buy, and the effect of animosity on boycott participation together in one study about Chinese animosity toward France in 2008. Animosity toward a country can be caused by war or disapproval of a country's actions. In the case of this research project, the involvement of France in China's foreign policies is what created animosity among Chinese consumers toward France.

As background, in 2008, China hosted the summer Olympics. Prior to the Olympics and after French President Nicholas Sarkozy met with the Dalai Lama, Sarkozy publicly called for a boycott of the Olympics in Beijing, China, in order to punish China for its attitude and treatment toward the Tibetan people. The Chinese were outraged about such blatant involvement in their foreign policies, and many Chinese citizens viewed Sarkozy's meeting with the Dalai Lama as unacceptable and offensive. This outrage led to a Chinese boycott of French products. The largest Chinese internet bulletin board showed that 80 million users had signed up to boycott French products, in general, and largest French Hypermarket, Carrefour, in particular. It is with situation in mind that we decided to test our hypotheses about the effect of animosity on boycott participation.

The goal of this study is to move beyond looking just at the effect of animosity on willingness to buy and move toward an understanding of whether animosity translates into real boycott participation. We wanted to determine if consumers who feel animosity and participate in a boycott would be motivated by their general attitude towards boycotts, the efficacy of a boycott, and by self-enhancement. In particular, we propose that the relationship between animosity and boycott participation is mediated by the consumer motivations for boycott participation.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Research about consumers' evaluation of foreign products has revealed that the criterion "country of origin" is an important variable used to evaluate foreign products. Published studies have found that the attribute "country of origin" may be a determinant criterion in a consumer's decision-making process. In fact, a country's manufacturing and technological abilities and reputation are often used usually as indications of a product's quality (Bilkey & Nes, 1982; Erickson, Johansson, & Chao, 1984). However, a review of the literature about country image reveals that country of origin is not only cognitive in nature and may not always be used to signal quality but, also, that it has an emotional and normative connotation to consumers (Varlegh & Steenkamp, 1999).

At times, consumers refuse to buy foreign-made products because of their feelings of ethnocentrism or because they feel animosity towards a specific country. In such situations, country image may become the most important decisive variable for consumers. In the international marketing literature, Shimp, et al. (2004, p. 80) defined animosity as "not only an open hostility but [it] indicates as well ideas of ill will, displeasure and enmity." Klein, et al. (1998, p. 90) defined animosity as, "the remnants of antipathy related to previous or ongoing military, political or economic events." Consumer ethnocentrism has also been defined as the, "unique proclivity for people to view their own group as the center of the universe, to interpret other social units from the perspective of their own group, and to reject persons who are culturally dissimilar while blindly accepting those who are culturally like themselves (Shimp &

Sharma, 1987, p. 24). Consumer animosity is targeted towards a specific country per se, while consumer ethnocentrism is targeted towards all foreign nations.

Consumer animosity is manifested at the national level and impacts consumers' willingness to buy products from the country at fault (Klein & Ettenson, 1998). Indeed, many Chinese consumers have avoided buying Japanese products due the 1937 Nanjing Massacre, when 300,000 Chinese died (Klein & Ettenson, 1998). Even though the massacre occurred more than half a century ago, many Chinese consumers have not forgiven Japan for its role, and they avoid purchasing Japanese products.

Animosity is a multidimensional construct (Lyn, Chao, & Arnold, 2005), which can be manifested due to war (Klein, et al., 1998) or economic animosity (Klein et al.; Hoon-Ang, et al., 2004). Klein, et al (1998) examined both war and economic animosity as determinants of general animosity, and war animosity was found to be the most important predictor of Chinese animosity towards Japan. War animosity has also been found to be related to reluctance to buy in markets with high levels of foreign trade as well as when only one domestic brand is available (Nijssen & Douglas, 2004). War animosity is usually stable in nature. An incidence of stable animosity is defined as, "the general antagonistic emotions accumulated over years because of historical events such as previous economic or military hostilities between countries" (Hoon-Ang, et al., 2004, p. 527). For such an animosity, there is always a constant reminder of the terrifying actions exerted by the country at fault.

The second dimension of animosity is economic animosity which may arise from an economic rivalry between two countries, such as Canada and United States, or may result from feelings of economic/political dominance or aggressive posturing of one country over another (Klein, et al., 1998). In the case of the war between Japan and China, the Chinese perception was that they could not trust the Japanese because the Japanese gained economic power over China by taking advantage of them economically and by trying to influence their decisions (Klein, et al., 1998). During and after the 1990s Asian economic crisis, Hoon-Ang, et al. (2004) found that the animosity felt by Koreans, Singaporeans, Thais, Malaysians, and Indonesians toward the United States and Japan was economic in nature and was more strongly manifested toward the United States, in particular. This type of animosity is mainly situational. Situational animosity refers to, "strong emotions of enmity associated with a specific circumstance at hand" (Jung et al., 2002, p.527). Situational arises from a negative perception of a country's or company's actions.

Three antecedents were found to affect animosity (Shoham, Davidow, Klein & Ruvio, 2006): dogmatism, nationalism, and internationalism. Dogmatism is the degree to which consumers are closed or open (Rokeach, 1960). Dogmatic people do not accept differences easily and are not tolerant of minorities (Mangis, 1995). Shoham, et al. (2006) found that dogmatic consumers are the types of consumers who usually feel animosity toward an offending country. Indeed, the more dogmatic a consumer is (meaning he/she is closed-minded and resistant to differences), the more likely he/she is to feel animosity toward an offending country.

Balabanis (2001, p. 160) defined the second antecedent, nationalism, as a feeling that "one's country is superior and should be dominant," which is a denigration of other nations. In essence, nationalism is the strong identification of an individual with his/her country. A nationalistic consumer will be proud of his country's products and will likely experience feelings superiority and dominance. Literature has shown that nationalistic people tend to be more aggressive toward other nations than less nationalistic people (Druckman, 1994). Indeed, nationalistic people are very supportive of trade protectionism (Sidams, et al., 1997).

Nationalism was found to be a strong predictor of animosity in the case of the Intifada in Israel where, in October 2000, Israeli Arabs joined Palestinians in violent demonstrations in Israeli locations (Shoham, et al., 2006). The more nationalistic a consumer is, the more he/she will feel animosity toward an offending country (Shoham, et al., 2006). In our case, we believe that nationalism is one of the most important predictors for animosity in China. Chinese are usually very proud of their history and their culture. Chinese animosity is most likely to be affected in the French incident with nationalism. We do not believe that, in such circumstances, dogmatism or internationalism will affect consumer animosity towards France.

The third antecedent, internationalism, has been found to negatively affect both consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism (Shoham, et al., 2006). The more a consumer is open to international relations, the less likely he/she will feel animus toward an offending country. In addition, the more a consumer feels positive feelings toward other nations and accepts other cultures, the less ethnocentric he/she will be (Balabanis, et al., 2001). Thus, in our study we posit that only one variable predicts consumer animosity:

H1: Consumers who are nationalistic are likely to feel animus toward an offending country.

In addition, consumers who feel animosity toward a country are likely to avoid purchasing products from the offending country (Klein & Ettenson, 1998; Ettenson & Klein, 2005). In prior analyses, Chinese consumers demonstrated that their judgment of Japanese products was independent of product quality. Their animosity had a direct impact on their willingness to buy (Klein, Ettenson, & Morris, 1998). Chinese animosity toward Japan was negatively related to consumer willingness to purchase Japanese products. Ettenson and Klein (2005) showed that Australian animosity toward France led consumers not only to withhold purchasing products “made in” at the individual level but also to participate in a boycott of French products.

Boycott participation depends mainly on individuals. Some individual may feel animus toward a country. Nonetheless, they still purchase the same products from that country as they had done in the past. In fact, some consumers ignore boycotts even though they are angry at the offending country. On the other hand, other consumers will withhold their purchase of products from an offending country to express their anger, namely because they believe that by doing so, they can change the offending country’s attitude (Ettenson & Klein, 2005). Thus we posit:

H2: Animosity towards France will have a positive effect on boycott participation.

The question that arises is when does animosity affect boycott participation? Indeed, animosity is a feeling that is felt at the individual level rather than at the group level. Therefore, for the individual to translate this individual feeling into group action, there needs to be motivation. In other words, for an individual to decide to join a group boycott, he/she needs to be motivated to do so. Based on the literature, consumers are usually rational in their purchasing behavior. They are boycotting a country’s products mainly to make a difference and feel good about themselves (Klein, Smith, & John, 2004).

When a consumer likes a country, he/she will usually be proud of the products “made in” that country. Consumers will even try to brag about owning those products. However, if consumers are dissatisfied with a country’s actions, they will try to avoid purchasing products from that “offending” country because they may be ashamed in front of their reference group or

counterparts (Varlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). As a result, consumers may participate in a boycott to be accepted by their counterparts (Klein, Smith, & John, 2004). Indeed, Klein, et al. (2004) tested a theoretical framework proposing that boycott participation was based mainly on a cost-benefit analysis of helping. They suggested that there were four categories of motivations for boycotting. Consumers may also boycott a country of company's products to feel better about themselves and enhance their self-esteem. By boycotting certain products, consumers try to avoid feeling guilt that they may encounter in their society. In other words, if they were to consume the products of the boycotted company, consumers may feel that they betrayed their society. At that point, consumers are searching for the approval of others in the society. Thus we posit that:

H3: Animosity is positively related to self-enhancement.

H4: Self-enhancement is positively related to boycott participation.

Additionally, consumers who feel animosity may participate in a boycott if they believe that their participation is going to change the behavior of the offending party (Ettenson & Klein, 2009). Indeed, consumers often feel that by boycotting a firm's products, they are doing their part as citizens in an effort to influence a firm or country and change behavior. Therefore, consumer animosity leads to consumer participation in a boycott when the consumer feels that the boycott will be effective in changing an "offending" behavior. Boycott efficacy is therefore a motivator in boycott participation. Ettenson and Klein (2005, p. 209) defined boycott efficacy as, "the belief that a boycott is an effective mechanism for coercing a target to change an objectionable policy." In the case of Chinese consumers and French products, it is presumed that Chinese consumers will participate in the boycott of French products if they believe that it will change French attitudes. In that case, the boycott participation is mainly instrumental (Ettenson & Klein, 2005). Thus we posit that

H5: Animosity is positively related to self-efficacy.

H6: Self-efficacy is positively related to Boycott participation.

Consumers who feel animosity toward an offending nation might participate in a boycott if they have a generally positive attitude about boycotts and believe that boycotts are efficient. Based on social judgment theory, people interpret information based on how they feel or what they have learned (Solomon, 2012). When a consumer feels animosity toward an offending country, he or she develops a negative attitude toward that country and develops a positive attitude towards boycotts. Actions are usually preceded by either a positive or negative attitude. When a consumer has a positive attitude toward boycotts, he/she will feel that the participating in a boycott is the right thing to do. Thus we posit that:

H7: Animosity leads to a positive attitude towards boycotts.

H8: Positive attitudes toward boycotts affect consumers' willingness to buy.

Based on the literature (Ettenson & Klein, 2005), once a consumer has decided to participate in a boycott, he/she will not purchase products originating from the "offending country." Therefore, we posit that:

H9: Boycott participation is negatively related to willingness to buy.

In Appendix 1 is a diagram with the hypotheses, their variables, and their interrelationships.

METHODOLOGY

Data for this study was gathered in China during the summer of 2008. This was a period of time when Chinese consumers experienced animosity toward France because of the previously mentioned Sarchozy-Tibet issue. The survey instrument was translated to Chinese and back-translated to English in order to ensure linguistic and conceptual equivalence between the two languages (Brislin, 1970; Sperber, et al., 1994). The survey was pretested with 50 respondents in China. Data for the study was collected from Chinese university students in Beijing and was mainly focused on their attitudes toward the French chain, Carrefour, which is one of the largest retailers in China. The final sample in China consisted of 150 individuals. Data was collected randomly.

Measures

Existing scales used in the literature were modified to fit this study's purpose. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each item (on a 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree" scale). Ethnocentrism was measured by using the 10-item reduced CETSCALE (Shimp & Sharma, 1987; Netemeyer, et al., 1991). Willingness to buy was measured using the scale proposed by Wood and Darling (1998).

To evaluate animosity as a multidimensional construct, the Klein, et al. (1998) scale was used. We adopted the measures of nationalism from Kosterman and Feshbach (1989). Measures for willingness to buy came from Darling and Arnold (1988) and Darling and Wood (1990), measures of consumer efficacy were drawn from work by Ettenson and Klein (2005), measures of consumer attitudes toward boycotts came from Sen, et al. (2001), and the scale for self-enhancement came from Rosenberg (1965).

The Measurement Model

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed on the entire set of items simultaneously. Test for convergent validity were performed, factor loadings and their t-values were examined. We also used squared multiple correlation as an indication for reliability (Bollen, 1989).

Reliability and Validity

We used SPSS 18 to test the constructs' reliability. The reliability of all the multi-item constructs is achieved with all the constructs' Cronbach's alphas being greater than .70. We also performed Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using AMOS 16.0 to test convergent and discriminant validity for the six multi-item constructs. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed on the entire set of items simultaneously. Tests for convergent validity were performed; factor loadings and their t-values were examined. We also used squared multiple correlation as an indication for reliability.

The fit of the data to the CFA model (i.e., CFI=.78, GFI=.805, RMR=.175) is modest, but is adequate to interpret (Hooper, et al., 2008). The Chi square for the model was 379.186 and the Chi square /df (2.095), which is over 2. The standardized lambda estimate for each item and the

AVE (Average Variance Extracted) for each construct are all higher than .50, which suggests convergent validity. All AVE estimates are greater than the squared correlation between all pairs of constructs, providing strong evidence of discriminant validity of the constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

RESULTS

Nearly all of our hypotheses were supported by our analysis. In fact, only two of the nine proposed hypotheses were not supported. Table 1 below provides Cronbach's alphas, average variance extracted (AVE), and fit indices for analysis of data for all nine hypotheses.

TABLE 1
CONSTRUCT RELIABILITY, VALIDITY AND MODEL FIT

Constructs	Cronbach's α	AVE
Nationalism (NA)	.713	64%
Animosity (AN)	.709	69%
Consumer efficacy (CE)	-.788	82%
Self-enhancement (EN)	.744	50%
Attitudes toward boycott (AB)	.869	92%
Willingness to buy (BU)	.736	77%
	χ^2	379.186
	χ^2/df	2.095
	CFI	0.78
	GFI	.805
	RMR	.175

H1, which tested the relationship between nationalism and consumer animosity, was supported by the data. Consumers who are nationalistic are more likely to feel animus towards the offending country than consumers are not nationalistic is supported ($p < 0.001$). Therefore, the more nationalistic a consumer is, the more animus toward an offending country he/she will feel. H2 was not supported by the data in that animosity was not found to be positively related to boycott participation.

Our third hypothesis (H3) about the relationship between boycott participation and willingness to buy was supported by the data, which showed that the more a person participates in a boycott, the more he/she will avoid purchasing products "made in" the boycotted country. We also found that a consumer who feels animosity toward a country wants to feel good about himself/herself in a group. Therefore, an animus consumer will try to comply with his/her group

to be accepted and avoid guilt towards his reference group, and he/she will participate in a boycott if his/her group is also participating. Thus, H4 was also supported in that animosity was found to be positively related to self-efficacy ($p < 0.1$).

The effect of animosity on consumer efficacy was also found to be significant in our analysis. Therefore, H5 is supported by the data (H5, $P < 0.01$). Indeed, animus consumers in China will participate in a boycott if they believe that the boycott will make a difference and change the offending country's attitude. Self-efficacy was also found to be positively related to boycott participation (H6, $p < 0.1$). Animosity was also found to be positively related to self-efficacy, thereby supporting H6. Data analysis showed that consumers' participation in a boycott depends on consumer efficacy and consumer self-enhancement.

Additionally, animosity was found to affect consumers' attitudes toward boycotts, supporting H7 is ($p < 0.01$). However, H8 was not supported by the data, resulting in a finding that a positive attitude toward boycotts was not statistically significant in consumers' boycott participation. This result suggests that attitudes may not directly lead to consumers' boycott participation. Finally, H9 was supported as hypothesized; boycott participation was negatively related to willingness to buy ($p < 0.01$). In Table 2, below, is a summary of the findings for all hypotheses from statistical analysis of the data.

TABLE 2
HYPOTHESES TESTING RESULTS

Hypotheses	Estimate	P value	Conclusion
H1: Nationalism → Consumer animosity	1.455	***	Supported
H2: Animosity → Boycott participation	.333	.509	Not Supported
H3: Animosity → Self-enhancement	.883	***	Supported
H4: Self-enhancement → Boycott participation	-.717	**	Supported
H5: Animosity → Self-efficacy	-.729	***	Supported
H6: Self-efficacy → Boycott participation	.394	*	Supported
H7: Animosity → Attitudes toward boycott	.709	***	Supported
H8: Attitude toward boycott → Boycott participation	-.349	.208	Not Supported
H9: Boycott participation → Willingness to buy	-.376	***	Supported

***= $p\text{-value} \leq 0.01$; ** = $p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$; * = $P\text{-value} \leq 0.1$

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that Chinese consumers who were nationalistic felt animosity toward France due President Sarkozy's position vis-à-vis Chinese policies related to Tibet. This supports the first hypothesis and confirms conclusions from prior research that nationalism is an important predictor of consumer animosity. Analysis of our results shows that self-enhancement and consumer efficacy mediate the relationship between animosity and boycott participation. Indeed, the more a consumer feels guilt and wants to feel good about himself/herself, the more he/she will participate in a boycott against an offending country. We also confirmed that consumers who believe that such a boycott could be an effective means of punishing an offending country, are more likely to participate in a boycott. Previous published studies also concluded that consumer efficacy and consumer self-enhancement were both predictors of boycott participation.

However, because we extended previous research (Ettenson & Morris, 2004) to include two variables as mediators between animosity and boycott participation, we found that anger is not sufficient to make a consumer boycott a country's product (our H2). Anger will be translated into consumer action when the consumer believes that his/her participating will make a difference, when the consumer feels better about himself for participating, and that boycotts, in general, are effective. This finding stems from analysis of data related to H3, H4, H5, H6, and H7, which were supported by data.

We were surprised when analysis of data related to H8 revealed no statistically significant relationship between consumers' positive attitudes toward boycotts and their willingness to buy. This was unexpected given prior research supporting the causal relationship between attitude and behavior. However, through analysis of data for H9, we found that once consumers committed to participating in a boycott, their participation was negatively related to their willingness to purchase the boycotted product(s).

Managerial Implications

Conclusions from this study are relevant for managers or businesses around the world in that they should monitor consumer attitudes and animosity toward their company's home country to better understand consumers' propensity to purchase their products or to participate in boycotts of their products. Results from this study confirmed the fact that the animosity of Chinese consumers toward French political actions spurred them to participate in a boycott of French products, which directly hurt French businesses.

This study was conducted during an ongoing hostility. Managers should monitor the intensity of consumers' anger toward their home countries so they are aware of potential repercussions of things beyond their immediate control. One means of mitigating against this type of risk is to form close partnerships with local businesses, community organizations, and/or government agencies so as to appear more "local" and minimize perceived alignment with the "offending country." In the event of consumer animosity and boycotts, managers of foreign businesses should develop appropriate communications strategies to disassociate themselves from their countries of origin. Communications strategies should include messages about their local employees, suppliers, and partners. Advertisements and public relations stories should include information about their positive contributions to the local economy and citizenry. Multi-brand retailers should be sure to include a variety of brands from outside the offending country.

LIMITATIONS

This study presents several limitations, including the fact that data was collected during a period of ongoing animosity of Chinese consumers toward France. Because this type of animosity is situational in nature rather than stable, a follow-up study should be undertaken in which similar data is collected to see whether the animosity toward France persists and whether or not the same relationships between animosity and boycott participation hold.

Additionally, data was collected for this study from Beijing-based university students, who may not be representative of the generalized population. Also, the sample size of 150 may not have been large enough to fully capture all the statistically significant relationships between variables.

This study was focused on the consumer level, and our conclusions may not be relevant for a business to business situation.

In addition, this study did not include analysis of whether certain iconic brands of a country are more or less targeted by boycotts during periods of consumer animosity.

Finally, this research project only examined the relationship between animosity and boycotts (and mediating variables) for Chinese consumers and French products.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

With regard to recommendations for future research, we suggest the following:

- Expansion of this study to include a business to business context rather than just a consumer level situation,
- Replicating this same study in a different country to determine if similar statistical relationships hold true,
- Gathering data about iconic brands and consumer perceptions of those brands to determine differences and similarities in how they may be perceived and treated in times of consumer animosity.
- Replicate this study in a different part of China to determine whether this study's results can be generalized to Chinese society, in general.

REFERENCES

- Balabanis, G., Diamantopoulos, A., Mueller, R. D., & Melewar, T.C. (2001). The Impact of Nationalism, Patriotism, and Internationalism on Consumer Ethnocentric Tendencies, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(1), 157–75.
- Bilkey, W. J. & Nes, E. (1982). Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8(1), 89-91.
- Bollen, K A. (1989). *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brislin, Richard W (1970). Back Translation for Cross Cultural Research, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.

- Campbell, D. T. & Fiske, D.W. (1959). Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81-105.
- Darling, J. R. & Arnold, D.R. (1988). The Competitive Position Abroad of Products and Marketing Practices of the United States, Japan, and Selected European Countries, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 5(Fall), 61-68.
- Darling, J. & Wood, V. R. (1990). A Longitudinal Study Comparing Perceptions of U.S. and Japanese Consumer Products in a Third/Neutral Country: Finland 1975 to 1985, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21(3), 427-50.
- Druckman, D. (1994). Nationalism, Patriotism, and Group Loyalty: A Social Psychological Perspective, *International Studies Quarterly*, 38(51), 43-68.
- Erickson, G. M., Johansson, J. K. & Chao, P. (1984). Image Variables in Multi-Attribute Product Evaluation: Country of Origin Effects, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11(September), 694-699.
- 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(2), 199-224
- Ettenson, R., Smith, N. C., Klein, J. G. & John, A. (2006). Rethinking Consumer Boycotts. *Sloan Management Review*, 47, 4, 6-7.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F (1981). Evaluating structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.
- Friedman, M. (1985), Consumer Boycotts in the United States, 1970-1980: Contemporary Events in Historical Perspective, *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 19 (1), 96-117.
- Friedman, T. (2005). *The World is Flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Hoon-Ang, S., Kwon, J., Kau, A. K., Leong, S. M., Pornpitakpan, C. & Tan, S. J. (2004). Animosity Towards Economic Giants: What the Little Guys Think. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21(3), 190-207.
- Kwon, J., Ang, S. H., Leong, S. M., Tan, S. J., Pornpitakpan, S. & Kau, A. K. (2002), A Typology of Animosity and its Cross-National Validation, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, (6), 525-539.
- Klein, J. G. & Ettenson, R. (1999). Consumer Animosity and Consumer Ethnocentrism: An Analysis of Unique Antecedents. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 11(4), 5-24.
- 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(January), 89-100.

- Klein, J. G., Smith, N. C. & John, A. (2004). Why We Boycott: Consumer Motivations for Boycott Participation. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(July), 92-109.
- Kosterman, R. & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a Measure of Patriotic and Nationalistic Attitudes, *Political Psychology*, 10 (2), 257-74.
- Lyn S. A., Chao, M., & Arnold, M. J. (2005). Executive Insights: Exploring the Practical Effects of Country of Origin, Animosity, and Price-Quality Issues: Two Case Studies of Taiwan and Acer in China. *Journal of International Marketing*, 13(2), 114-150.
- Netemeyer, R., Durvasula, S. & Lichtenstein, D. (1991), A Cross-National Assessment of the Reliability and Validity of the CETSCALE, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(3), 320-327.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). *The Open and Closed Mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sen, S, Gurhan-Canli, S. & Morwitz, V. (2001). Withholding Consumption: A Social Dilemma Perspective on Consumer Boycotts,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28(December), 399-417.
- Solomon, M. R., (2011). *Consumer Behavior* 9 (ed), Prentice-Hall .
- Sharma, S., Shimp, T. A. & Shin, J. (1995). Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Test of Antecedents and Moderators. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(1), 26-37.
- Shimp, T. A., Dunn, T. H. & Klein, J. G. (2004). Remnants of the U.S. Civil War and Modern Consumer Psychology. *Psychology and Marketing*, 21(2), 75-91.
- Shimp, T. A. & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(August), 289-289.
- Shoham, A., Davidow, M., Klein, J. & Ruvio, A. (2006). Animosity on the Home Front: The Intifada in Israel and its Impact on Consumer Behavior,” *Journal of International Marketing*, 14 (3), 92-114.
- Varlegh, P. W. J & Steenkamp, J. E. (1999). A Review and Meta-Analysis of Country of Origin Research, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 20, 521-546.

APPENDIX 1
HYPOTHESES REGARDING CHINESE CONSUMERS' ANIMOSITY TOWARD
FRENCH PRODUCTS

