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Chapter 1: Introduction

The world economy has undergone a marked transformation in the last two decades. More and more firms look beyond the borders of the countries in which they operate (i.e. their domestic markets) in search of growth opportunities (Tragos, 1998). A number of factors have motivated firms to embark in international trade. First, trade agreements and technological advancements have made global trade more feasible. Asian countries, for example, have signed 56 free trade agreements by the end of August 2009 (Time, 2009). Second, advancements in communication (e.g. video conferences) and transport have lowered geographical and cultural distances (Marchant and Ward, 2003).

Firms that operate in the international scene benefit in several ways. First, they can become more price-competitive by moving their production facilities to countries such as China, India, Taiwan, etc. where labour costs are relatively cheap. Second, international firms can standardize their marketing strategies (Marchant and Ward, 2003) and thereby reduce marketing costs. In other words, a global company can use the same advertisement copy in all its markets (i.e. countries) by making minor modifications. For example, the maker of “Kinder” chocolates has adapted its advertisement to the Israeli market by merely adding a voiceover in Hebrew (i.e. the local language).

Finally, since products have international life cycles, a product that has reached the mature or decline stage in its life cycle in one country can be given a new “life” by exporting it to another country to which the product has not been sold before (Jaffe and Nebenzahl, 2001).

However, these benefits come with a price. First, moving a firm's production facilities to developing countries where the labor cost is cheaper could be detrimental to a firm’s reputation (Cordell, 1993). This is likely to occur since developing countries are perceived to be producers of low quality products by consumers (Okechuku and Onyemah, 1999). Consequently, the
manufacture of products in developing countries is likely to have a negative impact on the image or the reputation of firms and their goods.

Second, domestic competition becomes more intense as more foreign companies enter domestic markets so as to expand their market share. This could pose a serious threat to local companies since foreign competitors sometimes offer cheaper product substitutes. In Israel, for instance, the domestic production of textiles was ceased because it was possible to import them from the east for a price that made it unprofitable for Israeli firms to manufacture domestically.

Finally, import tariffs (which are significant barriers to free trade) have been reduced significantly by numerous countries (time, 2009). However, there are barriers to trade which are almost impossible to remove. These trade obstacles are referred to as non-tariff barriers to free trade. The extant consumer behavior literature demonstrates that the two most significant non-tariff barriers to international trade are consumer ethnocentrism and consumer animosity. Ethnocentric consumers tend to buy domestic products and avoid buying all foreign products (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2004). Consumers that harbor feelings of animosity, however, only boycott product made-in a country that is the target of animosity.

Klein et al. (1998) conducted a seminal study on the effects of animosity on consumer behavior in the context of the Nanjing massacre in which hundreds of thousands of Chinese people were murdered by Japanese soldiers during WWII. Klein, Ettensohn and Morris' study demonstrated that Chinese consumers boycotted Japanese products even 60 years after the Nanjing massacre. Examining the effects of events such as the Nanjing massacre on consumer behavior may have not been necessary if country of origin information would have not played a decisive role in consumers' decision-making. However, the overwhelming majority of consumer behavior research papers demonstrate that country of origin cues (henceforth referred to as COO cues) are likely to have a significant effect on assessments of product quality and product choice (Bilkey and Nes, 1982; Han and Terpstra, 1988; Tse and Gorn, 1993; Lee et al., 2005).
Russell and Russell's study (2006) provides further support to the significance of COO cues to consumers' decision-making. Russell and Russell find that economic animosity results in prevention-focus, that is, “resistance to products from powerful competitors” on the part of consumers (p.322). In order to resist "products from powerful competitors" consumers need to search for COO information as this is the only way they can learn about the origin of the products they intend to buy. Because of the relationship between consumer animosity and cue utilisation, the research of consumer animosity includes an examination of country of origin effects (Klein, 2002; Shin 2001).

Although past researchers have demonstrated that COO cues are important to consumers' decision-making, the importance consumers attribute to these cues is mediated by the level of purchase involvement (Ahmed et al., 2004; Johansson, 1989; Sadurin and Alain, 2008). In particular, consumers tend to pay more attention to extrinsic cues such as COO when their level of involvement is high (Li and Wyer, 1994).

Thus, it is likely that consumer animosity's effect on consumer behavior is mediated by involvement. Although the theoretical relationship between animosity and purchase involvement has been suggested by Klein (1999), no empirical research has been conducted to investigate this relationship. Hence, the purpose of the present work is to examine whether the effect of animosity on consumer behavior is mediated by purchase involvement.

Consumer animosity research is conducted in particular contexts (Nanjing Massacre, France's nuclear tests in the Pacific Ocean, etc.). Like other atrocities, the Holocaust (when roughly six million Jews were murder by the Nazis during WWII) is an event that has had profound social and psychological consequences on its survivors (Amir and Lev – Wiesel, 2003; Ben-Zur and Zimmerman, 2005; Dor – Shav, 1978).

The impact of the Holocaust on consumer behavior should be examined for a number of reasons. First, hundreds and thousands of Holocaust survivors are still alive today. Second, the impact of the Holocaust on consumer behavior has been examined by only one researcher (Podoshen, 2005). Similar to most
research into the effects of animosity on consumer animosity, Podoshen has not examined whether the impact of animosity on consumer behavior is mediated by other variables, such as purchase involvement.

Hence, examining whether the relationship between animosity and consumer behavior is moderated by purchase involvement in the context of the Holocaust will allow for a more profound understanding of the impact of animosity on consumer behavior. The following section provides background information on the Holocaust.

**The Holocaust**

Because the term Jewish will be used frequently in this work, the author deemed it necessary to defined what "Jewish" means. According to one definition, a Jew is anyone whose mother is Jewish regardless of whether or not Judaism is practiced provided that the person has not converted to a different faith. By a Jew is not just somebody who was born Jewish. A Jew is also anyone who chooses to be a Jew by undergoing the process of Jewish religious naturalization. Furthermore, anyone who practices Judaism is a Jew. However, not every Jew practices Judaism. Therefore, a Jew does not have to be religious as being a Jew can be a social identity (Whitfield, 1999).

During WWII some six million (European) or two-thirds of the Jews that lived in the countries occupied by Germany were systematically murdered within a twelve year period (1933 – 1945) by the Nazi regime and its collaborators. Consequently, Jewish consumers are unlikely to buy German-made products. They are also unlikely to choose Germany as their holiday destination (Podoshen, 2005).

As soon as the Nazi party rose to power in 1933 it ordered anti-Jewish economic boycotts, burned books written by Jewish authors and enacted anti-Jewish laws. Moreover, the Nazi party built a large number of detention camps where enemies of the state would be incarcerated and eventually murdered. In 1935 the Nuremberg Laws were enacted. These laws defined Jews by “blood” and called for the complete segregation of the Aryans from non-Aryans. To the
end, the Nazis attempted to annihilate those who they deemed to be “racially inferior” (e.g. Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, etc.). The Nazis believed that the destiny of the superior German nation is to rule Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The Nazis initiated the execution of their ideology by the annexation of Austria in March, 1938. After annexing Austria the Nazis arrested German and Austrian Jews which were sent to various concentration camps across Germany. The night of November 9, 1938 was the first time the Nazis used vandalism to express their prejudice or hatred towards Jews. In this event known as the "Kristallnacht" pogrom synagogues and shop windows of Jewish owned businesses were destroyed. Later that night a large number of adult male Jews were arrested and were transported to concentration camps. After the "Kristallnacht" pogrom, genocide became the only focus of the Nazi anti-Semitism. This attempt to annihilate the Jewish population is known as the Holocaust.

Following the annexation of Austria, the Nazi leadership turned its attention to Poland. Germany invaded Poland on September, 1939. At that time Poland had the largest Jewish population. The Nazis built extermination camps in Poland. These camps were used to murder the Jewish population. During WWII Jews were also deported to ghettos which were usually enclosed city districts in which the Jewish population was forced to live in deplorable conditions.

The purpose of the ghettos established by the Nazis was not only to segregate the Jewish population from the non-Jewish population but also to isolate them from other Jewish communities. Furthermore, ghettos were established so as to control and isolate the Jews while the heads of the Nazi party considered the various options available to them to destroy the Jewish population. The Jews that resided in the ghettos were forced to work for the German Reich.
Between 1941 and 1944 millions of Jews were deported from Germany, its occupied territories and from the countries of many of its allies to ghettos and extermination camps. In these ghettos and extermination camps Jews were murdered in gas chambers that were established to serve two purposes: (1) to raise the efficiency in which the Jews were murdered and (2) to make the killing process less personal for those carrying out the orders of the Nazi regime (USHMM, 2009).

At the end of WWII many Holocaust survivors immigrated to Israel, the USA, and other nations making these places their new homes (USHMM, 2011). These immigrants acculturated the cultural traits of their new home countries (Heinze, 1997). In other words, the culture of Jews the world over differs from country to country and reflects the culture of the local population.

Previous researchers have demonstrated that culture is likely to have a significant impact on consumer behavior (Heslop et al., 1998; Mihalyi, 1984). As a result, the effect of the Holocaust on the behavior of Jewish consumers is likely to vary from country to country. Hence, this work will be conducted in two countries, namely Israel and the UK. The UK was chosen as the impact of the Holocaust on the behavior of British-Jewish consumers was not the focus of previous research. What follows is a concise discussion of why cross-cultural studies are important in consumer behavior research. This is followed by a discussion of the differences between the culture of Jews in Israeli and the culture of Jews in the Diaspora in general and that of Anglo Jews and Israeli Jews in particular.

**Cross-Cultural Investigation**

The study to be conducted by the present researcher is cross-cultural in nature as it aims to examine the impact of consumer animosity on purchase involvement in two countries, namely, Israel and the UK. Conducting cross-cultural research is important for several reasons. First, in order to make generalizations from one research context to another it is necessary to conduct a study in more than one country (Strodbeck, 1964; Triandis et al., 1972). Second, a large body of research demonstrates that culture is a significant factor to
consider when an attempt is made to predict the purchase of foreign products (Heslop et al., 1998; Mihalyi, 1984). It is evident the Jews living in the Diaspora have (at least to a certain extent) assimilated to their countries cultures (Raman, 2012). Finally, conducting a cross-cultural study provides stronger evidence for the existence of the phenomenon under investigation (McCarty, 1989).

Culture is a system of beliefs to be accepted and a complex of beliefs that is shaped and adapted. Culture is comprised of numerous symbolic systems and practices that allow various groups to make sense of their lives. Cultural identity is not something people are born with. Rather, cultural identity is acquired and it can change during one’s life time. In other words, cultural identity is not permanent and changes in accordance with changes in history, culture and power (Whitfield, 1999).

The state of Israel was established in 1948 by refugees from the European Diaspora. The state of Israel is dependent on the Diaspora for both moral and financial support. However, Israelis hold Jews in the Diaspora in contempt. Israeli Jews believe that living in the Diaspora is both hazardous to Jewish security and harmful to the Jewish culture. Hence, Israeli Jews do not acknowledge Diaspora culture.

The differences between the cultures of Israeli Jews and Diaspora Jews are not myths but are rather facts. Jews that have immigrated to Israel from Middle-Eastern countries like Cairo, Damascus, and Baghdad, for example, have brought with them cultures that were different from that of the Jews living in Israel (Heer, 2004). Jews that have immigrated to Israel from Middle-Eastern countries are known as Oriental Jews. European Jews perceive Oriental Jews to be culturally different from them (Cohen and Horencyzk, 1999).

This not surprising giving the fact that he identity of Oriental Jews has transformed to a culture shaped by the fact that they lived in countries that were physically, institutionally and religiously different from their original cultures (Pergola, 2008).
Oriental Jews do not only have traditions that are very different from the traditions of other Jews (e.g. Ashkenazi Jews, Jews that have immigrated to Israel from European countries) but also like different food (Cohen and Horencyzk, 1999). Food is one of the factors that set one culture apart from another culture (Glenn and Sokoloff, 2010).

Jewish acculturation is not unique to any particular country or region. Acculturation of the Jewish Diaspora has taken place in other parts of the world as well. One case in point is India. Three sub-groups comprise the Jewish community in India: The Cochin Jews, the Bene Israel, and the Baghdadi Jews. The members of all of these sub-groups have acculturated to the dominant Indian community by adapting its symbols (Raman, 2012).

In a different part of the world, the UK, Jews have also underdone a process of acculturation. Immigrant Jews which have arrived in the UK during the 18th and 19th centuries were distinguishable by how they dressed, their haircuts, their Jewish names, the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, etc. However, at the beginning of the 19th century it became clear the Jewish population was undergoing gradual acculturation as the distinguishing characteristics of members of the Jewish community were becoming blurred. One piece of evidence that immigrant Jews have acculturated is the fact that they have anglicized their names. For example, Meir became Myer and Gershon became George. Furthermore, the observance of the Jewish Sabbath and Dietary laws has become virtually non-existent (JCR-UK, 2012).

From the above discussion it is evident that Jews in the Diaspora, regardless of where they live, have undergone a process of acculturation which has resulted in a culture that is different from that of the culture of Jews in other parts of the world, including Israel.
Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is presented as follows. Chapter 2 focuses on the review of the related literature. Chapter 3 was written several objectives in mind. The first aim of this chapter is to discuss the development of the instruments and measurements in this study. The second objective is to justify the adoption of some well researched constructs from the field of consumer behaviour into the proposed model to be tested in this work.

Finally, three models are examined for their suitability to the purposes of this work. In particular, the appropriateness of the following three models and concepts are examined: (1) Orbaiz and Papadopoulos’ (2003) “Empirical Model of Receptivity toward Products from Various Origins”; (2) Thakor and Katsanis’ (1997) “Model of Brand and Country Effects” and (3) Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) “Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase”. Further on in the chapter the conceptual framework and the hypothesis of the present work are discussed. Namely, the relationship between the constructs making up model to be tested in the current study is reasoned.

Chapter 4 focuses on the methodology and design employed in the present work. Chapter 5 focuses on the stimuli and instrument development through a discussion of the four pilot studies conducted in this work. In Chapter 6 the main study conducted in this work is discussed, namely, the cross-cultural investigation conducted in the UK and Israel. Chapter 7 reports the results of the study discussed in Chapter 6. Chapter 8 is the final chapter in this work. The chapter draws conclusions emanating from the study main study conducted in the framework of this work. Furthermore, practical and theoretical contributions are emphasized. Finally, study limitations and recommendations for further research are discussed.
Chapter Summary

This chapter initiated with a discussion of international trade with an emphasis on the effects of non-tariff barriers to trade (i.e. ethnocentrism and animosity) on consumer behavior. This work is conducted in the context of the Holocaust. Therefore, the author set the scene by briefly discussing the Holocaust. Finally, the author justified adopting a cross-cultural design to examine the potential effect of animosity on purchase involvement in the context of the Holocaust.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

To select source documents for this literature review, articles were identified by searching the standardized computer databases (for instance, ABI/Inform Global, Emerald Insight Management Xtra [140]). In addition, issue by issue searches of a number of journals (Journal of International Business Studies, Journal of Consumer Research, Psychology and Marketing, etc.) were conducted. In order to run searches of the various journals and databases, the following keywords were used: country of origin and consumer behavior (96 results), ethnocentrism (284 results), product evaluation (269 results), product choice (716 results), animosity (255 results), purchase involvement (5 results) and product involvement (63 results).

The articles used in the literature review were screened out in a two-stage process. First, the articles were screen for their topical appropriateness. If the title of an article seemed relevant, then the author read the abstract. At this stage, if the abstract was deemed relevant, then the article was read in greater detail. The total number of citations in the literature review is 295. This includes 256 peer-reviewed articles, 5 dissertations, 2 proceedings and 24 books.

The extant consumer behavior research focuses on the moderators and antecedents of consumers’ decision-making process. These moderators and antecedents can be grouped into two main classes: (1) personal factors, such as purchase involvement, consumer demographics (e.g., age and gender), product familiarity, consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism; and (2) product related attributes such as extrinsic product cues (e.g. the country of origin information, price, warranty, etc.), and intrinsic product cues (e.g. color, quality, etc.). This work focuses on the relationship between two personal factors, namely, purchase involvement and consumer animosity.

When researchers investigate the effect of consumer animosity they are in fact examining the consequences of the emotional dimension (as opposed to the cognitive dimension) of the COO construct on consumer behavior. A large body research demonstrates that COO cues impact consumer behavior (Klein et al., 1998; Kwok and Uncles, 2006; Shin, 2001; Ulgado and Lee, 1998; Zhang,
1997). However, the relationship between COO cues and consumer behavior is moderated by purchase involvement (Ahmed et al., 2004; Sadurin and Alain, 2008). Thus, this chapter focuses on a review of the COO effects, consumer animosity, and purchase involvement literature.

The literature review initiates with a discussion of the various definitions of country of origin images. The author then discusses the saliency of the COO cue by reflecting on the moderators of COO effects. This is followed by a discussion of purchase involvement and consumer animosity.

COO Effects

Definitional Domains of Country of Origin Images

Because consumer animosity and country of origin constructs are inter-related, this section is dedicated to a discussion of the effects of country of origin images on consumer behavior. But first, the three definitional domains of country of origin images (henceforth referred to as COI) are discussed. It is especially noteworthy that every definition of COI is based on one of these definitional domains.

The first domain relates to the images of countries and their products (i.e. product-country image). The underlying assumption of this definitional domain is that the country image and product image concepts are different from each other and yet related. In other words, product images are influenced by country images. Li et al. (1997), for example, defines product country images as “Consumers' images of different countries and of products made in these countries.” (p. 116). However, because in the overwhelming majority of cases product images (beliefs) are not affected by consumer animosity, this definitional domain is not relevant to the current study.

The focal point of the second domain is that product images affect consumer behavior. Han (1989) defines product images as “consumers’ general perceptions of quality for products made in a given country.” (p.222). In fact, the overwhelming majority of COO research focuses on the effects of product
images rather than country images (Papadopoulos and Heslop, 2003). However, because the majority of consumer animosity research demonstrates that animosity impacts intentions to buy but not assessments of product quality, this definitional would not be adequate in explaining the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement.

The third and final domain focuses on the definition of country image as a generic construct. This definitional domain takes into account the fact that country images are formed by a country's history in addition to representative products, the degree of political and economic maturity, culture, traditions, and the country's technological capabilities and the degree of industrialization (Bannister and Saunders, 1978).

Allred and Miller's (1999) definition of COI is based on this definitional domain. Allred et al. define country images as “The perception or impression that organizations and consumers have about a country. This impression or perception of a country is based on the country's economic condition, political structure, culture, conflict with other countries, labor conditions, and stand on environmental issues.” (p. 36). This definitional domain seems most appropriate to the purposes of the present investigation since this is the only definitional domain to take into consideration the "historical events and relationships" between countries. Thus, Allred and Miller's definition of country image will be adopted to this research effort.

In this section, the definitional domains of COI have been discussed and justifications for adopting the third definitional domain were provided. What follows is a discussion of the COO concept and the theories that are likely to explain when COO cues are likely to become more salient to consumers' decision-making process.

The Saliency of COO Cues

Findings as to when COO cues bear on consumers' behavior decision-making and the context in which they are more salient have been inconsistent (Ahmed et al., 2002; Samiee et al., 2005; Tse and Gorn, 1993; Usunier, 2006).
The inconsistency in research findings may be accounted for by the fact that consumer behavior studies have been conducted in different contexts. COO studies that have employed product familiarity and product involvement as moderators of country of origin effects demonstrate that these moderators are context-specific and determine the importance consumers attribute to COO images during their assessment of product quality (Ahmed et al., 2004; Johansson, 1989; Sadurin and Alain, 2008).

The types of involvement found in the consumer behavior literature can be classified into two general groups: (1) product involvement and purchase involvement (Clarke and Belk 1978; Howard and Sheth, 1969; Hupfer and Gardner, 1971; Mittal and Lee, 1989; Hibbett and Cohen, 2006).

Product involvement can be described as a situation where a particular consumer, for example, expresses constant interest with a particular product category. If an individual buys magazines about the automobile industry, tends to talk about automobiles quite frequently can be said to be highly involved with cars. Purchase involvement is quite a different situation. As opposed to product involvement, purchase involvement is more temporary in nature as it can occur only when making a purchase (Clarke and Belk, 1979).

Because of the relationship between context and purchase involvement (Clarke and Belk, 1979), purchase involvement is more relevant than product involvement to the present work. Animosity is not likely to impact consumers' involvement with particular product classes. In other words, consumers are unlikely to relate more or less importance to the purchase of a computer because they harbor feelings of animosity. However, it is reasonable to assume that feelings of animosity are likely to change a consumer's level of purchase involvement if a stimulus present during the purchase triggers this feeling (product cues such as brand name, COO information, etc.).

Thus, the purpose of the present study is to examine the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement. The following section initiates with a discussion of the various definitions of involvement. This is followed by a discussion of the dimensions of the involvement construct.
Purchase Involvement

Definitions of Purchase Involvement

An extensive review of the literature uncovered various definitions of involvement. However, all definitions are related to the importance or the relevance of a product or a purchase decision to a consumer (Bloch, 1982; Brennan and Mavondo, 2000; Day, 1970; Dholakia, 2001; Greenwald and Leavitt, 1984; Higie and Feick, 1989; Mittal 1983; Mitchell, 1979; O’Cass, 2000; O’Cass and Muller, 1999; Slama and Tashchian, 1985; Zaichkowsky 1985) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Definitions of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, 1983; Mitchell, 1979</td>
<td>Product involvement refers to the amount of <strong>interest</strong> or attention a consumer directs toward a product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dholakia (2001)</td>
<td>A variable that indicates how much arousal, <strong>interest</strong> or drive is produced by a product class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higie &amp; Feick, 1989</td>
<td>The <strong>personal relevance</strong> or importance of a product category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Cass (2000)</td>
<td>Involvement refers to the extent to which the consumer views the focal object as a central part of his/her life, as well as a meaningful and engaging and <strong>important</strong> object in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Cass &amp; Muller (1999)</td>
<td>The Intensity with which a product gestalt is embedded in and driven by the consumers’ value system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel and Blackwell (1982)</td>
<td>Involvement reflects the extent of <strong>personal relevance</strong> of the decision to the individual in terms of her basic values, goals, and self-concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwald and Leavitt</td>
<td>High involvement means (approximately)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1984)</td>
<td><strong>personal relevance or importance</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell (1979, 1981)</td>
<td>Involvement is ‘an internal state variable that indicates the amount of arousal, <em>interest</em>, or drive evoked by a particular stimulus or situation’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittal (1983)</td>
<td>Involvement is ‘a motivational state of mind of a person with regard to an object or activity. It reveals itself as the level of <em>interest</em> in that object or activity’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Mittal (1985)</td>
<td>Involvement is a goal-directed arousal capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan and Mavondo (2000)</td>
<td>Involvement is “a motivational and goal-directed emotional state that determines the personal relevance of a purchase decision to a buyer.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slama and Tashchian (1985)</td>
<td>Purchase involvement is a general measure of the self-relevance of purchasing activities to the individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day (1970)</td>
<td>The overall level of <em>interest</em> in the object or the importance of the object to the person’s ego-structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mittal's PDI scale will be adopted to the present work. Mittal’s scale is discussed in great detail in Chapter 3. The justification for adopting Mittal's scale is also discussed in the same chapter. The next section discusses the dimensions of the involvement construct. Becoming familiar with each and every one of the dimensions of the involvement construct is essential to attaining a more profound understanding of the construct.

**Dimensions of the Involvement Construct**

The involvement construct is a multi-dimensional construct. The involvement construct has three dimensions: (1) intensity – an individual’s extent of involvement; (2) direction – the object or issue towards which an individual is motivated; (3) persistence – duration of the involvement intensity
The intensity of involvement refers to the degree to which a consumer is involved with a product. Although the extent of involvement with a given product varies from one individual to another, some products tend to produce higher levels of involvement than others. Research suggests that durable and costly products such as cars, for example, are likely to generate a greater degree of involvement than non-durable and relatively inexpensive products such as toothpastes (Kwon, 1990).

The direction of involvement is a second dimension and it refers to the product with which an individual is involved. All products are sources of involvement. However, the level of involvement varies with the product in question (Kwon, 1990).

The persistence of involvement is a third dimension. The duration of involvement is temporary if it no longer exists after the product has been purchased. This type of involvement is referred to as purchase involvement in the literature. If, however, an individual constantly thinks about a product (i.e. before and after it has been purchased), then the involvement is of durable nature (Broderick, 2007). The latter type of involvement is referred to as product involvement. The persistence and intensity dimensions of involvement is most relevant to the present work as it relates to purchase involvement rather than product involvement.

The next chapter is dedicated to a review of the consumer animosity literature as previous researchers have suggested that purchase involvement and consumer animosity are related.

*Consumer Animosity*

**Defining Consumer Animosity**

The definition of animosity differs from one researcher to another. However, all the definitions found in the literature relate to “anger” as the root
cause of animosity. Klein et al. (1998) define animosity as "anger related to previous or ongoing political, military, economic, or diplomatic events" (p. 90).

In contrast to Klein et al. (1998), Averill's (1982) definition is more specific since it refers to animosity between nations or peoples that acted unfairly or in a socially unacceptable manner. According to Averill (1982), animosity as a strong emotion of dislike and hatred stemming from past or present military, political, or economic aggression and actions either between nations or peoples that are perceived to be unjustifiable or as going against what is socially acceptable.

Although officially Germany is in good political and trade relations with Israel, Israeli Jews appear to still be angry with Germany as a whole over its role in the Holocaust (See Chapter 5). This is evident from the attitude of some Israeli Jews towards the German language. Angela Merkel's scheduled speech in the Israeli parliament in 2008 has led to a heated debate among members of parliament. Some MPs were against the Chancellor giving a speech in the German language. One MP was cited in a local newspaper (Hadashot Hayum, 2008) saying that he refuses to listen to her speech in German because this was the language in which his grandparents were murdered. At least eight other MPs have chosen not to be present during the Chancellor's speech in the Israeli parliament.

Thus, there is evidence for the existence of animosity between Israeli-Jews and the German nation. Because Averill's definition of animosity specifically refers to animosity between peoples, it is deemed to be more appropriate to the purposes of the present work.

**Consumer Animosity Research**

To date roughly two dozen studies (including PhD theses and research papers published by peer-reviewed journals) have been conducted to study the effects of consumer animosity on consumer behaviour. Animosity is a hostile attitude made up of emotional and belief components toward national out-groups (Jung et al., 2002). Hostility consists of a cognitive and an attitudinal...
component. The cognitive component includes cynical beliefs and mistrust of others. The attitudinal component is characterized by negative emotions of anger, contempt and disgust. In fact, consumers are less likely to purchase products from a country perceived to be hostile towards them (Brummett, 1988).

- Antecedents of Consumer Animosity

Consumer animosity researchers have investigated various sources of animosity (war animosity, economic animosity, etc.) which are referred to as antecedents of consumer behavior. According to Rice and Wongtada (2007) there are five sources of animosity: (1) war animosity; (2) political animosity; (3) ecological animosity; (4) social-cultural animosity; (5) economic animosity.

War animosity results from disputes (for instance, political, military, etc.) between two countries or regions and leads to consumer boycotts (Shoham and Davidow et al, 2007; Klein et al, 1998; Shin, 2001; Klein, 2002; Nijssen, 2004; Kesic and Rajh et al., 2005; Shimp et al., 2004). The American Civil War, for example, has affected the preferences of Southerners and Northerners in the United States (Shimp et al., 2004). In particular, Southerners tend to prefer products from the south and avoid products from the north. Northerners, in contrast, preferred products from the north to those from the south.

While the tension between the populations in Southern USA and Northern USA stemmed from a military conflict, the source of tension between the Israeli-Jewish and Israeli-Arab populations in Israel was of a political nature. In 2000 Israeli Arabs took to the streets to show support for the Palestinian cause. The uprising was violent and included stone throwing on Israeli vehicles on main roads and confrontations with the Israeli police and defense forces. Consequently, the Israeli-Jewish population boycotted products and services provided by the Arab population (Shoham and Davidow et al, 2007).

While studies have consistently demonstrated that war animosity results in consumer boycotts, findings regarding the effects of political tensions between countries on consumer animosity (i.e. political animosity) are mixed. Australian consumers boycotted French products during and after a nuclear test
that was conducted by the latter in the South Pacific (Ettenson and Klein, 2005). Similarly, the tense political relationship between China and Tibet has taken its toll: Chinese consumers refrain from buying Tibetan jewelry and clothing (Mububani, 2008).

Israel has also been boycotted due to its occupation of Gaza and the West Bank. For example, brands such as Caterpillar and Motorola have been targets of divestment. Caterpillar was divested from due to its role and demolishing of Palestinian homes while Motorola was divested from merely because it provided communication equipment to the Israeli Defense Forces (The Economist, 2007).

Similarly, because of the tensions between the USA and Iran over the latter's pursuing of nuclear power, American consumers reported that they would be less likely to purchase a car even if part of its production was shifted to Iran (Funk et al., 2010). Hence, the political tensions between Iran and the USA have resulted in political animosity.

While in certain cases political tensions have led to boycotts, in other cases they have not had any effect. The tension between the USA and Iran over the latter's pursuing of nuclear power, for example, has not prevented Iranian consumers from purchasing American products. Iranian consumers probably continue purchasing American products since Americans are not perceived as threatening (Bahaee and Pisani, 2009b). Thus, the level of consumer animosity is low in Iran.

Just as wars are likely to lead to war animosity and political tensions to political animosity, trade disagreements between countries are likely to result in economic animosity (Klein and Morris, 1996; Klein and Ettenson, 1999; Hinck et al., 2004). Klein and Morris’ (1996) study results, for example, indicate that Americans harbour economic animosity toward Japan because they feel that latter is being unfair in its trade relations with the U.S.

While social-cultural animosity stems from interethnic or religious conflict (Hinck, 2004; Hinck et al., 2004; Rice and Wongtada, 2007; Shimp,
Dunn et al., 2004), ecological animosity is likely to arise when a country or a company is accused of denigrating the natural environment (Rice and Wongtada, 2007).

In sum, the discussion in this section focused on the various antecedents of animosity. Each and every one of these antecedents is a construct that can be employed to measure consumers' level of animosity towards a particular country, peoples or firm. However, the author of the present work deems it most appropriate to focus on the following antecedents in this work: war animosity, general animosity and economic animosity for several reasons. First, Jews are more likely to harbor war animosity and general animosity towards the Germans than social-cultural animosity.

Second, because German is one of Israel's most important trade partners and because Israel is dependent on importation from Germany, Israeli Jews might feel that Germany is taking advantage of them and their small country. Thus, they are also likely to harbor economic animosity towards Germany. Finally, unlike political animosity and social-cultural animosity constructs, war animosity, general animosity and economic animosity have been employed in numerous consumer animosity studies (Hinck et al., 2004; Klein et al., 1998; Shimp et al., 2004; Shin, 2001). Consequently, there is evidence for the validity and reliability of these constructs.

- The Consequences of Consumer Animosity

Now that the antecedents of consumer animosity have been discussed, the author of this work will focus on the consequences of consumer animosity on consumer behavior.

Klein et al. (1998) were the first to examine the effects of animosity on consumer behaviour thereby ushering in a new stream of research. Klein et al. have conducted their study in the People's Republic of China in the context of the Nanjing massacre during WWII. Their findings demonstrate that Chinese consumers are unwilling to buy Japanese products despite the fact that several decades have passed since the massacre.
The finding that animosity has long-term effects on consumer behavior has been supported by later studies (Podeshen, 2005; Shimp et al., 2004; Shin, 2001). For instance, Podeshen's (2005) study demonstrates that Germany has a negative image in the Jewish "world" as a result of the atrocities committed by the Nazis during WWII. Consequently, American-Jewish consumers, for example, are unlikely to buy German-made products.

While feelings of animosity can be directed towards countries in general (for example, Japan, Germany, etc.), they can also be directed towards particular brands and products associated with these countries. For example, America’s declaration of war in Iraq in 2003 resulted in diplomatic tensions between the U.S. and Germany. As a result, bars and restaurants across Germany refused to serve American brands such as Coca-Cola beer and Budweiser (Wood et al., 2008).

Likewise, British-Muslims boycotted American brands and bought Arab brands instead. For example, British-Muslims preferred Mecca Cola and Qibla Cola to Coca-Cola. In another instance, Aria Foods of Denmark which is the producer of the Middle-East’s best selling butter, and has been producing dairy products in Saudi Arabia for two decades was boycotted following the display of Muhammad in cartoons (The Economist, 2006).

To sum up, consumer animosity has long-term consequences on consumer behavior. This animosity is pronounced in the boycott of brands and products associated with the country towards which these feelings are directed. Consumer animosity not only leads to boycotts but may also impact consumers' evaluation of the products made in the country towards which they harbor feelings of animosity (Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Shoham et al., 2006). Thus, the following subsection focuses on the relationship between consumer animosity and evaluation of product quality.

- Consumer Animosity and Judgments of Product Quality

The judgments of product quality concept comprises of two dimensions: a cognitive dimension and an affective dimension. According to the cognitive
According to the affective dimension, however, consumers’ decision-making stems from emotions resulting from an evaluative judgment and interpretation of stimuli in the environment. Especially noteworthy is that emotions are action-oriented and could result in internal (mental) and external (behavioural) reactions (Hansen, 2005) such as denigrating the quality of the products manufactured by the country which is the target of consumers’ animosity (Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Shoham et al., 2006).

Dichter (1962) was the first to suggest that the country of origin could possibly have an effect on judgments of product quality. An early empirical test of the effects of COO cues was conducted by Schooler (1965). The product stimuli used in the study were two drinking glasses. The only apparent difference between them was the made-in label displayed on each one. The findings of the study point to significant differences in the evaluation of products as result of differences in COO information.

Later studies compared the impact of country of origin cues on consumers' assessment of product quality and intentions to buy. Most of these studies demonstrate that COO cues are more likely to impact consumers' evaluation of product quality than their purchase intentions (Leonidou et al. 2007; Roth and Diamantopoulos, 2009; Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999). However, the effects of country of origin cues are product specific (Dmitrović and Vida, 2007; Knight, 1999; Powers and Fetcherin, 2008; Sevgin and Karen, 1989; Thorelli et al., 1989). In other words, in some cases COO cues will have a more significant effect on consumers' assessment of product quality. While in other cases it will have a greater impact on consumers' willingness to buy.

Although in general COO cues are more likely to affect consumers' evaluation of product quality, it is less likely to occur in cases of consumer animosity. The overwhelming majority of studies demonstrate that when consumers harbor feelings of animosity they are likely to avoid buying products originating from the target country but will not denigrate the quality of these products (Cui et al., 2009; Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Klein and Ettenson, 1996;
In sum, the review of the consumer animosity literature in the present section demonstrates that animosity affects consumers' willingness to buy. However, it is unlikely to impact consumers' evaluations of product quality. The main study to be conducted by the author of the present work focuses on the effects of consumer animosity on purchase involvement. However, in this chapter the consumer ethnocentrism literature is also reviewed for two reasons. First, consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism are related constructs (Klein, 2002). In other words, animosity is a socio-psychological antecedent of consumer ethnocentrism (Klein et al., 1998; Shankarmahesh, 2006). That is to say, the higher the level of animosity harbored by consumers, the more likely they are to become ethnocentric.

**Consumer Ethnocentrism (CE)**

Since trade tariffs have significantly decreased, the barriers to trade have shifted from tariff related to non-tariff related. One such non-tariff block to trade is ethnocentrism (Shankarmahesh, 2006). Consumers’ attitudes toward foreign products are influenced by their level of ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism can be defined as the preference of people to regard the world through the viewpoint of the group they are part of (Upadhyay and Singh, 2006). That is to say, ethnocentrism is a means of evaluating other cultures (out-groups) in relation to the standards of the culture a given individual belongs to (in-group).

Ethnocentric consumers tend to buy domestic products and avoid purchasing foreign ones (Rice and Wongtada, 2007). Ethnocentric consumers boycott foreign products because they feel that buying foreign products hurts their country's economy.

However, if a particular consumer is ethnocentric, this does not mean that he or she will completely avoid purchasing all foreign products. Sharma et al. (1995), for example, find that French consumers prefer French wine but not French cameras. Similarly, Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2004) find that most British consumers prefer British food products, do it yourself tools and
toys. However, they do not tend to prefer British TV sets, cars and fashion clothing.

A possible explanation to these findings is that consumers tend to prefer domestic products if they are of higher quality than foreign alternatives (Schuh, 1994; Supphellen and Rittenburgh, 2001). Alternatively, ethnocentric consumers may prefer foreign products if they are superior to the same products produced domestically (Supphellen and Rittenburgh, 2001).

The consumer behavior literature distinguishes between low ethnocentric consumers and high ethnocentric consumers. Low ethnocentric consumers tend to use country of origin cues as objective information about product quality. Therefore, low ethnocentric consumers are not likely to be affected by stereotypes.

In contrast, high ethnocentric consumers use country of origin cues to express patriotic sentiments and are influenced by them while making a purchase decision (Brodowsky, 1998). Therefore, their decisions are more likely to be influenced by stereotypes and they are thus more likely to be influenced by COO information than low ethnocentric consumers (Ahmed et al., 2004). Highly ethnocentric consumers favor domestic goods because they feel that they assist the economy and provide jobs in addition to increasing national pride (Marchant and Steven, 2003; Kukukemiroglu, 1999). Hence, consumers who are ethnocentric avoid foreign products due to the perceived economic and cultural threats they pose (Rice and Wongtada, 2007).

Ethnocentrism is moderated by country class, that is, whether a country is classified as developing country or a developed country (Ahmad et al., 2009). In other words, consumers in less developed countries tend to be less ethnocentric than consumers in developed countries (Hamin and Elliot, 2006). This may be explained by the fact that consumers in less developed countries have better perceptions of the quality of foreign products than consumers in developed countries (Ahmad et al., 2009; Elliot and Camoron, 1994; Wang et al., 2000).
Table 2. Summary of the Related Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Study Objectives</th>
<th>Research Methodology</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schooler (1965)</td>
<td>To explore the effects of national origin on product images.</td>
<td>Four experimental conditions in which the only difference between the various conditions was the COO cue.</td>
<td>Consumers’ evaluation of products is influenced by the COO information available to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimp &amp; Sharma (1987)</td>
<td>To develop a scale to measure consumer ethnocentrism.</td>
<td>The resultant CETSCALE scale is reliable and has both discriminant and convergent validity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okechuku (1994)</td>
<td>To research the relative importance of COO cues.</td>
<td>Multi-attribute conjoint analysis conducted on a convenience sample.</td>
<td>COO cues are at least as important as brand name and price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein et al. (1998)</td>
<td>To explore whether animosity impacts consumer behaviour.</td>
<td>A self-completion questionnaire was administered to consumers chosen at random.</td>
<td>Animosity is distinct from ethnocentrism. Chinese consumers’ evaluation of Japanese products despite the belief that it produces high quality products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To examine the effects the Holocaust on the intentions of American-Jewish consumers to buy German-made cars and travel to Germany.</td>
<td>To investigate if consumption situation and involvement have a significant impact on the importance allocated by consumers to a number of key attributes determined by a sample of experts and product users.</td>
<td>To examine the “Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase” in a country which is dependent on imports.</td>
<td>To determine to what extent consumer ethnocentrism affects assessment of domestic and foreign products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436 Americans were surveyed and 5 of those participated in in-depth interviews.</td>
<td>A large sample drawn from a variety of wine retail outlets was asked to rank ten hypothetical wine products, the purchase of which related to three different consumption situations.</td>
<td>530 consumers asked to fill-out a self-completion questionnaire.</td>
<td>Conjoint analysis of 297 consumers interviewed and selected based on a stratified random sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families of Holocaust survivors in the US avoid buying German cars and refrain from travelling to Germany.</td>
<td>The differences in mean relative importance between the various consumption situations were found to be statistically significant.</td>
<td>Consumer ethnocentrism and animosity have a significant effect on consumers’ willingness to buy foreign products even when there are no domestic alternatives.</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism has a significant effect on product evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Summary

This chapter initiated with a discussion of relationship between animosity and COO effects. Then, the moderating effects of purchase involvement on COO effects were discussed. Next, the antecedents and consequences of animosity were discussed. The animosity has several antecedents. However, the author of the present work has opted to focus on the following antecedents in this work: war animosity, general animosity and economic animosity for several reasons. First, Jews are more likely to harbor war animosity and general animosity towards the Germans over its role in the Holocaust.

Second, because German is one of Israel's most important trade partners and because Israel is dependent on importation from Germany, Israeli Jews might feel that Germany is taking advantage of them and their small country. That is to say, they are likely to harbor feelings of animosity. Finally, unlike political animosity and social-cultural animosity constructs, war animosity, general animosity and economic animosity have employed in numerous consumer animosity studies. Consequently, there is evidence for the validity and reliability of these constructs.

Although consumer animosity has several antecedents, its consequences on consumer behavior are pronounced in consumers' boycott of brands and products associated with the country towards which these feelings are directed.
The next chapter discusses several constructs and models with the aim of either adopting an existing model to the present work or constructing a new model. In addition, hypotheses are generated and will be tested in the main study conducted in this work.
Chapter 3: Model Development and Hypothesis

This chapter reviews several models and constructs from the consumer behavior literature. The purpose of the review is to either develop or modify an existing model to enable the researcher to examine the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement. While reviewing the models and constructs, the author will generate hypotheses that will be tested in the main study.

Review of Consumer Behavior Research Models

1. “Model of Brand and Country Effects”

The first model that has been examined for its potential to explain consumer behavior stemming from negative feelings toward a particular country is Thakor and Katsanis’ (1997) “Model of Brand and Country Effects” (see FIGURE 1). The model examines the effects of brand of origin and country of origin on perceptions of quality. The model hypothesizes that COO cues affect three dimensions of quality (i.e. search, experience and credence) directly and indirectly through the brand cue.
According to the search dimension, the features and ease of use of certain products can be evaluated prior to making a purchase. The brand cue is the only cue hypothesized to affect this dimension. Thus, the model examines the relationship between brand origin effects on assessment of product quality. However, this relationship is not likely to exist when examined in the context of consumer animosity (Cui et al., 2009; Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Klein and Ettenson, 1996; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Shimp et al., 2004; Shoham et al.,
The experience dimension, in contrast, enables the evaluation of certain product characteristics (e.g. reliability, serviceability and performance) only after the product has been tried. Both the brand cue and the country cue are hypothesized to affect this dimension. However, the aim of this study is to examine the effects of animosity on purchase behavior rather than post-purchase behavior.

Finally, the credence dimension refers to products whose most important symbols of quality are aesthetics and prestige. Similar to the experience dimension, it is hypothesized that both brand and country cues will impact this dimension. In other words, particular products will be considered more prestigious if made in a particular country. For example, a Swiss made Swatch is considered more prestigious than a watch manufactured in China. Similarly, French cosmetics are more prestigious than cosmetics made in Israel.

However, employing Germany as one of the COO proxies in this work together with a product stimulus that is associated with Germany may have confounding effects on the results on the research findings. In other words, some Jewish consumers may prefer German made cars over other cars because of the prestige associated with German cars. Consequently, the product stimulus employed in the author's study will not include luxury (prestigious) products associated with Germany. As a result, the credence dimension in Thakor and Katsanis’ model is not relevant to the aims of this work.

2. “Empirical Model of Receptivity toward Products from Various Origins”

The second model to be examined is the “Empirical Model of Receptivity toward Products from Various Origins” (see FIGURE 2) developed by Orbaiz and Papadopoulos (2003). The model was developed to address four research aims. The first objective was to test a model of product-country image (henceforth referred to as PCI) effects including both product and country measures. The second goal was to examine whether ethnocentrism, affect,
country image, and familiarity have an impact on consumers' product beliefs (i.e. assessment of product quality) and intentions to buy (i.e. receptivity). The third aim was to examine the first two research aims in international as well as subnational contexts. The fourth and final objective was to examine the potential variability in PCI effects depending on the stimulus origins and their links with respondents.

FIGURE 2. Empirical Model of Receptivity Toward Products from Various Origins

This model's suitability to the present work was examined due to the inclusion of the "affect" construct in the model. While animosity is associated only with negative feelings, affect refers to positive or negative feelings consumers' possess towards countries (Haubl, 1996; Klein et al., 1998; Knight and Calantone, 2000; Li et al., 1997; Papadopoulos, et al., 1988). In Orbaiz and Papadopoulos' research model, the positive dimension of affect is examined in the context of the cooperation between Spain and France. The negative dimension, in contrast, is examined in the context of the rivalry between the two countries.

Orbaiz and Papadopoulos have tested four hypotheses related to affect with their research model. The first hypothesis tested in the model was that positive affect toward a country or its people will lead to positive beliefs (assessment of product quality) about its products. The second hypothesis tested
was that negative affect toward a country or its people will lead to negative beliefs about its products. The third hypothesis tested was that positive affect toward a country or its people will result in a positive effect on the willingness to buy a country's products. The fourth and final hypothesis tested is that negative affect toward a country or its people will result in a negative effect on the willingness to buy a country's products.

Orbaiz and Papadopoulos' model was designed to examine the effect of the trade relationship between two countries on consumers’ product beliefs and intentions to buy. The present work, however, will be carried out by the author of the thesis will be conducted in the context of the Holocaust. That is to say, the aim of the study is to examine the impact of strong emotion of dislike and hatred stemming from past or present military, political, or economic aggression and actions either between nations or peoples, that is, animosity, on consumer behavior (i.e. purchase involvement).

Thus, several modifications would have to be made if Orbaiz and Papadopoulos' model were to be adapted to this work. First, the affect construct would have to be replaced by the animosity construct. The animosity construct has been employed to examine the impact of strong emotion of dislike and hatred stemming from past or present military, political, or economic aggression and actions either between nations or peoples in previous consumer behavior research (Klein et al., 1998; Podoshen, 2005; Shin, 2001).

Second, it would also be necessary to incorporate a construct known as product choice into any model that is designed to provide an account of the casual relationship between animosity and purchase involvement. The various scales employed to measure purchase involvement measure the level of involvement with an "actual" purchase rather than intentions to buy. Thus, the "buy" construct in the "Empirical Model of Receptivity Toward Products from Various Origins" would have to be replaced by the product choice construct.

In sum, several modifications would have to be made if Orbaiz and Papadopoulos' were to be adapted to this research effort. Furthermore, while Orbaiz and Papadopoulos report that the model is both valid and reliable, the
model has been tested only once and it is questionable whether it will produce equally reliable and valid results when applied to other contexts. For these two reasons, this researcher deemed it inappropriate to adapt it to his study.


The third model examined is Sadrudin and d’Astous’ (2007) Research Model (see FIGURE 3). According to this model, familiarity with a country’s products, the level of purchase involvement when purchasing cars and VCRs, and consumer demographics (i.e. age, income, and education) are antecedents of country-specific cognitions. In other words, these antecedents affect consumers’ images of countries which in turn impact consumers’ product-country evaluations of four product dimensions (that is, economy, performance, quality and originality).

According to the model, consumers’ product-country evaluations determine how they will evaluate COO cues along three dimensions, namely, country of design (COD), country of assembly (COA), and country of parts (COP). It is hypothesized that the relationship between product-country evaluations and evaluations of COO cues is mediated by consumers’ nationality which reflects their country’s level of economic development, cultural heritage and their level of ethnocentrism.
Figure 3. Sadrudin and D’Astous’(2007) Research Model

Sadrudin and D’Astous’(2007) model makes a significant contribution to consumer behavior research as it demonstrates not only that purchase involvement affects consumers’ evaluation of product quality but that this relationship is mediated by nationality. Thus, the model accounts for the consequences of purchase involvement on consumer behavior.

Although Sadrudin and D’Astous’(2007) research model makes significant contributions to the understanding of consumer behavior, the author has decided against adapting the model to his work for a number of reasons. First, Sadrudin and D’Astous’(2007) research model focuses on the cognitive rather than affective dimension of the judgments of product quality construct. The judgments of product quality concept comprises of two dimensions: a cognitive dimension and an affective dimension. According to the cognitive dimension, consumers’ decision results from an evaluation procedure.

According to the affective dimension, however, consumers’ decision-making stems from emotions resulting from an evaluative judgment and interpretation of stimuli in the environment. These emotions are action-oriented and are could result in internal (mental) and external (behavioural) reactions.
(Hansen, 2005) such as denigrating the quality of the products manufactured by the country which is the target of consumers’ animosity (Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Shoham et al., 2006). Because of this relationship between emotions and animosity, it would be more appropriate to focus on the affective, rather than cognitive, dimension of the judgments of product quality construct.

Second, the animosity construct has not been incorporated into the model. In principle, it would be possible to incorporate the animosity construct into Sadrudin and D’Astous’ (2007) research model. However, this would necessitate the making of a number of changes to the model.

Sadrudin and D’Astous’ research model is designed to examine the impact of country-specific cognitions on product-country evaluations which, in turn, impact consumers' assessment of the three components of the COO construct (country of design, country of assembly, and country of parts). However, a large body of consumer animosity research illustrates that animosity does not impact consumers' assessment of product quality (Klein et al., 1998; Podoshen, 2005; The Economist, 2006; Wood et al., 2008). Instead, it has an effect on the purchase behavior (willingness to buy, product ownership, and their product choices). As a result, it would be necessary is to replace the COD, COA, and COP subcomponents of the COO construct in the "outcomes" component of the model with either the "willingness to buy", "product ownership" or "product choice" construct.

Further modifications would be necessary even if the animosity construct is to be incorporated into the model. Sadrudin and D' Astous' research model hypothesizes that there is a relationship between purchase involvement and country-specific cognitions. However, the purpose of the present work is to examine the relationship between purchase involvement and animosity. Thus, the country-specific cognitions construct in Sadrudin and D' Astous' research model would have to be omitted and replaced by the animosity construct.

Finally, although the relationship between product familiarity and animosity has not been explicitly examined by previous studies, there does not seem to be a relationship between these two constructs. As a result, the product
familiarity construct would have to be omitted from Sadrudin and D'Astous' research model.

In sum, if Sadrudin and D'Astous' research is to be adapted to the present research, it would be necessary to make several modifications. First, the COO construct (COA, COP, and COD) would have to be replaced by with either the "willingness to buy", "product ownership" or "product choice" construct. Second, the country-specific cognitions construct would have to be replaced with the animosity construct. Finally, the product familiarity construct in Sadrudin and D'Astous' research model would have to be omitted. Thus, if all the abovementioned modifications were made, Sadrudin and D'Astous' model would have looked like this:


Following the making of the necessary modifications, Sadrudin and D'Astous'(2007) model would look very different from their original model. That is to say, if the author of the present work were to modify Sadrudin and D'Astous' research model, he would be left with a new model that has not been tested before. In other words, the validity and reliability of the modified research model would be in doubt. Hence, Sadrudin and D'Astous' research model will not be adapted to the present study.
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In addition to the three models discussed above, several constructs which are not necessarily part of any particular model were evaluated as to their adequacy to be included in the present study. These constructs include: cultural openness, salience, animosity, stable animosity, situational animosity, national animosity, personal animosity, worldmindedness, patriotism, nationalism, dogmatism, collectivism, and individualism.

Jung et al. (2002) and Ang et al. (2004) developed a taxonomy of four types of animosity: (1) stable animosity; (2) situational animosity; (3) national animosity; (4) personal animosity. The effects of national animosity (i.e. feelings resulting from aggression toward a nation as a whole) on consumer behavior was the focus of the overwhelming majority of previous investigations (Klein et al., 1998; Podoshen, 2005; Shimp et al. 2004). Ang et al. (2004), however, have focused on personal animosity (i.e. feelings resulting from personal experience). In other words, Ang et al. (2004) differentiate between what they call personal stable animosity and personal situational animosity.

According to Ang et al. (2004), situational animosity is defined as hatred resulting from a particular and an on-going situation (e.g. domestic economic crisis blamed on a foreign country). Stable animosity, on the other hand, is defined as hatred stemming from a general historical background (war atrocities perpetrated by a former occupier, for example). Situational animosity becomes stable animosity when a past event (that is, the source of animosity) is not forgotten for many years and even decades later. It may be, therefore, inferred that the Holocaust was a onetime event (situational animosity) which is commemorated annually and has consequently turned into stable animosity.

A study conducted by Ettenson and Klein (2005) lends further support to the stable/situational animosity distinction made by Ang et al. (2004) and Jung et al. (2002). Ettenson and Klein (2005) show that situational animosity can become stable (“stable animosity”) after a short period after the source of animosity (political, military, economic, or diplomatic event) has dissipated.
Once situational animosity has turned into stable animosity, it could last for hundreds of years although the findings regarding the impact of animosity for such long periods of time are mixed. The American Civil War, for example, appears to be continuing to have an impact on consumer behaviour in the US (Shimp et al., 2004). The enslavement of Africans in America, in contrast, no longer seems to affect the consumer behaviour of African-Americans. In particular, African-Americans don’t boycott American companies (e.g. J.P. Morgan) that played a role in the enslavement of their ancestors (Podoshen, 2008).

The distinction between situational animosity and stable animosity is an important one as it can be employed to account for how the occurrence of a single event can lead to long-term feelings that will translate into consumer boycotts. Notwithstanding the importance of this distinction, neither situational nor stable animosity will be adapted to the investigation conducted by the author of the present work. The items measuring the four constructs relate only to economic animosity and disregard war animosity (Ang et al., 2004; Jung et al., 2002). Israelis still seem to harbour war animosity toward Germany (refer to Pilot Study # 1 in Chapter 5). It is, therefore, important to take consumers’ feelings of war animosity into consideration.

Other constructs (i.e. cultural openness, salience, worldmindedness, patriotism, nationalism, dogmatism, and collectivism/individualism) were examined for their suitability to the present study. Each and every one of these constructs is related to consumer ethnocentrism but not animosity (Shankarmahesh, 2006). However, a review of the consumer behaviour research demonstrates that animosity, rather than consumer ethnocentrism, is more appropriate to studying the effects of war atrocities on consumer behavior. This is an important distinction to make as this work will be conducted in the context of the Holocaust. Thus, the animosity construct will be adopted to the present work. However, cultural openness, salience, worldmindedness, patriotism, nationalism, dogmatism, individualism and collectivism will not be adopted to the present study.
The Adopted Research Model

Following a review of several models and constructs employed in previous consumer behaviour studies, the author has opted to adapt Klein, Ettenson and Morris' (1998) “Model of Foreign Product Purchase” to the present work (see Figure 5). Klein, Ettenson and Morris' model is comprised of the following constructs: (1) animosity; (2) consumer ethnocentrism; (3) product judgments; (4) willingness to buy and (5) product ownership.

FIGURE 5. The Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase (Klein et al., 1998)

There are several reasons for deciding to adopt Klein, Ettenson and Morris' (1998) research model. First, other models (e.g. the "Empirical Model of Receptivity toward Products from Various Origins") in the consumer behaviour and international marketing literature were reviewed in this chapter and found to be inadequate to explain the effect of events such as the Holocaust on purchase involvement.

Second, the model has been used (essentially unchanged) in earlier studies with various populations and contexts (Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Klein, 2002; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Shin, 2001). Shin (2001), for one, has retested Klein, Ettenson and Morris' (1998) “Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase” in the context of the Korean-Japanese relationship during WWII. While in the former study students comprised the sampling frame, in the latter study the sampling frame consisted of Chinese consumers.
Shin’s study demonstrates that the relationships between the various constructs in the model (i.e. animosity, ethnocentrism, judgments of product quality and intentions to buy) can be replicated even when used with various populations. This is an encouraging finding as it shows that the items used to measure the various constructs comprising the animosity model are not only valid but also reliable. In other words, it is likely that results obtained from one group of people can be generalised to other groups.

Hence, adapting the items in the consumer animosity construct to various research contexts is an adequate alternative to completely replacing the original items. Ettenson and Klein (2005), for example, borrowed an item (i.e. “I will never forgive the Japan for the Nanjing Massacre”) from Klein (1998) and adapted it to the particular context of their study by modifying it to “I will never forgive France for its nuclear testing in the South Pacific”. This modification did not have a negative affect neither on the construct validity nor or the internal validity of the consumer animosity construct. This attests to the model’s high level of internal and external validity.

Third, Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) model will be adapted to the present study because it includes constructs that have been shown to be related to each other by previous empirical work. Thus, for example, animosity is likely to increase consumer ethnocentrism (Klein et al., 1998; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004). Furthermore, consumer ethnocentrism (CE) is a predictor of assessments of product quality (Orth and Firbasova, 2003). Moreover, CE is likely to make consumers more aware of COO cues (Samiee, 1994). This in turn has an impact on the willingness to buy construct (Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Klein et al., 1998; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Shin, 2001). The author of this work has reviewed several constructs and has come to the conclusion that it is most appropriate for the purposes of the present work.

However, several modifications will have to be made in order to examine the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement. These changes will result in a new theoretical framework designed specifically for this DBA. First, the purchase involvement construct will be added to the model (see
FIGURE 6). It was decided to add purchase involvement to the model for several reasons. One reason is that some researchers have suggested that these two constructs are related (Klein et al., 1998; Russell and Russell, 2006). However, to the knowledge of the present researcher, the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement has not been investigated.

Another modification will be made by replacing the product ownership construct. Studies that have examined the effects of animosity on consumers’ purchase behaviour focused on three dependent variables: Product choice, willingness to buy and product ownership (i.e. the construct employed in Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ research model). Product choice and product ownership are similar in the sense that both focus on the “actual” choices that consumers make or have made. This is in stark contrast to willingness to buy which is merely a measurement of consumers’ intentions to buy. In other words, willingness to buy indicates how likely consumers are to buy a particular product in the future. The downside of measuring willingness to buy is that there may be discrepancies between what consumers say they will buy and what they actually buy (Kwok et al., 2006).

The “willingness to buy” construct will not be included in the study conducted by the author of this work for a number of reasons. First, the “willingness to buy” construct is useful when the purpose is to predict future choice (that is, intentions to buy). The primary aim of the present work is to explore the potential effect of consumer animosity on purchase involvement. Purchase involvement becomes relevant when a consumer has to make a purchase decision. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to adopt the "product choice" construct than the “willingness to buy” construct.

Second, as it was mentioned earlier, there could be discrepancies between what consumers say they will buy and what they actually buy (Kwok et al., 2006). It is evident that social norms impact the type of information consumers will search for and the choices they make (Midgley et al., 1989). Thus, in the present work some subjects might be biased in their responses due to the social belief that it is not socially desirable to buy German – made products. In other words, they might be inclined not to choose a German product.
even if they would have liked to.

The product ownership construct will not be included in the author's research model as well. Examining the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement by relying on consumers retrospective recall will leave the researcher without control over the manipulation of purchase involvement.

Thus, although few studies have investigated the effects of animosity on actual product choice, there is evidence for a possible relationship between the two constructs (Klein, 2002).

In sum, this work focuses on the relationships between the following constructs: (1) war animosity; (2) economic animosity; (3) ethnocentrism; (4) purchase decision involvement; (5) product judgments; (6) product choice.

FIGURE 6. The Research Model

In the following section the author categorizes the constructs employed in the present study into dependent, independent and control variables and describes how they will be measured and controlled. Next, the author discusses each and every one of these constructs and the relationships between them in detail. This is followed up by the generation of hypotheses.
Dependent Variables, Independent Variables, Control Variables and Measuring Instruments

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in this study are: purchase involvement, assessment of product quality and product choice.

- Purchase Involvement

Several scales that have been developed to measure consumer purchase involvement have been considered for inclusion in the study (Laurent and Kapferer’s scale (1985), Ratchford’s FCB scale, Mittal’s Purchase Decision Involvement scale (1989) and Zaichkowsky’s Personal Involvement Inventory scale (1985). These scales were assessed based on the following criteria: (1) applicability to purchase involvement in the context of an ambient event such as the Holocaust: (2) construct reliability; (3) construct validity; and (4) discriminant validity.

According to the first criterion, the scale adapted to the present investigation needs to consist of items that are suitable to the particular context of the investigation. According to the second criterion – construct reliability – the chosen purchase involvement scale needs to include items which were demonstrated to be reliable (Gerbing and Anderson, 1988; Ping, 2004). In other words, these items produce consistent results. According to the third criterion – construct reliability – a purchase involvement scale should consist of items that have a high level of correlation between them (i.e. the construct’s Cronbach’s alpha is over 0.7). This will ensure that the items do in fact measure the purchase involvement concept.

The fourth criterion is discriminant validity. A test for discriminant validity is conducted so as to ensure that the constructs employed in a study measure different concepts.
The items in Zaichkowsky’s (1985) scale were compared to those in Mittal’s (1983) scale. The following scales are used to measure purchase involvement in Zaichkowsky’s (1985) scale: important/unimportant, boring/interesting, relevant/irrelevant, exciting/unexciting. However, a particular purchase situation (i.e. being exposed to a German product) is more likely to result in thoughts such as: would choosing a German brand over a non-German brand make a difference? Would making the wrong choice be risky? Hence, Zaichkowsky’s (1985) scale is not appropriate to the context of the current study.

The 33-item six point scale developed by Slama and Tashchian (1985) was also considered for possible adaptation to the present study. The items in the scale are suitable to investigations concerned with examining consumers’ general involvement with purchases. For example, one of the items in the scale measures consumers’ interest in shopping (“I have little interest in shopping”).

Other items on the scale measure how much time consumers would be willing to spend in order to obtain good prices on products (“I don’t like to waste a lot of time trying to get good deals on groceries” or “I am willing to spend extra time shopping in order to get the cheapest possible price on goods of like quality”). Thus, findings from studies employing the scale may not be extrapolated to specific product categories. Because specific products are used in the present study, it would inappropriate to adapt Slama and Tashchian’s (1985) purchase involvement scale to the present study.

Another scale the researcher of the present work has looked into is Mittal’s (1983) Purchase Decision Involvement scale (henceforth referred to as PDI). The PDI scale includes items such as: "In making your selection of this product, how concerned would you be about the outcome of your choice”?). Concern over the potential consequences of one’s choice is critical to the nature of such studies as the ones conducted by the author of the present study. It is possible that to certain people and in certain contexts it will matter to them whether they purchase a product made –in a certain country (e.g. German).
Thus, while Laurent and Kapferer’s scale, Zaichkowsky’s Personal Involvement Inventory scale and Ratchford’s FCB scale met most of the requirements set by the abovementioned criteria, the items in Mittal’s PDI scale are considered most appropriate for the purpose of the current study.

Mittal’s PDI scale includes items such as: "In making your selection of this product, how concerned would you be about the outcome of your choice"?). Concern over the potential consequences of one’s choice is critical to the nature of such studies as the one conducted by the author of the present study. Podeshen (2005) has demonstrated that American-Jewish consumers still refuse to by German-made products merely because they are German. Thus the author of this work has opted to adopt Mittal’s (1983) Purchase Decision Involvement scale due to the appropriateness of the scale's items to the purposes of this work.

Mittal’s scale consists of three items measured on a 7 point Likert scale (see Appendix 1). The cutoff point is determined by averaging the total score. Individuals who have scored below average would be considered to have low involvement and vice versa. In line with previous research, median scores will be calculated during the analyses (Quester and Smart, 1998).

- Judgments of Product Quality

The items measuring the judgments of product quality construct were adapted from Klein et al. (1998). The scale items were originally developed by Darling and Arnold (1988), and Darling and Wood (1990). The construct includes six items measured on a seven point Likert scale. The judgments of product quality construct has been adapted to all of the studies that have investigated the effects of animosity on consumer behavior. Moreover, the construct has proven to be both valid and reliable in various research contexts (Ben-Mrad, 2008; Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002; Nijsen and Douglas, 2004; Shoham et al., 2006). Hence, this construct will also be adapted for the present investigation.
Product Choice

There are various ways of investigating product choice. This can be done by using a statistical tool known as conjoint analysis (Rokka and Uusitalo, 2008), a methodology called information display board (Liefeld et al., 1996) and in a scale format (Klein 2002). Conjoint analysis (henceforth referred to as CA) is a computerized program that enables researchers to predict product choices. CA doesn’t provide researchers with such information as when particular data were accessed or in what order. CA merely indicates what product consumers prefer. However, data obtained from the conjoint analysis can be used for market segmentation purposes post-hoc.

Rokka and Uusitalo (2008), for example, conducted an investigation to examine the relative importance consumers attribute to green packaging of products relative to other product attributes using CA. In the study subjects were requested to choose one of three different functional drinks displayed on a computer screen. The products differed in their price, brand name, etc. The average importance of the various product attributes were assessed based on the choices made by subjects. Subjects were then segmented based on the relative importance that each subject has attributed to every product attribute.

The second tool at the disposal of the researcher is the information display board (IDB). The IDB displays a matrix. Each box in the matrix displays a different product cue (for example price, brand name, COO, etc.). This information becomes visible to subjects only after they click on the boxes. In contrast to CA, when using the IDB the computer records the time and sequence in which the various product data were accessed (Liefeld et al., 1996). Finally, the scale format is another tool researchers can employ to predict consumers’ product choices. In Klein’s (2002) study, for example, respondents were asked to indicate on a scale of 1 to 7 how likely they are to buy a United States product compared to a Japanese product.

Each and every one of these tools has its advantages and disadvantages. While CA only indicates to marketers what product attributes consumers prefer, IDB records the time and sequence in which these various product attributes
were accessed. However, the aim of the present study is not to examine what product attributes consumers prefer nor in what order these attributes are accessed. One of the purposes of the present study is to examine whether consumers' are likely to choose a German-made product when two other alternatives with the same attributes (price, size, etc.) are included in their choice set. It would, therefore, be inappropriate to employ either CA or IDB in the present study. The scale format employed in Klein's (2002) will be adapted to the present study.

Independent Variables

There are several independent variables in the present study: general animosity, war animosity, economic animosity, consumer ethnocentrism.

- Animosity

Animosity is a second order construct which includes two dimensions: war animosity and economic animosity (first order constructs). Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007) assert that for the items measuring the animosity construct to be valid in various contexts, they need to be generated anew in every study. According to this argument the items generated to measure the construct in the context of the Japanese-Sino relations (Klein et al., 1998) will not be appropriate to employ in other contexts.

However, the constructs comprising the model tested in the present study have been tested in various countries and contexts. The cross-cultural validity and reliability of the animosity construct has been established as researchers have used it to measure in various countries including Australia (Ettenson and Klein, 2005), China (Klein et al., 1998), The Netherlands (Nijssen and Douglas, 2004), Israel (Shoham et al., 2006), the US (Klein, 2002). Cronbach’s alpha, the convergent validity, construct reliability and validity were all satisfactorily high in all these studies.

Hence, adapting the items in the consumer animosity construct to various research contexts is an adequate alternative to completely replacing the original
items. For example, Ettenson and Klein (2005) borrowed an item (i.e. “I will never forgive the Japan for the Nanjing Massacre”) from Klein (1998) and adapted it to the particular context of their study by modifying it to “I will never forgive France for its nuclear testing in the South Pacific”.

Similarly, Bahaee and Pisani’s (2009) have conducted an investigation to test the reliability of the animosity construct in Iran. The consumer animosity construct was adapted to the Iranian construct by making minor modifications to the items in the scales. For example “I feel angry toward the Japanese” in Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) was replaced with “I feel angry toward the Americans”. Hence, the items comprising the general animosity, war animosity and economic animosity constructs will be adapted to the context of this work (see Appendices 2 - 4).

Similar to previous studies which have made these types of modifications, the reliability of the modified scales were encouragingly high as the Cronbach’s alpha was between the acceptable range of 0.70 and 0.90. Consequently, the authors have concluded that the consumer animosity construct can be adapted to other Middle-Eastern countries. Hence, the author of the present study expects that the animosity construct will produce equally high reliability results when tested in Israel.

The number of items used to measure animosity varies from study to study. But in most investigations, the items employed in Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) seminal study were adapted to the particular context of the research. Klein et al. (1998), for example, measured general animosity with a single item: “I dislike the Germans”. In a later study, Klein (2002) used three items to measure the same construct (see Table 3). Furthermore, while Klein et al. (1998) employed 5 items to measure economic animosity, Klein (2002) used only 3 items (see Table 4).
Table 3. Items in the General Animosity Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I dislike the Japanese.</td>
<td>I feel angry towards Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like Japan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not like Japan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 compares between the items used in Klein et al. (1998) and in Klein (2002). The first item in both scales is identical as in Klein’s (2002) study the U.S. is replaced by China in Klein, Ettenson and Morris' (1998) study. The next two items (item # 2 and item # 3) in both studies relate to feelings of unfairness in trade. The only difference between these two items is their wording. So far, the scales look the same and so researchers are likely to be indifferent as to which one of the scales to adapt to their study. However, the major difference between the two scales is pronounced in the two additional items included in Klein, Ettenson and Morris' study (1998) but omitted from Klein’s (2002) study (see item # 4 and item # 5). These last two items relate to the economic power or influence one country has or is trying to gain over another country.

Table 4. Items in the Economic Animosity Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Japan is taking advantage of China.</td>
<td>Japan is taking advantage of the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Japan is not a reliable trading partner.</td>
<td>I feel angry toward Japan because of the way they have conducted trade with the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Japanese are doing business unfairly with China.</td>
<td>The U.S. is more unfair within its dealings with Japan than Japan is with the U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Japan has too much influence in China.

Japan wants to gain economic power over China.

In certain cases, however, the items used in Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) study were adapted to a study while simultaneously one or two items were developed by the authors (Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Russell and Russell, 2006). Bahee (2009), Shoham et al. (2006), and Rose et al. (2009), for instance, employed the items employed by Klein et al. (1998) in addition to adding the following item to the war animosity construct: “……should pay for what they did during……”.

The item: "…..should pay for what they did during...." was used in a pilot study (Pilot Study # 1) conducted in the framework of this research effort. The results of the pilot study illustrated that some subjects were unsure what “pay” meant. In other words, when placed in the context of this study does it mean that Germany has to, literally, pay compensation to the victims of the Holocaust? If this is so then perhaps it is irrelevant for the context of the work since Holocaust survivors have been reimbursed by Germany.

“Pay” may also mean that Germany should somehow be “punished” for its deeds. However, if this is what “pay” means, then how should Germany be “punished”? Should its products be boycotted or should all present diplomatic ties between Israel and Germany be severed? Because of the ambiguity of the term “pay”, the item including it will not be adapted to the present research.

In sum, Klein's (2002) scale items will be employed in the present study for a number of reasons. Firstly, while Klein et al. (1998) employed a single item to measure general animosity, Klein (2002) used multiple-items. Some researchers argue that multiple item scales are preferable to single-items (Huang, 2004; Srinivasan et al., 2004). They maintain that multiple-items scales are more reliable than single item scales since they allow researchers to measure inter-item correlations. If the average inter-item correlation is high and positive
(i.e. the alpha value is high), then construct reliability has been established.

The same researchers also argue that the use of multiple-items scales enable researchers to tap all the aspects of the construct in question (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988; Baumgartner and Homburg 1996). That is to say, multiple-item measures allow researchers to classify research subjects into a greater number of categories (Bergkvist and Rossiter, 2007).

Secondly, the scale employed in Klein’s (2002) study doesn’t include this item: “……should pay for what they did during……” which problematic due to the ambiguity of the term “pay” in the item. Consequently, the author of the present study will adapt the scales employed in Klein’s (2002) to the current investigation.

- Consumer Ethnocentric Tendency Scale (CETSCALE)

The development of the CETSCALE by Shimp and Sharma (1987) enabled researchers to measure consumer ethnocentrism (CE) using a 7 – point 17 item scale. The higher consumers score on the scale, the more they are considered to be ethnocentric.

The cross-cultural validity and reliability of the scale has been established as researchers have used it to measure ethnocentrism in various countries including Russia and the US (Durvasula and Andrews, et al, 1997), Israel (Shoham and Brencic, 2003), India (Upadhyay and Singh, 2006) and Indonesia (Hamin and Elliot, 2006). A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.94 or more is considered to be statistically reliable. If such an alpha is obtained, it may be assumed that all the items in the CETSCALE (17 items) measure the same construct (i.e. consumer ethnocentrism).

Some studies have summed up the scores on the CETSCALE to assess respondents’ or subjects’ level of ethnocentrism (Shimp and Sharma, 1987). When the scores are summed up respondents’ score on the scale ranges between 17 and 144 points.
However, most studies that have used this scale have reported mean scores (Klein, 1998; Shoham and Brencic, 2003; Upadhyay and Singh, 2006). The mean score can range between 1 and 7 (i.e. the scales range). Consumers scoring less than 4 points (on average) can be classified as polycentric while those scoring more than 4 points (on average) can be classified as ethnocentric. The major advantage of reporting mean scores, rather than summations is that it enables researchers to compare between scales varying in their number of items (Klein et al., 2006). Hence, mean scores will be calculated in the present study.

Although the 17 item CETSCALE is valid and reliable (Durvasula and Andrews, et al, 1997; Hamin and Elliot, 2006; Shoham and Brencic, 2003; Upadhyay and Singh, 2006), research shows that a shortened 10-item CETSCALE produces equally valid and reliable results (Chandrasen and Dusit, 2009; Dmitrović and Vida, 2007; Mittelstaedt et al., 2004; Netemeyer et al., 1991). Consequently, the shorter version of the scale will be employed in this work. Similar to the other constructs employed in the present work, the CETSCALE will be adapted to the context of this work (see appendix 5).

Control Variables

Control variables are variables which may affect the phenomenon under investigation but are not manipulated. The control of these variables is crucial so as to minimize that probability of drawing false conclusions. For example, concluding that there is a cause and effect relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable(s) when in fact this relationship doesn't exist. These variables are controlled for by measuring them so as to keep them constant and thereby minimize their effect on a dependent variable (Calder et al., 1982).

An example of a variable held constant in the overwhelming majority of consumer behavior research is type of consumer. These studies employ student samples (Aboulnasr, 2006; Amine and Shin, 2001; Eroglu and Machleit, 1989; Hui and Zhou, 2003; O’Cass, 2000; Rodgers and Schneider, 1993; Zhang, 1997). Apparently, researchers that employ student samples assume that type of consumer doesn't affect the independent variable. Hence, they hold this variable
constant.

One potential problem with holding this type of consumer constant is that if certain characteristics, such as intelligence, income, lack of experience, etc. of the sample (e.g. students) affect the independent variable, then generalising the obtained results to other populations would not be feasible (Calder et al., 1982).

Another detrimental effect for generalisability (i.e. external validity) is likely to arise when the particular control variables that affect a dependent variable in real life (i.e. outside the laboratory) are held constant in an experiment (inside the laboratory).

Apparently, control variables could be detrimental to the external validity of research findings. According to Lynch (1982), this potential impact on external validity can be dealt with in several ways: (1) Using a greater sample size; (2) employing a with-in subjects design; and (3) using background factors as covariates. Covariates are variables that correlate with the dependent variable and other independent variable(s).

If a background factor combines additively with the manipulated variable, the data will provide a precise and valid picture of how the manipulated variables impacts the dependent variable, except for random error. The precision of the estimate of the treatment effects can be improved by either holding background factors constant or by testing their effects with ANCOVA or blocking it on ANOVA.

If, however, background factors and treatment conditions interact, background variables should be allowed to vary and should be treated as a blocking factor (that is, covariate) in the data analysis. Should background factors and treatment conditions interact, the effect of the treatment manipulation will differ across subpopulations (i.e. increased variance) as defined by their associations with different levels of the background factor. Therefore, if background factors and treatment conditions interact, variance can be decreased by employing a representative sample (Lynch, 1982).
Thus, Calder et al. (1982) and Lynch' (1982) main argument is that researcher should allow background factors to vary. Cronbach (1975), in contrast, contends that background variables should be measured rather than simply allowing them to vary. Cronbach recommends measuring an independent variable, if a researcher suspects that a particular background factor is likely to have an affect on the independent variable. The impact of the background factor on the independent variable should be examined post hoc.

Consumer behaviour researchers seem to have adopted the views of Cronbach (1975) rather than those of Lynch (1982). Age, for example, is an important moderator of the effects of COO on purchase behaviour. That is to say, younger consumers tend to be more receptive to foreign products (Sadrudin and d’Astous, 2002; Han and Terpstra, 1988; Leonidou et al., 1999). Thus, rather than let age vary and increase the variability of the results, researchers obtain information about respondents’ age and control for its potential impact on research findings in the data analysis (Sadrudin and d’Astous, 2007; Balabanis et al., 2002; Kaynak et al., 2000).

What follows is a discussion of how certain background variables such as marital status, level of income, education, product price, product heterogeneity, social surroundings, product knowledge, and brand familiarity affect purchase involvement (Antil, 1983; Rossiter and Percy, 1987; Zaichkowsky, 1985). Furthermore, the importance of controlling these variables and the manner in which they will be controlled also discussed.

- Marital Status, income and education

Women who are mothers, earn a moderate income and relatively educated tend to be highly involved with a purchase (Slama and Tashchian, 1985). These variables (i.e. marital status, gender, income and education) will be controlled for in the present investigation by randomly assigning subjects to either a control group or an experimental group. This will ensure the researcher of the present study that an increase in subjects’ level of purchase involvement cannot be attributed to consumers’ marital status, gender, level of income or education.
• **Product Price**

High–ticket items are likely to increase consumers’ involvement with a purchase (Antil, 1983; Rossiter and Percy, 1987; Zaichkowsky, 1985). Hence, product price will be controlled by exposing half of the subjects to a relatively cheap product (shower gel) and exposing the other half to a relatively high-ticket item (refrigerator). This will ensure that in this research any increase in subjects’ level of purchase involvement is not due to product price.

• **Product heterogeneity**

The greater the difference between products in a choice set, the greater the level of purchase involvement (Antil, 1983; Rossiter and Percy, 1987; Zaichkowsky, 1985). To control for the potential effects of heterogeneity on purchase involvement, products in the present study only differ in the COO information. All other attributes will be identical in both products.

• **Social Surroundings**

According to Belk (1974) social surroundings impact purchase involvement. It, therefore, likely that when a consumer is shopping for a product with another person (whether a friend, a relative, etc.) his/her choice will be influenced by the mere presence of the other person. The potential effects of social surroundings on purchase involved are controlled for by requesting subjects to complete the questionnaire on the spot. Hence, subjects will undergo the experiment in isolation of any external influence (e.g. family, relatives, friends, etc.).

• **Product Knowledge**

Product knowledge needs to be controlled for in the present investigation for two main reasons. First, product knowledge is recognized as a potentially significant variable which can affect the type of product cues consumers rely on to make choices (Chattalas et al., 2008; Nebenzahl et al., 2001; Schaefer, 1997). Product knowledge indirectly affects willingness to buy through its affect on
product beliefs. This relationship between product knowledge and willingness to buy is especially salient when consumers evaluate a product manufactured by a country that is famous for producing the product in question (Lee and Chen, 2008). Thus, controlling for the potential effect of product knowledge on study results is especially important as Germany is renowned for the high-quality electronic products it produces.

Therefore, the author deems it necessary to establish that the choices made by subjects in the present study are not related to their familiarity or lack of familiarity with German products. Consequently, product familiarity needs to be controlled for so as to ensure that if subjects choose a German product, it is not because they are familiar with German products but rather because they no longer harbour feelings of animosity towards it.

The second reason why product knowledge needs to be controlled for in the present study is due to its relationship with purchase involvement. The level of involvement varies with consumers’ knowledge of a product category. The consumer behaviour literature distinguishes between two types of consumer knowledge: Objective knowledge and subjective knowledge. Objective knowledge refers to consumers’ real knowledge while subjective knowledge refers to their perceived knowledge (Huffman et al., 1990). Objective product knowledge tends to influence how consumers process product cues.

Subjective product knowledge, however, impacts on the confidence they possess in their ability to make right decisions based on stored memory (Day, 1970; Schaefer, 1997; Zajonc and Marisette, 1960). Involvement with products increases consumers’ perception of subjective product knowledge and expertise (O’Cass, 2004). Hence, it is possible that the more consumers are involved with a product the more familiar they become with it. Thus, on the one hand, purchase involvement is likely to increase consumers’ familiarity with a given product. Product familiarity, on the other hand, is likely to decrease consumers’ level of involvement as they will probably neither expend a lot of cognitive effort nor much time to process product information.
A review of the consumer behavior literature indicates that product knowledge and product familiarity are, at least in some cases, used interchangeably in the consumer behavior literature (O’Cass, 2004). In other words they are used to refer to a single concept. According to Schaefer (1997), “product knowledge or familiarity is the cognitive representation of product-related experience in a consumer’s memory, which takes the form of a product schema and is likely to contain knowledge in the form of coded representations of brands, product attributes, usage situations, general product class information, and evaluation and choice rules” (p. 57).

Similarly, some researchers use product expertise and product familiarity interchangeably (Chattalas et al., 2008). Other researchers contend that product and expertise and product familiarity are distinct concepts. Schaefer (1997), for one, argues that product familiarity and product expertise are distinct aspects and that directly measuring the former is more appropriate as it has a direct influence on consumer behaviour. Similarly, Alba and Hutchinson (1987) argue that product familiarity and product expertise are distinct concepts. However, they also contend that the product familiarity construct is made up of two dimensions: familiarity and expertise. Alba and Hutchinson define familiarity as “the number of product related experiences that have been accumulated by the consumer” (p.411). Expertise is referred to as “the ability to perform product-related tasks successfully” (p.411).

Alba and Hutchinson merely define product class expertise and they do not provide an explanation of what they mean by “…perform product related tasks successfully”. Apparently, however, their definition of product class expertise reflects the theory behind subjective product knowledge. While objective product knowledge tends to influence how consumers process product cues, subjective product knowledge impacts their confidence in their ability to make right decisions based on stored memory (Day, 1970; Schaefer, 1997; Zajonc and Marisette, 1960). It is likely that when Alba and Hutchinson stated that product expertise is “the ability to perform product-related tasks successfully” they were referring to consumers’ ability to make the right
decision based on stored memory (Day, 1970; Schaefer, 1997; Zajonc and Marisette, 1960).

The author agrees with Schaefer and Alba and Hutchinson and argues that product expertise and product knowledge are in fact distinct concepts. The former concept is more suitable to the type of studies for which the distinction between expert consumers and novice consumers is important (Chiou, 2003; Pecotich and Ward, 2007). Hence, the author will focus on product knowledge rather than product expertise.

**Measuring Product Knowledge**

The purpose of the following section is to discuss the various scales available to measure product knowledge and to justify the adaptation of one of these scales to the present study.

1. Albs and Hutchinson’s (1987) Product Class Knowledge scale

The first scale that was considered for inclusion in the present work is Albs and Hutchinson’s (1987) Product Class Knowledge scale (see FIGURE 7). The Product Class Knowledge scale employs three items to measure consumers' knowledge of the particular product class classes (i.e. TV, Beer and Cars). The first item is designed to measure how frequently these product classes are used by consumers. The second question measures how much of the product in question is purchased. The third question is a measure of how often the products are bought by consumers.

The three items in the product class knowledge scale can be used to measure consumers' knowledge of shower gels but not refrigerators. For example, the second item on the scale asks study participants to state the average amount bought per week or per month. Refrigerators are neither bought on a weekly nor monthly basis. Hence, the scales will not be adapted to the current study.
FIGURE 7. Albs and Hutchinson’s (1987) Product Class Knowledge Scale

1. Usage: six-packs of beer consumed per week/hrs of TV watched per week, miles driven per month
2. Purchasing: Amount in an average week or month
3. Purchasing frequency: In an average month, how often do you buy _____? Include all your purchases either at grocery stores or bars (to be used with relevant products only - item is reverse ordered).

2. Josiassen’ et al. (2008) Product Familiarity Scale

The adoption of another product knowledge/familiarity scale was considered, namely, Josiassen’ et al. (2008) Product Familiarity Scale (see FIGURE 8). As opposed to Orbaiz and Papadopoulos (2003) who have designed a scale to measure consumers’ familiarity with a particular product from a particular country (see Figure 10), Josiassen et al. (2008) have developed a single seven point Likert scale to measure consumers' familiarity with a specific product regardless of where it is produced.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all familiar with (product)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>very familiar with (product)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thus, some researchers measured respondents familiarity with the products of a certain country in general (Sadrudin and Alain, 2008). Others, however, have assessed product familiarity with a particular product category manufactured by a particular country (Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000; Orbaiz and Papadopoulos, 2003).
Focusing on consumers’ familiarity with a particular product category produced by a specific country is more appropriate as different countries are well known producers of different types of products. For example, Italy is renowned for production of high quality apparel, India is known for its tea, Columbia for its coffee, and Germany and Japan are famous for their electronic products and cars.


Another product familiarity scale (see FIGURE 9) considered for inclusion was developed by Schaefer (1997). Schaefer’s (1997) Product Familiarity Scale has two outstanding advantages. First, it contains four items which makes it more reliable than single-item scales. Second, two of the four items (item # 3 and item # 4) are reversed score so as to minimise the effects of demand artefacts on the reliability of research results. Response bias/demand artefacts may result from responds’ or subjects’ will to provide the answers they believe the researcher expects to hear (Churchill, 1979). However, the items on the scale measure general product knowledge rather than knowledge or familiarity with a particular product from a particular country.


In your own opinion, how much do you know about the various types and brands of (product) available in the UK? The purpose of this question is not to test you. Whichever of the answers below you tick is equally valuable.

1) I know a lot about them. 2) I have an average knowledge about them.
3) I don’t know very much about them. 4) I know very little or nothing at all about them.


In light of the disadvantages of the product familiarity scales discussed thus far, the author examines another scale designed to measure respondents’ product familiarity (see Figure 10). The scale discussed here is Orbaiz and Papadopoulos’ (2003) product familiarity scale. The scale consists of a single
item on a seven point Likert scale ranging from 1 - I do not know much about products from (country) to 7 - I know very much about products from (country).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not know much about products from (country)</th>
<th>I know very much about products from (country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following considers the four different product familiarity scales discussed thus far (Albs and Hutchinson, 1987; Josiassen et al., 2007; Orbaiz and Papadopoulos, 2003; Schaefer, 1997). The main disadvantage with Albs and Hutchinson's (1987) scale is that it was designed to measure consumers' familiarity with particular classes of products. Thus, while it can be used to measure familiarity with cars, beer and TVs, it cannot be employed with refrigerators.

Both Josiassen et al. (2008) and Schaefer's (1997) scales can be employed to measure consumers' knowledge of any product class. However, they are limited by the fact that can be used to measure consumers knowledge with a particular product class with no consideration for the country in which the product was manufactured. The author of this study deems it important to take country of origin information when product knowledge is measured as different countries are well known producers of different types of products. Although Orbaiz and Papadopoulos' (2003) scale consists of one item, it can be used to measure consumers familiarity with a product class produced by a particular country.

Hence, in this study consumers’ familiarity with shower gels and refrigerators produced by Israel, Germany and the USA will be measured using

- Brand Familiarity

   The potentially confounding effects of brand familiarity are controlled for by either using fictitious brand names (Pecotich and Ward, 2007; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995; Sadrudin and d’Astous, 2004) or omitting brand names altogether to eliminate its potential effect on subjects (Aqueveque, 2006; Wong et al., 2008). Thus, brand names will not be employed in the present study.

This section focused on how the constructs employed in the present work will be measured. The purpose of the next section is to develop hypotheses regarding the relationships between these constructs.

_Hypotheses Development_

**General Consumer Animosity and Consumer Ethnocentrism**

Consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism are unique constructs (Klein and Ettenson, 1999). The constructs differ in that consumer animosity is directed toward a particular country and results from consumers' perceptions of the actions of a certain country. Consumer ethnocentrism, in contrast, is not directed towards any particular country. In other words, ethnocentric consumers are likely to avoid buying products not just from a certain country but from all foreign countries.

Despite the differences between consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism, the two constructs are related. The two constructs are related in that the more consumers harbour feelings of animosity towards a particular country the greater the likelihood they will avoid buying foreign products (Klein et al., 1998; Levine and Campbell, 1972; Shankarmahesh, 2006). Hence, H1: The greater the level of general animosity harboured by consumers, the more they are likely to be ethnocentric.
Antecedents of Consumer Animosity

Demographic variables such as gender, age, education and race are antecedents of consumer animosity (Bahaee and Pisani, 2009; Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002; Klein and Ettenson, 1999; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2007). However, the direction of the relationship between these demographic variables and consumer animosity is still not clear.

Findings regarding the relationship between age and animosity, for example, are inconsistent (Bahaee and Pisani, 2009; Huang et al., 2010; Klein 2002). Studies employing the animosity model demonstrate that the effect of age on animosity is context-specific. Thus, while in some instances animosity is positively correlated with age (i.e. the level of animosity increases with age), in other cases this relationship, in all likelihood, will not be observed as the level of animosity is static across various age groups. For example, Klein (2002) observed that older Americans who have been directly involved in WWII expressed higher levels of animosity than younger Americans. The higher level of animosity observed in the older population may have been observed because these events are still fresh in the minds of those have experienced WWII.

A very different relationship between age and animosity was observed in a study conducted by Bahaee and Pisani (2009). Bahaee and Pisani conducted an investigation to examine Iranian consumers' attitudes toward products imported from the USA. The study was conducted in the context of America's trade embargo against the Iran. Their findings indicate that there is an inverse relationship between age and the level of animosity. At a first glance these findings seem to contradict Klein's (2002) research results. However, Bahaee and Pisani explain their results by arguing that it likely that the older respondents in their study harboured lower levels of animosity because of their memories of the past relationship between Iran and the USA which was sound.

Thus, it is likely that events occurring in the distant past have more profound implications on consumer behaviour than more recent events. Furthermore, the effect of age on animosity depends on the past versus the present relationship between two countries. In other words, if the relationship
between two countries has changed for the better, older consumers are more likely to harbour feelings of animosity than younger consumers because of their memories of the past relationship. However, if the relationship between two countries has changed for the worse, younger consumers are likely to harbour greater feelings of animosity than older consumers since the latter consumers remember the more friendly or positive relationship between the two countries in the past. This, however, is a relatively simple assumption and more complex arrangements can exist, vis-à-vis individual relationships and life experiences.

For example, in sharp contrast the study conducted by Klein (1998) suggests that when the older part of the population is directly affected by war it may have repercussions for their families and friends as well. That is to say, the level of animosity is likely to remain consistent two and even three generations after the event. These results are supported by Little' et al. (2009) finding that animosity towards Vietnam was passed down from generation to generation. Hence, age did not seem to have moderated animosity since the older population sampled have probably shared their experiences with their children and/or grandchildren.

The present work is conducted in the context of the Holocaust. Based on the findings by Little et al (2009), it can be hypothesized that Holocaust survivors were likely to have shared their experiences with their families including their children and possibly even their grandchildren. Thus,

H2: The elderly and the young Jewish populations will not differ in the level of animosity they harbour towards Germany.

Another demographic variable that is likely to be an antecedent of consumer animosity is gender. Klein et al. (1998), for example, find that females tend to harbour lower level of economic animosity than males. In stark contrast to Klein, Ettenson and Morris' (1998) findings, Bahaee and Pisani (2009) show that females are likely to possess higher levels of animosity than males. Despite the importance of gender as a antecedent of consumer animosity, no researcher has suggested what is likely to give rise to this difference between males and females.
Although it is out of the boundaries this research, it is reasonable to assume that there are fundamental differences in the worldviews of men and women think. Therefore, it is hypothesized that,

H3: Men and women will differ in the level of animosity they harbour towards Germany.

The Effect of Consumer Ethnocentrism on Judgments of Product Quality

Consumer ethnocentrism is negatively related to product judgments (Shimp and Sharma, 1987). A number of studies (Wall et al. 1991; Hamin and Elliot, 2006) have demonstrated that consumer ethnocentrism affects the willingness to buy indirectly through product judgments. In other words, the more a consumer is ethnocentric the more negatively he/she is likely to evaluate a foreign product. Consequently, an ethnocentric consumer is less likely to purchase a foreign product. Thus,

H4: Ethnocentric consumers are likely to denigrate foreign products.

The Impact of Economic Animosity on Product Choice

Economic animosity can result from two reasons: trade disagreements between countries (Klein and Morris, 1996; Klein and Etenson, 1999; Hinck et al., 2004) and feelings of economic dominance or aggression (Klein et al., 1998). Economic animosity is more likely to be prevalent in small nations or economies, where the population may be discontent with the fact that their country's economy is dominated by a larger and stronger country. These feelings may lead to general animosity and in turn to reluctance to buy products from the country in question (Nijssen and Douglas, 2004). Thus,

H5: Economic animosity is positively associated with general animosity.

Purchase Involvement

The level of purchase involvement is affected by situational factors which, in turn, determine the number and type of cues (extrinsic vs. intrinsic)
consumers will process to assess product quality (Lin and Chen, 2006; Zhang, 1997) and to make purchase decisions (Miquel, 2002; Zhang, 1997).

Prior to embarking on a discussion on the relationship between situational factors, product cues and purchase involvement the author will discuss the dimensions of the situational factors investigated in previous consumer behavior studies. According to Foxall and Goldsmith (1994) situational factors consist of five dimensions: (1) physical surroundings; (2) social surroundings; (3) temporal issues; (4) task definition and (5) antecedent states.

The physical surroundings are the most obvious features of a given situation. These features include the materials surrounding the stimulus object such as the geographical location, scent, lighting, weather, etc.

Social situations comprise other people present, their characteristics, roles and interactions, and crowding, time constraints, and elapsed or expected time.

Temporal issues pertain to the time in which a situation occurs (for instance, time of day, season, etc.).

Task definition is the orientation, intent, role or frame of a person, through which particular aspects of the environment may become relevant. Thus, the choice of a particular product or brand depends on the situationally determined task definition such as shopping for oneself vis-à-vis shopping for someone else.

Antecedent states are temporary moods (e.g. excitement, hostility) and momentary conditions (e.g. tiredness, illness) that influence the perception, evaluation, and acceptance of the environment.

A number of studies have examined the effects of situational factors on decision making (Belk, 1974; Duncan and Capella, 1995; Gehrt et al., 1991; Klein and Manjit, 1989; Newman and Foxall, 2003). These studies show that situational variables have a significant effect on consumer decision-making. In
Belk’s study, for example, situational main effects and interactions explained almost 50% of variance in meat and snack preferences. In another study (Duncan and Capella, 1995) it was demonstrated that shoppers spend less time making a purchase when under time pressure. They also show that shoppers spend more money in the time available to them.

The abovementioned situational factors are, however, not the only factors that are likely to affect consumer behavior. Hadjimarcou and Hu’s (1999) were the first to study the effect of apparently another situational factor, ambient task complexity, on information processing. Hadjimarcou and Hu define ambient task complexity as “any cognitively demanding judgmental task required of or brought upon an individual that is the result of cognitive complexity related to events (emphasis added) often remotely connected to the task at hand per se, but may otherwise bear some weight on the context in which evaluations are made” (Hadjimarcou and Hu, 1999, p. 586). This implies that consumers’ feelings that have no connection to an evaluation process at hand are likely to become unusually salient and impact their decision-making process.

The use of the words “often remotely connected to the task at hand” seems to indicate that Hadjimarcou and Hu’s definition of a situational factor was based on Gehrt and Yan (1991) definition. Gehrt et al. define situational factors as “all of those factors particular to a time and place which do not follow from knowledge of personal and stimulus attributes and which have systematic effect on current behavior” (p. 45). In other words, similar to other situational factors, ambient task complexity is not a tangible component of the product being evaluated by a consumer.

Hence, it is likely that in the case of low ambient task complexity, an event associated with a particular product or company does not make an assessment of product quality a more difficult task than it would have been otherwise. In contrast, high ambient task complexity involves an event associated with a product/company which does in fact make an evaluation task more difficult than usual.
This may result from the very fact that simply knowing that an ambient event (for example, war, political disputes) has occurred and deciding whether it is significant makes it more difficult for consumers to assess the quality of a given product. Hence, ambient events are likely to increase the complexity of the evaluation process and consequently the level of purchase involvement. As a result, consumers are more likely to base their decision process on heuristics (e.g. COO cues) than on more careful evaluation of product attributes (Hansen, 2005). Hence, the following hypothesis is extended:

H6a: High ambient task complexity will result in a high level of purchase involvement which will, in turn, lead to the use of heuristics to make a purchase decision.

COO cues are one of the many informational cues consumers take into consideration prior to making a purchase decision. But since COO cues cannot be used to describe a situation, they are not considered to be part of the several situational factors that are likely to impact consumers' behavior. However, COO cues may trigger consumers' memory of a particular ambient event thereby making them important to consumers’ decision-making process in particular situations.

This argument is line with studies that have demonstrated that the more it is difficult for consumers to evaluate a product the more it is likely that they will depend on extrinsic product cues (e.g. COO) in assessing product quality and product choice (Kwon, 1990; Li et al., 2000; Park and Hastak, 1994; Richardson et al., 1994).

In this research the main objective is to examine the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement in the context of the Holocaust. Because COO cues are one the informational cues that can trigger consumers' memories of particular events, the author will focus on the effects of this particular informational cue.

As already mentioned, purchase involvement is a context-specific moderator that determines the importance consumers attribute to COO images
(that is, COO cues) during their assessment of product quality. Some studies suggest that COO cues are likely to be used by consumers when their level of purchase involvement is low (Beatty and Smith, 1987; Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000; Sadrudin and d'Astous, et al., 2005). A review of the consumer behavior literature uncovers two possible explanations to the relationship between low purchase involvement and the utilization of COO cues. According to some researchers, COO cues may be more important to consumers when their level of involvement is low because COO cues are salient and readily accessible (Beatty and Smith, 1987; Gurhan-Canli and Maheswaran, 2000; Josiassen et al., 2008; Sadrudin and d'Astous, et al., 2005; Verlegh et al., 2005).

However, other researchers argue that low involvement consumers tend to use COO cues because they are likely to base their decisions on prior beliefs and stereotypes (Li et al., 2000; Park and Hastak, 1994). According to these researchers, these prior beliefs concern the quality of products produced by different countries and the stereotypes associated with them. Thus, according to this argument, consumers will not invest much cognitive effort on information processing and will be more likely to be affected by stereotypes when their level of purchase involvement is low. In other words, they are more likely to search for and base their purchase decisions on extrinsic product cues, such as COO cues.

The argument that there is a relationship between stereotypes and purchase involvement is in line with the information processing theory (Hansen, 2005). According to this theory, consumers try to avoid cognitive dissonance by balancing their attitudes and beliefs with the outside world. Thai consumers, for example, are not willing to buy a Sony walkman made in China. They are, however, willing to buy a Sony walkman made in Japan (Amine and Shin, 2002). The reluctance to buy a Sony walkman manufactured in China may have resulted from China’s poor image as a producer of consumer goods.

There is also evidence of a very different relationship between purchase involvement and cue utilisation. Some studies show that consumers are more likely to take COO cues into consideration when their level of involvement is high rather than low (Sadrudin and D’astous, 2004). According to these studies
this is likely to be so because consumers who are highly involved with a product are more likely to search for more product information (price, COO cue, warranty, etc.) than consumers who have a low level of product involvement.

A possible explanation to these contradictory findings is that the impact of purchase involvement on cue utilization is context-specific. A hypothetical case will be used to explain how context may moderate the effect of purchase involvement on cue utilization. A customer goes into a store searching for product belonging to a particular product class. This particular customer is aware of the fact that the country (country X) towards which he or she harbours general animosity is known for producing high-quality products. Therefore, this country's products are sold by the majority of retail stores. If the same customer boycotts products made in country X due to animosity, the only way he or she can be assured that this country's products are not bought is by looking for particular product information, namely, the made-in label. In other words, this customer may not have search for as much product information hadn't it been for this customer's feelings towards country X. Thus, it may be assumed that the feeling (i.e. animosity) is responsible for the relatively high level of purchase involvement experienced by the customer. Thus,

H6b: General animosity will increase the level of purchase involvement experienced by consumers.

**Economic Animosity and Purchase Involvement**

Russell and Russell (2006) find that economic animosity results in prevention-focus, that is, “resistance to products from powerful competitors” on the part of consumers (p.322). Powerful competitors could either be firms or countries. In order to resist "products from powerful competitors" consumers would need to search for extrinsic product cues such as the brand name and COO cues.

In other words, a high level of economic animosity is likely to lead to a high level of purchase involvement which will, in turn, result in greater attention and importance attributed to COO cues. This possible relationship between
animosity purchase involvement, and the importance attributed to the salience of COO cues has been suggested by Klein (1999).

The relationship between animosity and purchase involvement will be demonstrated with a fictional story about an Israeli consumer shopping for an oven. It must be noted that most ovens available in stores across Israel are imported into the country. An Israeli consumer who lost parents in the Holocaust enters an electrical appliance store in search of an oven. This consumer likes the appearance of a particular oven. In addition, its technical attributes are favorable to him or her. However, the brand name is unfamiliar to this particular customer.

When this customer asks the salesperson about the origin of the oven he/she finds out that it is German-made. A customer who was so close to buying the oven is in a dilemma since his internalized and family belief system regarding the Holocaust and German products negate the impulse to purchase. Thus, a relatively simple purchase task has become much more complex because of an ambient event (e.g. the Holocaust) associated with an extrinsic product attribute (COO) of the product in question. Thus,

H6c: Economic animosity is likely to increase consumers’ level of purchase involvement.
Chapter Summary

In sum, several models and concepts were reviewed with the purpose of adopting or modifying an existing model that could be employed to test this study’s hypotheses. It was finally concluded that Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) “Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase” will be adapted to this work. On the one hand, the following constructs are omitted from Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) model: willingness to buy and product ownership. On the other hand, two constructs are integrated into the model, namely, purchase involvement and product choice. Thus, the model used in the current investigation includes the following constructs: animosity, ethnocentrism, product judgments, purchase involvement and product choice.

The following chapter discusses the design and methodology employed to collect data for this work.
Chapter 4: Foundation of Research Method and Research Design

This section commences with a review of several epistemological approaches, namely, rationalism, post-modernism, positivism, constructionism, and interpretivism. This is followed by a discussion of the epistemological approach taken in the present work. Next, the methodology and design of the present work is discussed. Finally, the pilot studies that will be conducted prior to undertaking the main study are briefly described.

Epistemological Approach and Foundation of the Research Method

Epistemology is the branch of philosophy devoted to studying the nature, sources and limits of knowledge. The defining questions of epistemology include the following (Markie, 2008):

1. How do we know that knowledge about a particular proposition is true?

Knowing a particular proposition requires that we believe it, that it be true, and that this belief is warranted. For some rationalists, for example, a belief is warranted if it is true beyond even the slightest doubt.

2. How can we gain knowledge?

We can form true beliefs merely by making some lucky guesses. It is not clear how we can attain warranted beliefs. In other words, it is unclear how we gain the concepts we use in thought or what guarantee we have that the ways in which we divide up the world using our concepts are consistent with the divisions that really exist. For example, when one watches sunset from the coast, it looks as if the sun is going to sink into the ocean. But is it really so? No, it is just how we see the world.

3. What are the boundaries of our knowledge?

Some world phenomena may be within the boundaries of our thought but beyond the limits of our knowledge. Because of contradictory descriptions of these phenomena, we cannot know which one of these descriptions is true. Some
phenomena of the world may even be beyond the limits of our thought. Consequently, we are unable to form comprehensible descriptions of them. For example, when one looks at the Hermann grid, how many triangles does he or she see? 3 or 6? How many triangles are actually there?

The answers to some of these questions are controversial. Rationalists and Empiricists, for instance, mainly differ on the answers to the second question. However, their disagreement on this topic leads them to give conflicting responses to the other questions as well. The following section is dedicated to a discussion of rationalism. Empiricism will not be discussed separately as it is the foundation of positivism. Positivism is discussed further on in this section.

**Rationalism**

Rationalists believe that some external world truths can and must be known *a priori*. They also believe that some of the ideas required for that knowledge are and must be innate and that this knowledge is superior to any one that can be attained with experience.

Rationalists embrace at least one of the following three theses: (1) The Intuition/Deduction thesis; (2) The Innate Knowledge thesis; and (3) The Innate Concept thesis.

*The Intuition/Deduction Thesis* postulates how we become warranted in believing propositions in a particular subject area. Some propositions in a particular subject area are known to us by intuition alone. For instance, if our child coughs we assume that he or she is sick. Unless a physician examines the child, our assumption can be said to be based merely on our intuition. Others, however, are known by being deduced from intuited propositions. Let’s take the case of somebody intuited that it is a hot day because it is sunny outside. Unless this person opens the window to verify this, it can be said that his knowledge of the weather is based on intuition. If as a result of this intuition, which can either right or wrong, this person dresses up lightly, it can be said that the decision to dress up in such a way was deduced from an intuited proposition.
Like the Intuition/Deduction thesis, *Innate Knowledge thesis* asserts the existence of knowledge gained *a priori*, independently of experience. However, these two theses differ in the understanding of how this *a priori* knowledge is acquired. The Intuition/Deduction thesis cites intuition and subsequent deductive reasoning. According to the Innate Knowledge thesis, however, our innate knowledge is not learned through either sense experience or intuition and deduction but is rather a part of our rational nature. In other words, it has been with us all along as it was gained in an earlier existence. For instance, how do we know that it snows in the winter? According to the Innate Knowledge theses, we know this as this knowledge was acquired by our ancestors and passed down from generation to generation.

In spite of the discord between these two theses, some rationalists claim that the Innate Concept thesis and the Innate Knowledge thesis are interrelated. In other words, a particular instance of knowledge can only be innate if the concepts that are contained in the known proposition are also innate.

Rationalists adopt at least one of the three abovementioned theses as they are essential to rationalism. Two other closely related theses are generally adopted by rationalists, although one can be considered a rationalist without adopting either one of them. The two theses are: (1) The indispensability of Reason Thesis; and (2) The superiority of Reason Thesis.

According to *The Indispensability of Reason thesis*, the knowledge we gain in a particular subject area by intuition and deduction, as well as the ideas and knowledge in the subject area that are innate to us, could not have been gained via sense experience.

According to *The Superiority of Reason thesis*, however, the knowledge we gain in a particular subject area by intuition and deduction and the ideas and knowledge in the subject area that are innate to us is transcendent to any knowledge gained by sense experience (Markie, 2008).

In sum, Rationalists believe that some external world truths can and must be known *a priori*. In addition, they believe that some of the ideas required for
that knowledge are and must be innate and that this knowledge is superb to any
one that can be acquired through experience. However, this epistemological
approach will not be adopted to the present work as the theses on which it is
based contradict the fundamentals of both quantitative and qualitative research.
That is to say, rationalism opposes the view that we can attain knowledge
through our senses (e.g. observing subjects of research to learn about their
behavior). Hence, other epistemological approaches that can possibly be adopted
to the present work will be evaluated.

Post-Modernism

Another epistemological approach that is evaluated is post-modernism.
Post-modernism is grounded in the conception that such phenomena as science,
knowledge, evidence and truth are social constructions. That is to say, scientific
practice does not achieve an approximate representational fit between the
content of scientific theories and reality (Boyd, 2010). In other words,
researchers cannot obtain objective truth as reality is a social (i.e. subjective)
construction. This implies that knowledge can only be acquired through
qualitative research methods (rather than quantitative research methods).
Quantitative research methods employ the same instrument (e.g. research
questionnaire) and don't enable researchers to examine a given phenomenon as it
is viewed by the subjects of research.

Constructionism

Similar to Post-Modernists, Constructionists argue that researchers' explanations of the social world are their constructions of social phenomena (i.e.
reality). When it is said that something is constructed it is meant that it is
essentially brought into existence by somebody's purposeful actions at a given
point in time. In other words, it is not there merely to be found or discovered
(Boghossian, 2006). Hence, when researchers report their research findings they
present a specific (subjective rather than an objective) version of social reality
(Bryman and Bell, 2007).
In the present work, however, constructs employed in previous research and which have been proven to be both reliable and valid will be adopted to the present work. Because existing scales will be employed, a quantitative rather than a qualitative research method is deemed more appropriate. Hence, both the constructionist and the post-modernist approaches to epistemology are deemed inadequate for this work.

The assumptions underlying both the constructionist and post-modernist approaches to epistemology have been contended by Postivists.

**Positivism**

Positivism is an epistemological approach according to which facts are not constructed by people but rather already exist and wait to be discovered. In other words, according to positivism there exists an objective reality that can be quantified (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Consequently and in stark contrast to Constructionists, Positivists favor quantitative rather than qualitative research methods (Steinmetz, 2005). The following five principles underpin positivism:

1. Only phenomena and knowledge verified by the senses can be considered knowledge.
2. The aim of theory is to generate hypotheses that can be tested (i.e. deductivism).
3. Facts lead to the generation of laws that, in turn, lead to knowledge (inductivism).
4. Scientific research must be conducted in an objective manner. Scientific statements and normative statement are clearly distinguishable. According to this principle the true domain of the scientist is the former since the latter cannot be confirmed by the senses.

Although both deductivism and inductivism are features of positivism, the former is more emphasized than the latter in this epistemological approach.

There are two versions to the positivist approach: Hard positivist ontology and the "softer" version of the positivist ontology (Hanson and Grimmer, 2007).
According to hard positivist ontology, the notion of objective reality is true and it can be epistemologically described with certain statistical levels of confidence (0.9, 0.95 or 0.99) by employing objectively-correct scientific methods.

The “softer” version of the positivist ontology is similar to the hard positivist ontology in all but two convictions. The two key arguments of the "softer" version are as follows: First, understanding reality with only a particular level of confidence does not allow for a true understanding of reality. Second, researchers’ understanding of the world is not objective and this needs to be taken into consideration. However, the “softer” version of ontology doesn’t reject the existence of reality.

In sum, several epistemological approaches have been discussed in this section. However, it was finally decided to adopt a positivist approach to the present study for a number of reasons. First, Gummesson (2005) argues that a qualitative, rather than a quantitative approach would be more appropriate in cases in which it is necessary to generate items for a particular study because existing scales are not appropriate to testing its hypotheses or answering its research questions.

Scale construction has been considered by the author of the present work but eventually rejected for a number of reasons. One reason is that the author's research model includes, amongst others, three constructs designed to measure various dimensions of consumer animosity (that is, general animosity, war animosity and economic animosity). Generating items for the war animosity construct, for example, would necessitate the author of this work to conduct in-depth interviews with Holocaust survivors and their families about the formers' experiences during WWII. This could cause unnecessary distress on the part of the interviewees. Thus, by using existing scales the author will avoid potential ethical issues that can emerge from scale construction in the present work.

The sensitivity of the present work has prompted the author to adapt existing scales rather than generate new ones. Hence, this work is deductive (principle # 2 in positivism). Thus, adopting the positivist approach (as opposed
to the constructivism, for example) to epistemology is deemed more appropriate by the author of this work.

Another reason why scale construction was rejected is because the construct validity, construct reliability and the discriminant validity of all the constructs employed in the current study were demonstrated by previous studies (Ang et al., 2004; Jung et al., 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002).

A positivists approach is also taken in the work because the underlying assumption of other epistemological approaches such as Rationalism is that that innate knowledge is superior to one that can be acquired with experience. That is to say, any sort of data collection technique employed in a research effort would be considered inferior by rationalists. Positivists, in contrast, argue that the only way that reality can be discovered is through our senses (that is, various data collection techniques).

Finally, the main principle of Postmodernism and Constructionism, for example, is that people’s perceptions of reality are their constructions of that reality. That is to say, reality is experienced subjectively. As a result, postmodernists and constructionists (as opposed to positivists) favor qualitative rather than quantitative research methods. However, the scales used in the present work have been adapted from previous studies. Hence, adopting a quantitative research methodology and thus a positivist approach to epistemology would be more appropriate for the present work.

In sum, this work has opted for the positivistic approach to investigating animosity as it will enable the researcher of the present work adopted existing scales to this work. The sensitivity of this work makes it crucial to adopt existing scales rather than develop new ones.

In the next section the researcher of this work discusses the various research designs employed in consumer behavior research. The researcher then justifies the adaption of one of these research designs to his work.
There are four types of research designs at the disposal of consumer behavior researchers: The experimental design, the case study design, the longitudinal design and the cross-sectional design (De Vaus, 2001). A review of the extant consumer behavior research reveals that the experimental design and the cross-sectional design are the two most common research designs employed in consumer behavior research (Churchill and Surprenant, 1982; Marchant and Ward, 2003; Srinivasan et al., 2004; Wang and Heitmeyer, 2006).

However, cross-sectional designs are more prevalent than experimental designs. Cross-sectional designs are employed in studies concerned with describing a particular situation in a given point in time. For example, cross-sectional designs have been employed in investigations designed to examine the affects of the country of origin on consumers’ perceptions of product quality and intentions to buy (Chattalas et al., 2008; Cordell, 1992; Gaedeke, 1973; Kaynak et al., 2000; Leonidou et al., 1999; Sadrudin et al., 2005; School, 1965).

Experimental designs, in contrast, are more appropriate to studies aimed at establishing causal relationships between pre-determined independent variables and a specified dependent variable (De Vaus, 2001). In other words, experimental research enables researchers to manipulate dependent variables and to establish causal direction (Hakim, 2000).

The main objective of the present work is to examine whether animosity affects consumers’ level of purchase involvement. To examine the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement, it would be necessary to manipulate consumers' level of animosity. Hence, it is more appropriate to adopt an experimental design rather than a cross-cultural design to the present work. The following section focuses on the two dimensions of experimental research (that is, control and impact) and how they can impact study results. Furthermore, the section discusses how researchers can balance the potential effects these dimensions can have on research findings so as to attain more reliable results.
Experimental Research

The experimental research design is employed in various fields of study (medicine, business administration, etc.). Experiments are suitable to studies concerned with establishing causal relationship between variables (Bryman and Bell, 2008). In the planning stages of every study, social psychologists find themselves in a situation where they need to balance two important but yet conflicting dimensions in experimental research: control and impact (Aronson et al., 2001). What follows is a discussion of these dimensions and how they can impact study results.

Control

Control refers to the extent to which a researcher is able to examine the effect of an independent variable on a dependent variable while keeping other possible extraneous variables (that is, predictors of the dependent variable) constant (Hakim, 2000).

An infinite number of factors may predict any given phenomenon in the social sciences (Hayek, 1994). Because it would be impossible to examine the impact of all the possible factors on the phenomenon in question, researchers must hold important extraneous variables constant (i.e. control them) while allowing factors that are considered less significant to vary at random (Cronbach, 1975; Lynch, 1982). These extraneous variables are held constant by measuring them and later employing them in manipulation checks in which statistical tools such as ANOVA and MANOVA are used to conduct post-hoc analyses so as to examine whether these variables account for any observed group differences (Amine and Shin, 2002; Leonidou et al., 2007; Mehrkens, 2000).

Thus, greater control over an experiment decreases the potential effects extraneous variables may have on the dependent variable in a given study. For example, consumers may buy a particular brand for different reasons. Some consumers may purchase a brand because of brand loyalty (Jensen and Hansen, 2006). And yet others buy certain brands because of price discounts (Scriven
Thus, if a researcher is interested in the effects of price discounts on brand-switching, for example, the only way he or she can ensure that any observed brand-switching can be attributed to price discounts and not to other extrinsic factors (brand loyalty, brand familiarity, etc.) is by controlling these extrinsic factors.

However, excessive control over an experiment could generate results that are statistically significant but yet weak. Consequently, the interpreter of these results is likely to draw erroneous conclusions. The following section discusses the sources of these errors and describes how they can be avoided.

**Sources or Error in Experimental Research**

There are two potential sources of error in experimental research: Random error and systematic error. Both sources of error are likely to stem from excessive control. However, understanding how these errors are likely to occur is an important step in minimizing their repercussions. Random error results from minor events (which can occur during an experiment) and subject variables (for example, age, intelligence, gender, income, marital status, familiarity with the product in question, etc.).

Minor events in an experiment can result from differences in stimuli to which subjects are exposed to. Random error resulting from minor events such as the one mentioned above can be minimized in two ways: (1) by subjecting individuals to exactly the same stimuli; (2) holding extraneous variables constant which also increases the statistical power of an analysis (Lynch, 1982).

In contrast to random error, systematic error is likely to result from the overrepresentation of a certain group of subjects in a single experimental condition. If, for example, all consumers familiar with a product stimuli employed in a study are assigned to the experimental group and those not familiar with it are assigned to the control group, any differences in perceptions of quality, for example, would be attributed to systematic error.

If, however, all subjects are assigned to the two groups (i.e. experimental group and control group) at random, then any differences in
perception resulting from familiarity with the product stimuli, for example, would be balanced out. That is to say, if familiarity were to affect perceptions of quality it would do so in both experimental conditions and thereby produce random rather than systematic error. This would prevent the researcher from concluding that familiarity with the product stimuli has an impact on evaluations of product quality when in fact it does not.

In the present study systematic error will be minimized by randomly assigning subjects to either a control group or an experimental group. The participants in the present study may avoid buying German products for various reasons. For example, some Jewish consumers may boycott German products because they think that this what society expects of them. Others may avoid buying German products merely because they are expensive.

Because factors such as product price, social pressure and other potential factors are not measured in the present work, their potential effect on product choice cannot be assessed. Thus, the potential effect of these factors on research subjects will be balanced out by randomly assigning subjects to the experimental and control group. This, in turn, will prevent the researcher from falsely concluding that subjects avoid buying German products because of these extraneous variables rather than because they harbour feelings of animosity toward Germany.

Impact

The second dimension of experimental research is impact. Impact (also referred to as experimental realism) occurs when subjects believe in, are forced to attend to and take seriously the experiment in which they participate. Subjects must find the experiment in which they participate relevant if it is to have a stronger impact on their responses. Consumer behaviour researchers have increased the impact of their studies by including products which are relevant to or frequently used by their subjects of research (Hui, 2003; Srivastan, 2004; Ulgado and Lee, 1998). The more realistically an experiment is perceived to be, the greater impact it will have on subjects. However, greater the level of impact, the lower the level of control possessed by a researcher (Aronson, 1990).
In the main study of this work, impact will be increased by means of two ways: (1) exposing subjects to real advertisements which have been modified to enable the researcher to test the study’s hypothesis; (2) employing product attributes consumers consider most important when buying refrigerators and shower gels.

A further important issue is whether subjects should be requested to assess all levels of the independent variables (within subject design) or just one of the levels (between subjects design).

With-in Subjects Designs versus Between Subjects Designs

The research methods literature distinguishes between two experimental research designs: *with-in subjects designs* and *between subjects designs*. Within subject design subjects are exposed to all levels of the independent variable/s, whereas the use of between subject designs exposes every subject to one of many levels.

A sound example of a within subject design is Srinivasan, Jain and Sikand's (2004) study which was aimed at investigating the impact of branding country and manufacturing country on assessment of product quality. Their subjects were required to evaluate three versions of a single product. In contrast, Biswas et al. (2006) have adopted a between subjects design. In their study they have used print advertisements so as to determine the effects of low-price guarantees on pre-purchase assessments of product quality and search intentions and shopping intentions. Every subject was exposed to a single version of the advertisement.

Between subjects designs have several advantages. First, they do not result in learning and contamination (LaTour and Miniard, 1983). Learning and contamination are situations in which subjects' response may be biased because they have learned what is expected of them. Learning and contamination are more likely to occur when researchers expose study participants to more than one experimental condition (i.e. within-subject designs).
Second, they are less likely to lead to order effects or carry-over effects (Keppel, 1973). Order effects or carry over effects occur when the order in which advertisements are presented to consumers impacts their response (Bergkvist and Rossiter, 2007).

Third, they significantly decrease the chances that any given subject will guess the purpose of research, since subjects are not requested to evaluate different versions of a single product. Hence, demand effects\(^1\) are less likely to occur (Crane, 1996).

*The Design of the Main Study*

The present work is based on an experimental between subjects research design. The aim of the main study in this work is to examine whether animosity impacts consumers' level of purchase involvement. In order to examine this relationship it would necessary to manipulate animosity. Animosity was manipulated in a previous study with a statement about the trade relationship between the U.S and France (Russell and Russell, 2006). In particular, economic animosity was manipulated as the items employed to measure this construct focus on the trade relations between countries.

As the present work is conducted in the context of the Holocaust, which occurred during WWII, it is more likely to produce feelings that are associated with war animosity rather than economic animosity. The fact that Russell and Russell (2006) manipulated economic animosity rather than war animosity leads to two research design issues in the present work: (1) Whether the statement employed by Russell and Russell should be modified so as to enable the researcher of the present work to manipulate ‘war animosity’ rather than ‘economic animosity’ and (2) if the statement is modified, will the manipulation of ‘war animosity’ be successful if Holocaust survivors were to be included in the sampling frame?

War animosity has not been manipulated in previous research. Doing so

---

Demand effects occur when subjects guess a studies hypothesis and as a result provide answers which they deem to be consistent with the researcher's hypothesis

\(^1\)
in the present study is, therefore, risky as there is a chance that the manipulation of war animosity would prove to be invalid and/or produce unreliable results. Hence, the decision is not to manipulate war animosity.

As to the second question, this researcher contends that manipulating ‘war animosity’ may not prove to be successful with Jewish consumers as feelings of animosity tend to be deep-rooted and difficult to change. The extant literature clearly demonstrates that war animosity is likely to have long term effects on consumer behavior (Abraham et al., 2003; Klein et al., 1998; Podeshen, 2005). South Korea, for example, is accusing Japan of committing war atrocities between 1910 and 1945. As a result Japanese cars are banned in South Korea. In addition, theaters and television stations can’t present Japanese plays of films. Furthermore, radio stations are forbidden to play Japanese songs (International Herald Tribune, 1998).

Consequently, manipulating war animosity with Jewish consumers would be an attempt to change deeply-rooted feelings and most likely upset and perhaps even irritating to them. This would be unethical to do.

Hence, the experimental design for this work will consist of a manipulation of economic animosity rather than war animosity. Economic animosity will be manipulated with a statement adapted from Russell and Russell (2006). The statement will provide research subjects with information about the current trade relations between Germany and Israel (see Appendix 6).

Adopting Russell and Russell's (2006) statement to the context of the Jewish-German relations is likely to be successful for two reasons. First, Israel is a small economy which is dominated by imports and Germany is one of Israel’s most important trade partners (CBS, 2008). LeVine and Campbell (1972) suggest that when a country is dependent on imports it is likely that its citizens will harbour feelings of economic animosity towards its dominant exporter or exporters.

Second, Nijssen and Douglas' (2004) study suggests that economic animosity could have a more significant impact on Jewish consumers as
memories of the Holocaust are likely to increase their level of economic animosity toward Germany. Thus, it is likely that economic animosity and war animosity are interrelated and learning if ‘economic animosity’ affects purchase involvement would at least allow us to hypothesize how ‘war animosity’ is related to purchase involvement.

Despite the fact that economic animosity rather than war animosity will be manipulated in the present research, both war animosity and economic animosity will be included in the research questionnaire. This will enable the researcher to assess the relationship between these constructs and purchase involvement with structural equation modeling.

**Sampling Technique**

Researchers that have investigated consumer behavior have collected data in various ways: mail surveys (Bearden and Shimp, 1982; Churchill and Suprenant, 1982; Gehrt and Yan, 2004; Kim, 2005; Klein, 2002), the mall-intercept method (Ben-Mrad, 2008; Broderick, 2007; Chao et al., 2005; Klein et al., 1998; Kustin, 1993; Leonidou et al., 2007; Lockshin et al., 1997; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Okechuku, 1994; Quester and Smart, 1998; Ruvio et al., 2008; Shoham and Makovek, 2003; Shoham et al., 2006), door-to-door interviews (Ang et al., 2004; Miquel et al., 2002), telephone interviews (Crane, 1996), on-line surveys (Chernev, 2006), a combination of both surveys and interviews (Podoshen, 2005), and the drop off/pick up technique (Alain and Sadrudin, 1999; Ettensohn and Klein, 2005; Heslop et al., 1998; Laroche et al., 2003; Wang and Lamb, 1980).

The aim of this section is to discuss several potential data collection methods and to justify the decision to employ one of these methods in this work. Noteworthy is the fact that while reviewing the various data collection methods employed in previous consumer behaviour studies, the uniqueness of the present work guided the final choice of a study method. Furthermore, the unique contexts of this research (that is, the UK and Israel) may necessitate the researcher to adopt a different data collection method for every country.
The first data collection technique considered was the mail survey. As it is the case with every data collection method, mail surveys have their advantages and disadvantages. There are several advantages to this data collection technique. Firstly, in comparison to conducting interviews, they are cheaper and take less time to administer (Anonymous, 1987). Secondly, mail surveys are more convenient to respondents as they can complete the questionnaires at a convenient time and at their own pace. Finally, the interviewer is not present while respondents fill out the questionnaire thereby eliminating potential interviewer effects which can bias respondents’ responses (Bryman and Bell, 2007).

However, mail surveys suffer from several limitations. First, the researcher cannot provide assistance to respondents should they be in need of it. In other words, should a question be unclear, the researcher will not be around to explain it to the respondent. In such a case a respondent might either leave an unclear question unanswered or interpret the question differently than is expected.

Second, the researcher cannot probe if it is necessary for the respondent to provide a detailed response. Third, some respondents may avoid answering some of the questions either because they think that these are irrelevant, unimportant to them, etc.

Moreover, respondents may answer the questions in any order they desire. In some studies the order of the questions is intended to avoid response biases. It is crucial that in the current investigation subjects answer the questions in the order in which they appear. The order of the questions in the questionnaire has two purposes: (1) to provide the conditions to test the main hypothesis of this study (i.e. animosity has an effect on purchase involvement); (2) to minimize the likelihood that subjects will guess the study’s purpose.

Another disadvantage of mail surveys is that when questionnaires are mailed to respondents, the researcher does not have control over who completes them. It is essential that all the subjects taking part in the present work be Jewish. Hence, if data is to be collected via the mail, there is no way that the
researcher can be sure that non-Jewish individuals have not completed the questionnaires.

Furthermore, there is a greater chance of ‘respondent fatigue’ and as a result a large number of incomplete questionnaires. In addition, response rates are low in mail surveys unless an incentive of some sort is offered to respondents (Bryman and Bell, 2007). The abovementioned disadvantages associated with mail surveys probably explains why they are rarely used in consumer behaviour research (Gehrt and Yan, 2004; Kim, 2005).

Finally, in the case of mail surveys one cannot be sure that subjects will complete a questionnaire alone in the absence of anybody’s presence. It is important that subjects taking part in the present study complete the questionnaires free of any social pressures.

In sum, the author finds the mail survey sampling technique inappropriate for the purposes of the present study. Hence, this sampling technique will not be employed to collect data for the main study.

The author also considered employing the mall-intercept method to collect data for the present study. There are several advantages to this data collection method. First, in contrast to mail surveys, the investigator has control over who completes the questionnaire. Second, the researcher is around to provide any assistance respondents may need when completing the questionnaire.

However, there are several downsides to this approach. First, malls are noisy places which would make it difficult for subjects to concentrate and seriously consider the various questions in the questionnaire. Second, people in malls are busy shopping or rush in and out quickly which would make it difficult to obtain a large enough sample who would take the time to answer all of the questions in the questionnaire. That is to say, response rate is likely to be low.

Despite the two disadvantages associated with the mall-intercept method,
this researcher has opted to employ it to collect data in Israel. In an effort to obtain reliable results the researcher will elicit consumers as they exit shops. However, the mall-intercept method will not be employed to collect data in the UK. Not every customer exiting an electronics store in the UK will be Jewish even if subjects are sampled in Jewish neighborhoods. The researcher will attempt to overcome the potential obstacles of this method in the following manner: The author will overcome the first obstacle by giving subjects the option to take the questionnaire home and return it to the researcher by post. The second obstacle will be surmounted by offering potential subjects a reward (i.e. participating in a draw for a digital camera).

Because the author of this work has decided against using the mall-intercept to collect data in the UK, the drop off/pick up technique was also considered. When employing this technique the researcher goes door to door and *drops off* questionnaires at people’s homes and either waits for them to fill out the questionnaire on the spot or leaves it with them and *picks up* the questionnaires at a later time. Alternatively, the researcher can leave a pre-posted envelope and once the questionnaire has been filled out it can be sent to the investigator.

This data collection method has several advantages. First, in contrast to mail surveys, response rates obtained with the drop off/pick up sampling technique are relatively high (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2004; Kaynak and Kara, 2001; Laroche et al., 2005; Wang and Lamb, 1980). Second, this technique is convenient to subjects as they can complete the questionnaire at a convenient time.

This benefit does come with a price. One disadvantage of this data collection technique is that it takes time to administer as the researcher needs to go from door to door to administer the questionnaires. Another disadvantage is that if the questionnaires are left with respondents, the researcher loses control over who completes the questionnaire (i.e. a Jewish respondent over the age of 18) and how it is done (e.g. in the presence of other people or alone). It is crucial that everyone in the sample to be Jewish. Although there are several drawbacks
associated with this sampling technique, at least some of them can be overcome.

It is virtually impossible to overcome the first disadvantage. However, it is possible to circumvent the second and third disadvantages. The researcher will overcome this disadvantage by waiting for subjects to complete the questionnaires. This will give him greater control over who completes the questionnaire and how it is done.

Field Work Design: Stage 1 – Pilot Studies

Prior to collecting data for the main study, the researcher conducted several pilot studies. In particular, the present work comprises of four pilot studies in addition to the main study. What follows is a concise discussion of the four pilot studies. These pilot studies are discussed in full detail in the next chapter (Chapter 5).

Pilot Study # 1

The purpose of the first pilot study was to learn from Israeli consumers what country they harbor feelings of animosity towards, if any. This pilot study was conducted in response to Riefler and Diamantopoulos’ (2007) critique of consumer animosity studies. Riefler and Diamantopoulos are critical of consumer animosity researcher for having assumed what country their respondent harbor feelings of animosity towards.

80 Israeli consumers were interviewed in the study. The interviews consisted of two main parts. Demographic data was collected in the first part of the interview. The second part of the interview consisted of a single question asking respondents to express their preferences for ten countries. Germany was the least preferred country by the majority of respondents.

Pilot Study # 2

The results of the first pilot study demonstrate that the majority of study participants prefer Germany the least. Thus, the main study of this work will be conducted in the context of the Holocaust.
The first aim of this pilot study is to determine what other foreign country (besides Germany) should be used as a proxy for an additional COO cue in the experiment. Finding another COO proxy is essential as animosity becomes as determinant of consumer behavior when consumers' choice set consists of products from at least two foreign countries. In addition, COO effects are moderated by perceptions of product quality (Al-Sulaiti and Baker, 1998). It is, therefore, critical that the two countries employed as COO proxies are perceived to be equal in the quality of the products they produce. This was determined by requesting subjects in this pilot study to provide assessments of the images of three foreign countries, namely, Japan, Germany and the USA.

The main objective of the main study is to examine whether animosity impact consumers' level of purchase involvement. Hence, another purpose of this pilot study was to examine whether economic animosity can be manipulated. 23 consumers were randomly assigned to the high animosity treatment (i.e. experimental group) while 20 consumers were assigned to the low animosity treatment (i.e. control group).

In order to test whether the effect of animosity on purchase involvement depend on product type (low involvement vs. high involvement), the product stimuli employed in the main study are shower gels and refrigerators. Thus the third and final objective of this pilot study was to determine which one of the products is associated with low purchase involvement and which product is associated with high purchase involvement.

The mall-intercept method was used to collect data for this pilot study. Consumers were solicited in a central location in the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area. 43 of the 80 consumers solicited agreed to participate in the study.

Pilot Study # 3

The main objective of the main study in the present work is to examine whether animosity impacts on purchase involvement. Because feelings of animosity can only be triggered when an individual is exposed to COO cues, it is the main informational cue that this study is concerned with. As a result, the
products employed in the main study will be identical in all features but their COO cues. However, research subjects are likely to guess the aim of the investigation if only a single product cue is employed (Bilkey and Nes, 1982; Sawyer, 1975). In order to minimize the likelihood that study participants will guess the aim of the present work, other product information will be included in the product advertisements presented to consumers with the COO cue.

Thus, this pilot study was conducted in order to decide what other product attributes to employ in the present work. The mall-intercept method was used to collect data with consumers solicited in a central location in the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area. The location was chosen because it is frequented by consumers from all across the country. 100 of the 151 consumers solicited agreed to participate in the study.

Pilot Study # 4

Pilot study 4 had several objectives. The first objective was to explore whether animosity in fact affects purchase involvement. For this purpose study subjects were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions: low animosity experimental condition (i.e. control group) and to a high animosity experimental condition (i.e. the experimental group). The second aim was to examine the reliability of the constructs employed in the main study. The final purpose was to pre-test the questionnaire to be used in the main study.

Data was collected during the winter of 2009/2010 using the mall-intercept method. 100 out of the 176 elicited for participation have agreed to take part in the study (response rate: 57%).

What follows is a concise description of the main study conducted by the author of the present work.
Field Work Design: Stage 2 - The Main Study

The main study is a cross-cultural investigation conducted in two countries, namely, Israel and the UK. The study is a 2 economic animosity (high vs. low) * 2 product type (shower gel vs. refrigerator) * 3 COO (Israel, USA, Germany) between subjects design. Thus, all in all, the study consists of 12 experimental conditions. Subjects were assigned to each of the experimental conditions on a random basis. All subjects were given a copy of a fictitious advertisement for either refrigerators or shower gels each of which includes three alternatives that are identical in all attributes but the COO information.

In Israel, data was collected from June 21 to June 24, 2010. The mall-intercept method was employed to collect data for this study. A convenience sample of 325 consumers were elicited for participation in the study as they exited electric appliance stores and supermarkets in three central locations across Israel. 240 consumers agreed to take part in the study (response rate = 73.8%).

In the UK data was collected between 28 June 2010 and 2 July 2010 using the drop off/pick up sampling technique. Members of the Jewish community were sampled based on convenience. All in all 100 out of the 161 questionnaires handed out (response rate = 62%) were returned. The questionnaires were handed out to the members of the Jewish community in four places: (1) in a falafel shop; (2) London Jewish Family Centre; (3) Yeshivas; (4) Golders Green.

In sum, all in all 100 British-Jews and 240 Israeli-Jews agreed to take part in the study. Overall, 340 of the 486 questionnaire that were handed out to consumers in both the UK and Israel were returned (response rate = 70%).

The next chapter provides a detailed account of the pilot studies discussed in the present chapter. The pilot studies are discussed in a separate chapter due the number of pilot studies conducted and the wish of the author to separate the discussion of the pilot studies from the discussion of the main study.
Chapter Summary

This work consists of four pilot studies and a main study that was conducted in the UK and Israel. This chapter initiated with a discussion of the various epistemological approaches to studying social phenomena. The author, then, justified the decision to adopt the positivist approach to this work. Next, the author discussed the various study designs and justified the adoption of an experimental between-subjects design to his work. Then, the author briefly discussed each one of the four pilot studies that were conducted prior to the main study. Finally, the author briefly discussed the main study. Instrument development and the pilot testing undertaken in this work are discussed in greater detail in chapter 5. The main study is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6.
Chapter 5: Instrument Development and Pilot Testing

The present chapter commences with a discussion of the instrument design. This is followed by an in-depth discussion of the pilot studies conducted in this work.

Questionnaire Design

There are two ways of designing research questionnaires: the horizontal format and the vertical format (Bryman and Bell, 2007). In the horizontal format the answers are presented horizontally while in the vertical format they are presented vertically (see FIGURE 11).

Despite the fact that the horizontal format takes up a lot of space it is frequently used in consumer behaviour research (Herstein and Tifferet, 2007; Ruvio et al., 2008). This may be so because fitting a range of values one below the other is likely to confuse subjects/respondents (Bryman and Bell, 2007). In line with previous studies, all questions but the demographic questions included in the questionnaire used in the present study will be formatted horizontally (Herstein and Tifferet, 2007; Ruvio et al., 2008).

FIGURE 11. The Horizontal and Vertical Format in Questionnaire Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Format</th>
<th>Horizontal Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your marital status?</td>
<td>What is your marital status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Married</td>
<td>A. married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Divorced</td>
<td>B. divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Widowed</td>
<td>C. widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Single</td>
<td>D. single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following constructs comprise the author's research model: purchase involvement, consumer ethnocentrism, evaluation of product quality, consumer animosity, and product choice. In line with previous, the following constructs: purchase involvement, consumer ethnocentrism, product quality and product choice were operationalized in a culture-free (that is, etic) manner. In contrast, the animosity constructs (i.e. general animosity, war animosity and economic
animosity) were operationalized in a culture-specific (that is, emic) manner to reflect Israel's unique historical relationship with Germany (Klein, 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Shin, 2001).

The questionnaire employed in the present study comprises three sections. The order of the questions is identical in all of questionnaires used in every one of the 12 experimental treatments.

The validity, reliability and the discriminant validity of all the constructs employed in the questionnaire employed in the present study were demonstrated by previous studies (Ang et al., 2004; Jung et al., 2002; Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002). The questionnaire consists of 7-point Likert scales ranging from 1-“strongly disagree” to 7 – “strongly agree”.

Noteworthy is that in at least one previous study respondents were asked to indicate the degree with which they "AGREE" with several statements (Podoshen, 2005). This manner of asking a question is likely to produce subject bias. When subjects are asked to express the extent with which they agree with a particular statement, it might signal to them that they are expected to agree with it. This is likely to lead to demand artifacts. In other words, subjects will provide the answers that they think the author expects them to give. These demand artifacts are likely to have dire consequences on research validity. In order to minimize potential subject bias, the researcher of the present study requested subjects to express the extent to which they agree or disagree with every statement throughout the questionnaire.

Likert scales will be employed to measure the following six concepts: Purchase involvement, product quality, consumer ethnocentrism, animosity towards Germany in general (second order construct), war animosity (first order construct), and economic animosity (first order construct). Hence, higher ratings point to: (1) more positive product judgments; (2) greater ethnocentrism; (3) greater levels of animosity; and (4) a higher level of purchase involvement.

The items employed in the present work have been modified to the particular context of this cross-cultural study. However, in general, the wording
of the items used to collect data in Israel and in the UK will be identical. The researcher of the present work argues that making modifications to the items for each country is unnecessary as they are general enough to be suitable to both contexts.

However, the items comprising the CETSCALE will be adapted to the context of each country (see FIGURE 12). The items comprising the CETSCALE measure consumers' attitudes towards purchasing domestically made products. Therefore, slight contextual modifications would be necessary when the scale is adapted to various countries.

FIGURE 12. CETSCALE in Israel Vs. CETSCALE in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CETSCALE in Israeli Study</th>
<th>CETSCALE in UK Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only those products that are unavailable in Israel should be imported.</td>
<td>Only those products unavailable in the UK should be imported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Israeli products, first, last and foremost.</td>
<td>UK products, first, last and foremost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purchasing foreign-made products is un-Israeli.</td>
<td>Purchasing foreign-made products is un-British.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products because it puts Israelis out of jobs.</td>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products because it puts Britons out of jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A real Israeli should always buy Israeli-made products.</td>
<td>A real Briton should always buy products made in the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We should purchase products</td>
<td>We should purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manufactured in Israel instead of letting other countries get rich off of us.</td>
<td>products manufactured in the UK instead of letting other countries get rich off of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Israelis should not buy foreign products, because this hurts business and causes unemployment.</td>
<td>Britons should not buy foreign products, because this hurts business and causes unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It may cost me in the long run but I prefer to support Israeli products.</td>
<td>It may cost me in the long run but I prefer to support UK products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country.</td>
<td>We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Israeli consumers who purchase products made in other countries are responsible for putting their fellow Israelis out of work.</td>
<td>British consumers who purchase products made in other countries are responsible for putting their fellow Britons out of work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire employed in this work will be comprised of three sections. Each section will consist of several parts. In Section I, Part A subjects' level of purchase level will be measured. An adapted version of Mittal’s (1995) Purchase Decision Involvement scale will be employed to measure subjects’ purchase involvement when buying refrigerators/shower gels. Familiarity with
the product under investigation is recognized as a potentially significant external variable which can potentially impact observed differences between variables.

Therefore, previous studies have controlled for the possible confounding effects of familiarity by first measuring it and then employing ANOVA tests to determine whether there are differences between subjects resulting from variations in familiarity (Biehal et al., 1992; Hui and Zhou, 2003; Torres et al., 2007). Subjects’ familiarity with refrigerators/shower gels will be measured in Section I, Part B with a 7 point scale ranging from 1 - I don’t know very much about products from Germany/the USA to 7 – I know very much about products from Germany/the USA (Flyn, 1993).

Economic animosity will be manipulated in Section II, Part A with a statement about the current trade relations between Germany and Israel adapted from Russell and Russell (2006). One of the aims of Pilot study # 2 will be to examine whether the statement can be successfully adapted to the context of this work. The purpose of the experimental manipulation is to examine the potential effects of animosity on purchase involvement by triggering subjects' memory of the German – Jewish history.

Animosity was manipulated in a previous study (Russell and Russell, 2006). The aim of Russell and Russell's study was to examine the potential effects of the tense political and economic animosity between America and France on movie choices. Animosity was manipulated via two scenarios: High animosity and low animosity. Both scenarios were manipulated with a short statement about the current trade relations between the two countries. High animosity was manipulated by stating that, as always, trade relations between the two countries are tense. Low animosity was manipulated by stating that trade relations have improved.

Therefore, in the present study, subjects assigned to the experimental condition in which a positive statement is given about the trade relations between Germany and Israel will comprise the control group while those assigned to the negative economic animosity condition (i.e. high economic animosity) will comprise the experimental group. Subjects will be assigned to
the control group and the experimental group on a random basis. The purpose of assigning subjects to the two groups at random is to control for the possible impact of demographics (i.e. marital status, gender, income and education) on the outcomes.

In Section II, Part B, subjects will be requested to express their agreement or disagreement with five items used to measure economic animosity. This construct has been adapted from Klein (1998). The items are measured on a 7 point scale (1 - strongly disagree to 7 – strongly agree). The objective of measuring economic animosity following its manipulation is to determine when the manipulation was successful. That is to say, if subjects assigned to experimental condition score relatively higher on the economic animosity scale than those assigned to the control group, then it may be concluded that the manipulation did achieve its purpose.

In section II, Part C, subjects will be introduced to a purchase scenario. The questionnaire includes two purchase scenarios and 12 experimental conditions. Subjects will be randomly assigned to the experimental conditions. In six experimental conditions subjects will be requested to choose one of three alternatives of a refrigerator (one purchase scenario). In the other six experimental conditions, however, subjects will be requested to choose one of three alternatives of a shower gel (a second purchase scenario).

The choice of product attributes used in the advertisements will be based on the results of pilot study # 3. To examine the potential effect of single attribute (i.e. COO) on purchase involvement, it would be necessary to keep all other product attributes constant (Biswas et al., 2006). Similar to previous research, the only product cue that will be allowed to vary (in both cases) in the study is the COO cue (Lee et al., 2005). The order of the products and their attributes will be randomized so to avoid potential bias to order effects (Li and Wyer, 1994; Xue, 2008).

An order effect is said to occur when the order in which the product attributes or the products themselves affect consumers’ responses. It is common practice to rotate the order of the product stimuli in experimental research so as
to avoid the potential impact of order on subjects’ responses (Xue, 2008). Research shows that the effect of COO cues, for example, depends upon whether they appear first or last (Pecotich and Ward, 2007).

Subjects will be provided with the following information about the purchase scenarios. First, subjects will be asked to imagine that they are planning to buy a refrigerator (in one scenario) or a shower gel (in another scenario). Furthermore, in order to increase experimental realism, subjects will be asked to make the utmost effort to treat the task as if they were really shopping for a refrigerator/shower gel and plan to buy the product. They will also be told to take their time to examine the three alternatives of the refrigerator or shower gel depicted in the advertisement.

Furthermore, study participants will also be asked to assume that money is not important so as to minimize the potential effect product price and time pressures could have on purchase involvement. It is important to isolate all the factors but economic animosity that could potentially increase consumers’ involvement in the purchase scenario. After reading the scenario subjects will be asked to choose one of three alternatives of a refrigerator or shower gel displayed in an advertisement. In order to examine whether the statement about the current trade relations between Germany and Israel has an impact on purchase involvement, subjects will be asked to consider the statement that they have read about the trade relations between Germany and Israel.

For the type of study conducted here there are basically two ways of presenting products to consumers. One way is to instruct subject/study participants to picture a product. This approach has been adopted by Klein (2002) in an attempt to exam the effects of animosity on actual product choice. Klein instructed study participants to “picture the same product made by two different countries. It is important that you are picturing a product where the brands are equal across all aspects of the product including price, quality and styling. For each statement please indicate the likelihood of buying this product manufactured from the first country compared only to this product manufactured from the second country” (pg. 363).
The methodology used by Klein (2002) from one limitation: the researcher has no control over what particular product respondents have pictured in their minds. Thus, it is quite likely that different respondents will “picture” products from dissimilar product classes and product categories. This will compromise the ability to compare the data elicited from all respondents. Even if respondents are told that the products are similar in all but a particular attribute (e.g. the COO cue), one cannot be completely sure that consumers have taken other attributes (not mentioned by the researcher) into consideration when choosing among products or evaluating the quality of products (Bilkey and Nes, 1982).

Some researchers argue that studies that employ such verbal product descriptions produce unreliable results. Peterson and Jolibert (1995), for one, have conducted a meta-analysis of the COO literature. Their findings indicate that the stimulus context (i.e. using real products as opposed to verbally describing them) moderates the impact COO cues have on assessments of product quality and willingness to buy.

Another way of presenting product to subjects is by displaying product attributes to consumers in a fictitious advertisement. Dhar (1997), for example, displayed three versions of a single product (one on the right side of the picture, one on the left side and one at the bottom) which only differed in the product attributes being manipulated. Similarly, Lee et al. (2005) examined how situational and enduring involvement affects the processing of product information including COO cues. For that purpose they have designed two advertisements. The product stimulus in both advertisements was a laptop. The laptops look so identical in both advertisements that it is as if it is actually the same laptop used in both advertisements. Both advertisements included identical product information about the laptop (e.g. memory, warrant, weight, etc.).

Both Dhar’s and Lee, Yun and Lee’s (2005) method of displaying their product stimuli gives a more realistic impression than the method used by Klein (2002). However, similar to Lee et al. (2005), the present study is concerned with the effects of single cue, namely, COO on purchase involvement. Thus, the idea behind the advertisement used in Lee, Yun and Lee’s (2005) study will be
adapted to the advertisement employed in the present study.

After having made their choice, subjects’ purchase involvement with refrigerators/shower gels will be measured again (Section II, Part D). During the repeat measurement subjects’ purchase involvement will also be measured with an adapted version of Mittal’s (1995) Purchase Decision Involvement scale. The purpose of measuring subjects’ purchase involvement once before the experimental manipulation and again after they have made their product choice is to ensure that the experimental manipulation was in fact successful. In other words, it would allow the researcher to determine whether the manipulation of animosity impacts consumers’ level of purchase involvement. Subjects’ level of involvement is expected to increase more significantly among subjects assigned to experimental conditions 2 and 4 (shower gels) than among subjects in experimental conditions 1 and 3 (refrigerators).

This expectation is based on two assumptions. The first one is that consumers tend to be more involved with the purchase of high ticket items (Kwon, 1990). Hence, subjects are expected to be more involved with the purchase of refrigerators. The second assumption is based on the hypothesis that the level of purchase involvement will be higher for those subjects that have been assigned to the high animosity experimental condition (Shankarmahesh, 2006).

In Section III, Part A and Part B, subjects' assessment of the quality of German and American products will be measured using 6 items adapted from Klein et al. (1998) which were originally developed by Darling and Arnold (1988), and Darling and Wood (1990). Measures of perceptions of the quality of both German and American products were adapted from previous studies (Darling and Arnold, 1988; Darling and Wood, 1990; Wood and Darling, 1993). The measures of assessments of product quality comprise of the following 6 aspects: workmanship, technological advancement, quality, reliability, design, and value for money.

Consumer ethnocentrism will be measured in Section III, Part C using a shorter (i.e. 10 out of 17 items) version of the CETSCALE developed by Shimp.
and Sharma (1987). General animosity and war animosity are measured in Section III, Part D and E, respectively. Both constructs are measured with scales adapted from Klein (2002). All of the constructs that have been adapted to the present paragraph are based on 7 point scales ranging from 1 - strongly disagree to 7 – strongly agree.

The order of the questions in the questionnaire is designed to ensure that subjects’ responses will not be biased. Attitudes toward Germany will be measured after the product choice stage of the experiment and after purchase decision involvement is measured. If attitudes toward Germany were to be measured first, they would have probably biased subjects’ product choice. In addition, it may have biased them against choosing German products probably because of guessing the study’s purpose.

The general animosity and war animosity constructs will only be used to measure animosity towards Germany. Subjects’ assessment of product quality, however, will be measured in relation to both American and German products. This is in contrast to most previous studies which have inquired about assessments of product quality toward the country the researchers assume to be the target of animosity (Hinck, 2004; Klein et al. (1998); Klein and Ettenson, 1999; Nijssen, 2004; Rice and Wongtada, 2007; Shoham et al., 2007).

There are several reasons for deciding to measure consumers’ assessment of the products manufactured both by Germany and the U.S. First, while there is no history of animosity between the U.S. and Israel, Jewish consumers seem to believe that Germany should be boycotted for its role in the murder of more than five million Jews during WWII (Podoshen, 2005).

Second, demand effects are one of the major concerns of consumer behaviour researchers. Demand effects occur when subjects of research guess a study’s aim or hypotheses. The majority of studies that have examined the effects of animosity on consumer behaviour seem to have been less careful with potential demand effects (Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002; Shin, 2001; Shoham et al., 2006). These studies measured consumers’ perceptions of the quality of products made by the country towards which
animosity is suspected.

Klein et al. (1998), for example, measured Chinese consumers’ perception of Japanese products. The answers provided by consumers in Klein, Ettensohn and Morris’ study may have been somewhat biased. This bias, if it in fact existed, may have resulted from the fact that the assessment of product quality construct was measured in relation only to a single country (Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002). Inquiring about consumers’ attitudes toward a single country may have provided a hint to respondents as to the study’s purpose which in turn biased their responses. Therefore, the author of the current study argues that measuring subjects’ assessment of the quality of both American and German products will make it more difficult for them to guess what the true goal of the study is.

In line with the majority of the studies that have examined the effects of animosity on consumer behaviour, demographic data will be collected at the end of the study, namely, in Section III, Part F (Ben Mrad, 2008; Shin, 2002; Ishii, 2009; Klein, 2002; Podoshen, 2008). Section III, Part F in the research questionnaire consists of six questions. The first question inquires about subjects’ gender. The second question inquires about their marital status while the third one is intended to classify subjects into one of six age groups (i.e. 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56 – 65, 66 and above). The purpose of the fourth question is to learn about subjects’ level of education. Consumers’ level of animosity and ethnocentrism will in all likelihood vary with their age, gender and level of education (Ishii, 2009). It is, therefore, important to control for these demographic variables.

The fifth question in Section III, Part A inquires about subjects' level of income. Consumer behavior researchers in Israel measure income in one of the following two ways. One way they do this is by asking subjects/respondents whether their income is much below the national average (roughly 8000 NIS or $2000 US), below average, average, above average or much above average (Herstein and Tifferet, 2007). Another way they do it by asking subjects/respondents whether their income is below the national average, at the average, or above average (Shoham and Makovek, 2003; Shoham and Makovek,
The author argues that the second way of measuring income is less likely to be confusing to subjects than the first way. The first way is likely to be confusing to subjects because of the difficulty that some subjects may have in understanding what much below average and much above average actually means. As a result, it was decided against adopting it to the present investigation.

Average income is not assessed in the same way in every country. In the UK, for example, The British Office for National Statistics distinguishes between average income before housing costs and average income after housing costs. However, Israel's Central Bureau of Statistics only reports average incomes before housing costs. Because the researcher of this study may wish to compare income data obtained from both countries, subjects in the UK will be requested to indicate whether their average monthly income (before housing costs) is below the national average, at the average or above average.

According to the British Office for National Statistics, the average income before housing costs in the UK is £487 per week or £1948 per month or about $3000 U.S (The Office for National Statistics, 2009). In contrast, in Israel, the average income in 2009 was 8131 NIS or roughly $2000 U.S. (CBS, 2009). Finally, the sixth question asks about subjects’ occupation.

Cross Cultural Equivalence

Ensuring the cross-cultural equivalence of the concepts in the questionnaire is essential because of the cross-cultural nature of the study. It is important to note that there are various ways of ensuring the cross-cultural equivalence of concepts used in international marketing research. One way is to make sure that concepts have normative, semantic and conceptual equivalence (Ben Mrad, 2008).

If a concept has normative equivalence then it can be said that it is cross culturally acceptable. Semantic equivalence means that the translation of an item
from one language to another does not change its meaning. *Conceptual equivalence* is accomplished by conducting a range of statistical analyses such as testing a concept’s factor invariance. Such statistical analyses are usually conducted so as to examine whether a particular concept is cross-culturally valid.

However, consumer behaviour researchers tend to neither test the normative nor conceptual equivalence of constructs they employ in their investigations. Instead, they have used the translation and back-translation method to adapt constructs to various contexts (Bahee and Pisani, 2009; Johansson et al., 1985; Jung and Ang, 2002; Kaynak and Kara, 2001; Nijjsen and Douglas, 2004; Russel and Russel, 2006; Shin, 2001; Shoham et al., 2006). The concepts used by the majority of previous studies may have not been tested for normative and conceptual equivalence because in many of these studies researchers have adapted concepts which have already been tested in various cultures and contexts. For example, the constructs (i.e. animosity and ethnocentrism) comprising Klein, Ettenson and Morris’ (1998) “Animosity Model of Foreign Product Purchase” have been tested in various countries and cultures.

In line with previous studies, the translation and back-translation method will be employed to ensure the cross-cultural comparability of the items measuring each construct used in the present study. The translation and back-translation process will include several steps. First, a bilingual person will translate the questionnaire. Then, another bilingual person, unfamiliar with the original questionnaire, will back-translate the questionnaire. Finally, two more bilinguals will evaluate the accuracy and cross-cultural equivalency of the translations.

In the previous section the instrument design was discussed. This section discusses four pilot studies that, in general, have been conducted in order to test the instrument design intended for use in the present work. In line with previous studies, the participants that have taken part in these pilot studies were not included in the main study (Pecotich and Ward, 2007).
What follows is a detailed description of each pilot study including information about the purpose, methodology and results of every study.

Pilot Study # 1

Purpose

Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007) have conducted an extensive review of the consumer behavior research published between 1998 and 2007. Their main criticism of these studies is that the countries towards which consumers harbour feelings of animosity have been assumed by the researchers. Asking a respondent what are his or her attitudes about products made in a particular country (i.e. not necessarily a past or present enemy) is likely to result in the increase in the importance attributed to the COO cue (Liefeld, 2003).

The same phenomenon is likely to be observed when the country under investigation is perceived to be a past or present enemy of one's country. If, for example, Tibetans were asked whether they like China, they might be motivated to provide an answer (whether it’s negative or positive) designed to satisfy social norms. Thus, the purpose of this quantitative and exploratory pilot study is to learn from respondents whether they harbor feelings of animosity towards any particular country. Interviews will be conducted to elicit data from respondents.

Methodology

Participants

Data were collected from a sample of 80 Israelis. This sample size was deemed appropriate for the study since small sample sizes are the norm in pilot studies (Zeynep and Durairaj, 2000; Aboulnasr, 2006; Riefler and Diamantopoulos, 2007). 52.5% of the respondents were either Holocaust survivors or had family members who were survivors. 47.5% of the respondents were neither survivors nor did they have family members that were survivors.
The term family members is used to refer both to close family members (e.g. siblings, parents, grandparents, etc.) and to extensive family members (e.g. uncles, aunts, cousins, etc.).

Table 5. Sample Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>48 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>$875 (average gross inc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that the mean age of respondents is 48. In addition, the average (gross) income of the sampled population is $875 US a month. This is significantly lower than the national average which is about $2000 a month (CBS, 2010). The lower than average monthly income can be accounted for by the relatively large number of retirees making up the sample size.

The sample includes a virtually equal number of men (47.5%) and women (52.5%). The proportion of males to females in the present study reflects the distribution of men and women in the Israeli population (CBS, 2010).

Sampling Technique

Several sampling techniques were considered. The stratified sampling technique, for instance, was one such technique. Stratified sampling could have helped generate a random sample of each the populations to be sampled. However, while the number of Holocaust survivors living in Israel and their age distribution are known, no such data is available regarding their children and grandchildren. Thus, this sampling technique was found to be inappropriate. Another sampling technique considered was quota sampling but, similar to stratified sampling, it was rejected due to the lack of data concerning the decedents of Holocaust survivors.
Finally, the appropriateness of a simple random sampling was examined. Sampling respondents on a random basis may have posed several methodological problems. First, because of their old age (40% of all Holocaust survivors are over 80 years old), some of them may be too mentally debilitated to provide valid information. Second, Holocaust survivors are only one of the many groups of interest of this study.

Because holocaust survivors make-up merely 4% of the total Israeli Jewish population, it is likely that they would be underrepresented if the sampling technique considered would have been used. The author was keen on obtaining a sample which would include certain groups in the population that may not be accessible with the sampling techniques discussed thus far. Thus, a judgmental sample was deemed to be the most appropriate for a study of this nature (Strutton et al., 2001; Kaynak et al, 2000; Schaefer, 1997).

Respondents were selected based on their availability and suitability to the current study. In other words, because the current investigation focuses on the effects of a past political conflict (namely, the Holocaust) on the image of Germany as it is perceived by various Israeli consumers, meticulously choosing and assigning the research subjects into three main groups: (1) survivors; (2) their children and grandchildren and (3) the rest of the Israeli Jewish population (Israeli Jews that are neither survivors nor have family members that have experienced the Holocaust).

**Measuring Instrument**

A 7 point Likert scale will be used in the present study for a number of reasons. First, the scale has already been used in a previous research (Johnson et al, 1970). Second, the scale is bipolar as the majority of COO studies employ bipolar (Zeynep and Durairaj, 2000; Smith, 1993; Sadrudin and d Astous, 1996) rather than unipolar scales (Nagashima, 1970; Zhang, 1996). Finally, Israeli consumers are familiar with such scales (Herstein and Tifferet, 2007; Nebenzahl et al., 2001; Shoham and Bencic, 2003).
Using a 7 point Likert scale has several advantages over other scales. First, if a respondent feels neutral towards a particular country he/she can choose 4 on the Likert scale. As a result, respondents are not “coerced” into preferring or not preferring a country if they feel neutral about it. Second, the 7 point Likert scale would assist not only in learning whether an individual prefers a particular country but also to what extent. Hence, the grandchild of a Holocaust survivor might prefer Iran or Syria the least but this does not necessarily mean that he or she prefers Germany. In sum, combining a list of the top ten trading partners of Israel with a 7 point Likert scale would enable to measure relative rather than the absolute preferences of the various sectors of the Israeli society.

Hence, attitudes toward Israel’s ten most important trade partners were measured on a 7 point Likert scale (i.e. 1- least preferred country, 7 - most preferred country). The researcher of the current study opted to examine consumer attitudes toward 10 countries for two reasons. First, the top ten exporting countries to Israel comprise the majority (57%) of the volume of all products coming into Israel. Second, previous studies have examined consumers’ attitudes toward at least as many countries in a single investigation (Johnson et al, 1970; Kaynak et al, 2000). Hence, it is not expected to discourage potential respondents from taking part in the study.

Data Collection

This study was conducted in line with the ethical guidelines set by the University Manchester. In general, several measures were taken prior to commencing the interviews. First, the author introduced himself to potential study participants by saying that he is a doctoral student at the University of Manchester and that his conducting a research as part of the requirement for a doctoral degree in business administration. Then, individuals that had expressed their willingness to take part in the study were asked for their age.

Subjects who were at least 18 years old were given a copy of the information sheet to read. After they read it they were asked whether they had any questions about the study. Once all their questions were answered they were
required to sign a consent form. After the consent form was signed, the researcher asked them to complete the questionnaire.

The information sheet starts with a statement of the study’s purpose. The researcher of the present investigation had a dilemma regarding how much should be told to respondents so as to avoid potential subjects from guessing the purpose of research (i.e. demand effects) and at the same time adhering to a sound ethical framework. Telling respondents that the purpose of the study was to examine the effects of the Holocaust on the consumption of products made in Germany would have affected the validity of the study by leading to subject bias. Hence, respondents were only made aware of the general purpose of the study, that is, to examine the attitudes of the Israeli Jewish population toward Israel's ten most important trading partners.

The information sheet also provided information about the study's procedure, the study’s duration, the name of the researcher, an explanation of what the subject is expected to do, a statement that participation is voluntary and that participation may be withdrawn at any time. Furthermore, potential participants were told that the study is anonymous and their names will not be mentioned in the study or any ensuing publication of the study results.

Next, the information sheet informed subjects that there is no right or wrong answer (Dhar, 1997). After having read the information sheet potential subjects were requested to sign a consent form. Finally, subjects were notified that they will be entitled to get a copy of any published materials related to study. All they had to do in order to obtain a copy of published results is to email the researcher of the present study.

Procedure

Similar to the procedure followed by Riefler and Dianmantopoulos (2007), an interview was conducted to collect data for the present study. The interview conducted in the framework of the current study consisted of two main parts. Demographic data was collected in the first part. The second part of the interview contained a single question asking respondents to express their
preferences for ten countries on a 7 point Likert scale.

The administrations of a number of “Amcha” branches (a nonprofit organization that provides psychological support to survivors) have been contacted and a formal request to interview members was submitted. After permission to interview was granted, the administration was asked to provide information as to the days and time of the day the organizations’ members visit the place.

Once this information was received, the researcher who also conducted the interviews made arrangements with the administration of the various branches to revisit the organization on the specified days and hours in an attempt to meet and encourage as many members as possible to participate in the study. Those members that were present on the days visited were approached individually by the researcher. Those that have agreed were given further information about the study.

Out of the total of 30 survivors approached, 24 agreed to participate in the study. Once individuals approached expressed their agreement to participate in the study, they were asked whether they agree to being interviewed via the phone. Face-to-face in-depth interviews were not conducted for a number of reasons. First, it was presumed that the preoccupation of the subjects with the Holocaust within the confines of the organization would be greater than it is normally. This in turn would have resulted in more members mentioning Germany as the country they prefer the least. Conducting face-to-face interviews in the homes of each organization member were also considered. However, this was not possible due to the fact that the organizations' members live in different cities and an attempt to schedule interviews at times of the day which would have suited all respondents was not successful.

In order to examine whether there are any intergenerational differences between Holocaust survivors, the second and third generations, Holocaust survivors were asked if they would provide the telephone number of their children and/or grandchildren. For the purposes of the present study, “children” and “grandchildren” refer to second and third generation survivors
respectively. In accordance with the ethical guidelines set by the University, second and third generation survivors younger than the age of 18 were not solicited for participation. Out of the 24 survivors interviewed, 19 provided the telephone numbers of their children and/or grandchildren.

Eight second generation survivors and 8 third generation survivors were willing to participate in the study. The second and third generation survivors were asked whether they can provide the telephone numbers of two or three friends who they definitely know are not connected to the Holocaust in any way. Using the snowball sampling techniques has enabled the researchers to collect the telephone numbers of 50 potential participants who are unrelated to the Holocaust. These respondents lack of a relationship to the Holocaust was confirmed during the interview. 40 of the 50 respondents contacted expressed their willingness to participate in the study. Thus, a judgmental sample was used to collect data from Holocaust survivors while snowballing was employed to collect data from their children and grandchildren.

**Pre-Test of Interview Question**

The question used in the pre-test interview was adopted from a similar study conducted by Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007). A judgmental sample consisting of ten individuals was used to pre-test the interview question.

When asked to “spontaneously list the country you dislike the most for whatever reason”, 30% of respondents (i.e. 20% having no relationship to the Holocaust and 10% either Holocaust survivors or somehow related to it) mentioned Iran and Syria. 15% of the study participants said that there is no such country. In other words, there was no other country they disliked more. Noteworthy is the fact that this was the reaction of both Holocaust survivors and those having no relationship to the Holocaust, 7% and 8%, respectively.

There are apparently two problems with the interview question. The first problem is associated with the fact that respondents mentioned countries that have no trade relations with Israel, such as Syria and Iran. Because the objective of the pilot study to is to examine the effects of animosity on
consumer behavior, countries such as Syria and Iran are irrelevant as none of them have trade relations with Israel.

A number of reasons may lie behind the choice of these two countries as the most disliked. Firstly, these countries may have been mentioned because the question was too general. That is to say, respondents must have thought, and rightly so, that the interviewer meant any country. Another possible reason is that Iran’s president has openly declared on several occasions that he would like to see Israel wiped off the map. While Syria has not made similarly extreme declarations with respect to Israel, Israeli Jews may harbor feelings of animosity towards Syria due to its support of Hizbullah (i.e. a terrorist group based in Lebanon) which waged a month-long war with Israel in the summer of 2006.

Another problem with the question is that some interviews came to an end immediately after respondents were asked the question. In several instances the response to the question was "there is no such country".

To overcome the first problem it would be necessary to rephrase the question in a way that would make it unambiguously clear to respondents that the country they prefer the least must be one that has trade relations with Israel. In order to cope with the second problem it would be necessary to use assistive memory rather than the top of mind approach used by Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007). Israel imports products from dozens of countries and hence respondents may have been overwhelmed by the question. Therefore, assistive memory would help respondents come up with an answer.

Hence, as a means of surmounting the second obstacle encountered in the initial pre-test, a 7 point Likert scale (i.e. 1- not prefer at all, 7- I prefer very much) was used to measure attitudes towards ten countries mentioned to respondents.

The apparent ambiguities of the question in the initial pre-test led the researcher to conduct an additional pre-test in which the modified question was tested. The problems encountered in the first pre-test have been completely eliminated. The modified questions were therefore employed in the interview.
conducted for this pilot test.

**Results**

Each interview lasted 16 minutes on average. The majority of respondents (55%) mentioned Germany as the country they favour the least. The US and Belgium are the most popular countries among Israeli Jews (see Table 6).

Table 6. Frequency of Countries Preferred the Least by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>66.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Respondents’ Relationship to the Holocaust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the Holocaust</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son/daughter of survivor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandson/granddaughter of survivor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended family victimized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends victimized</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>63.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 demonstrates that 52.5% of the individuals sampled are either Holocaust survivors or have a family member or a relative who is a survivor. However, 36.25% of respondents are neither survivors nor do they have family members or friends that are survivors.

A Chi-Square analysis of the data suggests that there is no statistically significant relationship (Pr = 0.6) between the closeness to the Holocaust (for example, whether an individual is a survivor or has a parent who endured the Holocaust) and the country any given individual prefers the least.

This study also shows that the roughly 42% of those individuals who dislike Germany the most are those who are somehow connected to the Holocaust. However, the majority of those individuals who prefer Germany the least (53%) have no connection to the Holocaust. This is in contrast to 54% of those who are related to the Holocaust but have ranked all countries but Germany the lowest (see Table 8).
Table 8. Relationship to the Holocaust and Choosing Germany as the Least Preferred Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the Holocaust</th>
<th>Dislike Germany the Most (in percentage points)</th>
<th>Dislike Other Countries the Most (in percentage points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of Survivor</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild of Survivor</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot Study # 2

Purpose

The results of the first pilot study demonstrate that Israeli-Jews sampled harbor feelings of animosity towards Germany. Hence, the main study of this work will be conducted in the context of the Holocaust. The aim of the present pilot study is threefold: (1) to examine whether the short statements developed by Russell and Russell (2006) to manipulate economic animosity will be as successful in the context of Israeli-German trade relations; (2) to learn what two foreign countries Israeli consumers perceive to be producers of high-quality products and (3) to examine whether refrigerators are associated with high purchase involvement and whether shower gels are associated with high purchase involvement.

Design

Product Stimuli

Most consumer behaviour studies that have focused on consumer decision making in general and those focusing on product choice in particular, employ products which are either relevant to or used by the target population.
The product stimuli used in the present study are refrigerators and shower gel. These product stimuli were chosen for several reasons. Firstly, it was deemed important to employ product categories which are relevant (used by) to both males and females (Leonidou et al., 2007). Both males and females use shower gels as it a unisex product. Similarly, they both make use of their refrigerators on a daily basis. It may therefore be assumed that they are both familiar with refrigerators and shower gels. Since product familiarity could impact evaluations of product quality and product choice it is important to include product stimuli which are familiar to the target population. The extent of familiarity with the refrigerators and shower gel will be measured and will not be assumed.

Another reason for employing refrigerators and shower gel as the product stimuli is that the choice of two very different product categories enables the extrapolation of results across product categories (Hsieh, 2004). One of the major limitation of some of the studies that have examined the effects of COO cues on consumer behaviour is that they have used only one product category in their study (Sadrudin and d’Astous, 2004; Hui and Zhou, 2003; Thorelli et al., 1989). Thirdly, Israel, Germany, and the USA are all manufacturers of both product categories. Thus, including three alternatives of a either a refrigerator or shower gel manufactured in these three countries reflects real purchase situations and thereby increases the impact of the experiment (i.e. experimental realism) on subjects (Calder et al., 1981).

The fourth reason for opting to use shower gel and refrigerators as the product stimuli is associated with the difference in purchase involvement evoked by these two product categories. Finally, using two products with various levels of purchase involvement is essential since it allows one to examine whether the potential relationship between animosity on purchase involvement is product specific.
Choice of Countries

Israel

Israel was chosen as one of the COO proxies for several reasons. The first reason is linked to the difference between animosity and ethnocentrism. Feelings of animosity affect consumer behavior when a consumer has to choose between two foreign products. Ethnocentrism, however, is pronounced when a consumer has to choose between a foreign product and a domestic alternative.

Although consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism are different, they are related. The greater the level of animosity harboured by a consumer the more he or she is likely to be ethnocentric. Thus, because of this relationship between animosity and ethnocentrism, researchers need to eliminate the possibility that respondents or subjects of research have avoided buying products from a given country due ethnocentrism rather than animosity. The only manner in which they can do this is by employing two foreign COO proxies and one domestic COO proxy.

Second, wars are likely to trigger memories of the Holocaust (Solomon and Prager, 1992). Thus, because Israel is in a constant state of war, war animosity towards Germany by Jewish consumers is expected to be higher in Israel than in any other country where Jewish people live.

A few countries came to mind while considering which two foreign countries to include in the study. It is evident that perceptions of product quality are affected by the image of the country in which they are produced (Laroche et al., 2005; Papadopolous et al., 1990; Sadrudin et al., 2005). As a result, it was deemed necessary to take two countries that are similar in the sense that both are perceived to be the producers of high-quality products. However, it is important to choose two countries that differ in the level of animosity felt towards them by Israeli consumers. Thus, the following two countries were considered for inclusion into the study alongside Germany: Japan and the U.S.A.
Germany

Germany is a potential candidate for several reasons. First, during WWII Nazi Germany has singled out the Jewish population as the enemy of the state. In its attempt to “clean” Germany of its Jewish population, Nazi Germany has murdered 5 million Jews. Consequently, the Holocaust underpins the negative image Germany has among the majority of the Israeli population (Podoshen, 2005; Schuette, 2005). In fact, a pilot study conducted by the author (Abraham, 2007) shows that Israeli Jews do not have favourable attitudes toward Germany. The Holocaust doesn’t only impact the attitudes of Jewish consumers but it also has repercussions on the behavior of Jewish consumers. Podoshen (2005), for one, shows that the American-Jewish population is not willing to buy a German car merely because it is German.

Second, according to Israel’s Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS, 2008), Germany is one of Israel’s most important trade partner. And according to Nijssen and Douglas (2004), countries that are dependent on imports are likely to experience economic animosity towards the countries that are its dominant trade partners. Their study, for instance, shows that Dutch consumers harbour animosity towards Germany despite the close economic ties between the two countries. The tensions between the countries stem from Germany’s occupation of the Netherlands during WWII. Thus, close economic ties are not sufficient to safeguard against economic animosity.

Third, the findings of surveys conducted by the American Jewish Committee in the years 2002 and 2005 show that Germans and Jews alike feel that the holocaust is an historical event which is not to be forgotten. It is a tragedy that is retold and passed from generation to generation. In addition, from reading the various newspapers available in Israel and from listening to various radio and TV shows it could be inferred that from year to year more and more people are becoming interested in learning about the Holocaust. Hence, German marketing managers face a complex situation: They need to market products to an important trading partner which at least some of its population may boycott.
The United States

The U.S. is considered a good candidate for several reasons. First, while it is one of Israel’s most important trade partners (CBS, 2008), there is no history of animosity between the Jewish nation and the US. Second, products made in the U.S. are highly regarded (Leonidou, 2007). Thus, it appears that the U.S. would make a good alternative to Germany.

Japan

Similar to Germany and the U.S.A, Japan is one of Israel’s ten most important trade partners (CBS, 2008). In addition, Japan is perceived to be the producer of high quality products (Leonidou, 2007).

Methodology

Participants

This pre-test is experimental in nature. The mall-intercept method was used to collect data for the present work. Consumers were solicited in a central location in the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area. The location was chosen because it is frequented by consumers from all across the country. 43 of the 80 consumers solicited agreed to participate in the study. Sample sizes in previous pilot studies ranged from 19 (Dholakia, 2001) to 80 (O’Cass, 2000). Thus, the sample size of the present study is in line with previous studies. 47 % the subjects were males and 53 % were females. The average age of the respondents is 39.

Procedure

Similar to the procedure followed in the first pilot study and in line with the ethical guidelines set by the University of Manchester, several measures were taken prior to commencing the experiment. First, the author introduced himself by saying that he is a doctoral student at the University of Manchester and that he is conducting a research as part of the requirement for a doctoral degree in business administration. Potential subjects were asked whether they would be willing to take part in a consumer behaviour research.
Then, consumers that had expressed their willingness to take part in the study were asked for their age. Subjects who were at least 18 years old were giving a copy of the information sheet and research questionnaire.

The information sheet provided extensive details about the study including its purpose, why and how they have been selected to participate, etc. However, similar to the first pilot study, only the general purpose of the study was revealed to subjects. After having read the information sheet potential subjects were requested to sign a consent form.

After signing the consent form subjects were asked to carefully read the instructions provided on the questionnaires prior to answering the questions. In order to minimize the potential effects of demand artefacts on the validity of the results, subjects were informed that there is no right or wrong answer and that they should answer all questions. The questionnaire consisted of three sections.

In the first section, subjects’ purchase involvement with shower gels and refrigerators was measured with Mittal’s (1995) 7 point Purchase Decision Involvement scale. The purpose of the main study is to examine the potential effects of animosity on involvement. Therefore, it is important to measure the level of involvement with two different product categories. It is hypothesized that consumers will be more involved with the purchase of a refrigerator than with the purchase of shower gels which is purchased more frequently. This hypothesis is based on previous research suggesting that products that are purchased frequently are likely to decrease consumer’s involvement with their purchase (Kwon, 1990).

In the second section of the questionnaire subjects were instructed to express their perceptions of the quality of products produced by three foreign countries, namely, Israel, Japan, Germany and the USA. Country image perceptions were measured on a 10 point scale (from 1 – low quality products to 10 – high quality products) adapted from Hong and Wyer (1990).
The aim of investigating perceptions of the quality of products produced by three foreign countries was to determine which two countries are perceived to be producers of high-quality products. This will allow the researcher of the present work to minimize the possibility that (in the main study) one product will be chosen over another merely because differences in perceptions of country of origin images. The two countries with the highest ratings will employed as proxies of COO cues in the main study.

After having evaluated the quality of product produced by Germany, the U.S.A, and Japan, subjects were randomly assigned to one of the two experimental conditions: high economic animosity and low economic animosity. Economic animosity was manipulated by means of two statements regarding the trade relations between Germany and Israel. The statements have been adapted from a previous study which was the first to show that animosity can be manipulated successfully (Russell and Russell, 2006).

23 consumers were assigned to the high animosity treatment while 20 consumers were assigned to the low animosity treatment. Subjects in the high economic animosity comprised the experimental group while subjects in the low economic animosity treatment made up the control group. Randomly assigning subjects to the two experimental conditions ensured that any differences observed would be due the experimental conditions and not to individual differences. Random assignment to experimental treatments also decreases variance resulting from systematic error (Aronson et al., 1990).

The statement about the trade relations between Israel and Germany was followed by two sets of questions. The first set of questions measured economic animosity. All in all, the economic animosity construct consists of five questions measured on a 7 point (from 1- strongly disagree to 7 – strongly agree) Likert scale. The scale was adapted from Klein et al. (1998).

Following economic animosity, subjects’ level of consumer ethnocentrism was measured with items adapted from Shimp and Sharma (1987). Both economic animosity and consumer ethnocentrism were measured following the manipulation of economic animosity so that it could be shown that the statement
has had an impact on economic animosity but not on consumer ethnocentrism.

Economic animosity and consumer ethnocentrism were measured after inquiring about subjects' perceptions of quality and the manipulation statement. A different order would not have been appropriate for a number of reasons. First, the manipulation of economic animosity affects scores on the economic animosity construct. Furthermore, ethnocentrism is associated with unfavourable assessments of the quality of foreign products (Marchant and Steven, 2003; Kukukemiroglu, 1999).

Thus, first measuring subjects' level of consumer ethnocentrism and then their evaluation of American and Japanese products would have biased their responses to the items in the product evaluation scale. Consistent with similar consumer behaviour studies, demographic data were collected at the very beginning of the investigation (Bahae and Pisani, 2009, Rose et al., 2009). After the questionnaires were returned study participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation in the study.

Results

A positive (0.337) and a statistically significant correlation was observed between subjects' opinion about the USA and Germany. In other words, subjects who hold positive country perceptions about Germany tend to have equally positive perceptions about the USA.

However, while the results of this study also show that Japan has a positive image among Israeli consumers (average rating of product quality= 7.8), statistically insignificant relationships were observed between perceptions of Japan and perceptions of other countries.
Table 9. The Effects of the Experimental Treatments on the Economic Animosity Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (high)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0696</td>
<td>1.28856</td>
<td>.26868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (low)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>.90844</td>
<td>.20313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that subjects assigned to the high animosity experimental treatment scored higher on the economic animosity construct (mean 3.0696) than those assigned to the low animosity treatment (mean 2.4). Two t-tests were conducted to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the subjects assigned to the experimental group and the control group (see Table 10).

In the first test, equal variance between subjects was assumed. The findings of this test indicate that there is a marginally statistically significant difference (0.059) between the subjects in the two experimental conditions. In the second test, unequal variance was assumed. Similar to the first test, the results point to a marginally statistically significant difference between the subjects in the two experimental conditions (0.054). This indicated that the experimental manipulation of economic animosity was successful.
It is important to demonstrate that the manipulation of economic animosity impacts the economic animosity construct and not the consumer ethnocentrism construct. That is to say, manipulation checks are necessary so as to show that exposing subjects to a high animosity statement will increase their level of economic animosity. For that purpose an ANOVA test (Table 11) was conducted. Results show that the animosity statements have had an impact on economic animosity but not on consumer ethnocentrism. But again the difference is marginally statistically significant.
Table 11. Test of Between Subjects Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>4.796(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.796</td>
<td>3.766</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>.186(^b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>320.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>320.033</td>
<td>251.325</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>426.174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>426.174</td>
<td>283.576</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>4.796</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.796</td>
<td>3.766</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>52.209</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>61.617</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>384.120</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>491.310</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>57.005</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>61.803</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\). R Squared = .084 (Adjusted R Squared = .062)  
\(b\). R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = -.021)
Pilot Study # 3

Purpose

The aim of the main study is to investigate the potential effect of animosity on purchase involvement. To examine this relationship it would necessary to trigger animosity by exposing subjects to products produced by a country towards which they harbour feelings of animosity. Thus, country of origin information needs to be made available to subjects. However, using only one product cue is likely to have a detrimental effect on the validity of the findings since subjects will have no choice but to base their decision on the informational cue that is available (Bilkey and Nes, 1982; Liefeld, 2003).

Hence, subjects taking part in the study were asked which product attributes they search for when purchasing shower gels and refrigerators. Learning about these product attributes from consumers has several advantages. First, using product attributes that are perceived important to consumers is likely to increase the experiment’s realism. Second, the experimental realism of the experiment is likely to yield more reliable results than would have been produced otherwise (Bryman and Bell, 2007).

Methodology

Participants

The mall-intercept method was used to collect data for the present study. Consumers were solicited in a central location in the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area. The location was chosen because it is frequented by consumers from all across the country. 100 of the 151 consumers solicited agreed to participate in the study. This sample size is in line with sample sizes used in similar studies (Lin and Chen, 2006). 51% the subjects were males and 49% were females. The average age of the respondents is 37.
Data Collection and Procedure

Similar to the procedure followed in previous pilot studies described in this chapter and in line with the ethical guidelines set by the University of Manchester, several measures were taken prior to commencing the experiment. First, the author of the present investigation introduced himself to potential subjects by telling them that he is a doctoral student at the University of Manchester. They were also told that the author is conducting the research in partial fulfillment of the requirement for a doctoral degree in business administration. To encourage participation, the researcher then informed potential subjects if they'd be willing to participate in the study, they will participate in a draw for a digital camera.

Second, subjects were solicited for participation based on the following criteria: (1) the individual had to be at least 18 years old, (2) she or he has purchased the relevant product (shower gel/refrigerator). It was ensured that consumers were at least 18 years old by asking them for their age prior to inviting them to participate in the study.

Finally, subjects that have agreed to participate were given a copy of the information sheet to read. The information sheet starts with a general statement of the study’s purpose. The information sheet also provides information about the study procedure and the study’s duration. In addition, the information sheet informed subjects that there is no right or wrong answer and that they should circle the number under each statement that best reflects their agreement or disagreement with the relevant statement (Dhar, 1997). Furthermore, the information sheet notifies potential subjects that participation is voluntary and that it may be withdrawn at any time.

Moreover, potential research subjects were told that the study is anonymous and their names will not be mentioned in the study or any ensuing publication of the study results. Subjects were also informed that they will be entitled to get a copy of any published materials related to study. All they had to do in order to obtain a copy of published results is to email the researcher of the present study.
After subjects read the information sheet they were asked whether they had any questions about the study. Once all their questions were answered they were required to sign a consent form. As soon as the consent form was signed, the researcher asked them to complete the questionnaire.

In line with previous studies, the author of the present research requested subjects to list all the product attributes they would consider if they were actually buying the products in question (Alden, 1993; Rogers et al., 1994). Thus, subjects were requested to “freely express what product attributes you believe are the most important when buying a refrigerator”. The same question was asked about shower gels (Eroglu and Machleit, 1989; Quester and Smart, 1998). The researcher of the present study has also searched newspapers, magazines, and the internet for advertisements for refrigerators so as to compare the product attributes though to be important by consumers to those that appear in real shower gel and refrigerator advertisements.

Results

Refrigerators

The results of the pilot study show that consumers consider the following product attributes most important when purchasing refrigerators: that warranty, brand name, size and price.

Shower Gels

Based on the results of the present pilot study, brand name, price, size, and fragrance are considered most important by consumers when buying shower gels.

Pilot Study # 4

Purpose

This final pilot study had three main objectives: (1) to examine the reliability of the constructs employed in the present study; (2) to explore whether animosity has an effect on purchase involvement; (3) to examine the
questionnaire’s workability in terms of structure, content, flow, and duration;

Methodology

Participants

Data was collected during the winter of 2009/2010. The investigation was conducted in the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area. 176 consumers were intercepted at random as they exited electronic stores and supermarkets using the mall-intercept method. 100 consumers agreed to take part in the study (response rate: 57%). The sample comprised of 43 males and 57 females. Their age ranged between 18 and 65.

Measuring Instrument

The scales employed in the present study (general animosity and war animosity, economic animosity, product familiarity, Purchase Decision Involvement, product judgments, and the CETSCALE) have been adapted from previous studies. All of these scales are measured on 7-point Likert scales. The shortened 10-item CETSCALE was employed to collect data.

No contextual modifications have been made to the CETSCALE. However, for some of the scales used, contextual changes were necessary. For example, in the case of the Purchase Decision Involvement scales, it was necessary to make contextual modifications to the scales in order to measure purchase involvement after manipulating economic animosity (see table 10).

Data Collection

Similar to the procedure followed in previous pilot studies described in this chapter and in line with the ethical guidelines set by the University of Manchester, several measures were taken prior to commencing the experiment. First, the author of the present investigation introduced himself to potential subjects. Second, subjects were told that the present study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for a DBA. To encourage participation, the
researcher then informed potential subjects if they'd be willing to participate in the study, they will participate in a draw for a digital camera.

Second, subjects were solicited for participation based on the following criteria: (1) the individual had to be at least 18 years old, (2) she or he has purchased the relevant product (shower gel/refrigerator). It was ensured that consumers were at least 18 years old by asking them for their age prior to inviting them to participate in the study.

Finally, subjects that have agreed to participate were given a copy of the information sheet to read. The information sheet starts with a statement of the study’s purpose. The information sheet also provides information about the study procedure and the study’s duration. In addition, the information sheet informed subjects that there is no right or wrong answer and that they should circle the number under each statement that best reflects their agreement or disagreement with the relevant statement (Dhar, 1997). Furthermore, the information sheet notifies potential subjects that participation is voluntary and that it may be withdrawn at any time.

Moreover, potential subjects were told that the study is anonymous and their names will not be mentioned in the study or any ensuing publication of the study results. Subjects were also informed that they will be entitled to get a copy of any published materials related to study. All they had to do in order to obtain a copy of published results is to email the researcher.

After they read the information sheet they were asked whether they had any questions about the study. Once all their questions were answered they were required to sign a consent form. As soon as the consent form was signed, the researcher asked them to complete the questionnaire.

Procedure

Study subjects were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions: Subjects assigned to the low animosity experimental condition comprised the control group while subjects assigned to the high animosity
experimental condition comprised the experimental group. Because shower gels were associated with low purchase involvement, it would be easier to observe differences in the level of purchase involvement as a result of the different experimental treatments than would be the case with refrigerators. Therefore, all subjects were exposed only to fictitious shower gel advertisements.

Once respondents completed the survey they were requested to provide feedback about the items’ wording and clarity and to suggest possible modifications (Leonidou et al., 2007; Zafar, 2004).

After feedback was received from subjects they were debriefed. Debriefing study participants at the end of a study assists researcher identify whether their findings are contaminated by demand effects. Demand effects occur when study participants or research subjects guess the purpose of study. As a result, some researchers debrief subjects at the end an investigation in order to learn whether they have guessed the aim of their investigation (Klein, 1998; Pecotich and Ward, 2007).

It is not uncommon for research subjects to guess research question or the hypothesis of the study in which they have taken part. The number of respondents that guess the hypotheses or research questions varies from study to study (Pecotich and Ward, 2007; Torres and Briggs, 2007).

45% of subjects that have taken part in the present research stated that they thought the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between the Holocaust and the purchase of German made products. 5% of subjects assumed that the purpose of the study is to investigate the effects of stereotypes on consumer behaviour. 10% believe that the aim of the study was to study the effects of COM on purchase behaviour. 12% said that the study’s aim is to examine the trade relations between Germany and Israel. 10% stated that the purpose of the study is to examine whether Israeli consumers are ethnocentric.

The rest of subjects (18%) provided various answers. For example, some thought that objective of the study is to examine whether individualism is the most important consumer characteristic in purchase behavior. Others stated that
they believed that the purpose of the investigation was to examine whether it would be profitable to market German made shower gels in Israel. Especially noteworthy is the finding that no subject has guessed the true aim of the investigation (i.e. to investigate the effects of animosity on purchase involvement). Thus, demand artifacts were not likely to have affected the reliability of this study's findings.

Debriefing research subjects at the end of an investigation is in line with ethical guidelines according to which that the complete and true purpose of an investigation should be disclosed to subjects once it is over (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Hence, the complete aim of the present study was revealed to subjects as soon as they have been debriefed by the researcher.

The draw was conducted by the researcher at the end of the data collection process. The following paragraphs provide a detailed description of as to how the draw was conducted. First, the full names of all subjects were written down on A4 sheet of paper. The names were drawn out from the consent forms returned by the subjects. Second, the names were cut out.

Third, the cut out names were placed in a shoe box. Next, the box was shaken several times so as to allow the names of subjects to mingle inside. This was done to ensure that a winner would be selected at random. Then, the researcher blindly opened the box and took a piece of paper without looking at the box. The purpose was to avoid a situation in which the results of the draw are biased in favor of a particular participant. Finally, the winner’s contact information was sought by searching through the consent forms subjects have signed prior to participating in the study. Subjects were required to write down their telephone numbers and email addresses on the consent forms so that the subject that wins the prize could be contacted.
Results

Table 12. Internal Validity (Cronbach's α) of the Constructs Employed in the Present Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PDI(before treatment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>when item # 3 is excluded</td>
<td>PDI(before treatment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PDI(after treatment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assessment of Product Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>when item # 2 is excluded</td>
<td>Assessment of Product Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>General Animosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>War Animosity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the α values of all the constructs employed in this pilot study were within the acceptable 0.70 – 0.85 range (see Table 12 above). In the following sections the author will discuss the α values for each construct separately.

*Purchase Decision Involvement*

Cronbach’s α in the PDI scale measured prior to the manipulation of economic animosity is 0.665 which is slightly lower than the acceptable range of 0.7 – 0.85 (see Table 13). In order to discover which item does not load well with the construct an inter-correlations table was generated. It was found that item number 3 has a low correlation with both item number one and item number two. Thus, the author decided to re-test the constructs internal reliability but this time excluding item number 3. When item number was dropped from
the analysis Cronbach’s α increased to 0.809. This shows that the Cronbach’s α was low when all three items were used because item # 3 did not load well with the construct.

Table 13. Cronbach’s α Values on the PDI Scale Before and After Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>PDI (after manipulation)</th>
<th>PDI (before manipulation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>While examining the three refrigerators made available to you in this experiment, would you say that: (1) I did not care as to which refrigerator I buy (7) I cared a great deal as to which refrigerator I buy</td>
<td>In selecting from the many types and brands of refrigerators available in the market, would you say that: (1) I would not care as to which I buy (7) I would care a great deal as to which I buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How important to you was it to make the right choice of a refrigerator? (1) Not at all important (7) Not at all important</td>
<td>How important to you would it be to make the right choice of this product? (1) Not at all important (7) Not at all important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In making your selection of a refrigerator, how concerned were you be about the outcome of your choice? (1) not at all concerned (7) very much concerned</td>
<td>In making your selection of this product, how concerned would you be about the outcome of your choice? (1) not at all concerned (7) very much concerned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consumer Ethnocentrism

This used the shortened 10-item version of the CETSCALE developed by Shimp and Sharma (1987). The α value obtained (0.935) is in line with the findings of previous studies that have used shortened scale and show that it is as reliable as the longer 17-item scale (Ishii, 2009; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Russell and Russell, 2006; Ettenson and Klein, 2005).
Assessment of Product Quality

The α value obtained (0.726) is within the acceptable 0.7-0.85 range and is in line with previous research (Ben Mrad, 2008; Ishii, 2009; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004). However, if item # 2 ("Products made in (country) are generally of lower quality than similar products available from other countries") is dropped, the α value increases to 0.855.

Economic Animosity

The α value obtained for this construct (0.819) is also within the acceptable 0.7-0.85 range. This α value is higher than the values obtained in most previous studies (Ben Mrad, 2008; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Rose et al., 2009; Russell and Russell, 2006).

General Animosity

The α value obtained for this construct (0.753) is within the acceptable 0.7-0.85 range as well.

War Animosity

The α value obtained for this construct (0.707) is within the acceptable 0.70-0.85 range and is in line with previous studies (Ben Mrad, 2008; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Rose et al., 2009).

The Effect of Animosity on Purchase Involvement

An ANOVA (Multivariate analysis) was conducted to examine the differences between the two experimental groups regarding purchase involvement prior to the treatment. There were differences in the average scores on the PDI scale between subjects assigned to the high animosity group and those assigned to the low animosity group. The average score among the subjects assigned to the high animosity group was 3.85 while the average score among the subjects assigned to the low animosity group is 3.67. However, no statistically significant differences were observed between the two groups (P = 0.502; F(2,100) = 0.454).
Notwithstanding the statistically insignificant results observed before the treatment, a statistically significant difference was found between the groups in their level of purchase involvement after treatment. No statistically significant difference was found between the treatment groups regarding the other variables (see Table 14).

Table 14. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>PI2mean</td>
<td>10.862</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.862</td>
<td>4.735</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Familiarity1</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Familiarity2</td>
<td>5.623</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.623</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity mean</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>2.302</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa mean</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase Involvement1 mean</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Examination of the Questionnaire Workability in Terms of Structure, Content, Flow, and Duration

Another aim of this was pilot study was to examine the questionnaire's workability in terms of structure, content, flow, and duration for the main study. Short interviews were conducted with 20 subjects chosen at random at the end of the study. No structural problems were identified. Furthermore, the subjects interviewed stated that they thought that there was a logical flow to the questionnaire. It has taken subjects 15 minutes on average to complete the questionnaire.

The following section provides a detailed account of the design of the questionnaire employed in the present study. Modifications were made in
accordance with the findings of Pilot Study # 4.

*General Discussion of the Pilot Studies*

The purpose of this section is to discuss the results obtained in each of the pilot studies in this chapter. While discussing these findings the researcher will stress how they inform the main study in terms of its design.

The purpose of the *first pilot study* was to learn from respondents whether there is any particular country towards which they harbor feelings of animosity. The results of the study show that of the ten countries inquired about, Germany is disliked the most by the majority of respondents (55%). These negative feelings towards Germany are not unique to Holocaust survivors. This is evident from the fact that both first, second and third generation Holocaust survivors and the general Israeli population (i.e. that was not affected by the Holocaust) mentioned Germany as the country they dislike the most. It appears that the holocaust has had long-term, intergenerational effects on the Jewish population sampled.

This finding is in line with previous studies that have examined the attitude towards Germany. Germany’s occupation of the Netherlands in the Second World War, for example, continues to be a sticking point in the relationship between the two countries. The overwhelming majority (65%) of the members of the Dutch House of Parliament, for example, have stated that they dislike Germany (Hoedeman, 1990). Similarly, Aspeslagh and Dekker (1998) found that teenagers possess anti-German feelings despite the fact that over 50 years have elapsed since WWII at the time of the investigation.

Thus, Germany is the least preferred but the majority of individuals sampled regardless of their relationship to the Holocaust. A likely explanation is the annual commemoration of the Jews who were killed during the Holocaust in which official ceremonies are held and a minute-long siren is sounded across Israel. These ceremonies serve to remind Israelis of the atrocities of the Holocaust year after year. Thus, it would not be necessary to merely sample Holocaust survivors to learn about the consequences of the Holocaust on the
behavior of Jewish consumers. Instead, the general Jewish population in both Israel and the UK will be sampled.

In sum, the major contribution of this pilot study is to provide empirical support for Israeli consumers' feelings toward Germany. Consequently, Germany will be employed as a COO proxy in the main study.

The second pilot study had three objectives. The first aim was to examine whether economic animosity can be manipulated with a statement about the current trade relations between Germany and Israel. Subjects were randomly assigned to either a high economic animosity condition or a low economic animosity condition. In the high economic animosity condition subjects read a negative statement about the trade relations between the two countries. In contrast, subjects assigned to the low economic animosity condition read a positive statement about the present trade relations between the two countries.

The second aim of the study was to investigate what two foreign countries are perceived to be the producers of high quality products by Israeli consumers. The third objective of the study was to examine the level of purchase involvement with refrigerators and shower gels.

Study findings demonstrate that the manipulation of economic animosity with a statement about the present trade relations between Israel and Germany was successful. This evident from the higher mean scores observed on the economic animosity scale in the high animosity condition than in the low animosity condition. However, this difference is marginally statistically significant. Thus, only the statement employed to manipulate high economic animosity will be used in the main study.

Study results also demonstrate that Israeli consumers perceive Japanese products to be of higher quality than German products. It, therefore, stands to reason that if Israeli consumers have two alternatives to choose from that are equal in all aspects but the COO (Germany vs. Japan), there would be likely to choose the Japanese alternative.
Thus, if Japan is used a proxy for one of the COO cues, subjects might choose the Japanese alternative not because the harbour feelings of animosity towards Germany but merely because they think that the Japanese alternative is of better quality.

However, the results of the second pilot study show that subjects that hold positive country perceptions about Germany tend to have equally positive perceptions about the USA. In other words, they are both perceived to be producers of high quality products. Hence, both Germany and the USA will used as proxies of COO cues in the main study since subjects are unlikely to prefer the products of country over the products of the other country.

Furthermore, findings indicate that the purchase of refrigerators results in the highest level of purchase decision involvement (average score 5.9) while buying shower gels produces the lowest level of purchase decision involvement (average score 2.3). Thus, refrigerators will be used as the product stimuli to manipulate high purchase involvement. Shower gels, however, will be employed to manipulate low purchase involvement.

In sum, the results of the second pilot study have several implications on the design of the main study. Both Germany and the USA will used as proxies of COO cues since subjects are unlikely to prefer the products of country over the products of the other country. Second, refrigerators will be used as the product stimuli to manipulate high purchase involvement while shower gels should be employed to manipulate low purchase involvement. Third, the findings demonstrate that a short statement about the trade relations between Israel and Germany can serve to deteriorate subjects’ perceptions of Germany. Thus, these statements will be used to manipulate animosity in the main study.

The objective of the third pilot study was to learn from respondents what product attributes they consider the most important when purchasing refrigerators and shower gels. The results of the study show that the following product attributes are considered most important by consumers when they buy refrigerators: warranty, brand name, price, and size.
Consequently, in the experimental conditions in which consumers will be requested to indicate which refrigerator they would be willing to buy, four product attributes are used to describe the three available alternatives: Price, COO, warranty, volume (i.e. the interior size of the refrigerator). The price of the refrigerators in the advertisements used in Israel was 4700 NIS and £748 in the advertisements used to collect data in the UK. This price was determined based on the average price of refrigerators in the UK and Israel at the time in which the questionnaire was designed.

The duration of warranty was determined based on the level usually offered by manufacturers which was one year when this questionnaire was designed. Refrigerator size is measured in volumes. The volume of the refrigerators used in the study is 500 litres. The size of the refrigerators was determined based on the average size of family-size refrigerators which ranges between 400 and 600 litres.

The price and volume will be identical in all product alternatives. Since differences in price could affect involvement per se, they will be kept constant.

In the experimental conditions in which consumers will be requested to “purchase” a shower gel will be presented with the following product attributes: COO, price and quantity in litres. The COO cues used in the study will be operationalized with ‘made in’ labels used in the advertisement. Each alternative will have one of three made in labels.

The price of the shower gels is 20 NIS (roughly $5 USA) in the advertisement used to collect data in Israel and £6.8 in the advertisement employed to collect data in the UK. The price was determined based on the average price of shower gels in both the UK and Israel at the time when this questionnaire was designed. The quantity in all the shower gels was 1 litre. This size was chosen because a search of relevant newspaper and magazine advertisements indicated that this is the usual size of shower gels that cost about 20 NIS.
The present pilot study also demonstrates that a product's brand name is one of the attributes consumers believe to be the most important when both purchasing refrigerators and shower gels. However, using brand names in research poses several problems. First, according to consumer behavior research, consumers' familiarity with a brand is likely to have an impact on their evaluations of product quality and intentions to buy (Hui and Zhou, 2003; Samiee et al., 2005). As a result, the potentially confounding effects of brand familiarity are controlled for by either using fictitious brand names (Pecotich and Ward, 2007; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995; Sadrudin and d’Astous, 2004) or omitting brand names altogether to eliminate its potential effect on subjects (Aqueveque, 2006; Wong et al., 2008).

Another problem with employing brand names is that consumers may misidentify brand names. Some of the respondents in Choe and Cho's (2000) study, for example, thought that brands such as Samsung and Hitachi are Chinese brands. In fact, Samsung is a Korean brand while Hitachi is a Japanese brand. Thus, employing brand names in the main study could lead to misleading results.

In sum, the author argues against using brand names in the main study due to two reasons. First, subjects may not correctly identify a fictitious German brand as intended (i.e. made in Germany). In addition, using brand names may have confounding effects on the study results. Therefore, the researcher of the present study has opted to omit brand names and employ COO cues instead in the main study. While warranty, COO, price, and size will be used to describe the refrigerator used in the main study, price, size and COO cues will be used to describe the shower gel used in the main study.

Pilot Study # 4 had several objectives. The first aim was to examine the reliability of the constructs employed in the study. One of the constructs employed in the study was Mittal’s (1995) Purchase Decision Involvement (PDI). PDI was used to measure subjects' level of purchase involvement. An interesting finding about the PDI scale is that the Cronbach’s α obtained when it was measured after manipulating economic animosity (α = 0.816) was higher than the one obtained when purchase was measured before the manipulation (α
= 0.665). This is curious as minor adaptations were made to the PDI scale before the treatment. However, essential contextual modifications were made to the PDI scale when it was measured after the experimental treatment.

The low alpha value observed when purchase involvement was measured prior to exposing subjects to the experimental manipulation may have resulted from either one of two possibilities. First, perhaps the translated items have not been understood as intended by subjects. To examine this possibility, the experts that have helped the author with the translations were reconvened by the researcher to see whether misunderstanding on the part of subjects could have been the problem. After they have revisited the item in the PDI scale the experts concluded that misunderstanding of the translated items by subjects was unlikely to have occurred.

Another possible explanation to the low alpha score is that the relatively weak alpha value observed may be "normal" for the PDI scale. To examine that possibility, the researcher of the present study referred to two studies that have used the PDI scale. In one of the studies (Torben, 2005) purchase involvement was measured in relation to shrimps and cheese. The alpha values observed were 0.68 and 0.73, respectively. In another study, (Mittal, 1995), alpha value of 0.85 was obtained when jeans and VCRs were the product stimuli.

Hence, it appears that alpha values in the PDI scale can be expected to be slightly below the acceptable range when using low involvement products (e.g.shrimps, cheese, shower gel). However, alpha values within the acceptable range can be accepted when high involvement such as jeans, VCRs and refrigerators are employed.

Notwithstanding the statistical support that these studies provide, these are just two studies and as such supply limited evidence. However there is sufficient to support the view that involvement can vary with products (Mittal, 1989; Quester and Lim, 2003; Richins and Bloch, 1986) and so the values obtained by Pilot Study # 4 are within acceptable limitations. Hence, no modifications will be made to the PDI scale employed in the main study. The α values of the other constructs employed in the current pilot study, however, are
within the acceptable 0.70 – 0.85 range.

The second aim of the study was to examine whether animosity affects purchase involvement. A between-subjects effect test was conducted for this purpose. The results of the test demonstrate that subjects’ level of purchase involvement is affected by the manipulation of economic animosity. When purchase involvement was measured after the experimental manipulation of economic animosity, statistically significant differences were observed between the subjects assigned to the control group and those assigned to the experimental group.

The questionnaire employed in this pilot study was also intended for use in the main study. Thus, the third and final aim of this was pilot study was to examine the questionnaire’s workability in terms of structure, content, flow, and duration.

Following this pilot study several necessary modifications were made to the questionnaire. First, a job category, namely, a soldier in the regular army, was added to the demographic questions about subjects’ occupation. The addition of this class of jobs was necessary since some of the subjects who have participated were soldiers in the regular army and for them none of the other categories were appropriate.

Second, some of the phrases used were rephrased due to lack of clarity with some of the questions. For example, the first item on the CETSCALE (“Products made in Germany are carefully produced and have fine workmanship”) had to be rephrased following its initial translation by the bilinguals.

Chapter Summary

Four pilot studies have been conducted in this work. The results of Pilot Study # 1 demonstrate that Israeli consumers still harbor feelings of animosity towards Germany. Thus, the main study conducted in this work will examine whether animosity towards Germany is likely to increase Jewish consumers' level of purchase involvement. The results of Pilot Study # 2 show
that a statement about the trade relations between two countries can be successfully used to manipulate economic animosity. Thus, this statement will be employed to manipulate economic animosity in the main study (see Chapter 6).

The findings of Pilot Study # 2 also demonstrate that both the USA and Germany are perceived by Israeli consumers to be producers of high quality products. Hence, both America and Germany will used as two of the three proxy COO cues to describe the products in the fictitious advertisement employed in the main study.

The results of Pilot Study # 3 demonstrate that Israeli consumers feel that price, bottle size, brand name, fragrance and COO information to be most important when they buy shower gels. The study findings also show that Israeli consumers consider price, brand name, warranty, size and COO information when they buy refrigerators. Because fictitious advertisements are used to describe the shower gels, fragrances cannot be used in the advertisements despite the fact that consumers consider this attribute to be one of the most important when they buy shower gels. Israeli consumers, however, consider the brand name to be one of the most important product attributes when buying both refrigerators and shower gels.

However, brand names will not be used in the present study for several reasons. First, studies show that consumers' familiarity with a brand name can have an impact their evaluations of product quality and intentions to buy (Hui and Zhou, 2003; Samiee et al., 2005).

Second, research shows that consumers may misidentify brand names. For example, some of the respondents in Choe and Cho's (2000) study thought that brands such as Samsung and Hitachi are Chinese brands. In fact, Samsung is a Korean brand while Hitachi is a Japanese brand. Thus, employing brand names in the main study could lead to misleading results. Using a brand name that sounds German can be misinterpreted as a Swiss name, for example, thus causing subjects to choose it when in fact this would not have happened if they knew that the name is German.
The potentially confounding effects of brand familiarity are controlled for by either using fictitious brand names (Pecotich and Ward, 2007; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995; Sadrudin and d’Astous, 2004) or omitting brand names altogether to eliminate its potential effect on subjects (Aqueveque, 2006; Wong et al., 2008). The researcher has opted to omit brand names from the fictitious advertisement employed in the present study.

But because of the potential detrimental effects that using brand effects can have on demand artifacts, they will not be used in the fictitious advertisements designed for this work (Hui and Zhou, 2003; Samiee et al., 2005).

Pilot study # 4 shows that the reliability of the constructs employed in the author's research model are all within the acceptable range of reliability (0.7 – 0.85). As a result, no modifications will be made to any one of the items employed to measure these constructs. The findings of this study also provide initial support to the main hypothesis of this work, namely that animosity impacts involvement. Consequently, this hypothesis will be re-examined with a greater sample size and in two countries in a study described in chapter 6.
Chapter 6 – The Main Study

The main study was conducted in two countries, namely, Israel and the UK as British-Jews have deep ties and strong commitment to the State of Israel (Graham and Boyd, 2010). The ties and commitment of British-Jews to the State of Israel is pronounced in a number of ways. First, 82% of respondents reported that Israel plays a main or significant role in their Jewish identities. Second, 90% of the respondents said that Israel is the 'ancestral homeland' of the Jewish people. Third, the overwhelming majority (95%) of the respondents reported having visited Israel sometime in the past. Fourth, about 3/4 of respondents (72%) classify themselves as Zionists.

Moreover, 87% of respondents believe that British-Jews constitute an integral part of a global Jewish Diaspora. Also, 77% of respondents believe that 'Jews have a special responsibility to support Israel'. In addition, 87% respondents believe that it is the obligation of Jews to guarantee the survival of the State of Israel. Furthermore, the majority of respondents feel that Israel is relevant to their day to day lives in Britain. However, 67% of the sample doesn't feel that there is a conflict in loyalty stemming from being committed to Israel but living in the UK (Graham and Boyd, 2010).

Conducting cross-cultural research is important for several reasons. First, in order to make generalizations from one research context to another it is necessary to conduct a study in more than one country (Strodbeck, 1964; Triandis et al., 1972).

Second, COO effects – which are likely to become salient to consumers when they harbor feelings of animosity - are likely to vary from country to country (Sadrudin and d’Astous, 1993; Powers and Fetscherin, 2008). In particular, research shows that COO effects are moderated by culture (Heslop et al., 1998; Mihalyi, 1984). Culture is determined by the economic, political and education systems, religion and social structure of a given country (Nebenzahl et al., 2001).
Merchant and Ward (2003), for one, explored whether the COO cue and brand name played a role across and within countries in two places (Australia and Singapore). The results of the research demonstrate that people are likely to evaluate products differently depending on the country they live in and the subcultural (domestic vs. expatriate) group they belonged to. Thus, product-country image effects may even vary across subcultures within a single country.

Similarly, Laroche and Papadopoulos, et al. (2003) show that subcultural differences impact consumers' assessment of culturally related countries and their products. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the buying behavior of Jews living in the UK will differ from that of Jews living in Israel due to dissimilar cultural backgrounds.

Although Israel and the UK are very different from a cultural point of view, they have a lot in common. First, both Israel and the UK have been classified by the World Bank (2009) as high-income economies alongside other countries such as Estonia, Greenland, Hong Kong, and China. Thus, they are both economically developed countries. Choosing two countries that are economically developed is crucial as that consumers in developing countries have more positive perceptions towards foreign products than consumers in developed countries (Chao, 1989; Kaynak et al., 2000). Thus, no statistically significant differences are likely to be observed in the attitudes of Israeli and British consumers towards Germany.

Second, the two countries have a strong commercial and scientific relationship which is considered to be a cornerstone of the relationship between the two countries. The Israel-Britain Chamber of Commerce (IBCC) promotes trade, investment and business relations between Israel and the United Kingdom. Annual bilateral trade exceeds US$3 billion and over 300 known Israeli companies are operating in Britain (IBCC, 2011).

Finally, Germany is an important trade partner to both countries. Germany is the UK’s second most important export market. In addition, most of the imported goods entering the UK originate in Germany (The Office for
National Statistics, 2008). Similarly, a large volume of products imported into Israel originate in Germany. According to Israel’s Central Bureau of Statistics, in 2008 imports from Germany totaled roughly four billion U.S. dollars while exports to Germany were just below two billion U.S. dollars. Germany ranks fifth among the ten countries Israel imports from the most. In addition, Germany ranks sixth among the ten countries Israel exports its products to the most.

**Sampling Frame**

The author abided by the guidelines set by the ethics committee of the University which state that certain populations are not solicited for participation in any type of research. In line with these guidelines the research will not target the following populations: children under the age of 18 and the elderly. In addition, data will not be collected from individuals who cannot provide consent such as those who are intellectually debilitated, mentally impaired or physically disabled. Finally, prisoners and parolees will not be solicited for participation.

The decision regarding the units of analysis was carefully considered. Initially, the author considered sampling Holocaust survivors living both in Israel and the UK and the general Jewish population in both countries (i.e. Jewish consumers who have not directly experienced the Holocaust). These populations were consideration for inclusion in the sampling frame due to the desire to compare results among various population groups (i.e. survivors vs. non-survivors). However, Holocaust survivors and their families were not solicited due to disapproval by MBS's ethics committee.

Sampling students was also taken into consideration. The appropriateness of conducting research on student subject is controversial. Students have been used as consumer proxies in the overwhelming majority of consumer behaviour studies (Aboulnasr, 2006; Amine and Shin, 2001; Eroglu and Macleit, 1989; Hui and Zhou, 2003; Lee and Lou, 1995/1996; O’Cass, 2000; Rodgers and Schneider, 1993; Zhang, 1997). In fact, since the 1960s the majority of research in social psychology has been based on student samples (Sears, 1986). It has been suggested that this may be the case because students
make for easy research subjects since they are easily accessible to researchers (Liefeld, 2003; Sears, 1986).

Researchers that oppose using students in consumer research argue that it is inappropriate to extrapolate results obtained from research conducted on students to consumers in general (Liefeld, 2003; Peterson, 2001; Sears, 1986; Smith Jr., 1993; Upadhyay and Singh, 2006). That is to say, employing student sample has a negative effect of the external validity of research findings.

Peterson' (2001) research findings support the argument that external validity is likely to be impacted by the use of student samples. Peterson conducted four meta-analyses with the aim of studying response homogeneity and 30 meta-analyses to compare the effect sizes for behavioural and psychological relationships between student and non-student subjects. Effect sizes have two dimensions: a directional dimension and a magnitude dimension. The direction of effect sizes refers to the interrelationships between variables. In other words, does variable x predict variable y or vice versa. The magnitude of the effects size is in essence the magnitude of impact an independent variable has over a dependent variable.

Study results indicate that student responses are somewhat more homogeneous than non-student responses. In other words, the direction and magnitude of the effect sizes obtained from students frequently differed from those obtained from non-student subjects. Employing students may produce results that show that the relationship between variables is either weaker or stronger than they actually are (Sears, 1986). Thus, using student samples is likely to have a negative effect on the external validity of research findings.

Despite the evidence that students have an effect on external validity, some researchers suggest that student subjects do not pose a problem to external validity as long as one condition is met: these students are solicited to participate in theoretical research, that is, theory application research rather than effects application research (Calder et al., 1981).
This argument is in line with Li and Wyer's (2000) conclusion that results obtained from student samples are not generalisable to consumers as a whole when the effects of consumer behavior on willingness to purchase are investigated (effects application research). However, Li et al. argue that findings from studies employing students can be extrapolated to other consumers when ‘how’ products are assessed is the topic being studied (theory application research). Lynch (1982), in contrast, contends that if a hypothesis tested on any subgroup of consumers is supported, then these results can be generalised to consumers in general. Others, however, argue that students should not be employed in any type of consumer research (Peterson, 2001).

Besides the potential negative effect student subjects are likely to have on a study's external validity, employing student samples could be problematic for other reasons. First, students are too young and according to Usunier (2006), the attitudes of 20-25 year-old students do not necessarily reflect those of the general population. Usunier also argues that students’ attitudes are in the formation stage. This, in turn, is detrimental to the attitude-behaviour consistency. In other words, the relationship between what they say they will do and what they actually do is affected by the fact that their attitudes about different issues are likely to change more drastically than those of older individuals. Hence, predicting long-term behaviour is more difficult with students than it is with more mature consumers.

Usunier also suggests that students do not have experience with product purchase. This argument is supported by empirical research. Wong et al. (2008), for instance, conducted a study to investigate the effects of the three subcomponents of COO, namely country of parts, country of assembly and country of design on evaluations of product quality and intentions to buy high involvement products. The authors were also interested in how these subcomponents interact with CE. They show that the three subcomponents of COO are neither likely to have an effect on subjects' perceptions of product quality nor on their intentions to buy. Furthermore, country of parts is in the only subcomponent of the COO construct that is likely to have a statistically significant interaction with CE. Similar to Usunier (2006), the authors have
concluded that these results may have stemmed from the lack of product experience on the part of the research subjects who were students.

According to some researchers students also differ from the general population by their weak self-definition, greater cognitive skills and a predisposition to comply with authority. Furthermore, students represent a narrow age group in the population and are more highly educated (Sears, 1986). In addition, they are usually sampled from a single department (Liefeld, 2003). Consequently, they don't represent any particular group in the population. In other words, they neither represent all students nor all consumers.

Finally, students are allegedly not "real" consumers (Liefeld, 2003). It is likely that this claim is based on the assertion that some students do not work and those that do, have temporary part-time jobs. Hence, many of the objects they owe are bought buy their parents. These characteristics clearly distinguish them from most people.

While some investigators are against using student samples in consumer behavior research, others do not object to it. Cook and Campbell (1979), for instance, strongly support using student samples in research as they argue that greater statistical power is gained when a study is conducted in an isolated setting, when standardized procedures are employed and when homogeneous samples are used. It has also been suggested that greater statistical power can be achieved by holding background factors constant, increasing the sample size, treat background factors as covariates and employing within subjects designs (Lynch, 1982). This seems to imply that it is appropriate to employ students in experimental research.

In sum, the use of students in consumer research is controversial. The main argument of those researchers that are against employing students is that there are several substantial differences between students and consumers. That is to say, using a student in the present study may produce results that do not accurately reflect the direction and magnitude of the effect sizes of animosity on purchase involvement in consumers (Sears, 1986). Hence, students will not be
included in the present work. Instead, Jewish consumers in both Israel and the UK will be solicited for participation in the study.

Sample Characteristics

Data was collected from permanent Jewish residents of both Israel and the UK. Non-Jews were omitted from this study. Non-Jewish Israeli or British citizens whose family has been affected by the Holocaust may not harbour the same feelings toward Germany as those citizens whose family members fell victim to the atrocities of the Nazis.

Therefore, extra care was taken in order to solicit only those consumers for whom the Holocaust is part of their national history, namely the Jewish population. Whether a subject Jewish or not was verified with a question in demographic data section in the questionnaire. Subjects were asked to indicate whether they are Jewish, Christian or Muslim.

Permanent residents who had been living in either Israel or the UK for at least 5 years were included in the sample for two reasons. First, consumer behaviour researchers suggest that it takes at least five years for immigrants to go through the process of acculturation (Leonidou et al., 2007). Therefore, soliciting for participation only those individuals who have been living in Israel or the UK for at least 5 years ensures that any observed differences between them does not arise from cultural differences.

Second, because the victims of the Holocaust are commemorated across Israel annually, those who have been living in Israel for at least a half a decade are more likely to be more sensitive to events related to the Holocaust than new immigrants or the non-Jewish population.

The fact individuals who have been living in Israel for at least five years are more likely to be sensitive to events related to the Holocaust does not necessarily stem from more knowledge about the Holocaust. Rather it is because no other country in the world commemorates the Holocaust like Israel. Thus, the eligibility of potential subjects was determined with a question asked prior to eliciting participation. The question ask by researcher was: “for how many years
have you been living in Israel?" in the study conducted in Israel and “for how many years have you been living in the UK?” in the study conducted in the UK.

**Sample Size**

The sample size used in the current study is in line with previous experimental studies. These investigations have included 8 to 30 subjects in each experimental condition (Aqueveque, 2006; Churchill and Surpenant; Crane, 1996; Hong and Kang, 2006; Hui and Zhou, 2003; Srinivasan et al., 2004). Consequently, 20 subjects were assigned to each experimental condition in the present study. Assigning 20 subjects to each experimental condition makes for a middle ground for the range of 8 to 30. Since there are 12 experimental or treatment conditions in this study, it would be necessary to sample at least 240 subjects. However, distributing merely 240 questionnaires would not suffice as response rates are unlikely to be 100%.

Several consumer behaviour studies (including those published in peer-reviewed journals and PhD theses) have, for some reason, not reported response rates (Aqueveque, 2006; Amine and Shin, 2002; Ben-Mrad, 2008; Herstein and Tifferet, 2007; Hong and Kang, 2006; Hong and Wyer, 1990; Johansson et al., 1985; Leong et al., 2008; Miyazaki et al., 2005; Nebenzahl et al., 2001; Srinivasan et al., 2004; Wang and Heitmeyer, 2006). It is important that future studies do report response rates. This will allow researchers to make more accurate estimates of how many questionnaires they should distribute to consumers so as to obtain the desired sample size.

One possible explanation for this may lie in the fact that students were sampled in most of these studies. Some of these students were elicited for participation by their own lecturers who, in some instances, have given them extra credit to encourage participation (Chowdhury, 2008). Few students would refuse to fill out a questionnaire in return for extra course credit. Hence, the response rate was high.

Although response rates are likely to near 100% when the sample consists of students and the study is conducted by their lecturer, in general,
response rates are culture-bound. It has been suggested that unusually high response rates could be expected in studies conducted in Israel because of its informal culture (Reichel et al., 2007). This is in stark contrast to studies that were conducted in other parts of the world. In China, for example, the response rate to a study conducted by Klein et al. (1998) was only 50%. The response rate was even lower (40%) in Nijssen and Douglas’ (2006) study which was conducted in The Netherlands.

Because response rates are culture-bound, consumer behavior investigations conducted in both Israel and the UK were reviewed by the author of the present study. In particular, studies which have employed the mall-intercept technique (the technique employed in the current investigation) to collect data were scrutinized. The response rates in the studies conducted in Israel ranged from 81% to 100% (Kustin, 1993; Shoham et al., 2006; Ruvio et al., 2008; Shoham and Brencic, 2003). The response rates in the UK differed from study to study. In some studies response rates have exceeded 70% (Balabanis and Diamantopoulos, 2004; Leonidou et al., 2007). In other studies, however, response rates were as low as 23.6% (Jamal and Goode, 2001).

Design

Two very different product stimuli are employed in the main study: Shower gels and refrigerators. These two products have been chosen since they are likely to elicit different levels of purchase involvement. Consumers buy shower gels more frequently than refrigerators and as a result are more likely to be familiar (that is, knowledgeable) with them. Furthermore, shower gels are relatively inexpensive. Therefore, they are likely to elicit low levels of purchase involvement. In contrast, consumers purchase only a few refrigerators in their lifetimes. Consequently, consumers are less likely to have experience buying refrigerators in comparison to shower gels. In addition, refrigerators are relatively expensive and there are greater differences among alternatives. These factors are likely to increase consumers’ purchase involvement with refrigerators (Leonidou et al., 2007).
Thus, several factors are likely to affect consumers’ level of purchase involvement with shower gels and refrigerators. Controlling these factors is important since the author wishes to isolate all of the factors that may affect purchase involvement to determine whether animosity effects purchase involvement when all other factors are kept constant.

In order to control for the potential effect of the abovementioned individual factors on purchase involvement, subjects will be randomly assigned to 12 experimental conditions. Half of the experimental conditions will include three refrigerators in the product choice stage of the experiment and the other half will include three shower gel alternatives. Assigning subjects to the various experimental conditions will allow the researcher to assume that subjects only differ in the experimental treatment they have been assigned to and that any observed differences are random rather than systematic.

For purposes of convenience, the researcher has divided the 12 experimental conditions into four groups A, B, C, and D and three subgroups (A1, A2, A3; B1, B2, B3; C1, C2, C3; D1, D2, D3). The product stimuli employed in groups A and C are refrigerators. Subjects that were assigned to one of the six subgroups (that is, A1, A2, A3; C1, C2, C3) were requested to choose one of three alternatives of refrigerator presented to them in a modified product advertisement. While subjects assigned to group A were exposed to the low animosity experimental condition, subjects assigned to group B were exposed to the high animosity experimental treatment.

Subjects assigned to groups B and D will be required to choose one of three alternatives of a shower gel shown to them in a modified product advertisement. Subjects assigned to group B will be placed in the high animosity experimental condition and comprised the experimental group. However, subjects assigned to group D will placed in the low animosity experimental condition and comprise the control group.

Subjects assigned to the experimental group will read a positive statement about the current trade relations between Germany and Israel. Those subjects assigned to the control group, however, will read a negative statement.
about the trade relations between the two countries. The purpose of employing statements about the present trade relations between Germany and Israel was to trigger subjects' thoughts about the Holocaust.

In sum, the present study is a 2 economic animosity (high vs. low) * 2 product type (shower gel vs. refrigerator) * 3 COO (Israel, USA, Germany) between subjects design. Thus, all in all, the study consists of 12 experimental conditions. Subjects will be assigned to each of the experimental conditions on a random basis. All subjects will get a copy of a fictitious advertisement for either refrigerators or shower gels each of which includes three alternatives that are identical in all attributes but the COO information. Brand names will not be employed to identify the products in the advertisements as brand familiarity is likely to impact the choices consumers make.

Ethical Considerations

The data collection process in the present work was conducted in accordance with acceptable ethical principles in human research. According to Bryman and Bell (2007) five principles underpin ethics in research involving humans: 1) harm to participants; 2) lack of informed consent; 3) invasion of privacy; (4) deception and (5) benefit subjects in some way. These principles are intertwined and interrelated and disregard for one principle will necessarily lead to the violation of another principle. No matter what type of research (i.e. quantitative or qualitative) is conducted or how data is collected (i.e. interview, survey, experiment), ethical dilemmas arise time and time again.

1. Harm to Participants

The first ethical principle underpinning human research is harm to participants. Research is to be conducted for the benefit of research subjects. In addition, possible benefits to subjects need to be maximized while potential harmful effects minimized. When discussing harm in research one refers to: (1) physical pain, (2) psychological harm, (3) stress, (4) endangering a participant’s job, (5) coercing participants to perform illegal actions. The present study is not likely to result in any physical harm. Moreover, the participants' workplace will
not be endangered as the study will not be conducted in their place of work (Bryman and Bell, 2007).

While psychological harm and/or stress are possible, there are very unlikely to occur. First, similar to previous studies which have also focused on the effects of events similar to the Holocaust on consumer behavior (Klein et al., 1998; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Shin, 2001), Holocaust survivors will not be solicited for participation. These studies do provide a description of their samples. However, none of them mention whether survivors were part of the sample and why they were not included in the study. It stands to reason that because of consumer behavior researchers’ concern over how survivors of such events would feel when directly inquired about them, they have avoided soliciting survivors. Since it is unknown how Holocaust survivors will react to the questions in the experiment, they will not be solicited for participation.

Furthermore, studies which have studied the effects of events similar to those of the Holocaust have sampled those who were indirectly involved in such events. These studies have not reported any ethical issues and it can therefore be assumed that sampling those who have not been directly involved in the Holocaust shouldn’t raise any ethical dilemmas.

Finally, potential psychological harm will be minimized if not eliminated by a statement in the consent form to be issued to all potential participants. The statement will declare explicitly that participation is voluntary and that participation may be withdrawn at any in stage in the study. Furthermore, a social worker will be present during the experiment so that should any subject have questions or need support, he or she will receive it immediately. If any subject will have questions or need support after taking part in the study, he or she will be able to contact the social worker by calling the number that appears on the information sheet he or she will be required to read prior to taking part in the study. The contact information contains the social worker's full name and telephone number and will be theirs to keep if they decide to participate in the study.
2. Informed Consent and Deception

The second ethical principle underpinning human research is informed consent while the fourth principle is deception. While these informed consent and deception are two distinct principles, the author of this thesis has opted to discuss them together as they are related. Before a study can get underway researchers must obtain the free, voluntary and informed consent of potential participants. In other words, potential subjects need to receive adequate information as to what is the purpose of the study and what will be required of them once they agree to participate. However, in order for participants to provide an informed agreement, researchers would, ideally, need to completely disclose their study’s objective to the former.

Consumer behavior researchers tend to avoid being too specific about the aims of their studies (Pecotich and Ward, 2007). This avoidance stems from investigators' concern that this would bias the answers participants provide. Some might argue that this behaviour on the part of researchers borderlines deception which is unethical.

Penslar (1995), however, argues that providing general information about a study's purpose is ethical as long as the following requirements are met: (1) the research involves minimal risks to subjects; (2) the rights and welfare of the participants is not compromised; (3) the study cannot be conducted effectively without deception and (4) participants are given information about the study at the end of their participation. Penslar’s final requirement (i.e. requirement number four) is in line with Bryman and Bell’s (2007) contention that revealing a study’s overall purpose at the beginning of the investigation and a more detailed account at the end of the study is acceptable if doing so at the outset of an investigation is not feasible. In fact, some researchers do reveal the specific aim of their investigation at the end of the study (Klein, 1998; Pecotich and Ward, 2007).

It is evident that, at least in some cases, elaborating on a study's research aims at the outset of the investigation is not feasible as it is likely to produce misleading results. It is likely that revealing the overall aim of research, rather
than the specific research objectives, is in fact inevitable in much consumer behaviour research. Let’s take the case of Pecotich and Ward’s (2007) study. While the aim of their study was to examine the decision-making processes of experts and novices with respect to international brand names, COO and intrinsic quality differences, they have told their subjects that goal of the investigation was to test advertising copy for computers. Had the authors told subjects precisely what the aim of their study was, this could have produced unreliable results due to the reluctance of some subjects to admit that they are novices rather than experts.

Similar reliability concerns arise in the present study. Revealing to participants that the study examines the effects of involvement on consumer behavior in the context of animosity (that is, the Holocaust) is likely to result in biased responses from them. Hence, in conformity with Penslar’s fourth requirement and in line with previous studies, initially only the general purpose of study will be revealed to respondents. Thus, subjects will be informed that the aim of the study is to investigate product choice. Research subjects in the present study will be exposed to the complete purpose of the study at the end of the experiment.

3. Invasion of Privacy

The third ethical principle underpinning human research is invasion of privacy. In the current study subjects will remain anonymous at all times and so will the information they provide. The data collected in the present study will only be accessible to the following individuals and bodies: the researcher of the main study (Villy Abraham), the researcher’s supervisor (Prof. Andrew Newman), and the members of the DBA researcher committee.

4. The Benefit to Research Subjects

The fifth and final ethical principle underpinning human research is that it should benefit subjects in some way. The results of Pilot Study #1 demonstrate that Jewish consumers still harbor feelings of animosity towards Germany. These feelings translate not only to boycotts of German products.
(Podeshen, 2005) but also to traumatic reactions to films, clips or advertisements featuring figures associated with the Holocaust.

For example, in 2009 a scene from the German film "Der Untergang" was uploaded to YouTube as part of a campaign against the parking space crisis in Tel-Aviv, Israel. Subtitles were added to the movie. However, the scene was not translated. The subtitles were merely produced to pass a message. The chair of one of the Holocaust Survivors Organization in Israel and a Holocaust survivor himself said that watching the scene brought back memories from the Holocaust (Ezer, 2009).

The findings of this research could benefit Holocaust survivors, their families and perhaps other populations by creating a better understanding of how the use of certain copy can influence some social groups and populations.

Procedure

Data for the present study was collected from both the UK and Israel between June 21 and July 2. The author of the present investigation introduced himself by saying that he is a doctoral student at the University of Manchester and that his conducting a research as part of the requirement for a doctoral degree in business administration.

To encourage participation, the researcher used a different incentive in each one of the countries in which the present study was conducted (the UK and the Israel). Subjects in Israel participated in draw for a digital camera. The researcher thought that a better incentive for British-Jews would be a more symbolic gift relating to the Jewish religion. Therefore, subjects in the UK were given a miniature copy of the Book of Psalms attached to a keychain.

Offering a gift for participation is common practice in studies which include a large number of questions as is the case in the present study. Researchers offer different gifts for participation. Some offer money either in cash (Aldan, 1993; Dahr, 1997; Teng et al., 2007) or in the form of coupons (Beatty and Smith, 1987). Yet others give respondents/subjects a chance to
participate in a draw (Dholakia, 2001; Grewal, 1998; Mort and Duncan, 2003; Russell and Russell, 2006; Torres and Brigg, 2007). It is ethical to provide reasonable compensation to subjects for their participation in the study. However, the payment should not be excessive so as to avoid coercing potential subjects from participating against their better judgment (MBS Ethics Committee Guidelines).

In an apparent effort to conform to these or similar ethical rules, researchers that have wished to compensate subjects for their participation in their studies have not paid them more than $5 US. Offering each subject a small incentive may elicit a greater response rate than a chance to win a prize. However, because the current the study was sponsored by the researcher himself, paying $5 US to at least 240 subjects (a total of $1200 US) was not possible.

Subjects that have agreed to participate were given a copy of the information sheet to read. After they read it they were asked whether they had any questions about the study, and they were then required to sign a consent form. After the consent form was signed, the researcher asked them to complete the questionnaire.

The information sheet starts with a statement of the study’s purpose. The information sheet also provides information about the study’s duration, the name of the researcher, an explanation of what the subject is expected to do, a statement that participation is voluntary and that participation may be withdrawn at any time. Furthermore, potential participants were told that the study is anonymous and their names will not be mentioned in the study or any ensuing publication of the study results. In addition, subjects were notified that they will be entitled to get a copy of any published materials related to study. All they had to do in order to obtain a copy of published results is to email the researcher of the present study.

Next, the information sheet provides potential subjects with general information about the experiment. The information sheet informs subjects that there is no right or wrong answer and that they should circle the number under
each statement that best reflects their agreement or disagreement (Dhar, 1997). After having read the information sheet, study participants were requested to sign a request form. Once the consent forms were returned, study participants were handed a copy of the research questionnaire.

Immediately after respondents completed the survey they were debriefed. Debriefing study participants at the end of a study assists researcher identify whether their findings are contaminated by demand effects. Demand effects occur when study participants or research subjects guess the purpose of study. As a result, some researchers debrief subjects at the end an investigation in order to learn whether they have guessed the aim of their investigation (Klein, 1998; Pecotich and Ward, 2007). Debriefing study participants at the end of an investigation is in line with ethical guidelines according to which that the complete and true purpose of an investigation are disclosed to subjects once it is over (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Hence, the complete aim of the present study was revealed to subjects as soon as they have been debriefed by the researcher.

The debriefing started as soon as subjects have handed the completed questionnaire to the researcher. First, the researcher thanked subjects for agreeing to take part in the study. Then, they were asked what they thought was the researcher question or main hypothesis of the study.

There are various ways of learning what subjects think is the hypothesis research question if the study in which they have participated. One way is to ask subjects to write down what they think the hypotheses are (Torres and Briggs, 2007). Another way of doing this is by asking two questions (Baker, 1999): First, “which brand or product do you think the experimenter wanted you to choose over the others”? Second, “did you conclude that now, or were you thinking about that at the time you were making your brand [product] choice?” (p.44). In the present study subjects were asked to write down what they thought was the research question or hypothesis.

It is not uncommon for participants to guess research question or the hypothesis of the study in which they have taken part. The number of respondents that guess the hypotheses or research questions varies from study to
study. Only 1% of participants in Torres and Briggs’ (2007) study were very close to guessing its underlying hypothesis. However, in Pecotich and Ward’s (2007) investigation as many as 34.1% of the participants guessed the aim of the study.

In line with previous research (Pecotich and Ward, 2007), the following measures will be taken to minimize the potential effect of demand artifacts on study results: If the subjects of the present study guess the hypothesis or research questions correctly, they will be included in a comparison test in which they would be compared with those who have not guessed correctly. If no statistically significant difference will be observed between the groups, then the subjects that have guessed the purpose of the investigation will not eliminated from further statistical analysis (Chris and Ward, 2003).

Once the questionnaires were collected they were edited to ensure that they were answered appropriately. Finally, data were typed into electronic file for statistical analysis (Leonidou et al., 2007).

The draw was conducted by the researcher at the end of the data collection process. The following paragraphs provide a detailed description of as to how the draw was conducted. First, the full names of all subjects (n=340) were written down on A4 sheet of paper. The names were drawn out from the consent forms returned by the subjects. Second, the names were cut out. Third, the cut out names were placed in a shoe box. Next, the box was shaken several so as to allow the names of subjects to mingle inside. This was done to ensure that a winner would be selected at random. Then, the researcher blindly opened the box and took a piece of paper without looking at the box. The goal was to avoid a situation in which the results of the draw are biased in favor of a particular participant. Finally, the winner’s contact information was sought by searching through the consent forms subjects have signed prior to participating in the study. Subjects were required to write down their telephone numbers and email addresses on the consent forms so that the subject that wins the prize could be contacted.
Data Collection in Israel

Data was collected between June 21 -24, 2010. Sampling consumers outside stores (which is equivalent to the mall-intercept method) is deemed most appropriate for collecting data in Israel. This data collection has been used in the past by several consumer behaviour researchers in Israel (Herstein and Tifferet’s, 2007; Kustin, 1993). A convenience sample of 325 consumers were elicited for participation in the study as they exited electric appliance stores and supermarkets in three central locations across Israel. However, only 240 consumers agreed to take part in the study (response rate = 73.8%).

A random sample would have been more preferable. However, it would not be technically possible as not every consumer exiting an electric appliance store buys a refrigerator and not every consumer coming out of a supermarket will have shower gel in his/her shopping bag.

Data Collection in the UK

The majority of the Jewish population (66%) in the UK lives in London (Jewishdatabank.org, 2011). As a result, the data for this study was collected from the Jewish community in the London area between 28 June 2010 and 2 July 2010 using the drop off/pick up sampling technique. Members of the Jewish community were sampled based on convenience. A convenience sampling technique was deemed more appropriate for the study conducted in the UK. Random sampling would have been impossible as members of the Jewish community cannot be identified from a list or accessed at random (Graham and Boyd, 2010). The questionnaires were handed out to the members of the Jewish community in four places: (1) in a falafel shop; (2) London Jewish Family Centre; (3) Yeshivas; (4) Golders Green. All in all 100 out of the 161 questionnaires handed out (response rate = 62%) were returned.

The falafel shop was located in Southgate, Northern London. A falafel shop was chosen since falafel is an iconic part of Israeli cuisine and often referred to as a national dish. Falafel is made from fried chick peas. The origin of falafel is unknown and controversial. A common theory is that the dish
originated in Egypt. While falafel is not a specifically Jewish dish, it was eaten by Oriental Jews in their countries of origin. Oriental Jews are Jews who have immigrated to Israel from North Africa and the Middle East and whose ancestors did not reside in either Germany or Spain (Britannica.com, 2012). Later, it was adopted by early Jewish immigrants to Palestine. The custom of eating falafel in a pita stuffed with salads began in Israel. In Israel, falafel crosses ethnic and religious bounds, and is enjoyed by all sectors of society (peopleil.org, 2011).

The owner of the shop was contacted by the researcher in advance. The researcher has spoken to the owner on the phone several times before going to London. The purpose of these phone calls was to: (1) explain to the shop's owner what the purpose of the study was; (2) obtain the owner's permission to elicit the shop's customers to take part in the investigation; (3) to set the dates in which data collection would most convenient to the owner.

Because the falafel is not a specifically Jewish dish, non-Jews are also likely to eat it. Therefore, it was necessary to make sure that the shop's customers that take part in the study are Jewish. Fortunately, the shop is well-known in the area, it has many frequent customers which the owner knows very well. Thus, the owner of the shop was able to help the researcher identify the customers that are Jewish. This was also verified in the demographic data section of the questionnaire in which subjects were asked to indicate their religion. The researcher has also left instructions for the owner in case a customer would be interested in completing a questionnaire while the research himself was not present. The researcher has spent 3 hours a day between 12 and 3 o'clock in the afternoon everyday for 4 days in the falafel shop. All in all, 36 customers agreed to take part on the study.

Data was also collected from The London Jewish Family Centre (LJFC). The researcher has come across this Jewish centre while searching the internet for Jewish centres in the UK.

The LJFC is an initiative of Tzivos Hashem: Jewish Children International. Tzivos Hashem was founded in 1980 by the Lubavicher Rebbe,
Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson. The centre's goal is to inspire informal education in a positive Jewish environment. In particular, its objective is to help Jewish children acquire a positive Jewish identity and appreciation of their heritage (ljfc.com).

LJFC has over 300,000 members worldwide and over 9,000 in the UK. It sponsors a wide range of educational, recreational and entertaining programmes. Thus, (LJFC) provides Jewish families with a place where they can participate in various activities.

These activities include after school clubs, mother and toddler groups, lectures, IT training, art classes, woodwork, Taekwon-Do, ladies aerobics, cooking, first aid courses and more. The centre has also got a playground for toddlers. Hence, it's a place where children and adults can study and relax.

The administration of LJFC informed the researcher that parents take their toddlers to the playground every morning. Consequently, the researcher visited the centre in the morning hours for four days. The researcher was convinced that the mothers that will come to the centre with their toddlers to the playground would be relaxed and therefore more likely to be willing to participate in the study.

The data collection process included several stages. First, the researcher introduced himself to potential subjects individually. Then, the author informed them that he a doctoral student at the University of Manchester and was conducting research in partial fulfillment of the degree requirements. This was followed by a general statement about the study's aim. Finally, potential subjects were asked if they would be willing to take part in the study. Individuals that answered in the affirmative were given an information sheet in which they could obtain more information about the study. After having read the information sheet, subjects were given a consent form to read and sign. A total of 22 individuals agreed to take part in the study.

Data was also collected with the help of the chief Rabbi of the Jewish community in the borough of Barnet who was a distant acquaintance of the
researcher. His telephone number was obtained from the main office in his Yeshiva and a visit followed.

During the visit the researcher has given the Rabbi a general description of the study and requested his help in contacting members of the Jewish community in London. The Rabbi suggested taking the researcher to a few yeshivas. A yeshiva is any one of the countless Jewish academies of Talmudic learning, whose biblical and legal interpretations and implementation of Scripture have defined and regulated Jewish religious life for hundreds of years (Britannica.com, 2012). And so, during the next few days the researcher and the Rabbi have visited a number of yeshivas. 27 questionnaires were collected from yeshivas.

Finally, the author collected data from members of the Jewish community in Golders Green. Golders Green is an area in the London Borough of Barnet in London, England. Golders Green is a 19th century suburban development located roughly 5.3 miles (8.5 km) northwest of Charing Cross and centred on the crossroads of Golders Green Road and Finchley Road. Golders Green is a cosmopolitan district and since the 1900s it has had a large Jewish community (Wikipedia.org, 2010).

The researcher has gone into every store he thought was owned by a Jewish owner. In order to make sure that the owner was no mistake in identity, the researcher developed conversations with them. Even if the researcher would take somebody for a Jew when he or she in fact was not, this would surface in the questionnaire as subjects were requested to indicate what their religion is along with other demographic data in the last section of the questionnaire.

After developing a friendly conversation with the owners, the researcher asked them whether they be willing to dedicate a few minutes of their time to completing the research questionnaire. In some shops the researcher has overheard employees speaking in Hebrew so he also asked them if they'd be willing to participate.

The response rate was lower than that collected from the falafel shop and
from Yeshiva students. Some refused to take part in the study because they said they had no time. When the researcher offered to leave a copy of the questionnaire and collect it at a more convenient time they still refused. Other people have agreed to take a copy and return it to the researcher the next day. However, when the researcher returned the next day so as to collect the questionnaire, some of the potential subjects have told the researcher that they have changed their minds. The main reason provided for the backtracking is the reluctance to give away personal information. All in all, the researcher managed to get 15 employees/owners of shops in Golders Green to take part in the study.

In sum, all in all 100 British-Jews and 240 Israeli-Jews agreed to take part in the study. Overall, 486 questionnaire were handed out to consumers in both the UK and Israel. 340 questionnaires were returned (response rate = 70%). This sample size is consist with sample sizes obtained in previous experimental research (Ang and Jung et al., 2004; Shimp and Dunn, 2004; Klein, 2002).

Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the main study conducted in the present work. The discussion included a debate about the reasons for choosing to conduct the study in the UK and in Israel. The sampling frame, sample size, study design and data collection procedure were also discussed. The following chapter reports the study findings.
Chapter 7 – Results

Pre-Analytic Process

SPSS version 16 was employed in the analysis of all data collected. Items left unanswered by research subjects were omitted from analysis with the SPSS software. Dropping missing values is the default option of the SPSS software program. The advantage of dealing with missing values in the manner delineated above is that if a subject does not answer a question on one scale, then rather than disqualifying a questionnaire completely due to missing data, only a particular part is dropped from analysis. This decreases the number of questionnaires that become useless due to missing data.

The author will report the results from each of the two countries where data was collected separately. The purpose of the separate reporting of the data is to enable the researcher to compare and contrast the research findings. Then the researcher will combine the datasets from each country so as to look for general attitudes and behaviors among the Jewish populations in both countries.
**Israeli Study**

**Sample Description**

Table 15. Description of the Israeli Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Worker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Table 15 we can see that 50.4 of subjects are female while 49.6 percent are male. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of subjects (94.6%) are between the ages of 18 to 45. Finally, 50% of subjects are professional or clerical workers.

**Manipulation Checks**

The purpose of conducting a manipulation check is to examine whether an experimental manipulation was in fact successful. In the present study the author has manipulated economic animosity with a statement about the present trade relationship between Germany and Israel. Thus, a manipulation check was
conducted to examine whether the manipulation of economic animosity was successful. That is to say, the researcher of the study needed to make sure that the manipulation of economic animosity has resulted in greater mean scores on the economic animosity construct. Previous studies have demonstrated that that there is a positive correlation between animosity and ethnocentrism (Rose et al., 2009). That is to say, the more consumers harbor feelings of animosity the more likely they are to be ethnocentric. Thus, eliminating the possibility that the manipulation of economic animosity would impact results on the CETSCALE rather than the economic animosity construct was essential.

In line with previous research (Russell and Russell, 2006), the manipulation check was carried out by examining whether the manipulation of economic animosity has had a statistically significant impact on economic animosity rather than on ethnocentrism (see Table 16).

Table 16. ANOVA Analysis – The Effect of Treatment and Country on Economic Animosity vs. Ethnocentrism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>.135$^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>26.934$^b$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.934</td>
<td>21.986</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>3799.308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3799.308</td>
<td>1639.158</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>2124.150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2124.150</td>
<td>1733.964</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>26.934</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.934</td>
<td>21.986</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>551.646</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>291.556</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>4351.090</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>2442.640</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>551.782</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>318.490</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 16 shows that the manipulation of economic animosity was in fact successful. First, a statistically significant relationship was observed between the treatment condition and mean scores on the economic animosity construct (p=0.000). Second, a statistically insignificant relationship was observed between the treatment condition and mean scores on the ethnocentrism scale (p=0.809).

Mittal’s (1995) Purchase Decision Involvement (PDI) scale was used to measure subjects’ level of involvement in the study conducted by the researcher. The PDI scale was used to measure subjects’ involvement with two products: refrigerators and shower gels. All subjects’ level of purchase involvement, regardless of whether they were assigned to the experimental group or control group, was measured twice in the experiment.

Because of the need to demonstrate that the experimental manipulation per se has impacted purchase involvement and eliminate the possibility that other factors may have been at play, purchase involvement was measured once at the beginning of the experiment and once again after the product choice stage of the experiment.

The reason purchase involvement was measured again only after the product choice stage and not immediately after having read the statement is because the Purchase Decision Involvement scale is used to measure consumers’ level of purchase Involvement. Therefore, measuring subjects’ purchase involvement after the product choice stage in the experiment would be more sensible than measuring it in any other stage.

In this study subjects assigned to the experimental group read a statement about the trade relationship between Israel and Germany. In the statement it was said that Israel was being exploited economically by Germany. Subjects assigned to the control group, however, were not exposed to a statement about the present trade relations between Germany and Israel.

Before examining the effect of the experimental treatment on purchase involvement (i.e. the dependent variable), it was necessary to check
whether there are additional factors that might have had an impact on the dependent variable which in turn might confound the effect of the experimental treatment. This was examined using Pearson's correlation (see Table 17).

Table 17. Pearson’s Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Purchase involvement (prior to treatment)</th>
<th>Product familiarity</th>
<th>Purchase involvement (after treatment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase involvement</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>.604**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product familiarity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.229**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

A significant and strong correlation was observed ($r = 0.604, P = 0.000$) between purchase involvement measured prior to the experimental treatment and purchase involvement measured after the experimental treatment (Table 16). Consumers’ level of purchase involvement is likely to vary with the context in which they make their purchase decisions. Every subject’s individual level of purchase involvement is likely to account for the abovementioned finding. Thus, it was deemed necessary to neutralize the potential effects of differences in purchase involvement when examining the effect of the experimental treatment on the level of purchase involvement.

Product familiarity is one of several moderators of consumer behavior (Samiee et al., 2005; Usunier, 2006). Consequently, it was considered important to examine whether there is a statistically significant relationship between product familiarity and purchase involvement in the present
A statistically significant but a relatively weak correlation was found between product familiarity and purchase involvement (see Table 17). This was observed both when the relationship between product familiarity and purchase involvement measured prior to the experimental condition was examined (r=0.229, p = 0.000) and when the relationship between product familiarity and purchased involvement measured after the experimental treatment was examined(r=0.247, p = 0.000).

Table 18. Partial Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Purchase involvement (after treatment)</th>
<th>Product familiarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase involvement (after treatment)</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product familiarity</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the observed correlation between product familiarity and purchase involvement, it was necessary to control for the effect of the former on the latter. Partial correlations were used to neutralize the effect of product familiarity on purchase involvement (see Table 18).

A Univariate ANOVA analysis was conducted to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the control group and the experimental group in the level of purchase involvement measured after the experimental manipulation of economic animosity. The purpose of this analysis was to examine whether the level of purchase involvement increased among the subjects who were assigned to the experimental group. That is to say, the aim of the analysis was to determine whether the attempt to manipulate economic animosity was in fact successful.
In this analysis, PI2 (purchase involvement measured after assigning subjects to a treatment condition) was the dependent variable, the treatment (experimental vs. control group) and type of product were the independent variables. Furthermore, PI1 (i.e. purchase involvement measured before assigning subjects to a treatment condition) and product familiarity were treated as co-factors in the analysis (see Table 19).

Table 19. Univariate ANOVA Analysis of Purchase Involvement After the Experimental Treatment as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Involvement (Prior to Experimental Treatment)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.126</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Familiarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.898</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Type * Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 demonstrates that when PDI was measured prior to the experimental treatment, no statistically significant difference was observed between the level of purchase involvement with both products (P = 0.218). The table, however, shows that the level of purchase involvement measured after the experimental manipulation is statistically significant (P = 0.028).

An additional ANOVA analysis was conducted to examine whether the type of product depicted in the advertisements subjects were exposed to in the product choice stage of the experiment has had an effect on the measurements of purchase involvement taken after the experimental manipulation. Table 20 demonstrates that the experimental treatment had a statistically significant effect on purchase involvement (F(1,239)=5.32, p=0.022). However, no statistically significant relationship between the type of product and purchase involvement was observed (F(1,239)=1.69, p=0.194).
Table 20. ANOVA Analysis of the Relationship between the Experimental Treatment, Product Type and Purchase Involvement

Dependent Variable: Purchase Involvement Measured after Manipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8.859^a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>6.910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.910</td>
<td>5.323</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>product</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment *</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>306.377</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315.291</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>315.236</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .028 (Adjusted R Squared = .016)

Age and Animosity

An ANOVA test (see Table 21) was conducted to examine if there are statistically significant difference between age, gender and the three types of consumer animosity (that is, economic, war and general animosity). No statistically significant differences were found between the various age groups studied and war animosity and economic animosity. However, a statistically significant difference was observed between the various age groups regarding general animosity (0.033). In other words, age does not have an impact on war and economic animosity but does effect general animosity.

Because of the observed relationship between age and general animosity, descriptive statistics were generated (see Table 22) to obtain a more profound observation of the pattern in this relationship.
Table 21. Multivariate Analysis of the Treatment Condition as a Co–Factor and the Three Types of Animosity as the Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>45.864&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.698</td>
<td>2.197</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>21.015&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>47.709&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>386.855</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>386.855</td>
<td>315.017</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>1100.243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1100.243</td>
<td>582.431</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>821.756</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>821.756</td>
<td>435.532</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>4.310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.310</td>
<td>3.510</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>3.197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.197</td>
<td>1.694</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>4.611</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>6.026</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>20.205</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.051</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment * gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment * age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>4.703</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>9.793</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>13.279</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender * age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>3.414</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment * gender * age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA mean</td>
<td>3.306</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA mean</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA mean</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .144 (Adjusted R Squared = .078)
b. R Squared = .048 (Adjusted R Squared = -.025)
c. R Squared = .102 (Adjusted R Squared = .034)
Table 22 demonstrates that the relationship between age and general animosity is positive. Although the mean score on the general animosity score decreases from 4.15 in the 18-25 to 3.84 in the 26-35 age group, the mean score increases with subjects' age.

Table 22. Mean Scores on Economic Animosity, War Animosity and General Animosity Constructs by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Economic Animosity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>3.0198</td>
<td>1.17426</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>2.9745</td>
<td>1.13790</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>2.8455</td>
<td>1.11087</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>2.5818</td>
<td>1.10799</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.9655</td>
<td>1.14839</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>War Animosity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>5.3093</td>
<td>1.38222</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>5.0887</td>
<td>1.33080</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>5.5455</td>
<td>1.47482</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>5.5152</td>
<td>1.10919</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.2535</td>
<td>1.36003</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>General Animosity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>4.1532</td>
<td>1.42757</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3.8475</td>
<td>1.30495</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>4.4545</td>
<td>1.48910</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>4.7273</td>
<td>1.26331</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.0868</td>
<td>1.39079</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Consistency (Cronbach's α)**

Internal consistency of the items/indicators measuring each construct were examined by employing Cronbach’s α which is one of the most commonly used tools of reliability in consumer behaviour research (Sadrudin and d’Astous, 2007; Aurier and Fort, 2007; Chow et al., 1990; Half et al., 1999; Huffman et al., 1990; Patrick et al., 2007; Xue, 2008). Cronbach’s alpha gives a tool to assess two basic attributes of the scale: 1) the overall usefulness of the scale in capturing the intended phenomena; 2) the contribution of each scale item in the
overall reliability of the scale. Chronbach’s alpha examines each item’s contribution to the scale by providing alpha coefficient for the scale if that item was deleted. An acceptable level of internal consistency ranges between 0.71 and 0.89 (Nijssen and Douglas, 2004).

Table 23. Alpha and Mean Scores of Constructs Employed in the Main Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Problematic item and new ( \alpha ) score following its omission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Involvement 1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>Item # 3, 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Familiarity</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Familiarity - Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Familiarity - USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Involvement 2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Quality</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Item # 2, 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Animosity</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Item # 2(reverse scored), 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Animosity</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Item # 2, 0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 demonstrates that the \( \alpha \) scores of all constructs but the war animosity are within the acceptable range. The construct named "purchase involvement 1" represents subjects' level of purchase involvement with the purchase of refrigerators and shower gels prior to the manipulation of involvement. The "purchase involvement 2" construct represents subjects' level of purchase involvement with the purchase of refrigerators and shower gels following the manipulation of involvement. Both constructs have equal levels of scale reliability (purchase involvement 1, \( \alpha = 0.76 \); purchase involvement 2, \( \alpha = 0.75 \)).

The reliability of the other constructs used in the present study (product
familiarity, economic animosity, product quality, consumer ethnocentrism and general animosity) are also within the acceptable reliability range. The reliability of the war animosity construct (0.65) is slightly below the acceptable range of reliability. However, this level of reliability is in line with the findings of previous studies. The $\alpha$ score in the war animosity construct in Shin's (2001) study, for example, was 0.58.

The output produced by SPSS shows that if Item # 2 in construct (i.e. "We should not forget the atrocities committed by Germany during World War II") would be dropped, reliability would increase to 0.8 which is significantly higher.

**Mean Item Scores**

Table 23 above also provides a description of the mean scores of the constructs comprising the model tested in the present investigation.

Overall, subjects seem to harbour a low level of economic animosity towards Germany ($x=2.97$). Another finding is that subjects' familiarity with German and American products is 3.74 and 3.16, respectively. Subjects' familiarity with both American and German products was measured on a 7-point Likert scale.

While subjects harbour a relatively high level of war animosity (5.25), their level of general animosity is relatively low (4.10). This finding is very similar to the results of Shin's (2001) study.

Subjects' mean score on the PDI scale was measured by both product (refrigerator vs. shower gel) and treatment condition (control group vs. experimental group). Table 24 below shows that, in general, subjects are more involved with the purchase refrigerators ($x = 4.93$) than they are with shower gels ($x = 4.07$). A similar pattern was observed in both the control and experimental groups. In the control group, the average score on the PDI scale was 3.93 for shower gel and 4.81 for refrigerators. In the experimental group the average score on the PDI scale was 4.2 and 5.06 for shower gels and refrigerators, respectively.
Table 24. Mean scores on the PDI scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.40356</td>
<td>3.9357</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Shower Gel</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26696</td>
<td>4.8118</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39925</td>
<td>4.3922</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.43893</td>
<td>4.2043</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Shower Gel</td>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39445</td>
<td>5.0690</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.47683</td>
<td>4.6222</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.42247</td>
<td>4.0756</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Shower Gel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33074</td>
<td>4.9361</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.44032</td>
<td>4.5077</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects’ Product Preferences (Product Choice)

Table 25. Product Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Marginal Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpopulation</td>
<td>27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The dependent variable has only one value observed in 4 (14.8%) subpopulations.

The proportion of subjects that preferred an Israeli, American or German product was also examined. The majority of research subjects (53.8%) have preferred an Israeli product. Roughly a quarter (26.7%) of subjects preferred a product made in the USA while only 19.6% chose a German product (see Table 25).

Because economic animosity was manipulated in the experiment conducted by the author, the relationship between economic animosity and product choice was examined.
A likelihood ratio test was conducted to examine the effect of economic animosity on overall product preferences. That is to say, are research subjects more likely to choose an Israeli or an American product over a German one?

Table 26. Likelihood of Buying a Domestic Product over a Foreign Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Model Fitting Criteria</th>
<th>Likelihood Ratio Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>160.480</td>
<td>7.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>159.474</td>
<td>6.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.

a. country_no = IL

Economic animosity was observed to have a statistically significant effect on the likelihood to choose an Israeli or an American product over a German product (see Table 26).

Animosity influences consumers' behavior when a choice set includes at least two foreign products (Klein, 2002). Therefore, a test was conducted to examine whether subjects that harbor economic animosity were more likely to choose an American product over a German product. The results of the analysis indicate that the likelihood to choose an American product over a German product increases as the level of economic animosity increases. This relationship is statistically significant (see Table 27). However, the likelihood of choosing an Israeli product over a German product also increases as the level of economic animosity increases. Yet, this relationship is marginally statistically significant (0.07).
Animosity, as opposed to consumer ethnocentrism, affects consumer behavior when consumers are in a dilemma regarding to foreign products. Hence the analysis in Table 27 was conducted to examine whether economic animosity is likely to impact subjects' choice of an American product over a German product or vice versa.

Table 27. The Impact of Economic Animosity on Product Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choicea</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.959</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>3.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic animosity</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>6.101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>1.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic animosity</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The reference category is: Germany.
b. country no = IL

Predictors of Product Choice

Several independent variables were included in the analysis of animosity on product choice. The purpose of the analysis was to examine which one of the variables are stronger or more likely predictors of product choice.

A statistical analysis was conducted to examine what variables are predictors of product choice (see Table 28).
Table 28. Predictors of Product Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Model Fitting Criteria</th>
<th>Likelihood Ratio Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>404.475$^a$</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>412.687</td>
<td>8.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with products of the USA</td>
<td>431.092</td>
<td>26.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with German products</td>
<td>419.851</td>
<td>15.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product evaluation</td>
<td>414.425</td>
<td>9.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>423.250</td>
<td>18.775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 demonstrates that gender, familiarity with American products, assessment of product quality and the level of consumer ethnocentrism are all likely predictors of subjects' product choices.

The Effects of the Experimental Treatment on Product Choice

Analyses revealed that subjects assigned to the control group were 493% more likely to choose a German product over an American alternative. This result is expected as those assigned to the experimental group were exposed to a negative statement about the current trade relations between Germany and Israel. In particular, subjects were informed that relations were unhealthy as Germany is taking advantage of Israel. Subjects have been assigned to the groups on a random basis.

Because subjects assigned to the experimental group were less likely to purchase a German product than those assigned to the control group, it
can be assumed that what has affected the decision of the subjects assigned to the former group is the statement they have read.

*The Impact of Animosity on Purchase Involvement*

Stepwise regression was used to examine the effect of each one of the three types of animosity on purchase involvement (see Table 29). Stepwise regression models gradually insert the independent variables into the model.

Table 29. Stepwise Regression Analysis of Purchase Involvement with the Variables that were Included in the Model (a) and the Variables that were Excluded (b).

(a) Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.922</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-3.764</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A variable that doesn’t add explanatory power to the model is omitted. Table 29 illustrates that economic animosity rather than war animosity has a statistically effect on purchase involvement ($R^2 = 0.253$).

(b) Variables Excluded From the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War Animosity</td>
<td>.026a</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>-.002a</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, when both war animosity and economic animosity are included in the model (see Table 29b above), its explanatory power decreases.
Table 30. Description of the British Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26-35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 36-45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 46-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 56-65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below average</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Average</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Above average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Professional</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Clerical</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Blue Collar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Manual Worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Retiree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unemployed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Self-Employed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 demonstrates that 47% of subjects are females while 52% are males. Furthermore, 81% of the subjects are between the ages of 18 to 45. Finally, 53% of subjects are either professional or clerical workers.
Manipulation Checks

In line with previous research (Russell and Russell, 2006) and similar to the analysis conducted on the Israeli sample, it was checked whether the manipulation of economic animosity had an impact on mean scores on the economic animosity construct rather than scores on the CETSCALE. Table 31 shows that the experimental treatment affected economic animosity (p=0.001) but not ethnocentrism (p=0.248).

Table 31. ANOVA Analysis – The Effect of Treatment Condition and Country of Origin on Economic Animosity vs. Ethnocentrism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Between-Subjects Effects</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>3.523(^c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>13.973(^d)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.973</td>
<td>11.295</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>1526.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1526.041</td>
<td>584.186</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>810.938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>810.938</td>
<td>655.540</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>13.973</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.973</td>
<td>11.295</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>253.388</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>119.994</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>1779.910</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>952.120</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>256.91</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>133.967</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.004)
b. R Squared = .085 (Adjusted R Squared = .081)
c. R Squared = .014 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)
d. R Squared = .104 (Adjusted R Squared = .095)
Internal Consistency and Mean Item Scores

Table 32. Alpha and Mean Scores of Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach's $\alpha$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Involvement 1</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>4.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Involvement 2</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>4.7138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>2.8920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>3.9222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Animosity</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>3.9259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Animosity</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>5.2458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 shows that the internal validity of all constructs but war animosity are within the .70 - 0.85 range (Nijssen and Douglas, 2004). Although the internal validity of the war animosity construct is slightly below the acceptable range, it is consistent with previous studies (Shin, 2001).

Age and Animosity

Mean scores on the following constructs were calculated by age group: Economic animosity, general animosity, and war animosity. The purpose of this analysis was to examine whether there is a relationship (positive or negative) between age and animosity.
Table 33. Mean Scores on the Economic Animosity Construct by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>2.9313</td>
<td>1.03812</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>2.9526</td>
<td>1.24287</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>2.6727</td>
<td>.99307</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>1.71963</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>1.26491</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.8755</td>
<td>1.17518</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Mean Scores on the General Animosity Construct by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>4.0938</td>
<td>1.10792</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3.7368</td>
<td>1.36044</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>3.9091</td>
<td>1.48392</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>.99203</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.31233</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>4.5833</td>
<td>1.81302</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.9286</td>
<td>1.26930</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to identify a clear tendency in the relationship between general animosity and age and economic animosity and age (see Table 33 and Table 34). However, when examining the relationship between age and general animosity, a clear upward trend is observed between the 46-55 age group and 65 and over age group.
Table 35. Mean Scores on the War Animosity Construct By Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>4.0938</td>
<td>1.10792</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3.7368</td>
<td>1.36044</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>3.9091</td>
<td>1.48392</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>.99203</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.31233</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>4.5833</td>
<td>1.81302</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.9286</td>
<td>1.26930</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a clearer tendency, though, in the relationship between age and war animosity (Table 35). The mean score decreases from the 18-25 group to the 26-35 age group by roughly 26 points. However, there is evidently an increase in the level of war animosity from the 26-35 age group (3.7368) to the 56-65 age group (4.00). The mean score slightly drops in the next age group (65 and over) to 5.75.

Subjects' Product Preferences (Product Choice)

This part of the analysis examined whether there is a relationship between consumers' attitude toward Germany and their actual product choices. In other words, the aim is to see whether the fact that British Jews mean score on the war animosity constructs translates into the boycott of German products. The majority of research subjects (51%) have preferred an Israeli product. A quarter (25%) of subjects preferred a product made in the USA while a similar number of subjects (24%) chose a German product (see Table 36).
Table 36. Product Choice Statistics

Research subjects were presented with either an advertisement for a refrigerator or shower gel. The product attributes included were all similar except for the COO information. Whether assigned to the shower gel advertisement or refrigerator advertisement, subjects had to choose between either a product of the USA, a German product or an Israeli product. Thus, the probability that will choice a product of one country over the product of another country was calculated. The chances of choosing an American product as opposed to a German product was lower in the control group (P=0.035). However, no differences were observed in the chances of choosing an Israeli product over a German product (P=0.085). This is despite the fact that subjects assigned to the control group are more likely to choose an Israeli product over a German product than subjects assigned to the experimental group (see Table 37).
Table 37. Parameter Estimates\(^c\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice(^a)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>-1.269</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>4.456</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>0(^b)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>9.765</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>- .890</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>2.969</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>0(^b)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The reference category is: Germany.
b. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.
c. country_no = UK
The UK and Israeli Samples

So far this chapter has focused on the analysis of each sample (UK sample vs. Israeli sample). The objective of the present section is to combine the samples from both countries to form a larger sample. This will provide a more general understanding of the relationships between the variables studied in the context of the study conducted by the author of this research effort.

Sample Description

Table 38. Description of the Israeli and British Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-25</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26-35</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 36-45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 46-55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 56-65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Female</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Male</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Below average</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income average</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Above average</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Professional</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Clerical</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Blue Collar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Manual Worker</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Retiree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unemployed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Self-Employed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 demonstrates that 91% of subjects are between the age of 18 to 45. Furthermore, 49% of subjects are females and 51% are males. Finally, 51% of the subjects are either professional or clerical workers while 33% are either retired or unemployed.
Manipulation Checks

Table 39. An Examination of the Effects of the Manipulation of Economic Animosity

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>General animosity</td>
<td>8.941&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.941</td>
<td>4.962</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War animosity</td>
<td>1.260&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic animosity</td>
<td>38.138&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.138</td>
<td>31.390</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ResPI2/PI1</td>
<td>6.320&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.320</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiarity GR</td>
<td>3.208&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Familiarity US</td>
<td>.735&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General animosity</td>
<td>8.941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.941</td>
<td>4.962</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War animosity</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic animosity</td>
<td>38.138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.138</td>
<td>31.390</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ResPI2/PI1</td>
<td>6.320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.320</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiarity GR</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiarity US</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .015 (Adjusted R Squared = .012)  
b. R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)  
c. R Squared = .086 (Adjusted R Squared = .083)  
d. R Squared = .015 (Adjusted R Squared = .012)  
e. R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

The researcher of the present study assumed that the manipulation of economic animosity would increase subjects' level of economic animosity and general animosity which, in turn, affect their level of purchase involvement. Thus, a multivariate analysis (see Table 39) was conducted to examine whether there are statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group in economic animosity, general animosity, war animosity, and purchase involvement. Findings demonstrate that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups in their level of economic animosity (F(1,
Similar to the analysis conducted for each country (Israeli and UK), an ANOVA analysis was carried out to examine the effect of the experimental manipulation on economic animosity and ethnocentrism (see Table 40). Results of the analysis demonstrate that the experimental manipulation of economic animosity did have an effect on economic animosity (F(1,338)=33.195, p=0.000 but not ethnocentrism (F(1,338)=0.739, p=0.391).

Table 40. ANOVA analysis – The Effect of Treatment on Economic Animosity vs. Ethnocentrism Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>1.769a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>40.635b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.635</td>
<td>33.195</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>5323.384</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5323.384</td>
<td>2222.617</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>2935.253</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2935.253</td>
<td>2397.857</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>40.635</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.635</td>
<td>33.195</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>807.148</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>412.527</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>6131.000</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>3394.760</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>808.917</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>453.161</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)
The Relationship between Experimental Treatment and Purchase Involvement

Economic animosity was manipulated in the experimental group to examine whether animosity will increase subjects' level of purchase involvement. Therefore, the relationship between the experimental treatment of economic animosity and purchase involvement was examined. The results of the analysis show that purchase involvement was higher among subjects assigned to the experimental group than subjects assigned to the control group for both product classes (see Table 41).

Table 41. Purchase Involvement by Experimental Condition and Product Type - Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>product</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>shower gel</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.47406</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refrigerator</td>
<td>4.9031</td>
<td>1.24393</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.4623</td>
<td>1.43055</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>shower gel</td>
<td>4.2602</td>
<td>1.42005</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refrigerator</td>
<td>5.0674</td>
<td>1.37361</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.6803</td>
<td>1.44952</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>shower gel</td>
<td>4.1301</td>
<td>1.44874</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>refrigerator</td>
<td>4.9867</td>
<td>1.31032</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.5723</td>
<td>1.44216</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Effect of Animosity and the Experimental Condition (Control Group vs. Experimental Group) on Purchase Involvement

A further multinomial regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the various types of animosity and purchase involvement by the experimental treatment (see Table 42). The analysis was carried out twice, i.e. once for each data set (Israeli vs. British). In the Israeli study a statistically significant relationship was observed between purchase involvement and economic animosity in the experimental group (p=0.02).
No statistically significant relationship was observed in the control group (0.552). However, in the UK sample, no statistically significant difference was observed between economic animosity and purchase involvement in neither subjects in the control group nor subjects in the experimental group.

Table 42. Multinomial Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.771</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>-1.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Animosity</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>War Animosity</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.154</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>-1.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Animosity</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>War Animosity</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.204</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>-2.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Animosity</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>War Animosity</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.064</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>-1.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Animosity</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>War Animosity</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Involvement
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In line with the majority of previous consumer animosity studies Structural equation modeling in SPSS (AMOS) was used to analyze the fit of the full measurement model (Ben Mrad, 2008; Ettenson and Klein, 2005; Funk et al., 2010; Ishii, 2009; Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002; Leong et al., 2008; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Rose et al., 2009; Shin, 2001; Shoham et al., 2006). Each construct was analyzed separately and the fit of indicators to constructs were evaluated (Klein et al., 1998).

Structural equation modeling (SEM) has been derived from multiple regression. SEM and multiple regression serve similar purposes. However, SEM does so in a stronger manner which takes into account the modeling of interactions, nonlinearities, correlated independents, measurement error, correlated error terms, multiple latent independents each measured by multiple indicators, and one or more latent dependents (i.e. multiple indicators for each variable) also each with multiple indicators. Furthermore, the assumptions of SEM are not as strict as those of multiple regression. For instance, even in cases of multicollinearity interpretation is possible. In addition, SEM enables the modeling of intervening variables.

SEM is an alternative which is a lot more powerful than other forms of analysis such as multiple regression, path analysis, factor analysis, time series analysis, and analysis of covariance. The latter analysis, analysis of covariance, is the focus of SEM. In sum, SEM is an extension of the general linear model (GLM) of which multiple regression is a part.

Obviously, SEM cannot itself draw causal arrows in models or settle doubts as to the causal direction. For that end, the theoretical insight and judgment of the researcher is crucial.

In general, SEM is a process consisting of two stages. The first stage is the validation of the measurement model. Confirmatory factor analysis\(^2\) is

\(^2\) **Confirmatory factor analysis** is used to determine if the number of factors and the loadings of
employed to validate the measurement model. Based on a large (a sample size
greater than 100) representative sample, factor analysis (i.e., common factor
analysis or principal axis factoring)\(^3\) is employed to establish that indicators
apparently measure the corresponding latent variables represented by the
factors.

The researcher cannot proceed with the model unless the measurement
model has been validated. Two or more alternative models (one of which may
be the null model) are created. Several indicators are developed for each model,
with the purpose of being left with a minimum of three per latent variable
following confirmatory factor analysis. The indicators are then compared in
terms of "model fit". The model fit measures the extent to which the covariances
predicted by the model fit in with the observed covariances in the data.
"Modification indexes" and other coefficients may be used by the researcher to
change one or more models in order to improve fit.

The second stage involves fitting the structural model. This stage is
conducted via path analysis with latent variables. Latent variables cannot be
directly observed. These variables are inferred from other variables observed or
directly measured. Consumer animosity, product familiarity, purchase
involvement, etc. are all examples of latent variables as they cannot be measured
directly. One starts by specifying a model on the basis of theory. Each variable
in the model is conceptualized as latent, measured by multiple indicators. In the
case of the animosity model, the variables are the constructs employed in the
model. The indicators are the items used to measure each one of the constructs.
For instance, three indicators ("I like Germany", for example) were used to
measure the general animosity construct employed in the present study.

Two models (Research Model 1 and Research Model 2) were constructed
and analyzed with AMOS. In both models the independent variables are

---

\(^3\) Common Factor Analysis or Principal Axis Factoring is a form of factor analysis which assists in
finding the minimum number of factors which can explain the common variance (correlation) of a group
of variables.
animosity, ethnocentrism, purchase involvement and judgments of product quality. The depended variable is product choice. However, the two models differ in that the demographic variables age, income and education were excluded from Research Model 1 (see Figure 13) but included in Research Model 2 (see Figure 14).

Figure 13. Research Model 1

Research Model 1 accounts for 28.6% of the variance in the Product Choice construct. Three out of the five items in the economic animosity scale loaded well on the construct. A positive and statistically significant relationship was observed between economic animosity and general animosity ($\gamma = .40, P < 0.01$). The higher the level of economic animosity consumers harbor, the more likely they are to harbor feelings of general animosity and vice versa. Furthermore, a positive and statistically significant relationship was observed between economic animosity and purchase involvement ($\gamma = .27, P < 0.01$). That is to say, the greater the level of economic animosity harbored by an individual, the greater the level of his or her level with a purchase is likely to be. In line with previous studies, a positive relationship was also observed between consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism. In particular, a positively
significant relationship was observed both between economic animosity and consumer ethnocentrism ($\gamma = .18$, $P < 0.01$) and general animosity and consumer ethnocentrism ($\gamma = .37$, $P < 0.01$). In other words, as the level of general and economic animosity increases, so does the level of consumer ethnocentrism.

Three items were employed to measure the general animosity construct: (1) I feel angry towards Germany; (2) I like Germany; (3) I don't like Germany. However, only two items, namely, items 1 and 3 loaded well on the construct. Furthermore, one of the three items employed to measure the war animosity construct, namely, "I still feel angry towards Germany because of WWII", loaded well with the general animosity construct.

Research Model 1 also demonstrates that there is a negative and statistically significant relationship between general animosity and purchase involvement ($\gamma = -.21$, $P < 0.01$). In other words, the greater the level of general animosity harbored by an individual, the less he/she is likely to be involved with a purchase.

It can also be observed that only six of the ten items employed to measured the consumer ethnocentrism construct loaded well (i.e. items 4,5,6,7,8,10). In contrast to previous research, no statistically significant relationship was observed between consumer ethnocentrism and product evaluation.

Three of the six items employed to measure the product evaluation construct loaded well (i.e. items 1, 5, 6). The relationship between product evaluation and purchase involvement was also examined in the model. Of the three items used to measure purchase involvement, only items 1 and 2 loaded well on the construct. A negative but yet statistically significant relationship was observed between purchase involvement and product evaluation ($\gamma = -.16$, $P < 0.01$). That is to say, the greater the level of purchase involvement experienced by a consumer, the lower his or her evaluation of a product is likely to be.

However, a positive and statistically significant relationship was observed between product evaluation and product choice ($\gamma = .43$, $P < 0.01$). In
other words, an individual is more likely to purchase a German-made product as his or her evaluation of German products in general increases.

The relationship between purchase involvement and product choice was also tested in the model. A negative statistically significant relationship was observed between these two variables ($\gamma = -.16, P < 0.01$). Thus, the greater the level of purchase involvement experienced by an individual, the smaller the likelihood that he or she will choose to buy a German product.

Table 43 describes the construct interrelations of the constructs in both Research Model 1 and Research Model 2. Table 44 presents values for the indicators of model fit (e.g. RMSEA, RMR, GFI, etc.). The values for the construct reliability in both models range from 0.74 to 0.93. These values are acceptable as the value of construct reliability should be above 0.7 (Hair et al. 1998).

The variance extracted (VE) values for all the constructs included in both research models are higher than the 0.5 minimum (Hair et al., 1995). The CFI values of the constructs in both research models are in line with previous animosity research (Ettenson and Klein, 2004; Funk et al., 2010; Klein et al., 1998; Nijssen and Douglas, 2004; Shoham et al., 2006). The CFI values observed in these studies ranged from 0.91 (Klein et al., 1998) to 0.99 (Ettenson and Klein, 2004). The fact that that the indicators of model fit are within the acceptable value ranges indicates that the model is a sound account of the observed covariances and variances among constructs (Hair et al., 1995).
In line with previous research, discriminant validity was tested by performing χ² difference tests on each of the estimated interfactor correlations (Jung et al. 2002). Two models were constructed, a constrained model and unconstrained model. In the constrained model φᵢ was set to 1 while in the unconstrained model it was freely estimated. The results were then compared. Discriminant validity is supported if the χ² value of the unconstrained model is markedly lower than that of the constrained model (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bagozzi & Phillips, 1982). All χ² difference tests with a restricted model, where φ = 1, were significant (p < .05). All the items were observed to be significantly related (p < .001 & p < .005) to their respective constructs with acceptable factor loadings. Hence, the test findings lend support to discriminant validity.
Table 44. Correlation Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>ΔVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Animosity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Animosity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of single-construct measurements models

Note. CR = Construct Reliability; VE = Variance Extracted; n = number of items.

Note. * p < .05, * * p < .001, **

Research Model 2 (see Figure 14) accounts for 23.5% of the variance in the Product Choice construct. In contrast to Research Model 1, demographic variables (that is, gender, age, and income) were incorporated into Research Model 2 to examine whether they moderated the observed levels of animosity. No statistically significant relationship was observed between these demographic variables and animosity (economic animosity and general animosity).
Similar to the findings in the first research model (Research Model 1), in the second model (Research Model 2) all the items in the economic animosity scale loaded well on the construct. A positive and statistically significant relationship was observed between economic animosity and general animosity ($\gamma = .40$, $P < 0.01$). The high the level of economic animosity consumers harbor, the more likely they are to harbor feelings of general animosity and vice versa. In addition, a positive and statistically significant relationship was observed between economic animosity and purchase involvement ($\gamma = .27$, $P < 0.01$). Hence, the greater the level of economic animosity harbored by an individual, the greater the level of his or her level with a purchase is likely to be. In line with previous studies, a positive relationship was also observed between consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism ($\gamma = .4$, $P < 0.01$). In particular, a relationship was observed both between economic animosity and consumer ethnocentrism ($\gamma = .23$, $P < 0.01$) and general animosity and consumer ethnocentrism ($\gamma = .34$, $P < 0.01$).

Three items were employed to measure the general animosity construct: (1) I feel angry towards Germany; (2) I like Germany; (3) I don't like Germany.
However, only two items, namely, items 1 and 3 loaded well on the construct. Furthermore, one of the three items employed to measure the war animosity construct, namely, "I still feel angry towards Germany because of WWII", loaded well with the general animosity construct.

Research Model 2 shows that there is a negative and statistically significant relationship between general animosity and purchase involvement ($\gamma = -0.24$, $P < 0.01$). In other words, the greater the level of general animosity harbored by an individual, the less he/she is likely to be involved with a purchase.

It can also be observed that only six of the ten items employed to measured the consumer ethnocentrism construct loaded well (i.e. items 4,5,6,7,8,10). In contrast to previous research, no statistically significant relationship was observed between consumer ethnocentrism and product evaluation.

Three of the six items employed to measure the product evaluation construct loaded well (i.e. items 1, 5, 6). The relationship between product evaluation and purchase involvement was also examined in the model. Of the three items used to measure purchase involvement, only items 1 and 2 loaded well on the construct. A negative but yet statistically significant relationship was observed between purchase involvement and product evaluation ($\gamma = -0.21$, $P < 0.01$). That is to say, the greater the level of purchase involvement experienced by a consumer, the lower his or her evaluation of a product will be.

However, a positive and statistically significant relationship was observed between product evaluation and product choice ($\gamma = 0.29$, $P < 0.01$). In other words, an individual is more likely to purchase a German-made product as his or her evaluation of German products in general increases.

The relationship between purchase involvement and product choice was also tested in the model. In contrast to the findings in Research Model 1, no statistically significant relationship was observed between these two variables.
In conclusion, no statistically significant differences were observed between age and animosity (see Research Model 2). Several findings stem from Research Model 1. First, a statistically significant relationship was observed between economic animosity and purchase involvement. Second, a statistically significant relationship was observed between general animosity and purchase involvement. Third, both economic animosity and general animosity have an indirect effect on product choice through purchase involvement. Fourth, a statistically significant relationship was observed between general animosity and economic animosity. Furthermore, a statistically significant but yet negative relationship was found between purchase involvement and product evaluation. Finally, no statistically significant relationship was found between ethnocentrism and product evaluation.

The next chapter discusses the results described in this chapter. In addition, the implications, contributions, limitations of this study, and recommendations for further research are also discussed.
Chapter 8 – Conclusion, Implications, contributions, and Recommendations for Future Research

The purpose of this work was to examine whether animosity has an impact on consumers' level of purchase involvement. This relationship was examined in the context of the Holocaust.

Conclusion

This work was conducted in two countries, namely, Israel and the UK. Prior to examining the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement, subjects' overall level of economic animosity, war animosity and general animosity was examined. A separate analysis was conducted for each sample. Findings indicate that subjects comprising the Israeli sample harbor a low level of economic animosity towards Germany. In addition, this study demonstrates that subjects' in the Israeli sample possess a relatively low level of general animosity. Nijssen and Douglas (2004) have observed that there is a positive association between economic animosity and general animosity. Hence, the fact that the level of economic animosity in this sample is low may account for the relatively low level of general animosity observed. However, subjects’ observed level of war animosity is relatively high. In sum, the subjects in the Israeli sample possess neutral feelings toward Germany in general but at the same time find it difficult to forgive Germany for its role in the Holocaust.

Similar to the Israeli sample, subjects in the British sample neither harbor high levels of economic animosity nor general animosity. However, they do harbor relatively high levels of war animosity. The relatively high scores on the war animosity construct may explain why only 24% of subjects preferred a German-made product.

There are two possible explanations to the relatively high levels of war animosity observed in the UK sample. First, research suggests that the more strongly a formerly oppressed group is committed to its country and the more it
tends to be religiously observant, the more likely it is to express hostility towards its oppressor (Half et al., 1999). British Jews are committed to Israel (Graham and Boyd, 2010). Hence, the relatively high level of war animosity observed among the Jewish population in the UK may be accounted for by their commitment to Israel. It would seem that country commitment is a predictor of war animosity. In contrast to the majority of previous studies (Klein et al. 1998; Podeshen, 2005; Russell and Russell; Shin, 2001), this work demonstrates that not only does animosity impact consumers’ purchase behavior but that level of animosity itself can be affected by other constructs such as country commitment.

Another possible explanation lies in the different political climates in the two countries. Although Israel is under a constant threat of war, anti-Semitism is a marginal social phenomenon. In Europe in general and in the UK in particular, anti-Semitism is on the rise (Liphshiz, 2009). Because the Holocaust was a culmination of anti-Semitism in Germany, acts of anti-Semitism in more recent history may bring back memories of the Holocaust and as a result, intensify the population's level of war animosity. It would seem that when a certain group in the population feels that it is being victimized due to its religious beliefs, way of life, culture, etc., memories of an event that has occurred in the past (e.g. the Holocaust) is likely to raise the level of war animosity harbored in the present. Thus, it appears that the feeling that one is being victimized is a possible predictor of war animosity.

Once subjects’ levels of economic animosity, war animosity and general animosity were examined separately for each sample, the relationship between economic animosity and general animosity was examined for the two samples combined. Some researchers have demonstrated that that two constructs are inter-related (Nijssen and Douglas, 2004). The relationship between these two constructs was examined in the present work so as to provide further support to this observed relationship.

The results of this work demonstrate that the higher the level of economic animosity harbored by consumers, the more likely they are to harbor
general animosity. In other words, animosity for a specific reason [e.g. (country name) is not a reliable trading partner] is likely to become more general [e.g. I don’t like (country name)] and potentially have a broad impact on all aspects of the relationship between two countries (trade, diplomacy, scientific cooperation, etc.).

Once the relationship between economic animosity and general animosity was examined, the potential impact of animosity on purchase involvement was examined. This relationship was examined by manipulating economic animosity. The purpose of manipulating economic animosity was to increase purchase involvement by making subjects' evaluation of the product stimuli in the experiment more cognitively complex than it might have been in other circumstances.

Economic animosity (as opposed to war or general animosity) was manipulated for several reasons. First, the purpose of manipulating economic animosity was to trigger subjects' thoughts about the Holocaust. Second, Israel is a small country and most of the products on the market are foreign-made. Although Israel imports its products from numerous countries, Germany is one of Israel’s most important trade partners and numerous German products are on the market. (CBS, 2008). Consequently, at least some Israeli consumers may feel that Germany is attempting to gain economic power over Israel or that it is taking advantage of Israel, for example. As a result, Israeli consumers are likely to harbor feelings of economic animosity towards Germany (LeVine and Campbell, 1972).

Finally, while economic animosity has been manipulated in past research (Russell and Russell, 2006), war animosity and general animosity have not. The researcher of this work can attempt to manipulate war animosity or general animosity. However, it would be risky as the manipulation of either war animosity or general animosity may not prove to be as reliable.

Prior to manipulating economic animosity in the main study, it was pre-tested in a pilot study (Pilot Study # 4). The purpose was to examine whether the statement about the trade relationship between Germany in Israel affected the
observed level of economic animosity measured after the manipulation. No statistically significant difference was observed between the experimental group and the control group in the level of economic animosity prior to the experimental manipulation. In other words, the level of economic animosity was similar in both groups. However, a statistically significant difference was observed between the two groups in the level of purchase involvement measured after the experimental treatment. That is to say, subjects in the experimental group experienced higher levels of economic animosity than subjects in the control group. Hence, it was concluded that the manipulation of economic animosity was successful. To the best knowledge of the author of this work, economic animosity was manipulated in only a single study (Russell and Russell, 2006). The results of the present work provide further support to Russell and Russell’s findings and demonstrate that economic animosity can be manipulated with a simple statement about the trade relations between two countries.

Following the successful manipulation of economic animosity in Pilot Study # 4, the relationship between animosity and purchase involvement was examined in the main study. The relationship between economic animosity and purchase involvement was examined separately for each country so as to enable the researcher to compare the two samples. A statistically significant relationship was observed between animosity and purchase involvement in the Israeli sample. That is to say, the higher the level of economic animosity harbored by subjects, the higher their level of purchase involvement is likely to be. In other words, the more subjects felt that their country is taken advantage of by another country, the more concerned they were with their purchase.

In the UK sample, in contrast, no statistically significant relationship was observed between the two constructs. The fact that a statistically significant relationship was observed in Israel but not in the UK may be accounted for by the fact that no contextual modifications have been made to the statement employed in the UK study. The statement contained information about the trade relations between Israel and Germany. The purpose of employing an identical statement was to enable the researcher to compare the results obtained from the
two samples. Perhaps the statement would have had a more powerful impact on subjects in the UK if it contained information about the trade relations between the UK and Germany rather than Israel and Germany. Thus, when economic animosity is manipulated in cross-cultural research, contextual modifications should be to the statement employed to manipulate economic animosity.

However, when the two samples were combined a positive and statistically significant relationship between economic animosity and purchase involvement was observed. Thus, overall, the findings of this work demonstrate that the greater the level of economic animosity harbored by an individual, the greater the level of his or her level of involvement with a purchase is likely to be. In other words, when the subjects of research harbored high levels of economic animosity, they were more likely to care about which product alternative they buy. Furthermore, it became more important to them whether they made the right choice. Finally, they were more likely to be concerned with the outcomes of their choices.

The findings of this work also suggest that there is a positive relationship between economic animosity and general animosity. Consequently, the relationship between general animosity and purchase involvement was also examined. In contrast to the positive relationship observed between economic animosity and purchase involvement, a negative association was observed between general animosity and purchase involvement. In other words, the findings of the present study suggest that the greater the level of general animosity harbored by subjects, the less likely they were to be involved with a purchase. Hence, when the subjects of research harbored high levels of general animosity, they were less likely to care about which product alternative they buy. In addition, it was less important to them whether they made the right choice. Finally, they were less likely to be concerned with the outcomes of their choices.

The positive relationship between economic animosity and purchase involvement on the one hand and the negative relationship between general animosity and purchase involvement on the other hand may be accounted for by a greater concern over the choices consumers make when buying products made
in countries towards which they harbor specific feelings (i.e. economic animosity) rather than general feelings (i.e. general animosity). This distinction can help marketing managers segment their markets more efficiently. Hence, when penetrating new markets, marketing managers should be familiar with the history (economic, diplomatic, etc.) between their country and the host country. If there is a history of animosity between the two countries, then they should conduct surveys to assess consumers' attitudes so as to learn whether they still harbor economic and or general animosity.

The overwhelming majority of consumer animosity research has focused on the relationship between animosity and willingness to buy and product ownership (Klein et al., 1998; Podeshen, 2005; Russell and Russell, 2006; Shin, 2001). Thus, one purpose of the present work was to examine whether animosity impacts product choice. Two research models (Research Model 1 and Research Model 2) were constructed in Amos to examine this relationship.

An analysis conducted on Research Model 1 demonstrates that not only does economic animosity impact product choice but that this relationship is moderated by consumers' level of purchase involvement. In other words, the findings of this model show that the higher the level of economic animosity, the higher the level of purchase involvement experienced by subjects and the less likely they are to choose a German product. The impact economic animosity is likely to have on product choice is further supported by this study's finding that the majority of the sample did not choose the German alternative. This finding is in line with Klein's (2002) finding that US consumer that harbored war or economic animosity towards Japan were less likely to prefer a Japanese product.

In contrast to the findings in Research Model 1, no statistically significant relationship was observed between purchase involvement and product choice in Research Model 2. The lack of a statistically significant relationship between purchase involvement and product choice resulted from the addition of product familiarity as an intervening variable to the model. However, the results regarding the effect of product familiarity on product choice are inconsistent. On the one hand, familiarity with American products was observed
to have a statistically significant impact on product choice. On the other hand, familiarity with German products did not have a statistically significant affect on product choice. This demonstrates that subjects' reluctance to buy German products is independent of their familiarity with these products.

The relationship between age and animosity was also examined in the present work. Previous studies have demonstrated that these two variables are related and that this relationship is context-specific (Bahee and Pisani, 2009; Klein et al., 1998; Klein, 2002; Little et al., 2009). In certain contexts older individuals are more likely to harbour feelings of animosity than younger individuals (Klein 2002). A positive association between age and animosity is more likely to be observed when an older generation was the victim of war atrocities, for example.

In other contexts, however, younger consumers will tend to harbour greater feelings of animosity than older consumers (Bahae and Pisani, 2009). This is more likely to occur in cases in which people belonging to a younger generation have personally experienced an event (such as diplomatic tensions, trade disputes, etc.) which has made them, rather the older population, harbor strong feelings of animosity. Let's take the case of a relationship between two countries which was good in the past but has now changed for the worst. In this case, the older population is likely to have positive memories of the past relationship. Therefore, their feelings of animosity are not likely to be as strong as those of the younger generation that may not be aware of the past history between the two countries. Yet in other contexts, age is unlikely to be related to animosity. In other words, animosity is so strong that it is likely to pass from generation to generation (Klein et al., 1998; Little et al., 2009).

Overall, no statistically significant relationships were observed between age and animosity (i.e. both economic animosity and general animosity). The lack of a statistically significant relationship between age animosity may have resulted from the mixed findings regarding the relationship between animosity and age. In the UK sample, for example, no statistically significant differences were observed between age and animosity.
However, in the Israeli sample, a statistically significant difference was observed between age and general animosity but not between age and economic animosity. In other words, the older the study participant, the more he or she is likely to harbor general animosity towards Germany.

The finding that there is a statistically significant relationship between age and animosity in the Israeli sample but no statistically significant relationship in the UK sample may have a number of explanations. One possible explanation is that the majority of the sampled population in the UK consisted of Ashkenazi Jews (i.e. European Jews) who mostly have family members (grandparents, etc.) who are Holocaust survivors. The sample in Israel, however, consisted of a mixture of both Ashkenazi and Mizrahi Jews (i.e. Jews that have immigrated to Israel from Arab speaking countries). Most of these Jews were not affected by the Holocaust.

Another possible explanation lies in the mean score on the general animosity and economic animosity constructs in the UK sample. In the UK, the mean scores on the general animosity and economic animosity constructs were below the midpoint (3.92 and 2.89, respectively). However, the mean score on the war animosity construct was above the midpoint (5.24). Thus, the finding that there is no statistically significant relationship between animosity and age shows that the sampled population harbours animosity (especially war animosity) regardless of age.

A previous study has demonstrated that consumer animosity is related not only to age but also to consumer ethnocentrism (Klein, 2002). This is curious as other researchers have demonstrated that these two constructs have very different antecedents (Ettenson and Klein, 1999).

The findings support Klein's contention as a positive and statistically significant relationship was observed both between economic animosity and consumer ethnocentrism and general animosity and consumer ethnocentrism. Thus, as the level of general animosity and economic animosity increases, so does the level of consumer ethnocentrism. That is to say, if an individual avoids
buying products from a particular country, eventually, he or she is also likely to avoid buying foreign product altogether. Hence, when assessing a market's receptivity to foreign markets, marketing managers need to not only evaluate consumers' level ethnocentrism but also their level of animosity. In contrast to the majority of previous research, the present work demonstrates that animosity is likely to be a critical variable not only in the choice between two foreign products but also in the choice between a domestic product and a foreign product.

The relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and product evaluation was also examined in the present work. Most previous research demonstrated that there is a negative relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and product evaluations (Hamin and Elliot, 2006; Orth and Firbasova, 2003; Shimp and Sharma, 1987; Wall et al. 1991). In the present work, however, no statistically significant relationship was observed between consumer ethnocentrism and product evaluation. Thus, the fact that a consumer is ethnocentric is not likely impact his evaluation of product quality.

One possible explanation to this unexpected finding is likely to be the COO cues included in the advertisement employed in the present work. The subjects of the present study have been assigned at random to one of twelve different experimental conditions. Every experimental condition included an advertisement for either a shower gel or a refrigerator. In other words, half the subjects were assigned to the experimental condition that included an advertisement for a shower gel. The other half were assigned to the experimental condition that included an advertisement for a refrigerator.

Each advertisement included three alternatives of the refrigerator or shower gel displayed. The alternatives only differed in the COO information. Hence, subjects had three options to choose from: A shower gel that is either made in Germany, Israel or the USA or a refrigerator that is either made in Israel, Germany or the USA. The fact that German is known for its superior high-quality refrigerators is likely to explain why no statistically significant relationship was observed between consumer ethnocentrism and product evaluation in the present study. Previous research shows that ethnocentric
consumers are likely to denigrate the quality of domestic products if foreign products are superior to the same products produced domestically (Supphellen and Rittenburgh, 2001). The quality of German refrigerators is perceived to be superior to that of Israeli refrigerators. Consequently, even subjects that are ethnocentric preferred a German refrigerator to an Israeli one due to their quality.

Contributions

Theoretical Contribution

The present work makes several theoretical contributions to the study of consumer behavior. To the knowledge of the author of this work, this is the first study in which the potential impact of animosity on purchase involvement was examined. In other words, in contrast to previous studies which have focuses on the antecedents (i.e. dogmatism, internationalism and nationalism) of animosity (Shoham et al., 2003), this work has focused on the consequences of animosity.

The incorporation of the purchase involvement into Klein, Ettenson and Morris' (1998) model contributes to a better understanding of how animosity affects product choice. This work demonstrates that animosity predicts purchase involvement which, in turn, predicts product choice.

Thus, two theoretical contributions stem from this finding. One contribution is that animosity affects purchase involvement. In other words, the greater the level of animosity harbored by subjects, the more involved they become with a purchase. Although Klein (1999) has suggested that animosity and purchase involvement are likely to be related, this relationship has not been tested in previous research. Thus, Mittal's (1983) Purchase Decision Involvement construct should be incorporated into the models employed in future consumer animosity research.

The second contribution is related to the indirect relationship observed between animosity and product choice. That is to say, they higher the level of
animosity harbored by subjects, the more they are likely to become involved with a purchase and the less likely they are to buy a product made-in a country that is the target of animosity. This is another major contribution as it confirms previous research findings which have employed the willingness to buy and product ownership constructs instead of the product choice construct. In other words, this work suggests that the willingness to buy and product ownership constructs employed in consumer animosity research can be utilized to predict the effects of animosity on consumers' product choices.

Moreover, a major finding of the present study is that an ambient event such as economic animosity is likely to affect consumers' level of purchase involvement. Thus, an ambient event is a situational factor that is likely to impact the behavior of consumers. The researcher of the present work argues that if future studies provide further support to this finding, then ambient events should be added to the other five situational factors thought to affect consumer behavior (Foxall and Goldsmith, 1994). In other words, it is possible that, eventually, it will be determined that situational factors consist of six dimensions rather than just five, namely (1) physical surroundings; (2) social surroundings; (3) temporal issues; (4) task definition; (5) antecedent states and (6) task complexity.

Finally, the results of the present work demonstrate that when consumers harbor animosity, purchase involvement is likely to affect their product choices only when product familiarity is held constant. Thus, when one of the aims of a research effort is to examine whether product familiarity has moderating effects on a dependent variable, it should be measured but held constant. In other words, it should not be incorporated into a research model.

**Contributions to Methodology**

The present work makes several methodological contributions to the study of consumer behavior. The first contribution is related to the use of Mittal's (1995) Purchase Decision Involvement (PDI) scale. A pilot study (Pilot Study # 4) conducted in this work demonstrates that the scale does not always produce acceptable reliability values. In other words, α values on Mittal's (1995)
PDI scale are likely to vary from one product category to another. Thus, one can argue against employing the PDI in future research. However, the findings of the present work are in line with previous research (Torben, 2005).

Torben, for one, employed low involvement products, such as shrimps and cheese in his study and has obtained alpha values that were slightly below the acceptable range (0.7 – 0.85). Mittal (1995), in contrast, employed high involvement products such as jeans and VCRs in his study and has obtained alpha values that were within the acceptable range. This demonstrates that contextual modifications may be necessary when the scale is used with different product categories (high involvement vs. low involvement).

The second contribution pertains specifically to the manner in which the effects of animosity on consumer behavior were examined. Previous consumer animosity research have examined the effect of animosity on consumer behaviour in one of the following two ways: (1) The overwhelming majority of studies have examined whether respondents were willing to buy or owned products made by the country that is the target of animosity; (2) only a single study has examined the effects of animosity on product choice using real products (Klein, 2002).

In Klein's (2002) study, for example, subjects were asked to “picture the same product manufactured in two different countries” (pg. 363) (that is, U.S vs. Japan and Korea vs. Japan) and state which of the two options they would be likely to buy.

Asking respondents to “picture” a product in their minds has serious consequences on the reliability and validity of research findings. The researcher has no control over what particular product respondents will picture in their minds. It is quite likely that different respondents will “picture” products from dissimilar product categories and different attributes.

To overcome this limitation, fictional advertisements for a shower gel and a refrigerator were employed in the present work. The advertisement included product information based on a pilot study and real advertisements
found in local newspapers and magazines.

**Implications**

**Managerial Implications**

A large body of research, including the present study, demonstrates that the victims of an attempted genocide (Muslims in Bosnia, for example) will develop feelings of animosity against its perpetrators. These feelings of animosity will lead to the boycott of the products made in a country that is held responsible for such atrocities. In other words, consumers will not buy a product merely because it is made by a country that is the target of animosity.

While the present investigation was conducted in the context of the Holocaust, the results can possibly be extrapolated to other contexts. For example, in Rwanda where 800,000 Tutsis were killed between April and June 1994 (10,000 per day) by Hutu militia, Tutsis are likely to harbor war animosity towards the Hutu's and consequently boycott products made by or associated the latter group (Shoham et al., 2006). Similarly, the findings of the present study may also be extrapolated to Bosnia where Serbs murdered 200,000 Muslims during the years 1992-1995 (UHRC, 2008). However, more research would be necessary to confirm that the relationship observed between animosity and purchase involvement in the present work can be employed to predict consumer behavior in other contexts.

Thus, marketing managers that wish to market products made by a country that is the target of consumer animosity are up against a serious challenge. There are two possible ways to cope with the problem. One way is to manipulate product attributes on products and in advertisements. In the present work no differences were observed between subjects in age, gender, and income. This suggests that marketing managers need to make more careful decisions regarding the product attributes they emphasize at the point of purchase or in advertisements.

In other words, marketing managers should focus on how to manipulate
product factors (i.e. product attributes) rather than personal factors (for example, demographics, animosity, ethnocentrism, etc.). There are numerous product attributes marketers can manipulate. However, the present work demonstrates that COO are salient to consumers when they harbor animosity. Thus, marketing managers should de-emphasize COO cues and emphasize other cues such as price, warranty, etc on products and advertising campaigns.

Alternatively, marketing managers can segment their market and target those consumers who do not harbor any feelings of animosity. The fact that the majority of the subjects in the present study are unlikely to buy German products does not mean that all Jewish consumers are unlikely to buy them. Thus, marketing managers working for German companies can target particular Jewish subcultural groups (that is, Mizrachim, Jews who have immigrated to Israel from Arab-speaking countries) rather than other subcultural groups (i.e. Ashkenazim) which have immigrated to Israel from European countries where Jews fell victim to the Nazi rule.

**Implications for Public Policy**

The results of the present study demonstrate that the Jewish populations of both Israel and the UK harbor feelings of animosity towards Germany regardless of age, gender, and income. The present study has not examined the emotional and psychological effects of being exposed to a German product whether in a store or an advertisement. The emotional and psychological effects of being exposed to movies or anything else that can serve to resurface memories of the Holocaust were not examined either.

However, it seems that social campaigns using scenes from movies about Hitler, for example, can be traumatic to Holocaust survivors. In 2009, a scene from the German film "Der Untergang" was uploaded to YouTube as part of a campaign against the parking space crisis in Tel-Aviv, Israel. Subtitles were added to the movie. However, they were not translations of the actual scene. The subtitles were merely produced to pass a message. In response to the scene, the chair of one of the Holocaust Survivors Organization in Israel and a Holocaust survivor himself said that watching the scene brought back memories from the
Governments and parliaments around the world have legislated laws against the use of copy that is bound to be traumatic to certain populations. Apparently, however, it is not always possible to enforce these laws on the internet. Therefore, governments the world over should establish bodies that will be empowered to sanction websites that violate laws intended to protect sensitive populations such as Holocaust survivors.

**Study Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

The present study has several limitations resulting from time and budget constraints. First, an unequal number of subjects were sampled in the UK and Israel, 100 and 240 respectively. The relatively small size of the UK sample resulted from a low response rate. Second, the present study was conducted in a controlled laboratory setting. Future research should repeat the present study with computer programs (e.g. Conjoint Analysis) that enable researchers to study consumer behavior in more realistic settings. Conjoint analysis is a computerized program that enables researchers to predict product choices by indicating what product attributes consumers prefer the most. In other words, the conjoint analysis software enables the researcher to manipulate several product attributes at a time. This in stark contrast to the present work where only a simple product cue (i.e. COO) was manipulated while the other product cues (price, size, etc.) were kept constant.

The author of this work makes several recommendations to future research. First, the results of Pilot Study # 4 demonstrate that alpha values in the PDI scale can be expected to be slightly below the acceptable range when using low involvement products. In contrast, alpha values within the acceptable range can be accepted when using high involvement products. Because few studies have examined the relationship between the level of purchase involvement and α values, future studies are needed to examine this relationship. In particular, future studies should employ Mittal's (1983) PDI scale with more product classes so as to enable researchers to draw more precise conclusions regarding the relationship between product class and α values on the PDI scale.
Second, the present study was conducted in the context of the Holocaust. More Jewish people were murdered during the Holocaust than any other genocide attempt. Therefore, another recommendation for future research is to test the model developed in the present research in other contexts in general and in contexts in which animosity is less intense in particular. This would serve to demonstrate whether the model presented here is also applicable to other contexts in which animosity is not as intense as is in the case of Jewish consumers.

Third, previous consumer behavior researchers have demonstrated that COO effects are product specific. Hence, the research model developed in this work should be tested with other product categories. Furthermore, a study conducted by Podoshen (2005) suggests that Jewish consumers’ attitude towards purchasing German-made products depends on their level of acculturation. Consequently, future researchers should consider incorporating the acculturation construct into the model presented here when conducting cross-cultural consumer animosity research.

Fifth, this work demonstrates that animosity is likely to increase consumers' level of ethnocentrism. However, it is unclear at what point consumer animosity is replaced by consumer ethnocentrism. In other words, researchers need to determine how high does consumer animosity has to be for it to turn into consumer ethnocentrism.

Next, the present work was conducted in the context of the Holocaust which is a very sensitive issue to many Jews the world over. Therefore, the research design of this work was put together to avoid causing subjects of research unnecessary harm. For example, animosity was manipulated by employing a statement referring to the trade relations between Israel and Germany rather than to the historical relationship between the two countries (i.e. the Holocaust). Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007) have criticized consumer animosity researchers for not having constructed context-specific scales for every one of their unique studies. Constructing new scales for every study entails conducting in-depth interviews. However, in-depth interviews may result in unnecessary harm to study participants especially when dealing with sensitive
issues such as the Holocaust. Consequently, scales employed in previous research were adapted (rather than constructed) to the context of this work. Hence, future research intended to investigate the effects of animosity on consumer behavior in the context of sensitive events (e.g. the Holocaust) should adapt existing scales.

Finally, overall, the results of the present study demonstrate that Jewish consumers are unlikely to buy German products. However, this does not mean that all Jewish consumers will avoid buying German product. Some research indicates that the effects of COO cues on consumer behavior are likely to vary from one subculture to another subculture (Laroche et al., 2003; Schouten and McAlexander, 1995). Thus, the effects of the Holocaust on the various subcultural groups may not be the same. Therefore, future consumer behavior research should examine the effects of animosity on consumer behavior at the subcultural level.
Appendices

**Appendix 1: Purchase Involvement (adapted from Mittal, 1995)**

1. In selecting from the many types and brands of (shower gels/refrigerators) available in the market, would you say that:
   - I would not care at all as to which I buy
   - I would care a great deal as to which I buy
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. How important to you would it be to make the right choice of this product?
   - Not at all important
   - Extremely Important
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. In making your selection of this product, how concerned would you be about the outcome of your choice?
   - Not all concerned
   - Very much concerned
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**Appendix 2: General Animosity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel angry towards Japan.</td>
<td>I feel angry towards Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like Japan.</td>
<td>I like Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not like Japan.</td>
<td>I do not like Germany.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: War Animosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I still feel angry towards Japan because if World War II.</td>
<td>I still feel angry towards Germany because if World War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We should not forget the atrocities committed by Japan during World War II.</td>
<td>We should not forget the atrocities committed by Germany during World War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I cannot forgive Japan for the Holocaust.</td>
<td>I cannot forgive Germany for the Holocaust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 4: Economic Animosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Japan is not a reliable trading partner.</td>
<td>Germany is not a reliable trading partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Japan wants to gain economic power over Israel.</td>
<td>Germany wants to gain economic power over Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Japan is taking advantage of Israel.</td>
<td>Germany is taking advantage of Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Japan has too much influence in Israel.</td>
<td>Germany has too much influence in Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Japanese are doing business unfairly with Israel</td>
<td>The Germans are doing business unfairly with Israel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 5: The Consumer Ethnocentrism Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Only those products that are unavailable in the U.S. should be imported.</td>
<td>Only those products that are unavailable in Israel should be imported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>American products, first, last and foremost.</td>
<td>Israeli products, first, last and foremost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Purchasing foreign-made products is un-American.</td>
<td>Purchasing foreign-made products is un-Israeli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products because it puts Americans out of jobs.</td>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products because it puts Israelis out of jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A real American should always buy Israeli-made products.</td>
<td>A real Israeli should always buy Israeli-made products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We should purchase products manufactured in America instead of letting other countries get rich off of us.</td>
<td>We should purchase products manufactured in Israel instead of letting other countries get rich off of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Americans should not buy foreign products, because this hurts business and causes unemployment.</td>
<td>Israelis should not buy foreign products, because this hurts business and causes unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>It may cost me in the long run but I prefer to support Israeli</td>
<td>It may cost me in the long run but I prefer to support Israeli products.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country.

| 16 | We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country. | We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country. |
| 17 | American consumers who purchase products made in other countries are responsible for putting their fellow Israelis out of work. | Israeli consumers who purchase products made in other countries are responsible for putting their fellow Israelis out of work. |

Appendix 6: Economic Animosity Statements

Low Economic Animosity

As you might know from watching or reading the news, trade relations between Israel and Germany are better now than any time before. Germany continues to openly support trade with the Israel and trades a great number of goods. Many people feel these policies serve to promote free trade. Such policies greatly enhance the Israel's ability to export products to Germany. As a result, the trade balance between Germany and Israel is more equitable than compared to most other trading partners.

High Economic Animosity

As you might know from watching or reading the news, trade relations between Israel and Germany have always been turbulent. Germany continues to impose various restrictions and quotas on many Israeli products in an attempt to protect its local markets. Many people feel these policies are calculated measures to counter free trade. Such policies greatly restrict the Israeli’s ability to export products to Germany. As a result, the trade deficit between Germany and Israel has increased to more inequitable levels.
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