

This file was downloaded from the institutional repository BI Brage - <http://brage.bibsys.no/bi> (Open Access)

***Exploring the animosity domain and the role of affect in a cross-national context***

**Erik B. Nes**  
**BI Norwegian Business School**

**Rama Yelkur**  
**University of Wisconsin**

**Ragnhild Silkoset**  
**BI Norwegian Business School**

This is the authors' final, accepted and refereed manuscript to the article published in

***International Business Review, 21(2012)5: 751-765***

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2011.08.005>

The publisher, Elsevier, allows the author to retain rights to “post a revised personal version of the text of the final journal article (to reflect changes made in the peer review process) on your personal or institutional website or server for scholarly purposes, incorporating the complete citation and with a link to the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) of the article”. (Publisher’s policy 2011).

EXPLORING THE ANIMOSITY DOMAIN AND THE ROLE OF AFFECT IN A  
CROSS-NATIONAL CONTEXT

Erik B. Nes\*  
Associate Professor of Marketing  
BI Norwegian School of Management  
0442 Oslo Norway  
Phone: +4746410547  
Email: [erik.nes@bi.no](mailto:erik.nes@bi.no)

Rama Yelkur  
Professor of Marketing  
University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin USA  
Phone: 715-836-4674  
Email: [yelkurr@uwec.edu](mailto:yelkurr@uwec.edu)

Ragnhild Silkoset  
Associate Professor of Marketing  
BI Norwegian School of Management  
0442 Oslo Norway  
Phone: +4746410565  
Email: [ragnhild.silkoset@bi.no](mailto:ragnhild.silkoset@bi.no)

\*Contact author

# **EXPLORING THE ANIMOSITY DOMAIN AND THE ROLE OF AFFECT IN A CROSS-NATIONAL CONTEXT**

## **ABSTRACT**

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to contribute to the development of animosity theory in three areas; construct domain, the mediating role of affect and model testing.

**Design/methodology/approach** – Exploratory and empirical research is carried out in two countries in order to explore the domain and to test the factor structure and the hypotheses through confirmatory analysis.

**Findings** – We find animosity is a four-dimensional construct which impacts buying behavior through affect.

**Originality/value** – The research extends the domain of the animosity construct to a four-dimensional structure rather than the two-dimensional structure used in most previous studies. It is the first study to empirically test an extended animosity domain and investigate the mediating role of affective emotional responses between animosity and buying intentions.

**Keywords** Animosity, affect, consumer behavior, international business

**Paper type:** Research paper

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Today's global environment, which includes civil wars, regime change, and military conflicts, presents an on-going challenge for international business. Actions of governments and organizations from different countries, both in the past and present, have not been well received by consumers around the world. For example, it has been reported that countries in the Middle East have boycotted Danish manufacturers of consumer products due to the publishing of a comic in the Danish press that Middle Eastern consumers considered offensive (Munter, 2006). This pattern can also be observed with regard to past events, where consumers from China, for example, would typically be averse to buying Japanese products due to economic hardship and war inflicted upon the Chinese by Japan (Klein, Ettenson, & Morris, 1998). Subsequent research has generally confirmed the negative impact of animosity on consumer preferences in a variety of countries.

Klein et al. (1998) were the first to define and measure the animosity construct. They state that animosity has a direct, negative effect on buyer behavior as it relates to the products originating in a country that is the target of consumers' anger. Klein et al. (1998) define animosity as "antipathy related to previous or ongoing political, military, economic, or diplomatic events." Their Animosity Model posits that "animosity" and "consumer ethnocentrism" are antecedents to "willingness to buy." That is, when consumers experience animosity towards a certain country due to past or present events, they simply refuse to buy products from that country. An important point to note in the Klein et al. (1998) model is that animosity is unrelated to product judgments or quality perceptions of products from that country. Their research extends the traditional beliefs that country-of origin affects work through their impact on product evaluations (Bilkey & Nes, 1982; Papadopoulos, 1993).

The notion that issues relating to political actions and international civil, diplomatic, and military conflicts may impact demand for products from the country that is the target of

animosity has sparked substantial research interest. Previous studies find that animosity has some impact on various dependent variables, particularly buying intentions (e.g., Bahae & Pisani, 2009; Funk, Arthurs, Trevino, & Joireman, 2010; Hinck, Cortes, & James, 2004; Hong & Kang, 2006; Huang, Phau, & Lin, 2010; Klein, 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Leong et al., 2008; Maher & Mady, 2010; Nakos & Hajidimitriou, 2007; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004; Parker, Haytko and Hermans 2011; Shin, 2001; Shoham, Davidow, Klein, & Ruvio, 2006; Witkowski, 2000).

Published research in this area has also confirmed the impact of animosity for products in general, (Hinck et al., 2004; Huang et al., 2010; Leong et al., 2008; Nakos & Hajidimitriou, 2007; Witkowski, 2000), for specific categories of products (Ettenson & Klein, 2005; Hong & Kang, 2006; Jimenez & Martin, 2010; Klein, 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004; Russell & Russell, 2006; Shimp, Dunn, & Klein, 2004; Shin, 2001; Shoham et al., 2006), and finally for hybrid products with partial shifts in production to animosity targets (Funk et al., 2010). Some studies have tested and established a correlation between the level of animosity and actual product ownership (Klein, 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Shin, 2001). Animosity may negatively impact trust in a supplier (Jimenez & Martin, 2010), acceptance or rejection of symbols in mass communication (Lwin, Stanaland & Williams, 2010), and evaluations of brands that are associated with the animosity target (Russell & Russell, 2010). The observed level of prejudice and discrimination against the brands depend on the strength of the brand-country association (Russell & Russell, 2010). Rose, Rose, & Shoham (2009) found animosity levels differed strongly between cultural subgroups in Israel, and they suggest that this highlights the importance of considering such cultural subgroups when studying animosity. Most of these studies are in line with the original animosity model by Klein et al. 1998 which found that animosity has no impact of animosity on product judgments. However a some studies refute this claim, and find animosity does impact

evaluations of products from the animosity target (Huang, Phau & Lin, 2010; Leong et al., 2008; Rose et al., 2009; Shoham et al., 2006). All of the above research studies provide strong support for the notion that national animosities caused by war, economic policies, and other conflicts may have a profound impact on consumer buying behavior. It is important for those engaged in international business to understand the nature and impact of conflicts and animosity between countries on the demand for products in international markets. For example, Edwards, Gut, and Mavondo (2007) found that 58 percent of French businesses operating in Australia and/or New Zealand reported loss of sales as a result of the French nuclear tests in the South Pacific. Several French companies responded to this increase in animosity by using strategies such as temporarily deferring investment in the region or even modifying their brand/company name.

Leong et al. (2008) recommended that animosity research employ a more theory-driven approach. In their study they distinguished between cognitive and affective product evaluations and found the impact of animosity to be much greater on the latter. This is in line with Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) who argued that animosity includes mainly affective and normative attitudes.

In this study, we endeavor to contribute to the development of the animosity theory in important areas. First, due to a shortage of exploratory research, we still have limited knowledge of the domain of the animosity construct. In all previous quantitative studies, the animosity targets, and thus the nature of the conflicts, are selected by the researchers. But this also implies that the domain of the animosity construct is predetermined, and it limits our understanding of the construct itself and the processes through which it influences consumer behavior. In our study we endeavor to explore the domain when the restriction of pre-selection of the animosity target is lifted. We find the domain of the concept to be four-dimensional rather than two-dimensional as applied in most of the previous studies. Second,

the processes through which animosity influences buying intentions have received only scant empirical attention. We propose that animosity influences buying intentions mainly through affective outcomes, and we test a model of the relationship between the four animosity dimensions and buying intentions with affect as the mediating variable. Building on recent branding research, our affect concept complements and extends the present understanding of affect in animosity research (Leong et al., 2008) by defining affect as the affective benefits (disbenefits) of buying and consuming products.

The paper is structured as follows: we review the animosity background and construct domain, and we report from the qualitative pre-studies concerning the domain of the construct. We then develop our research model. Finally, we report results from our quantitative studies and discuss the findings.

## **2. ANIMOSITY BACKGROUND AND CONSTRUCT DOMAIN**

In their original model, Klein et al. (1998) posited that animosity is founded in war-based animosity and economic-based animosity. Most of the the bi-national studies that followed the Klein et al. (1998) study built on one or both of their two animosity dimensions. Of the bi-national studies that included economic-based animosity, the majority dealt with unfair trade practices (Ang et al., 2004; Klein, 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Klein & Ettenson, 1999; Shin, 2001; Witkowski, 2000). The war-based animosity dimension had to do with military occupation (Klein et al., 1998; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004; Shin, 2001), Pearl Harbor (Klein, 2002), civil war in the U.S. (Shimp et al., 2004), animosity toward Germany among Jewish consumers living in the United States (Podoshen & Hunt, 2009) or the second Intifada (Shoman et al., 2006; Guido, Prete, Tedeshi & Dadusc, 2010). The exceptions to war-based and economic-based animosity included current political issues between the U.S. and China (Witkowski, 2000), French nuclear testing in the Pacific (Edwards et al., 2007; Ettenson &

Klein, 2005), and undefined historic hostilities between the U.S. and France (Amine, 2008; Russell & Russell, 2006) and between Greece and Turkey (Nakos & Hajidimitriou, 2007).

The strong reliance on the original two dimensions (war and economics) may be due to the nature of the bi-national conflicts. The qualitative pre-studies in these studies do not concern the two-dimensional dichotomy of animosity (Klein, 2002; Shimp et al., 2004). Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007) challenge the traditional construct domain assumptions of animosity in previous studies. Their exploratory research suggests that the animosity concept also encompasses perceived differences in mentality and perhaps religion in addition to the war and economic animosity dichotomy. The complexity of animosity is also exemplified by Nakos and Hajidimitriou (2007) who describe the adversarial relationship between Greece and Turkey that originated almost a thousand years ago and the numerous wars and conflicts that followed, all of which created hostility between the two countries that exists even today. Amine (2008) provides another example of the great complexities of animosity. She applied ethnographic fieldwork to achieve insight into the hostility between the U.S. and France which has lasted for centuries (Amine, 2008). The studies by Amine (2008), Nakos and Hajidimitriou (2007) and Riefler and Diamantopolous (2007) show that many animosity constructs are more complex than the two-dimensional dichotomy of just war and economic animosity.

Jung et al. (2002) suggest a typology of animosity categorized by two dimensions; personal-national and stable-situational. Several studies address specific bilateral tensions that we argue tend to be in the “stable” and “national” cell (e.g., Japan in China (Klein et al., 1998), Japan in the U.S. (Klein & Ettenson, 1999), China in the U.S. (Witkowski, 2000), and Japan in Korea (Shin, 2001)). The strained relationship between the U.S. and France (Amine, 2008; Russell & Russell, 2006) is considered stable though the conflict was exacerbated due to more recent situational events following September 11, 2001. The studies which address

the impact of French nuclear tests in the Pacific may reflect animosity which is more temporary in nature (Edwards et al., 2007; Ettenson & Klein, 2005). One could, however, argue that French nuclear testing in the Pacific is war-based and not just based on a past war but rather a potential war in the future. All empirical studies have specified target countries for animosity. Thus, as pointed out by Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007), the nature of the conflict is predetermined by the researcher(s). Since most animosity settings are chosen to depict long-lasting hostility the question arises as to whether such old conflicts are perceived by respondents as generating strong reactions, or if more recent, and perhaps more temporary, enmities are felt to be more important (Riefler & Diamantopoulos, 2007).

### **3. QUALITATIVE PRE-STUDY TO EXPLORE ANIMOSITY DIMENSIONS**

A typical procedure in theory development is to develop and test the theory in a base country (often the United States) and then translate the items to new languages for applications in new countries. It is assumed that the constructs are equivalent if measurement equivalence is obtained. However, as argued by Douglas and Craig (2006) this may not always be the case. Douglas and Craig (2006) identified two alternative approaches that provide comparability without ignoring emic elements. Following their recommendations, we used their linked emic model. This model takes the local context as a starting point, but at more than one research site. Input from each site is then used to develop constructs and scales. Our information was collected in the U.S. and Norway. These countries represent one very large country and one very small country on two different continents. Both are very affluent countries. The cultures have important similarities in the European heritage, but also have substantial differences. Data from the World Values Survey indicate that the two countries are quite similar with regard to self expression values, while the U.S. is much more based on traditional values than Norway (Inglehart & Baker, 2000). The U.S. belongs to an English speaking cluster of nations and Norway belongs to a protestant European cluster (Inglehart

and Baker, 2000). Differences in scores on Hofstede's cultural indexes have been used as expressions of cultural differences between countries in several previous studies (e.g. Kogut & Singh 1988; Nes, Solberg, & Silkoset 2007). Upon examination of Hofstede's dimensions, values are quite similar between the two countries on most dimensions except that the U.S. is characterized by masculine values and Norway by feminine values (Hofstede, 1980). Overall, the countries are similar enough for the same dimensions to be relevant and different enough to provide increased international validity relative to a single country setting.

The qualitative study involved conducting interviews with open-ended questions in the U.S. and Norway. The analysis of the qualitative responses from the two countries led us to specify the four dimensions of animosity and their composition. Fifty-four semi-structured, in-depth interviews were conducted, 34 in the U.S. and 20 in Norway. We used a qualitative methodology with unprompted questioning to identify countries towards which feelings of animosity may exist, as well as the underlying reasons for such animosity. In the qualitative questioning, we asked respondents in the two sample countries to think about the foreign country they liked the least and to answer a series of open-ended questions about that country. Most important was the question that asked why they disliked the particular foreign nation that they mentioned in the interview.

The animosity countries identified by Norwegian consumers were Turkey, North Korea, Serbia, China, Iraq, Pakistan, France, Russia, the U.S., and Israel. Those identified by U.S. consumers were England, Japan, Iraq, Ireland, India, Iran, North Korea, France, China, Somalia, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti. Using the software *Atlas.ti*, we grouped all the qualitative responses to the question "Why do you dislike this country?" under four major categories of animosity as suggested by the open-ended responses (see Table 1).

**Table 1 Dimensions of animosity from qualitative interviews**

<b>Categories of Animosity</b>	<b>Statements</b>
Economic	No concern for environment Poverty (3) Suppression (2) Death due to starvation and disease They can't wait to get our money from tourism Lawlessness Because we can do everything better and cheaper in our country This country isolates itself from the world They have very low productivity No infrastructure Illegal immigrants from this country taking our jobs (2) Hardship and disaster
Military/war	Huge threat to our country Nuclear threat, nuclear weapons and testing (6) War (17) This country did not help us in the fight against terrorism (7) WW II Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor (2) Invasion of other Asian countries Its former occupation of other countries

Categories of Animosity	Statements
People	<p>No respect for people</p> <p>Genocide, killings, deaths, ethnic hatred, kill their own people, own people are treated as slaves (5)</p> <p>Because of their beliefs they have no value for life</p> <p>Everyone seems to be stuck up, they think they are better than everyone else, arrogant (6)</p> <p>Whiny and annoying</p> <p>Attitude of the people/ immigrants from this country living here, exploit our country, their attitude towards our country, increasing crime rates by these immigrants (5)</p> <p>Dislike these people's political views</p> <p>Unfriendly people, harsh and rude, mean, they spit on my friends (13)</p> <p>Dirty, throw trash on street (4)</p> <p>Because they hate us, our country, spread ill will about our country (4)</p> <p>Violence and riots, suicide bombings, terrorism, weapons (5)</p> <p>People are not welcoming, hostile to foreigners, bad experience during visit (3)</p> <p>They stick together with others from their own country</p> <p>Cannot identify with their values, fundamentalists (2)</p> <p>People</p> <p>Food</p> <p>Religion, Muslim (3)</p> <p>Corrupt (4)</p> <p>Crime (2)</p> <p>Their language, not open to my language (3)</p> <p>The way these people act or are portrayed on television</p> <p>Cruelty to animals</p> <p>Crowded</p> <p>Ungrateful</p>
Politics/government	<p>Authoritarian government (6)</p> <p>Mix of politics and religion</p> <p>This country neglects the majority of its people for global prestige</p> <p>Evasive official attitude towards invasion in 1937</p> <p>Dislike the politics and government (4)</p> <p>Government regulations and policies, censorship imposed on their people, lack of freedom, oppression (13)</p> <p>Communist government, undemocratic, political system (8)</p> <p>Human rights violations (5)</p> <p>Women's rights, male dominated (6)</p> <p>Child birth policies</p> <p>Disregard for innocent people, does not do enough for its citizens (2)</p> <p>This government is a threat to world peace</p> <p>Government policies to preserve their cultural identity</p> <p>Their foreign policies</p> <p>Political tensions</p>

The analysis of the qualitative responses from the two countries grouped by *Atlas.ti* suggests that the domain of the animosity construct includes four dimensions: people animosity, economic animosity, military/war animosity, and politics/government animosity.

#### **4. DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH MODEL**

Animosity theory postulates that animosity has a direct negative influence on consumers' willingness to buy, with little or no impact on cognitive product judgments. Several animosity researchers suggest that social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) is useful in explaining the nature and causes of animosity (Shimp et al., 2004; Shoham et al., 2006; Huang et al., 2010). However, increased understanding of why animosity leads to less buying has long been a missing piece in the puzzle of animosity research.

We argue that buying and consuming products from animosity targets involves negative psychological and social affective consequences, and these consequences influence buying behavior. One example of psychological and social consequences of animosity would be a French car buyer who feels a typical American car would be incongruent with her personality. She may fear negative reactions from people around her (who presumably share some of the same attitudes), she may resent being associated with products from the animosity target, and it may make her feel discomfort and even embarrassment. The U.S. and France have a long history of mutual antagonism (Amine, 2008). The psychological and social effects may be partially explained by inferences from image congruity theory, from cognitive dissonance theory, and from boycott research.

In consumer research it has long been suggested that symbolic attributes of a brand are important for explaining consumer behavior (Aaker, 1997; Austin, Sigaw, & Mattila, 2003; Sirgy, 1982). The argument is that attitude objects (e.g., brands) are associated with personality traits that have symbolic and self impressive implications for the consumer and that influence consumer behavior. Image congruity theory holds that these associations should

be in congruence with the consumer's personality. The ability to express personality traits is often associated with positive affects, such as pleasure or pride, whereas the inability to do so is associated with negative affect (Swann, De La Ronde, & Hixon, 1994). It has increasingly been recognized that nations (and thus animosity targets) have brand-like properties as exemplified by research into the concept of national branding (Dinnie, 2008).

Support for the psychological and social impact of animosity may also be found in cognitive dissonance theory as connoted by Shoham et al. (2006). Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) suggests that a person has knowledge about himself, his past behavior, and his beliefs and attitudes. If one element is congruent with another they are viewed as consonant. If one does not follow from another they are said to be dissonant. In our previous example, the perceived attributes of an American automobile may be dissonant with the French car buyer's beliefs and attitudes. Because cognitive dissonance is psychologically uncomfortable, consumers prefer to avoid it, thus creating a negative impact on buying intentions.

Finally, the influence of affective and normative animosity may be partially explained by inferences from the boycott literature. A boycott occurs "when a number of people abstain from purchase of a product, at the same time, as a result of the same egregious act or behavior, but not necessarily for the same reasons" (John & Klein, 2003, p. 1198). Consumers participate in boycotts to express severe dissatisfaction with a company or country's actions and/or policies (Shaw, Newholm, & Dickinson, 2006), and animosity plays an important role in attitudes toward participating in boycott activities (Smith and Qianpin 2010). Therefore, a boycott may be an outcome of animosity. One example of a boycott directed toward a country was experienced by the Danish dairy giant Arla Foods. They became a target of widespread boycotts in the Muslim world approximately six months after a Danish newspaper printed a

series of caricatures depicting the prophet Muhammad (Ettenson, Smith, Klein, & John, 2006).

A negative impact on buying behavior due to war or other animosity may be due to feelings of a moral obligation not to support the economy of an offending nation. Supporting the economy of an offending nation may also lead to feelings of guilt. Guilt is the “negative emotion which results from a consumer decision that violates one's values or norms” (Burnett & Lunsford, 1994, p. 33). It may be considered a psychosocial variable that negatively impacts self-enhancement (Klein, Smith, & John, 2004). To avoid this feeling, consumers are motivated to refuse purchasing products from a target country, even if the country is unable to change the egregious act (John & Klein, 2003). Pressure group motivations (social impact) also partially explain individual motives to boycott (Klein, Smith, & John 2002; 2004).

Building on cognitive dissonance theory, image congruity theory, and the boycott literature, we suggest that psychological and social affect mediate the impact of animosity on buying intentions. Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) define brand affect “as a brand's potential to elicit a positive emotional response in the average consumer as a result of its use.” This definition encompasses positive affect only, while negative brand affect is likely a consequence of country animosity. Furthermore, as evidenced in the boycott literature, animosity may also elicit normative emotions that are related to the purchase of goods from an animosity target, independent of eventual use. We modify Chaudhuri and Holbrook’s (2001) definition of brand affect for the negative emotions and for their use-only condition. We define affect as the product’s potential to elicit a positive or negative emotional response as a result of its purchase or use. The emotional response may have psychological (the way I think about myself) or social (the way others think of me) underpinnings, and in order to distinguish this concept from affect in the meaning of affective product judgments (Leong et al., 2008), we label the variable “psychosocial affect.”

## 4.1 Hypotheses

Based on the four-dimensional structure of animosity depicted in Figure 1 and on the preceding discussion of psychosocial affect as a mediating variable between animosity and buying behavior, we develop the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Economic animosity has an impact on psychosocial affect for the full sample (H1a), the U.S. sample (H1b), and the Norwegian sample (H1c).

Hypothesis 2. People animosity has an impact on psychosocial affect for the full sample (H2a), the U.S. sample (H2b), and the Norwegian sample (H2c).

Hypothesis 3. Politics/government animosity has an impact on psychosocial affect for the full sample (H3a), the U.S. sample (H3b), and the Norwegian sample (H3c).

Hypothesis 4. Military/war animosity has an impact on psychosocial affect for the full sample (H4a), the U.S. sample (H4b), and the Norwegian sample (H4c).

Hypothesis 5. Product beliefs have a direct impact on buying intentions for the full sample (H5a), the U.S. sample (H5b), and the Norwegian sample (H5c).<sup>1</sup>

Hypothesis 6. Psychosocial affect has a direct impact on buying intentions for the full sample (H6a), the U.S. sample (H6b), and the Norwegian sample (H6c).

Insert figure 1 approximately here

---

<sup>1</sup> Hypothesis 5 is confirmed in many previous studies, but is included here to complete the research model.

## 5. METHODOLOGY CONFIRMATIVE STUDY

Data was collected in Oslo, Norway and in Wisconsin, USA by graduate students in both countries using the drop-off-pick-up method. The samples are convenience samples. We divided Oslo into five sections and conducted approximately the same number of interviews in each section. The sample in Wisconsin was obtained from five major cities with a balanced representation from each area. The interviewers received detailed written instructions and personal briefings and debriefings about all aspects of the data collection. Respondents were approached in their homes. After agreeing to participate, they received the questionnaire, and the interviewer returned approximately one hour thereafter to pick up the finished questionnaire. The response rate was 58.7 percent combined (63.2 percent in Norway and 52.5 percent in the U.S.), calculated as the proportion of useable questionnaires received in proportion to eligible respondents approached. A total of 573 usable questionnaires were collected, 210 in the U.S. and 363 in Norway. Respondents were requested to note the foreign country they disliked the most and to answer a series of questions related to the country. “Dislike” is frequently used in the animosity literature as indicator of animosity (e.g. Klein 2002).

From Table 2 we see that Iran is the most cited animosity country in both the U.S and the Norwegian samples, and countries like Iraq, Afghanistan, France, and North Korea are frequently cited in both countries. We contend that animosity toward Iraq and Afghanistan is, to a large extent, motivated by the “War on terror.” Animosity toward France, Iran, and North Korea may have been stimulated by terror-related conflicts, but these animosities go back much further than the post-2001 focus on terrorism. Several of the countries are presently only small trading partners due to ongoing security-related hostilities. However, the link between animosity and buying intentions/product ownership is established in several other studies.

**Table 2 Frequency animosity countries**

US sample n= 210		Norway sample n= 363		Total animosity n= 573	
<i>Country</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Iran	42	Iran	45	Iran	87
China	38	USA	42	Iraq	60
Iraq	37	Russia	24	China	50
France	19	Iraq	23	USA <sup>2</sup>	42
North Korea	15	Pakistan	21	Russia	32
Mexico	8	Burma	13	France	27
Russia	8	Turkey	13	North Korea	24
Cuba	5	Afghanistan	12	Pakistan	21
Japan	4	China	12	Burma	13
Sudan	4	North Korea	12	Turkey	13
Afghanistan	4	Israel	11	Israel	11
England	3	Poland	10	Poland	10
Saudi Arabia	3	France	8	Germany	9
		Germany	8	Somalia	9
		Nigeria	8	Mexico	8
		Somalia	8	Nigeria	8
				England	7
Total ≥ 3	190	Total ≥ 8	270	Total ≥ 7	460

The model (Figure 1) consists of 7 variables and 29 items measured on a 7-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 – strongly disagree to 7 – strongly agree. The items for buying intentions and for product beliefs are adapted from previous studies (Heslop, Lu, & Cray, 2008; Klein et. al. 1998; Johansson, Ronkainen, & Czinkota, 1994).

The four animosity dimensions include economic animosity, which is composed of three items; people animosity, which is composed of three items; politics/government animosity, which is composed of three items; and military/war animosity, which is composed of two items. The animosity items are taken from our exploratory research and from Russel and Russel (2006) and Klein et al. (1998).

---

<sup>2</sup> Norway sample only

The affect scale has five items. Two affect items are modified from Kaplan, Szybillo and Jacoby (1974) (...will not fit in well with my self-image or the way I think about myself; ... negatively affects how others think of me). Two items are developed from our qualitative pre-studies and from (John & Klein, 2003; Klein et al., 2004) to better measure normative aspects of using a product from an animosity country (... makes me feel embarrassed, makes me feel guilty). Finally, one affect item is modified from Chaudhuri and Holbrook's (2001) brand affect scale. All items are reported in Appendix A.

## 6. RESULTS

We first present our quantitative construct validity test by analyzing the descriptive statistics. Eighteen cases were excluded because of missing data: four cases in the U.S. sample and fourteen cases in the Norwegian sample. The Mardia's multivariate sample statistic, testing the assumption of multivariate normality of the data, reported a significant positive multivariate kurtosis with a Z-statistic at 67.88. Bentler (2006) suggests that values > 5.00 indicate data that are non-normally distributed. Therefore, we used the maximum likelihood (ML) robust estimates when testing the research model in the SEM analysis (Bentler, 2006; Byrne, 2006). The univariate statistics are reported in Table 3.

**Table 3 Descriptive statistics**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Economic animosity	4.65	-0.34	-0.46	1.48
People animosity	5.28	-0.63	-0.08	1.36
Politics/government animosity	5.88	-1.38	1.51	1.34
Military/war animosity	5.75	-1.14	0.73	1.51
Product beliefs	4.89	-0.34	-0.44	1.49
Psychosocial affect	3.74	0.13	-1.00	1.80
Buying intentions	4.97	-0.49	-0.42	1.42

### 6.1 Measurement model

Next, we identified the factorial validity of the scores using a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) model. This first-order CFA model of animosity structure hypothesizes  $a$

*priori* that (a) animosity can be explained by four dimensions, (b) each item has a nonzero loading on the animosity factors it was designed to measure and zero loadings on all other factors, (c) the seven factors are uncorrelated, and (d) the error-uniqueness term associated with the item measurements are uncorrelated (Byrne, 2006).

The CFA analysis identified six items that did not correspond to the factorial structure of the measurement model. The goodness of fit summary for the *a priori* CFA animosity dimensions clearly indicated an ill-fitting model with a Satorra-Bentler scaled Chi-square (S-B Chi-square) at 1406.35, p-value at  $< 0.01$ , 355 degrees of freedom (df), Standardized Root Mean-Square Residual (SRMR) at 0.08, the Robust Comparative Fit Index (R-CFI) at 0.86, and Robust-Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation (R-RMSEA) at 0.08. The exploratory Lagrange Multiplier Test (LM Test) in the CFA analysis identified problems with six items, namely, one item for economic animosity, two items for people animosity, two items for military animosity, and one item for buying intentions. The goodness of fit summary after deleting these six items improved the model fit significantly, with an S-B Chi-square at 569.88 and  $p < 0.01$ , 207 df, SRMR at 0.05, R-CFI at 0.95 and R-RMSEA at 0.05.

## **6.2 Multigroup invariance test and convergent validity**

We further validated the measurement model by testing for invariance between the two sample groups. This multigroup invariance test was run in order to validate the measurements across the U.S. and the Norwegian samples (He, Merz, & Alden, 2008). This test identifies whether the items are group-invariant across the populations and whether the specified causal structures are invariant across the populations. This analysis is based on the baseline models which represent the one that best fits the data from the perspectives of both parsimony and substantive meaning (Byrne, 2006).

The multigroup invariance test identified two items which were not equivalent across the two sample groups. In the procedure to test for such factorial invariance we constrained

the observed measures across the two groups. This requires that numbers of factors and factor-loading patterns remain the same across the two groups. Therefore, we tested each group separately against estimates of the multigroup model. The goodness of fit results changed slightly with a corrected  $\Delta$  Chi-square at 234.25,  $p < 0.01$ , and  $\Delta$  CFI at 0.01, and the multigroup model continued to report a good fit to the data with a S-B Chi-square at 804.13,  $p < 0.01$  and 506 df, SRMR at 0.06, R-CFI at 0.94, and R-RMSEA at 0.05. The incremental univariate Chi-square values were due to two parameters not operating equivalently across the U.S. and Norwegian samples as identified by the LM test. These included one item in people animosity with a Chi-square at 9.30 and  $p < 0.05$ , and one item belonging to the psychosocial impact variable with a Chi-square at 7.31 and  $p < 0.05$ . Thus, it appeared that the remaining 21 items had a high degree of convergent validity and were designed to measure animosity and its corresponding constructs across the two samples. The measurement model, which is reported in Table 6, shows that the factors' scores were strong and valid. This supports the convergent validity for the constructs. Also the reliability scores, which are reported in Table 6, demonstrate that the constructs were valid and seemed to measure what they intended to measure.

### **6.3 Discriminate Validity**

Our final validity analysis tested for discriminate validity among the 21 animosity items and the 7 latent variables. First, we ran a series of models allowing all latent variables to correlate and compared this against a series of models where the paths were fixed to 1.00, respectively. This test reported satisfactory values for all of the variables in the research model. Second, we tested the factorial scores by running a confirmatory model with a one-factor versus a two-factor model. This test also reported significant discriminate values for the latent variables. Therefore, the above tests together with the correlation matrix support the

notion that the latent scaled variables are distinct and valid. The correlation matrix for the full sample is reported in Table 4.

**Table 4 Correlation matrix for the full sample (USA + Norway)**

	Economic animosity	People animosity	Politics/government animosity	Military/war animosity	Product beliefs	Psycho-social distress	Buying intentions
Economic Animosity	.81 <sup>a</sup>						
People Animosity	.19 (0.00) <sup>b</sup>	.74					
Politics/government Animosity	.31 (0.00)	.30 (0.00)	.88				
Military/war Animosity	.32 (0.00)	.27 (0.00)	.60 (0.00)	.91			
Product Beliefs	.23 (0.00)	.30 (0.00)	.34 (0.00)	.13 (0.00)	.83		
Psychosocial Affect	.28 (0.00)	.29 (0.00)	.28 (0.00)	.29 (0.00)	.38 (0.00)	.94	
Buying Intentions	.31 (0.00)	.30 (0.00)	.32 (0.00)	.20 (0.00)	.65 (0.00)	.61 (0.00)	.75

<sup>a</sup> The construct reliability is reported in the diagonal

<sup>b</sup> Two-tailed level of significance in parenthesis

Given that the data collection technique employed in the present study was cross-sectional self-reports, the threat of common method variance was present. In an effort to determine the extent of this problem, a confirmatory factor analysis was used to implement a Harman one-factor test (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003, p. 889). If the results indicated that a one-factor model fit the data well, then common method variance would be a powerful force in this study. However, if a one-factor model did not fit the data, one might have assumed that common method variance was not a prevalent influence in this study. All 21 of the items that composed the 7 variables were included in a one-factor model estimated via EQS 6.1. Results from this test indicated that a one-factor model was not the best representation of the data (SRMR at 0.148; R-CFI at 0.573; R-RMSEA at 0.160) as the full measurement model (i.e., a seven-factor model) produced a better fit (SRMR at 0.05; R-

CFI at 0.95; R-RMSEA at 0.05). Further, the chi-square difference test between these two models was significant ( $\Delta$ S-B Chi-square ( $\Delta$ df) at 1967.5327 (21), p-value < .001). Hence, common method variance seems not to have been a significant factor in the present study, although the analysis showed a significant S-B Chi-square at 2850.6117 with 187 df (p-value < .001).

To summarize, 8 out of 29 items were deleted. We were left with three items measuring economic animosity, three items measuring people animosity, three items measuring governance animosity, two items measuring military animosity, two items measuring product decisions, five items measuring psychosocial affect, and three items measuring buying intentions. Table 5 reports each item's factor score for the full sample, the U.S. sample, and the Norwegian sample.

**Table 5 Factor score matrix**

	Full sample		USA sample		Norwegian sample		Test of invariance	
	Factor scores <sup>a</sup>	Z-scores	Factor scores	Z-scores	Factor Scores	Z-scores	Chi-square	p-value
<b>Economic animosity</b>	<b>0.81<sup>b</sup></b>		<b>0.77</b>		<b>0.81</b>			
EA1	0.82	--c	0.77	--	0.84	--	--	
EA2	0.92	(21.43)	0.95	(10.77)	0.89	(18.59)	2.49	0.11
EA3	0.52	(12.89)	0.40	(5.82)	0.53	(10.27)	0.69	0.41
<b>People animosity</b>	<b>0.74</b>		<b>0.78</b>		<b>0.71</b>			
PA1	0.81	--	0.85	--	0.81	--	--	
PA4	0.61	(11.18)	0.74	(11.00)	0.56	(7.10)	0.02	0.90
PA6	0.64	(10.58)	0.62	(9.18)	0.64	(7.35)	0.93	0.34
<b>Politics/government animosity</b>	<b>0.88</b>		<b>0.90</b>		<b>0.87</b>			
PGA1	0.89	--	0.89	--	0.88	--	--	
PGA2	0.92	(22.55)	0.94	(11.89)	0.92	(18.63)	0.33	0.57
PGA3	0.70	(15.88)	0.75	(9.34)	0.68	(12.83)	1.57	0.21
<b>Military/war animosity</b>	<b>0.91</b>		<b>0.91</b>		<b>0.90</b>			
MWA1	0.86	--	0.91	--	0.84	--	--	
MWA2	0.95	(25.62)	0.92	(24.97)	0.97	(17.79)	3.07	0.08
<b>Product beliefs</b>	<b>0.83</b>		<b>0.77</b>		<b>0.82</b>			
PB1	0.79	--	0.75	--	0.83	--	--	
PB2	0.89	(20.20)	0.83	(11.18)	0.84	(15.25)	0.17	0.68
<b>Psychosocial affect</b>	<b>0.94</b>		<b>0.93</b>		<b>0.93</b>			
PSA1	0.81	--	0.81	--	0.81	--	--	
PSA2	0.90	(30.60)	0.90	(14.67)	0.87	(21.65)	0.10	0.75
PSA3	0.87	(26.87)	0.84	(13.72)	0.83	(18.63)	0.21	0.65
PSA4	0.89	(30.26)	0.88	(15.71)	0.88	(23.18)	1.59	0.21
PSA5	0.87	(29.46)	0.87	(16.26)	0.87	(21.74)	3.71	0.05
<b>Buying intentions</b>	<b>0.75</b>		<b>0.78</b>		<b>0.72</b>			
BI1	0.70	--	0.67	--	0.59	--	--	
BI2	0.79	(17.75)	0.88	(10.30)	0.82	(10.92)	.187	.665
BI3	0.59	(11.99)	0.63	(7.81)	0.61	(8.37)	.892	.345
<b>Goodness of fit statistics</b>								
S-B Chi-square		455.65		302.33		345.48		
Df		166		166		166		
p-value		0.01		0.01		0.01		

SRMR	0.05	0.05	0.06
R-CFI	0.95	0.93	0.95
R-RMSEA	0.05	0.06	0.05
N	555	206	349

<sup>a</sup> Standardized factor scores

<sup>b</sup> Construct reliability in bold numbers

<sup>a</sup> Factors marked with -- are fixed to 1.00 for the purpose of scaling

#### 6.4 Test of the structural model: Hypotheses tests

We then tested the paths in the structural research model and our hypotheses. Our research model predicted six hypotheses. Our statistical tests supported Hypothesis 1(H1), that economic animosity positively impacts psychosocial affect, for the full sample (a), the U.S. sample (b), and the Norwegian sample (c), with the following values: H1a) 0.22,  $p < 0.001$ ; H1b) 0.28,  $p < 0.001$  and H1c) 0.11,  $p < 0.10$ . This supports H1a), H1b) and H1c). We found support for Hypothesis 2 (H2) that people animosity positively impacts psychosocial affect, for the full sample, the U.S. sample, and the Norwegian sample, with the following values: H2a) 0.23,  $p < 0.001$ ; H2b) 0.49,  $p < 0.001$  and H2c) 0.15,  $p < 0.05$ . This supports H2a), H2b) and H2c). We found support for Hypothesis 3 (H3) that politics/ government animosity positively impacts psychosocial affect, for the full sample and the Norwegian sample, but not for the U.S. sample in which the regression coefficient is not significant. The values are H3a) 0.10,  $p < 0.05$ , H3b) -0.08,  $p = \text{NS}$ , and H3c) 0.14,  $p < 0.05$ . Therefore, H3a) and H3c) are supported statistically, while H3b) is rejected. For Hypothesis 4 (H4) that military/ war animosity positively impacts psychosocial affect, the analysis indicates support for the full sample and the U.S. sample, but a non significant result for the Norwegian sample. The values for H4 are: H4 a) 0.08,  $p < 0.10$ , H4 b) 0.10,  $p < 0.10$  and H4c) 0.07,  $p = \text{NS}$ . Thus, H4a) and H4b) are supported statistically, while H4c) is rejected. For Hypothesis 5 (H5) that product beliefs impacts buying intentions, our tests show a strong and statistically significant effect for all of the three samples with values H5a) 0.51,  $p < 0.001$ , H5b) 0.50,  $p < 0.001$  and H5c) 0.51,  $p < .001$ . Thus H5a) H5b) and H5c) are supported. For Hypothesis 6

(H6) that psychosocial affect impacts buying intentions, we find strong and statistically significant results for all of the three samples with values H6 a) 0.63,  $p < 0.001$ , H6b) 0.58,  $p < 0.001$  and H6c) 0.66,  $p < 0.001$ . Thus, H6a), H6b), H6c), are strongly supported. The results are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6 Structural model**

	Full sample a)		USA sample b)		Norwegian sample c)	
	Std. regression coefficients	Z-scores	Std. regression coefficients	Z-scores	Std. regression coefficients	Z-scores
H1: Economic animosity → Psychosocial affect	0.22***	(4.33)	0.28***	(3.47)	0.11†	(1.59)
H2: People animosity → Psychosocial affect	0.23***	(4.31)	0.49***	(5.81)	0.15*	(2.09)
H3: Politics/government animosity → Psychosocial affect	0.10*	(1.79)	-0.08	(-.85)	0.14*	(1.84)
H4: Military/war animosity → Psychosocial affect	0.08†	(1.42)	0.10†	(1.32)	0.07	(0.90)
H5: Product beliefs → Buying intentions	0.51***	(11.92)	0.50***	(6.80)	0.51***	(8.54)
H6: Psychosocial affect → Buying intentions	0.63***	(10.83)	0.58***	(6.34)	0.66***	(7.87)
Goodness of fit statistics						
S-R Chi-square		489.24		444.9		379.16
P		0.01		0.01		0.01
Df		172		172		172
SRMR		0.06		0.06		0.07
R-CFI		0.94		0.89		0.93
R-RMSEA		0.05		0.07		0.05
N		555		206		349
† $p < 0.10$						
* $p < 0.05$						
** $p < 0.01$						
*** $p < 0.001$						

## **6.5 Validity test of the structural model**

Our statistical tests supported four of the hypotheses, while two of the hypotheses were only partially supported. The explained variance for the psychosocial impact was 21.1 percent for the full sample, 44 percent for the U.S. sample, while only 9.7 percent for the Norwegian sample. The explained variance for buying intentions was 78.9 percent for the full sample, 77.4 percent for the U.S. sample, and 77.8 percent for the Norwegian sample. The measurement invariance test for the specific causal structures identified invariance for hypothesis two, the effect from people animosity on the psychosocial impact with a Chi-square at 7.2 and a  $p < 0.05$ . This analysis indicated that people animosity matters more in the U.S. sample than in the Norwegian sample. Variation in the explained variance across the samples supported this finding.

In our test to validate the causality structures we ran a LM Test to identify any additional paths that the data might suggest. This exploratory approach suggested a path between psychosocial affect and product beliefs with a univariate increment in the Chi-square at 43.38 and  $p < 0.05$ . Even then, adding paths in the research model based on statistical covariation might have been a result of statistical fit rather than theoretical fit. Therefore, we chose not to include this path in our research model.

## **6.6 Testing for alternative models**

Next we compared six structural models consisting of a four-dimensional model of animosity and a one-dimensional model of animosity within a direct effect model, a full mediation (indirect effect) model, and a partial mediation model. Table 7 presents the results. The first two models, the direct effect models, omitted psychosocial affect by restricting these paths to zero. Model 1, the direct effect model, included the direct path from the four dimensions on animosity on buying intentions (S-B Chi-square at 1018.80,  $p < 0.01$  and 172 df, SRMR at 0.65, R-CFI at 0.84, and R-RMSEA at 0.09, S-B Chi-square/df at 5.92). Model

2, the direct effect model treated animosity as one dimensional construct, and tested the direct path on buying intentions (S-B Chi-square at 1525.66,  $p < 0.01$  and 184 df, SRMR at 0.11, R-CFI at 0.75, and R-RMSEA at 0.12, S-B Chi-square/df at 8.68).

**Table 7 Alternative models**

Model	Direct effect model		Full mediation model		Partial mediation model	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Animosity	Four dimensions	One dimension	Four dimensions	One dimension	Four dimensions	One dimension
S-B Chi – square	1018.801	1525.66	489.24	1581.50	488,34	1524.13
Df	172	184	172	184	169	183
SRMR	0.65	0.11	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.11
R-RMSEA	0.09	0.12	0.06	0.12	0.06	0.12
R-CFI	0.84	0.75	0.94	0.74	0.94	0.75
S-B Chi – square/df	7.80	8.59	2.84	8.18	2.91	8.23

The third and fourth models tested the full mediation model, meaning that it included the direct path from animosity on psychosocial affect, and the effect from psychosocial affect on buying intentions. Model 3, which represented the hypothesized model, treated animosity as four dimensions. This model received the best fit indices (S-B Chi-square at 489.24,  $p < 0.01$  and 172 df, SRMR at 0.07, R-CFI at 0.94, and R-RMSEA at 0.06, S-B Chi-square/df at 2.84). Model 4 treated animosity as a one-dimensional construct, and received the following fit indices (S-B Chi-square at 1581.50,  $p < 0.01$  and 184 df, SRMR at 0.13, R-CFI at 0.74, and R-RMSEA at 0.12, S-B Chi-square/df at 8.59).

The fifth and sixth models represented the partial mediation effect models. These models included the direct effects from animosity on buying intentions, and the indirect effects via psychosocial affect. Model 5, which used the four dimension models of animosity, received slightly lower model fit compared to the full mediation effect model (S-B Chi-square at 488.34,  $p < 0.01$  and 168 df, SRMR at 0.07, R-CFI at 0.94, and R-RMSEA at 0.06, S-B Chi-square/df at 2.91). In this model none of the direct effects from animosity dimensions on

buying intentions were statistically significant. Model 6, which treated animosity as a one dimensional construct, received the following fit (S-B Chi-square at 1524.13,  $p < 0.01$  and 183 df, SRMR at 0.11, R-CFI at 0.75, and R-RMSEA at 0.12, S-B Chi-square/df at 8.33). To summarize, these findings supported the hypothesized Model 3, being the full mediation effect model using the four dimensions of animosity to best represent the data.

## **7. DISCUSSION**

### **7.1. Discussion of findings and implications for theory**

In using qualitative pre-studies in two countries, and by asking consumers about countries they most dislike and the reasons for such dislike, we started without any preconceived notions about animosity countries or the reasons for the animosity felt by respondents. This research design made it apparent that animosity may have more diverse backgrounds than just war animosity and economic animosity, which seem to be most important in the bi-national conflicts addressed in previous research. We find that animosity is a four-dimensional construct (war animosity, economic animosity, political animosity, and people animosity). Political animosity and people animosity give new insight in the animosity problem area. War animosity and economic animosity relate to military and economic events and foreign policies of the animosity target. Interestingly, political animosity relates to the internal politics of the animosity target. The most frequently mentioned reasons for political animosity in Table 1 are authoritarian government; government regulations and policies, censorship imposed on their people, lack of freedom, oppression; Communist government, undemocratic, political system; human rights violations; women's rights, male dominated. These animosity backgrounds do not necessarily concern the sample country directly. Rather, our findings indicate that political animosity is an expression of animosity due to unacceptable use of power within the animosity target as perceived in the sample country. Thus, while animosity backgrounds in previous studies of bi-lateral conflicts typically

concern the sample countries directly, our findings suggest that feelings based on normative and moral evaluations of use of political power within a foreign country may be animosity background, even when such policies have no direct impact on the sample country.

The “people” animosity dimension reflects strong dislike of the mentality and of the perceived hostility of the people from the animosity target. Interestingly, several respondents (see Table 1) expressed animosity feelings toward a foreign country due to negative impressions of immigrants from the animosity country who live in the sample country. Furthermore, in Table 2 we see that several of the animosity countries selected by Norwegian respondents are those from which Norway has sizeable immigrant populations (Pakistan, Turkey, Poland, Somalia, and Nigeria). Norway has, as do many European countries, a historically more homogenous population than the U.S. and seems to have more difficulties in integrating immigrants. With the possible exception of Pakistan’s role in “the war on terror,” there seems to be other underlying motivations for the frequent mention of the remaining countries (Turkey, Poland, Somalia, and Nigeria) in the Norwegian sample. Table 1 and Table 2 support of a pattern where animosities toward immigrants may stimulate animosity feelings toward the immigrants’ homeland. Together with the impact of internal political factors in the animosity target discussed previously in this section, these inferences suggest that animosity theory may embrace more animosity backgrounds than in the bi-lateral conflicts that are exemplified in most previous studies.

We hypothesized that animosity influenced buying intentions through the negative emotional affect resulting from the purchase or use of products. The results of our quantitative study generally supported the model. The model was tested in 3 samples: the U.S. and Norwegian samples separately and in the combined sample. The original animosity model (Klein et al., 1998) included two animosity indicators: war animosity and economic animosity. Finding full support for the impact of economic animosity on psychosocial affect

indicates that hostility towards a nation due to economic reasons has affective outcomes which mediate the impact on buying intentions. Support was also found for the impact of military/war animosity on psychosocial affect for the full sample and the U.S. sample, but not for the Norwegian sample. This may be due to the context of the Iraq war at the time of data collection and a greater involvement in the “war on terror” felt by U.S. respondents. People animosity has significant impact on psychosocial affect in all three samples. Support was found for the impact of politics/government animosity on psychosocial affect in the full sample and in the Norwegian sample separately. However, this effect was not observed in the U.S. sample. As a small country, Norway may be more normative in their judgments of internal politics in the animosity target, while as a superpower, the U.S. may be more pragmatic. Norway is characterized as a feminine culture (Hofstede 1980) and compassion for the suffering of people in a foreign country is a rather feminine value. For example, in Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi, former General Secretary of the National League for Democracy and Nobel Peace Prize winner, has been detained in house arrest by the ruling military junta most years since 1990. Burma is among the top animosity countries in the Norwegian sample only, and internal politics is the plausible reason for Burma being an animosity target.

We also found strong evidence to indicate that both product beliefs and psychosocial affect have a strong influence on buying intentions for the overall sample as well as for the two countries independently. This further corroborates our contention that the impact of animosity feelings on buying intentions is mediated by affect. To summarize, all hypotheses were supported for the total sample, and five of the six hypotheses were supported in the US and Norwegian samples separately. Building on the definition by Klein et al. (1998), we include our theoretical extensions and define animosity: *Country animosity is strong hostility towards a country due to that country’s previous or ongoing military, economic, or political*

*actions, or the perception of that country's people as being hostile with unsympathetic mentality.*

## **7.2 Implications for practice**

Buying and consuming products from countries with a poor political image, a reputation for economic exploitation, military conflict, or hostile people gives consumers in many countries negative feelings characterized by a combination of guilt, embarrassment, and reduced self-image and social image. These feelings, which we label psychosocial affect, contribute to shifting the demand curve for products from animosity targets to the left. Thus, consumer animosity abroad becomes a liability in international competitiveness. Governments may alter their offending domestic and/or international politics and they may attempt to improve their image through information and through national branding. For example, China, one of the top animosity targets in our U.S. sample, takes this very seriously. China's image building and promotion have been a national project since the 2008 Olympic Games. According to Shi Anbin, deputy dean of the School of Journalism and Communication at Tsinghua University, the biggest breakthrough has been transforming "international propaganda" into "professional communication" (Anbin, 2011). China launched the promotional video, "The China Image," in Times Square, New York in February 2011. An estimated 1.7 million people pass through New York's Times Square daily. It has long been a prime location to promote major brands, and this time the brand is China. Chinese celebrities, elite, and ordinary people appear in the video which presents the Chinese spirit.

Animosity feelings influence demand, and managers should consider this variable when they perform foreign market potential analysis for possible new export markets and when they conduct market portfolio analysis. Animosity feelings contribute to reduced priority of the target market in relation to other markets. Hence, animosity also becomes a variable in market segmentation on the national level. When animosity feelings are unequally distributed within a population, animosity may also be an effective segmentation variable within a market. Businesses should analyze the level and the backgrounds of animosity whenever they consider direct investments in countries where animosity may be a factor.

They should carefully monitor the internal policies of a country when making manufacturing, sourcing, or branding decisions and disassociate themselves from the policies and actions of an oppressive government.

We believe the profitability for a private company considering spending significant resources in an attempt to reduce animosity in most cases would be highly questionable. Animosity is directed toward a country and should be addressed at the same level. A company may try to hide or to downplay their national origin if a negative impact of animosity on brand equity is likely, and they may instead promote a global brand image. For example, the phonetics of a brand name, use of language, models and spokespersons should not be associated with an animosity target. Several brands actually deliberately tie in to the image of a foreign country. For example, Smirnoff vodka is an American brand, and Gant is a Swiss-owned brand, globally headquartered in Stockholm that uses a U.S. flag-inspired logo on many of their products. Though managers must evaluate their options with great caution there are many ways excellent brand marketing may reduce the negative impact of animosity on brand associations.

China is among the largest trading partners with the U.S., and both the U.S. and China are among the largest trading partners with Norway. At the same time China and the U.S. are among the top animosity countries. This indicates that animosity may be compensated for by other factors (e.g., low prices or superior technology). Animosity has a negative impact on foreign demand, but managers should be aware that animosity is but one of several factors that influence behavior. Increased insight into animosity may increase the role of foreign consumer animosity for political policymakers in the future. By understanding the intricacies of animosity, companies and countries can develop strategies to reduce or to overcome animosity-based problems.

### **7.3 Limitations and future research**

We recommend several directions for future research based on the findings and limitations of our study. First, there may be differences in the structure of animosity due to cultural differences that are not captured in our research design. Hence, the findings need to be

confirmed in more samples from more countries. Only one study so far (Russell & Russell, 2006) has addressed animosity in the business-to-business context. It is important to get further insight into the impact of animosity and the processes through which animosity influences business between organizations. In many cases, animosity research in marketing may be considered a special problem area within the more general area of country-of-origin research. Animosity and country of origin go through cognitive, affective, and normative information processing (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). The cognitive impact on product quality evaluations has been thoroughly studied. The affective impact of animosity and of country of origin in general is much less understood. The self-construal concept, or thoughts, feelings, and actions concerning the relation of self to others and as distinct from others, may give further insight into the affective and normative impact of animosity on buying behavior. Product category involvement may moderate the same relationship. As more countries develop excellence in production of quality products, the differentiating effect of country of origin on cognitive product quality evaluations may diminish. But, the symbolic and emotional effects of country of origin may increase. This is one of the biggest challenges in animosity research and in country-of-origin research.

Animosity theory development has its outset in marketing, but the impact of animosity is not limited to marketing. For example, the profitability of international direct investments may be influenced by animosity in the investment target country, in the home country of the investing company, and in third countries. Also, animosity may play important roles that need to be explored in international management problems (e.g., in intra and interorganizational relations). The principles behind the role of personal ties in relationship development are found in the development of common goals through socializing and through selection of partners. All economic activity is interwoven in social contacts (Granovetter, 1985). We argue that animosity, and perhaps especially people-based animosity, may be a negative factor in

two-way communication and in trust. Communication and trust are key variables in the development of international interorganizational relationships (Nes et al., 2007). To conclude, animosity may impact more problems than revealed in research so far, and we believe it constitutes a promising area for future international business research.

## Appendix A Scale Items

---

### **Economic animosity**

- EA1 This country is out to exploit the economy of my country and other countries
  - EA2 This country is taking advantage of my country and other countries
  - EA3 This country has too much economic influence in my country and other countries
- 

### **People animosity**

- PA1 I don't like the mentality of the people in this country
  - PA2 I feel that the people in this country are hostile and not open to foreigners
  - PA3 My experiences with people from the country are negative
- 

### **Politics/government animosity**

- GA1 I dislike this country's government policies
  - GA2 I dislike the political system in this country
  - GA3 There is too much corruption in this country
- 

### **Military/war animosity**

- MA1 I dislike this country's involvement in wars
  - MA2 I dislike the military operations of this country
- 

### **Product beliefs**

- PRD1 I am not confident about the quality of products from this country
  - PRD2 Products from this country are usually not reliable nor long-lasting
- 

### **Psychosocial affect**

- PDI1 I would feel guilty if I bought a product from this country
  - PDI2 Using products from this country will not fit in well with my self-image or the way I think about myself
  - PDI3 Using products from this country may negatively affect how others think of me
  - PDI4 Using products from this country makes me feel embarrassed
  - PDI5 I don't feel good using products from this country
- 

### **Buying intentions**

- BI1 I don't get my money's worth from products from the country
  - BI2 Whenever possible I avoid buying products from this country
  - BI3 If 2 products were of equal quality, I would rather pay 10% more for a product from my home country than buying a product from this country
-

## REFERENCES

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-56.
- Amine, L. S. (2008). Country-of origin, animosity and consumer response: Marketing implications of anti-Americanism and Francophobia. *International Business Review*, 17(4), 402-422.
- Anbin, S. (2011). [China.org.cn/opinion/2011-01/17/content.21755910.htm](http://China.org.cn/opinion/2011-01/17/content.21755910.htm)
- Ang, S., Jung, K., Kau, A., Leong, S., Pornpitapan, C., & Tan, S. (2004). Animosity toward the economic giants: What the little guys think. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21(3), 190-207.
- Austin, J., Siguaw, J. A., & Mattila, A. S. (2003). A re-examination of the generalizability of the Aaker brand personality measurement framework. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 11(2), 77-92.
- Bahaee, M., & Pisani, M. (2009). Iranian consumer animosity and U.S. products: A witch's brew or elixir? *International Business Review*, 18(2), 199-210.
- Bilkey, W. J., & Nes, E. B. (1982). Country of origin effects on product evaluations. *Journal of International Business Studies* 13 (1), , 89-100.
- Bentler, P. M. (2006). *EQS 6 structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software, Inc.
- Braunsberger, K., & Buckler, B. (2011). What motivates consumers to participate in boycotts: Lessons from the ongoing Canadian seafood boycott. *Journal of Business Research* , 64, 96–102.

- Burnett M. S., & Lunsford, D. A. (1994). Conceptualizing guilt in the consumer decision-making process. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 11(3) 33–43.
- Byrne, B. M. (2006). *Structural equation modeling with EQS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(April), 81-93.
- Dinnie, K. (2008). *Nation branding. concepts, issues, practice*. Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Douglas, S. P., & Craig, C. S. (2006). On improving the conceptual foundations of international marketing research. *Journal of International Marketing*, 14(1), 1-22.
- Edwards, R., Gut, A. M., & Mavondo, F. (2007). Buyer animosity in business to business markets: Evidence from the French nuclear tests. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36(4), 483-92.
- 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.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Funk, C. A., Arthurs, J. D., Treviño, L. J., & Joireman, J. (2010). Consumer animosity in the global value chain: The effect of international production shifts on willingness to purchase hybrid products. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 639–651
- Granovetter, Mark (1985), Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510.
- Guido, G., Prete, M.I., Tedeschi, P. & Dadusc, L. (2010). Effects of Jewish-Italian consumer animosity towards Arab products: The role of personality. *Marketing Management Journal*, 20(1), 1-18.
- He, Y. M., Merz, M. A., & Alden, D. L. (2008). Diffusion of measurement invariance assessment in international marketing: Perspectives from the literature and a survey of researchers. *Journal of International Marketing*, 16(2), 64-83.
- Heslop, L. A., Lu, I. R., & Cray, D. (2008). Modeling country image effects through an international crisis. *International Marketing Review*, 25(4), 354-378
- Hinck, W., Cortes, A., & James, K. (2004). An empirical investigation of the failure of Eastern German products in Western German markets. *Journal of International Business and Entrepreneurship Development*, 2(1), 104-111.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultures consequences; International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hong, S., & Kang, D. (2006). Country-of origin influences on product evaluations: The impact of animosity and perceptions of industriousness, brutality and atypical products. *Journal of Psychology*, 16(2), 232-239.

- Huang, Y., Phau, I., & Lin, C. (2010). Consumer animosity, economic hardship, and normative influence: How do they affect consumers' purchase intention? *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(7/8), 909-937.
- Inglehart, R., & Baker, W. E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values. *American Sociological Review*, 65(1), 19-51.
- Jimenez, N.H., & Martin, S.S. (2010). The role of country-of-origin, ethnocentrism and animosity in promoting consumer trust. The moderating role of familiarity. *International Business Review*, 19(1), 34-45.
- Johansson, J. K., Ronkainen, I. A., & Czinkota, M. R. (1994). Negative country-of-origin effects: The case of Russia. *Journal of International Business Studies* 25(1), 157-176.
- John, A., & Klein, J.G. (2003). The boycott puzzle: Consumer motivations for purchase sacrifice. *Management Science*, 49(9), 1196-1209.
- Jung, K., Ang, S. H., Leong, S. M., Tan, S. J., Pornpitakpan, C., & Kau, A. K. (2002). A typology of animosity and its cross-national validation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(6), 529-39.
- Kaplan, L. B., Szybillo, G. J., & Jacoby, J. (1974). Components of perceived risk in product purchase: A cross-validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(3), 287-91.
- Klein, J. G. (2002). Us versus them, or us versus everyone? Delineating consumer aversion to foreign goods. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33(2), 345-63.

- 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.
- 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., Smith, N., & John, A. (2002). Exploring motivations for participation in consumer boycott. *Advances in Consumer Research* 29(1), 363-369.
- Klein, J. G., Smith, N., & John, A. (2004). Why we boycott: consumer motivation for boycott. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(3), 92-109.
- Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(Fall), 411-432.
- Leong, S. M., Cote, J. A., Ang, S. H., Jung, K., Kau, A. K., Tan, S. J., & Pornpitakpa C. (2008). Understanding consumer animosity in an international crisis: Nature, antecedents, and consequences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39 (6), 996-1009.
- Lwin, M.O., Stanaland, A.J.S. & Williams, J.DS. (2010). American symbolism in intercultural communication: An animosity/ethnocentrism perspective on intergroup relations and consumer attitudes, *Journal of Communication*, 60(3), 53-59.
- Maher, A., & Mady, S. (2010). Animosity, subjective norms, and anticipated emotion during an international crisis. *International Marketing Review*, 27(6), 630-651.
- Munter, P. (2006). Muslim boycott cuts Danish dairy exports by 85%. *Financial Times*, April

- Nakos, G. E., & Hajidimitriou, Y. A. (2007). The impact of national animosity on consumer purchases: The modifying factor of personal characteristics. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 19(3), 53-72.
- Nes, E. B., Solberg C. A., & Silkoset, R. (2007). The impact of national culture and communication on exporter – distributor relations and on export performance. *International Business Review*, 15(4), 405-420.
- Nijssen, E. J., & Douglas, S. P. (2004). Examining the animosity model in a country with a high level of foreign trade. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 21(1), 23-38.
- Papadopoulos, N. (1993). What product and country images are and are not. In L.A. Heslop, & N. Papadopoulos (Eds.), *Product country images: Impact and role*. New York: International Business Press.
- Parker, R.S., Haytko, D.L. & Hermans, C.M. (2011). Ethnocentrism and its effect on the Chinese consumer: A threat to foreign goods? *Journal of Global Marketing*, 24(1), 4-17.
- Podoshen, J.S., & Hunt, J.M. (2009). Animosity, collective memory, rumor and equity restoration: Consumer reactions to the Holocaust. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 12(4), 301–32.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.

- Riefler, P., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2007). Consumer animosity: A literature review and a reconsideration of its measurement. *International Marketing Review*, 24(1), 87-119.
- Rose, M.; Rose, G. M., & Shoham, A. (2009). The impact of consumer animosity on attitudes towards foreign goods: a study of Jewish and Arab Israelis. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 26(5), 330-339.
- Russell, D.W., & Russell, C. A. (2006). Explicit and implicit catalysts of consumer resistance: The effects of animosity, cultural salience and country-of-origin on subsequent choice. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23(3), 321-331.
- Russell, C.A., & Russell, D.W. (2010). Guilty by stereotypic association: Country animosity and brand prejudice and discrimination. *Marketing Letters*, 21(4), 413-425.
- Shaw, D., Newholm, T., & Dickinson, R. (2006). Consumption as voting: an exploration of consumer empowerment. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(9/10), 1049-1067.
- Shimp, T. A., Dunn, T. H., & Klein, J. G. (2004). Remnants of the U.S. Civil War and modern consumer behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*, 21(2), 75-91.
- Shin, M. (2001). The animosity model of foreign product purchase revisited: Does it work in Korea? *Journal of Empirical Generalizations in Marketing Science*, 6, 6-14.
- Shoham, A., Davidow, M., Klein, J. G., & 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.
- Sirgy, J. (1982). Self-concept in consumer behavior: A critical review. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 287-300.

- Smith, M. & Qianpin, L. (2010). The role of occupation in an integrated boycott model: A cross-regional study in China. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 23(2), 109-126.
- Swann, W. J., De La Ronde, C., & Hixon, G. (1994). Authenticity and positive strivings in marriage and courtship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 857-69.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1-39.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W.G. Austin (Eds), *Psychology of intergroup relations*, 2nd ed., (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Verlegh, P. W., & Steenkamp, J. B. E. M. (1999). A review and meta-analysis of country-of origin research. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 20(5), 521-46.
- Witkowski, T. (2000). Effects of animosity toward China on willingness to buy Chinese products. In G. McClean, E. Kaynak, & O. Aliago (Eds.), *Managing in a turbulent international business environment*. Hummelstown, PA: The International Management Development Associations.