

Review

Scales to Measure Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Guide for Researchers

José Felipe Jiménez Guerrero 

Department of Economics and Business, Mediterranean Research Center of Economics and Sustainable Development, CIMEDES, University of Almería, 04120 La Cañada, Spain; jfjimene@ual.es; Tel.: +34-950-215441

Abstract: The study of consumer ethnocentrism is, and has been, widely studied in academic literature. The need to analyze what drives the consumer to adopt an attitude of rejection towards specific products/services from abroad is undoubtedly a crucial consideration for many companies wishing to access new markets. One of the most important reasons is, actually, the concern for sustainability in the production process, a key aspect to satisfy many consumers who are increasingly demanding environmentally sustainable products. With the aim of studying this characteristic of consumer behavior, various measurement scales have been proposed in the literature, with CETSCALE—developed by Shimp and Sharma in 1987—being the most commonly utilized. In the present work, we conduct a study of the different scales designed to measure consumer ethnocentrism, with the goal of offering researchers a comparative analysis of the advantages and drawbacks of these scales to guide them in their future research.

Keywords: ethnocentrism scales; E-scale; GENE; CETSCALE; CEESCALE; CES; SCNET

1. Introduction

Ethnocentrism as a theoretical concept originates from the study of behaviors and ways of interacting among groups. It was formally introduced for the first time by Sumner in 1906 [1], who defined it as *“the view of things in which one’s own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it”* (p. 13). This author argued that ethnocentrism nourished a group’s pride and vanity while looking at outsiders, or outgroups, with contempt.

The first attempt to adapt this theoretical concept to a practical instrument with which it could be measured is credited to Adorno et al. (1950) [2], who designed the E-Scale (Ethnocentrism Scale). Subsequently, Warr, Faust, and Harrison (1967) [3] designed the BE-scale (British Ethnocentrism Scale), Beswick and Hills (1969) [4] proposed the Australian Ethnocentrism scale, Chang and Ritter (1976) [5] designed the BES (Black Ethnocentrism Scale), Neuliep and McCroskey (1997) [6] introduced the GENE scale (Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale), and recently, Kock et al. (2019) [7] proposed TE (Tourism Ethnocentrism), as alternative scales. The E-scale consists of 34 items and comprises three subscales: N (Negro subscale), M (minority subscale), and P (patriotism subscale). The Australian Ethnocentrism Scale incorporates some items from the E-scale and BE-scale. The GENE scale [6] has two versions of 21 and 24 items. The scale of 24 items was reviewed later by Neuliep, Chandoir, and McCroskey (2001) [8] and validated by Neuliep (2002) [9]. In addition, Neto and Neto (2022) [10] propose SFGENE-7, a short version of GENE scale with seven items (see Appendix A). In the case of GENE or TE, Kock et al. (2019) [7] argued that the CETSCALE is not applicable in the tourism context and introduced the notion of



Academic Editors: Anshu Arora, John R. McIntyre and Amit Arora

Received: 24 February 2025

Revised: 7 March 2025

Accepted: 14 March 2025

Published: 17 March 2025

Citation: Jiménez Guerrero, J.F. Scales to Measure Consumer Ethnocentrism: A Guide for Researchers. *Sustainability* **2025**, *17*, 2635. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17062635>

Copyright: © 2025 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

tourism ethnocentrism (TE). However, according to Stepchenkova [11], CETSCALE can be applied to both domestic and international tourism. TE has been applied by Lever, Elliot, and Joppe (2023) [12], Stepchenkova (2023) [11], Kim and Hyun (2024) [13], and Amani (2024) [14], who analyzed the ethnocentrism in the tourism context (see Appendix A).

In 1987, Shimp and Sharma introduced “consumer ethnocentrism”, a concept interpreted by both authors as a subset of ethnocentrism in a specific domain for the study of consumer behavior with marketing implications [15]. In this regard, consumer ethnocentrism is considered a “unique economic form of ethnocentrism that captures the beliefs held by consumers about the appropriateness and indeed morality of purchasing foreign-made products” (Shimp and Sharma 1987) (According to Bizumic (2019) [16], Shimp and Sharma (1987) [17] incorrectly claimed that Sumner invented the concept because the original conceptualization of ethnocentrism was by Gumpłowicz, a Polish Jew working in Austria-Hungary (can be found in his eight publications in German and Polish in 1881 and 1887). Sumner (1906) [1] defined ethnocentrism under the influence of Gumpłowicz .

Both aspects, appropriateness and morality, have been considered from an economic perspective in the different scales that have been proposed in the literature. In fact, all of them, including the most recent ones, consider the negative effects that imports have on a country’s economy and their influence on employment or the profitability of companies.

However, something as important nowadays as environmental sustainability is not expressly included, despite the fact that it is a main reason for the rejection of many products by consumers. Aspects such as the manufacture of products that, in all phases of their life cycle, have a lower impact on the environment, the consumption of renewable resources, or the minimization of the quantity and toxicity of the waste generated, are left out of the possible causes of consumer ethnocentrism. Therefore, we can affirm that the scales developed do not consider ethnocentrism from a sustainability perspective.

Consumer ethnocentrism has been extensively explored in the literature, with an increasing number of works published since Shimp and Sharma’s study. In fact, it is still a very important research area today, as evidenced by the numerous studies that continue to be published in different research journals, as well as the numerous citations that these works receive. Only in the last decade (2015–2024), according to Scopus, an average of 60 documents (articles, books, and book chapters) have been published, and there have been an average of 1.775 citations.

It must be recognized that the study of consumer ethnocentrism remains a very important area of research, as confirmed by recent studies, among which we can find bibliometric analyses [18–23], systematic reviews [22,24–26], meta-analyses [27], monographic books [28–30], and innovative research approaches [31].

One of the key aspects of consumer ethnocentrism introduced by Shimp and Sharma (1987) [17] is that this concept was supported by the development of CETSCALE (Consumer Ethnocentrism Tendencies Scales), the first complete scale to measure the concept. However, as Shankarmahesh (2006) [15] highlights, at that time, there were already other instruments to measure “attitudes towards foreign goods”, such as the scale by Reiersen (1966) [32].

CETSCALE was originally developed in the USA but was subsequently confirmed in numerous works conducted in different geographical locations throughout the five continents [33,34]. It was this scale’s international validity that made it so prevalent over other measurement scales.

Despite being the scale of choice, in recent years, some works have proposed the need to review the concept of consumer ethnocentrism and how it should be measured [34–40], even questioning the scale proposed by Shimp and Sharma (1987) [17]. However, as mentioned above, none of these new scales include items related to sustainability in their design.

The present work conducts a study of the different scales proposed in the literature for measuring consumer ethnocentrism, with the objective of offering researchers a comparative analysis of said scales so it may serve to guide them during future research. For this purpose, first, Section 2 contains a theoretical background of the different scales found in the literature to measure consumer ethnocentrism. Next, Section 3 analyses the different measurement scales proposed, focusing on CETSCALE, the most widely used scale in the last four decades, and also considering CEESCALE, CES, and SCONET, the most recent proposals found in the literature. Finally, Section 4 offers a discussion that compares the four scales analyzed, examining their advantages and drawbacks to provide a tool for measuring consumer ethnocentrism.

Although this paper focuses on scales that measure consumer ethnocentrism, it also aims to recover those scales that were the germ of CETSCALE or that have been proposed more recently and that measure ethnocentrism. All of these appear in Appendix A.

2. Theoretical Background

Since Shimp and Sharma (1987) [17] introduced the term “consumer ethnocentrism” and proposed CETSCALE as a measurement model, their scale has been without question the point of reference in the literature, enjoying exclusivity for many years. In fact, it was not until 2015 that other alternative proposals began to emerge. Therefore, more than three decades of exclusive use of CETSCALE passed before new scales appeared in the literature.

However, in recent years, various works have already been warning about the need to review the concept of consumer ethnocentrism and, above all, how it should be measured [35–38].

Regarding its conceptualization, Maison et al. (2018) [40] consider that CETSCALE is based on a very strong ideological and normative character. In fact, today, this ideological component could be contradictory to the concepts of opening-up to different cultures, acceptance of diversity, and globalization. As for Sharma (2015) [39], this author highlights the lack of consensus on the conceptual and empirical structure of CETSCALE and its applicability in different countries, product categories, and consumer characteristics.

With regard to measurements, as stated by Jiménez, Pérez, and Galdeano (2020) [34], the literature contains a large number of works carried out in different cultural contexts that question the existence of one single dimension when applying CETSCALE. To a certain extent, these inconsistent findings might be due to the lack of relevance of CETSCALE in the contemporary world, considering that it is based on a series of conscious consumer beliefs that buying foreign products is negative for local industry (Maison et al., 2018) [40]. However, such beliefs are especially irrelevant among consumers in developing countries, who do not display such a high level of ethnocentrism as in western countries [41–43], given that the quality of many locally manufactured products is, quite often, objectively inferior.

The collective result of this body of critical research is the recent development of new alternative scales to measure consumer ethnocentrism with the aim of improving on those aspects for which CETSCALE has been most notably criticized: its multidimensional behavior and the strong ideological bias upon which the scale is constructed.

Thus, in 2015 two proposals were presented: first, CES (Revised Consumer Ethnocentrism Scale), developed by Sharma (2015) [39], and, months later, CEESCALE (Consumer Ethnocentrism Extended Scale) by Siagmagka and Balabanis (2015) [44]. Three years later, a new proposal emerged in SCONET (Scale of Consumer Ethnocentrism), a scale created by Maison et al. (2018) [40].

Among the arguments that the various studies present to justify their scales, in some cases (CEESCALE and CES), they coincide in the need to address the main deficiency that the empirical evidence on CETSCALE has detected: its multidimensional behavior. Thus,

CEESCALE contemplates five different dimensions of ethnocentrism, and CES reconceptualizes the concept of consumer ethnocentrism into a construct of a three-dimensional attitude that contemplates emotional, cognitive, and behavioral components. As for SCONET, its authors propose the need for a scale that is free of the ideological factors present in CETSCALE.

Table 1 summarizes the main characteristics of the different scales proposed in the literature.

Table 1. Scales to measure consumer ethnocentrism.

Scale	Author	Year	Dimen.	Items
CETSCALE	Shimp, T.A. and Sharma, S. [17]	1987	1	17
CEESCALE	Siamagka, N.T. and Balabanis, G. [44]	2015	5	17
CES	Sharma, P. [39]	2015	3	18
SCONET	Maison, D., Ardi, R., Yulianto, J.E., and Rembulan, C.L. [40]	2018	1	6

As can be seen in Table 1, CEESCALE and CES are two scales composed of a similar number of items from CETSCALE, while SCONET features a smaller number of items.

The following section analyzes the most significant aspects of each of the measurement scales.

3. Scales to Measure Consumer Ethnocentrism Behavior

3.1. CETSCALE

For over 35 years, researchers have been applying CETSCALE to represent consumer beliefs about the suitability of acquiring foreign products.

Although its original application focused on consumers in the United States, it has subsequently been validated at the international level by numerous works in many geographic areas.

Only in the past decade do we find applications of CETSCALE in countries such as Bangladesh [45,46], China [47,48], Germany [33], India [49,50], Indonesia [51], Iran [52], Kazakhstan [53], Kenya [54], Malaysia [55], Mexico [56], Nigeria [57], Portugal [58,59], Romania [60], Serbia [61], Slovenia [62], Turkey [63], Tunisia [64], USA [65,66], Vietnam [67], and Zimbabwe [68] (For a more in-depth review of CETSCALE application, see the work by Jiménez, Gázquez, and Linares (2014) [33] and Jiménez, Pérez, and Galdeano (2020) [34]).

As CETSCALE was developed more than three decades ago, it currently has important limitations in its conceptual approach. For example, it does not address the complexities of existing consumer markets, so consumers may prefer foreign products but still hold ethnocentric beliefs [11]. In addition, it is a scale that completely ignores consumer preferences for environmentally sustainable products.

Regarding its practical application, in recent years, as mentioned in the Introduction, some works have also proposed the need to review the way of measuring ethnocentrism, primarily because empirical evidence has revealed a non-unidimensional behavior of CETSCALE [49,55,65,69–72].

This possibility to consider different assessments of a reduced set of the 17 items that comprise CETSCALE, has resulted in many works applying a fragmented version of the scale [73–76] or alternative versions [42,77,78].

The following section analyzes the multidimensional behavior of CETSCALE as well as the different versions of the scale presented in the literature.

3.1.1. Multidimensionality of CETSCALE

One of the aspects that has generated the most debate in the literature with regard to the use of CETSCALE, as confirmed over time by empirical evidence, is its multidimensional behavior.

However, there are many works in the literature carried out in different geographic areas, in which the scale exhibits a unidimensional behavior. For example, Netemeyer, Duvarsula, and Lichtenstein (1991) [79] in Germany, the USA, France, and Japan; Durvasula, Andrews, and Netemeyer (1997) [80] in the USA and Russia; Kucukerimoglou (1999) [81] in Turkey; Luque, Ibáñez, and Del Barrio (2000) [82] in Spain; Pereira, Hsu, and Kundu (2002) [83] in China, India, and Taiwan; Orth and Firasová (2003) [84] in Czech Republic; Balabanis and Diamantopoulos (2004) [85] in the UK; Kwak, Jaju, and Larsen (2006) [86] in South Korean, the USA, and India; Nadiri and Tümer (2010) [87] in Cyprus; Teo, Mohamad, and Ramayah (2011) [88] in Malaysia; Bandyopadhyay (2012) [89] in Iceland; and Mockaitis, Salciuviene, and Ghauri (2013) [90] in Lithuania.

The problem arises because, on the other hand, there are also a large number of works conducted in different cultural contexts that question the existence of a single dimension when applying CETSCALE. As highlighted by Jiménez et al. (2020) [34], these works obtain two dimensions (e.g., Holland [91], Australia [92], Russia [37], Greece [93], China [69], South Africa [94], Germany [33], USA [65], Zimbabwe [68], Malaysia [55], and Azerbaijan [95]) or, in some cases, three dimensions (e.g., Poland [96], India [97]; Brazil [98], and Ethiopia [72]) and even four different dimensions (e.g., Czech Republic [99], Moldova [71], and Nigeria [57]) that explain the ethnocentric behavior of consumers within a specific cultural and geographic context.

By closely analyzing some of these studies, it can be observed that the authors came to identify nearly thirty different dimensions, resulting from the various combinations of the CETSCALE items and their subsequent interpretation. Terms such as patriotism, protection, hard ethnocentrism, conservatism, animosity, and xenophobia, among others, define the different dimensions identified in these works (see Table 2).

As can be seen in Table 2, not only is the multidimensional nature of CETSCALE evident, but there does not appear to be a clear pattern that makes it possible to identify which items comprise each dimension, given that the interpretation in each study is very different. Therefore, the large number of dimensions identified, along with the mere fact that one specific dimension is the result of various combinations of different items (e.g., six in the case of the protectionism dimension and four for soft ethnocentrism), rather than serving as a reference to guide researchers, the application of CETSCALE ultimately proves chaotic and complex.

Table 2. Dimensions of CETSCALE. (We can find in the literature other works in which CETSCALE presents a multidimensional behavior, but the authors do not provide a description of these dimensions (e.g., Yu and Albaum (2002) [100], Bawa (2004) [97], Saffu and Walker (2005) [37], Khan and Rizvi (2008) [101], Singh and Dhiman (2012) [102], Renganathan et al. (2015) [49])).

Dimension	Study	Number of Item	Items (Detail)
Patriotism/Patriot	Marcoux et al. (1997) [96]	4	1,7,9, 10
	Wanninayake and Chovancová (2012) [99]	6	1,4,5,7,9,13
	Pentz et al. (2013) ^a [94]	5	1,2,3,6,8
	Weber et al. (2015) [65]	12	5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17
	Kiriri (2019) [54]	6	1,2,3,4,9,13,
	Kibret and Shukla (2021) [72]	6	1,4,5,7,9,13

Table 2. Cont.

Dimension	Study	Number of Item	Items (Detail)
Conservative patriotism	Hsu and Nien (2008) ^a [103]	8	2,4,7,8,11,13,16,17
Defensive patriotism	Hsu and Nien (2008) [103]	2	5,6
Protectionism	Marcoux et al. (1997) [96]	5	2,12,14,15,16
	Upadhyay and Singh (2006) [104]	3	14,15,17
	Hsu and Nien (2008) [103]	7	5,6,7,8,11,13,17
	Weber et al. (2015) [65]	4	1,2,3,4
	Cazacu (2016) [71]	5	11,12,14,15,17
	Kibret and Shukla (2021) [72]	6	2,10,12,14,15,16
Hard ethnocentrism	Chryssochoidis et al. (2007) [93]	9	5,6,7,8,11,12,14,15,17
	Ramayah et al. (2011) [105]	10	5,6,7,8,11,12,13,14,15,17
	Teo et al. (2011) [88]	10	5,6,7,8,11,12,13,14,15,17
	Akbarov (2022) [95]	5	5,6,7,12,14
Soft ethnocentrism	Chryssochoidis et al. (2007) [93]	8	1,2,3,4,9,10,13,16
	Ramayah et al. (2011) [105]	7	1,2,3,4,9,10,16
	Teo et al. (2011) [88]	7	1,2,3,4,9,10,16
	Akbarov (2022) [95]	6	1,2,3,4,10,16
Domestic product preferences/Positive attitude/Buy domestic products	Wei et al. (2009) [69]	9	1,2,3,4,7,8,9,10,13
	Strehlau et al. (2012) [98]	6	3,4,7,8,9,13
	Jiménez et al. (2014) [33]	4	1,2,3,4
	Lewis and Grebitus (2016) [70]	8	1,2,3,4,8,13,16
Foreign products negative attitude/No imports	Wei et al. (2009) [69]	7	5,6,11,12,14,15,17
	Jiménez et al. (2014) [33]	9	5,6,7,8,11,12,14,15,17
	Lewis and Grebitus (2016) [70]	9	5,6,7,10,11,12,14,15,17
Socio-economic conservatism	Marcoux et al. (1997) [96]	5	6,8,11,13,17
	Upadhyay and Singh (2006) [104]	4	2,8,10,16
	Cazacu (2016) [71]	4	2,8,10,16
Emotional consumer ethnocentrism	Acharya and Elliot (2003) [92]	5	1,3,4,9,13
Self-reliance	Hsu and Nien (2008) [103]	3	2,4,16
Rational consumer ethnocentrism	Acharya and Elliot (2003) [92]	12	2,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Animosity	Mavondo and Tan (1999) [106]	-	-
	Ghani and Mat (2017) [55]	6	5,6,11,14,15,17
Nationalism	Upadhyay and Singh (2006) [104]	5	1,3,4,9,13
	Cazacu (2016) [71]	5	1,3,4,9,13
Ultra nationalism	Upadhyay and Singh (2006) [104]	3	5,6,7
	Cazacu (2016) [71]	3	5,6,7
Xenophobia	Wanninayake and Chovancová (2012) [99]	3	12,14,15
Negative impact on economy and/or employment/Economic	Wanninayake and Chovancová (2012) [99]	5	3,6,8,11,17
	Strehlau et al. (2012) [98]	5	
	Pentz et al. (2013) [94]	5	5,6,11,16,17
	Kiriri (2019) [54]	5	5,6,7,11,17
Product availability	Wanninayake and Chovancová (2012) [99]	3	2,10,16
Trade	Strehlau et al. (2012) [98]	6	1,2,10,12,14,15
Foreign products	Kiriri (2019) [54]	3	14,15,16
Prosocial	Kibret and Shukla (2021) [72]	5	3,6,8,11,17

Source: Own elaboration. ^a These studies use the reduced version of CETSCALE (10 items).

3.1.2. Versions of CETSCALE

CETSCALE can be applied using the full 17-item scale (CET-17) or a reduced scale of only 10 items (CET-10) (see Appendix B).

However, we can find in the literature that some authors decide not to utilize CET-17 or CET-10 in the original version, carrying out an item selection or rewriting that responds to the need to adapt the scale to the specific geographic and socio-cultural context of their analyses. Therefore, for example, Steenkamp, Hofstede, and Wedel (1999) [107], Batra et al. (2000) [42], and Guo, Tu, and Chang (2018) [48] selected only four items; Keillor et al. (1996) [77], Strizhakova, Coulter, and Price (2012) [108], Russell and Russell (2006) [109], and Sun, González, and Wang (2021) [110] selected five items; Klein et al. (2006) [78], Sharma (2011) [75], and Miguel, Marques, and Duarte (2022) [58] chose six items; John and Brady (2010) [74] and Kamwendo, Corbishley, and Mason (2014) [111] selected seven items; Ma, Wang, and Hao (2012) [112], Yadav and Kishor (2023) [50], and Hanchukova, Velikova, and Koo (2024) [66] chose only eight items, and finally, Elida, Hasyim, and Hanfan (2016) [113] selected nine adapted items. As highlighted by Jiménez et al. (2020) [34], some of these “new scales” have demonstrated their reliability and validity, so they have been used in subsequent research [42,77,78,107] (see Table 3). However, such practices can lead to dimensional confusion and, especially, to proposing scales with a significant loss of reliability and validity.

However, sometimes, authors only change the country in which the scale is applied but still decide to give it a unique name, as is the case with the Ice-scale and the Indian Consumer Ethnocentrism Scale [114].

Table 3. Adapted versions of CETSCALE.

New Version of Scale	Other Applications	Items	Items (Detail) ¹
Keillor et al. (1996) [77]	Keillor and Hult (1999) [115] Thelen et al. (2011) ² [116]	5	2,8,9,11,13
Bailey and Gutiérrez de Pineres (1997) ³ [117]	Seidenfuss et al. (2013) [118]	10	2,4,5,6,7,8,11,13,16,17
Klein et al. (1998) [119]	Ishii (2009) [120] Wang et al. (2013) [121] Narang (2016) [122] Nguyen et al. (2023) [123]	6	4,5,6,8,16,17
Steenkamp et al. (1999) [107]	Klein (2002) [124] Cleveland et al. (2013) [125]	4	6,7,8,11
Batra et al. (2000) [42]	Alden et al. (2006) [126] Cleveland et al. (2009) [38] Zhou et al. (2010) [127] Nelson and Deshpande (2013) [128] Jin et al. (2015) [129]	4	5,6,7,11
Klein et al. (2006) [78]	Bevan-Dye et al. (2012) ⁴ [130] Auruskeviciene et al., (2012) [131] Tong and Li (2013) [132] Fernández and Bande (2013) ⁵ [133] Fernández and Bande (2015) [134] Aktan and Chao (2016) [135] Fernández et al. (2018) ⁶ [136]	6	2,4,7,11,13,17
Fernández and Bande (2013) [133]	Pestar et al. (2018) [62] Fernández et al. (2018) [136]	5	2,4,7,11,17

Table 3. *Cont.*

New Version of Scale	Other Applications	Items	Items (Detail) ¹
Prats and Vida (2013) [137]	Purwanto (2014) [138]	5	1,6,11,16,17
Zeugner-Roth et al. (2015) [139]	Wilkins et al. (2019) [140]	5	6,7,8,9,11
Kock et al. (2019) ⁷ [7]	Lever, Elliot, and Joppe (2022) [12] Stepchenkova (2023) [11] Kim and Hyun (2024) [13] Amani (2024) [14]	6	

Source: Jiménez et al. (2020) [34] and own elaboration. ¹ Some items have adapted wording. ² Remove an item from the scale. ³ It is an adapted version of CET-10 (Items 16 and 17). ⁴ Add one more item to the scale. ⁵ It is an adapted version of Klein et al. (2006) [78] with one item removed. ⁶ It is an adapted version of Klein et al. (2006) [78] and Fernández and Bande (2013) [133], consisting of six items. ⁷ It is an adapted version for the tourism context.

There are several explanations for this widespread practice of using a reduced number of items from CET-17, according to Jiménez et al. (2020) [34]. The first reason could lie in the high internal correlation that exists among the 17 items in CETSCALE, as highlighted by Klein (2002) [124], which would naturally lead researchers to create a reduced scale. The second explanation is directly linked to the specific objective of a given study and the resulting convenience of using only a portion of the scale for a particular aim. Without question, this practice provides a measurement of the flexibility of CETSCALE and the vast possibilities that it offers to researchers. The third reason relates to the fact that numerous works, such as those analyzed in the previous section, have confirmed the multidimensional behavior of the scale.

3.2. CEESCALE and CES: Two Solutions to Behavior Multidimensional of CETSCALE

With the aim of solving the problem of multidimensionality identified in numerous studies that have applied CETSCALE, two alternative proposals have emerged in the literature: CEESCALE, by Siamagka and Balabanis (2015) [44], and CES, by Sharma (2015) [39]. It is mainly this multidimensional aspect that determined the need to conceptually re-examine consumer ethnocentrism, in addition to modifying how it is measured. The aim, therefore, is to help researchers to identify consumer ethnocentrism behavioral intentions with greater accuracy.

3.2.1. CEESCALE

CEESCALE is a scale comprised of 17 items and distributed among five different dimensions: (1) Prosociality (items 1–5); (2) Cognition (items 6–8); (3) Insecurity (items 9–11); (4) Reflexiveness (items 12–14); and (5) Habituation (items 15–17) (see Appendix B).

Despite being a scale structured in five different dimensions, some of its items display great similarity to the items in CETSCALE with regard to their wording. Thus, for example, Item 1 of the *Prosociality* dimension is very similar to Item 4 of CETSCALE, while Items 3 and 4 of this dimension are very similar to Items 9 and 7, respectively. Also, another close similarity can be observed between Item 9 of the *Insecurity* dimension and Item 6 of CETSCALE.

Consequently, it seems logical that Siamagka and Balabanis (2015) [44] do not question the content of many of the items in CETSCALE, nor how they are worded. Instead, they only attempt to offer a shortened multidimensional structure based on five dimensions. In doing so, they seek to avoid two very important aspects: first, that the interpretation of a given set of items depends on the discretion of the researcher, as observed in Table 2, thus preventing multiple dimensions from being proposed; and, second, to prevent the

fragmented use of the scale that has so frequently occurred with CETSCALE, as mentioned in Table 3.

Finally, regarding the results produced by CEESCALE, it has been observed that it has a higher reliability and predictive validity than CETSCALE.

At present, studies that have utilized this scale to measure consumer ethnocentrism are still very scarce (e.g., China and Greece [141], Syria [142], Iraq and Turkey [143], and Myanmar [144]).

3.2.2. CES

CES is a scale comprised of 18 items that, like CEESCALE, is also distributed in different dimensions, although in this case, there are only three: (1) Affective reaction (6 items); (2) Cognition bias (6 items); and (3) Behavioral preference (6 items) (see Appendix B).

The scale was designed and validated with consumers from four countries: China, India, the UK, and the USA. The three sub-scales of CES, and the full scale of 18 items, showed high reliability.

As occurred with CEESCALE, despite being a scale structured in three different dimensions, some of its items also bear great similarity in their wording to the CETSCALE items. Thus, for example, Item 1 for the dimension of *Behavioral preference* is very similar to 4 in CETSCALE, while Item 2 of this same dimension bears a close similarity to the idea presented in Item 7.

What CES does feature, unlike CETSCALE and CEESCALE, is a hate and disdain component for foreign products in the wording of certain items. More specifically, Items 5 and 6 of the *Affective reaction* dimension are presented in rather radical terms, in an attempt to reflect the deepest patriotic sentiment among consumers.

With regard to the arguments of Sharma (2015) [39] for proposing this tridimensional scale, they are in keeping with what we have presented for the case of CEESCALE, that is, it offers a solution to the multidimensionality problem of CETSCALE. However, its level of acceptance still remains to be tested, considering that studies that have utilized this scale to measure consumer ethnocentrism are still very scarce (e.g., Colombia [145], Brazil and Russia [146], and China [147]).

3.2.3. Equivalence of the Dimensions of CETSCALE, CEESCALE and CES

To finalize the analysis of the scales that attempt to provide a solution to the multidimensional behavior of CETSCALE, Table 4 establishes a parallelism between the different dimensions of CETSCALE proposed in the literature and its equivalent in CEESCALE and CES. For this purpose, we considered the items that comprise each dimension and its corresponding meaning.

As can be seen in Table 4, most of the dimensions in CETSCALE that have been identified in the literature have their equivalent in both CEESCALE and CES.

Therefore, the fact that the multidimensional structure of both scales (five in CEESCALE and three in CES) contemplates a set of items that clearly resemble most of the dimensions of CETSCALE undoubtedly solves the multidimensional problem while also opening the door to increased use of these scales.

Because the multidimensionality of CETSCALE should be understood as an “abnormality” in the scale’s behavior, the ideal scenario would be to have a measurement tool that somehow reduces and limits these dimensions, and both CEESCALE and CES provide a solution.

However, it is important to recognize that the greatest obstacle that both scales may have is the tendency in the literature to use only a part of the CETSCALE items, according to the criteria of the researchers. In fact, as can be seen in Table 3, this selection of items has

even given rise to “subscales” that are beginning to be used in other studies, although with these “subscales”, it is not possible to identify any of the dimensions described in Table 2. Therefore, we do not believe that these subscales will hinder the use of CEESCALE or CES in the future.

Table 4. Equivalence of the dimensions of CETSCALE, CEESCALE, and CES.

Dimensions of CETSCALE	Dimensions of CEESCALE	Dimensions of CES
Patriotism/Patriot	Prosociality	Affective reaction
Protectionism	Habituation	Behavioral preference
Hard ethnocentrism	Prosociality	Affective reaction
Soft ethnocentrism	Habituation	Behavioral preference
Domestic product preferences/Positive attitude/Buy domestic products	Habituation	Behavioral preference
Foreign products negative attitude/No imports	Prosociality	Affective reaction
Socio-economic conservatism	Habituation	Behavioral preference
Emotional consumer ethnocentrism	Cognition	Cognition bias
Rational consumer ethnocentrism	Habituation	Behavioral preference
Animosity	-----	Behavioral preference
Nationalism	Prosociality	Affective reaction
Ultra nationalism	Prosociality	Affective reaction
Xenophobia	-----	Behavioral preference
Negative impact on the economy and/or employment/Economic	Insecurity/Reflexivity	-----
Prosocial	Prosociality	Affective reaction
Product availability	-----	-----
Trade	----	-----

Source: Own elaboration.

3.3. SCONET

SCONET is a scale comprised of 6 items, which analyzes consumer ethnocentrism from a psychological point of view, eliminating the normative character and, above all, highly ideological of CETSCALE. In this regard, as Maison et al. (2018) [40] state in the justification of their scale, SCONET eliminates the strong ideological bias that many individuals would encounter when responding to the items in CETSCALE (see Appendix B).

Objectively, it is understandable that, in view of the growing need for tolerance and acceptance of diversity, compounded with the phenomenon of modern globalization, many people do not wish to express their negative opinions about foreign products in such a direct manner, as CETSCALE proposes. In fact, Maison et al. (2018) [40] consider that some inconsistent data obtained with CETSCALE, related to its multidimensional behavior, might be partially caused by the lack of relevance of Shimp and Sharma’s scale in the contemporary world, having been designed years ago in 1987. In this sense, they argue that, in this day and age, it does not seem logical to continue to maintain that conscious

beliefs exist among consumers that link purchasing foreign products with a negative effect on local industry or a reduction in employment and, therefore, with unpatriotic behavior.

With the objective of analyzing the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and preference for national brands, while also contemplating the link with the psychological concept of “social identity”, SCONET was designed and validated with consumers from two countries, Poland and Indonesia, displaying a unidimensional behavior. The results confirm the relationship between SCONET, social identity, and the preference for national brands in both countries.

As with the previous scales, at present, studies that have utilized SCONET to measure consumer ethnocentrism are still very scarce [148].

4. Discussion: Selection of a Scale to Measure Consumer Ethnocentrism

Following the in-depth analysis of the different scales found in the literature for measuring consumer ethnocentrism, a degree of uncertainty arises concerning which scale would be the most suitable for beginning a new study, regardless of the geographic area where it would be conducted. Thus, Table 5 summarizes the main advantages and drawbacks that each of the analyzed scales features.

Table 5. Advantages and drawbacks for scales to measure consumer ethnocentrism.

Scale	Advantage	Drawbacks
CETSCALE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Abundant empirical evidence * Possibility of using the original version (17 items) or the reduced version (10 items) * Possibility of selecting items at the researcher’s discretion * Possibility of using reduced subscales (e.g., 4, 5, or 6 items), which have already been replicated in the literature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Possibility of displaying a non-unidimensional behavior, both with the 17-item version and the 10-item version * Multiple dimensions identified in the literature without clear limitations * Dimensions with the same description can be comprised of different items * Displays strong ideological bias * The scale does not consider the sustainability aspects
CEESCALE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Contemplates different dimensions that identify various ethnocentric behaviors among consumers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Scarce empirical evidence * Ethnocentric behavior of consumers limited to 5 dimensions * Displays strong ideological bias * The scale does not consider the sustainability aspects
CES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Contemplates different dimensions that identify various ethnocentric behaviors among consumers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Scarce empirical evidence * Ethnocentric behavior of consumers limited to 3 dimensions * Displays strong ideological bias * The scale does not consider the sustainability aspects
SCONET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Eliminates ideological bias * The scale presents a psychological approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Scarce empirical evidence * Fails to describe the ethnocentric behavior of consumers * The scale does not consider the sustainability aspects

Without question, CETSCALE has been the undisputed reference in studies on consumer ethnocentrism ever since Shimp and Sharma developed it in 1987. It has been utilized in the original 17-item version, the 10-item version, and in fragmented form through the selection of certain items at the researcher’s discretion, by adapting the wording of the items and by means of applying subscales proposed in the literature (e.g., [52,81]). Whichever the case, CETSCALE has always offered an acceptable academic solution for countless studies. It would appear, therefore, that the criticism that CETSCALE has received in the literature,

thus far, has not diminished its use, possibly because no alternative scale has been available to researchers.

As can be seen in Table 5, the main arguments upon which the new alternative scales to CETSCALE were based, and which rectify its main limitations, basically focus on two aspects: its multidimensional behavior, a clear anomaly for a scale conceived as a single construct, and its strong ideological bias, which is inappropriate in the current context of the globalized world economy.

With regard to the first limitation, we consider that accepting as valid all the proposed dimensions that studies submitted for a scale designed to be unidimensional proves rather questionable and, therefore, detracts credibility from CETSCALE. In all probability, the fact that, until very recently, there were no alternative scales may have led to the general acceptance of using CETSCALE in any of the forms previously mentioned, as well as accepting as valid the results of the various studies.

However, as of 2015, when CEESCALE and CES, two scales with reduced dimensions (five in one case and three in the other), appeared in the literature, researchers had access to new measurement tools that, from then on, have served as legitimate alternatives to CETSCALE. Nonetheless, we believe that the wider range of possibilities that CEESCALE offers with five dimensions, that is, five different motivations with which to describe ethnocentric consumer behavior, gives it a certain advantage over CES for future use.

Although CEESCALE and CES solve the problem of multidimensionality, the fact that both scales have maintained a wording style in the items similar to CETSCALE fails to solve the limitation of its strong ideological component. In this sense, SCONET, the scale developed by Maison et al. (2018) [40], could be considered the only one that truly adapts to the current context of economic globalization by eliminating this ideological bias. However, SCONET features the notable limitation of offering a single conception of consumer ethnocentrism, erroneously ignoring the concept's various nuances.

Therefore, in short, we consider CEESCALE to be a legitimate alternative to CETSCALE, provided it gains wider recognition and adoption. However, the deep-rooted hold that CETSCALE has in the literature means it will surely continue to be used in both its original formats and through the various subscales that have been designed and validated. With respect to CES and SCONET, it is likely they will not achieve a lasting presence in the literature. In any case, the reflections that have been presented here, based on the advantages and drawbacks offered by each of the different scales in relation to the others, will have to be confirmed by the literature in the years to come.

Finally, as we mentioned in the Introduction, we consider the contribution that these new scales make to the literature to be limited, since they focus, above all CEESCALE and CES, exclusively on solving the problem of multidimensionality. None of the scales modifies the content of the items and, therefore, the economic perspective with which they were designed. The new scales do not allow us to know, for example, whether this attitude of consumer rejection responds to sustainability criteria related to production methods, the use of non-recyclable materials, or the emission of waste, among other causes. For this reason, we believe that it would be recommended to design a new scale whose items would focus on economic sustainability, i.e., the use of economic practices that are profitable from both the social and environmental points of view, or to modify the wording of the items of the most recent scales. For example, the wording of the items in the Cognition dimension of CEESCALE could be revised as follows: 6. When it comes to British products manufactured in an environmentally sustainable way, I do not need further information to assess their quality; the country of origin is a sufficient signal of high quality for me. 7. British products manufactured with sustainable methods are better than imported goods.

8. British products are manufactured to high standards using environmentally sustainable production systems, and no other country can beat them.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: PPIT-UAL, Junta de Andalucía-FEDER 2021–2027. Programa: 54.A.Ref (P_FORT_GRUPOS_2023/27).

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. Original E-Scale.

N°	Item
1	The many political parties tend to confuse national issues, add to the expense of elections, and raise unnecessary agitation. For this and other reasons, it would be best if all political parties except the two major ones were abolished.
2	If there are enough Negroes who want to attend dances at a local dance hall featuring a colored band, a good way to arrange this would be to have one all-Negro night, and then the whites could dance in peace the rest of the time.
3	Patriotism and loyalty are the first and most important requirements of a good citizen.
4	Certain religious sects whose beliefs do not permit them to salute the flag should be forced to conform to such a patriotic action, or else be abolished.
5	The Negroes would solve many of their social problems by not being so irresponsible, lazy, and ignorant.
6	Any group or social movement that contains many foreigners should be watched with suspicion and, whenever possible, be investigated by the FBI.
7	There will always be superior and inferior nations in the world and, in the interests of all concerned, it is best that the superior ones be in control of world affairs.
8	Negro musicians are sometimes as good as white musicians at swing music and jazz, but it is a mistake to have mixed Negro-white bands.
9	Although women are necessary now in the armed forces and in industry, they should be returned to their proper place in the home as soon as the war ends.
10	Minor forms of military training, obedience, and discipline, such as drill, marching, and simple commands, should be made a part of the elementary school educational program.
11	It would be a mistake to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
12	The main threat to basic American institutions during this century has come from the infiltration of foreign ideas, doctrines, and agitators.
13	The present treatment of conscientious objectors, draft evaders, and enemy aliens is too lenient and molycoddling. If a person won't fight for his country, he deserves a lot worse than just a prison or a work camp.
14	Negroes may have a part to play in white civilization, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much intermixing with whites.
15	One main difficulty with allowing the entire population to participate fully in government affairs (voting, jobs, etc.) is that such a large percentage is innately deficient and incapable.

Table A1. *Cont.*

N°	Item
16	Manual labor and menial jobs seem to fit the Negro mentality and ability better than more skilled or responsible work.
17	It was a mistake to allow any Japanese to leave internment camps and enter the army, where they would be free to commit sabotage.
18	In view of the present national emergency, it is highly important to limit responsible government jobs to native, white, Christian Americans.
19	In a community of 1000 whites and 50 Negroes, a drunken Negro shoots and kills an officer who is trying to arrest him. The white population should immediately drive all the Negroes out of town.
20	European refugees may be in need, but it would be a big mistake to lower our immigration quotas and allow them to flood the country.
21	The many faults of and the general inability to get along with the Oklahomans ("Okies"), who have recently flooded California, prove that we ought to send them back where they came from as soon as conditions permit.
22	The people who raise all the talk about putting Negroes on the same level as whites and giving them the same privileges are mostly radical agitators trying to stir up conflicts.
23	It has become clear that the Germans and Japanese are racially war-minded and power-seeking, and the only guarantee of future peace is to wipe out most of them and keep the rest under careful control.
24	A large-scale system of sterilization would be one good way of breeding out criminals and other undesirable elements in our society and so raise its general standards and living conditions.
25	An occasional lynching in the South is a good thing because there is a large percentage of Negroes in many communities and they need a scare once in a while to prevent them from starting riots and disturbances.
26	Mexico can never advance to the standards of living and civilization of the US, due mainly to the innate dirtiness, laziness, and general backwardness of Mexicans.
27	Filipinos are all right in their place, but they carry it too far when they dress lavishly, buy good cars, and go around with white girls.
28	It would be best to limit Negroes to grammar and trade school education since more schooling just gives them ambitions and desires which they are unable to fulfill in white competition.
29	Zootsuits demonstrate that inferior groups, when they are given too much freedom and money, just misuse their privileges and create disturbances.
30	The most vicious, irresponsible, and racketeering unions are, in most cases, those having largely foreigners for leaders.
31	There is something inherently primitive and uncivilized in the Negro, as shown in his music and his extreme aggressiveness.
32	We are spending too much money on the pampering of criminals and the insane and the education of inherently incapable people.
33	There will always be wars because, for one thing, there will always be races who ruthlessly try to grab more than their share.
34	Most Negroes would become officious, overbearing, and disagreeable if not kept in their place.

Source: Adorno et al. (1950). [2] (1) Items of subscale N (Negro): 2,5,8,11,14,16,19,22,25,28,31,34. (2) Items of subscale M (Minority): 1,4,6,9,15,17,21,24,27,29,30,32. (3) Items of subscale P (Patriotism): 3,7,10,12,13,18,20,23,26,33.

Table A2. Original BE-Scale.

N°	Item
1	Mods and Rockers demonstrate that inferior groups when given too much money and freedom just misuse their privileges and create disturbances.
2	Communists should be carefully watched and strong action taken against any suspicious activities observed.
3	In the last few years, teenagers have shown that they are being given too much independence and too much money.
4	Due mainly to the innate dirtiness, laziness, and general backwardness of most of the Irish, Ireland can never advance to the standard of living and civilization of England and Scotland.
5	One big trouble with Jews is that they are never contented but always try for the best jobs and the most money.
6	There is something primitive and uncivilized in the Negro, as shown in his music and extreme aggressiveness.
7	It is probably true to say that one fault of the Jews is their conceited idea that they are a chosen race.
8	We should do more to limit immigration in order to give British workers more jobs.
9	Negroes would most likely become officious, overbearing, and disagreeable if not kept in their place.
10	It does seem that we are spending rather too much money on the pampering of criminals and the insane and the education of inherently incapable people.
11	There is very little discipline in today's youth.
12	It would probably be a mistake to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
13	The Irish are perfectly capable of skilled and responsible work and should certainly not be restricted to manual labor and menial jobs.
14	Homosexuals are not criminals and should never be treated as such.
15	It is right that capital punishment has been abolished.
16	Negroes should not be segregated from whites in schools, jobs, and housing estates.
17	The State should give students more generous financial help and support.
18	It is not wrong for Negro and white people to intermarry.
19	Sex offenders should not be punished but treated with kindness and sympathy by qualified psychiatrists.
20	On the whole Negroes are a responsible hardworking race.
21	There is much to be said for many of the rites and customs within the Roman Catholic Church.
22	Districts containing many Negroes are hardly ever as dirty as many people make out.
23	It is very likely that British trade and industry have improved because of the increase of foreign skills in factories and other workplaces.
24	Even though people of all sorts mix together nowadays one should not have to worry very much about catching an infection or disease.

Source: Warr, Faust and Harrison (1967) [3].

Table A3. Original BES.

N°	Item
1	If a black person and a white person were selling the same thing, I would go out of my way to buy it from the black person.
2	Most whites sympathize with the Ku Klux Klan.
3	Blacks should elect public officials of their own race regardless of the campaign issues.
4	You cannot condemn the entire white race because of the actions of some of its members.
5	The highest duty of a man is to fight for the glory and power of his own race.
6	White men are by nature prejudiced and bigoted.
7	A political party consisting of only black members should be formed.
8	We will not have a true democracy in this country as long as whites are in power.
9	Blacks should forget about integration and struggle for black power.
10	Racial discrimination will not disappear until prejudiced whites are severely punished.
11	I am in favor of creating a black sovereign state within the United States of America.
12	Blacks and whites are brothers.
13	I am for my own race, right or wrong.
14	Whites will remain oppressive even though integration is accomplished.
15	On the whole, blacks have better qualities of character than whites.
16	There is little hope for improving race relations because of deliberate attempts by whites to suppress black people.
17	We need more black leaders who speak up for black supremacy.
18	It is disgraceful for a black girl to invite a white man to her home.
19	The use of force to overthrow the unjust law is always justified.
20	Most whites who sympathize with the civil rights movement are primarily motivated by guilt or fear.
21	Blacks should focus on black pride rather than integration.
22	Court decisions are most often unjust when blacks are involved.
23	Blacks who lack “black pride” are abandoning their own people.
24	It is a shame for a black to marry a person of the white race.
25	The black race is better than any other.
26	Whites who are friendly with blacks are only trying to use them.
27	The black community should have the right to stop other racial groups from living in it.
28	Whites must pay their debt to black people.
29	In general, black people are more creative than whites.
30	“A tooth for a tooth” is fair practice against the white man’s injustice.
31	Blacks should give their first loyalty to America instead of to their own kind.
32	Blacks should give up trying to be on friendly terms with whites.
33	Blacks, on the whole, are genetically superior to whites.

Table A3. *Cont.*

N°	Item
34	Blacks and whites can never get along well.
35	The US Constitution should be amended to ensure that either the president or vice president of the United States would be black.
36	Only fools believe that friendliness toward whites can accomplish anything in the black people's struggle.
37	There should be a national black committee on education to see to it that schools teach children black culture and history.
38	Individuals who are not members of the black race should not be permitted to teach in predominantly black schools and colleges.
39	Black children, from a very early age, should be taught to be loyal to their own race.
40	White people try to keep black people down.

Source: Chang and Ritter (1976) [5].

Table A4. Original GENE Scale.

N°	Item
1	Other countries should model themselves after my country.
2	People in my country have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere else.
3	My country should be the role model of the world.
4	Most other countries are backward in comparison with my country.
5	Most people would be happier if they lived like the people in my country.
6	My country is a poor example of how to run a country.
7	My country is a poor role model for other countries.
8	Lifestyles in other countries are just as valid as in my country.
9	Countries are smart to look up to my country.
10	Life in my country is much better than most other places.
11	People in my country could learn a lot from people from other countries.
12	Countries really should not use my country as a role model.
13	A lot of other countries are primitive compared to my country.
14	I enjoy learning about the customs and values of other countries.
15	Although different, most countries have equally valid value systems.
16	I'm not interested in the values and customs of other countries.
17	Many other countries have really strange and unusual customs as compared to mine.
18	People from other countries act strange and unusual when they come to my country.
19	People should respect the values of customs of other countries.
20	I have little respect for the values and customs of other countries.
21	Most people from other cultures just don't know what is good for them.

Source: Neuliep and McCroskey (1997) [66].

Table A5. Revised GENE Scale.

N°	Item
1	Most cultures are backward compared to my culture.
2	My culture should be the role model for other cultures. (*)
3	Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in my culture.
4	Other cultures should try to be like my culture. (*)
5	I'm not interested in the values and customs of other cultures.
6	People in my culture could learn a lot from people in other cultures.

Table A5. *Cont.*

N°	Item
7	Most people from other cultures just don't know what's good for them.
8	I have little respect for the values and customs of other cultures.
9	Most people would be happier if they lived like people in my culture. (*)
10	People in my culture have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere. (*)
11	Lifestyles in other cultures are not as valid as those in my culture.
12	I'm very interested in the values and customs of other cultures.
13	I respect the values and customs of other cultures.
14	I apply my values when judging people who are different.
15	I have many friends from different countries.
16	I see people who are similar as virtuous.
17	I do not cooperate with people who are different. (*)
18	I do not trust people who are different. (*)
19	I dislike interacting with people from different cultures. (*)
20	Most people in my culture just don't know what's good for them.
21	Other cultures are smart to look up to my culture.
22	People from other cultures act strange and unusual when they come into my culture.

Source: Neuliep, Chaudoir and McCroskey (2001) [8]. (*) Items on Short Form Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale (SFGENE-7).

Table A6. Original TE.

N°	Item
1	Americans should support the American economy by traveling to holiday destinations in the US.
2	Americans should feel a duty to book a national holiday.
3	Everyone should support the American economy by spending their holiday in the US.
4	Every time an American decides to spend their holiday in the US, it makes America's future a little bit brighter.
5	It comes down to all Americans to spend their holiday in the US and support the country.
6	Americans should spend their holiday in the US because this secures jobs in the American tourism industry.

Source: Kock et al. (2019) [7].

Appendix B

Table A7. Original CETSCALE.

N°	Item
1	American people should always buy American-made products instead of imports.
2	Only those products that are unavailable in the US should be imported. (*)
3	Buy American-made products. Keep American working.
4	American products, first, last, and foremost. (*)
5	Purchasing foreign-made products is un-American. (*)
6	It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts Americans out of jobs. (*)
7	A real American should always buy American-made products. (*)
8	We should purchase products manufactured in America instead of letting other countries get rich off us. (*)
9	It is always best to purchase American products.
10	There should be very little trading or purchasing of goods from other countries unless out of necessity.

Table A7. *Cont.*

N°	Item
11	Americans should not buy foreign products, because this hurts American business and causes unemployment. (*)
12	Curbs should be put on all imports.
13	It may cost me in the long run, but I prefer to support American products. (*)
14	Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products on our markets.
15	Foreign products should be taxed heavily to reduce their entry into the US.
16	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 Americans out of work. (*)

Source: Shimp and Sharma (1987) [17]. (*) Items on reduced version CETSCALE.

Table A8. Original CEESCALE.

N°	Item
Prosociality	
1	Buying British goods helps me maintain my British identity.
2	I believe that purchasing British goods should be a moral duty of every British citizen.
3	It always makes me feel good to support our products.
4	A real Briton should always back British products.
5	British people should always consider British workers when making their purchase decisions.
Cognition	
6	When it comes to British products, I do not need further information to assess their quality; the country of origin is a sufficient signal of high quality for me.
7	British goods are better than imported goods.
8	British products are made to high standards and no other country can exceed them.
Insecurity	
9	Increased imports result in greater levels of unemployment in this country.
10	Buying foreign products is a threat to the domestic economy.
11	Job Losses in this country are the result of increased importation of foreign goods.
Reflexiveness	
12	I would be convinced to buy domestic goods if a campaign was launched in the mass media promoting British goods.
13	If British people are made aware of the impact on the economy of foreign product consumption, they will be more willing to purchase domestic goods.
14	I would stop buying foreign products if the British government launched campaigns to make people aware of the positive impact of domestic goods consumption on the British economy.
Habituatation	
15	I am buying British products out of habit.
16	I prefer buying British products because I am more familiar with them.
17	I am buying British products because I am following the consumption patterns that were passed to me by my older family members.

Source: Siamagka and Balabanis (2015) [44].

Table A9. Original CES.

N°	Item
Affective reaction	
1	I love the products and services from (Home Country).
2	I am proud of the products and services from (Home Country).
3	I admire the products and services from (Home Country).

Table A9. Cont.

N°	Item
4	I feel attached to the products and services from (Home Country).
5	I hate the products and services from foreign countries.
6	I despise the products and services from foreign countries.
	Cognition bias
1	East or West, the products and services from (Home Country) are the best.
2	Products from (Home Country) are examples of best workmanship.
3	Service providers from (Home country) have the best work attitudes.
4	Products and services from foreign countries are no match for those from (Home Country).
5	(Home Country) has the hardest-working people in the manufacturing industry.
6	Service providers from (Home Country) are more caring than those in any foreign country.
	Behavioral preference
1	For me, it's always the products from (Home Country) first, last and foremost.
2	If I have a choice, I would prefer buying products and services from (Home Country).
3	I prefer being served by service providers from (Home Country).
4	As far as possible, I avoid buying products and services from foreign countries.
5	I often refuse to buy a product or service because it is from a foreign country.
6	I would much rather not buy a product or service, than buy one from a foreign country.

Source: Sharma (2015) [39].

Table A10. Original SCONET.

N°	Item
1	In my opinion, we should support our national companies by buying Polish */Indonesian ** products.
2	If I have a choice between a Polish */Indonesian ** and a foreign product, I choose the Polish/Indonesian.
3	Buying foreign products when Polish */Indonesian ** are available is not right.
4	It is always better to buy Polish */Indonesian ** products.
5	I often buy Polish */Indonesian ** products.
6	I think that Polish */Indonesian ** products are as good as foreign ones.

Source: Maison et al. (2018) [40]. (*) For study 1 and 2. (**) For study 3.

References

- Sumner, W.G. *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Manners, Customs, Mores and Moral*; Ginn & Company: Boston, NY, USA, 1906.
- Adorno, T.; Frenkel-Brunswik, E.; Levinson, D.J.; Sanford, R.N. *The Authoritarian Personality*; Harper & Row: New York, NY, USA, 1950.
- Warr, P.; Faust, J.; Harrison, G. A british ethnocentrism scale. *Br. J. Soc. Clin. Psychol.* **1967**, *13*, 145–155. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Beswick, D.; Hills, M. An Australian ethnocentrism scale. *Aust. J. Psychol.* **1969**, *21*, 211–225. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Chang, E.; Ritter, E. Ethnocentrism in black students. *J. Soc. Psychol.* **1976**, *100*, 89–98. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Neuliep, J.; McCroskey, J. The development of a US and generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Commun. Res. Rep.* **1997**, *14*, 385–398. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kock, F.; Josiassen, A.; Assaf, A.; Karpen, I.; Farrelly, F. Tourism ethnocentrism and its effects on tourist and resident behavior. *J. Travel Res.* **2019**, *58*, 427–439. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Neuliep, J.; Chaudoir, M.; McCroskey, J. A cross-cultural comparison of ethnocentrism among Japanese and United States college students. *Commun. Res. Rep.* **2001**, *18*, 137–146. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Neuliep, J. Assessing the reliability and validity of the Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale. *J. Int. Commun. Res.* **2002**, *31*, 201–215.
- Neto, J.; Neto, F. Ethnocentrism: A short form measure (SFGENE-7). *SAGE Open* **2022**, *12*. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Stepchenkova, S. Comparative analysis and applicability of GENE, CETSCALE, and TE ethnocentrism scales in tourism context. *Curr. Issues Tour.* **2023**, *26*, 1409–1426. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

12. Lever, M.W.; Elliot, S.; Joppe, M. Pride and promotion: Exploring relationships between national identification, destination advocacy, tourism ethnocentrism and destination image. *J. Vacat. Mark.* **2023**, *29*, 537–554. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
13. Kim, H.; Hyun, S. Impact of travelers' consumer ethnocentrism on purchase and behavior intention: Moderating effect of implicit prejudice. *Int. J. Tour. Res.* **2024**, *26*, e2607. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
14. Amani, D. Strengthening tourism ethnocentrism in emerging tourism destinations. *Tour. Crit. Pract. Theor.* **2024**, *5*, 178–204. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
15. Shankarmahesh, M. Consumer ethnocentrism: An integrative review of its antecedents and consequences. *Int. Mark. Rev.* **2006**, *32*, 146–172. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
16. Bizumic, B. Effects of the dimensions of ethnocentrism on consumer ethnocentrism: An examination of multiple mediators. *Int. Mark. Rev.* **2019**, *36*, 748–770. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
17. Shimp, T.; Sharma, S. Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *J. Mark. Res.* **1987**, *24*, 280–289. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
18. Chahal, S.; Narwal, M.; Rozera, P. Consumer ethnocentrism research over three decades: A bibliometric analysis and future directions. *Asia-Pac. J. Manag. Res. Innov.* **2023**, *19*, 200–218. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
19. Baber, R.; Upadhyay, Y.; Baber, P.; Kaurav, R. Three decades of consumer ethnocentrism research: A bibliometric analysis. *Bus. Perspect. Res.* **2023**, *11*, 137–158. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Botello, F.A.; Vega, R.L.; Arencibia, R. El Etnocentrismo como objeto de investigación: Un enfoque bibliométrico. *Iberoam. J. Sci. Meas. Commun.* **2024**, *4*, 1–19.
21. Yonfá, M.; Sabando, D.; Pérez, J.; Jara, C. Consumer ethnocentrism: Bibliometric analysis and literature review through cognitive structure and mapping of research based on web of science (WoS) and scopus. *Cogent Bus. Manag.* **2024**, *11*, 2377320. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Yadav, S. A systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis of consumer ethnocentrism. *SAGE Open* **2024**, *14*. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Srivastava, G.; Narang, D. Revisiting consumer ethnocentrism using thematic cluster analysis. *Int. J. Manag. Pract.* **2025**, *18*, 133–156. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
24. Vardarsuyu, M. Consumer ethnocentrism: A systematic review and directions for future research. *J. Consum. Consum. Res.* **2022**, *14*, 637–676.
25. Baber, R.; Sankpal, S.; Baber, P.; Gulati, C. Consumer ethnocentrism: What we learned and what we need to know?—A systematic literature review. *Cogent Bus. Manag.* **2024**, *11*, 2321800. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Trivedi, S.; Tapar, A.; Dharmani, P. A systematic literature review of the relationship between consumer ethnocentrism and product evaluation. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2024**, *36*, 41–61. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Balabanis, G.; Siamagka, N. A meta-analysis of consumer ethnocentrism across 57 countries. *Int. J. Res. Mark.* **2022**, *39*, 745–763. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. Kinawy, R. Unraveling consumer behavior: Exploring the influence of consumer ethnocentrism, domestic country bias, brand trust, and purchasing intentions. *Strateg. Chang.* **2024**, *34*, 137–150. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Thin, N. Ethnocentrism. In *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*; Springer International Publishing: New York, NY, USA, 2024; pp. 2195–2197.
30. Al-Sulaiti, K.; Al-Sulaiti, I.; Abaas, J.; Al Halbusi, H. *Ethnocentrism and Country of Origin Effects. The Asian Consumers Perspective*; Qatar University Press: Doha, Qatar, 2025.
31. Baruk, A. The effect of consumers' ethnocentric attitudes on their willingness for prosumption. *Heliyon* **2019**, *5*, e02015. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Reiersen, C. Are Foreign Products Seen as National Stereotypes? *J. Retail.* **1966**, *42*, 33–40.
33. Jiménez, J.F.; Gázquez, J.C.; Linares, E. Using standard CETSCALE and other adapted versions of the scale for measuring consumers' ethnocentric tendencies: An analysis of dimensionality. *Bus. Res. Quart.* **2014**, *17*, 174–190.
34. Jiménez, J.F.; Pérez, J.C.; Galdeano, E. Alternative proposals to measure consumer ethnocentric behavior: A narrative literature review. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 2216. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Hult, G.; Tomas, M.; Keillor, B. The impact of social desirability bias on consumer ethnocentrism research: A cross-national perspective. *J. Mark. Manag.* **1994**, *4*, 48–55.
36. De Cremer, D. Relations of self-esteem concerns, group identification, and self-stereotyping to in-group favoritism. *J. Soc. Psychol.* **2001**, *141*, 389–400. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
37. Safu, K.; Walker, J. An assessment of the consumer ethnocentric scale (CETSCALE) in an advanced and transitional country: The case of Canada and Russia. *Int. J. Manag.* **2005**, *22*, 556–571.
38. Cleveland, M.; Laroche, M.; Papadopoulos, N. Cosmopolitanism, consumer ethnocentrism, and materialism: An eight-country study of antecedents and outcomes. *J. Int. Mark.* **2009**, *17*, 116–146. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Sharma, P. Consumer ethnocentrism: Reconceptualización and cross-cultural validation. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* **2015**, *46*, 381–389. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

40. Maison, D.; Ardi, R.; Yulianto, J.; Rembulan, C. How consumer ethnocentrism can predict consumer preferences—Construction and validation of SCONET scale. *Pol. Psychol. Bull.* **2018**, *49*, 365–374. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Bilkey, J.; Nes, E. Country-of-origin effects on product evaluations. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* **1982**, *35*, 89–99. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
42. Batra, R.; Ramaswamy, V.; Alden, D.L.; Steenkamp, J.B.; Ramachander, S. Effects of brand local and non-local origin on consumer attitudes in developing countries. *J. Consum. Psychol.* **2000**, *9*, 83–95. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Tsai, W.-H.; Lee, W.-N.; Song, Y. A cross-cultural study of consumer ethnocentrism between China and the U.S. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2013**, *25*, 80–93. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Siamagka, N.; Balabanis, G. Revisiting consumer ethnocentrism: Review, reconceptualization, and empirical testing. *J. Int. Mark.* **2015**, *23*, 66–86. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Chowdhury, T.; Ibn, M. Conceptualizing consumer ethnocentrism in a developing country: Validity and applicability of CETSCALE in Bangladesh. *J. Asia-Pac. Bus.* **2014**, *15*, 27–53. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Alam, M.; Roy, D.; Akther, R.; Hoque, R. Consumer ethnocentrism and buying intentions on electronic products: Moderating effects of demographics. *South Asian J. Mark.* **2022**, *3*, 82–96. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
47. Sui, H. Study on the Correlation between Consumer Ethnocentrism and Demographic Factors in China. In *International Conference on Logistics Engineering, Management and Computer Science (LEMCS 2014)*; Atlantis Press: Beijing, China, 2014; pp. 818–822.
48. Guo, G.; Tu, H.; Cheng, B. Interactive effect of consumer affinity and consumer ethnocentrism on product trust and willingness-to-buy: A moderated-mediation model. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2018**, *35*, 688–697. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
49. Renganathan, R.; Sukumaran, S.; Balachandran, S. Customers' attitude and perception about ethnocentrism-application of consumer ethnocentrism scale (CETSCALE). *Res. J. Appl. Sci. Eng. Technol.* **2015**, *9*, 807–812. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. Yadav, S.; Kishor, N. Global vs local: A choice influenced by consumer ethnocentrism level. *NMIMS Manag. Rev.* **2023**, *31*, 240–255. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
51. Ramadania, R.; Suh, J.; Rosyadi, R.; Purmono, B.; Rahmawati, R. Consumer ethnocentrism, cultural sensitivity, brand credibility on purchase intentions of domestic cosmetics. *Cogent Bus. Manag.* **2023**, *10*, 2229551. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Shahabi, S.; Gorton, M. The effects of perceived regulatory efficacy, ethnocentrism and food safety concern on the demand for organic food. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2021**, *45*, 273–286. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
53. Nakip, M.; Gökmen, A. An empirical survey of consumer ethnocentrism in Kazakhstan and the preference of consumers on imported products. *Bilig* **2017**, *82*, 65–88.
54. Kiriri, P. Consumer ethnocentrism and attitudes towards local products: A case of Kenyan consumers. *Univ. J.* **2019**, *1*, 1–18. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
55. Ghani, N.; Mat, N. Malaysian consumers ethnocentrism: The measurement scale and index. *Int. Rev. Manag. Mark.* **2017**, *7*, 521–528.
56. Chapa, S. Hope as a mediator of ethnocentrism among hispanics: The post analysis of the nothing gringo boycott of 2006. *Int. J. Econ. Bus. Manag.* **2014**, *2*, 10–18.
57. Kilders, V.; Caputo, V.; Liverpool-Tasie, L. Consumer ethnocentric behavior and food choices in developing countries: The case of Nigeria. *Food Pol.* **2021**, *99*, 101973. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Miguel, L.; Marques, S.; Duarte, A. The influence of consumer ethnocentrism on purchase of domestic fruits and vegetables: Application of the extended theory of planned behaviour. *Br. Food J.* **2022**, *124*, 599–618. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Miguel, L.; Marques, S.; Duarte, A. Characterising the fruit and vegetables consumer ethnocentrism in a southern European country: An assessment of the reliability and validity of the “CETSCALE” in Portugal. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2023**, *105*, 104770. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Stamule, S. Trends in ethnocentrism of Romanian consumers and their attitudes towards the marketplace. *Manag. Mark.* **2018**, *13*, 996–1013. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. Fernández, P.; Bande, B.; Klein, J.G.; del Rio, M.L. Consumer ethnocentrism and consumer animosity: Antecedents and consequences. *Int. J. Emerg. Mark.* **2015**, *10*, 73–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Pestar, S.; Hristov, H.; Kosmerl, T.; Kuhar, A. Influence of consumer regiocentrism on perceived value of wine. *Br. Food J.* **2018**, *120*, 33–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Acikdilli, G.; Ziemnowicz, C.; Bahhouth, V. Consumer ethnocentrism in Turkey: Ours are better than theirs. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2018**, *30*, 45–57. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
64. Karoui, S.; Khemakhem, R. Consumer ethnocentrism in developing countries. *Eur. Res. Manag. Bus. Econ.* **2019**, *25*, 63–71. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Weber, M.; Lambert, J.; Conrad, K.; Jennings, S. Consumer ethnocentrism and tendencies to protect Wisconsin-made cheese products. *Int. Acad. Mark. Stud. J.* **2015**, *19*, 149–168.
66. Hanchukova, O.; Velikova, N.; Koo, B. Cheers to local! Exploring consumer ethnocentrism in the context of regional wines. *Br. Food J.* **2024**, *126*, 3584–3603. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

67. Nguyen, T.; Dang, P.; Tran, P.; Nguyen, T. The impact of consumer ethnocentrism on purchase intention: An empirical study from Vietnam. *J. Asian Financ. Econ. Bus.* **2022**, *9*, 427–436.
68. Makanyeza, C.; du Toit, F. Measuring consumer ethnocentrism: An assessment of reliability, validity and dimensionality of the CETSCALE in a developing market. *J. Afr. Bus.* **2016**, *17*, 188–208. [[CrossRef](#)]
69. Wei, Y.; Wright, B.; Wang, H.; Yu, C. An evaluation of the consumer ethnocentric scale (CETSCALE) among Chinese consumers. *Int. J. Glob. Manag. Stud.* **2009**, *1*, 18–31.
70. Lewis, K.; Grebitus, C. Why U.S. consumers support country of origin labeling: Examining the impact of ethnocentrism and food safety. *J. Int. Food Agribus. Mark.* **2016**, *28*, 254–270. [[CrossRef](#)]
71. Cazacu, S. Preference for domestic goods: A study of consumer ethnocentrism in the Republic of Moldova. *Ecoforum J.* **2016**, *5*, 295–302.
72. Kibret, A.; Shukla, A. Is Consumer ethnocentrism scale, CETSCALE, applicable in Africa? *J. Glob. Mark.* **2021**, *34*, 353–371. [[CrossRef](#)]
73. Altintas, H.; Tokol, T. Cultural openness and consumer ethnocentrism: An empirical analysis of Turkish consumers. *Mark. Intell. Plan.* **2007**, *25*, 308–325. [[CrossRef](#)]
74. John, A.; Brady, M. Consumer ethnocentrism and conspicuous consumption of domestic and foreign consumer goods in Mozambique, a less-developed SADC country. *Irish J. Manag.* **2010**, *30*, 41–72.
75. Sharma, P. Country of origin effects in developed and emerging markets: Exploring the contrasting roles of materialism and value consciousness. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* **2011**, *42*, 285–306. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Shu, S.; Strombeck, S.; Hsieh, C. Consumer ethnocentrism, self-image congruence and local Brand preference: A cross-national examination. *Asia Pac. Manag. Rev.* **2013**, *18*, 43–61.
77. Keillor, B.; Hult, G.T.; Effmeyer, C.; Bakakus, E. NATID: The development and application of a national identity measure for use in international marketing. *J. Int. Mark.* **1996**, *4*, 57–73. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Klein, J.G.; Ettenson, R.; Krishnan, B. Extending the construct of consumer ethnocentrism: When foreign products are preferred. *Int. Mark. Rev.* **2006**, *23*, 304–321. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Netemeyer, R.; Durvasula, S.; Lichtenstein, D. A cross-national assessment of the reliability and validity of the CETSCALE. *J. Mark. Res.* **1991**, *28*, 320–327. [[CrossRef](#)]
80. Durvasula, S.; Andrews, J.; Netemeyer, R. A cross-cultural comparison of consumer ethnocentrism in the United States and Russia. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **1997**, *9*, 73–79. [[CrossRef](#)]
81. Kucukerimoglu, O. Market segmentation by using consumer lifestyle dimensions and ethnocentrism: An empirical study. *Eur. J. Mark.* **1999**, *33*, 470–487.
82. Luque, T.; Ibáñez, J.A.; Del Barrio, S. Consumer ethnocentrism measurement. An assessment of the reliability and validity of the CETSCALE in Spain. *Eur. J. Mark.* **2000**, *34*, 1353–1373. [[CrossRef](#)]
83. Pereira, A.; Hsu, C.; Kundu, S. A cross-cultural analysis of ethnocentrism in China, India, and Taiwan. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2002**, *15*, 77–90. [[CrossRef](#)]
84. Orth, U.; Firbasová, Z. The role of consumer ethnocentrism in food product evaluation. *Agribus. Int. J.* **2003**, *19*, 137–153. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Balbanis, G.; Diamantopoulos, A. Domestic country bias, country-of-origin effects, and consumer ethnocentrism: A multidimensional unfolding approach. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2004**, *32*, 80–95. [[CrossRef](#)]
86. Kwak, H.; Jaju, A.; Larsen, T. Consumer ethnocentrism offline and online: The mediating role of marketing efforts and personality traits in the United States, South Korea, and India. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2006**, *34*, 367–385. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. Nadiri, H.; Tümer, M. Influence of ethnocentrism on consumers' intention to buy domestically produced goods: An empirical study in North Cyprus. *J. Bus. Econ. Manag.* **2010**, *11*, 444–461. [[CrossRef](#)]
88. Teo, P.; Mohamad, O.; Ramayah, T. Testing the dimensionality of consumer ethnocentrism scale (CETSCALE) among young Malaysian consumer market segment. *Afr. J. Bus. Manag.* **2011**, *5*, 2805–2816.
89. Bandyopadhyay, S. Ethnocentrism in Icelandic consumers and its consequences. *Int. Bus. Eco. Res. J.* **2012**, *11*, 307–314. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Mockaitis, A.I.; Salciuviene, L.; Ghauri, P. On what do consumer product preferences depend? Determining domestic versus foreign product preferences in an emerging economy market. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2013**, *25*, 166–180. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Douglas, S.; Nijssen, E. On the use of “borrowed” scales in cross-national research: A cautionary note. *Int. Mark. Rev.* **2003**, *20*, 621–642. [[CrossRef](#)]
92. Acharya, C.; Elliott, G. Consumer ethnocentrism, perceived product quality and choice-An empirical investigation. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2003**, *15*, 87–114. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. Chrysoschoidis, G.; Krystallis, A.; Perreas, P. Ethnocentric beliefs and country-of-origin (COO) effect: Impact of country, product and product attributes on Greek consumers' evaluation of food products. *Eur. J. Mark.* **2007**, *41*, 1518–1544. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Pentz, C.; Terblanche, N.; Boshoff, C. Measuring consumer ethnocentrism in a developing context: An assessment of the reliability, validity and dimensionality of the CETSCALE. *J. Trans. Manag.* **2013**, *18*, 204–218. [[CrossRef](#)]

95. Akbarov, S. Consumer ethnocentrism and purchasing behavior: Moderating effect of demographics. *J. Islamic. Mark.* **2022**, *13*, 898–932. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
96. Marcoux, J.; Filiatrault, P.; Cheron, E. The attitude underlying preferences of young urban educated polish consumers towards product made in western countries. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **1997**, *9*, 5–29. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
97. Bawa, A. Consumer ethnocentrism: CETSCALE validation and measurement of extent. *Vikalpa J. Decis. Makers.* **2004**, *29*, 43–57. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
98. Strehlau, V.I.; Ponchio, M.C.; Loebel, E. An assessment of the consumer ethnocentric scale (CETSCALE): Evidences from Brazil. *Braz. Bus. Rev.* **2012**, *9*, 103–126. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
99. Wanninayake, W.; Chovancová, M. Consumer ethnocentrism and attitudes towards foreign beer brands: With evidence from Zlin Region in the Czech Republic. *J. Compet.* **2012**, *4*, 3–19. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
100. Yu, J.; Albaumb, G. Sovereignty change influences on consumer ethnocentrism and product preferences: Hong Kong revisited one year later. *J. Bus. Res.* **2002**, *55*, 891–899. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
101. Khan, M.; Rizvi, S. Consumer ethnocentrism: Relevance and implications for marketers. *J. Consum. Behav.* **2008**, *3*, 52–65.
102. Singh, A.; Dhiman, M. An evaluation of ethnocentric scale (CETSCALE) among indian consumers of imported foods. *Indian Manag. Stud. J.* **2012**, *16*, 1–18.
103. Hsu, J.; Nien, H. Who are ethnocentric? Examining consumer ethnocentrism in Chinese societies. *J. Consum. Behav.* **2008**, *7*, 436–447. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
104. Upadhyay, Y.; Singh, S. Preference for domestic goods: A study of consumer ethnocentrism. *VISION J. Bus. Perspect.* **2006**, *10*, 59–68. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
105. Ramayah, T.; Mohamad, O.; Chee, N.; May-Chuin, L. Testing dimensionality of the consumer ethnocentrism scale (CETSCALE): Assessing reliability and validity in a multicultural context. *Aust. J. Basic Appl. Sci.* **2011**, *5*, 325–334.
106. Mavondo, F.T.; Tan, A. Reconceptualizing the CETSCALE (Consumer Ethnocentric Tendency Scale). In Proceedings of the Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference 1999: Marketing in the Third Millennium, Sydney, Australia, 28 November–1 December 1999.
107. Steenkamp, J.B.; Hofstede, F.; Wedel, M. A cross-national investigation into the individual and national cultural antecedents of consumer innovativeness. *J. Mark.* **1999**, *63*, 55–69. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
108. Strizhakova, Y.; Coulter, R.; Price, L. The young adult cohort in emerging markets: Assessing their glocal cultural identity in a global Marketplace. *Int. J. Res. Mark.* **2012**, *29*, 43–54. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
109. Russell, D.; Russell, C. Explicit and implicit catalysts of consumer resistance: The effects of animosity, cultural salience and country-of-origin on subsequent choice. *Int. J. Res. Mark.* **2006**, *23*, 321–331. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
110. Sun, Y.; González, H.; Wang, S. Examining the relationships between e-WOM, consumer ethnocentrism and brand equity. *J. Bus. Res.* **2021**, *130*, 564–573. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
111. Kamwendo, A.; Corbishley, K.; Mason, R. South African consumer ethnocentrism and attitudes towards foreign convenience products. *Probl. Perspect. Manag.* **2014**, *12*, 320–333.
112. Ma, J.; Wang, S.; Hao, W. Does cultural similarity matter? Extending the animosity model from a new perspective. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2012**, *29*, 319–332. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
113. Elida, S.; Hasyim, M.; Hanfan, A. The trends of indonesian consumer ethnocentrism as a reference for international marketer. *Int. Bus. Manag.* **2016**, *10*, 2641–2648.
114. Joshi, R.; Joshi, Y. Construction and validation of Indian consumer ethnocentrism scale: The ice-scale. *Gadjah Mada Int. J. Bus.* **2021**, *23*, 173–192. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
115. Keillor, B.; Hult, G. A five-country study of national identity: Implications for international marketing research and practice. *Int. Mark. Rev.* **1999**, *16*, 65–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
116. Thelen, S.; Yoo, B.; Magnini, V. An examination of consumer sentiment toward offshored services. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2011**, *39*, 270–289. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
117. Bailey, W.; Gutierrez, S. Country of origin attitudes in Mexico: The Malinchismo effect. *J. Int. Con. Mark.* **1997**, *9*, 25–41. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
118. Seidenfuss, K.; Kathawala, Y.; Dinnie, K. Regional and country ethnocentrism: Broadening ASEAN origin perspectives. *Asia Pac. J. Mark. Logist.* **2013**, *25*, 298–320. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
119. Klein, J.; Ettenson, R.; Moris, M. The animosity model of foreign product purchase: An empirical test in the People's Republic of China. *J. Mark.* **1998**, *62*, 89–100. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
120. Ishii, K. Nationalistic sentiments of chinese consumers: The effects and determinants of animosity and consumer ethnocentrism. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2009**, *21*, 299–308. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
121. Wang, W.; He, H.; Li, Y. Animosity and willingness to buy foreign products: Moderating factors in decision-making of chinese consumers. *Asia Pac. Bus. Rev.* **2013**, *19*, 32–52. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

122. Narang, R. Understanding purchase intention towards chinese products: Role of ethnocentrism, animosity, status and self-esteem. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2016**, *100*, 253–261. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
123. Nguyen, N.; Kien, D.; Duong, T.; Nguyen, T.; Nguyen, V.; Dao, T. Role of consumer ethnocentrism on purchase intention toward foreign products: Evidence from data of Vietnamese consumers with Chinese products. *Heliyon* **2023**, *9*, e13069. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
124. Klein, J. Us versus them, or us versus everyone? Delineating consumer aversion to foreign foods. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* **2002**, *33*, 345–363. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
125. Cleveland, M.; Laroche, M.; Hallab, R. Globalization, culture, religion, and values: Comparing consumption patterns of Lebanese Muslims and Christians. *J. Bus. Res.* **2013**, *66*, 958–967. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
126. Alden, D.; Steenkamp, J.B.; Batra, R. Consumer attitudes toward marketplace globalization: Structure, antecedents and consequences. *Int. J. Res. Mark.* **2006**, *23*, 227–239. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
127. Zhou, L.; Yang, Z.; Hui, M. Non-local or local brand? A multi-level investigation into confidence in Brand origin identification and its strategic implications. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2010**, *38*, 202–218. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
128. Nelson, M.; Deshpande, S. The prevalence of and consumer response to foreign and domestic brand placement in Bollywood movies. *J. Advert.* **2013**, *42*, 1–15. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
129. Jin, Z.; Lynch, R.; Attia, S.; Chansarkar, B.; Gülsoy, T.; Lapoule, P.; Purani, K. The relationship between consumer ethnocentrism, cosmopolitanism among younger generation consumers: The moderating role of country development status. *Int. Bus. Rev.* **2015**, *24*, 380–393. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
130. Bevan-Dye, A.; Garnett, A.; de Klerk, N. Materialism, status consumption and consumer ethnocentrism amongst black generation Y students in South Africa. *Afr. J. Bus. Manag.* **2012**, *6*, 5578–5586. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
131. Auruskeviciene, V.; Vianelli, D.; Reardon, J. Comparison of consumer ethnocentrism behavioural patterns in transitional economies. *Transform. Bus. Econ.* **2012**, *11*, 20–35.
132. Tong, X.; Li, C. Impact of brand personality and consumer ethnocentrism in China's sportswear market. *Asia Pac. J. Mark. Logist.* **2013**, *25*, 491–509. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
133. Fernández, P.; Bande, B. Regional ethnocentrism: Antecedents, consequences and moderating effects. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2013**, *30*, 299–308. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
134. Fernández, P.; Bande, B. Attitudes and reactions of Galician (Spanish) consumers towards the purchase of products from other regions. *Glob. Bus. Econ. Rev.* **2015**, *17*, 131–150.
135. Aktan, M.; Chao, P. Mediating effect of self-congruity between country personality and attitude toward foreign products in an emerging market. In Proceedings of the 2016 Global Marketing Conference at Hong Kong Proceedings, Hong Kong, China, 21–24 July 2016; pp. 441–445.
136. Fernández, P.; Calvo, A.; Bande, B.; Artaraz, M.; Galán, M.M. The valuation and purchase of food products that combine local, regional and traditional features: The influence of consumer ethnocentrism. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2018**, *64*, 138–147. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
137. Prats, O.; Vida, I. The effects of cosmopolitanism on consumer ethnocentrism, product quality, purchase intentions and foreign products purchase behavior. *Am. Int. J. Contemp. Res.* **2013**, *3*, 144–155.
138. Purwanto, E. The effect of consumer ethnocentrism on perceived domestic product quality and purchase intentions among young consumers in Jakarta, Indonesia. *Int. J. Asian Soc. Sci.* **2014**, *4*, 1003–1012.
139. Zeugner, K.; Žabkar, V.; Diamantopoulos, A. Consumer ethnocentrism, national identity, and consumer cosmopolitanism as drivers of consumer behavior: A social identity theory perspective. *J. Int. Mark.* **2015**, *23*, 25–54. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
140. Wilkins, S.; Butt, M.; Shams, F.; Pérez, A. The acceptance of halal food in non-muslim countries: Effects of religious identity, national identification, consumer ethnocentrism and consumer cosmopolitanism. *J. Islam. Mark.* **2019**, *10*, 1308–1331. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
141. Ding, Q.; Niro, M.; Pollalis, Y.; Zhou, Y.; Tsogas, M. Consumer ethnocentrism threatens import brands? Empirical evidence from China and Greece and validation of CEESCALE. In Proceedings of the British Academy of Management Conference, Coventry, UK, 5–7 September 2017.
142. Paylan, M.; Çetinkaya, C.; Özceylan, E.; Dabbaa, A. Consumer ethnocentrism: An application of CEESCALE on syrian refugees. *Gaziantep Univ. J. Soc. Sci.* **2017**, *16*, 937–949. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
143. Başgöze, P.; Salihi, M. The effect of consumer ethnocentrism on attitudes towards global consumer culture advertisements: Iraq-Turkey example. *Pazarlama Ve Pazarlama Araştırmaları Derg.* **2021**, *14*, 1–30.
144. Htet, A. Effect of consumer ethnocentrism on purchase intention of consumers in myanmar textile market. *J. Manag. Mark. Logist.* **2018**, *9*, 127–135.
145. Areiza, J.A.; Cervera, A.; Manzi, M. Ethnocentrism at the coffee shop industry: A study of Starbucks in developing countries. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.* **2020**, *6*, 164. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
146. Ma, J.; Yang, J.; Yoo, B. The moderating role of personal cultural values on consumer ethnocentrism in developing countries: The case of Brazil and Russia. *J. Bus. Res.* **2020**, *108*, 375–389. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

147. Hong, E.; Park, J.; Jaroenwanit, P.; Siriyota, K.; Sothonvit, A. The effect of customer ethnocentrism and customer participation on global brand attitude: The perspective of chinese customer. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2023**, *70*, 103167. [[CrossRef](#)]
148. Gašević, D.; Jovičić, D.; Zdravković, S.; Čakajac, B. The application of SCNET scale in the research of consumer ethnocentrism in Serbia. *Marketing* **2024**, *55*, 115–124. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.