

Influence of Consumer Ethnocentrism on the Attitude towards Domestic Products

– Shashi Yadav*

Research Scholar, SOMS, IGNOU


 shashiy247@gmail.com

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0769-0887>

– Nawal Kishor

Professor, SOMS, IGNOU, New Delhi

 nkishor@ignou.ac.in

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4271-8208>



ARTICLE HISTORY

Paper Nomenclature: Empirical Research Paper (ERP)

Paper Code: GJEISV15I3JS2023ERP2

Submission at Portal(www.gjeis.com): 8-Jul-2023

Manuscript Acknowledged: 12-Jul-2023

Originality Check: 24-Jul-2023

Originality Test (Plag) Ratio (Turnitin): 08%

Author Revert with Rectified Copy: 28-Jul-2023

Peer Reviewers Comment (Open): 31-Jul-2023

Single Blind Reviewers Explanation: 13-Aug-2023

Double Blind Reviewers Interpretation: 18-Aug-2023

Triple Blind Reviewers Annotations: 29-Aug-2023

Author Update (w.r.t. correction, suggestion & observation): 31-Aug-2023

Camera-Ready-Copy: 15-Sep-2023

Editorial Board Excerpt & Citation: 21-Sep-2023

Published Online First: 30-Sep-2023

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The study aims to determine the influence of consumer ethnocentric tendencies on attitude formation towards domestic products.

Design/Methodology/Approach: A quantitative study was done with 156 responses collected from self-administered questionnaires from Delhi-NCR using convenience sampling. CFA, regression, and t-test were applied for statistical analysis.

Findings: Indians exhibited an average ethnocentric attitude towards domestic products. The difference between the attitudes of high and low ethnocentric respondents was marginally significant.

Originality/Value: The present research results help marketers to make consumer ethnocentric tendencies a psychographic segment variable while planning marketing strategies. Marketers can also formulate strategies that include country name (India in our case) to promote domestic goods, especially among the highly ethnocentric consumers.

Paper Type: Empirical Research Paper

KEYWORDS: Ethnocentrism | COO | Attitude | Domestic Products

*Corresponding Author (Shashi)

- Present Volume & Issue (Cycle): Volume 15 | Issue-3 | Jul-Sep 2023
- International Standard Serial Number:
Online ISSN: 0975-1432 | Print ISSN: 0975-153X
- DOI (Crossref, USA) <https://doi.org/10.18311/gjeis/2023>
- Bibliographic database: OCLC Number (WorldCat): 988732114
- Impact Factor: 3.57 (2019-2020) & 1.0 (2020-2021) [CiteFactor]
- Editor-in-Chief: Dr. Subodh Kesharwani
- Frequency: Quarterly

- Published Since: 2009
- Research database: EBSCO <https://www.ebsco.com>
- Review Pedagogy: Single Blind Review/ Double Blind Review/ Triple Blind Review/ Open Review
- Copyright: ©2023 GJEIS and it's heirs
- Publishers: Scholastic Seed Inc. and KARAM Society
- Place: New Delhi, India.
- Repository (figshare): 704442/13

GJEIS is an Open access journal which access article under the Creative Commons. This CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>) promotes access and re-use of scientific and scholarly research and publishing.



Introduction

Globalisation has facilitated the world with numerous products. This transition has been made possible by lower import taxes, lower tariffs, and organisations with a more globalised impact, like IMF and WTO. The Indian market is seeing numerous structural changes due to this ongoing transformation, including higher competition, greater product availability in terms of both quantity and quality, and greater customer knowledge. India is the third-largest economy in Asia in terms of GDP after China and Japan, ranking sixth with a growth rate of 9.50%. (*World Economic Outlook, 2021*). Every international corporation wants to advertise its products because of India's strong market position. There are 600 million middle-class individuals in India (*BBC, 2017*). With the rise of global culture, customers are comfortably picking between local and foreign goods in their shopping baskets. Shopping experiences that were previously limited to regional brands are now available worldwide. As a result, buyers encounter a choice conundrum.

The "MADE IN INDIA" campaign, which aims to promote purchasing Made in India goods, is receiving considerable attention in India. The COVID-19 pandemic has hastened this process. Thus, it is clear that Indian preferences are evolving and they are increasingly making sensible judgements after carefully weighing a wide range of facts. Literature has amply demonstrated how ethnocentrism explains attitudes towards domestic products (Bawa, 2004). Consumer Ethnocentrism (CE) is an important component of the Country of Origin (COO) image (Yadav, 2023). Attitude refers to the degree to which a person has a favourable or unfavourable outlook for an object (Ajzen, 1991), while, CE refers to the beliefs held by consumers about the appropriateness and morality of acquiring global products (Shimp & Sharma, 1987).

There isn't much research on ethnocentrism in the literature, particularly ones that focus on the Indian context. The current study purpose is to specifically examine how ethnocentrism aids Indians in their evaluation of domestic goods. The results of this study will add to the body of knowledge by assisting marketers in considering customer ethnocentric tendencies as a psychographic segment when formulating marketing tactics. In order to promote local goods, particularly among the ethnocentric portion of society, marketers can also develop techniques that feature a positive country image, such as "Indians buy MADE IN India goods."

Review of Literature and Research Hypotheses

Consumer Ethnocentrism

According to Shimp & Sharma (1987), ethnocentrism is a trait-like feature of a person's personality that includes

consumer ideas about the appropriateness and morality of purchasing products from other countries. They created CETSCALE to measure consumers' propensities to buy products made abroad as opposed to those made in the United States. CETSCALE is both a reliable and a valid scale that has been tested in many nations (Good & Huddleston, 1995; Huddleston et al., 2000; Klein et al., 1998). Further, CETSCALE's unidimensionality has been demonstrated by earlier researchers as well (Netemeyer et al., 1991).

Ethnocentric consumers are often seen overestimating domestic products (Baber et al., 2023; Balabanis & Siamagka, 2022; Camacho et al., 2021; Chaudhry et al., 2021; Nguyen et al., 2023; Piron, 2002; Ramadania et al., 2023; Trivedi et al., 2023). According to Balabanis et al. (2001), nationalism and patriotism are two factors that precede CE. Such nationalistic sentiments affect customers' decisions about domestic products (Hamin et al., 2014). The product type is one of many variables that affect CE. The CE effect varies depending on the type of product. Additionally, Javalgi et al. (2005) found that the impact of CE on purchase intention is negligible when a product is regarded as an absolute necessity. According to Shimp & Sharma (1987) ethnocentric customers think purchasing imported items hurts their homegrown enterprises and results in job loss. Consumer age has been identified as a factor substantially associated with ethnocentrism on numerous occasions. It has been demonstrated that consumers over the age of 50 are significantly more ethnocentric than consumers under the age of 50 (Witkowski, 1998). Consumer education and ethnocentrism are inversely correlated, with more educated consumers being less ethnocentric (Hsu & Nien, 2008).

Additionally, one's own country's level of development has an impact on CE. According to Wang & Chen (2004), consumers in industrialised nations place a higher value on domestic goods than on imports, leading them to favour the former and avoid the latter. On the other hand, consumers in developing countries, consider imported goods from developed nations superior to those from their own country. Customers favour domestic goods when they have a strong sense of patriotism or love for their nation (Wall et al., 1991), when imported goods threaten their nation (Papadopoulos & Heslop, 1993), when product serviceability is easy to obtain (Han & Terpstra, 1988), and when the consumer is unfamiliar with other nations' products (Alden et al., 1993).

Balabanis & Diamantopoulos (2004) contend that whether or not people favour imported goods depends little on the degree of cultural and economic similarity between different countries. Customers exposed to CE choose locally produced goods rather than outright rejecting foreign goods. Last but not least, they proposed that the effect of CE varies significantly among product categories. As a result, they advise businesses to consider other factors when forecasting the ups and downs of their products in target markets.

Consumer Ethnocentrism and Attitude

According to Lee et al. (2003), CE is a consumer's personality trait that influences his feelings about domestic items. CE is thought to have a detrimental impact on attitudes towards and prejudice towards buying foreign goods (Bawa, 2004; Kwak et al., 2006; Netemeyer et al., 1991). According to Shankarmahesh (2006), highly ethnocentric consumers value home products more than foreign ones (i.e., in groups). While less ethnocentric viewpoints favour the quality of the product over its place of origin (Shimp & Sharma, 1987). Ethnocentric consumers judge a product using moral standards that go beyond its intended uses (Yagci, 2001).

According to social identity theory, extremely ethnocentric consumers hold foreign items in disdain and are proud of their own country's products. Serviceability may be a factor in locally produced items besides patriotism or affection for the nation (Han & Terpstra, 1988; Wall et al., 1991). Furthermore, CE affects customers' opinions towards local products (Bianchi & Mortimer, 2015; Fernández-Ferrín et al., 2018). Another aspect thought to affect sentiments towards home products is nationalism (Chao & Rajendran, 1993; Olsen et al., 1993). Sometimes, it was thought that purchasing imported goods was inappropriate due to issues with the country (Shoham & Gavish, 2016). High ethnocentricity consumers strongly prefer for domestic goods (Xin & Seo, 2020). However, CE may change if imported goods are of a higher calibre than domestic goods (Acharya & Elliott, 2003).

H01: Consumer Ethnocentrism positively influences purchase attitudes towards domestic products.

H02: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of high and low ethnocentric respondents towards domestic products

Research Methodology

Pre-and Pilot Study Testing

- A pretesting was conducted on seven respondents while drafting the questionnaire. After making the full questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted to investigate the reliability and content validity of the constructs. The questionnaire was sent to a few experts of the domain area and their suggestions were duly incorporated. The questionnaire was then sent to 65 respondents who were requested to complete and review it. The value of Cronbach's alpha, a reliability test, was .811 above the desired limit of .70 (Hair et al., 2014; 2019).

• Sampling and Data Collection

- Quantitative research was conducted with 156 respondents. The Delhi-NCR area was selected for this study since Delhi is one of India's largest metropolitan areas. In Delhi, people come from practically every Indian state, making a city a miniature version of the country. Responses were gathered using convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling technique. The questionnaire has three sections: The first section requests sociodemographic information, including age, gender, income, education level, and occupation. The second part measures consumers' ethnocentrism using the CETSCALE (Shimp & Sharma, 1987) on a five-point Likert scale with endpoints strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). The third part measures consumers' attitudes towards domestic products (Han & Terpstra, 1988; Roth & Romeo, 1992). The analysis was performed using CFA in IBM-AMOS (23), regression and t-test in IBM-SPSS (23), and Microsoft Excel (2016). Primary data was collected from July 2023 to September 2023.

Analysis and Results

Socio-demographic Profile

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Descriptive	Frequency (n=156)	(%)
Gender		
Male	74	47.4
Female	82	52.6
Age (years)		
Below 20	25	16.0
20-30	97	62.2
30-40	23	14.7
40-50	8	5.1
50-60	3	2.0
Above 60	0	0
Occupation		
Student	73	46.8
Working	61	39.1
Non-Working	11	7.0
Self-employed	9	5.8
Others	2	1.3
Income (in Rs)		
Below 20k	82	52.6
20k-40k	23	14.7
40k-60k	22	13.4
60k-80k	18	11.5
Above 80k	11	7.0
Educational qualifications		
Secondary	0	-
Senior Secondary	31	19.8
Graduate	76	48.7
Post- Graduate	40	25.6
Higher Studies	9	5.7

Reliability and Validity

Internal consistency of the constructions is gauged by reliability. Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability (CR) were used to examine the construct's reliability. The benchmarks for Cronbach's alpha and CR for each research construct were both > 0.70. As a result, construct reliability was determined to be considerable (Byrne et al., 2014; Islam et al., 2021). Convergent validity was evaluated using CR and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) (Iglesias et al., 2019; Pervan et al., 2017). The CR values were also over 0.7 and the AVE values were greater than 0.50. Convergent validity was established as a result. Additionally, the HTMT ratio's discriminant validity is examined (Ahmed et al., 2022; Henseler et al., 2015). All values were less than .85. In light of this, discriminant validity was demonstrated. Table 2a and 2b. summarizes the results:

Table 2 a: Reliability

Constructs	No. of Items	Alpha (α)	CR	AVE
ET	22	.913	.861	.501
AT	5	.823	.878	.511

Table 2 b: Discriminant Validity

	CE	AT
CE		
AT	.224	

Descriptives

The mean rating of CET-SCALE (Mean = 2.534, SD = 1.069) used for measuring ethnocentrism revealed mixed results, some respondents were more ethnocentric while others had an average score. A total of 22 statements of ethnocentrism were asked, the most salient results are as follows: 87% of respondents agree on 'Buy Indian-made products. Keep India working' (Q15, mean= 1.77, SD=.684). 91% of respondents believed 'Purchase of Indian products gives a boost to local MSMEs and Micro Industry' (Q20, mean= 1.75, SD=.679). Similarly, 85% of respondents had an opinion that 'Buying home country products makes us self-reliant in all aspects in the long run' (Q21, mean= 1.93, SD=.833) and last but not least 89% respondents argue that 'Buying Indian products make Indian economy prosper' (Q22, mean= 1.84, SD=.713). A summary of the individual statements of the CETSCALE is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Mean and Std. Deviation of CETSCALE

CETSCALE	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Indians should buy Indian products in place of imports.	2.31	.927
2. Only products that are not available in India should be imported	2.33	.955
3. There should be little trading of goods from other countries unless out of necessity	2.77	1.053
4. Curbs should be put on all imports.	2.98	1.108
5. Foreigners should not be allowed to place their products in Indian market.	3.57	.997
6. We should buy only those foreign products that we cannot obtain in our own country.	2.43	1.024
7. Indian products, first, last and foremost.	2.39	.997
8. Purchasing foreign made products is un-Indian.	3.63	1.101
9. A real Indian should always buy Indian-made products.	3.24	1.234
10. It is always best to purchase Indian products.	2.59	1.075
11. It may cost me in the long-run but I prefer to support Indian products.	2.37	.927
12. Purchasing Indian products is showing love for India.	2.48	1.136
13. Buying Indian products is a matter of pride.	2.32	.998
14. Indian products should be purchased as we trust them.	2.36	.926
15. Buy Indian-made products. Keep India working.	1.77	.684
16. It is not right to purchase foreign products, as it put Indians out of jobs.	2.91	1.117
17. We should purchase Indian products instead of letting other countries get rich off us.	2.34	.927
18. Indian should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indian business and causes unemployment.	2.68	1.008
19. Foreign products should be taxed heavily to reduce their entry in India.	2.77	1.085
20. Purchase of Indian products gives boost to local MSMEs and Micro Industry.	1.75	.679
21. Buying home country products make us self-reliant in all aspects in long run.	1.93	.833
22. Buying Indian products make Indian economy prosper.	1.84	.713
	2.534	1.069

**Table 4: Attitude Mean and Std. Deviation, (N=156)**

Attitude towards domestic products.	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I like to buy domestic goods.	3.40	.981
2. I am willing to pay extra price to buy domestic goods.	3.11	.974
3. I recommend others to buy domestic goods.	3.21	.943
4. I have a favourable attitude towards domestic goods.	3.28	.942
5. I love buying domestic goods.	3.08	.964
Overall	3.216	.960

The mean of respondents' attitudes towards domestic products (mean = 3.26, SD = .960). A summary of the individual statements measuring attitude is shown in Table 4.

Cluster Analysis

The various CE levels was examined using the cluster analysis. Two clusters—highly and lowly ethnocentric—were identified. The first cluster had 73 respondents (46% of N), and the second had 86 respondents (54% of N). The findings are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Mean, Std Deviation and Significant Differences of Clusters, CETSCALE

CETSCALE Cluster		Mean	Std. Deviation	T test	
				t	sig.
1. Indians should always buy Indian-made products instead of imports.	1	2.91	.826	8.818	0.00
	2	1.85	.704		
2. Only those products that are unavailable in India should be imported	1	2.73	.989	5.007	0.00
	2	1.98	.792		
3. There should be very little trading or purchasing of goods from other countries unless out of necessity	1	3.39	.977	7.994	0.00
	2	2.25	.808		
4. Curbs should be put on all imports.	1	3.47	1.09	5.311	0.00
	2	2.58	.964		
5. Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products in Indian market.	1	4.15	.516	8.339	0.00
	2	3.09	1.03		
6. We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country.	1	3.07	1.12	8.088	0.00
	2	1.88	.523		
7. Indian products, first, last and foremost.	1	2.98	.895	8.057	0.00
	2	1.88	.791		
8. Purchasing foreign made products is un-Indian.	1	4.24	.789	7.652	0.00
	2	3.11	1.04		
9. A real Indian should always buy Indian-made products.	1	4.12	.748	10.672	0.00
	2	2.55	1.09		
10. It is always best to purchase Indian products.	1	3.33	.902	9.367	0.00
	2	2.01	.823		
11. It may cost me in the long-run but I prefer to support Indian products.	1	2.78	.899	5.578	0.00
	2	2.03	.806		
12. Purchasing Indian products is showing love for India.	1	3.25	1.00	9.138	0.00
	2	1.89	.827		
13. Buying Indian products is a matter of pride.	1	2.91	.959	7.901	0.00
	2	1.84	.742		

CETSCALE Cluster		Mean	Std. Deviation	T test	
				t	sig.
14. Indian products should be purchased as we trust them.	1	2.87	.898	6.777	0.00
	2	1.97	.737		
15. Buy Indian-made products. Keep India working.	1	2.07	.714	5.435	0.00
	2	1.52	.547		
16. It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts Indians out of jobs.	1	3.49	.844	6.878	0.00
	2	2.43	1.09		
17. We should purchase products manufactured in India instead of letting other countries get rich off us.	1	2.71	.853	4.965	0.00
	2	2.03	.876		
18. Indian should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indian business and causes unemployment.	1	3.29	.815	8.323	0.00
	2	2.17	.864		
19. Foreign products should be taxed heavily to reduce their entry in India.	1	3.43	.906	8.074	0.00
	2	2.25	.919		
20. Purchase of Indian products gives boost to local MSMEs and Micro Industry.	1	1.74	.676	-.188	0.85*
	2	1.76	.685		
21. Buying home country products make us self-reliant in all aspects in long run.	1	2.21	.981	3.848	0.00
	2	1.68	.598		
22. Buying Indian products make Indian economy prosper.	1	2.08	.744	4.207	0.00
	2	1.62	.617		

Note. *p value significant if <0.05

Every statement of CETSCALE shows a significant difference between the two clusters ($p < 0.05$) except statement 20 'Purchase of Indian products gives boost to local MSMEs and Micro Industry' with $p = .85 (> 0.05)$. This indicates that

both clusters show a significant difference on each statement of CETSCALE and on the overall CE construct. Table 6 shows the results of the cluster analysis on attitude:

Table 6: Mean, Std Deviation and Significant Differences of Clusters, CETSCALE

ATTITUDE Clusters		Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	
				t	sig.
1. I like to buy domestic goods.	1	3.56	.908	2.026	.041
	2	3.33	1.03		
2. I am willing to pay extra price to buy domestic goods.	1	3.28	.911	2.077	.044
	2	2.96	1.07		
3. I recommend others to buy domestic goods.	1	3.39	.885	2.652	.009
	2	3.11	.979		
4. I have a favourable attitude towards domestic goods.	1	3.32	.889	2.586	.006
	2	3.28	.988		
5. I love buying domestic goods.	1	3.33	.951	2.652	.009
	2	2.92	.942		

Note. *p value significant if <0.05



Hypotheses Testing

H1: There is a significant impact of Consumer Ethnocentrism on attitude towards domestic product.

ET significantly influences AT ($f = 13.136$, $b = .281$, $p < .00$). Therefore, H1 was supported. However, the effect size ($r = .281$) was low, explaining 7.7% (R^2) of variance. Table 7 summarizes the results:

Table 7: Regression

Hypothesis	B	R ²	F	p-value	Hypothesis Supported
H1	ET→AT .281	.077	13.136	0.00	Yes

Note. * $p < 0.05$. ET: Ethnocentrism, AT: Attitude

H2: There is a significant difference between the attitude of the high and low ethnocentric respondents.

An independent sample t-test shows marginal differences ($t(155) = 2.27$, $p = 0.024$) in the high and low ethnocentric respondents mean scores. The mean score of CL1 ($M = 3.236$, $SD = .575$) was higher than CL2 ($M = 3.029$, $SD = .578$). The magnitude of mean difference (.208 @ 95% CI .028 to .392) was found not that significant. However, H3 was supported. Also, the effect size ($r = .1787$) was small, explaining only 3.18 % of the variance. The results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Differences Between Attitudes of High and Low Ethnocentric Respondents

		Levene's Test for Equality of variances					t-test for Equality of Variances					
		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig	t	df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% CI of difference	
										Lower		Upper
ET	CL1	71	3.236	.575	.423	.518	2.27	155	.024	.208	.028	.392
	CL2	86	3.029	.578								

Note. * $p < 0.05$. AT: Attitude, CL1: High Ethnocentric cluster, CL2: Low Ethnocentric cluster

Discussion and Conclusion

- According to the CET-SCALE (Shimp & Sharma, 1987), Indian consumers' ethnocentrism level exhibited a mean value of 2.534, indicating average results, i.e., respondents are neither excessively high nor excessively low on the CE level (see Table 3). Similar findings were put by (Balabanis & Diamantopoulos, 2004), who found that customers choose locally-produced goods but do not necessarily avoid imported goods because they may be from poor economies. This can serve as a reminder to businesses that, especially in a nation like India, they shouldn't rely only on consumer ethnocentrism levels of target markets when predicting the success or failure of

their products. Mean value of 3.216 shows slight skewed preference for domestic products (Table 4). The probable reason could be the developing nature of our country, wherein people have gradually started thinking about their nation's well-being before making any purchase. They have started evaluating the after-effects of their purchase on the citizens of India.

- The sample was divided into two clusters using a cluster analysis (Table 5). The first cluster (Mean= 3.047, $SD = .339$, $n = 73$, 46% of N) was characterised as having strong ethnocentrism, and the second (Mean= 2.102, $SD = .369$, $n = 86$, 54% of N) as having low ethnocentrism. With the exception of statement 20 ('Purchase of Indian products gives help to local MSMEs and Micro Industry'), every CETSCALE statement demonstrates a significant difference between the two clusters ($p < 0.05$) (see Table 6). This shows that each CETSCALE statement and the overall CE construct considerably differ for both clusters.

Regression analysis assessed the first hypothesis and determined how ethnocentrism affected Indians' opinions towards buying domestic goods. $P < .005$ indicates that the hypothesis was supported (see Table 7), indicating that ethnocentrism affects Indians' attitudes towards buying domestic goods. The results suggest strongly ethnocentric

Indians prefer goods created in their own nation. Though, the effect size ($r = .281$) only accounted for 7.7% (R^2) of the variance. According to research, consumers' ethnocentric tendencies are more powerful than other components of the marketing mix in explaining consumer purchase behaviour (Watson & Wright, 2000). Shimp & Sharma (1987) found that CE positively influenced consumers' decisions between buying local and imported goods.

To ascertain whether there was any statistically significant difference in the views of high and low ethnocentric respondents towards domestic products, the second hypothesis was tested using a t-test. There is no discernible difference between the

attitudes of high and low ethnocentric respondents towards local items, as indicated by $P = 0.024$, which is marginally less than 0.05. Nevertheless, the hypothesis was supported (see Table 8). Low effect size ($r = 0.1787$) only accounts for 3.18% (R^2) of variance. Consumers with higher levels of ethnocentrism assess foreign goods according to how they will affect their country. They believed that importing goods damages the home economy and is therefore disloyal since it causes widespread unemployment. More ethnocentric consumers prefer to buy more domestically produced goods than less ethnocentric consumers (McLain & Sternquist, 1992).

Implications

The current study has a number of managerial implications. When there is a moderate level of ethnocentrism among Indians, where one segment of consumers prefers local products while others don't care about distinction, consumer ethnocentrism first offers useful insight to understand the rationale behind consumers' choice of domestic products. The results show that consumers' levels of ethnocentrism vary (Josiassen et al., 2011). Marketing professionals face a significant issue when trying to avoid inciting nationalistic sentiment with their advertising. While it serves as a deterrent for many global marketers, it is an opportunity for local marketers. This study would help frame customer ethnocentric tendencies as a psychographic segment variable while formulating marketing strategies, especially for Indian manufacturers who are facing severe competition from other foreign marketers. To make their products equally compatible throughout the world, they should put more of an emphasis on "technology, engineering, and innovation." To promote domestic goods, particularly among the very ethnocentric portion of society, they can develop methods that incorporate a Positive Country Image like "Buy Indian Products, Keep India Working."

Limitations and Future Research Direction

The limited sample size of the current study is one of its limitations, which somewhere restricts its generalizability to the whole nation. The sample size did not effectively represent the diverse demographic features of the Indian people. Future research should focus on adding more mediators and moderators to improve the validity and reliability of the findings. The outcomes could be different in rural or semi-developed areas, where educational attainment, economic standing, and acquaintance with foreign goods vary. The impact of ethnocentrism on the development of attitudes towards domestic items utilising various sets of products or with a bundle of products requires further study. Numerous nations, particularly those that differ from India in terms of culture, politics, and economy, could be used as comparison points.

A more comprehensive sociodemographic profile of the respondents could be helpful for generalising the results. Investigation of regional and international items with a diverse range of attributes can be done using conjoint analysis. A comprehensive model that includes the causes, modifying factors, and potential results of ethnocentrism might be tested in a different situation to help us understand it better.

References

- Acharya, C., & Elliott, G. (2003). Consumer Ethnocentrism, Perceived Product Quality and Choice—An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 15(4), 87–115. https://doi.org/10.1300/J046v15n04_05
- Ahmed, R. R., Štreimikienė, D., & Štreimikis, J. (2022). The extended UTAUT model and learning management system during COVID-19: Evidence from PLS-SEM and conditional process modeling. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 23(1), 82–104.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Alden, D. L., Hoyer, W. D., & Crowley, A. E. (1993). Country-of-origin, perceived risk and evaluation strategy. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Baber, R., Upadhyay, Y., Baber, P., & Kaurav, R. P. S. (2023). Three decades of consumer ethnocentrism research: A bibliometric analysis. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 11(1), 137–158.
- 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(1), 80–95.
- 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, 157–175.
- Balabanis, G., & Siamagka, N. T. (2022). A meta-analysis of consumer ethnocentrism across 57 countries. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 39(3), 745–763.
- Bawa, A. (2004). Consumer ethnocentrism: CETSSCALE validation and measurement of extent. *Vikalpa*, 29(3), 43–58.
- Bianchi, C., & Mortimer, G. (2015). Drivers of local food consumption: A comparative study. *British Food Journal*, 117(9), 2282–2299.
- Byrne, A., Dionisi, A. M., Barling, J., Akers, A., Robertson, J., Lys, R., Wylie, J., & Dupré, K. (2014). The depleted leader: The influence of leaders' diminished psychological resources on leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 344–357.
- Camacho, L. J., Ramírez-Correa, P. E., & Salazar-Concha, C. (2021). Consumer ethnocentrism and country of origin: Effects on online consumer purchase behavior in times of a pandemic. *Sustainability*, 14(1), 348.
- Chao, P., & Rajendran, K. N. (1993). Consumer profiles and perceptions: Country-of-origin effects. *International Marketing Review*, 10(2). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/02651339310032534/full/html>
- Chaudhry, N. I., Mughal, S. ali, Chaudhry, J. I., & Bhatti, U. T. (2021). Impact of consumer ethnocentrism and animosity on brand image and brand loyalty through product judgment. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 12(8), 1477–1491.
- Fernández-Ferrín, P., Calvo-Turrientes, A., Bande, B., Artaraz-Miñón, M., & Galán-Ladero, M. M. (2018). The valuation and purchase of food products that combine local, regional and traditional features: The influence of consumer ethnocentrism. *Food Quality and Preference*, 64, 138–147.



- Good, L. K., & Huddleston, P. (1995). Ethnocentrism of Polish and Russian consumers: Are feelings and intentions related. *International Marketing Review*, 12(5), 35–48.
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106–121.
- Hamin, H., Baumann, C., & L. Tung, R. (2014). Attenuating double jeopardy of negative country of origin effects and latecomer brand: An application study of ethnocentrism in emerging markets. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 26(1), 54–77.
- Han, C. M., & Terpstra, V. (1988). Country-of-Origin Effects for Uni-National and Bi-National Products. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(2), 235–255. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490379>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43, 115–135.
- Hsu, J. L., & Nien, H.-P. (2008). Who are ethnocentric? Examining consumer ethnocentrism in Chinese societies. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 7(6), 436–447.
- Huddleston, P., Good, L. K., & Stoel, L. (2000). Consumer ethnocentrism, product necessity and quality perceptions of Russian consumers. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 10(2), 167–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095939600342343>
- Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., & Rialp, J. (2019). How does sensory brand experience influence brand equity? Considering the roles of customer satisfaction, customer affective commitment, and employee empathy. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 343–354.
- *Is India's middle class actually poor? - BBC News.* (n.d.). BBC, 2017. Retrieved September 27, 2023, from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-41264072>
- Islam, T., Ahmed, I., Usman, A., & Ali, M. (2021). Abusive supervision and knowledge hiding: The moderating roles of future orientation and Islamic work ethics. *Management Research Review*, 44(12), 1565–1582.
- Javalgi, R. G., Khare, V. P., Gross, A. C., & Scherer, R. F. (2005). An application of the consumer ethnocentrism model to French consumers. *International Business Review*, 14(3), 325–344.
- Josiassen, A., Assaf, A. G., & Karpen, I. O. (2011). Consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy: Analyzing the role of three demographic consumer characteristics. *International Marketing Review*, 28(6), 627–646.
- 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(1), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299806200108>
- Kwak, H., Jaju, A., & Larsen, T. (2006). Consumer ethnocentrism offline and online: The mediating role of marketing efforts and personality traits in the United States, South Korea, and India. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34, 367–385.
- Lee, W.-N., Hong, J.-Y., & Lee, S.-J. (2003). Communicating with American consumers in the post 9/11 climate: An empirical investigation of consumer ethnocentrism in the United States. *International Journal of Advertising*, 22(4), 487–510. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2003.11072865>
- Lu Wang, C., & Xiong Chen, Z. (2004). Consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy domestic products in a developing country setting: Testing moderating effects. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21(6), 391–400.
- McLain, S., & Sternquist, B. (1992). Ethnocentric Consumers: Do They "Buy American"? *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 4(1–2), 39–58. https://doi.org/10.1300/J046v04n01_03
- Netemeyer, R. G., Durvasula, S., & Lichtenstein, D. R. (1991). A Cross-National Assessment of the Reliability and Validity of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(3), 320–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379102800306>
- Nguyen, N. H., Dao, T. K., Duong, T. T., Nguyen, T. T., Nguyen, V. K., & Dao, T. L. (2023). Role of consumer ethnocentrism on purchase intention toward foreign products: Evidence from data of Vietnamese consumers with Chinese products. *Heliyon*, 9(2).
- Olsen, J. E., Biswas, A., & Granzin, K. L. (1993). Influencing consumers' selection of domestic versus imported products: Implications for marketing based on a model of helping behavior. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21(4), 307–321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02894523>
- Papadopoulos, N. G., & Heslop, L. (1993). *Product-country images: Impact and role in international marketing.* Psychology Press.
- Pervan, M., Curak, M., & Pavic Kramaric, T. (2017). The influence of industry characteristics and dynamic capabilities on firms' profitability. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 6(1), 4.
- Piron, F. (2002). International outshopping and ethnocentrism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(1/2), 189–210.
- Ramadania, R., Suh, J., Rosyadi, R., Purmono, B. B., & Rahmawati, R. (2023). Consumer ethnocentrism, cultural sensitivity, brand credibility on purchase intentions of domestic cosmetics. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(2), 2229551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2229551>
- Roth, M. S., & Romeo, J. B. (1992). Matching Product Category and Country Image Perceptions: A Framework for Managing Country-of-Origin Effects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(3), 477–497. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490276>
- Shankarmahesh, M. (2006). Consumer ethnocentrism: An integrative review of its antecedents and consequences. *International Marketing Review - INT MARK REV*, 23, 146–172. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330610660065>
- Shimp, T. A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(3), 280–289.
- Shoham, A., & Gavish, Y. (2016). Antecedents and Buying Behavior Consequences of Consumer Racism, National Identification, Consumer Animosity, and Consumer Ethnocentrism. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 28(5), 296–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2016.1214661>
- Trivedi, S. D., Tapar, A. V., & Dharmani, P. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review of the Relationship between Consumer Ethnocentrism and Product Evaluation. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2023.2180790>
- Wall, M., Liefeld, J., & Heslop, L. A. (1991). Impact of country-of-origin cues on consumer judgments in multi-cue situations: A covariance analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19(2), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02726002>
- Watson, J. J., & Wright, K. (2000). Consumer ethnocentrism and attitudes toward domestic and foreign products. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(9/10), 1149–1166.
- Witkowski, T. H. (1998). Consumer ethnocentrism in two emerging markets: Determinants and predictive validity. *ACR North American Advances*.
- *World Economic Outlook, October 2021: Recovery During A Pandemic.* (n.d.). IMF, 2021. Retrieved September 27, 2023, from <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2021/10/12/world-economic-outlook-october-2021>

- Xin, L., & Seo, S. (2020). The role of consumer ethnocentrism, country image, and subjective knowledge in predicting intention to purchase imported functional foods. *British Food Journal*, 122(2), 448–464.
- Yadav, S. (2023). The Mediating Role of Attitude on Country of Origin and Consumer Purchase Intention. *Parikalpana KIIT Journal of Management*, 19(1), 21–42.
- Yagci, M. I. (2001). Evaluating the Effects of Country-of-Origin and Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Case of a Transplant Product. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 13(3), 63–85. https://doi.org/10.1300/J046v13n03_05

GJEIS Prevent Plagiarism in Publication

Turnitin is an Internet-based similarity detection service run by the American company Turnitin, LLC, a subsidiary of Advance Publications which is a fully-automatic machine learning text- recognition system made for detecting, preventing and handling plagiarism and trusted by thousands of institutions across worldwide. Ouriginal by Turnitin is an award-winning software that helps detect and prevent plagiarism regardless of language. Combining text- matching with writing-style analysis to promote academic integrity and prevent plagiarism, Ouriginal is simple, reliable and easy to use. Ouriginal was acquired by Turnitin in 2021. As part of a larger global organization GJEIS and Turnitin better equipped to anticipate the foster an environment of academic integrity for educators and students around the globe. Ouriginal is GDPR compliant with privacy by design and an uptime of 99.9% and have trust to be the partner in academic integrity (<https://www.ouriginal.com/>) tool to check the originality and further affixed the similarity index which is {08%} in this case (See below Annexure-I). Thus, the reviewers and editors are of view to find it suitable to publish in this Volume-15, Issue-3, Jul - Sep 2023.

Annexure 15.3.2

Submission Date	Submission Id	Word Count	Character Count
24-July-2023	27535:45367861 (Turnitin)	3213	18174

Analyzed Document	Submitter email	Submitted by	Similarity
1.2 ERP2_Shashi_GJEIS Jul to Sep 2023.docx	shashiy247@gmail.com	Shashi Yadav	08%



8% Overall Similarity
 Top sources found in the following databases:

- 5% Internet database
- 5% Crossref database
- 5% Submitted Works database
- 4% Publications database
- Crossref Posted Content database

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 ksom.ac.in Internet 1% 2 Savitribai Phule Pune University on 2017-12-17 Submitted works <1% 3 Anupam Bawa. "Consumer Ethnocentrism: CETSCALE Validation and ... Crossref <1% 4 University of Strathclyde on 2013-02-06 Submitted works <1% 5 scp-knowledge.eu Internet <1% 6 Athanassios Krystallis, George Chrysochoidis. "Does the Country of O... Crossref <1% 7 core.ac.uk Internet <1% 8 studymode.com Internet <1% 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9 University of Sunderland on 2023-07-07 Submitted works <1% 10 tandfonline.com Internet <1% 11 Associatie K.U.Leuven on 2016-08-19 Submitted works <1% 12 Oporto British School on 2022-04-05 Submitted works <1% 13 hdl.handle.net Internet <1% 14 Coventry University on 2019-04-29 Submitted works <1% 15 econstor.eu Internet <1% 16 internationaljournalcorner.com Internet <1%
--	--



Reviewers Memorandum



Reviewer's Comment 1: The paper highlights a very thought-provoking topic i.e. "Ethnocentrism". The "MADE IN INDIA" campaign, which aims to promote purchasing Made in India goods, is receiving considerable attention in India. The COVID-19 pandemic has hastened this process. Thus, it is clear that Indian preferences are evolving and they are increasingly making sensible judgements after carefully weighing a wide range of facts. And aimed to determine the influence of consumer ethnocentric tendencies on attitude formation towards domestic products.

Reviewer's Comment 2: The article is presented in a systematized manner. A thoughtful introduction followed by a rich review of literature having recent literature. A well-explained data analysis section and enlightened implications and scope for future research.

Reviewer's Comment 3: One of the limitations of the study is the limited sample size, which somewhat restricts its generalizability to the whole nation. Moreover, some qualitative interviews could have also been conducted to validate the results of the quantitative data.



Shashi Yadav and Nawal Kishor
"Influence of Consumer Ethnocentrism on the
Attitude towards Domestic Products"
Volume-15, Issue-3, Jul-Sep 2023. (www.gjeis.com)

<https://doi.org/10.18311/gjeis/2023>

Volume-15, Issue-3, Jul-Sep 2023

Online ISSN : 0975-1432, Print ISSN : 0975-153X

Frequency : Quarterly, Published Since : 2009

Google Citations: Since 2009

H-Index = 96

i10-Index: 964

Source: <https://scholar.google.co.in/citations?user=S47TtNkAAAAJ&hl=en>



Conflict of Interest: Author of a Paper had no conflict neither financially nor academically.

Editorial Excerpt



The article has 08% of plagiarism which is the accepted percentage as per the norms and standards of the journal for publication. As per the editorial board's observations and blind reviewers' remarks the paper had some minor revisions which were communicated on a timely basis to the authors (Shashi & Nawal Kishor), and accordingly, all the corrections had been incorporated as and when directed and required to do so. The comments related to this manuscript are noticeably related to the theme "**Influence of Consumer Ethnocentrism on the Attitude towards Domestic Products**" both subject-wise and research-wise. The current study purpose is to specifically examine how ethnocentrism aids Indians in their evaluation of domestic goods. The results of this study will add to the body of knowledge by assisting marketers in considering customer ethnocentric tendencies as a psychographic segment when formulating marketing tactics. Overall, this paper contributes significantly to Consumer Ethnocentrism literature. After comprehensive reviews and the editorial board's remarks, the manuscript has been categorized and decided to publish under the "**Empirical Research Paper**" category.

Acknowledgement



The acknowledgment section is an essential part of all academic research papers. It provides appropriate recognition to all contributors for their hard work and effort taken while writing a paper. The data presented and analyzed in this paper by the author (Shashi & Nawal Kishor) is collected first handily and wherever secondary data is used the proper acknowledgment and endorsement are depicted. The authors are highly indebted to all who facilitated accomplishing the research. Last but not least, I/we endorse all reviewers and editors of GJEIS in publishing in the present issue.

Disclaimer



All views expressed in this paper are my/our own. Some of the content is taken from open-source websites & some are copyright free for the purpose of disseminating knowledge. Those some I/we have mentioned above in the references section and acknowledged/cited as when and where required. Tables or data presented from other referenced sources in this particular paper have been presented within quotes and references at the bottom accordingly and appropriately. Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not reflect the views of the GJEIS. The authors have made every effort to ensure that the information in this paper is correct, any remaining errors and deficiencies are solely their responsibility.

