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ABSTRACT

Muslims have become important consumers for marketers because of their significant growing and migratory population. Studies have found that Muslim consumers have different behaviours and characteristics compared to other religions followers. Religiosity has long been regarded as one key factor that might have a significant effect on Muslim consumers’ decision-making processes. However, this thesis found that Muslim consumers also regard secular factors in their reported boycotting of foreign brands. Thus, Muslim consumers’ behaviours are more complex than they may be previously have been considered.

The present study examines both religious and secular factors that have significant effects on Muslim consumers’ boycotting decisions. In terms of religiosity, the present study investigates whether being extrinsic or intrinsic has an effect on the respondents’ boycotting behaviour. Both extrinsic and intrinsic motivations can reflect how Muslim consumers perceive the influence of Islam in their lives. In terms of secular reasons, the present study identifies several possible secular reasons for boycotting foreign brands among Muslim consumers. These factors were found by the qualitative phase of this study, and are; health consciousness, peer pressure, ethnocentrism, animosity, halal validity, and awareness of a boycott fatwa (declaration about a boycott by Islamic scholars).

The data collection for the current study involved a two-phase process including an initial qualitative and subsequent quantitative phases. The qualitative phase employed in-depth interviews and focus group discussions to collect preliminary data that was subsequently used to formulate the final version of the quantitative survey. The data were taken from 36 Indonesian subjects for the qualitative phase and this was followed by a survey of n=400 respondents in the final quantitative phase of the study. The qualitative and quantitative methods complement each other. Qualitative data can help to explore explanations of underlying boycott phenomena, while quantitative data can help to quantify the relationship between different boycott factors in reported boycotting of foreign brands for different samples.
This study found that there is no direct effect of religiosity on reported boycotting of foreign food brands. However, religiosity moderates the relationship of six factors (respondents’ animosity, ethnocentrism, uncertainty of the healthiness of foreign brands, uncertainty of the halal validity, awareness of a boycott fatwa and experience of peer pressure) and their reported boycotting of US and Chinese food brands. Eight boycott behaviour models were designed to investigate the direct or moderating effect of religiosity in this study, for each of two brands and for two samples. All models that specified religiosity as a moderator fit the data. The two models of the non-student sample’s boycott behaviour provide a better explanation (71% US brands and 58% Chinese food brands) than the two models for the student sample (31% and 34% respectively). In general, there were more boycotters of Chinese food brands (130 out of 400 respondents) than US food brands (79 out of 400 respondents).

The effects of each factor in each model were also investigated. The results show that the effect of health consciousness is modified by the respondent’s religiosity in the four models. The effects of the “experience of peer pressure” were relatively strong and were modified by the respondents’ religiosity in both samples’ models for their boycotting of Chinese brands. For the student and non-student respondents, “the experience of peer pressure” had a direct positive effect on their reported boycotting of US food brands. The positive effects of ethnocentrism on boycotting were found to be moderated by religiosity in three out of four models. Ethnocentrism had no effect in one model of boycotting behaviour (US food brands in the student sample).

The effect of the respondents’ “animosity” and their “uncertainty of halal validity” were significant when moderated by their religiosity, was only found in one model. In this case, animosity has a significant effect on respondents’ reported boycotting of US brands (student sample) while “uncertainty of halal validity” has as a significant effect in respondents’ reported boycotting of Chinese brands (non-student sample). Further, the religion related reasons (such as uncertainty of halal validity) only have an effect in the reported boycotting of Chinese brands for the non-student sample although the effects were relatively strong in that model. Awareness of boycott fatwas had no effect in the reported boycotting behaviour of foreign food brands.
This study contributes to the literature in several ways. Firstly, previous researchers point out about Muslims’ boycotting of US or Western brands. This present research found that more Muslims in the sample boycott Chinese than US brands. Secondly, most other studies looked at Muslim consumers’ boycotting behaviour only in relation to religion. This study is offering important insights into secular factors, such as the respondents’ experience of peer pressure, ethnocentrism and health consciousness that are important factors in Muslim consumers’ boycotts. There are slightly different factors that are important in explaining respondents’ boycotting behaviour across different brands and samples. Thirdly, the present study also found that there is a tendency for young Muslim consumers (student sample) to boycott foreign food brands with less influence of religiosity compared to non-student respondents. For example, the respondents’ uncertainty of halal validity is a strong effect in reported boycotting of Chinese brands for only the non-student sample. Neither a fatwa nor uncertainty of halal validity have any effect on the boycotting behaviour in the student sample. In contrast, health consciousness and peer pressure are important in all four boycott behaviour models and ethnocentrism is important in three models. In other words, these were the significant factors in the reported boycotting of foreign brands for both samples.

The findings of this study provide some new insights about Muslim consumers in Southeast Asian markets, particularly in Indonesia, that may be different compared to those who live in the Middle East. The boycotting of foreign brands’ phenomena can challenge marketing to Muslim consumers.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Riots across the Islamic world against American interests in 2012 were quickly blamed on an anti-Islamic movie (the original title is “Innocent of Muslims”) made by an American citizen. Millions of Muslim consumers decided to boycott American brands peacefully as a statement of their offense at the film, and encouraged others to join them in these boycotts. While the film is assumed to be the reason for the boycott, other reasons beyond religion had little investigation (Anderson, 2012; Al Hyari, Alnsour, Al-Weshah, & Haffar, 2012, Abdul-Talib & Abdul-Latif, 2014 and Hoffmann & Müller, 2009).

The misuse of religious icons or symbols has also been found to trigger boycotts of foreign brands or products (Anderson, 2012; Jensen, 2008; Maamoun & Aggarwal, 2008). For example, Muslim consumers were motivated to boycott Danish products as their way of protesting against a political cartoon representing the Prophet Muhammad that was used as an object of political satire in a Danish newspaper – Jyllands Posten (Jensen, 2008; Maamoun & Aggarwal, 2008). The cartoon was unacceptable to some Muslims because they believe that drawing any image of Prophet Muhammad is forbidden in Islam. As a consequence, it was argued that Muslim consumers from all over the world participated in boycotting almost all Danish products from butter to Lego, and even Danish butter cookies that are made in England (Cass, 2006). Sales of Danish products were reported to be dramatically reduced because of the boycott. For example, the Danish dairy giant, Arla, lost up to $430 million per year or about 54 million euros in the Middle East (Al Hyari, Alnsour, Al-Weshah, & Haffar, 2012). This
anecdotal information is used as evidence that Muslim consumer’s boycotts can have a strong effect on Muslim consumption.

On the one hand, people believe that religiosity is an important factor in evaluating Muslim consumer’s boycotts of foreign brands. Muslim customers also have a strong connection with one another and are motivated to support their fellow Muslims across nationalities. On the other hand, there are a large number of studies in the boycott literature that supports various secular reasons for boycotts of foreign brands and products. For example, some people were found to have boycotted Microsoft (for abuse of power), Amazon.com (for attempts to patent “oneclick shopping”), Nestlé (for promotion of infant formula in poor countries), Disney (for contracting multiple social problems, including for fostering inauthentic entertainment and homosexuality), China (for human rights violation issues), and numerous others (Best & Lowney, 2009; John & Klein, 2003; Luigi, Oana, Mihai, & Simona, 2011; Pagan Jr, 1986; Slayton, 2000; Ward & Ostrom, 2003).

Furthermore, some people might join a boycott to experience the “thrill of victory” by being part of a successful boycott movement, while some others only want to express their self-concept (“I am the sort of person who cares about others”) (John & Klein, 2003) and hope to increase their self-esteem in front of others (Fein & Spencer, 1997). People might want to avoid some sort of guilty feeling by joining a boycott (Abdul-Talib & Abdul-Latif, 2014), for example, by not purchasing products that were known to be produced by child labor, or foodstuffs that they believe are the result of cruelty to animals. A study found that an animal-rights activist might feel social pressure to boycott meat products, particularly if she/he often eats with friends who have strong
concern about this issue (John & Klein, 2003). However, these types of reasons have not been tested on Muslim consumers.

In fact, in a complex and dynamic environment nowadays (Jafari & Suerdem, 2012), it would suffice to say that Muslim consumers’ reasons to boycott may not be restricted by religious reasons only. It is common to highlight the fact that some Muslim customers have reacted to religious issues and symbols by boycotting KFC, McDonalds, Coca Cola, etc. (Abdul Talib & Abdul Latif, 2014). However, some unexplored reasons may play a greater role than religious reasons. For example, 60% of Indonesia’s franchise companies are foreign brands (Suhendra, 2013), and Yuswohady, Program Director of the Indonesian Brand Forum has estimated that although foreign brands are only 20% of the market players in Indonesia, they enjoy 80% of the market share and revenue, suggesting Indonesia’s market has been dominated by foreign brands (Neraca, 2013).

Some blogs, internet sites, and Facebook status updates by individual customers have been dedicated to showing consumers’ displeasure about this situation, and this can be an antecedent to boycott activities in Indonesia. The impact of Indonesian Muslim boycotts of foreign brands in financial terms is unclear, but as a free trade market is adopted by Indonesia, it is expected that foreign brands and consumers’ boycotts would be an even more important issue in the near future.

Unfortunately, previous studies have not clearly explained the concept of boycotting foreign brands in Muslim societies. One study that explained about concept of anti-globalization, for example, only emphasized American values (Holt, Quelch, & Taylor, 2004). This is an incomplete concept since the boycott of foreign brands is not necessary related (only) to American brands. The nature of this study is to explore
some possible reasons for Muslim consumers’ to boycott products. By doing so, it is expected to provide a better understanding of Muslim consumer’s boycotts in the context of Indonesia.

1.1 THE AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

The present study has two major research questions:

a) What factors have an effect in Muslim consumers’ decisions to boycott foreign brands? This study evaluates the possible reasons for Muslim consumers to boycott a foreign brand. Animosity, ethnocentrism, peer pressure, perceived halal validity of foreign brands, and boycott fatwa will be investigated as possible reasons that may motivate a boycott action of current Muslim consumers.

b) What is the role of religiosity of buyer? Does a Muslims’ religiosity mediate or moderate the effects of other reasons Muslims boycott foreign brands? For example, being an intrinsic religiosity Islamic follower might strengthen the effects of peer pressure in intrinsic Muslim consumers’ decisions to boycott foreign brands). It is also important to investigate whether religiosity was only one of several antecedents in reported boycotts of foreign brands. This study will also investigate how important religious factors are for Muslim consumers compared to possible secular factors that influence Muslims in this sample to boycott a brand.
1.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

The data collection for the current study involved a two-phase process including an initial qualitative and subsequent quantitative phase. A preliminary questionnaire was prepared based on the existing literature on boycotts. The qualitative phase used in-depth interviews and focus group discussions to collect preliminary data that was subsequently tested for the final version of the quantitative survey. The use of both quantitative and qualitative study methodologies is advocated by many researchers in the social sciences (Jick, 1979; Näslund, 2002; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005).

These methods complement each other. For example, qualitative data can help to explore more in-depth explanations about underlying phenomena, while quantitative data can help to collate the facts and discover relationships that usually cannot be generalised in qualitative data (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). There are five potential functions of mixed method research, as reported by Greene, Caracelli, and Graham (1989). The five potential functions are; triangulation, complementary, development, initiation, and expansion. The most important function in terms of this research project was “development” because the data collected in the initial qualitative stage was used to develop the final version of the questionnaire in the quantitative phase.

Qualitative research tends to focus on gaining a deeper understanding in interpreting the meaning of social actions and focusing on underlying processes (Gephart, 2004). This is a very useful concept to be used in an exploratory study where the researcher should not over rely on existing ideas or research. As such, a qualitative method was chosen for the first phase of the study because it was helpful in developing a more in-depth
understanding of Muslim consumers’ boycott behaviours. The qualitative phase aimed to develop reliable constructs to be used in the final quantitative phase.

1.3 THE STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

The thesis is organised into seven chapters. Chapter 1 provides a brief background to the present study and introduces the study’s research objectives, research design and the structure of the whole thesis. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature on boycotts and Muslim consumer behaviour leading to the identification of possible reasons to boycott foreign products and brands. In Chapter 3, the initial, qualitative phase of the current study is presented. This phase of the research investigated Muslim consumers’ boycott behaviours of foreign products and brands, with an aim to answer the research questions. The findings of this phase were used to generate the hypothesis and the development of the final version of the questionnaire for the final quantitative phase.

In Chapter 4, hypotheses were developed based on the literature review and the finding of the preliminary qualitative study. Chapter 5 presents the research methodology undertaken for the quantitative phase including the techniques used to analyse the resulting data and how the hypotheses were tested.

Chapter 6 presents the results of testing the hypotheses from the final quantitative phase of the study. Specifically, findings on religious and secular reasons and motivations behind Muslim consumers’ boycotting of foreign brands and products are explained in this chapter. This chapter also describes whether religiosity mediates or moderates the effects of other reasons on Muslim consumers’ boycotting of foreign brands or whether religiosity was only one of several antecedents in reported boycotts of foreign brands.
Chapter 7 presents the conclusions drawn from the two research phases of the study. The implications of the findings for researchers, managers and policy makers are discussed. Finally, avenues for further research are suggested.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

For decades, scholars from various disciplines have experienced a great challenge in understanding about heterogeneous Muslim consumers including about their boycotting behaviours. This study reviews existing studies related to boycotts, Muslims’ behaviour toward foreign brands as well as the effects of religiosity for Muslim consumers from religious and secular perspectives. The nature of the present study is exploratory, in that it explores many factors leading to Muslim consumer’s boycotting of foreign brands. By identifying boycott concepts and some important concepts in Muslim consumers’ behaviour, it is expected that this can give a better understanding about Muslim consumers.

This chapter is divided into five parts. Part one presents boycott concepts including a definition of a boycott and its impact on targeting companies. Part two explores Muslim consumers’ behaviour and some important concepts that are strongly related to Muslim consumers. These concepts include religion and religiosity in consumer behaviour and Muslim consumers’ responses to foreign brands. Part three examines
foreign brands and Muslim consumers. Part four discusses some possible reasons consumers join a boycott. The last part presents the Indonesian context of the present study in terms of the boycotting of foreign brands.

2.1. BOYCOTTS

2.1.1 A Definition of a Boycott

Based on the existing boycott literature, it appears the concept of a ‘boycott’ does not have an exact or acknowledged definition and it is indeed a complex concept (John & Klein, 2003). However, customer boycotts exist in the market place and can have a significant impact on a company whose products are boycotted (Friedman, 1999). Some definitions of boycott were identified. According to Black’s Law Dictionary (1983, p.98), a boycott is a ‘concerted refusal to do business with a particular person or business in order to obtain concessions or to express displeasure with certain acts or practices of a person or business.’

Furthermore, Friedman (1985, pp.97-98) believes a customer boycott is “an attempt by one or more parties to achieve particular objectives by urging individual customers not to buy selected products.” In these boycott definitions, a similar point about boycotts is stressed: boycott participants may have some strong objectives in their minds when they decide to undertake boycotting activities. Friedman’s definition of a boycott is further elaborated on by John and Klein (2003) who see boycotts as a tactic to influence the behaviour of a firm. The present study explores various reasons for boycotting foreign brands, and it is expected that more reasons will emerge and signify more fundamental reasons to boycott.
A study by Klein et al. (2004) suggested that consumer boycotts have been carried out since the fourteenth century. A doctoral thesis by Leo Wolman in 1914 at Johns Hopkins University in the US attempted to create the first academic explanation of a boycott. Wolman (1916) divides boycotts into primary (direct) and secondary (indirect) ways of conducting a boycott. For a primary boycott, boycotters express their action directly to the targeted company. For example, customers boycotted Nike because Nike had mistakenly included the logo Allah in one of its shoe designs. For secondary (indirect) boycotts, consumers indirectly target a country by boycotting a company that comes from that country. For example, there is animosity from China toward Japan. Chinese people boycott brands from Japanese companies to target Japan as a country. Studies about boycotts have been significantly developed including in relation to marketing research, but more research is needed as the motivation of participate in boycotting foreign brands is not fully understood (John & Klein 2003).

2.1.2 Boycotts as Consumer Power

A boycott is a fascinating form of consumer behaviour. It is hard to explain a boycott using any marketing concepts in the market, and this issue did not attract the attention of marketing researchers until the 1980s (Garret, 1987) even though from time to time, boycotts have had their place in affecting society (Klein et al., 2004). Historians illustrate boycotts as a market muscle that is used by shoppers as part of consumer activism (Simon & Simon, 2011). In line with this viewpoint, a boycott has been seen as a way for powerless people to show their disagreement (Cortright, 2009). For example, Gandhi’s boycott of British salt prior to India’s independence to reduce the price of land (Cortright, 2009). Powerless people regard a boycott as a manifestation of
their fight against more powerful entities. Gandhi is well-known for his non-violence movement and self-sufficiency (swadeshi). He said, “First they ignore you, then they ridicule you, then they fight you, and then you win” (Mahatma Gandhi Online, n.d.) which may have inspired boycott actions in many countries.

Research has found that there is a complex concept and interrelated links behind boycotts (John & Klein, 2003). Batson (1998, p.282) views boycott participation as “*a form of prosocial behaviour by which actions (are) intended to benefit one or more people other than one self.*” This conceptualisation is also supported by Klein et al. (2004) who argue boycotts are a strategy to influence other people’s behaviour. In line with this viewpoint, *boycotts* may happen because of a consumer reaction toward some social phenomena such as perceived unfair price increases (e.g., Kahneman, Knetsch & Thaler, 1986). In this case, a boycott is mainly associated with consumers’ anger (Rotemberg, 2003). Hirschman (1970) argues that some consumers show their anger by ‘voice’ (i.e. non-market protests, such as exerting social or political pressure) or by ‘exit’ (i.e. refusing to buy).

Boycotts are now a major consumer tool to express anger or dislike of what is happening in relation to some brands, and are predicted to become bigger in the future (John & Klein, 2003). Gelb (1995) argues that marketers will have bigger challenges to handle boycotts in the future. This is because there are a growing number of boycott activities worldwide that need serious attention from marketers (Davidson III, Worrell, & El-Jelly, 1995). John and Klein (2003, p. 1208) emphasize that “...*boycotts are now a major tool for consumer protest groups, and are likely to become even more significant in the future.*” Boycotts are occurring everywhere. It could be publicly obvious or
hidden. John and Klein (2003) predict that around 42% of the most famous multinational companies in the world, as well as approximately 54% of top brands, have experienced being boycotted by some customers.

The number of consumers participating in boycotts has been increased (Sen, Gurhan-Canli & Morwitz, 2001, Cromie & Ewing, 2009, Lee, Motion & Conroy, 2009) from 18% in 1992 (Miller et al., 1992) to almost 67% in 2005 (Glickman, 2005) in the US alone. The increase of boycott numbers has mostly happened because of the availability of information on the internet (Glickman, 2005) as well as the failure of boycott targets to understand how to deal with this movement (Yuksel & Mryteza, 2009). This signifies that marketers are dealing with significant and more complex challenges with consumers’ boycotts. Therefore, more studies related to boycotts are needed.

Most studies about boycotts have focussed on investigating micro-boycotting, such as boycotting specific firms’ products (e.g., Garret, 1987; Smith, 1990; Friedman, 1995; Sen et al., 2001; John & Klein, 2003). Studies on macro-boycotting are more focused on broader possible reasons to boycott, not only on a firm. The present study explores both macro and micro boycotting as a way to provide a comprehensive understanding of Muslim boycotts of foreign brands. This research is meant to provide a clear guide on how boycotts are perceived by some Muslim consumers and how this may lead to the boycotting of foreign brands. The following sections provide a detailed explanation regarding the significance of Muslim consumers and some other points to consider in explaining Muslim consumer behaviour.
2.2 MUSLIMS CONSUMERS AND MARKETING

2.2.1 The Population of Muslim consumers

There were 1.6 billion Muslims all over the world or 23.4% of the world population in 2010, a figure which is expected to reach 26.4% of the world population in 2030 as can be seen in Table 2.1. Islam is the fastest growing religion in the world and is the majority religion in more than 50 countries (Saeed, Ahmed & Mukhtar, 2001). Muslim populations in the world are projected to increase at around 1.5% per year for the period from 2010 to 2030 (Pew Research Center Forum, 2011). The global Muslim market was estimated to be US$2.7 trillion in 2007 and is estimated to reach $30 trillion by 2050 (JWT, 2007). These facts and estimations confirm the importance of Muslim marketplaces, Muslim consumption, and an understanding of how being Muslim influences someone to consume or not to buy some brands.

Table 2.1 Muslims as a share of World Population, 1990-2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Non-Muslims</th>
<th>% Muslims</th>
<th>% Non-Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1.1 B</td>
<td>4.2 B</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.3 B</td>
<td>4.6 B</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.6 B</td>
<td>5.3 B</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1.9 B</td>
<td>5.8 B</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2.3 B</td>
<td>6.1 B</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are calculated from unrounded numbers. Cross hatching denotes projected figures.

Pew Research Center’s Forum on Religion & Public Life • The Future of the Global Muslim Population, January 2011
2.2.2 Crescent Marketing

The term crescent marketing was created by Wilson et al. (2013). They identified some philosophies behind this term and this is related to the emergence of Islamic marketing as new and important knowledge to understand Muslim markets. These philosophies, to some extent, can signify the complexity and the nature of Muslim consumer behaviour which in turn can help in understanding Muslim boycotts of foreign brands. They identify that Islamic marketing encompasses issues beyond the Muslim consumers’ big market even though it is an important consideration. They see the crescent as a powerful symbol, not only in the Muslim world, but also in other Eastern religions hailing from India, China, and Japan. This can be compared to marketing from a Western context which can be totally different to a non-Western context. The use of the crescent in the Muslim world is also to signify the concept of a global ummah (community), emphasizing social solidarity across race, social status, and familism, and the concept of asabiyyah which emphasizes social solidarity based on total loyalty regardless of adherence to Islam.

The development of the term crescent marketing led to a new understanding that although Eastern Muslim consumers share similar characteristics with, for example, Muslim consumers in Western countries, they may offer some peculiarities as they have different contexts to their counterparts in Western societies. The recognition of a global ummah signifies that Muslim consumers may come from different backgrounds, for example, a different social status and different countries, but they still have a strong connection to each another.

Interestingly, in reality the use of the crescent symbol in marketing campaign activities has existed for some time. According to Belk (1989), customer behaviour concepts
might include sacred things based on customer perceptions. Muslim consumers are concerned about their religious symbol, the crescent and star (Wilson et al. 2013). Religious symbols are regarded as important symbols for many people as they are related to, ”vital and cultural elements of the soul” (Tillich, 1958, p.5). Furthermore, religious symbols have been used in ads for products which are either relevant or irrelevant in terms of religion (Kulenović, 2006). For example, in Indonesia some ads use a woman in a hijab to advertise shampoo (Willer, 2006).

Likewise, famous brands such as Coca Cola have designed special ads for Ramadan (a holy month for Muslims) by including the crescent moon and star (Willer, 2006) (see Figure 2.1), a well-known symbol for the Islamic religion, to attract Muslim customers’ attention. In this case, the crescent moon in particular and religious symbols in general signify the importance of solidarity and connectedness among Muslims. This is one of the reasons why Muslims are strongly linked with Islamic values and identity as they see the crescent moon as a representative of their identity as Muslims (Kulenovic, 2006). The crescent moon and star figure is as follows:

Figure 2.1. The crescent moon and star (one well-known Islamic symbol)

In countries which are predominantly Muslim and in which Christians are the minority, such as Indonesia, Egypt, Malaysia, Lebanon, and Bosnia, the use of Islamic symbols in
ads has been familiar among followers of both religions (Kulenovic, 2006). Some marketers have tried to modify religious symbols and put them in advertising to attract customers’ attention as can be seen from the following advertising:

**Figure 2.2 Examples of Advertising with the Crescent Symbol**

![Figure 2.2 Examples of Advertising with the Crescent Symbol](image)

Source: Coca-Cola celebrates Ramadan (Worldnetdaily, 2008)

Figure 2.2 shows two kinds of advertising using religious symbols. On the left side, there is a big crescent moon and star modified in a stylistic version and on the right side is the smaller version of the crescent. Coca Cola used the crescent to entice consumers in Muslim countries, specifically in Ramadan (Worldnetdaily, 2008). On the right side, the religious symbol used is smaller in the Coke ad. Based on a definition from Allport and Ross (1967), religious symbols may be seen as a central route for intrinsic motivation (following religion as a central motive) and a peripheral route for an extrinsic motivation (use religion for social status). By using this religious-related symbol, Coca Cola wants to deliver a message that they understand their consumers and respect their beliefs.
Muslims in Indonesia as with other Muslims in many countries also experience some sort of close relationship to other Muslims around the world in places, such as Palestine (Azra, 2006). Muslims are also known to have a strong tendency to sympathize with religious-based activities (Lacar, 1994). For example, Indonesian people love to donate money to the Red Cross from Turkey because of the Islamic symbol in this organization (Lacar, 1994). In this case, the cross and crescent symbol of Turkey’s ‘Red Cross’ organization influences Muslims’ decisions to give more donations because they want to help other Muslim countries or communities. This confirms that it is important to see Muslim customers as part of a global ummah, while at the same time it is a must to consider the local context of the Muslim consumers.

Interpretation of symbols may vary among Muslim customers. For some Muslim customers, KFC, McDonald’s and Coca Cola may be interpreted as symbols of modernity, while for some others even though they are a minority, they may be seen as a symbol of capitalism and oppression (Abdul-Talib & Abdul-Latif, 2014). For instance, starting their business in Indonesia in 1979, KFC now has 465 outlets in Indonesia, and it is expected they will keep expanding their market (Winosa, 2014). However, in 2001, there was an accident when an explosion damaged a KFC outlet in Makassar. There were no fatalities or injuries reported, but there was a strong suspicion that the bomb had something to do with anti-American protests as fried chicken outlets had previously been targeted by protesters (Jupriadi, 2001). As was noted earlier, KFC in Indonesia is a strong foreign brand, but it is possible that KFC still has problems as some people associate this brand with the animosity towards the US.
2.2.3 Religiosity and Muslim Consumption

In recent years, there have been an increasing number of studies reporting that religion has an important role in influencing the decision-making processes of its followers (Bailey & Sood, 1993; Mokhlis, 2009; Wilkes, Burnett, & Howell, 1986). Religion originated from the latin word “religio” meaning conscientiousness which is defined as a bond between humanity and the greater-than-humanity power elements (Hill et al. 2000). Hackney and Sanders (2003) suggest religion is a multifaceted object, incorporating cognitive, emotional, motivational, and behavioural aspects. Further, the term religiosity has been defined as ‘the condition of being religious’ (Palmer & Gallagher, 2007, p.32) and it refers mainly to someone’s commitment to his/her religion (Delener, 1990; Paek, 2004). These definitions may indicate that those who perceive religion as important may have different motivational and behavioural aspects and this is worth discussing in regard to marketing.

Some researchers see that Muslim consumption is influenced by Islamic values. A study by Alam, Mohd and Hisham (2011) confirms that religion and religiosity influence Malaysian Muslim respondents in their purchase decisions. They found that those respondents spend moderately as they think this is one of the Islamic teachings. In other words, the essence of Muslim consumption is to consume moderately and wisely. By consuming moderately, they also tend to be less impulsive when making purchase decisions (Alam et al. 2011). According to Hamouri (1991), the characteristic of Muslim consumption can be seen from their tendency to consume the most preferred item as long as it is permissible in Islam.
In addition to this, Siddiqi (1992) has identified that there are some objectives of Muslim consumption such as avoidance of consumption of prohibited goods, not to perform excessive indulgence in luxurious living, and consumption as a means to the achievement of the higher ends of a purposeful life. This is in line with a notion that faithful Muslim customers will tend to be more cautious (Hardie & Rabooy, 1991). In brief, Muslim customers who see Islam as a way of life, which indicates a higher level of religiosity, are more likely to spend moderately and think about the reason for their consumption. This is an important notion that is relevant to the present study as this Muslim consumption characteristic see consumption as representing Islamic values. One of its consequences is that Muslim consumers may be more reactive to calls to boycott brands. This viewpoint is supported by some researchers (see Farah, 2011).

Studies emphasize that globalization has not reduced the effect of religion on people’s purchase behaviour (Donkin, 2006). Religiosity is believed to mix with local culture and those who identify themselves based on their religion may see it is as a way of life (Alam et al. 2011). This is why religiosity is still perceived to be a big influence for people for whom religion is important. In terms of the decision to boycott foreign brands, religiosity may have a significant role in making any decision including whether to buy or not to buy particular products. In line with this viewpoint, some previous studies have suggested the use of religion and religiosity to design a market targeting strategy (Delener, 1990). Because some Muslim customers are presumed to have a strong link with Islam and to see it as a way of life, it was expected that religiosity may also affect Muslims’ decisions to boycott a foreign brand (Abdul-Talib & Abdul-Latif, 2014). Some religious reasons behind Muslims boycotts have been reported (Anderson, 2012; Farah, 2011; Jensen, 2008; Maamoun & Aggarwal, 2008). This also confirms that
religious reasons may still need to be considered as a precursor to the boycotting of foreign brands.

Studies of marketing and psychology have recognized the role of religiosity in many aspects of individual personality and behaviour. For example, from a marketing perspective, religiosity is known to have some effects on consumers’ values (Lindridge, 2005), individual personality types, product choices (LaBarbera, 1987), and many others (Hirschman, 1983, De Jong, Faulkner & Warland, 1976). Additionally, religiosity has been found to negatively relate to sexiness (Weeden, Cohen, & Kenrick, 2008) and positively relate to particular personal values (Saroglou, Delpierre & Dernelle, 2004) and well-being (Shams, 1993). It also affects ethical attitudes to issues such as students cheating (Allmon, Page, & Robert, 2000), environmentalism (Wolkomir, Futreal, Woodrum, & Hoban, 1997), marital outcomes (Sullivan, 2001), and many other areas (Miesing & Preble, 1985). This confirms the importance of religiosity in examining various constructs that affect human lives.

Religiosity may also play a significant role in Muslim consumption, in particular, the boycotting of foreign brands (Abdul-Talib & Abdul-Latif, 2014). Religiosity may moderate or mediate the effects of some antecedents of the boycott on the reported boycott. Previous research found the moderating effects of religiosity in helping Muslims cope with some secular issues in their everyday lives. Religiosity was found to moderate the ability of individuals to better respond to some elements in their lives such as happiness and health (Abdel-Khalek, 2007). Some evidence shows that religiosity moderates the relationship between job stress and outcomes (Jamal & Badawi, 1993), stressful life events and delinquent behaviour (Johnson & Morris, 2008), the
psychological impact on Muslims as the result unemployment (Shams, 1993), chronic health problems, and psychological well-being (Momtaz, Hamid, & Yahaya, 2009) and many other issues related to how they deal with their problems.

Islam encourages brotherhood and many Muslims see Muslims around the world as one ummah (Wilson et al., 2013). This is why social solidarity is seen as one Muslim characteristic (Alatas, 2007). Some religious leaders may use the brotherhood in Islam as a reason to call for a boycott of foreign brands (Farah & Newman, 2010; Khemeini, 2001). The Palestinian issue has been a source of conflict in the Middle East for more than 50 years and may trigger sympathy from other Muslim countries (Perwita, 2007). When Muslim people are not satisfied with what their governments are doing in helping other Muslims, they may decide to carry out their own action, such as boycotting foreign brands (Perwita, 2007).

Despite its importance, religiosity alone may not be responsible for the behavioural condition for Muslims. As was explained in section 2.1.1, to some extent, religiosity is seen as a precursor of Muslim consumer behaviour. However, a study by Abdul-Talib and Abdul-Latif (2014) confirms that Islamic religiosity has no link with the willingness to boycott among Malaysian Muslim customers, suggesting that other factors such as country image and self-enhancement values may be more influential.

Some studies have found that religiosity may not be as influential as previously suggested. For example, some studies show that religiosity does not mediate some problematic behaviours (e.g., Morano & King, 2005) as religiosity did not mediate
caregiver’s stress in providing care to their patients. Furthermore, the impact of problematic behaviour was not reduced to non-significance after the influence of religion (Baron & Kenny, 1984). In addition, the effects of religion in predicting behaviour may vary because of some other elements such as ethnicity, culture, level of education, gender, and income (Taylor & Chatters, 2010).

### 2.2.4 Muslim Consumers and Peer Pressure

Escalas and Bettman (2003) argue that peer/social pressure is an individual variable, which is in line with social and normative influences. Research has found that reference groups have a strong effect on an individual’s evaluations, aspirations or behaviour (Park & Lessig, 1977). According to Ganassali et al. (2006), social influence, social rewards, peer pressure, and social cues, have a greater influence on individuals’ buying behaviour because, as suggested by Solomon (2015) they take place within the context of groups and other individuals’ presence which influences consumers’ processing of information and decision making. This is especially the case for the consumer behaviour of young people, who communicate with peers more frequently about consumption matters (Churchill & Moschis, 1979) and who are more at risk of being influenced by them (Achenreiner, 1997).

Shah and Alam (2011) identify that Muslims regard peer pressure as a crucial element to be considered in their decision making. They argue that that a possible reason for that is because individuals who are committed to their religion hold strong social values and are more susceptible to normative influences as a result of their regular interaction with others affiliated with the same religious organization. A study by Bonne, Vermeir, Bergeaud-Blackler, & Verbeke (2007) about the reason for Halal meat consumption
among Muslim consumers in France found that peer pressure is one important reason to predict the intention to eat halal meat among Muslims. This is in line with the previous research which found that faithful Muslim customers will tend to be more cautious (Hardie & Rabooy 1991). They would consider many issues before consuming particular products and they are more likely to consider other people’s view in this process.

### 2.2.5 Cultural aspects in general Muslim countries

Muslim consumers have heterogeneous cultures. Evidence shows that Muslim consumers still face difficulties in balancing between following their religion closely and being more similar to other “global” consumers (Sandikci, 2010; Wilson et al., 2013). Traditional aspects have also been found to influence them as individuals and their decisions as consumers. This can be seen from some mundane examples in everyday life. Djursaa and Kragh (1998) found that the preparation of meals varies between countries. For example, in Riyadh, Jedda and Dubai, lunch is central for those three cities, but breakfast is just peripheral (of low importance). For breakfast and lunch, their culture requires people from those three cities to consume local/traditional items. In Jedda and Dubai have there is some evidence that traditional and local culture still matters in shaping individuals’ consumption behaviour. In the night time, people in Jedda and Dubai are more welcome to consume non-traditional items (such as fast food or any other foreign brands), but not for breakfast and lunch. This is contrary to an early study that found less developed countries will simply follow the consumption patterns of economically developed countries (Pearce, 1989).
In addition to the importance of traditions in culture, there are some peculiarities in some Arab cities as observed by Djursaa and Kragh (1998). For example, in Saudi Arabia, women are forbidden to drive a car and have to wear a veil every time they go out from the house, otherwise they would be caught by the police. In contrast, it is common to see women with uncovered hair driving in Turkey, Malaysia and Indonesia even though these countries also have a predominantly Muslim population. While globalisation is seen as a cause for uniformity, some evidence shows that consumers from non-western cultures still have some characteristics that lead to different consumer characteristics (e.g., Boski, 1992).

Religiosity was found to be strongly associated with the conservation value type, mainly the tradition and conformity value types (Saroglou et al., 2004). All the values that link to religiosity confirm that Muslims tend to feel comfort with their existing traditions and being with people from the same groups (Games, Soutar & Sneddon, 2013). As was noted earlier, Muslims will tend to be more cautious (Hardie & Rabooy 1991). Responding to this, foreign brands targeting Muslim consumers are trying to be more Islamized for example, changing to make their product halal although they come from non-Muslim countries (Alserhan, 2010), so that Muslim consumers can trust foreign brands.

2.2.6 Perspectives of “Halal” among Muslim Consumers

The halal issue has been regarded as one of the most embedded issues in Islamic marketing (Wilson et al. 2013). Many Islamic followers have identified themselves as Muslims, with some making all their decisions based on following their religion (Essoo & Dibb, 2004). In terms of food consumption, Islam has a set of regulations in determining whether a food can be consumed or not (Lada, Tanakinjal, & Amin, 2009).
Food that is allowed to be consumed is labelled as Halal and Muslims who adhere to their religion will tend to consider the Halal factor as one of their main considerations when buying food (Lada et al., 2009). There are increasing numbers of products that have a halal logo to convince Muslim customers to buy their products.

Islamic branding in the Muslim market covers three big sectors, such as food, lifestyle and services (Alserhan, 2010). Nestrovic (2010) found that the market for Halal products is worth approximately US$670 billion per year and is estimated to grow by 15% per year worldwide. Muslims have a relatively high level of curiosity in relation to the products that they consume (Siddiqi, 1992). They always want to make sure that there is no ‘unlawful’ ingredient in products that they buy (Wilson & Liu, 2010). They usually have a special organization do routine checks of products that are available in Muslim markets or that target Muslim consumers. Once the organization has found any unlawful ingredients, Muslims will have no trust of those products (Halim & Salleh, 2012). For example, when traces of pig DNA were found in Cadbury products that were labelled halal in Malaysia, there was a religious call to boycott Cadbury in Malaysia and Indonesia (New York Post, 2014). Muslims have a strict definition of halal which means that no pork or any products derived from non halal substances can be consumed. Although Cadbury still has a Halal logo on its products, many Muslims do not trust the ‘Halalness’ of its products anymore. Once Muslims feel betrayed, they will have a tendency to boycott Cadbury brands (New York Post, 2014; Onislam.net, 2014).

While the importance of the Halal logo for Muslim consumers has been supported, there are huge challenges faced by marketers related to the non-standard regulation of Halal certification (Borzooi & Asgari, 2015). Many countries have their own Halal certifying...
body that may not have a similar definition of Halal to other countries. Based on a report of the International Halal Integrity Alliance (2011), there are currently 122 active Halal certifying bodies as well as non-governmental organisations, and local mosques or Islamic societies. Figure 2.3 shows different examples of the Halal logo from all over the world.

**Figure 2.3: Different usage of Halal logo**

![Halal logos from around the world](image)

Source: Halim & Salleh (2010, p.6)

Some researchers are aware of this issue and have reported demands for international certification bodies to establish a slogan of ‘once certified, accepted everywhere’ (Halim & Salleh, 2012), however it still does not exist. There is currently no consensus on a halal standard that unites Muslim customers. There is an undeniable need for unification of the halal logo so that it can be trusted by Muslims from all over the world (Hanzaee & Ramezani, 2011). However, as was noted earlier, global halal certification is hard to achieve because of the different standards in understanding of concept of halal. Consequently, there are groups of Muslims that cannot fully believe the Halal logo from some particular countries, especially non-Muslim countries (Hanzaee & Ramezani, 2011).

The uncertainty about the halal certification from particular countries is not only because of the logo but it is also related to the conditions where the product with the
halal certification is made (Borzooei & Asgari, 2015). For example, in deciding whether some products are halal or not there are some criteria that are important for customers. The equipment that was used has to be in a certain condition, such as being separated from non-halal products. Not only that, the way the animal is slaughtered, the level of additives that are used in a product cannot exceed the certain levels and many other criteria are deemed important for some Muslim groups (Kamaruddin, Iberahim, & Shabudin, 2012). However, none of the previous studies reported on the halal certification from countries that have the lowest trust by customers in most Muslim markets. The most common idea is that halal products from Muslim countries are the most trustworthy compared to those that are not because those countries should be more familiar with Islamic rules about Halal certification (Borzooi & Asgari, 2015).

2.2.7 Taboo Products and Fatwas

Religion has frequently prohibited the use of certain products (Rice & Al-Mossawi (2002). This is, in part, why particular products are considered taboo by Muslim consumers. There are some perspectives regarding the concept of taboo. Taboos could relate to prohibition based on the unclean nature of an element (Freud, 1961). For example, some groups of people may be prohibited from consuming some types of food because they believe those foods would be harmful (Freud, 1961). Similarly, taboos prohibit individuals from performing some specific activities, similar to prohibited activities in Islam. Products and behaviours that are prohibited in Islamic (sharia) rulings are called haram. Fam, Waller and Erdogan (2004) found that Muslims view some addictive products such as cigarettes, gambling and alcohol as controversial products and to advertise these types of products is also regarded as offensive for Muslim consumers.
As taboo products vary and they can be subjective to individual perceptions, Muslim consumers may seek opinions from *fiqh* (jurisprudence) from Islamic scholars (ulama). Muslims are reported to freely choose fatwa (legal opinion) from ulama that they believe followed the Quran (main reference of sharia/Islamic laws, believed to be the words of God) and Hadiths (recorded sayings and traditions of the Prophet Muhammad). The declaration of a fatwa prohibits Muslims from buying some foreign brands that are originally from countries that are perceived to have offended Islam. For example, Inminds (n.d.) reported that Yusuf Al-Qaradawi from the Sunni sect and Ayatollah Seestani from the Shiah sect, two respected Islamic scholars (ulama), declared almost similar fatwas to prohibit Muslim consumers from buying and supporting products from the US. Another fatwa was also declared on Danish products following the prophet Muhammad cartoon (Halevi, 2012). These are examples of “taboo” products for Muslim consumers, products that cannot be consumed based on the Islamic law (such as a fatwa).

### 2.3 FOREIGN BRANDS IN MUSLIM COUNTRIES

As was noted earlier, this section focuses on foreign brands and how Muslim consumers possibly respond to the brands. There are some specific concepts that are related to the consumer responses to foreign brands and some issues related to foreign brands. For example, ethnocentrism may influence consumer response to brands that come from a different culture, while ethnocentrism signifies attachment to their inner group and culture. More explanation about foreign brands and their relation to Muslim consumer boycotts will be explained in the following sections.
Foreign brands in Muslim countries can become the object of rejection (Sandıkçı & Ekici, 2009) and boycott (Farah, 2011) for several different reasons. In this study, foreign brands are defined as brands that were originally manufactured in foreign countries. Studies have found that country of origin is also an important aspect in consumers’ choices. Heslop, Lu and Cray (2008, p. 356) argue that country of origin of a brand means “a brand manufactured in, manufactured by a company with head office in, assembled in, designed in, ingredients from a country”.

Alserhan (2010) notes that for Muslim consumers, foreign brands in Muslim countries can be further divided into brands that come from other Muslim countries and non-Muslim countries. The study suggests that brands from other Islamic countries usually do not need “more effort” in terms of proving that the ingredients meet Islamic requirement (halal) although having a halal logo can still be a bonus. However, for brands and products that were originally from non-Muslim countries, which are prominent in Muslim markets, having a halal logo is something crucial for them to be accepted (Borzooei & Asgari, 2011). Foreign companies believe that by doing this, they can add value to their brands in Muslim countries because buying something halal is considered as doing a good deed for Muslims (Alserhan, 2010).

Brands from all over the world can now be easily found in Muslim countries. When brands target the Muslim market and follow Islamic regulations, such as using the halal logo, those brands can be named “Islamic brands”. Alserhan (2010, p.103) concludes that there are four types of Islamic brands in Islamic markets:

a) **True Islamic brands**, means that the brands have “Halal” certification and originate from Islamic countries.
b) *Traditional Islamic brands*, refer to brands which originate from Islamic countries, therefore the brands are assumed to be halal (although sometimes without the halal logo because of the country of origin.

c) *Inbound Islamic brands*, are brands with Halal certification because they target Muslim markets although they originate from non-Islamic countries (such as KFC)

d) *Outbound Islamic brands* are brands that have a halal logo, but not specifically for Muslim consumers. It may also be marketed non-Islamic countries. With a halal logo on them, the brands can reach both Muslim and non-Muslim consumers.

However, evidence shows that there is no guarantee that foreign brands originating from non-Muslim countries would be accepted in Muslim countries even though they are Islamized (such as by having halal logos) (Borzooi & Asgari, 2015). Consumers’ perceptions toward country of origin (e.g. non-Muslim countries) influence their evaluation of some foreign brands (Farah, 2011) even though there is a halal logo on the packaging. For example, McDonalds, Cadbury, KFC, and Pizza Hut are Halal in Muslim countries and can be categorised as having Islamic branding based on the definition by Alserhan (2010), however, there have still been some movements to boycott these brands (Ahmed, Anang, Othman, & Sambasivan, 2013; New York Post, 2014).

Secular factors may also influence Muslim consumers in responding to foreign brands. According to Batra, Ramaswamy, Alden, Steenkamp and Ramachander (2014), foreign brands in developing markets are associated with prestige and social status.
There is evidence that consumers buy foreign brands with the aim of receiving social approval in their society, especially in developing countries (Ger & Belk, 1996).

Jacoby and Olson (1985) found that perceived quality has the strongest effect on buying intention. For example, some studies indicate that local consumers in developing countries mostly preferred foreign brands (Etenson, 1993; Ahmed & d’Astous, 1999). According to Wu and Fu (2007) there is a link between perceived quality and purchase intention. Perceived quality can be evaluated based on either intrinsic, for example, performance, durability (Rao & Monroe, 1989) and/or extrinsic cues, such as brand name and warranty (Kirmani & Baumgartner, 2000). Evidence has shown that foreign brands are usually associated with high product quality in developing countries (Jin, Chansarker, & Kondap, 2006). Consumers were also found to have positive product evaluations toward global brands (Steenkamp, Batra, & Alden, 2003). The assessment of foreign brands often relies on consumers’ consumption experience or stereotyping beliefs such as those based on which country originates from the brand (Zhang, 1996).

2.4. SOME REASONS FOR MUSLIM CONSUMERS TO BOYCOTT

Following the explanation in sections 2.0 to 2.3, this section identifies some possible reasons why Muslim consumers boycott foreign brands. The present study recognises the division of religion and secular reasons for boycotting foreign brands. It is true that it is difficult to separate religious and non-religious reasons to boycott in Muslim customers as Muslims may see their religion and themselves as inseparable. To some extent, both religious and secular reasons are interrelated and sometimes unclear, however. For example, the dramatic stumble of Danish companies following the publishing of a Muhammad cartoon in a Danish newspaper occurred because Muslims boycotted Danish brands (Jensen, 2008). The Muhammad cartoon was one of the key
issues in the boycott; however the effects of Denmark’s immigration laws may also have made some contribution. Critics of a decade-long transformation in Denmark’s approach to immigration and integration may also have contributed to ‘hidden’ anger that influenced boycott participation (Bowlby, 2011). This confirms that other factors beyond religion may also play an important role in Muslim boycotts. This section starts with some general findings from previous studies in boycotts and this is followed by some possible reasons for Muslim consumers to boycott.

2.4.1 Boycott Participation

Kozinets and Handelman (1998) found that people participate in a boycott to express their emotions and moral obligations as an individual. Sen et al. (2001) found that consumers’ decisions to participate in a boycott depend on their perception about the likelihood of the boycott succeeding or not. Klein et al. (2004) discovered that boycott participation is triggered by the desire to make a difference, scope for self-enhancement, counterarguments and constrained consumption, with the relationship between perceived egregiousness and boycott participation being moderated by self-enhancement and constrained consumption. Two of these predictors relate to the benefits of boycotting. First is the desire to make a difference, which refers to a consumer’s belief in making companies change their actions (Kozinets & Handelman, 1998; Sen et al., 2001). It can also be because of personal reasons such as boosting their self-esteem and making them “free from guilt” by participating in a boycott (Kozinet & Handelman, 1998; Smith, 1990).
Boycott participation can be an individual decision by customers. A study by Klein (2004, p.1198) found that boycotts happen “when a number of people abstain from the purchase of a product, at the same time, as a result of the same egregious act or behaviour, but not necessarily for the same reasons”. Customers as individuals may have their own reasons for supporting (buycott) or rejecting (boycott) a company as reported by Ettenson (2006). However, there are only a few studies that uncover the real individual reasons behind their boycott decisions (Klein, 2004, Ettenson, 2005). Hoffman and Muller (2009) argue that the literature on consumer boycotts consists of three areas of research: (1) the frequency, causes, and goals of boycotts; (2) the consequences of boycotts; and (3) the motivations of participating individuals. However, among those three aspects, the motivations of individuals got the least attention (Klein, 2004). The present study offers a comprehensive understanding of the motivations of individuals to boycotts.

Most studies about boycotts are descriptive (case study), conceptual and over focussed on boycott targets and boycott organizers instead of the voice of customers as boycotters (Klein, 2004). Lack of comprehensive research in exploring reasons to boycott is unfortunate because the number of boycotts and the number of consumers participating in them has been increasing (Sen, Gürhan-Canli, & Morwitz, 2001).

Klein et al (2004) argue that motivation to boycott are varied between customers. It might not necessarily happen to benefit other people in society; rather it could also happen for the boycotters’ own good. For example, it could also be an effort by an individual to be accepted in a social group (Braunsberger & Buckler, 2011). An individual boycott may happen simply to show the anger of some boycotters because of
some egregious behaviour (Ettenson, 2006; Friedman, 1999). Braunsberger and Buckler (2011) found that more than 70% of participants in their studies participated in boycotts to make themselves feel good as moral individuals as well as to boost their self-esteem in society.

The customers’ emotional element that is attached to this action could be triggered by unfavourable feelings by customers such as feeling betrayed by a company or a country. Some studies found links between boycotts and political reasons. For example, boycott participation increased if politicians failed to satisfy people (Frank, 2003). It does not mean that people narrowed their political models; rather it might happen because people simply want to find an alternative solution that cannot be provided by politics. Boycotts are not only for punishing someone or a company, but also include emotional elements in doing such actions that give boycotters a strong objective to refrain from making a selected purchase in the market place (Friedman, 1985).

Some studies have attempted to explore the motives of people in participating in a boycott. There are many ways to uncover the reasons behind a boycott. Klein, John and Smith (2004) introduced a cost-benefit approach in analysing why people participate in a boycott. The more people believe that their participation has a strong benefit and less cost for themselves, the more likely they will be to participate in a boycott. However, the cost benefit alone cannot fully explain why people boycott. The content analysis of Kozinets and Handelman (1998) found that customers may also boycott to express their emotional feeling toward some brands or to fulfil their individual moral obligation. People may keep boycotting for individual reasons and not necessarily to get any benefit from it.
However, the motives behind the decision to boycott are different for different people. For some people, a boycott might still be carried out although it cannot push companies to change their actions. Rather, the boycott may happen only to express their indignation (Ettenson & Klein, 2005). A cost benefit analysis look at how participating in a boycott can make a difference in changing a firm’s behaviour (Kozinets & Handelman, 1998), perceived consumer effectiveness (Smith 1990), expectations of positive outcomes (e.g., Midlarsky 1984), perceived efficacy in taking part in achieving collective goals, (Sen et al., 2001) and the possibility of the group attaining its goals (Wiener & Doescher, 1991). Customers may take action and boycott some brands to punish countries they believe have performed unethical actions (Farah & Newman, 2010). Boycotts can also be an individual expression by customers for other specific reasons such as maintaining their self-esteem in society (Brewer & Brown, 1998). In the case of Muslims boycotting, they may boycott particular brands to punish some brands in the name of Muslim solidarity and in sympathy to other Muslims. There may be some other reasons for Muslims to boycott.

2.4.2 Religiosity and Boycott

As was noted earlier, the inclusion of religiosity as one of the possible reasons for boycotting foreign brands is due to the assumption that Muslim customers have a strong adherence to their religion. Muslim customers are reported to have different behaviours compared to followers of other religions in relation to their commitment to their (Islamic) doctrines (Bailey & Sood, 1993; Fam et al., 2004; Vitell & Paolillo, 2003). For example, they react more negatively to the advertising of controversial products such as alcohol compared to other religious followers (Fam et al., 2004). They also have more concerns regarding ethical issues in a marketplace (Vitell & Paolillo, 2003).
Muslims are also less informed and more impulsive shoppers compared to followers of other religions (Bailey & Sood, 1993).

Reports of boycotts by Muslim consumers have mainly focused on religious reactions to some issues that are regarded as an “offense to Islam” as reasons to boycott foreign brands. For example, the long-standing Arab economic boycott of Israel (Fershtman & Gandal, 1998), against Danish products following the publication of cartoon caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad in a tabloid newspaper (Abosag, 2009) and against Dutch products in response to the release of an anti-Islam film, ‘Fitna’ (Abdullah, 2008).

Studies of Muslims boycotts that have focused on religious aspects arguably are triggered by some conflicts in the Middle East (Knudsen, Aggarwal & Maamoun, 2008). A special resolution entitled "The Boycott of Zionist Goods and Products" was issued after seven members of the Arab League met on March 22, 1945 (Kaikati, 1978). The resolution expressly states that any Jewish product shall be regarded as unwanted in Arab countries and by all Arab citizens, that institutions, organizations, entrepreneurs, agencies and individuals must refuse to deal, distribute or use Zionist products (Yunus, Man, Mohamad & Wan Mohd. 2013). Likewise, in 1957 after the Arab League met in Damascus the standing boycott committee declared that Jewish products were unwanted in Muslim countries (Kaikati, 1978).

It is evident that some studies focus on Muslim minorities and boycotts instead of the complete picture. For example, a study by Izberk-Bilgin (2012) took examples from a minority Muslim community in Turkey and found that global brands are seen as ‘infidel’ brands in that community. The major drawback of that article is the choice of participants in the study. The author just focused on interviewing Muslim women who
wear ‘chador’. Chador is a black garment that covers the entire body except the eyes. Izberk-Bilgin (2012) selected the sample under the perception that they are among the most visible public displays of Islamism. This study raises more questions. Is there any guarantee that women who wear chador are more ‘Islamic’ than those who are not wearing it? Are there more variables in evaluating the religiosity of Muslim people rather than just the way they dress or the way they look?

Studies argue that some Islamic concepts trigger Muslims to boycott foreign brands. as was noted in section 2.2.3, Farah (2011) found that Muslims have a higher intention to boycott compared to Christians. Muslims use their religiosity as a reason to boycott. Muslims scholars also aggressively make religious calls for the boycotting of foreign brands (see Al Qaradawi, 2007; Al Sistani, 2002; Cox, 2002; Khamenei, 2002). On the other hand, religious calls for Christians only occur in the Christian Orthodox Church. Christians are claimed to have less intention to boycott in the name of religion compared to Muslims (Farah, 2011).

As was explained in section 2.2.2, according to Allport and Ross (1967) religiosity can be divided into extrinsic and intrinsic religious orientation. They classified individuals with an extrinsic religious orientation as seeing religion as a means to other ends, such as social status. Further, those with an intrinsic religious orientation consider religion as an intrinsically motivating end in itself. In addition to these, people with a quest religious orientation characterize religion as a process involving questioning and re-examining values and beliefs (Batson & Gray, 1981). Considering this religiosity concept, it is possible that religiosity may influence particular behaviour. For example, extrinsic religious orientation may encourage people to see peer pressure or social
pressure as key issues in making decisions. Hardy and Carlo (2005) suggest that positive peer pressure may influence people’s decisions to support prosocial behaviour. Also, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish people’s motives as they may be motivated by religious reasons, or simply because they do something in responses to peer pressure.

2.4.3 Peer Pressure and Boycotting

Muslims are known as a collective society and have a close relationship to other Muslim countries. Islamic culture is highly collective which makes Muslims do some actions, including boycotting some foreign brands, in order to be accepted and look similar to other people in their community (Al Hyari et al., 2012). A recent study by Abdul-Talib and Abdul-Latif (2014, p.70) found that in the context of Malaysia, self-enhancement values have become a significant antecedent to the willingness to boycott among Malaysian Muslim customers. A self-enhancement value type has a strong link with social status (Schwartz, 1994), and a study by Games et al. (2013) about the Minangkabau ethnic group (a totally Muslim group and part of the Malay ethnic group) discovered that social status is influential in motivating people to do or not to do something. For this reason, in terms of boycotting foreign brands, Muslims have a tendency to show that they have the same feelings as other Muslims do and they tend to follow suggestions from their family and friends (Alam et al. 2011). These studies are in line with studies by Sen et al. (2001) and Klein et al. (2001) that elucidated the importance of peer pressure in the boycott context.

As was noted earlier in section 2.2.3, Muslims who have a strong link with their religion may have demonstratively explicated their standpoint regardless of the result of their action. This is, in part, because they accentuate their self-enhancement which is related
to feeling good and having high self-esteem (Abdul-Talib & Abdul-Latif, 2014, p.93). Evidence has shown that Muslim people want to show that they have similar attitudes to their fellow Muslims. Azra (2006, p.58) argues that in the case of Indonesia, while the majority of Muslims see moderation as the best way to deal with particular religion-related issues such as the Palestine-Israel war, Muslim hardliners who are unified and strongly connected to each other took to the streets in Jakarta and some other cities in Indonesia to appeal to Indonesians to boycott American products because America supports Israel.

A study from Al Hyari et al. (2012) found some evidence from Middle East samples that they boycotted Danish products following the publication of caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad in a Danish newspaper because they just wanted to be part of a Muslim boycott campaign. Approval of reference groups are important for consumers, particularly for those who want to gain some recognition for their in-group (Arkin, Lake, & Baumgardner, 1986). These studies have confirmed the importance of peer pressure in Muslim consumer’s boycotting activities.

2.4.4 The Effects of a Fatwa on Muslim Consumers’ Boycotts

Islamic scholars (ulama) are much respected figures in Islam who often guide their followers on how to live with Islam in all aspects of their lives. Fatwas are decrees based on Islamic principles that are issued by Islamic scholars for contemporary issues that are not stated in the Quran and Hadiths (Murad, 1996; Wiechman, Kendall, & Azarian, 1996). Ulamas produce fatwas to explain some rules of Islam to its followers, including about how Muslims view boycotts.
Fatwa rulings are mainly discussed in regard to the permissibility of behaviours that are related to the everyday activities of Muslims. For example, a fatwa can be about certain products that could be harmful to human health, and therefore can be categorised as haram (unlawful) or makruh (undesirable) because the Quran prohibits individuals to endanger themselves and others (Ghouri, Atcha, & Sheikh, 2006). For instance, there is a fatwa that prohibits Muslims from smoking cigarettes because smoking can harm their health.

In terms of boycotting, a fatwa can be issued mainly because the targeted country has an unhealthy relationship with the Islamic world or is offensive to Islam. For example, Al Qaradawi of Egypt declared a fatwa against supporting Israel (IslamOnLine.net, 18 April 2014). He said:

*Each riyal, dirham ...etc. used to buy their [U.S., Isr**li] goods eventually becomes a bullet fired at the hearts of a brother or a child in Palestine, For this reason, it is an obligation not to help them. To buy their goods is to support tyranny, oppression and aggression. Buying goods from them will strengthen them; our duty is to make them as weak as we can.*

*American goods, exactly like ‘Isr**li’ goods, are forbidden. It is also forbidden to advertise these goods,* Al-Qaradawi added. *‘America today is a second Isr**li. It totally supports the Zionist entity. The usurper could not do this without the support of America. ‘Isr**li’s’ unjustifiable destruction and vandalism of everything has been using American money, American weapons, and the American veto. America has done this for decades without suffering the consequences of any punishment or protests about their oppressive and prejudiced position from the Islamic world.*

Sheikh Yusuf Al-Qaradawi is the head of the World Union of Muslim scholars that has some influence in Muslims consumers worldwide. Based in Qatar, Al-Qaradawi is a popular figure in Sunni Islam. He currently serves as president of the European Council for Fatwa and Research (ECFW). He is also chairman of the IslamOnline website,
which is one of important sources for Muslim consumers in finding information regarding boycott fatwa.

The fatwa from Al Qaradawi is one of the most quoted fatwas about boycotting in online media. A study by Muhammad and Mizerski (2010) confirmed the influence of Al Qaradawi in boycott fatwa. This fatwa is used as a silent movement to help other Muslim countries such as Palestine. The boycott against the US is mostly described because of religious reasons. Besides the fatwa on US products, there is also a fatwa asking Muslims to boycott Chinese brands. Although there is no empirical study discussing this, some websites describe the call to boycott Chinese products. The fatwa comes from the head of the World Union of Muslim scholars, Al Qaradawi. He clearly states:

*It is the duty of each and every Muslim in the world, and not Syrians alone, to boycott Chinese and Russian products of all kinds. I ask you, oh my Muslim brethren, not to spend money on Chinese or Russian goods* (Peninsula, 2012).

This boycott fatwa was produced under consideration because China vetoed the UN Security Council’s resolution related to the Syria crisis. Qaradawi also mentioned on his fatwa website that the intervention of foreign countries in Syria can only be permitted if Arab countries cannot solve the problem (Peninsula, 2012). China is believed to have applied pressure to the Syrian President to leave the regime (The Wall Street Journal, 2012). Those reasons to boycott either American or Chinese brands are under the same umbrella to show their sympathy to other Muslim countries such as Palestine and Syria.

Many Muslim scholars can have different perspectives regarding issuing fatwa and there are differing levels of fatwa acceptance in various Muslim countries. Some Muslim scholars, for example in Iran and Iraq, issued fatwas targeting American, Israeli, and Danish commodities between 2000 and 2008 (AMSI, 2008; Khameini,
One of the reasons is because of the Danish cartoonist from the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten, who drew a cartoon of the Prophet Muhammad, which was condemned by Muslims from many countries. Here boycott fatwas can be seen as another method of protecting Muslim beliefs (Halevi, 2012). However, as mentioned earlier, Muslim consumers can freely decide which fatwas they are confident to follow (Sedgwick, 2000). Some examples of boycott campaigns can be found in Appendix D.

2.4.5 Patriotism and Product Substitution in Muslim Countries

Some countries in the developing world are now showing a tendency to buy their local brands instead of foreign brands (Ewing et al. 2002). Studies have found that foreign brands are perceived to be good quality and value. On the other hand, the tendency to switch to local brands was also found in Muslim consumers. Evidence has shown that some Muslim countries have their own local brands which compete with some global brands. However, studies have also found that there are other reasons for Muslims to boycott foreign brands.

Rejection of global brands in Muslim countries may happen for various reasons. A study by Sandıkçı and Ekici (2009) found that in a Muslim country, such as Turkey, brand rejection may not necessarily happen because of religious reasons. Turkish people prefer to consume local brands such as Cola Turka rather than Coca Cola simply because it is local. Customers have a tendency to support local brands as part of their patriotism. Holt, Quelch, and Taylor (2004) in their study also reached similar conclusions. They found that customers choose global brands only because they do not have the choice of a local brand. Once the local brands are available, they might reject the global brands. However, those two studies may contradict other studies that indicate
Muslims want to look more modern and more open to new things in the market (Mellery-Prait, 2014).

Cola Turka and Mecca Cola (see Figure 2.4) are two examples of local brands that were produced as a substitution to the American leading soft drink brand, Coca Cola. Mecca Cola was launched following the boycott calls in some Muslim countries toward Coca Cola. It is found that boycotting Coca Cola is one way to hit the US economy. Mecca Cola promises consumers that 10 per cent of the profit will be given to a Palestinian children’s charity. Their tagline is “Think Muslim, drink Muslim” (Henley, 2003).

Figure 2.4 Image of Cola Turka and Mecca Cola as Product Substitution for Coca Cola in Muslim countries

2.4.6 Consumers’ Animosity
Jaffe and Nebenzahl (2001) describe the concept of animosity as being related to a very negative form of attitude of consumers to a particular country that could possible range from affinity (the most positive attitude) to animosity (the most negative attitude). In simple words, affinity is related to the most positive association about a country from a consumer’s perspective and animosity is the opposite of it (Jaffe & Nebenzahl, 2001). Animosity could lead consumers to have a negative attitude toward brands that are produced in a particular country.

Personal judgments might be related to some tendencies and values. Animosity is an example of the personal judgement of some customers that may lead to their decision not to buy particular brands. Klein, Ettenson and Morris (1998, p.90) define animosity as, “The remnant of antipathy related to previous or ongoing military, political, or economic events.” They found that a buyer’s animosity toward a country will affect their willingness to buy a product from that country. People decide not to buy a particular product because of the country of origin of the product, instead of the performance of the product (Funk, 2010). Some recent studies describe the significant impact of animosity as the personal judgment of customers about some countries that affects their buying decisions (Klein et al., 1998, Ang et al., 2004; Klein, 1998; Klein, 2002; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004).

In their conceptual paper, Abd Razak and Abdul-Talib (2012) describe the importance of evaluating boycott campaigns in the Muslim world that are caused by animosity because there is a lack of research related to this issue. Ettenson (2006) emphasizes the long-term effect of animosity that influences consumers’ decisions to boycott some brands. Fischer (2007) argues that some tragic events such as the September 11 made a
big impact on Muslim relationship with western people, including the decision to boycotting some brands.

Attitudes toward a country have some effect on the responses of customers in a marketplace (Klein et al., 1998). Studies describe stable animosity that is mainly because of war or history as a reason that influences customers in their buying decisions (Ang et al., 2004; Shimp, Dunn, & Klein, 2004; Shin, 2001). Amine, Chao and Arnord (2005) describe that customers will avoid buying products that are made in countries that they believe have carried out unfriendly military, political and economic acts to their home countries. Ang et al. (2004) found that most customers in Asian countries have some level of animosity toward the US and Japan. Again, this is mainly because of historical facts in particular war and military actions. However, a study by van Herk and Poortinga (2012) in some European countries has found that history has become significantly less influential nowadays as a factor leading to changes in individuals’ values compared to an increase of wealth. This means that consumers may be more practical than was previously expected and this may influence their decision making in boycotts.

In addition to the pragmatic side of customers, these effects of animosity may decrease because of customers’ loyalty to particular brands (Rice & Wongtada, 2007). This may happen because customers who feel very attached to some brands will find it difficult to boycott those brands. Maher and Clark (2010) also explain that the level of animosity may decrease over the time. For example, they (2010) found that Chinese people currently have a positive attitude toward Japanese brands that is inconsistent with the previous finding of Klein (2002).
Despite some criticism of the relevancy of historical animosity in today’s era, some studies show that animosity still exists. Many studies have attempted to discover many other kinds of animosity in the marketplace, for example, situational animosity that occurs because of current issues about the economy, politics and diplomacy are still relevant for many customers in performing consumer behaviours (Ang et al., 2004; Cicic, Brkic, Husic, & Agic, 2005; Hinck, Cortes, & James, 2004; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004). Animosity, either stable or situational, can have an effect on customers’ buying decisions in many countries. Therefore, animosity toward the country of the brand can be considered as one possible cause for people to boycott foreign brands.

2.4.7 Consumer Ethnocentrism

There are some concepts related to cultures such as consumer ethnocentrism. Shimp (1984) and Shimp and Sharma (1987, p. 280) introduced the term "consumer ethnocentrism", which is explained as "the beliefs held by (American) consumers about the appropriateness, indeed morality, of purchasing foreign-made products." In another study, Sumner (1906, p. 12) defined ethnocentrism as “... the technical name for [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.” That is, ethnocentrism shows some cultural narrowness that only supports an individual’s in-group circle and avoids the out-groups because they are regarded as having negative behaviours that “hurt” the in-groups.

The notion of in-groups and out-groups in regard to consumer ethnocentrism was also found in some cultures in different contexts. Studies have found that consumer ethnocentrism also happens between different religions’ followers, for example, between Hindus and Muslims (Hassan, 1978; Taylor & Jaggi, 1974), from Christians toward Muslims (Rowatt, Franklin, & Cotton, 2005), from female westerners toward
Muslim females because of Islamic concepts targeting women such as being in a harem, wearing the veil, polygamy, etc (Ahmed, 1982). However, there is a lack of research into this concept, particularly in regard to Muslim consumers’ views towards other religions’ followers. While other religious followers targeting Muslims has been the object of ethnocentrism research, there has been a lack of research of consumer ethnocentrism in Muslim countries toward other religious followers. The only research focusing on consumer ethnocentrism in Muslim countries, such as Indonesia and Malaysia, focused on countries instead of religions (Sutikno & Cheng, 2011; Tabassi, Esmaeilzadeh, & Sambasivan, 2012). For example, Indonesian female consumers have been found to have higher levels of ethnocentrism toward countries like Australia, Malaysia and Singapore than male consumers (Sutikno & Cheng, 2011), however, the effects of religion have not been explored.

Watson and Wright (2000) found that cultural similarity is the main concern in evaluating foreign products for highly ethnocentric consumers. Measures of consumer ethnocentrism have been developed and tested in some Western cultures such as the US, France, and Germany (Shimp, 1984; Shimp & Sharma, 1987). With the exception of a few studies (Elliott & Hamin, 2006; Sutikno & Cheng, 2011; Tabassi et al., 2012), not many of the studies on consumer ethnocentrism were conducted in Muslim countries, particularly in Southeast Asia.

Ethnocentrism a concept that is becoming more important because people need to contemplate their own cultures in relation to foreign cultures in today’s globalized world. In addition, ethnocentrism is a different concept compared to animosity. While animosity is directed toward a specific country, ethnocentrism is targeted at all foreign products in the market (Ang et al., 2004; Klein, 2002).
Shimp and Sharma (1987) describe that from an ethnocentrism perspective, people have to buy local brands because buying foreign brands may harm the local economy. Shimp and Sharma (1987) developed the CETSCALE in predicting the tendencies of American consumers to buy foreign brands versus American brands. Ethnocentrism is a very interesting concept to study in this era of globalization because it can be used to evaluate the level of acceptance of foreign brands. This concept is even more important because nowadays there are no barriers to enter the market of most of the countries in the world (Watson & Wright, 2000). Some countries may cope with globalization much better than other countries. Other countries may feel ‘insecure’ because of the foreign brands that are available widely in their markets. It may trigger ethnocentrism because some consumers may avoid foreign brands to safeguard their local brands (see Watson & Wright, 2000).

Bannister and Saunders (1978), Cattin, Jolibert and Lohnes (1982) and Sandicki (2009) found that Turkish consumers boycotted Coca Cola once Cola Turka was available in the Turkish market as part of their way of supporting national brands. These types of customers may either boycott all foreign brands or avoid the products of some countries that they perceive as a ‘threat’ for their nation. Recent research by Tabassi et al. (2012) found that ethnocentrism is a major reason for Malaysian customers in deciding their purchase intentions toward European products followed by animosity and religiosity. However, the research only found the concept of ethnocentrism works for low involvement products such as chocolate from Europe.

Their study found that Malaysians prefer local brands of chocolate compared to European brands because they want to protect their local product (Tabassi et al., 2012). The ethnocentrism concept in that study does not fit well when Malaysian customers buy high involvement products. For high involvement products, the customers perceive
products from European countries to be better quality compared to products from their home country, therefore they prefer to buy European brands. Then, they ‘forget’ about their willingness to ‘save’ local brands because they do not want to take the risk of buying a ‘low quality’ product.

In addition to the concept of consumer ethnocentrism, the concept of xenocentricity is defined as an individual’s belief that a foreign culture is superior compared to one’s own. For example, someone who has an xenocentric view sees everything produced in Western countries as being the best products (Johnson, 2000). These types of consumers would buy the Westerner made products instead of local products. Studies have found a growing level of xenocentric views in developing countries including predominantly Muslim countries such as Indonesia. Willer (2006) identified that Indonesian consumers perceived that they increase their prestige when they consume brands and products from Western countries. In the Indonesian language, the prestige of using foreign brands is called “gengsi”. Some evidence has shown that Indonesian samples prefer music from Western countries that they presumed to be high class music compared to traditional and local Indonesian music (Wallach, 2002). These two concepts, ethnocentrism and xenocentrism, possibly exist in Muslim consumers and require a totally different strategy from marketers.

2.4.8 Increase in Concern about Healthy Aspects of Foreign Brands

Previous research has shown that the health-related motivation to prevent disease or improve health is regarded as the main reason for health behaviour in most theoretical models (Newsom, McFarland, Kaplan, Huguet, & Zani, 2005). Health consciousness can be defined as the degree of readiness to undertake healthy actions (Oude Ophuis, 1989; Schifferstein & Oude Ophuis, 1998). As such, health-conscious customers will be
highly motivated to consume healthy food. There are several aspects that can be part of the considerations of health conscious people in deciding to buy particular products. For example, these people consider hygienic ingredients or processes in producing some products as important elements (Bonne & Verbeke, 2008). They avoid products that they think will have a bad effect on their health. They may also warn other people not to consume brands they view as unhealthy from particular countries.

In terms of health consciousness, Islam has the *halalan toyyiba* concept that guides Muslims to consume not only halal (permissible) products, but also good (tayyiba) products including healthy products (Yunus, Wan Chik, & Mohamad, 2010). This is an important concept because this confirms that the importance of halal and healthy products for Muslims as a part of their Islamic values (Yunus et al., 2010) as it has been prescribed in the Quran that Muslims should consider ‘permissible’ (halal) and ‘good’ (toyyiba) in their consumption. This means that Muslim consumers who eat healthy food can be considered to have done a good deed based on a hadith of the Prophet Muhammad. The origin of food products is an important attribute for people to make their food choices. For example, in Europe, people consider German food to be unhealthy food, therefore, consumers who are concerned with the health issue will try to avoid foods made in Germany (Luomala, 2007). This situation may also happen in Muslim countries. Additionally, a recent study by Ambali and Bakar (2014) about halal and toyyiba in the Malaysian context, found the certification logo, and more importantly, health reason are potential sources of Muslim awareness about *halal* consumption. This means that Muslim consumers have a tendency to expect halal products to be healthy products as well.
Lee et al. (2009) argue that the consumption of unhealthy brands is immoral behaviour because it may harm societies’ health. They see unhealthy brands as common enemy and consumers should fight for their right to be able to consume healthy brands. These researchers identify two ways of showing this standpoint. First, consumers can switch to healthier options. Second, consumers can proactively promote healthy brands and discourage people for consuming unhealthy brands by using media, in particular online platforms which can reach customers around the world. Furthermore, Kaynak and Eksi (2013) found that those health conscious consumers are more likely to boycott unhealthy products or brands. This means that health consciousness has become an important issue nowadays and more and more actions will be carried out to express the importance of this issue in the future.

2.5 INDONESIA- A BIG MUSLIM MARKET

Based on the notion that culture and local context are important to explain Muslim consumer behaviour, the following sections elucidate Indonesia as a promising marketplace with specific cultures and economic and political aspects.

2.5.1 Population and Market Opportunity

Most studies of Muslim consumer behaviours have focused on consumers in the Middle East (Al-Khatib, Vitell, Rexeisen, & Rawwas, 2005; Djursaa & Kragh, 1998; Elbashier & Nicholls, 1983; Farah, 2011; Gulf News, 2000; Lerner, 1958; Sohail & Shaikh, 2008; Solberg, 2002; Swarbrooke & Horner, 2007), with a few about Turkey and other countries (Cukur & Carlo, 2004; Sandikci & Ekici, 2009; Schneider, Krieger, & Bayraktar, 2011) and very few about Indonesia (Kasri & Awaliah Kasri, 2013; Sutikno & Cheng, 2011). This is unfortunate because Indonesia is the most populous Muslim country in the world (see Table 2.2). Based on a 2010 survey by the Pew Research
Center’s Forum, Indonesia had 13.1 percent of the world’s Muslim population. Around 209,120,000 Muslims live in Indonesia which is a big marketing opportunity for foreign companies.

Table 2.2 Top Ten Countries with Largest Muslim Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Estimated 2010 Muslim Population</th>
<th>% of World Muslim Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>209,120,000</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>176,190,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>167,410,000</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>133,540,000</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>77,300,000</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>76,990,000</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>73,570,000</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>71,330,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>34,730,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>31,940,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Decades ago, Southeast Asian countries were only positioned as a source of physical and cheap labour (Van Goor, 1999). However, now their economic conditions are better and continuously improving. Their economic growth has created a new middle class which provides more opportunities for foreign companies to market their brands (Booth, 1999). Even before the investment liberalization of the late 1980s and 90s, Southeast Asian economies had been targeted by Western Multinational Corporations to sell their brands to the local Southeast Asian people who are predominantly Muslims (Booth, 1999, p.564). For example, various types of foreign brands such as automobiles, electronics, cosmetics and milk products are easy to find in Indonesia. Foreign brands like Avon, L’Oreal, Unilever, Ponds, Colgate and numerous others dominate Indonesian retailers and are easy to find all over the country (Willer, 2006). The context of Islamic
marketing research is important to consider when determining the findings and conclusions (Alam et al. 2011). Therefore, it is important to have a better understanding regarding Indonesia’s Muslim customers and not only see them as part of the most populous country in the world.

2.5.2 Religious Aspects

Indonesia is the largest Islamic nation in the world, 88 percent of the Indonesian population is Muslim (Suryadinata, Arifin & Ananta 2003). Orthodox Islam can be found in Aceh, a “special province” that implemented syariah law (Azra, 2006). However, on the whole, Indonesian Muslims can be regarded as “moderate Muslims” as they live together with followers of different religions (Dahm, 1999). Most Indonesian Muslims are Sunni followers, and at the doctrinal level, they are the followers of the Ash’ari theology and the Shafi’i school of Islamic law which is also followed by Malaysian Muslims (Azra, 2006).

A classic study by Geertz (1956) divides the Indonesian Muslim population, especially the Javanese into three categories: santri, priyayi, and abangan. Santri (students) represents a special group that identify themselves as Muslim first and who learn Islam comprehensively. They are observant Muslims. Further, Samson (1971) identified that there is a new type of santri-radical fundamentalist-which is more aggressive and open in showing their interpretation regarding Islam and letting other people know about it. Azra (2006) identified that in Indonesia after 1998 (after the fall of Suharto regime), some groups more publicly and aggressively promote their interpretation of Islam. However, Geertz (1956) identifies that the large majority of Indonesian Muslims especially the Javanese can be regarded as “abangan”. This means that they do not
adhere strictly to the tradition of Islam (Geert, 1956) and can also be specified as extrinsic religious followers who use religion mainly for their social status (Allport & Ross, 1967). While this classification “santri and abangan” by Geertz can be seen as a simplification of Indonesia’s heterogeneous Muslims, this conceptualisation may still be useful in understanding the characteristics of Muslims in Indonesia (Machmudi, 2008).

2.5.3 Other Cultural Aspects

Ricklefs (2001) argues that Islam is a product of cultural assimilation. Customary regulations (adat) are significant in Indonesian regional cultures (Federspiel, 2003). Accordingly, Islam in Indonesia, as can be found in many countries, also adopts the local culture. For example, Willer (2006: 169) quote an Indonesian proverb which says, “Religion came from across the sea but customs and tradition came down from the mountains.” Indonesia has a rich cultural heritage as do other Muslim countries in Southeast Asia. Islam is strongly influenced by the local tradition, noting that Islam in Southeast Asia has its own styles and traditions (Willer, 2006).

Cultural aspects have some impact on life and consumption patterns as well as in marketing strategies in Muslim markets. Willer (2006) identified that Indonesian consumers perceived that they increased their prestige when they consumed brands and products from Western countries. In the Indonesian language, the prestige of using foreign brands is called “gengsi”. For example, Indonesian students sample “underground” or indie rock music and often sing in English to increase their prestige rather than play local music. As Pinches (1999: 1978) argues “Lifestyle has become a crucial site for the construction, negotiation and contestation of identity in Indonesia”.
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In Indonesia, people prefer to have close relationships and prefer their local neighbourhood (Willer, 2006). Furthermore, Hofstede (1993) described culture as a social collective phenomenon which is shared within a community. In regards to the culture, people also carry out rituals within their community. Muslims have ritual guidelines to be followed based on the Quran and Hadiths.

Willer (2006) has identified that Indonesian Muslims consumers want the marketer to maintain a relationship with them. He exemplifies this by explaining a fact that, from 3000 respondents who participated in a Siemen mobile Lifestyle survey in 2001, 79 percent of Indonesia’s respondents agreed that using text messages (SMS) was a good way to foster relationships between consumers and marketers. Marketers are now realizing the importance of relationship – based behaviour for Muslim consumers in Indonesia (Nurhasanah, 2014). For example, the use of Islamic scholars to endorse some products on Indonesian TV is becoming more common, and not only temporal, for example, in Ramadan only (Nurhasanah, 2014). For example, Telkomsel, the biggest operator of cellular telecommunication services, has used Ustadz Nur Maulana (a famous Muslim preacher in Indonesia) to endorse and become a brand ambassador for its product (Nurhasanah, 2014). Another Muslim scholar, Ustadz Jeffry Albuchory, also advertised helmets in some media. Figure 2.5 shows examples of advertising that have ulama as endorsers in Indonesia. Both ulama in the pictures below (Figure 2.5) are wearing “kopiah”, a particular sort of hat as a symbol of male Muslim apparel in Indonesia, similar to the veil for women. The “kopiah” was originally introduced by the Caliphate, brought in by Indian Muslims; a number of Indonesian Muslims have Indian heritage (Yunos, 2007).
Successful brands should consider local cultures (Krisjanti, 2013). Coca Cola in Indonesia attempted to understand Indonesian culture and customize their advertising to correspond to ongoing celebrations in Indonesia such as Ramadan (Willer, 2006) which is a sacred month for Muslims. Coca Cola understands this and creates ads that match the theme of Ramadan as can be seen in Figure 2.6. Coca Cola also creates some event such as “free” break fasting for Muslims and providing an opportunity for the winner of a competition to invite five friends to join the event. This is in relation to Indonesian Muslims’ collective culture in which they prefer to share good things with their close friends or relatives. As a foreign brand, Coca Cola seems to understand Indonesian culture. Evidence has shown that Coca Cola is one among a very few foreign brands that were viewed as a “local brand” by Indonesian consumers (Willer, 2006).
Usunier and Lee (2005) found that the most prominent elements in creating a successful performance of foreign products are a combination of adaptation and standardisation strategies for foreign companies in a local market which can also be called “glocal”. Coca Cola seems to try this strategy by creating advertising that is in line with local cultures and religious norms in targeting Muslim consumers in Indonesia.

2.5.4 Boycott Activities in Indonesia

Previous sections regarding Indonesia’s marketplace indicate that Indonesia’s collectivism may lead to the importance of other people in Indonesian Muslim consumers. Customers may still see themselves as “we” rather than ‘I”. However, Indonesia is also experiencing an unprecedented freedom. Basri (2004) concludes that Indonesia is now heading for a better political and economic condition as freedom of expression is a new culture and is taken for granted by Indonesians. While freedom of expression has given significant benefits to Indonesia’s democracy, it can also be used
to express dissatisfaction. As was noted earlier in section 2.2.2, there was an incident at KFC Makassar which may indicate that there is a potential to misuse the freedom of expression by organizing a violence as a way to express opinions.

Indonesia is also predicted to be one of the foremost consumer markets in the future (Willer, 2006). Three Muslim countries have been included in the Group of Twenty (G20); Indonesia, Saudi Arabia and Turkey. This means that Indonesia is one among three Muslims countries and twenty countries in the world that account for 85 percent of the world’s economy, 76 percent of global trade and two thirds of the world’s population. An increase of wealth (GDP) can influence personal values (van Herk & Poortinga, 2012) and Indonesia’s new era may lead to rather individualistic values, and this could contribute to consumer response and activities. It is unclear as to the impact of Indonesian Muslims’ boycotts of foreign brands in financial terms, but as a free trade market is adopted by Indonesia, it is expected that foreign brands and consumer boycotts could be an even more important issue in the near future.

As was noted earlier, there is a new phenomenon occurring as Indonesian customers are more likely to publicly express their disapproval of foreign brands. They mostly perceive themselves as ordinary customers who simply want to do small things that they think can represent their values. Some of them openly mention their reasons for boycotting foreign brands. As was noted earlier, this is supported by the fact that in Indonesia, freedom of expression is guaranteed by the constitution, and as a result, Indonesia now has significantly more media especially online media (news portal). It is also worth noting that Indonesia has become one of the fastest growing countries in terms of using social media and some issues such as nationalism and religiosity have a
much higher chance to go viral (Lim, 2013). Facebook has 64 million users in Indonesia who actively access their accounts on a monthly basis and this number puts the country in the social networking site’s top five largest markets (Grazella, 2013). Social media will facilitate word of mouth and therefore, in terms of Muslim customers’ reasons for boycotting foreign brands, the use of social media can be an effective way to spread information about campaigns to boycott foreign brands.

Internationally, it is recognised that Boycott, Divestment, Sanction (BDS) grew rapidly from 2005 and this has inspired Muslims in many countries to boycott Israeli brands, and brands that are owned by companies that are presumed to support Israel (BDSmovement, 2015). This has been supported by some Muslims in Indonesia by spreading the BDS campaign through their news portal, blogs, Facebook pages, Twitter accounts, and other media. They boycotted, to name a few, KFC, McDonalds, A&W, Baskin & Robbins, Marlboro, Avon, and Revlon (A tree blog, 21 September 2010). Hidayatullah.com, one of the online media groups in Indonesia that supports this campaign have clearly stated that Indonesia’s Muslim consumers should see boycotting as “Islamic” as it is part of the fight against oppression (Hidayatullah.com, 2014).

Some people may argue that this BDS campaign is counterproductive as this movement is too small in the capitalist world and Muslim consumers, even those who enthusiastically promote the BDS campaign, would not be able to restrict themselves from companies and brands which are presumed to be Israeli supporters. One of the Indonesian’ bloggers who support the BDS campaign, responds this by explaining there is nothing too small as boycott campaigns have been an effective way in the past and this campaign is also supported by fatwas by some ulamas such as Al Qaradawi and Ali Khamenei (Sulaeman, 20 April 2010). Further, Sulaeman in her blog also mentions the
basic law in Islam *ta’arudh bainal amrain* which means that if there is a conflict of interest, a Muslim should choose the option that has more benefits and less negativity. In this case, she illustrated that she still bought a laptop (related to IBM and Intel) as it helps her in doing good deeds, for example, by promoting the BDS campaign. This means that in this case, a boycott is seen as a manifestation of solidarity among Muslim ummah.

In addition to religious reasons to participate in a boycott and a boycott campaign, the BDS campaign may represent the importance of the perceived effectiveness of a boycott. John and Klein (2003, p.1207) suggest that “the effectiveness of a boycott might depend critically on the expectations of potential participants about the behaviour of others. Individuals boycott if they think other people will do so; individuals do not boycott if they think that others will not”. This means that the BDS campaign may also be encouraged by the expectations of potential participants about the behaviour of other Muslim around the world including in Indonesia. They may see that because a boycott of foreign brands is an important issue, not only for them, there is an opportunity that the movement can strengthen Muslim solidarity and this will realise significant impacts in the near future.

Another noticeable consumer movement in Indonesia regarding boycotting of foreign brands comes from the Cintai Produk Indonesia (Love Indonesia’s brands) campaign. Some blogs proactively share the news about the dominancy of foreign brands harming Indonesia’s economy and local brands should be seen as the pride and pillar of the nation. Some websites have been dedicated to focusing on the sovereignty of Indonesia by rejecting foreign brands and intervention by multinational corporations. For example, http://membunuhindonesia.net has promoted Indonesia as a wealthy country
in terms of natural resources and population, therefore Indonesia should show its sovereignty by protecting local brands and rejecting the dominance of foreign brands (Membunuhindonesia.net, 23 May 2013).

Online media also aggressively promote the notion that Indonesia is weakened by foreign brands. For example, Wicaksono (2013) from liputan6.com wrote an article titled “Indonesia Sudah Terjajah Merek-merek Asing” (Indonesia is already occupied by foreign brands). Chinese brands are also considered to be harmful for Indonesian brands, as can be seen in the following picture (Figure 2.7). In this case, boycotts emphasize that buying Chinese brands means that consumers would make Chinese people richer.

**Figure 2.7 The Boycott of Chinese Brands’ Campaign**

More specifically, some customers in Indonesia publicly express their uneasiness towards Chinese brands. This is especially towards Chinese products that contain harmful materials. Indonesia’s Agency of Drugs and Food Control (BPOM) frequently releases news about this issue which has been going viral in social media and online. For example, they have issued press releases regarding some candies with a dangerous substance such as formalin (liputan6.com, 2007), dangerous cosmetics (Purwanto,
2009), and toys with harmful materials (Nasution, 2014). Although the boycott issue related to Chinese brands is less influenced by religious reasons, some Chinese brands are boycotted in response to pleas from the conservative Muslim media because the Chinese government is suspected to have restricted Islamic practices by Chinese Muslims in China (e.g., arrahmah.com, 2014).

It appears that ethnocentrism concept may also contribute to a boycott campaign for Chinese brands. A study by Elliot and Hamin (2006) identified that Indonesian customers have placed ethnocentrism at the high end of international comparisons. They found that high consumer ethnocentrism respondents preferred to buy the domestic television brand (Polytron) over foreign brand televisions such as Philips because they believed that the Polytron, was better quality, suggesting that strong brands and a ‘buy local’ campaign will be effective ways to deal with consumer ethnocentrism. In contrast, consumers with low consumer ethnocentrism will prefer the foreign brands.

While it appears that the reason why Muslims boycott Chinese brands is less ideological than those who boycott of foreign brands because of the Israel-Palestine conflict, boycotts may also be related to the rather long history of the link between pribumi/bumi putera (indigenous people) and Chinese ethnic groups in Indonesia. There was an attempt to boycott Chinese brands in the past (1913) which was led by Syarikat Islam (Islamic Association), which was a respected Indonesian Muslim organisation that had a dream to accelerate the economic development of the pribumi who are predominantly Muslim (Kuntowijoyo & Priyono, 2008). This signifies that there was a conflict between the pribumi and Chinese as the latter saw that the former enjoyed special treatment from the Dutch colonialists in Indonesia (before the Independence of Indonesia in 1945). While, in fact Chinese business owners are still dominant players in
Indonesia’s economy, with the abundance of Chinese brands coming to the Indonesia’s market, it is expected that this uneasiness towards Chinese domination will lead to more boycotting of Chinese brands.

2.6 SUMMARY OF MUSLIM CONSUMER’S BOYCOTTING OF FOREIGN BRANDS RESEARCH

The importance of understanding Muslim consumers is needed as they are a big market and are easily misunderstood by some marketers. Previous studies identify that Muslim consumers may have different characteristics compared to other customers as they are perceived to have a strong connection with Islam. In turn, it is expected that Muslim boycotts have a link with religiosity. However, it is also identified from previous research that Muslim customers are concerned with some issues that are also highly regarded by non-Muslim consumers such as ethnocentrism and health consciousness. Some studies identify that secular reasons may have a greater role as these reasons perhaps are more contextual. In more open and adaptive consumers in the Indonesian context, this may have an effect on the boycott decision. The present study has identified some possible reasons for a boycott. These are religiosity, peer pressure, boycott fatwa, halal validity, perceived quality of foreign brands, perceived value of foreign brands, patriotism, and product substitutions, health consciousness, ethnocentrism, and animosity. These may or may not be confirmed by the study as the participants of this study may have their own reasons to boycott which will be used in the data analysis of this study. This study is exploratory in nature as more possible reasons for boycotting are expected and a clear explanation about the role of religiosity is also needed.
CHAPTER 3

QUALITATIVE STUDY
3.0 INTRODUCTION

The main objective of the current study is to examine the key motivations of Muslim customers to boycott foreign brands. A preliminary qualitative phase was used in this study to explore religious and secular motivations behind Muslims consumers’ boycotting behaviour. The interviewees and focus group discussions were gathered from both student and non-student samples in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the motives behind Muslims’ boycotts from different segments of society to address the following research questions:

RQ1: What religious and secular factors have an effect on Muslim consumers’ decisions to boycott foreign brands?

RQ2: Which foreign brands have been affected most by those factors?

RQ3: What is the role of the religiosity of the buyer? Does the religiosity mediate or moderate the effects of other reasons that Muslim consumers’ boycott foreign brands?

3.1 QUALITATIVE APPROACH

The data collection for the current study involved a two-phase process including an initial qualitative and subsequent quantitative phase. A preliminary questionnaire was prepared based on existing literatures on boycotts. The qualitative phase used in-depth interviews and focus group discussions to collect preliminary data that was subsequently formulated for the final version of the quantitative survey.

Qualitative research tends to focus on gaining a deeper understanding in interpreting the meaning of social actions, focusing on underlying processes (Gephart, 2004). There are some justifications for combining qualitative and qualitative approaches (Bryman, 2006, p.106) and the present study in particular selects these two advantages:
Instrument development- refers to contexts in which qualitative research is employed to develop questionnaire and scale items

Completeness – refers to the notion that the researcher can bring together a more comprehensive account of the area of enquiry in which he or she is interested if both quantitative and qualitative research are employed

Muslim boycotts of foreign brands in Indonesia are not explored by previous researchers, suggesting that the present study cannot rely on existing ideas or research. This means that qualitative approach provide more opportunities to explore factors that could potentially influence Muslims’ boycotts of foreign products. In brief, qualitative method was chosen for the first phase of the study because it was helpful in developing a more in-depth understanding of Muslim consumers’ boycott behaviours. The qualitative phase aimed to develop reliable constructs to be used in the final quantitative phase. As noted earlier in section 1.2, quantitative and qualitative methods complement each other. A qualitative study has some limitations, for example it is difficult to implement with large sample. To overcome this issue, the qualitative study in this research was followed by a quantitative phase to confirm and quantify the initial, qualitative findings in a larger Muslim consumer sample (n=400).

3.1.1 Interviews and Focus Group Discussion

Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were used to explore this topic. Thirty-six Indonesian Muslim consumers from Padang, West Sumatra, participated in this qualitative phase. In-depth interviews and focus groups discussion were employed in this study to enhance the richness of the data in the qualitative phase, as recommended by Lambert and Loiselle (2008). In the in-depth interviews process, the
data were collected was mostly related to details of the participants’ thoughts, attitudes, beliefs and knowledge regarding their boycotting experiences. Following this, the focus group discussions were then used to evaluate interaction data resulting from discussion among the participants. According to Freeman et al. (2001) and Lambert and Loiselle (2008), focus group discussions that are conducted after the in depth interview process might enhance the richness of the data and unveil aspects of the phenomenon such as the participants’ boycotting experiences.

Thirty-six participants took part in this study. First, twenty interviewees were asked questions about their opinions about boycotts. Ten interviewees were students and the other ten were non-student subjects who had different types of occupations. After reviewing the interview data, further discussions with the focus groups were then performed for further confirmation. There were two focus groups, one for the student participants and another for the non-student participants with eight participants involved in each discussion (total focus group n=16). The interviewees were assured that their identity would not be released in any report, so that they were free to answer the questions and to express their opinions openly. Data was collected in Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia through digitally-recorded interviews which lasted around one hour.

As the nature of the qualitative is avoiding predetermined views, every possible factor that motivates Muslim consumers to boycott foreign product may emerge. Focus groups and individual in-depth interviews were used in this research because both methods can complete each other. As was pointed out by Lambert and Louiselle (2008), combining individual interviews and focus groups can enhance our understandings of phenomena and the trustworthiness of findings. Focus groups can provide some insights during interaction between the participants and individual interviews can give further detailed
explanations on boycott issues from the perspective of particular interviewees. Focus groups may provide detailed explanations regarding some debatable issues, while interviews may give more space to individuals to express their opinions freely. Both the focus groups and interviews were conducted in West Sumatra, Indonesia.

Below are some examples of questions that were used in the in-depth interviews and focus groups:

To answer the first and the second research question: Which foreign brands have been affected most by those factors? And What factors have an effect on Muslim consumers’ decisions to boycott foreign brands? Examples of questions that were asked to the interviewees and some of the focus group participants include:

1. What do you think about boycotting foreign brands?
2. Can you give examples of brands which have been boycotted?
3. Can you explain more about your experiences in boycotting brands?
4. Do you have any opinion why consumers boycott particular foreign brands?
5. Do customers recommend the boycotting of foreign brands to others?
6. Do your family and friends influence your decision to buy or boycott a brand?
7. Do you think boycotting is an effective action?
8. How many brands did you boycott in the last 12 month?
9. Do you always boycott the same brands?

The third research question is What is the role of religiosity of buyer? These following questions were asked in attempting to answer the research question:

1. What foreign brands have you or potentially boycotted?
2. How does religion affect your decision in buying or boycotting a brand?

3. Do you think boycotting relevant to Islamic values?

More specifically to participants of the focus group discussion, some deeper issues that identified from interviews will be followed up. Participants were asked about their views on religion, what they think about the boycott of foreign brands, whether they boycott any foreign brands and their opinion about why customers were boycotting particular foreign brands.

3.1.2 The Interviewees

The participants’ ages ranged between 18 and 21, with income levels between one to two million rupiahs (approximately $100-$400USD) per month. The ages of non-student participants ranged between 22 and 40, with occupations reported as civil servants, housewives, entrepreneurs and lecturers. There were an equal number of males and females for both student and non-students participants (participants: 18 males and 18 females). The age range for student participants was between 18 and 20, and between 25 and 40 of age to non-student participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants (pseudonyms)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni</td>
<td>18 year old</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caca</td>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deni</td>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eri</td>
<td>21 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitri</td>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilang</td>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of the non-student interview participants are as follows:

**Table 3.2 List of Non-Student Interviewees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants (pseudonyms)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karim</td>
<td>25 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>28 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>House wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad</td>
<td>22 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>30 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>House wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ong</td>
<td>35 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putri</td>
<td>27 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainal</td>
<td>30 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rina</td>
<td>40 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susi</td>
<td>36 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>35 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 Focus Group Sample Description

There were two focus groups in this study. The first focus group included eight student participants whose ages were between 18 and 22 years old, with an even number of male and female participants. The details of the focus group student participants are as follows:

**Table 3.3. List of Student Participants in Focus Group Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants (pseudonyms)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nana</td>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nila</td>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bintang</td>
<td>20 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second focus group included 8 non-student participants with a similar number of male and female participants. These participants were selected because they are also customers and have experience in buying some foreign brands. These participants also have good salaries which gives them more options to buy or not to buy most of the products that are available in the market. Each approximately one hour focus group lasted.

The details of the focus group of non-student participants are as follows:

### Table 3.4 List of Participants of Non-Students Focus Groups Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riko</td>
<td>36 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rijal</td>
<td>33 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeni</td>
<td>30 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina</td>
<td>31 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yayan</td>
<td>30 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risma</td>
<td>33 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>House wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robi</td>
<td>32 years old</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata</td>
<td>28 years old</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 DATA COLLECTION

All of the students’ participants come from the member Business School Student Association (HIMA). The researcher contacted the chairwoman of the HIMA asking for assistance to approach some potential participants from organization. Surprisingly, many students are interested in participating in this study. Face to face interviews were
used in this study as they are helpful to ensure that the meaning of the interviews are not misunderstood (Kvale, 1996).

Non-students participants come from various backgrounds. They have been approached by using social networks. The researcher know some people who can be potential participants of this study as they have publicly commented in social media (i.e. Facebook page) regarding boycotts of foreign brands. These people also recommended some other people who may be interested in discussing their viewpoints of boycotts. Interviews were carried out during January 2013. All interviews and focus groups were undertaken in the Indonesian languages.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

The present study has two groups of participants: students and non-students. Previous studies have identified that compared to other market segments, students in collectivist cultures are influenced by their religiosity in performing their behaviours as customers, including boycotting international brands (Al Hyari et al. 2012). In particular, students were reported to strongly participate in boycotts of US products (Sandıkçı & Ekici, 2009). Therefore, these two groups may represent different segments in the Muslim market, and different boycott behaviour may be expected.

As was noted earlier, the interviews data were collected which are mostly in relation to a detailed of participants’ thought, attitudes, beliefs and knowledge regarding their boycott experiences. Following this, the focus group discussion was then used to evaluate some important issues that have been identified in the interviews. The data analyses were conducted using Leximancer qualitative data analysis software. This software is used in the data analysis by helping in some steps as follows:
Leximancer implement a systematic text search from the transcripts of interviews and analyses the information.

The system selects the important concepts for participants based on interview results and analyses information based on word frequency and co-occurrence with other words, and creates relevant concepts (Smith & Humphrey, 2006).

The system evaluates words that were used the most by participants and groups those words in developing some concepts.

Furthermore, relational content analysis was implemented to define the concepts surrounding boycotts, relationships between concepts and how these concepts are interrelated to identify possible reasons for the participants to boycott foreign products.

Interviewees were grouped into categories of students and non-students as can be seen in Figures 3.1 and 3.2. In particular, Leximancer allows researchers to capture whether different groupings will address different aspects of the research question.

Location and distance of relative concepts within a cluster are identified. Concepts that are located close to each other means that they have a stronger association. For example, in Figure 3.1 the main concept is “brands,” which is strongly associated with boycotts, friends and Muslims. Themes are named via the strongest concept within the theme and ranked accordingly to indicate the connectivity between them.

Leximancer has been increasingly used as an analytical tool in qualitative research (Beven, 2007) and in marketing (Dann, 2010). Leximancer analyses data through extracting concepts and develops clusters based on related concepts. The concepts were
used to derive the semantic network that is shown in Figures 3.1 and 3.2 (in the next section).

To analyse whether data saturation was reached, topical concept maps were developed after the final three individuals interviews for both the student and non-student groups. No new concepts or co-occurrence of concepts were found. The numbers of participants were sufficient in generating concept maps to meet the purpose of this study. To check the stability of the topical concept maps produced, the analyses of the data was repeated. The concepts and co-occurrence of concepts remained similar indicating stability.

In a Leximancer concept map, the size of the themes indicates what themes and concepts are more and less important for participants. Figure 3.1 shows some strong and weak concepts in the concept map based on the interviews with student participants. Three concepts that are shown in bigger elips are “boycott,” “brands,” “Chinese products.” It means those themes were mentioned most often by the participants and were considered to be the most important themes during the interview process. On the other hand, the less important themes in the interviewes are shown in smaller elips, such as “KFC” (the US food brands), “Malaysian products” and “unfair to Muslims.” Figure 3.2 shows slight differences in themes for non-students. For non-student participants, the strong concepts are: “buy Indonesian products,” and “foreign brands.” However, “halal” and “Muslims” are among some of the less important concepts for non-student participants. The difference indicates that student participants have stronger motivations toward boycotting, especially Chinese food brands, compared to non-student participants. Non-student participants have a specific reason that strongly
makes them boycott foreign products such as their tendency to buy Indonesian local products. On the other hand, there are more reasons for student participants to boycott foreign products.

### 3.4 FINDINGS

#### 3.4.1 General themes of the interviews

It is worth noting that in terms of the foreign brands in this study, according to the participants, foreign products did not necessarily mean western products such as US brands. In the present study, foreign brands referred to all brands that had been developed in or originated from countries other than Indonesia. KFC, for example, is considered a foreign product/brand even though outlets branches is mostly owned or managed by Indonesians.

The measure of connectivity (i.e. proportion of words that were mentioned by respondents), portrayed in Table 3.5, provides an estimation of what concepts were perceived as more or less important during the interview process, comparing the student and non-student groups. The connectivity score in Table 3.5 indicates the relative importance of the themes in the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Non-Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5. Leximancer Theme Results based on Frequency of mentions
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign products</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Buy Indonesian local products</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott Chinese products</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Foreign products</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian People</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Boycott the US products</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad to Indonesia</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Indonesian People</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Sure about Halal</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Boycott Chinese products</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Boycott KFC</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student and non-student participants have some similarities and differences in terms of some concepts. In general, Table 3.5 illustrates that:

1. Non-student participants have a strong sentiment toward the US (81% connectivity) while student participants focused more on Malaysian people (34% connectivity).
2. Non-student participants focused on the “halalness” of foreign brands (48% connectivity) while student participants are not really concerned about this aspect (no connectivity score).
3. Influence of friends (peer pressure) is an important motivation for both student (14% connectivity) and non-student (44% connectivity) participants in boycotting foreign products. The connectivity percentages for peer pressure are stronger for non-students compared to students.
4. Student participants are more enthusiastic in talking about their participation in boycotting Chinese products compared to non-student participants. The
connectivity score for concept of “boycott Chinese products” was almost 50% for student participants while it was not even 20% for non-student participants.

5. Interestingly, the concept of being “Muslims” was not too relevant for either student or non-student participants. The connectivity score for this concept was very low, only 3% for the student sample compared to other concepts.

In general, the results of the interviews indicate that student and non-student participants have different boycotting behaviour. Student participants tend to boycott more foreign products in general compared to non-student participants. The motivation to boycott for student participants was more related to peer pressure (influence of friends) and animosity (such as unfavourable feeling toward Malaysian people). On the other hand, the motivation to boycott for non-student participants was mainly because of ethnocentrism (i.e. they want to buy local Indonesian products) and uncertainty about the “halalness” of foreign products.

3.4.2 Differences and similarities between students and non-students

Leximancer software also provides a ranked list of each category and their prominence scores (similar to relative probabilities) in evaluating which concepts are important for students and non-students. Both Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2 highlight different aspects that are important for each category within the concept of boycotting foreign products. Table 3.6 shows groups of words (concepts) that are closely associated with the word “boycott.” The higher the prominence scores, the more important the concepts are. For example, KFC is the most important concept related to boycotting for both student (2.5) and non-student (2.3) participants. However, in relation to boycotting, the Muslims
Concept was more important for non-student participants (1.6) compared to student participants (0.8).

Table 3.6 Ranking of Category Concepts via Prominence scores

(Category: Boycott for student and non-student groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Prom. Scores</th>
<th>Non-Students</th>
<th>Prom. Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFC</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>KFC</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian people</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>The US</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Muslim people</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Chinese products</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese products</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Muslim country</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim people</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Indonesian people</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian people</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 shows some differences between student and non-student participants in regard to their boycotting behaviour. For example, the concept of “boycott” has a strong link to “Malaysian products” in the student groups, but not for the non-student sample.

Figures 3.1 and 3.2 show a comparison of topical maps between students and non-students. It was found that the students emphasize the concepts of “Malaysian” and “Chinese products” as well as ” Indonesian (local) people”. “Malaysian” and “Chinese products” are two most boycotted country of origin by students. This was because they want to save local brands that were owned by Indonesian (local) people. Figure 3.1 shows that “Indonesian (local) people” are closely positioned to “foreign country” indicating student interviewees want to save their Indonesian (local) people from the (bad) influence of foreign countries. This result may suggest that the student sample has higher consumer ethnocentrism than the non-student sample.

Figure 3.1. Leximancer Topical Map for Student Subjects
Figure 3.2. Leximancer Topical Maps for Non-Students Subjects
The non-student sample places a stronger emphasis on “boycott”, “US products” and the concept of “Halal”. The concept of boycotting has a strong link with “US products” for the non-student sample. The non-student sample also emphasized the importance of “Halalness” for them. This may indicate that uncertainty about the “Halalness” of foreign brands will strongly influence the decision to boycott foreign brands by some Muslims groups (Grocer, 2007). This may also indicate that they somewhat distrust foreign brands because of the halal validity issue.

Overall, the prominence scores (refer to Table 3.6) and topical maps (refer to Figures 3.1 and 3.2) show what brands were boycotted the most by student and non-student participants and their motivations behind the boycotts. The higher prominence scores indicate stronger motivations to boycott those foreign products. For example, the student sample emphasizes non-religious reasons (“save local Indonesian products”) as their reason to boycott Malaysian and Chinese products. On the other hand, for the non-student sample, some religious reasons, for example, their sympathy to the other Muslims and the importance of “halal” influenced them in boycotting US food brands and other US brands. One key similarity between the student and non-student interviewees was that both groups regard “boycotting foreign products” and “influence of their friends” as important concepts.

### 3.4.3. Peer Pressure as the Strongest Reason to Boycott Foreign Products

Twenty five participants reflected on one belief, that participating in a boycott can help them gain group acceptance. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 indicate that “people” and “friends” are important concepts for both the students and non-students groups. This finding is in line with previous studies which have identified Muslims as a collective society (Al
Hyari et al., 2012; Games, Soutar, & Sneddon, 2013). Further, participants in the present study do not wish to buy products that were boycotted by their friends. They believe that they would have to behave in a manner similar to other people in the group, if they want to be accepted by the group.

The participants see “friends” as an important concept that is related to their concept of boycotts. The closeness of the “friends” and “boycott” concepts (see Figures 3.1 and 3.2) indicates that pressure from friends is one of the most influential factors that motivates participants to boycott foreign products and brands. Previous researchers have discovered that peer influence has a significant effect on the formation of behaviour for some people (Estrada & Vargas-Estrada, 2013; Salvy, 2012; Yi-Hsiu & Chen-Yueh, 2012). Other research found that Muslims tend to socialize more among similarly religiously motivated individuals (Muhamad & Mizerski, 2007). Therefore, their Muslims friends may have an influence on their decision to boycott, including what products and brands should be boycotted.

Group or social acceptance is a critical issue for Muslim communities (Al Hyari et al., 2012). Some of the interviewees admitted that they love to be communal and tend to follow their friends’ suggestions. Likewise, 28 out of the 36 participants admitted that they always try to follow their friends’ suggestions. Interestingly, one participant (female, 23 years old) mentioned that she bought KFC sometimes when she was alone but never bought it when she was with her friends because they boycott KFC. She admitted that she would feel ashamed if her friends knew that she had bought the US brand. The pressure from peers is critical in their decision to boycott.

However, it was found that KFC is less likely to be boycotted compared to Malaysian and Chinese products. Some participants admitted that they do not really “hate” the US.
Some participants boycotted the US products because their close friends boycotted those products. Most participants explained that they did not want to argue with their friends, especially in respect to religious reasons for a boycott. Jena, a female student (19 years old) described her opinion as follows:

Most of my friends boycott American brands. They say that they do it to help other Muslims. They do it for Islam. Although I am not really sure of the effectiveness of boycotts, I do not want to argue with them. I do not want them to see me as someone who does not care about other Muslims. Therefore, I decide to follow their actions in boycotting American brands.

It shows that in-group influence is an important element in deciding whether or not to boycott foreign brands. Jena acknowledged that she wanted to be accepted by her group. To achieve this she wanted to behave in a manner similar to that of the other group members. She followed her friends’ suggestions. Peer pressure is, therefore, a strong reason for her to boycott US products.

3.4.4. Animosity

3.4.4.1 Animosity toward a neighbour country

Indonesia and Malaysia are two of the closest neighbours in Southeast Asia and share many similarities. People from both countries share similar languages and cultures. They understand each other’s spoken language although they have slightly different accents. Both Indonesia and Malaysia are also Muslim countries. Surprisingly, those similarities do not inhibit some Indonesian participants, who are also Muslims, from boycotting Malaysian products.
Figure 3.1 shows that Malaysian products were boycotted the most by the student participants. This is mainly because these participants have some ‘anger’ toward some groups of Malaysian people. Caca (female, 18 years old, a student) mentioned that:

*Indonesia and Malaysia have a ‘love and hate relationship’. Both countries need each other, but they are also in direct competition.*

Most student participants showed anger toward Malaysian people because of secular and less ideological reasons that may be categorised as ‘people’ animosity; indicated by the participants’ dislike of the behaviour of the ‘people’. This is in line with a study by Shimp et al. (2004) who found that regional intra-national animosities that “southerners” and “northerners” could produce some anger toward each other. Most of the student participants (14 out of 18 people) also think that Indonesia can do better than Malaysia.

### 3.3.4.2 Religious Animosity

According to Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007), customer’s anger toward some countries (animosity) leads to the refusal to buy products from those countries. In the present study, KFC (a well-known US brand) was boycotted by 14 out of 18 non-student participants. They were found to boycott KFC because of their “sympathy to other Muslims” (as can be seen in Figure 3.2). These participants appeared to be influenced by their identity as Muslims when participating in boycotts. Figure 3.2 shows that non-student participants strongly evaluated some religious issues surrounding Muslims, such as “uncertainty of the halalness of the products” and “helping other Muslims” a closer concept when boycotting foreign products compared to the student participants.
Nila (female, 20 years old), admitted that she boycotted American brands such as KFC because she wanted to show her anger to the US. She assumed that by doing this, she would help other Muslim countries. Nila also said that she did not really care whether the boycott would be effective or not. She simply thought that she had to participate in the boycott as a Muslim. She also acknowledged that the fact that her friends also boycotted some US brands made her feel more committed to the boycott.

Some non-student participants explained that the US had a long history of supporting Israel. In this case, they assumed that some American brands such as KFC and McDonalds would have supported Israel financially. They considered that an easy way of demonstrating their displeasure with boycotting Israeli brands and by boycotting the brands of Israel’s friends such as America. They presumed this action was easier but powerful compared to, for example, if they personally had to make a donation to Palestine.

3.3.4.3. Product Animosity

The present study found that Chinese brands were boycotted by 26 out of 36 participants. The participants also perceived Chinese products to be low quality products. Based on Figure 3.1, student participants reported they had boycotted brands and products from China. Previous studies found that Indonesian people have a high level of animosity toward China. This is consistent with a previous study by Sutikno and Cheng (2011) which found Indonesian consumers have some high levels of animosity toward some foreign countries such as the US, Malaysia and China.
Participants in this study claimed that they boycott Chinese products because it may reduce their image and prestige within their community. Participants do not want their friends to see them using this kind of product because their friends’ opinions are really important to them.

Nana (Female, student, 19 years old) expressed her opinion that:

If I have to choose between Chinese products and some brands such as BlackBerry and IPhone, I will choose the non-Chinese products. They have better quality. I will be proud of being the owner of a BlackBerry or IPhone, but I will not feel the same way if I buy Chinese products. If I have Chinese products, I will hide them. I wouldn’t want my friends to know about them.

Consumer ethnocentrism was found to have a strong link to the rejection (Sandıkçı & Ekici, 2009) and boycotting of foreign brands (Tabassi et al., 2012). This may explain the interview results in the present study. Highly ethnocentric people see purchasing foreign made products as wrong and unpatriotic as well as hindering the growth of the local economy (Shimp & Sharma, 1987). Figure 3.2 shows that the concept of ‘buy Indonesian local products’ has a very close position to the concept of “Chinese products” which means that both concepts have a strong relationship. Interviewees were found to boycott Chinese products mainly as a way to save their local economy. Consumer ethnocentrism may have some influence on the level of animosity of participants toward Chinese products. Therefore, the concept of “buying Indonesian local products” is one of the most important concepts for the interviewees that may have links to some earlier studies about consumer ethnocentrism.

3.4.5 Halal Uncertainty

As seen in Figure 3.1, the concept of “halal” provided additional evidence of the importance of religious concepts in regard to the participants’ motivation to boycott. In
Islam, food that is allowed to be consumed is labelled as Halal and Muslims who adhere to their religion will tend to consider the Halal factor as one of their main considerations when buying food (Lada et al., 2009). Here, religious factors were considered as important concepts for the interviewees in the non-student group. The “halalness” of products that come from non-Muslims countries and some rumours about foreign brands are among the reasons to boycott that were mentioned by participants. For example, Murad (male, 22 years old, an entrepreneur) said that:

*I don’t believe that non-Muslims people will seriously consider Halal is important like we do as a Muslim... I do not think they are able to produce “halal” products that follow the requirements in the Quran and Hadiths,... I do not believe brands from China are truly Halal.*

The other participants supported this. Most of the non-student participants have a strong concern to only buy brands that originate from Muslim countries because they can fully trust the “Halalness” of the brands, especially food. Some participants also said that they boycotted products from non-Muslim countries because they are not sure about the “Halalness” aspects of those products. They also mentioned that they feel betrayed regarding foreign brands such as Cadbury that has a halal logo but cannot maintain the halalness of their brands in Malaysia and Indonesia. This type of case increases respondents’ uncertainty about the halalness of foreign food brands. Twenty eight participants decide to boycott some foreign brands especially brands that are originate from non-Muslim countries such as China and the US.

### 3.4.6 Boycott Fatwa

Although concept of “boycott fatwa” cannot be seen in the Leximancer concept maps for both the student and non-student groups, the analysis of the transcripts shows that three out of thirty six participants had boycott KFC and some other US products because they followed a fatwa about boycotting foreign brands. One of the participant
said that American goods are forbidden because of the fatwa. The other two participants said that they were helping Palestinian people by boycotting brands and products from the US because they were following a fatwa by Qaradawi, an Ulama from Egypt.

3.5 DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS IN RELATION TO THE LARGER STUDY

3.5.1 Theoretical Implications

Non-religious reasons are neglected concepts within the broader literature about Muslim customers’ boycotts. Many studies (Farah, 2011; Gulf News, 2000; Halevi, 2012; Jensen, 2008) seem to put a heavy emphasis on religious reasons for boycotts. Their decisions to buy or boycott some brands are important for marketers. This study has discussed Muslim consumers’ boycotting experience and their motivations to boycott foreign products.

The first theoretical contribution of this paper is identifying concepts surrounding boycotts for Muslims customers. While most theories about Muslim boycotts discuss the influence of religious factors, the present study captures the idea that Muslims may have different motivations to boycott foreign products beyond religious reasons. Therefore, marketers cannot overgeneralise the boycott reasons in Muslim customers boycott of foreign brands based on religious motivations.

There are three brands/products that were boycotted by participants in this study namely: US food brands, Chinese and Malaysian products. This framework is based on the data from interviews and focus groups that was analysed using Leximancer. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 show that participants boycotted some foreign brands because of the
perceived behaviour of a country’s people. For example, some student interviewees do not like Malaysian people; therefore they want to boycott Malaysian products although they are Muslims too. The other possibilities is that the interviewees boycott Chinese brands because they perceive Chinese products as being low quality products that can lower their prestige in front of their friends as well as potentially being unhealthy products. Besides that, religious reasons such as uncertainty about the halal validity of the products were also frequently mentioned by participants to boycott some US and Chinese brands. Thus, both religious and secular reasons need to be considered as possible reasons to boycott foreign brands.

This study confirms the finding of previous studies that peer pressure is an important factor in understanding boycotting behaviour in Muslims. Al Hyari et al. (2012) highlight the importance of the peer pressure concept in Muslim society. Muslim people prefer to act in a similar manner to their fellow Muslims. A Muslim tries to follow what other Muslims do. Participants acknowledged that this pressure is specifically related to their identity as a Muslim and acceptance by their social groups. For example, 7 out of 18 student participants said that they keep buying US food brands such as KFC when they are alone but they boycott KFC when they are with their friends. Participants admitted that acceptance by their friends is really important to them. Peer pressure made 30 out of 36 participants in this study boycott brands that were also boycotted by their friends.

Early studies have shown that halal is a highly important criteria in finding food for Muslim consumption (Abdul-Talib & Abd-Razak, 2013; Alam & Sayuti, 2011; Lada et al., 2009; Mukhtar & Butt, 2012; Wilson, 2011). The present study identified the notion
that uncertainty about “halal” can also lead to the boycotting of foreign brands. Participants admitted that some rumours or news related to non-Halal ingredients in some foreign products have made them decide to boycott some brands from the US and Chinese. They argued that they were not sure about the ‘halalness’ of food that came from non-Muslim countries. This is in line with previous studies that found Muslims prefer brands that come from other Muslim countries because of the ‘halalness’ of the brands (Alserhan, 2010). Thus, the present study found that participants have not fully trusted the halalness of brands/products that are originally from non-Muslim countries. This study extends previous findings about the effect of food halalness; it not only influences Muslim consumers’ decisions to buy certain products, it also influences their decision not to buy certain products, which in this case can be interpreted as boycotting.

3.5.2 Some Managerial Implications of the Qualitative Study

This study found that student and non-student samples may have different reasons for boycotting foreign brands. These differences require different strategies from marketers. Student participants, for example, regard animosity and peer pressure as their main reasons to boycott foreign brands. These participants appeared to have a high level of product animosity towards Malaysia and especially Chinese-made products. They also have a high level of ethnocentrism and consider boycotting foreign brands as a way to save their local Indonesian products. Marketers need to advise this group that their products also contribute to the Indonesian local economy. Recruiting local people and the helping local community may be helpful in increasing public sympathy which in return will reduce their anxiety about foreign brands. By doing so, this segment will not see foreign brands as the ‘enemy’.
The non-student participants who are more mature and have higher incomes also consider boycotting foreign products as an important concept. This group has a high level of ethnocentrism and prefers to buy local Indonesian products. However, for this group some religious concepts such as the ‘halalness’ of the products are also considered to be important. Failure to convince them regarding the halal factor will make them more likely to boycott foreign products. Marketers can overcome this problem by providing information about the halalness of their product regularly. It is important, especially for brands/products that originally come from non-Muslims countries, to keep the ‘trust’ of Muslim customers and to keep letting them know that the products are “still” and “always” will meet halal requirements.

3.6 SUMMARY

The main findings of the qualitative phase that will be basis of the quantitative phase of this study are:

- There are two most frequently mentioned brands that were boycotted by majority of the participants in this study: US food brands and Chinese food brands.
- 15 out of the 20 interviewees and 11 out of 16 focus group participants were found to boycotted Chinese food brands; most of them mentioned some products such as candy, cookies and noodles.
- 13 out of the 20 interviewees and 7 out of the 16 focus group discussion participants had boycotted US brands, and most of them mentioned KFC followed by McDonalds as examples of such brands.
The findings show that participants frequently mentioned the concepts of peer pressure, economic animosity and ethnocentrism during interviewees and focus group discussions.

Most of the participants have a strong commitment to saving their local brands and local Indonesian businesses (money).

Some participants dislike the fact that brands from foreign countries like the US and China are widely available in Indonesia. Participants also confidently mentioned that Indonesian local food brands are healthier and are better quality compared to foreign food brands.

Participants have a strong connection to other Muslim countries, which is also part of their reason to boycott foreign brands. The concept of “Muslims” appears in the concept map close to the concept of being Indonesian in the student concept map.

The concept of “friends” was frequently mentioned by sets of participants in regard to both Chinese and US food brands. The concept of “friends” has a very close connection to the concept of boycott in both samples.

The concept of “halal” was mentioned more in the non-student sample compared to the student sample.

The quality and the healthy aspect of foreign brands are other points that most of the participants considered to be a reason to boycott.

The student and non-student participants boycotted slightly different brands. Student participants were found to mostly boycott Malaysian and Chinese brands while non-students participants mostly boycotted US food brands and Chinese brands but not Malaysian brands. Another interesting finding is that Chinese products, rather than the
US brands, were considered by most participants to be at the top of the list of products to be boycotted.

Related to boycott reasons, cultural and societal aspects were found to have some effect on student participants’ boycott decisions to boycott products. Animosity toward people, country and product is the main reason for the student group to boycott Chinese and Malaysian products. In contrast, for non-student participants, following Islam has more of an effect on their decision to boycott. Non-student participants were more concerned with some issues regarding uncertainty about halal products as well as having sympathy for other Muslim countries. Non-students were also more health conscious in boycotting foreign products and brands.

Ethnocentrism along with peer pressures were found to be important reasons to boycott for both the student and non-student groups. Friends had some effect on both groups’ decision to boycott. Their strong efforts to buy and save local “Indonesian” products made them boycott foreign brands and products. Participants were aware that their local brands cannot compete with foreign products and brands, therefore boycotting foreign brands was believed to be the most effective way to save their local brands.
CHAPTER 4

DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES

4.0 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, it is proposed that there are some possible reasons for Muslim customers to boycott foreign brands. The hypotheses were constructed based on the findings of the preliminary qualitative study that are supported by previous studies. The reasons for Muslim consumers to boycott products were proposed from a number of perspectives. Two foreign brands were selected for this study, US food brands and Chinese food brands (for general food). These brands were selected based on the findings of the qualitative phase in this study as the participants also have different responses toward the boycotting of foreign brands. The proposed hypothesis was tested with a bigger sample (n=400), from the two groups, student (n=202) and non-student (n=198).

4.1 RELIGIOSITY AND CONSUMERS’ BOYCOTTS

Muslim boycotting activities may have a link to religiosity. For many Muslims, Islam is not only a religion but also an identity. Muslims may use their religiosity as a reason to participate in boycott. Muslim scholars also aggressively make religious calls for the boycotting of foreign brands (Al Qaradawi, 2007; Al Sistani, 2002; Khamenei, 2002) which may have some influence on their followers’ decision to boycott foreign brands. Findings from the chapter three also confirmed that being a Muslim has some effects on participants’ decisions to boycott foreign products and brands. The results of the Leximancer topical maps for both students (Figure 3.1) and non-students (Figure 3.2) have some important concepts which are related to the effects of following Islam and
being “Muslim”. This concept was particularly relevant for non-student participants in the interview and focus group discussions compared to the student participants.

Thus, religiosity may also have a significant impact on Muslim consumers’ boycotting of particular foreign brands. Intrinsically motivated followers that see their religion as a central motivation in their lives would be expected to have a higher possibility of supporting a boycott of foreign brands. Therefore, it was proposed that:

**Hypothesis 1**: The respondent’s religiosity will have a positive effect on their reported boycott of foreign brands.

4.2 BOYCOTT FATWA AND MUSLIM CONSUMERS’ BOYCOTT

Knudsen et al. (2008) highlight some possible strategies to spread the call for a boycott such as strengthening awareness of boycotting activities by encouraging religious leaders to issue a fatwa that prohibits Muslim customers from consuming some brands. Nowadays, Muslims around the world have a quick access to a fatwa although may have been issued in another part of the world. The internet even if the fatwa is issued in another part of the world by “googling fatwa” (Hosen 2008). The findings of the qualitative study also established that some participants, particularly the non-student group, were found to mostly boycott US brands and to be concerned about Muslims situation especially in the Middle East.

Boycott fatwas can be seen as another method of protecting Muslim beliefs (Halevi, 2012). Some participants in the qualitative study explained that they follow fatwas from ulamas to boycott some foreign brands. Farah and Newman (2010) found that most
Muslim respondents participate in boycotts in order to apply their religious values by following the boycott fatwa. Therefore, it was proposed that:

**Hypothesis 2:** The respondent’s awareness of a boycott fatwa will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands

### 4.3 Halal Products and Muslim Consumers’ Boycott

Muslims have different ways of making judgments about Halal labels on brands that are available in a marketplace (Bonne & Verbeke, 2008). According to Bonne and Verbeke (2008), Muslims can be divided into a number of groups that are different in the way they trust sources of information related to halal meat products. A study found that Halal meat in the supermarket, for example, will not be viewed as valid by some religious Muslims (Bonne & Verbeke, 2008). Therefore, some groups of Muslim people who are unsure about a food product’s ingredients may choose not to buy the products. The concept of “halal” was also found in the qualitative study (Chapter 3), particularly in the non-student topical maps (Figure 3.2) to be a reason to boycott foreign brands and products. Based on the frequency with which it was mentioned interview process, the connectivity score for this concept was 48% which means this concept was mentioned quite often and was important for non-student participants regarding their decision to boycott foreign products and brands. This could be one of the reasons for boycotting some products from foreign countries.

Muslims may have different perceptions related to Halal certification that was ruled in non-Muslim countries. Those who are intrinsic may differ to those who are extrinsic. As described by Allport and Ross (1967), intrinsically religious people will use their
religion as the central motive in their activities. They will avoid products from foreign countries if they are not sure about the Halal validity. Therefore, the Muslim consumers’ uncertainty about the validity of a Halal certificate will lead to the decision to boycott particular foreign products. If Muslims trust the validity of a Halal certificate on foreign brands, they tend to have less intention to boycott it. Therefore, it was proposed that:

**Hypothesis 3:** The respondents’ uncertainty of the validity of the Halal approval for a brand will have a positive effect in the respondents’ reported boycotting of foreign brands.

### 4.4 PEER PRESSURE AND MUSLIM CONSUMERS’ BOYCOTTING BEHAVIOUR

A study found that people join a boycott to avoid a guilty feeling of buying products that boycotted by their friends (Braunsberger & Buckler, 2011). The boycott participants want to show others that they are a moral person because they have boycotted some companies that have a bad image in society (Braunsberger & Buckler, 2011). Muslim followers have collectivism characteristics. Al Hyari et al. (2012) found that Muslim people want to act in a similar manner with their fellow Muslims. They will try to follow what other Muslims do. For example, Arabic Muslims reported that they boycotted Danish brands when they saw other Muslims in their home country do that, but most of them do not boycott the brands when they are alone in other countries (Al Hyari et al., 2012).

This study also captured the importance of peer pressure in terms of boycotting foreign brand, Muslims have a tendency to show that they have the same feelings as other
Muslims and they tend to follow suggestions from their family and friends (Alam et al. 2011). These studies are in line with studies by Sen et al. (2001) and Klein, John and Smith (2001) that elucidated the importance of peer pressure in the boycott context.

A study from Al Hyari et al. (2012) found some evidence from Middle Eastern samples that they boycotted Danish brands following the publication of caricatures of the Prophet Muhammad in a Danish newspaper because they just wanted to be part of Muslim boycott campaign. Approval of reference groups are important for consumers, particularly for those who want to gain some recognition from their in-group (Arkin et al., 1986). These studies have confirmed the importance of peer pressure in Muslim consumer’s boycotting activities.

The findings of the qualitative study confirmed findings of previous researches that peer pressure is one of the main reasons for boycotting foreign brands. “Friends” was one of the most frequently mentioned words for both the student and non-student participants (refer to Table 3.5). “Friends” is also the closest concept to “boycott” for both student and non-student participants as can be seen in the Leximancer conceptual maps (Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2). Peer pressure is a critical issue for Muslim communities (Al Hyari et al., 2012). Some of the interviewees admitted that they love to be communal and tend to follow their friends’ suggestions. Likewise, 28 out of 36 participants admitted that they always try to follow their friends’ suggestions. Therefore, it was proposed that:

**Hypothesis 4:** The respondents’ experiences of peer pressure about foreign brands will have a positive effect on the respondents’ reported boycotting of foreign brands.
4.5 ANIMOSITY AND MUSLIM CONSUMERS’ BOYCOTTING BEHAVIOUR

Other studies have also indicated the urgency of evaluating the link between “animosity” and boycott and its uniqueness in different societies. For instance, Farah and Newman (2010) focused on Arab customers’ boycotting of American products. Smith and Li (2010) focused on animosity to explain customer boycotts in trade between China and Japan. Previous research also found that anger caused by consumers maintaining their social acceptance in a community can also lead to customer boycotts (Brewer & Brown, 1998).

Animosity may also have some effects on Muslims’ boycotting behaviour. Blaydes and Linzer (2012) emphasize the rise of the anti-American movement in the Islamic world because some Muslim groups believe that America is a good friend of Israel (since World War II). Al Hyari et al. (2012) emphasize that there is a strong relationship between religiosity and customers’ decisions to boycott international brands. Ajami (2003) suggests that some Islamic extremists blame America for many domestic and international problems in Muslim countries. Many other issues such as the invasion of Iraq in 2003 have made the situation even worse (Chiozza, 2007).

The findings of the qualitative study show that participants in the interviews and focus group discussions boycotted some foreign products and brands because of animosity. For example, participants in the qualitative study have religious animosity (toward the US), product animosity (toward Malaysia and China) and people animosity (toward Malaysia). Therefore, it was proposed that:
Hypothesis 5: The respondents’ animosity toward the country of origin of a foreign brand will have a positive effect on the respondents’ boycotting of foreign brands.

4.6 HEALTH CONSCIOUSNESS AND MUSLIM CONSUMERS’ BOYCOTTING BEHAVIOUR

Many Muslims are very concerned about health issues. People with high levels of health consciousness tend to have a healthier lifestyle (Gould, 1990; Jayanti & Burns, 1998). As suggested by Gil, Gracia, and Sanchez (2000), a healthy lifestyle can be signified by implementing physical health-related activities like natural food consumption, health care, and getting their life in a healthier equilibrium. A study of some adolescents in the UK show that Muslim male adolescents have less healthy eating behaviours compared to female adolescents (Ahmad, Waller, & Verduyn, 1994). This may be because boys are treated as being more important compared to girls in Muslim families. Boys should be ready to be future leaders of their families while girls should be ready to be mothers and wives and should be more concerned about how to cook and take care their families.

Health consciousness may lead to several possible customer responses. Health conscious customers may react negatively to products that are not supporting their healthy lifestyle. They may also react negatively to products that are suspiciously unsafe and bad for their health even if the products are cheaper than other products in the market. Studies also describe the importance of product safety for customers in their buying decisions which can be related to the country of origin of foreign brands (Becker, Benner, & Glitsch, 2000; Ching, 1999). Thus, customers may boycott products
from foreign countries that they believe are not healthy, hygienic or unsafe for them. Findings from the qualitative phase of the study also confirmed this. Some non-student participants were found to boycott foreign brands that they perceived to be unhealthy.

For example, one non-student participant (Yayan, civil servant) said that:

*I started to boycott KFC because I read that they do unethical things to animal particularly chickens. They just want to get as much profit as they can. They gave hormonal medicine for example, to boost their chickens to grow faster than normal. That makes the chicken also unhealthy to be eaten. I really care about health issues therefore I never want to buy the chicken in KFC since I am aware about this issue. Another thing is they also deep fry the chicken and the chips. KFC offers unhealthy foods. I do not want to buy them.*

Health consciousness may also have a link to Muslims boycotting products. For example, Islam has a concept of *Halalan toyyiba* regarding food consumption. This means that the food should be Halal and also *toyyib* (good for health or body) (Kamaruddin et al., 2012). Furthermore, Bonne and Verbeke (2008) describe a group of Muslim customers that see hygiene and quality of food products as the most important factors in deciding to buy food products. Therefore, it was proposed that:

**Hypothesis 6:** the respondents’ level of health consciousness will have a positive effect on their respondents’ boycotting of foreign brands.

**4.7 ETHNOCENTRISM AND MUSLIM CONSUMERS’ BOYCOTTING BEHAVIOUR**

Ethnocentrism studies can provide some important insights regarding the level of people's acceptance of foreign cultures (Machida, 2012). One of the primary concerns of marketers is whether the "foreignness" of a product will make it less preferable to consumers in different countries (Schooler, 1965). According to Shimp and Sharma (1987), the consumer ethnocentrism concept can explain why consumers persistently
prefer domestic brands over foreign brands even if the latter are cheaper and/or of better quality. Here foreign cultures may be seen as a threat to their local identity. This view may lead to a decision by customers to boycott foreign brands.

Steenkamp et al. (2003) explain that groups of customers that have higher levels of ethnocentrism do not like to purchase global brands based on a study of Korean and American customers. Rice and Wongtada (2007) describe that consumers who are categorized as having a high ethnocentrism level tend to prefer their local brands. Haque, Rahman, and Haque (2011) describe that younger generation of Muslims in Malaysia have a high level of ethnocentrism that makes them avoid buying foreign products and prefer buying their national brands.

The findings of the qualitative study show that participants mentioned their concern about Indonesian local products (100 % connectivity score for non-student participants) as can be seen in Table 3.5. Most participants were also concerned about “Indonesian people” and their local Indonesian economy and culture. The participants believe that boycotting foreign brands is their way of saving local Indonesian products.

In a larger sample, consumer ethnocentrism could possibly have a link with the religiosity of Muslims. Individuals in one religion argue that values of their religion are best and values related to the others’ religions will be rejected (Sterkens & Anthony, 2008). For some Muslims, foreign brands may infer different values that can challenge their local values. Consumer ethnocentrism may have a link to Muslims’ decisions to boycott foreign brands.

Therefore, it was proposed that:
Hypothesis 7: The respondents’ level of ethnocentrism will have a positive effect on the respondents’ boycotting of foreign brands.

4.8 MEDIATING EFFECTS OF RELIGIOSITY

The present study also wanted to explore the possible role of religiosity as a mediator and a moderator. Some previous research sees that the role of religiosity is to mediate the link between stress and depression (Kirchner & Patino 2010; Reutter 2012). Reutter (2012) suggests that future researchers can consider religiosity as a mediator which can enrich understanding about the role of religiosity as empirical attempts to explore the moderation and/or mediation of religiosity/spirituality remain limited. This is in line with Frazier, Tix, and Baron’s (2004) suggestion that a particular research domain becomes empirically "mature" when moderation/mediation analyses are used to explain and/or describe the correlational relationship between any given variables.

4.9 MODERATING EFFECTS OF RELIGIOSITY

Studies on marketing and psychology have recognised the role of religiosity in many aspects of individual personality and behaviour. For example, from a marketing perspective, religiosity can have some effects on consumer values (Lindridge, 2005), individual personality types, product choices (LaBarbera, 1987), and many others (Hirschman, 1983, De Jong, Faulkener & Warland, 1976). From a psychology perspective, religiosity is found to be negatively related to sexiness (Weeden et al., 2008) and positively related to personal values (Saroglou et al., 2004) and well-being (Shams, 1993). It also affects ethical attitudes such as student cheating (Allmon et al.,
2000), environmentalism (Wolkomir et al., 1997), marital outcome (Sullivan, 2001), and many others (Miesing & Preble, 1985).

Research also found the moderating effects of religiosity in helping Muslims to cope with some secular issues in their everyday lives. Religiosity has been found to moderate the ability of individuals to better responded to some elements in their lives such as happiness and health (Abdel-Khalek, 2007). Some evidence shows that religiosity moderates relationships between job stress and outcomes (Jamal & Badawi, 1993), stressful life events and delinquent behaviour (Johnson & Morris, 2008), the psychological impact on Muslims as the result of some difficult time in their lives such as unemployment (Shams, 1993), chronic health problems and psychological well-being (Momtaz et al., 2009) and many other issues related to “Muslims’ problems” and how they deal with their problems.

In brief, based on the review of the general boycott and Muslim consumers’ boycott literature (Chapter 2) and the findings of the qualitative phase of this study it was expected that:

a) The respondent’s religiosity will have a mediating or moderating effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands (Hypothesis 1).

b) The respondent’s awareness of boycott fatwas will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands (Hypothesis 2).

c) The respondents’ uncertainty of the validity of the Halal approval for a brand will have a positive effect on their respondents’ reported boycotting of foreign brands (Hypothesis 3).
d) The respondents’ experiences of peer pressure towards foreign brand will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands (Hypothesis 4).

e) The respondents’ animosity toward the country of origin of a foreign brand will have a positive effect on their boycotting of foreign brands (Hypothesis 5).

f) The respondents’ level of health consciousness will have a positive effect on their boycotting of foreign brands (Hypothesis 6).

g) The respondents’ level of ethnocentrism will have a positive effect on their boycott of foreign brands (Hypothesis 7).

4.10 PROPOSED RESEARCH MODELS

Based on existing literatures there are two possible alternative models that need to be tested. Research Model One (see Figure 4.1) shows respondents’ religiosity is an independent variable that has the same direct effect as the other possible independent variables; respondents’ animosity toward foreign products, respondents’ perceived halal validity of foreign brands, respondents’ health consciousness, respondents’ ethnocentrism and respondents’ awareness of boycott fatwas that lead to reported boycotting of foreign brands. Also, religiosity mediates the other antecedents in reported boycott of foreign brands. Research Models Two and Three (see figure 4.2 and 4.3) show that respondents’ religiosity mediates and moderates the effects of five variables: respondents’ animosity toward foreign products, respondents’ perceived halal validity of foreign brands, respondents’ health consciousness, respondents’ ethnocentrism and respondents’ awareness of boycott fatwas in reported boycotting of foreign brands.
Figure 4.1 Religiosity’s direct effects as one of seven antecedents to reported boycotts of foreign brands

Figure 4.2 Possibility of religiosity mediates other antecedents in its effect in reported boycotts of foreign brands
Figure 4.3 Possibility of religiosity moderating other antecedents in its effect in reported boycotts of foreign brands
CHAPTER 5

QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.0 INTRODUCTION

As was noted earlier, this study employed both quantitative and qualitative methodologies as advocated by many researchers in the social sciences (Jick, 1979; Näslund, 2002; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). Both methods complement each other. For example, qualitative data can help to explore and develop more in-depth explanations about underlying phenomena, while quantitative data can help to composite the facts and discovered relationships that usually cannot be generalised in qualitative data (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005).

The objective of quantitative phase in this study was to quantify the qualitative findings that were discussed earlier in Chapter 3. The result of the interview and focus group discussions were explained earlier in this thesis. The quantitative approach in this study addressed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: a) The respondent’s religiosity will have a positive effect on their reported boycott of foreign brands

b) The respondents’ religiosity will mediate the effect of independent and dependent variables of Muslim consumers’ boycotting of foreign brands.

c) Religiosity will moderate the effect of independent and dependent variables of Muslim consumers’ boycotting of foreign brands.
**Hypothesis 2:** The respondent’s familiarity with fatwas about boycott will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese brands, for the student and non-student samples.

**Hypothesis 3:** The respondents’ uncertainty of the halal validity of a brand will have a positive effect on the respondents’ reported boycotting of foreign brands. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese brands, for student and non-student samples.

**Hypothesis 4:** The respondents’ experiences of peer pressure in regard to foreign brands will have a positive effect on the respondents’ reported boycotting of foreign brands. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese brands, for the student and non-student samples.

**Hypothesis 5:** The respondents’ animosity toward the country of origin of a foreign brand will have a positive effect on their boycotting of foreign brands. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese brands, for the student and non-student samples.

**Hypothesis 6:** The respondents’ level of health consciousness will have a positive effect on their boycotting of foreign brands. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese brands, for the student and non-student samples.

**Hypothesis 7:** The respondents’ level of ethnocentrism will have a positive effect on their boycotting of foreign brands. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese brands, for the student and non-student samples.
The hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 will be tested on the US food brands and Chinese food brands for both the student and non-student samples. One of the main objectives of this study was to test the effect of religiosity in reported boycotting of foreign brands. The direct, mediating and moderating effects of religiosity were decided based on the result of hypothesis one (a, b and c). The testing of hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 was also modified based on the finding in hypothesis one.

5.1 CONSTRUCT MEASUREMENT

Based on the literature review, exploratory research, the conceptual models and some respondents’ feedback in the pilot study, a five-page questionnaire as subsequently developed (Appendix A). Scales developed in prior research were used to measure the constructs in this study. This study measured religious and non-religious reasons for boycotting foreign brands. For convenience, the possible models are shown diagrammatically after the literature review chapter. The model that shows the best fit with data is explained in Chapter Six.

The present study discusses some possible reasons for Indonesian Muslim consumers to boycott foreign brands. In the qualitative phase of this study, participants boycotted foreign brands for religious and some secular reasons. The results showed that there were reasons beyond religiosity which may influence Muslims’ boycotting behaviour. Therefore, in this quantitative phase of the research, some possible reasons for Muslim consumers to boycott foreign brands will be further investigated based on the findings of the qualitative phase. The possible reasons that will be discussed in this phase were
religiosity, awareness of boycott fatwas and perceived halal validity of foreign brands, ethnocentrism, animosity, health consciousness and experiencing of peer pressure.

5.1.1 Religiosity

There has been some debate relating to how to measure the religiosity aspect. The Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) has been selected for this study. The scale has been used in many studies and has proved to be a reliable measure of religiosity (Donahue, 1985). There were extrinsic and intrinsic items to measure how respondents see their religion.

Some earlier studies found that religiosity is an important determinant for boycotting foreign brands for Muslim consumers (Ahmed et al., 2013; Tabassi et al., 2012). Perhaps, this is also the case for the Indonesian context. The findings of the qualitative phase of this study show that participants mentioned some aspects of religion during the interviews and focus group discussions. For example, participants made the following comments:

- *Life is too short. I try hard to carry my religion into all aspects in my life. I consider “what is my religion said” when I want to buy anything* (Roby, non-student).
- *I can feel the presence of Allah (God), watching me, I have to help my fellow Muslims, for example I can help my brother and sister Muslims in Palestine by boycotting KFC, the American brands*” (Lina, housewife)

These comments show that religious factors have positive effects on participants’ decision-making processes. Statements by the participants in the qualitative phase of the study indicating that they consider the presence of Allah (God) as well as Islamic religious teachings as their guideline in decision making were in line with previous
studies. For example, Muslims have strong intentions to buy products based on the halalness of the products because they want to follow the guidelines of their religion (Kamaruddin et al., 2012; Lada et al., 2009; Mukhtar & Butt, 2012). Evidence shows that religiosity is also the reason many Muslims to boycott foreign brands in the Middle East (Abosag, 2010; Farah, 2011; Gulf News, 2000; Halevi, 2012) and other Muslim countries (Abd Razak & Abdul-Talib, 2012; Al Hyari et al., 2012).

The findings in the qualitative phase of the study were also used in deciding which construct would be used in the final version of the quantitative survey. These religious issues, such as the concept of “Muslims” and “Muslims’ friends”, were also captured in the concept map of the qualitative phase of the study (Figure 5.1). Being Muslims, and feeling part of an in-group with other Muslims were captured in Figure 5.1 as elements that were important for both the student and non-student groups. This confirms that religiosity should be included as one of the constructs in investigating the reasons Muslim consumers boycott foreign brands.
To measure religiosity of the respondents, this study will use the scale of religiosity that was developed by Allport and Ross (1967) and modified to create an Islamic version by Muhamad (2008). The calculation process followed guidelines set out in Essoo and Dibb (2004) to categorise respondents into intrinsic and extrinsic. As noted earlier, for those who are intrinsic, the score will be 1 and 2 and for those who are extrinsic the score will be 4 and 5.

Muhamad (2008) made some modifications to the scale to make it more relevant to Islamic perspectives. The original scale developed by Allport and Ross (1967) used some Christian terms, such as “Bible study group” because the sample was made up of Christians. Therefore, Muhamad (2008) modified this scale to be able to use it with a Muslim sample. For example, “Bible study group” in the original version of religiosity
was replaced with “Quranic study group” in the Islamic version, “God” with “Allah” and “Church” with “Masjid”.

Essoo and Dibb (2004) explain the calculation process for extrinsic and intrinsic items. 5 and 4 indicate extrinsicness while 1 and 2 indicate intrinsicness. The intrinsic items need to be reversed in the calculation process. It appears that an extrinsic respondent will agree with extrinsic statements and will tend to disagree with the intrinsic statements. In contrast, an intrinsic respondent will be more likely to agree with intrinsic items and disagree with extrinsic statements. Table 5.1 shows an example of a respondent’s answers for 11 religiosity items in the questionnaire. The table includes some explanations of how to calculate the score to categorise the respondent as an extrinsic or intrinsic individual based on Allport and Ross (1967), which was explained further in Essoo and Dibb (2004). Below is an example of one respondent that was categorised as extrinsic:
Table 5.1. Religiosity Construct and Calculation process of Extrinsic and Intrinsic items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let my religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration influence my everyday affairs (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mosque is the most important place to formulate good social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What religion offers me is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought and mediation (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard to carry my religion into all my other dealings in life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of Allah, the</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Being (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read literature about faith (I)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion is especially important to me because it answers many</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions about the meaning of my life (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score:</td>
<td>5 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 5 + 4 + 4 = 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score:</td>
<td>46 divided by 11 items = 4.2 (Extrinsic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on Esso and Dibb (2004) in the scale of 1 to 5, 1 and 2 indicate intrinsicness and 4 and 5 indicate extrinsicness while 3 express no opinion. For example, answering Agree (4) or Strongly Agree (5) to extrinsic items means someone is extrinsic. In contrast, in responding to intrinsic items, the people who are extrinsic were most likely to Disagree or Strongly Disagree. The score for intrinsic items needs to be reversed (SD=5, D=4, N=3, A=2, SA=1). Answering Disagree (score =4) for Intrinsic items show that someone was extrinsic.
5.1.2 Fatwa to Boycott Foreign Brands

The findings of the qualitative phase of this study show that participants mentioned their awareness regarding boycott fatwas influenced their decision in boycotting some foreign brands. As discussed earlier, in Islam, there are people who are considered knowledgeable in religious matters who usually specialize in Islamic law; they are called ulama. Ulama have right to declare some ruling about specific issues that are known as “fatwa”. The scope of fatwa declarations include a wide range of Muslims’ activities, such as economic, medical related matters, family issues and include fatwas to boycott products from particular countries (Hosen, 2008; Muhamad & Mizerski, 2010). For example, based on the transcripts of the interviews and focus group discussions, some participants mentioned that fatwas influence their opinion when evaluating foreign brands. Lina and Iing said:

- *I boycott American brands and Chinese brands. Those two countries are not friendly to Muslims... I am also not quite sure about how Halal they are. I am also aware that some ulama (Islamic scholars) ask us to boycott brands from the US...”* (Lina, non-student).

- *I do not want to buy brands from countries in which the money would be used to kill my fellow Muslims in Palestine. Many Ulama (Islamic scholars) such as Qaradawi have warned Muslim consumers, I know this from internet and my friends also told me about this* (Iing, student)

Those quotes show the respondents’ familiarity regarding fatwas to boycott foreign brands has a positive effect on their decision to boycott particular foreign brands. This qualitative finding was in line with earlier studies describe in the literature review chapter (Chapter 2). For example, previous studies found a strong effect of boycott fatwas was to strengthen the awareness of Muslim consumers to boycott foreign brands, particularly from the US (Halevi, 2012; Knudsen et al. 2008). Reported news and websites also claim that boycott fatwas are an important reason for Muslim consumers to boycott foreign brands. Therefore, although not many participants mentioned boycott
fatwas as their boycott reason in the qualitative phase of the study, this construct is still included in the survey as this concept is still regarded as an important concept in research about Muslim consumers’ boycotting behaviour.

Measuring the respondents’ awareness about boycott fatwas followed a measure used by Halevi (2012) that views marketplace fatwas as nonviolent actions by Muslim customers. The items used to measure boycott fatwa in the present study for US brands and Chinese brand include:

1. I am familiar with fatwas to boycott US brands.
2. I am familiar with fatwa from local ulama (Islamic scholars) to boycott US brands.
3. I am familiar with fatwas from well-known ulama to boycott US brands.
4. I am familiar with fatwas to boycott Chinese brands.
5. I am familiar with fatwas from local ulama to boycott Chinese brands.
6. I am familiar with fatwas from well-known ulama to boycott Chinese brands.

5.1.3 Uncertainty about Halal Validity

The findings of the qualitative phase of this study indicated that participants were rather uncertain about the “halalness” of some foreign brands that they boycotted. For example, based on some of the interviews and focus group discussions, participants frequently mentioned some of these following comments:

- *Foreign brands especially from non-Muslim countries made me worry whether they have been mixed with other unlawful Islamic ingredients* (Ong, NGO Activist)
• I don’t think meat products from non-Muslim countries were slaughtered in the right way. They are massive slaughtered, such as KFC. That is not the “Halal” way of preparing things (Yayan, civil servant).

• ... I boycott Puma because it is made of pig skin. I can see from the pattern of the shoes and it is obviously pig skin. It will be “haram” for me to wear that kind of shoes. If our foot were sweating and we were wearing this kind of shoes, it would be Haram.” (Robi, entrepreneur)

• I don’t believe products from China are Halal. I am afraid they are mixed with non halal ingredients in the making process and also too many additives. They are not Halal as well as not healthy. I am responsible for me and my family’s everyday food. I never buy anything from China for that reason (Nina, housewife)

These comments indicate that halal factor has some effect on participants’ decision making processes. Some of the participants were not sure about the halal validity of some foreign brands and products. This finding is in line with previous studies. As was explained in the literature review chapter, studies have shown that religiosity was found to be Muslims’ main reason for boycotting foreign brands in the Middle East (Abosag, 2010; Farah, 2011; Gulf News, 2000; Halevi, 2012) and other Muslim countries (Abd Razak & Abdul-Talib, 2012; Al Hyari et al., 2012). The concern about the ‘halal’ aspect of foreign brands may also be related to Muslim consumers’ religiosity and their boycotting of foreign brands that they perceive to be ‘not halal’.
Figure 5.2 Concepts maps capturing participants’ uncertainty of halal validity of foreign brands based on the qualitative phase of the study (non-student group only)

Figure 5.2 shows that non-student participants regarded the concept of “halal” as an important concept for them in their buying decisions. Some participants in the qualitative study mentioned that “halal” concept also made them buy Indonesian products instead of foreign products and brands. This “halal” concept was positioned next to concept of “buy Indonesian product” in the Leximancer topical map (more details in the qualitative study, Chapter 4). The concept of halal was found in the qualitative study and regarded as a more important concept among the non-student participants compared to the student participant. The halal concept can only be seen in the non-student group but not in the student group, based on the Leximancer topical map (Figure 5.2).

Halal validity as an ideal main consideration for Muslims in buying products was measured based on the research of Bonne and Verbeke (2008) and Salehudin (2010) because those constructs were found to be relevant for this study. The items used in
combination with those two constructs seem to be in line with the findings of the qualitative phase of the study. The five-point Likert scales of 1-Strongly Disagree to 5-Strongly Agree were used for all the items. The items used to measure uncertainty about the Halal validity of foreign brands in the present study were as follows:

1. I am not sure about the halal validity of Chinese food brands.
2. I am not sure the ingredients in Chinese food brands make them halal.
3. I am not sure the Chinese food brands are halal.
4. I am not sure about halal validity of US food brands.
5. I am not sure the ingredients in the US food brands make them Halal.
6. I am not sure the US food brands are halal.

5.1.4 Peer Pressure

The findings of the qualitative phase of this study show that participants mentioned peer pressure as one their reasons to boycott some brands from foreign countries. Based on the transcripts of the interviews and focus group discussions. For example, Heni, a female student said:

*Most of my friends boycott American brands. They say that they do it to help other Muslims. They do it for Islam. Although I am not really sure of the effectiveness of boycotts, I do not want to argue with them. I do not want them to see me as someone who does not care about other Muslims. Therefore, I decide to follow their actions in boycotting American brands.*

Findings from the qualitative phase of the study show that many participants see peer pressure as their main reason to boycott foreign brands. This qualitative finding was in line with earlier studies described in the literature review chapter (Chapter 2). Evidence shows some effects of peer pressure in consumer behaviour (Escalas & Bettman, 2003;
Park & Lessig, 1977, Arkin et al., 1986). In the Muslim context, studies have found that Muslim consumers want to act in a similar manner to their fellow Muslims (Al Hyari et al., 2012).

The findings in the qualitative phase of the study were also used in deciding which constructs were used in the final version of the quantitative survey. Many participants confirm that they experienced some influence from their friends in deciding to boycott foreign brands and products. These qualitative findings were also captured in the concept map of the Leximancer result. This confirms that religiosity should be included as a construct in investigating reasons Muslim consumers’ boycott foreign brands.

**Figure 5.3 Concepts maps capturing participants’ experience of peer pressure to boycott foreign brands based on the qualitative phase of the study**

a) Student participants

![Concept map for student participants showing relationships between brands, boycott, friends, and KFC.]

b) Non student participants

![Concept map for non-student participants showing relationships between brands, boycott, friends, and other concepts.]

The results from Leximancer shown in Figure 5.3 indicate that the concept of “friends” is regarded as “peer” and has very close proximity to the concept of “boycott”. The importance of “peer” is evident among both the student (Figure 5.3 a) and non-student
Peer pressure is an important element in Muslim consumers’ behaviour (Al Hyari et al., 2012; Islam & Johnson, 2003; Muhamad, 2008). The items used to measure peer pressure in this study were developed based on Al Hyari et al. (2012) and seem to be in line with the findings from the qualitative phase of the study. The five-point Likert scale of 1-Strongly Disagree to 5-Strongly Agree were used for all the items. The items used to measure peer pressure in the present study were as follows:

1. My friends are encouraging me to boycott US brands.
2. My friends keep reminding me of reasons not to buy the US brands.
3. I would feel uncomfortable if my friends, who boycott the US brands, saw me buying those brands.
4. My friends are encouraging me to boycott Chinese brands.
5. I would feel uncomfortable if my friends, who boycott Chinese brands, saw me buying those brands.
6. My friends keep reminding me of reasons not to buy Chinese brands.

### 5.1.5 Animosity

The findings of the qualitative phase of this study showed that participants mentioned some sort anger toward a country of origin would make them decide to boycott some foreign brands. For example, based on transcripts of the interviews and focus group discussions, participants made the following comments:

- *I feel ashamed of using Malaysian products because my friends will think that I do not have a spirit of nationalism. Malaysia has done bad things to Indonesian people, in the soccer games, so I have to boycott Malaysian products.* (Deni, student)
- I definitely boycott Chinese brands! They are threat for Indonesian Small Business because there are too many Chinese brands everywhere. Most of products in the market are made in China. Our product actually has much better quality than those ‘made in China’ products, so, why should I buy Chinese product? (Eri, student)

Those quotes show that animosity toward the country of origin of brands has some effect on participants’ decision making processes to boycott those brands. The statements of the participants in the qualitative phase of the study show that some of them were not sure about the halal validity of some foreign brands and products. This qualitative finding was in line with earlier studies described in the literature review chapter (Chapter 2). Studies have shown that animosity has some links to boycotting behaviour as well as willingness to buy foreign products (Abd Razak & Abdul-Talib, 2012; Amine, 2008; Klein, 1998; Nijssen & Douglas, 2004).

The findings in the qualitative phase of the study were also used in deciding which items were used in the final version of the quantitative survey. Some participants’ feeling of animosity toward the country of origin of some foreign brands were also captured in the concept map of the qualitative phase of the study. This confirms that animosity should be included as a construct in investigating reasons Muslim consumers’ boycott foreign brands.
Figure 5.4 Concepts maps capturing participants’ animosity toward country of origin of foreign brands based on the qualitative phase of the study

a) Student Participants

b) Non-student Participants

Figure 5.4 shows two concept maps for the student and non-student group participants based on the finding from the qualitative study (Chapter 3). For student participants, there are some forms of religious animosity that can be seen toward particular countries, because those countries are “unfair to Muslims”. For non-student participants, “the unethical behaviour of the Chinese” appears in the Leximancer concept maps (Figure 5.4. b) and captured the economic animosity of the participants toward Chinese people.

The respondents’ animosity was measured based on a study by Klein (1998). The following items were used to measure animosity in this study for the US and Chinese brands:
Animosity (the US brands) Items:

1. The US wants to gain economic power over Indonesia.
2. The US is taking advantage of Indonesia.
3. I don’t like the fact that there are too many American products everywhere.
4. The US has too much economic influence in Indonesia.
5. US food brands represent American domination.

Animosity (Chinese Brands) Items:

1. Chinese is not a reliable trading partner.
2. Chinese wants to gain economic power over Indonesia.
3. I don’t like the fact that there are too many Chinese products everywhere.
4. The Chinese are doing business unfairly with Indonesian.
5. China is taking advantage of Indonesia.

5.1.6 Health Consciousness

The findings of the qualitative phase of the study showed that participants were concerned about brands that were originally from foreign countries. The participants were found to boycott some foreign brands because of this factor. For example:

- I don’t really do boycotts since about five years ago. I started to boycott KFC because I read that they do unethical things to animals, particularly chickens. They just want to get as much profit as they can. They gave hormonal medicine for example, to boost their chickens to grow faster than normally. That makes the chicken also unhealthy to be eaten. I really care about health issues therefore I never want to buy the chicken in KFC since I am aware about this issue. Another thing is they also deep fry the chicken and the chips. KFC offers unhealthy foods. I do not want to buy them.

(Zainal, civil servant).
• Chinese products are unhealthy. I don’t want to consume them; they are full of additive and ‘unknown’ ingredient. I will not buy Chinese products for my family as well (Lina, housewife).

These comments show that concern about the “health factor” of foreign brands has become a reason to boycott US food brands and Chinese food brands. Earlier studies have shown that health concerns are linked to the rejection of some products that are perceived to be “unhealthy”, particularly for Muslim consumers (Bonne & Verbeke, 2008; Kamaruddin et al., 2012). Findings in the qualitative phase of the research were also used in deciding which items that were used in the final version of the quantitative survey although these concepts are not shown in the Leximancer concept map.

Respondents’ health consciousness was measured based on a study conducted by Dutta-Bergman (2007) and re-examined in Hong (2009) study. The following items were used to measure health consciousness:

1. US food brands are unhealthy
2. US food brands are bad for my diet.
3. US food brands represent unhealthy lifestyle.
4. Chinese food brands are unhealthy
5. Chinese food brands are bad for my diet.
6. Chinese food brands have suspicious ingredients

5.1.7 Consumer Ethnocentrism

The findings of the qualitative phase of the research show that participants indicated their anger toward country of origin by boycotting some foreign brands. For example, one participant stated:
I definitely boycott Chinese brands! They are threat for Indonesian Small Business because there are too many Chinese brands everywhere. Most of products in the market are made in China. Our product actually has much better quality than those ‘made in China’ brands, so, why should I buy Chinese brands? (Doni, student).

This comment shows that consumer ethnocentrism toward the country of origin of brands has some effect on the participants’ decision making process to boycott those brands. Statements by the participants in the qualitative phase of the study show that some of them were thinking that there are too many Chinese products everywhere and that therefore this could be harmful to local Indonesian products. This qualitative finding was in line with earlier studies described in the literature review chapter (Chapter 2).

Figure 5.5 Concepts maps capturing participants’ ethnocentrism toward country of origin of foreign brands based on the qualitative phase of the study

a) Student Participants  
b) Non-student Participants

The results from the Leximancer concept map (Figure 5.5) show that the ethnocentrism spirit, such as to “buy Indonesian products” and the perception that Indonesian products are the best quality were captured for both student and non-student participants. The
results from qualitative study and literature reviews became a guideline in the decision to use the consumer ethnocentrism construct for this study. The respondents’ ethnocentrism was captured based on a study by Machida (2012). The items that were used to measure ethnocentrism were:

1. Purchasing foreign-made products is un-Indonesian.
2. It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts Indonesians out of jobs.
3. A real Indonesian should always buy Indonesian-made products.
4. We should always purchase products manufactured in Indonesia.
5. Indonesians should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indonesian businesses.
6. Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products in our markets.
7. Indonesians should buy Indonesian products and keep Indonesians working.

5.2. THE DATA COLLECTION APPROACH

A survey was designed to provide the data needed to examine the research questions and aims outlined in section 1.1. Prior to the main data collection phase, the questionnaire was pre-tested on 53 participants, 24 were male and 29 were female, to ensure that there were no problems in the survey. Their selection was based on a convenient sample with participants recruited from West Sumatra, Indonesia. There was also a wide range of ages, with 11 people being below 18 year old, 5 people were between 19-29 years old, 31 people were between 30-39 years of age, and 6 people were above 40 years old.
The survey took approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. The participants contributed suggestions on how to improve the survey. Suggestions from the participants were then incorporated into the final form of the survey. The researcher changed the wording of some items in the survey that were not clear to the participants. The pilot study was also used to assess the reliability of the questionnaire. Once refinements had been made, a final version of the questionnaire was used in the main study to collect data about the reasons participants boycotted foreign brands.

The questionnaire was developed based on the findings of the qualitative stage of this study. The results of the qualitative phase enabled the researcher to find some relevant construct measurement for investigating Muslim consumers’ reasons for boycotting foreign brands. The qualitative study enabled the researcher to find the representative foreign brand to be used in the final quantitative stage as explained in Chapter 3. Then, the pilot study was performed to make sure that there were no issues with the questionnaire prior to the final phase of data collection. The feedback from the respondents in the pilot study were mainly about the length of the questionnaire, some unclear questions and repetitiveness of the survey questionnaires.

The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to evaluate the results of the pilot study. Questions that have low (below 0.5) loadings and cross loadings with other factors were deleted to improve the effectiveness of the survey. For example, for an ethnocentrism original question by Shimp and Sharma (1987): “Curbs should be put on all import”, the results from the pilot study indicated that the loading of the question was below 0.5 and also that it had cross loading with the animosity factor. This question was also considered repetitive by respondents in the pilot study. Therefore, it was not
included in the main questionnaire. Further, two unclear questions were reworded. As a result, a shorter version of the survey was developed based on their feedback. The final five page questionnaires were prepared to be distributed for the main quantitative study. Data collection continued for ten weeks after the distribution of the questionnaire. A total of 400 usable responses were obtained, which was a response rate of 98%.

5.3. **THE CHOSEN FOREIGN BRANDS**

There were three top foreign brands that were mostly discussed by participants in the qualitative phase of this study: US food brands (representing American brands), Chinese food brands (in general although some participants mentioned one or two Chinese products such as Rabbit Candy and noodles) and Malaysian brands (mostly in general although some participants mentioned Malaysian brand like Proton). However, the quantitative phase of this study was more focused on US food brands and Chinese food brands. US food brands represent American brands and Chinese food brands were originated from non-Muslim countries. Those foreign brands were also market in Indonesia in several market segments.

**US food brands**

US food brands have been boycott targets for different reasons such as the unethical treatment of animals (Aspray, Royer, & Ocepek, 2014; Chatzidakis & Lee, 2013; McNeil, 2004; Warner, 2005), as part of Anti-American protests (Ahmed et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2009) as well as part of an Islamic religious calling (Yunus et al., 2013).
Previous research on boycotts has mainly focused on Muslim consumers in the Middle East while Southeast Asian Muslim consumers, particularly Indonesia, have been ignored. The findings of the qualitative phase of this study (in Indonesia) confirmed that US food brands was also one of the brands that were boycotted by participants. It was deemed that this needed further investigation in the larger sample of the quantitative phase.

**Chinese food brands**

The boycott of Chinese brands was also discussed in some previous research, especially research related to non-religious factors such as unsafe consumer products made in China (Phillips, 2008) and research which found that Chinese goods hurt local producers (Samboh, 2011). In terms of the religious element, it is reported that Muslims in China face some problems that trigger sympathy from other Muslims all over the world (Farooq, 2014; Israeli, 1977). There is also a fatwa from some Islamic scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese goods, for example, there was a fatwa from Qaradawi which explicitly declared, “It is the duty of each and every Muslim in the world, and not Syrians alone, to boycott Chinese and Russian products of all kinds. I ask you, oh my Muslim brethren, not to spend money on Chinese or Russian goods” (Dohanews.co 10 February 2012).

Therefore, it is important to investigate how Muslim consumers in Indonesia respond to Chinese brands. If they boycott those brands, are they doing it in the name of religion/religiosity or because of secular reasons? This study included Chinese products to be
further investigated in the quantitative study based on the finding of the qualitative phase of the study which confirmed that most participants boycotted Chinese products.

5.4. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The sample was 400 Indonesian Muslims people who have bahasa Indonesia (the national language of Indonesia) as their first language. Translating a survey into multiple languages (one in English for supervision purposes, another in bahasa Indonesia for the respondents) requires people experienced in translating scripts into various languages. The researcher, who is a native speaker of bahasa Indonesia, translated the survey questionnaire from English to bahasa Indonesia.

Confirming the accuracy of the translated survey was important to ensure the objectives of this study. It was crosschecked to other two Indonesian researchers who have experience in translating scripts. Then, the translated survey was translated back into English as part of the process of validating the Indonesian version of the survey (Franchis et al., 2004). There were no conceptual differences between the translated versions after comparing the bahasa Indonesia version with the back-translated English version.

The questionnaire developed for this research was five pages in length. In order to provide uniformity within the questionnaire, all items for measuring reasons for boycotting foreign brands (religiosity, ethnocentrism, uncertainty of halal validity, awareness of boycott fatwas, health consciousness, animosity and peer pressure) were used a five-point Likert-type scales. Some of the items used to obtain background information had a different format such as questions about gender, income, and age. In
order to increase the visibility and improve the readability of the questionnaire, alternate items were shaded grey.

5.5 THE SAMPLE

The population of this study is Indonesian Muslims who are students and non-students who live in Padang, West Sumatra Indonesia and who are aged 18 and above. Those two groups represent different segments in the Muslim market, and different boycotting behaviour may be expected. Padang is one of the major cities for people who want to enter a higher education institution in Indonesia. This city is also one of the central economic growth areas in Indonesia.

Indonesia is the largest country in Southeast Asian and the most populous Muslim country in the world. Indonesians significantly share the same languages and cultures as other Islamic followers in Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam (Azra, 2005). Indonesian Muslims predominantly follow the Sunni school of thought, thus this study may be limited to Sunni Muslims particularly to those who follow the Shafie school of thought.

Student

In total there are eight universities in West Sumatra and these are mostly located in its capital city, Padang. The universities chosen in this study were the Andalas University, Bung Hatta University and Padang State University. All of them have business schools. In the Indonesian education system, most universities accommodate both male and female students in a classroom without separation or borders between them.
The selection of students as the sample under consideration reflects the fact that students contributes significantly to the Muslim consumers market in Indonesia. As reported by the advertising and branding agency Ogilvy, the big numbers of Muslim youth below 24 years of age contribute to 10 percent of the world’s population. University students were selected for this study because they are considered well-informed customers who can spread their viewpoint to the wider community. They are also a big market segment that requires special attention by marketers. Thus, most previous studies have included students in their about Muslim consumers samples (Al Hyari et al., 2012; Farah & Newman, 2010; Sandıkçı & Ekici, 2009).

Non-Student

West Sumatra’s population is 4.3 million people (Indonesian Bureau of Statistics, 2014). The occupations of people in West Sumatra are similar to most of other cities in Indonesia. The main occupations in Indonesia are farmers, workers (in industrial companies), entrepreneurs or business owners and civil servants. It is also quite common to see housewives work from home while looking after their families.

Of 400 respondents in this study, 202 were students and 198 were non-students. These numbers are considered sufficient to meet the minimum requirement of the sample size for a study using the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) technique. There are several guidelines in determining the sample size for SEM analysis. One recommended sample size is 200, which provides a sound basis for estimation (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010; Kline, 2005). Another study considered N = 100 – 150 as a minimum sample size for conducting SEM (Reise, Waller, & Comrey, 2000).
The Importance of Age in the Present and Future Samples

The present study splits the samples according to students and non-students groups. Those two groups have different characteristics as consumers such as age and income. Students groups are younger and have lower income compared to non-student groups. In future samples, the significance of age in selecting samples are also important because different range of age can be related to their different behaviour as consumers that affect their decision making process. Given the findings of this study, future research by the student will further explore why there may be differences.

5.5.1 Procedure

Students

The present study used a self-administered questionnaire technique and distributed the questionnaires through purposive selected sampling (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). The questionnaires were distributed to a sample of undergraduate student in three universities in Padang, West Sumatra. The universities are Andalas University, Padang State University and Bung Hatta University. They are three major universities in Sumatra. The students who participated in this study were those who study business. The selection of which class should participate in this study was given to the instructor of course at the university. Most of students in the class were to participate in this study.

This was a self-administered survey. The students who were willing to participate in this study stayed for an extra 15 minutes after the class to complete the questionnaire. The students needed to fill in the questionnaire by themselves. The university students were mostly familiar with how to complete a survey questionnaire. Using university
students and administering the survey during lecture hours was convenient for students because they could fill in the questionnaire in a comfortable environment and they could also ask questions of the researcher if they found something unclear. Once finished, the respondents were asked to put the questionnaire in a box provided in the class.

**Non-Student**

The non-student respondents came from the Padang community. Resident data is available in every district office in the region. The researcher met respondents in convenience locations such as malls and offices. The researcher distributed the questionnaire to the third person that she met in each location. For example, some questionnaires were distributed to some people who were waiting in the bank based on every third person in the queue. This ensured that the researcher selected the participants objectively, not because of their “religious appearance” or other subjective factor. People who were approached generally agreed to participate in this study. They were happy to fill in the questionnaire while waiting for their number to be called in the bank. The respondents were asked to put the survey in a blank envelope to disguise their responses, and give the envelope to the researcher after they had finished.

**5.6 THE DATA ANALYSIS APPROACH**

The hypotheses in this study were tested using SEM techniques with a two-step approach in performing the analysis (Hair, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006: 848). This study used the *Mplus version 7* program to perform the SEM technique. SEM analysis was considered to be an appropriate statistical tool for this study.
SEM combines multi regression and factor analysis techniques and has advantages in estimating multiple equations as well as accounting for measurement errors in the estimation process (Hair et al., 2010). SEM has a number of advantages compared to some traditional statistical methods, such as analysis regression and path analysis that ignore measurement errors in independent variables and may impact by producing inaccurate results, particularly in cases where the errors are major (Hair et al., 2010). These types of mistakes can be avoided by using SEM.

In general, SEM is analysis is divided into two components or sub models. The first component is a measurement model that shows relationships between observed variables and their latent constructs. The second component is a structural model that shows relationships among latent constructs in the model (Byrne, 2010, p.13). In the two-step SEM approach that was used in this study, the measurement model was formulated first, and then this was followed by the evaluation of the full structural model in the second step (Hair et al., 2010).

5.6.1 Data Preparation and Descriptive Statistics
A descriptive analysis helps researchers understand their data and identify problems that might arise in a later stage of the analysis. During the data preparation, the researcher undertook some data cleaning to ensure that the data were ready to be used in the analysis. The normality of the data, the presence of outliers, and the extent of missing data were also checked during this stage.

5.6.2 Evaluation of the Measurement Model
The evaluation of the measurement model in this study was performed separately following the two-step approach. This is important because a structural model cannot be tested if the measurement model evaluation is not performed properly. An improper measurement model cannot be used to accurately measure the specific intended issues that researcher wants to observe, as a consequence a structural model test cannot be performed accurately (Hair et al., 2006)

5.6.2.1 Construct Validity

Evaluations of a measurement model enable a comprehensive estimation related to its convergent validity and discriminant validity. Convergent and discriminant validity are two subtypes of construct validity. Convergent validity was used to measure items that represented the same construct. On the other hand, discriminant validity is needed to measure some items from different constructs.

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity is a subtype of construct validity (Hair et al., 2010). This is an important step to ensure that all items included in a construct are able to measure what the researcher wants to measure. For instance, there were 5 items in this study to measure respondents’ awareness about boycott fatwas. Item 5 is the statement “Muslims scholars (ulama) think that I should boycott US brands”. They were rated using a 1-to-5 Likert scale format. The researcher expected that all 5 items reflect the idea of awareness of boycott fatwas.
A convergent validity can be estimated by evaluating the loading factor for items in the same construct. The rule of thumb is the Average Variance Extracted Score (AVE) has to be above a significant level. Hair et al. (2010) suggest an AVE score of 0.50 or higher implies there is more information than noise in the construct of interest. For example, the loading factors for items 1 to 5 in the awareness of boycott fatwa construct has to be above this level of significance (AVE score 0.50). This indicates that all 5 items measure the same (awareness of boycott fatwa) construct. As a consequence convergent validity can be assumed.

\[
\text{Average Variance Extracted Score} = \frac{\sum (\text{standardised loading})^2}{\sum (\text{standardised loading})^2 + \sum \varepsilon_i}
\] (1).

**Discriminant Validity**

 Discriminant validity is a measure of the extent to which indicators of a construct do not correlate well with indicators of other constructs. Fornell and Larker (1981) suggest that discriminant validity can be assessed by comparing the squared correlation between two constructs with their Average Variance Extracted (AVE) scores. It is expected that the correlation between two constructs (cross-construct correlation) is less than the square root of the constructs’ AVE scores (correlation within items in the same construct). For example, the correlation between items to measure the same construct (e.g. correlation between BF1 and BF2) should be higher than the correlation of two items from different construct (e.g. correlation between item BF3 and PP1). In other
words, the AVE score (indicating correlation between items in the same construct) has to be higher than the squared correlation ($r^2$) between constructs. The rule of thumb is that the AVE scores have to be $\geq 0.50$ (Hair et al., 2010).

5.6.2.2 Reliability

Internal consistency reliability was used to confirm that the items used in a construct were able to capture the concept sufficiently (Henson, 2001). This is also known as composite reliability. It is more commonly used in testing the reliability of the construct compared to other reliability measurements such as the ‘test-retest’ and alternate forms coefficients techniques. Composite reliability confirms scores’ stability and consistency in a construct. It can be calculated from a single administration of a test (Henson, 2001). For example, if the composite reliability coefficient of the 7 items which measured awareness of boycott fatwas was above 0.70 (Hair et al., 2010), it was expected that the number of items used to measure the construct was sufficient. The seven items were presumed able to convey adequate information to measure the construct.
Reliability is used to evaluate how well the items used to measure a construct are related to each other. To determine whether it is appropriate to combine these items, their measurement property was assessed (Cooper & Schindler, 2001). As noted earlier, it has been suggested that the construct reliability coefficient should be 0.70 or higher (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). High inter-item correlations support a construct’s reliability, which can be measured through the composite reliability. This coefficient can be calculated by Equation 2:

$$\text{Composite Reliability} = \frac{(\sum \text{standardised loading})^2}{(\sum \text{standardised loading})^2 + \sum \varepsilon_i} \quad (2).$$

### 5.6.2.3 Unidimensionality

Unidimensionality is usually assumed when the loadings (path coefficients) in a reflective construct are high (above 0.60) (Bagozzi & Yi 1988). It can also be defined as
“the degree to which the items load only on their respective constructs without having parallel correlations pattern” (Afthanorhan & Ahmad, 2013, p.55).” For example, all items to measure experience of peer pressure (PP1, PP2, PP3) should only load on their respective constructs (with the loadings above 0.60) and may not have a parallel correlation to the awareness of boycott fatwas construct.

**5.6.3. Evaluation of Structural Model**

This study was intended to evaluate which possible reasons significantly explained the respondents boycotting of foreign brands, in this study US food brands and Chinese food brands. The hypotheses that represent the relationship between one construct with other constructs were evaluated to check whether the path coefficient between those two constructs were significant $\alpha = 0.05$. The probability value has to be $(p) \leq 0.05$.

**Research Model One**

Research Model One predicted that there was a direct effect between each of the independent variables to the dependent variable (boycott of foreign brands). Each hypothesis was evaluated by testing the significance of each path coefficient that linked
between independent variables (consumers’ animosity, consumers’ ethnocentrism, consumers’ health consciousness, consumers’ perception of the validity of the halal approval for a brand, consumers’ awareness of a boycott fatwa, consumers’ experiences of peer pressure, and religiosity) with the dependent variable (boycott of foreign brands).

Figure 5.6 Research Model One: Religiosity as one of six antecedents to reported boycotts of foreign brands:

Estimation Procedure

This study used MPlus version 7 to evaluate the relationships of independent and dependent variables. The measurement model in this study was tested by specifying the ESTIMATOR=MLR for the measurement model in the MPlus software. MLR is an option in MPlus for a maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors (Muthen, 2007). The MLR standard errors are computed using a sandwich estimator.
that is robust to non-normality (Muthen & Muthen, 2010, p.33). In this study, the dependent variable was categorical/binary; Yes and No options, for the boycotting of foreign brands. Therefore, following the suggestion of the MPlus manual, for the full structural model, this study used WLSMV (a robust weighted least squares estimator using a diagonal weight matrix) as the default for a categorical/binary dependent variable (Muthen & Muthen, 2010, pp.531 – 533).

**Evaluation for Goodness of Fit Indices**

In SEM analysis, there are some criteria for goodness of fit in testing the models (measurement and structural models). The Goodness of Fit test was to measure whether a model can be accepted or not from a statistical perspective. MPlus version 7 allows the user to use some goodness of fit indices to test a model with some criteria as follow:

**Table 5.2 Cut-off Criteria for Fit Indices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Shorthand</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>Absolute fit</td>
<td>p-value &gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Chi-Square</td>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>Absolute fit</td>
<td>$1.00 &lt; \chi^2$/df &lt; 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative fit index</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Incremental fit</td>
<td>$\geq 0.95$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker–Lewis index</td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>Incremental fit</td>
<td>$\geq 0.95$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root mean square error of Approximation</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>Absolute fit</td>
<td>$&lt; 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Root mean square residual</td>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>Absolute fit</td>
<td>$\leq 0.08$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hair et al. (2010)

**Mediation Analysis**

Mediation analysis was used to test the mediation model. The mediating variable in this study was religiosity. The independent variables in this study were: consumers’ animosity, consumers’ ethnocentrism, consumers’ health consciousness, consumers’ perception of the validity of the Halal approval for a brand, consumers’ awareness of a boycott fatwa, and consumers’ experiences of peer pressure. The dependent variable is a reported boycott of foreign brands. The second research model was analyzed to see
whether religiosity mediates the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable (reported boycott of foreign brands).

The mediational hypothesis was measured by the product of coefficient strategy that was based on testing of the significance level of the indirect effects (Preacher, Rucker & Hayes, 2007). The direct and indirect effects can be estimated in MPlus using maximum-likelihood. Standard errors of the direct and indirect causal effects were obtained by the delta method (Muthen, 2011, pp.18 – 19).

**Moderating Effects of Religiosity**

A Multiple Group Structural Equation Modeling (MSEM) was used to test the moderation effect of religiosity toward other antecedents that explain respondents’ reasons to boycott foreign brands (Research Model 2). The moderation variable in this study was religiosity which represents intrinsically – and extrinsically motivated religious Muslim groups. This means the moderator in this study is categorical (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The second research model tested whether religiosity moderates relationships between independent variables (consumers’ animosity, consumers’ ethnocentrism, consumers’ health consciousness, consumers’ perception of the validity of the halal approval for a brand, consumers’ awareness of a boycott fatwa, and consumers’ experiences of peer pressure) and the dependent variable (reported boycott of foreign brands).

**Figure 5.7 Research Model Two: Religiosity moderates other antecedents in its effect on reported boycotts of foreign brands.**
The MSEM analysis was performed separately for the student and non-student samples and two types of foreign food brands, US food brands and Chinese food brands. For each sample and brand, the MSEM generated a model for each intrinsic and extrinsic religiously motivated follower simultaneously. This initial model is the most important and is known as the baseline model. The baseline model provides path estimations according to relationships between independent and dependent variables, for intrinsic and extrinsic groups. One set of model fit indices was generated for this research model.

The fit indices for this baseline model are crucial in determining whether or not the MSEM technique is suitable for the data collected in this study. A good fit between data from this study and the model at this stage would suggest that the MSEM technique is appropriate to perform a comparison between the intrinsic and extrinsic groups, on the model’s relationship between independent and dependent variable paths. On the other hand, if the fit indices from the baseline model shows a poor model fit between the collected data and the model, it suggests that the MSEM analysis is not a feasible technique for performing a group comparison using the data.

In the case of a good model fit between the data and the model, a comparison between the intrinsic and extrinsic groups on the paths deals with whether or not the differences between the groups on a particular path are significant. In order to test significant
difference between the groups on a path, for example on the relationship between Muslim consumers’ animosity and their reported boycotting of foreign brands, the MSEM hypothesizes that the effect of consumers animosity on reported boycott of brands is equally distributed between the intrinsic and extrinsic motivated followers. This is done by placing a fix constant (an alphabet ‘Ha1’- on animosity and boycott of foreign brands path) in the Mplus’s syntax.

In an MPlus multiple group analysis, all structural parameters are free and not constrained as the default to be equal across groups. Structural parameters include factor means, variances, and covariance and regression coefficients. Factor means are fixed at zero in the first group and are free to be estimated in the other groups as the default. This is because factor means generally cannot be identified for all groups (Muthen & Muthen, 2010, p.423).

A similar MSEM technique was also performed to check the moderating effects of gender on the relations between some religious and secular reasons (boycott fatwas, uncertainty of halal validity, ethnocentrism, health consciousness, animosity, peer pressure) and Muslim consumers’ reported boycotting of foreign brands.

**Model Difference Testing**

All explanations in this section are based on Muthen and Muthen’ (2010, pp.434 – 435) suggestions. In the chi-square difference testing of invariance, the chi-square value and degrees of freedom of the less restrictive model (baseline model) are subtracted from the chi-square value and degrees of freedom of the nested, more restrictive model (constrained model). The chi-square difference value is compared to the chi-square
value in a chi-square table using the difference in degrees of freedom between the more restrictive and less restrictive models. If the chi-square difference value is significant, it indicates that constraining the parameters of the nested model significantly worsens the fit of the model. This indicates non-invariance, suggesting that the effect of customers’ animosity on reported boycott of brands is not equal between the intrinsically and extrinsically motivated religious followers.

If the chi-square difference value is not significant, this indicates that constraining the parameters of the nested model did not significantly worsen the fit of the model. This indicates invariance of the parameters constrained to be equal in the nested model, suggesting that the effect customers’ animosity on reported boycotting of foreign brands is equal between the intrinsically and extrinsically motivated individuals and between female and male groups. The same process was performed to test the differences between the intrinsically and extrinsically motivated individuals on each of the paths. In this study, six models were generated by the MSEM in order to test differences between the intrinsically and extrinsically motivated individuals.
CHAPTER 6

RESULT OF QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

6.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of the data collected (n=400) after following preliminary steps for data cleaning and screening. As noted in Chapter Five, the data was obtained from participants in Padang, West Sumatra Indonesia. Each questionnaire was coded into a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) data file for subsequent analysis using MPlus software. The finding from the quantitative and the qualitative phases of this study complement each other in investigating Muslim consumers’ reasons to boycott foreign brands.

6.1 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

6.1.1 Sample Characteristics

The respondents of this study were between 18 to 60 years of age and divided into student and non-student samples (see Table 6.1). 202 students and 198 non-students, a total of n=400, participated in this study. There were almost equal numbers of males and females for both student and non-student participants. As shown in Table 6.1, many respondents responded they were currently boycotting some foreign brands. 79 out of the total of 400 respondents claimed that they had boycotted US brands, accounting for 20 percent of the total respondents. A larger proportion of respondents, 130 out of 400 respondents (32.5%) reported they boycott Chinese food products. This
shows that a relatively high percentage of respondents boycott foreign brands, particularly US and Chinese food brands.

Table 6.1 Respondent’s Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Student (n=202)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-student (n= 198)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 20 years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30 years</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 60 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL LEVEL</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than elementary school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer/worker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job seeker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Rp. 1.500.000</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp. 1.500.000 – Rp. 2.999.999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp. 3.000.000 – Rp. 4.499.999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp. 4.500.000 – Rp. 5.999.999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ Rp. 6.000.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYCOTT US FOOD BRANDS</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYCOTT CHINESE FOOD BRANDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two groups of respondents, students and non-students participated in this study. As shown in Table 6.1, in general, more respondents boycotted Chinese food brands (130 respondents) as compared to those who boycotted US food brands such as KFC and McDonalds (79 respondents). All of the students who participated are completing their bachelor’s degree. Normally, Indonesian university students finish their four-year of bachelor degree program between the ages of 18 to 23.

Further, Table 6.1 shows that the majority of the non-student respondents (more than 50 percent) are between 21 to 30 years old with the dominating occupation (44.9 percent) being business owners. Their levels of education are mostly senior high school with the majority having an income of one and half to three million rupiah per month. Indonesian people, particularly in Padang, usually have a family business. The next most common occupations for the non-student participants was housewives. The respondents that can be categorised as housewives are 38 out of 101 female participants, which mean 19 percent of the non-student respondents.

### 6.1.2 Descriptive Statistic for individual items in the Measurement Construct

A five pages questionnaire was developed to measure seven constructs to investigating Muslim consumers’ reasons to boycott US and/or Chinese food brands. The items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale because according to Kotabe et al. (2005), Asian respondents prefer the highest score at ‘5’ point scales as compared with any other numbers such as ‘7’. After closer examination of the data, it was found that in most items of the seven constructs used in this study, the standard deviation is above 0.8 and some of them exceeded one. Hair et al (2010) explain that this condition means that
there was a reasonable variation in the respondents’ views of the items they were asked to answer. It indicates that the data were likely to contain a reasonable amount of information. The mean score for the seven measurements were all above the average score in the 5-point Likert scale.

6.1.3 Profile of the Boycotters

As shown in Table 6.2, male and female respondents boycott slightly different brands. It was found that more females (75 respondents) as compared to males (55 respondents) boycotted Chinese foods brands. More male respondents boycotted more US brands compared to Chinese brands. In the non-student group, respondents who boycotted Chinese brands were mostly females (49 respondents) as compared to males (26 respondents). There was an almost similar number of male students (19 respondents) and female students (17 respondents) that boycotted US brands and Chinese brands (29 (male) and 26 (female) respondents. Females have a higher tendency compared to males to boycott Chinese brands in the non-student group but not for the student groups as shown in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2 Proportion of Boycotters based on Gender (n=400)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>US brands</th>
<th>Chinese brands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-student</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (S + NS)</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Divided into groups, the respondents in the student category of this study who boycotted US brands were mostly female (55.8%), whose aged ranged between 21 and 30 years (60.5%), had graduated from senior high school (83.7%) and had an income less than Rp. 1.500.000 (95.3%) or equal to AUD150 as a typical Indonesian student profile. In terms of gender, for the non-student respondents, there was a slightly higher number of males (52.8%) than females who boycotted US brands. The Chinese brands’ boycotters’ profile was almost similar to those who boycotted US brands among the student participants. Most boycotters were also male (52.7%) whose aged were between 21-30 years old (50.9%) with a low income level of less than Rp.1.500.000 or equal to AUD150.

US brand boycotters in the non-student groups were also found to be relatively young. Their ages were between 21-30 years old and they had also graduated from senior high school (58.7%). They mostly owned their own businesses (50%) and could be categorised as middle class people who have an average income of between Rp. 1.500.000 – Rp. 2.999.999 (52.8%) or equal to AUD150-300 per month. In the non-student group, the majority of people who boycotted Chinese brands were female (74%). Most Chinese brands’ boycotters were young, whose aged ranged between 21 – 30 years (50.7%), and who had graduated from senior high school (58.7%), were business owners (38.7%) and had less than Rp. 1.500.000 income (54.7%) or equal to AUD150 per month.
In terms of boycotting foreign brands, most of the boycotters fell into the category of light boycotters. This means most of them only boycott one or two brands accounting for 84% of the whole sample while 16 percent of the 400 respondents declared that they boycott three foreign brands or more. This shows that boycotting foreign brands is an important issue for respondents.

**Figure 6.1 Proportion of Respondents based on frequency of boycotting**

As shown in Figure 6.1, the majority of respondents in this study light boycotters and only a small percentage (16%) of them are heavy boycotters. As is displayed in Figure 6.2, of the total 400 respondents twenty percent of light boycotters and forty percent of heavy boycotters boycotted US food brands. It seems that the respondents in this study have been involved in boycotting US food brands.

**Figure 6.2 Profile of Respondents who Boycott US brands**
Figure 6.3 shows the profiles of respondents who boycott US and Chinese food brands. Respondents who boycott US and Chinese food brands are mostly categorised as light boycotters. It means they mostly do not boycott other foreign brands and only focus on boycotting US and Chinese food brands.

**Figure 6.3 Profile of Respondents who Boycott the Chinese Food Brands**
6.1.4 Group of boycotters based on their religiosity

As shown in Figure 6.4, there was an almost equal number of respondents that were categorised as extrinsically and intrinsically motivated in this study. The number of intrinsically motivated respondents was only slightly higher than extrinsically motivated respondents. There were slightly more intrinsically motivated respondents in the non-student group (57%) as compared to the student group (52%).

Figure 6.4. Religiosity in each Sample Group

![Figure 6.4](image)

In total, there was a larger number of respondents who were boycotting Chinese food brands compared to US food brands in both the student and non-student groups (Table 6.3). Regarding the religiosity aspect, a greater number of students were categorized as being intrinsically motivated in boycotting US food brands while there were more intrinsically motivated non-student respondents boycott Chinese food brands.

Table 6.3 Group of boycotters in each of Religiosity group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boycott</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3 shows that more respondents boycotted Chinese food brands compared to US food brands. For the non-student sample, the number of respondents who boycotted Chinese brands was twice those who boycotted US food brands. Among 198 non-student respondents, 75 were boycotting Chinese food brands, while only 36 of them were boycotting US food brands.

### 6.2 DATA CLEANING AND SCREENING

The raw data was screened and cleaned for coding errors, missing data, outliers and normality based on the requirement of the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). This step is very useful in making sure that the data is ready to be used in further analysis. It can also reduce some possible problems in the analysis.

#### 6.2.1 Coding Errors and Missing Data

To make sure that there were no coding errors, an analysis of the basic descriptive statistics and frequency distribution was conducted. This method was useful to detect if there were any improperly coded values. The tests detected two cases with incorrect data entries that were fixed after checking the respondent’s original answers in the questionnaire. Then the data were also screened to see if there were any missing data.
using IBM SPSS Statistics version 21. The result indicated that there were no missing data.

6.2.2 Outliers

Before doing a SEM analysis, it is recommended to identify outliers in the data. Hair et al. (2010) define outliers as observations that have extraordinary characteristics compared to the majority of observations. Observations can be categorized as an outlier when their responses were very different compared to other observations, also, possibly, opposite. There is a possibility that outliers can be caused by coding errors or missing data. However, the coding errors in this study were corrected and there were no missing data found in this study. Thus, the next step was to check whether the data have had univariate or multivariate outliers.

Univariate outliers were assessed first before recognizing multivariate outliers in the second step. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), univariate outliers can be identified by calculating the distribution of the values (z scores) of each item. Cases with standardized scores in $\pm 3.29$ ($p < 0.001$, two-tailed test) are regarded as potential univariate outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). However, the standardized scores mainly depend on the size of the sample. For example, Hair et al (2010) mention that in a sample size above 80 observations, the Z scores of $\pm 4$ are considered acceptable. Therefore, due to the relatively large sample size in this study ($n=400$), a z score of $\pm 4$ will be used to detect univariate outliers. Based on a z score generated by the SPSS program there was one item that had univariate outliers. The z score was -5.42 (case number 240 in the health consciousness measurement), which was more than the
acceptable value of ± 4. Thus, this case has been deleted from the data set due to the potential problems this outlier could cause for the SEM analysis.

**Multivariate Outliers**

In the multivariate analysis, the existence of outliers can be tested statistically by using mahalanobis distance squared ($D^2$) to identify cases that have great distances from the centroid (Hair et al, 2010). The $D^2/df$ value should not higher than 4 for a large sample like the one in this study (Hair et al, 2010). Based on that, it was found that there were seven cases that could be categorized as multivariate outliers ($D^2/df$>4). However, a closer examination indicated that the distance of these multivariate outliers from the centroid was not large compared with other observations. Hair et al (2010) note that outliers may also be retained to ensure generalizability to the entire population. Thus, they were retain for use in the subsequent analysis.

### 6.2.3 Assessing Normality of the Data

The normality of the data distribution is identified based on the skewness and kurtosis of the data (Hair et al, 2010). An absolute normal distribution resulting in zero values for skewness and kurtosis is very hard to find in social sciences studies (Tabachnick et al., 2001). For example, when the data were concentrated on the left side, the skewness is positive, while more data on the right side results in negative skewness (Tabachnick et al., 2001). Regarding kurtosis values, if it is more than zero, the graph would have very high peaks and short tail graphs of distribution. If the kurtosis value is less than zero, the graph distributions would be flat.
Skewness greater than 3.0 is considered to be too skewed, while kurtosis greater than 10 is problematic for univariate normality (Kline, 2011). A preliminary analysis of this study found skewness and kurtosis in some of the data although these were not severe. Further, this study has a large sample size (400) that was seen as sufficiently large to minimize the detrimental effects of such non-normality in the data (Hair et al, 2010). Consequently, it was felt reasonable to assume the data were reasonably normal and it was decided to use the data in its original format, as transforming data can lead to interpretation difficulties.

6.3 MEASUREMENT

6.3.1 Examining the Constructs’ Measurement Properties

The analysis for the fit of the conceptual model to analyze data of Muslim consumers’ responses to boycotting foreign brands begins with an analysis of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and reliability testing using Cronbach’s alpha for each construct. The reliability indicates the degree to which the items in all constructs are measures of the same underlying attributes (Pallant, 2007). The EFA was conducted first for the six individual latent constructs of awareness of boycott fatwas, uncertainty of halal validity, experiences of peer pressure, animosity, health consciousness and ethnocentrism to test the latent construct correlation. The KMO to measure sampling adequacy were all above 0.6 beyond Kaisers’ (1974) recommendation of 0.5. This means the sample size is adequate for factor analysis (Hair et al. 2010). More details about this are presented in Appendix C.
After testing the latent construct correlation, the next process was a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The CFA was conducted in MPlus prior to testing the hypotheses using SEM. The Average Variance Explained (AVE) and Construct Reliability (CR) were defined during the CFA process to test the reliability and validity of the constructs. Therefore, it was critical to have the data fit the CFA for the model testing Muslim consumers’ reasons to boycott US and Chinese food brands before testing further hypothesis.

6.3.1.1. Religiosity

Based on the literature, the qualitative results and the preliminary pilot study, eleven items were used to measure religiosity in this study. The measurement was divided into extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated questions.

It was found that the construct have an acceptable fit to the data with the following indicators: normed chi-square $\chi^2/df = 2.63$; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.06; Comparative Fix Index (CFI) = 0.98; Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) = 0.96, Standardized Root Mean Square (SRMR) = 0.04. Eleven loadings exceeded 0.50, so this construct was retained for further analysis.

The construct reliability was high at 0.94. The average variance explained was also acceptable at 0.52. Those indicators suggested the construct was reliable and the model fit the data well. The eleven religiosity items had good measurement properties for testing the religiosity of respondents and was used further in the analysis.
Table 6.4 Measurement Model of Religiosity Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Construct Reliability (CR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let my religious consideration influence my everyday affairs (E)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mosque is the most important place to formulate good social relationships (E)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What religion offers me is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike (E)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray (E)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life (E)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and mediation (I)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard to carry my religion into all my other dealings in life (I)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite often I am keenly aware of the presence of Allah, on Divine Being (I)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read literature about faith (I)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to religion (I)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of my life (I)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Fit Measurement-Religiosity

\[ \chi^2/df = 2.63; \ p = 0.00; \ RMSEA = 0.06; \ CFI = 0.981; \ TLI = 0.96, \ SRMR = 0.04 \]

6.3.1.2. Awareness of a Boycott Fatwa Construct

Based on the literature, qualitative results and the preliminary pilot study, there were five items used to measure the awareness of a boycott fatwa construct in this study. It was found that the construct had an acceptable fit to the data (US brands) with the following indicators: Normed Chi-square \( (\chi^2/df) = 1.2; \ p = 0.31; \) Root Mean-square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.00; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 1.00; Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) = 1.00, Standardized Root Mean Square (SRMR) = 0.06. The loadings exceeded 0.50 for both US and Chinese brands scales in measuring the familiarity of the fatwa to boycott foreign brands. The same procedure was repeated for Chinese brands measurement model. All indicators suggested the construct of measuring the familiarity of a fatwa to boycott US and Chinese brands was reliable enough to be used in this study.

Table 6.5 Measurement Model of Awareness on Fatwa about Boycott
### Items (US brands) Result of CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim scholars (ulama) think that I should boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from well-known muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwa on boycotting US brands is in line with my view</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very common to hear people discuss about fatwa on boycotting foreign brands</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Fit Measurement - Awareness on Fatwa about boycott (US brands)

$\chi^2 = 4.8; p = 0.31; df = 4; RMSEA = 0.02; CFI = 0.99; TLI = 0.99; SRMR = 0.02$

### Items (Chinese brands) Result of CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim scholars (ulama) think that I should boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from well-known muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwa on boycotting Chinese brands is in line with my view</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very common to hear people discuss about fatwa on boycotting foreign brands</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Fit Measurement - Awareness on Fatwa about boycott (Chinese brands)

$\chi^2 = 0.85; p = 0.36; df = 1; RMSEA = 0.00; CFI = 1.00; TLI = 1.00; SRMR = 0.006$

### 6.3.1.3 Perceived Uncertainty of Halal Validity Construct

Based on the literature review, qualitative result and the preliminary pilot study, five items were used to measure the uncertainty of halal validity of foreign brands. It was found that the construct had an acceptable fit to the data (US brands) with the following indicators: normed chi-square $\chi^2/df=1.22; p = 0.275; \text{Root Mean Square Error of}$
Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.024; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.99; Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) = 0.99, Standardized Root Mean Square (SRMR) = 0.02. As shown in Table 6.10, four loadings exceeded 0.50, which suggested these constructs were good enough to be used in a further analysis.

The construct’s composite reliability was 0.88 and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) score was 0.57 which suggested the construct was reliable and valid to be used in the further analysis. Thus, the five items measuring uncertainty of halal validity construct had good measurement properties and were retained for subsequent analysis. The same procedure was repeated for Chinese brands measurement model.

### Table 6.6 Measurement Model of Uncertainty of Halal Validity Construct for the foreign brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (US brands)</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim scholars (ulama) think that I should boycott US brands</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from well-known muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott US brands</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott US brands</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwa on boycotting US brands is in line with my view</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very common to hear people discuss about fatwa on boycotting foreign brands</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Fit Measurement-Uncertainty of Halal validity: $\chi^2 = 9.856; p = .275; df = 8; \text{RMSEA} = .024; \text{CFI} = .997; \text{TLI} = .995, \text{SRMR} = .016$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (Chinese brands)</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim scholars (ulama) think that I should boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from well-known muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwa on boycotting Chinese brands is in line with my view</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very common to hear people discuss about fatwa on boycotting foreign brands</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.1.4 Peer Pressure Construct

Based on the literature, qualitative results and the preliminary pilot study, there were three items used to measure the peer pressure construct in this study for each foreign brands. As shown in Table 6.11, the construct had an acceptable fit to the data (US brands) with the following indicators: $\chi^2 / df = 2.97; p = 0.09; \text{RMSEA} = 0.07; \text{CFI} = 0.99; \text{TLI} = 0.96, \text{SRMR} = 0.05$. Five loadings exceeded 0.50, so this construct was retained for further analysis.

The construct’s reliability was 0.81. The AVE score was 0.54. Those indicators suggested the construct was reliable and the model fit the data well. It means the three items of peer pressure construct had good measurement properties and were retained for subsequent analysis. The same procedure was repeated for Chinese brands measurement model.

Table 6.7 Measurement Model of Peer Pressure Construct for foreign brands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (US brands)</th>
<th>Result of CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends are encouraging me to boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends keep reminding me of reasons not to buy US brands</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel uncomfortable if my friends, who boycott US brands, saw me buying those brands</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Fit Measurement-Peer pressure

$\chi^2 = 2.973; p = 0.085; df = 1; \text{RMSEA} = 0.070; \text{CFI} = 0.99; \text{TLI} = 0.96, \text{SRMR} = 0.01$
6.3.1.5 Animosity Construct Testing

Five items were used to measure the animosity (US brands) construct, which is shown in Table 6.8. It was found that the construct had an acceptable fit with the following indicators: $\chi^2 / df = 1.35; p = 0.26; \text{RMSEA} = 0.03; \text{CFI} = 0.99; \text{TLI} = 0.99, \text{SRMR} = 0.01$ and five loadings exceeded 0.50. Thus, the items were used for analysis.

The construct’s reliability was 0.86 and Average Variance Explained (AVE) was 0.56, which suggested the construct was reliable. The five items for the animosity (US brands) construct had good measurement properties for testing the animosity of respondents in this study and were retained for subsequent analysis. The same procedure was repeated for Chinese brands measurement model.

Table 6.8 Measurement Model of Animosity Construct
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (US brands)</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The US is taking advantage of Indonesia</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US wants to gain Economic power over Indonesia</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the fact that there are too many US products everywhere</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US has too much economic influence in Indonesia</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US is doing business unfairly with Indonesian</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Fit Measurement - Animosity**

$\chi^2 = 4.048; p = .256; df = 3; RMSEA = .030; CFI = .998; TLI = .993; SRMR = .013$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (Chinese brands)</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China is taking advantage of Indonesia</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China wants to gain Economic power over Indonesia</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the fact that there are too many Chinese products everywhere</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US has too much economic influence in Indonesia</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese are doing business unfairly with Indonesian</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Fit Measurement - Animosity**

$\chi^2 / df = 2.22; p = 0.014; RMSEA = 0.06; CFI = 0.98; TLI = 0.97, SRMR = 0.02$

### 6.3.1.6 Health Consciousness Construct Testing

Based on the literature, qualitative results and the preliminary pilot study, five items were used to measure the health consciousness construct in this study. It was found that the construct had an acceptable fit with the following indicators: $\chi^2 / df = 1.49; p = 0.14; RMSEA = 0.04; CFI = 0.99; TLI = 0.99, SRMR = 0.017$. Five loadings exceeded 0.50 so this construct was retained for further analysis.
Those indicators suggested the construct is reliable and the model fits the data well. All the items had good measurement properties for testing health consciousness of respondents and was used further in the analysis. The same procedure was repeated for Chinese brands measurement model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (US brands)</th>
<th>Result of CFA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US food brands are unhealthy</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Construct Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US food brands are bad for my diet</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US food brands have suspicious ingredients</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US food brands represent unhealthy lifestyle</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuming US food brands means I do not care about healthiness</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Fit Measurement-Health Consciousness**

χ²/df = 1.49; p = 0.14; RMSEA = 0.04; CFI = 0.99; TLI = 0.99, SRMR = 0.017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (Chinese brands)</th>
<th>Result of CFA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands are unhealthy</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Construct Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands are bad for my diet</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands have suspicious ingredients</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands represent unhealthy lifestyle</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuming Chinese food brands means I do not care about healthiness</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Fit Measurement-Health Consciousness**

χ²/df = 1.40; p = 0.19; RMSEA = 0.03; CFI = 0.99; TLI = 0.99, SRMR = 0.02.
6.3.1.7. Ethnocentrism Construct Testing

Based on the literature, qualitative results and the preliminary pilot study, there were seven items used to measure the ethnocentrism construct in this study. It was found that the ethnocentrism construct had an acceptable fit to the data with the following indicators: $\chi^2 = 1.496; p = 0.133; \text{RMSEA} = 0.035; \text{CFI} = 0.995; \text{TLI} = 0.989, \text{SRMR} = 0.017$ and seven loadings exceeded 0.50.

Table 6.10 shows that the Cronbach’s Alpha for the seven items in the ethnocentrism construct was 0.87 and total variance explained was 57.5%. The construct’s composite reliability was 0.88 and the AVE score was 0.51. These indicators suggest the construct was reliable and the model fit the data well. The seven items of the ethnocentrism construct has good measurement properties and high loading factors which were all above 0.5. Thus, all items in the ethnocentrism construct were then retained for subsequent analysis.

Table 6.10 Measurement Model of Ethnocentrism Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (US brands)</th>
<th>Result of CFA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Construct Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing foreign brands is un-Indonesian</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts Indonesians out of jobs</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A real Indonesian should always buy Indonesian-made products</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should always purchase products manufactured in Indonesia</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we cannot obtain within our own country</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Fit Measurement-Ethnocentrism $\chi^2 / df = 1.757; p = .185; df = 1; \text{RMSEA} = .043; \text{CFI} = .996; \text{TLI} = .988, \text{SRMR} = .044$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items (Chinese brands)</th>
<th>Result of CFA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Construct Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indonesian businesses</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products in our markets 0.68
Indonesian consumer who purchase products made in other countries are responsible for putting their fellow Indonesian out of work 0.79
We should buy Indonesian products and keep Indonesian working 0.64
Indonesians should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indonesian businesses 0.69

Model Fit Measurement-Ethnocentrism
$\chi^2/df$ = 1.49; $\chi^2 = 14.960$; $p = 0.134$; df = 10; RMSEA = 0.04; CFI = 0.995; TLI = 0.99, SRMR = 0.02

6.3.2 Discriminant validity of the Measurement Constructs

Discriminant validity of the latent constructs was assessed by comparing the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and squared correlations. As all the squared correlation was smaller than the AVE scores, the constructs are therefore different from each other (Table 6.11). Further, the AVE scores ranged from 0.53 to 0.66. Therefore, the constructs can be considered reliable and can be used for further analysis (Hair et al., 2010). All of the AVE scores in this study were above 0.5, as a consequence of the validity of the construct can be assumed.

Table 6.11 Square Correlation and AVE Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs (US brands)</th>
<th>Squared Correlation</th>
<th>AVE Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott Fatwa</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animosity</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Pressure</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Consciousness</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of halal validity</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs (Chinese brands)</th>
<th>Squared Correlation</th>
<th>AVE Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott Fatwa</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animosity</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Pressure</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Consciousness</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of halal Validity</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

The quantitative part of this study was designed to quantify the finding of the preliminary qualitative phase in this study. The hypotheses proposed possible effects of religiosity along with other antecedents in the respondents’ boycotting of foreign brands. The direct, mediating and moderating effect of religiosity was tested in regard to their reported boycotting of foreign brands (hypothesis 1).

In order to test the hypotheses, a model of the hypothesized relationship between constructs was produced (Figure 6.5). Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) is considered suitable to analyze structural theory related to some phenomena (Byrne, 2010) and has some advantages compared to a traditional analysis. For example, SEM allows researchers to account for the errors that are inherent in the measuring of the constructs in this study. Further, SEM provides goodness of fit that analyzes whether the sample data support the hypothetical theoretical measure. Thus, it enables the researcher to analyze a model in a more comprehensive way in testing the hypotheses.

This exploratory study aims to investigate the effect of religiosity on the reported boycotting of foreign brands. One of the primary goals in the application of SEM was testing the fit between the data and the proposed model. Therefore, in the first hypothesis, indices of three models based on Hair et al. (2010) were evaluated to find the model that fit the data best. The first model has some direct effects of religiosity along with other boycott factors. The second model has religiosity mediating the effect of the other antecedents. The third model evaluates the fit of the indices of the model which has religiosity as the moderating variable. Further, in the first hypothesis, the model that fits the data best was chosen for the hypotheses testing.
In order to test the hypothesis, SEM was performed simultaneously for each model to test the direct effect of religiosity on the reported boycotting of US food brands and Chinese food brands. The models were evaluated for two different groups, students and
non-students. Religiosity had a direct effect in boycotting US food brands for non-student respondents. The weight of path was almost equal for the pressure of boycotting US food brands path in the student sample that appears as the strongest path among other boycott antecedents.

Figure 6.6 Factors that have Direct Effects on the Reported Boycotting of Foreign Brands

**STUDENT**

**US FOOD BRANDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Animosity</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Health Consciousness</th>
<th>Uncertainty of Halal Validity</th>
<th>Awareness of Boycott Fatwa</th>
<th>Experience of Peer Pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHINESE FOOD BRANDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Animosity</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Health Consciousness</th>
<th>Uncertainty of Halal Validity</th>
<th>Awareness of Boycott Fatwa</th>
<th>Experience of Peer Pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NON-STUDENT**

**US FOOD BRANDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Animosity</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Health Consciousness</th>
<th>Uncertainty of Halal Validity</th>
<th>Awareness of Boycott Fatwa</th>
<th>Experience of Peer Pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHINESE FOOD BRANDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Animosity</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Health Consciousness</th>
<th>Uncertainty of Halal Validity</th>
<th>Awareness of Boycott Fatwa</th>
<th>Experience of Peer Pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Correlation coefficients:

- Religiosity: 0.49**
- Animosity: 0.42**
- Ethnocentrism: 0.36*
- Health Consciousness: 0.45*
The direct effect of religiosity was tested with two different groups, students and non-students. In each sample group, two foreign brands were tested: US food brands and Chinese food brands. The findings of testing the direct effects of religiosity show some evidence that respondents’ religiosity has a positive (0.38) and significant (p<0.05) direct effect on the boycotting of US food brands for the non-student sample only. The direct path coefficient of religiosity can only be seen in the reported boycotting of US food brands (non-student) and there is no significant direct path in terms of boycotting Chinese food brands.

Table 6.12 Model Fits for Direct Effects of Religiosity and Other Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US food brands</td>
<td>Chinese food brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>$\leq 3.0$</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>$&lt; 0.08$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.95$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.95$</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hair et al. (2010)

Note: indicates significant effect, *significant at p<0.001, ** sign at p<0.01, *** sign at p<0.05
In this model, religiosity and other antecedents (such as animosity, uncertainty of halal, ethnocentrism, etc) were simultaneously tested to evaluate their direct effects on the reported boycotting of foreign brands. These models were tested for both the student and non-student samples in terms of boycotted US food brands and Chinese food brands. It appears that the model fit for this model show a good fit within the recommended suggestion based on Hair et al. (2010).

Before choosing which model was most relevant for this study, model fit indices were investigated in finding out how the model fit the data that was also based on previous studies. The indicators of model fit such as normed chi-square ($\chi^2$/df) value, Comparative Index (CFI), Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) and Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) were first tested to see how the model fit the data (Hair et al, 2010). Further, to investigate reasons for Muslim boycotting of foreign brands, this study selected the research models that had a good model fit. The goodness of fit of the first research model shows some good fit indices that indicate the model adequately fits the data.

However, after having a closer look at the path coefficient of religiosity in each of the direct models, it appears that religiosity only has a significant direct path in terms of boycotting US food brands in the non-student sample (Figure 6.6). The direct effects are not significant for the students in the boycotting US food brands model as well as the boycotting Chinese food brands model for both student and non-students. There were no significant direct paths for boycotting US food brands in the student sample, and the boycotting Chinese brands for both the student and non-student samples. Thus, the other effect of religiosity, such as mediating and moderating effects were tested next.
Figure 6.7 Direct Effect of Religiosity
(Significant Path for Reported Boycotting of US Food Brands (Non-students only))

![Diagram showing the direct effect of religiosity on reported boycotting of US food brands.]

6.4.1 Testing Mediating Effect of Religiosity

Figure 6.8 Mediating Effect of Religiosity

![Diagram showing the mediating effect of religiosity on reported boycotting of foreign brands through various factors.]
The result of simultaneously testing the mediating effect of religiosity indicates that the model does not fit the data. The mediating effect of religiosity model indices do not fall within recommended indices for model fit that was explained in Hair et al. (2010). Thus, the mediating effect of religiosity was not explored further in this study. Rather, this study focused on the moderating effect of religiosity.

Table 6.13 Model Fits for Mediating of Religiosity Model (Not Fit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Food Brands</td>
<td>Chinese Food Brands</td>
<td>US Food Brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>1.0 &lt; $\chi^2$/df &lt; 3.0</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$\geq$ 0.95</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>$\geq$ 0.95</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hair (2010). Note: It appears that the mediating model does not fit the data. Most of the fit indices such as normed chi-square, RMSEA, CFI, and TLI for the mediating model were outside the recommended indices.

6.4.2 Testing the Moderating Effects of Religiosity

The model fit for the moderating effects of religiosity shows a good fit with the data. In order to test the hypothesis about the moderating effects of religiosity toward boycotting foreign brands, this study used Multi group Structural Equation Modelling (MSEM) to simultaneously test all variables in the model. Religiosity was expected to moderate the effect of animosity, ethnocentrism, health consciousness, uncertainty of halal validity, awareness of a boycott fatwa, and the experience of peer pressure.

The MSEM using MPlus was conducted simultaneously for each model to test the moderating effect of religiosity on the boycotting foreign brands. The model fit indices for the baseline model are crucial in determining whether or not MSEM techniques were a feasible option. The MSEM techniques were considered appropriate because the moderating variable in this study was categorical (extrinsically and intrinsically...
motivated religiosity). Thus, a comparison between those two groups needed to be investigated to see the effects of religiosity in reported boycotting of foreign brands.

The good fit between the model and data found earlier in this study suggests that MSEM is a feasible technique for comparing extrinsically and intrinsically groups on the relationship between independent and dependent variables. The hypotheses in this study suggested that different degrees of religiosity (being extrinsic or intrinsic) have an effect on their responses to boycott factors. For example, the effect of the awareness of a boycott fatwa in reported boycotting of foreign brands was expected to be stronger for intrinsically motivated respondents than extrinsically motivated respondents (hypothesis 2). To test this hypothesis, the baseline model of extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation was performed and the effects of the awareness of a boycott fatwa in reported of boycotting of foreign brands were compared between intrinsically motivated and extrinsically motivated respondents. Some plots were prepared to compare the effect of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

The result of the model fit indices in Table 6.18 shows that the model, which has religiosity as a moderation variable, fits the data. The model met the recommended indices for normed chi-square, RMSEA, CFI and TLI as model fit indicators based on Hair (2010). It appears that religiosity has a moderating effect on the reported boycotting of foreign brands.

**Table 6.14 Fit Indices for the Baseline models for Boycotting Foreign Brands (Religiosity as the Moderating Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Food Brands</td>
<td>Chinese Food Brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df</td>
<td>$1 &lt; \chi^2$/df $&lt; 3.0$</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>$&lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.95$</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.2.1. Baseline Model-Student

The models for boycotting US food brands and Chinese brands showed differences between the extrinsically and intrinsically motivated students. The intrinsically motivated student was affected by animosity, health consciousness and peer pressure which explained 37% of their reasons for boycotting US food brands. Further, they were affected by ethnocentrism and health consciousness which explained 34% of their reasons to boycott Chinese food brands. The extrinsically motivated student was affected by peer pressure which explained 25% of their reason to boycott US food brands. Peer pressure explained 30% of reasons to boycott Chinese food brands for extrinsically motivated students.

6.4.2.2 Baseline Model-Non student

It appears that for the intrinsically motivated non-students, ethnocentrism, health consciousness and experience of peer pressure explained 71% of their reported boycotting of the US food brands. On the other hand, halal validity explained 58% of their reported boycotting of Chinese food brands. For extrinsically motivated non-student, ethnocentrism and peer pressure were explained 75% of their reported boycotting of US food brands. Further, ethnocentrism and experience of peer pressure explained 33% of reported boycotting of Chinese brands for extrinsically motivated non-student respondents.
6.4.3 Testing Hypothesis One:

The moderating effect of religiosity model is the most appropriate model to be used in this study. The indices of the model fall within the recommended level based on Hair et al. (2010). The baseline model for extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated groups also supports that religiosity moderating the effect of the relationship between independent and dependent variables in this study. This means, being extrinsically or intrinsically motivated can have some effect on factors which influence the boycotting of foreign brands.

Table 6.15 Result for Hypothesis One: The Direct, Mediating and Moderating Effects of Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁:a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ religiosity will have a positive (direct) effect on their reported boycot of foreign brands</td>
<td>Rejected (model fit, but no direct effect of religiosity)</td>
<td>Rejected (model fit, but no direct effect of religiosity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Religiosity will mediate the effect of independent and dependent variables of Muslim consumers’ boycott of foreign brands</td>
<td>Rejected (model does not fit the data)</td>
<td>Rejected (model does not fit the data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Religiosity will</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent and dependent variables of Muslim consumers’ boycotting of foreign brands</td>
<td>(model fit, some moderating effect of religiosity were found)</td>
<td>(model fit, some moderating effect of religiosity were found)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model C (moderating effect of religiosity) shows good indices and the moderating effect of religiosity were found based on the significance of the baseline model. Therefore, hypothesis 2,3,4,5,6,7 will be based on this model. Further, Model C will be used to evaluate the moderating effect of religiosity on the relationship between independent and dependent variables in the next hypotheses.

Based on an evaluation of model fit and previous research, the moderating effect of religiosity research models will be used to answer the hypotheses in this study. Hypotheses 2,3,4,5,6,7 will evaluate the moderating effect of religiosity on the relationship between independent variables, such as familiarity with a boycott fatwa (H2), uncertainty of halal validity (H3), experience of peer pressure (H4), animosity (H5), health consciousness (H6), ethnocentrism (H7) and the dependent variable (reported boycott of foreign brands).

Figure 6.9 The Hypotheses Tested (Model C)
One of the main objectives of this study was to evaluate the effect of religiosity for Muslim consumers’ boycotting decision. It appears that the moderating model can better explain the effect of religiosity. The moderating model has good model fit indices that can be seen in Table 6.13. The model fit indices based on Hair et al. (2010), such as normed chi-square, CFI, TLI and RMSEA are all within the suggested value range.

There were some significant differences between extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated respondents in both the student and non-student samples regarding their reasons to boycott foreign brands. That means religiosity moderates the effect of some independent variables such as animosity, health consciousness, experience of peer pressure, awareness of a boycott fatwa in the reported boycotting of foreign brands. Thus, Hypothesis 2,3,4,5,6, and 7 will be focused on the relationship between independent and dependent variables (boycotting foreign brands) and how religiosity moderates these relationships. There were two brands: US food brands and Chinese food brands that were tested in this study for the student and non-student samples.

6.4.4 Testing Hypothesis Two:

The respondents’ awareness of a boycott fatwa will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effects are stronger for intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated respondents. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese food brands, for the student and non-student samples.
Testing Hypothesis 2 involves examining the effect of religiosity (extrinsic and intrinsic) on the effect of awareness of a boycott fatwa in reported boycotting of foreign brands. The moderating effect of religiosity in the relationship between awareness of boycott fatwa and the reported boycotting of foreign brands was plotted in Figure 6.19 and 6.20 from the result of MPlus software. The slopes of extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation were compared to evaluate their positive or negative effect on the relationship between awareness of a boycott fatwa and the reported boycotting of foreign brands. Further, the weight of the extrinsic and intrinsic paths was also compared to evaluate which path was stronger and whether the difference is significant or not.

Based on Bollen (1989), if the path constraint between the groups is not equal, it means that there was a significant difference between groups; in this case extrinsic and intrinsic (represent their level of religiosity). To test how significant the difference is, a MSEM generated by MPlus version 7 software was examined. If there was a significant difference between extrinsic and intrinsic, it means religiosity moderates the relationship between awareness of a boycott fatwa and reported boycott of foreign brands. Similar methods were used to test the rest of the hypotheses.

**Student- Awareness of Boycott Fatwa**

**US Food Brands (students)**

It appears that awareness of a boycott fatwa has a positive effect on the reported boycotting of foreign brands particularly for intrinsic respondents. For both extrinsically and intrinsically respondents, an awareness of a boycott fatwa increases their tendency to boycott US food brands (Figure 6.10). This means, reported boycotting of US food brands increases as awareness of a boycott fatwa increases for both extrinsic and
intrinsic students. Further, Figure 6.10 shows that the effect of an awareness of a boycott fatwa was positive and stronger for intrinsic than extrinsic students. However, the chi-square test for difference testing is not significant for the path from awareness of a boycott fatwa to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 0.004$, df = 1, p=0.95). There were no significant differences between extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated respondent. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

*Chinese food brands (students)*

Further, for intrinsically motivated students, reported boycotting of Chinese brands increases rapidly as awareness of a boycott fatwa increases as can be seen in Figure 6.10 However, reported boycotting of Chinese brands does not increase regardless of the level of awareness of s boycott fatwa for extrinsically motivated students. Thus, intrinsically motivated students experience more effects of an awareness of boycott fatwa in their reported boycotting of Chinese food brands compared to extrinsically motivated students. However, the chi-square test for difference testing is not significant for the path from awareness of a boycott fatwa to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 3.574$, df = 1, p=0.059). Thus, while an awareness of a boycott fatwa has a positive effect on the reported boycotting of Chinese food brands, the effect was stronger for intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated student. However there were no significant differences between extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated respondents. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

*Figure 6.10 Result for Hypothesis 2 for Student Respondents*
Non-Student- Awareness of Boycott Fatwa

Boycott US food brands-non student

Based on Figure 6.11, it appears that an awareness of a boycott fatwa has a positive effect on the reported boycotting of US food brands in the non-student groups. Based on Bollen (1989), the chi-square test was performed to investigate the difference between those two groups. The result for difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ awareness of a boycott fatwa to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.015$, df = 1, p=0.314). This means there was a positive effect of an awareness of a boycott fatwa on reported boycotting of US food brands, the effect was stronger for extrinsically motivated than intrinsically motivated. However the difference between extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated respondents was not significant. Thus, hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Boycott Chinese food brands-non student
Figure 6.1 shows that an awareness of a boycott fatwa also had a positive effect on the reported boycotting of Chinese brands in the non-student group. Based on Bollen (1989), the chi-square test was performed to investigate the difference between those two groups. The result for difference testing was no significant for the path from consumers’ awareness of boycott fatwa to reported boycott of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 3.43$, df = 1, p=0.15). This means there was no significant difference between extrinsic and intrinsic in their effect of awareness of a boycott fatwa in reported boycotting of Chinese food brands for non-students. The effect was stronger for extrinsically motivated than intrinsically motivated non-student. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

**Figure 6.11 Result for Hypothesis 2 for Non-Student Respondents**

**US food brands**

**Chinese food brands**

6.4.5 Testing Hypothesis Three:
The respondents’ uncertainty of halal validity of a brand will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effects are stronger for intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated respondents. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese food brands, for student and non-student samples.

**Students- Uncertainty of Halal Validity**

*Boycotting US food brand- Student*

Figure 6.12 shows that the plots were positive for the intrinsically group. This means, uncertainty of halal has a positive effect to reported boycott of foreign brands for intrinsic students. The stronger the uncertainty of halal validity, the higher the tendency of the intrinsic (student) to boycott US foreign brands. However, for extrinsically motivated students, the increasing level of uncertainty about halal validity has a strong effect on the boycotting of US foreign brands. Although their uncertainty of a halal validity increases, the reported increases, the reported boycotting of US foreign brands for extrinsically motivated (student) does not increase much. This means the effect of uncertainty of halal was positive and stronger for intrinsically motivated than extrinsic motivated students in the reported boycotting of US foreign brands. However, the result for the difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ uncertainty of halal to reported boycotting of US foreign brands \( (\Delta \chi^2 = 0.680, df = 1, p=0.41) \). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

*Boycotting Chinese food brands-Student*

Figure 6.12 shows a positive effect of uncertainty of halal validity in boycotting Chinese brands for intrinsically motivated respondents. This means the more the intrinsic student is uncertain about the halal validity of Chinese food brands, the more
they will boycott Chinese food brands. The slope was positive for intrinsically motivated but negative for extrinsically motivated respondents. This means although they are uncertain about the halal validity of Chinese food brands, they were less likely to boycott Chinese food brands. It appears that the effect uncertainty of halal certification in reported boycotting of Chinese food brands was only strong for intrinsically motivated, but not for extrinsically motivated (student) which is consistent with our expectations. However, the result for difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ uncertainty of halal to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1.281$, df = 1, p=0.26). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was only partially supported.

**Figure 6.12 Result for Hypothesis 3 for Student Respondents**

*US food brands*  
*Chinese food brands*
**Non-Students - Uncertainty of Halal Validity**

**Boycotting US Food Brands - Non-Students**

Figure 6.13 shows that the plots were positive for both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated group. The effect of the uncertainty of halal validity and reported boycotting of US food brands was stronger for intrinsic than extrinsic (non-students). The stronger the uncertainty of halal validity, the higher the tendency of both intrinsic and extrinsic (non-student) to boycott US food brands, the effect was stronger for intrinsic than extrinsic. However, the result for difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ uncertainty of halal validity to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.267$, df = 1, $p=0.26$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

**Boycotting Chinese brands - Non-students**

Figure 6.13 shows that the plots were positive for both the intrinsically and extrinsically groups. However, the effect of uncertainty of halal validity and reported boycotting of Chinese food brands was stronger for intrinsic than extrinsic (non-student). The stronger the uncertainty of halal validity, the higher the tendency of both intrinsic and extrinsic (non-students) to boycott Chinese food brands. The result for difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ uncertainty of halal validity to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 5.315$, df = 1, $p<0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.
6.4.6 Testing Hypothesis Four:

The respondents’ experiences of peer pressure will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effects are stronger for intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated respondents. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese food brands, for student and non-student samples.

**Students- Peer Pressure on Boycotting Foreign brands**

**Boycotting US food brands (students)**

Figure 6.14 shows that the plots were positive for both the intrinsically and extrinsically group. The effect of peer pressure and reported boycotting of US food brands was stronger for intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated respondents (non-student). The stronger their experience of peer pressure, the higher the tendency of both intrinsically motivated and extrinsically motivated respondents (non-student) to boycott US food brands. However, the result for the difference testing was not significant for
the path from consumers’ peer pressure to reported boycotting of US brands ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1.681$, df = 1, p=0.194). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was only partially supported.

*Boycotting Chinese food brands (students)*

Figure 6.14 shows that the plots were positive for both the intrinsically and extrinsically motivated groups. The stronger their experience of peer pressure, the higher the tendency of both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated respondents (non-student) to boycott Chinese food brands. The result for difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ peer pressure to reported boycotting of Chinese brands ($\Delta\chi^2 = 7.489$, df = 1, p<0.01), however the effect of peer pressure in reported boycotting of Chinese brands was positive and stronger for extrinsically than intrinsically motivated respondents (student). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported.

**Figure 6.14 Result for Hypothesis 4 for Student Respondents**

*US food brands*  
*Chinese food brands*
Non-students – Peer Pressure for Boycoting Foreign Brands

Boycotting US brands (non-students)

Figure 6.1 shows that the plots were positive for both the intrinsic and extrinsic groups. The effect of peer pressure and reported boycotting of US brand was slightly stronger for intrinsic than extrinsic non-students. The effect of peer pressure in reported boycotting of US food brands was positive. That means, the stronger the peer pressure, the higher tendency of both the intrinsic and extrinsic non-students to boycott US food brands. The effect was stronger for intrinsic than extrinsic. However, the result for the difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ peer pressure to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.436, \text{df} = 1, p=0.23$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported.

Boycotting Chinese food brands (non-students)

Figure 6.1 shows that the plots were positive for both the intrinsic and extrinsic groups. The effect of peer pressure and reported boycotting of Chinese food brands was stronger for extrinsic than intrinsic non-students. The effect of peer pressure in reported boycott of Chinese brands was positive. That means, the stronger the peer pressure, the higher tendency of both intrinsic and extrinsic non-students to boycott Chinese food brands. However, the result for the difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ peer pressure to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 3.057, \text{df} = 1, p<0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported.
6.4.7 Testing Hypothesis Five:

The respondents’ animosity toward the country of origin of a foreign brand will have a positive effect on their boycotting of foreign brands. The effects are stronger for intrinsic than extrinsic Muslim respondents. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese food brands, for student and non-student samples.

**Student- Animosity**

**Boycotting US food brands (students)**

Figure 6.16 shows that animosity has a positive effect on students’ reported boycotting of US food brands. The higher the animosity, the higher the reported boycotting of US food brands. The intrinsic plot was higher than the extrinsic plot. It means that the effect of animosity on reported boycotting of foreign brands was higher for intrinsic than extrinsic student respondents. However, the result for difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ animosity to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 2.374, df = 1, p<0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was supported.
Boycotting Chinese food brands (student)

Figure 6.16 shows that animosity has a positive effect in students’ reported boycott of Chinese food brands. The higher animosity respondents’, the higher their reported boycott of Chinese food brands. However, the extrinsic plot was higher than the intrinsic plot. It means that the effect of animosity in reported boycott of foreign brands was higher for extrinsic than intrinsic for student respondents. However, the result for difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ animosity to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 2.058$, df = 1, p=0.15). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was partially supported.

Figure 6.16 Result for Hypothesis 5 for Student Respondent

US food brands

Chinese food brands
Non-student Animosity for boycotting foreign brands

Boycotting US food brands (Non-students)

Figure 6.17 shows that animosity has a positive effect on non-students’ reported boycotting of US food brands. The higher the animosity respondents’, the higher the reported boycotting of US food brands. The extrinsic plot was higher than intrinsic plot. It means that the effect of animosity on the reported boycotting of foreign brands was higher for extrinsic than intrinsic for non-student respondents. However, the result for difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ animosity to reported boycotting of the US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.81$, df = 1, p=0.18). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was partially supported.

Boycotting Chinese food brands (Non-students)

Figure 6.17 shows that animosity has a positive effect on non-students’ reported boycotting of Chinese food brands. The higher the animosity, the higher the reported boycotting of Chinese brands. The extrinsic plot was higher than intrinsic plot. It means that the effect of animosity in reported boycotting of Chinese food brands was higher for extrinsically motivated than intrinsically motivated non-student respondents. The result for the difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ animosity to reported boycotting of the Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.81$, df = 1, p=0.18). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was partially supported.
6.4.8 Testing Hypothesis Six:

The respondents’ health consciousness will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effects are stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese brands, for student and non-student samples.

**Students-Health Consciousness**

**Boycotting US food brands (students)**

Figure 6.17 shows that respondents’ health consciousness has a positive effect on students’ reported boycotting of US food brands. The respondents’ tendency to boycott US food brands increases as their health consciousness also increases. The intrinsically motivated plot was much higher than extrinsically motivated plot. This means that the effect of health consciousness in reported boycotting of US food brands was much higher for intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated student respondents. However, the result for the difference testing was significant for the path from
consumers’ health consciousness to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.002$, df = 1, p<0.05). Thus, Hypothesis 6 was supported.

**Boycotting Chinese food brands (students)**

Figure 6.18 shows that respondents’ health consciousness has a positive effect on reported boycotting of Chinese food brands. Respondents’ tendency to boycott Chinese brands increases as their health consciousness also increases. The intrinsic plot was higher than extrinsic plot. This means that the effect of health consciousness on reported boycotting of Chinese food brands was higher for intrinsically motivated than extrinsically motivated for student respondents. However, the result for difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ health consciousness to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 2.53$, df = 1, p<0.05). Thus, Hypothesis 6 was supported.

**Figure 6.18 Result for Hypothesis 6 for Student Respondents**

![Graph showing results for Hypothesis 6 for student respondents](image)
**Non-students-Health Consciousness**

*Boycotting US foreign brands (non-students)*

Figure 6.19 shows that respondents’ health consciousness has a positive effect on the reported boycotting of US food brands. Respondents’ tendency to boycott US food brands increases as their health consciousness also increases. The intrinsically motivated plot was higher than extrinsically motivated plot. The result for the difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ health consciousness to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 2.516$, df = 1, $p<0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 6 was supported.

*Boycotting Chinese food brands (non-student)*

Figure 6.19 shows that respondents’ health consciousness has a positive effect on their reported boycotting of Chinese brands. Respondents’ tendency to boycott Chinese food brands increases as their health consciousness also increases. The effect was positive for both extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated non-students. The extrinsic plot was slightly higher than intrinsic plot. The result for the difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ health consciousness to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 2.35$, df = 1, $p<0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 6 was partially supported.
6.4.9 Testing Hypothesis Seven:

The respondents’ ethnocentrism will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effects are stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents. The hypothesis will be tested on US and Chinese food brands, for the student and non-student samples.

Students-Ethnocentrism

Boycotting US food brands- Student
Figure 6.20 shows that the plots were positive for the intrinsically and extrinsically motivated groups. This means, ethnocentrism has a positive effect on the reported boycotting of foreign brands for both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated student respondents. The respondents’ tendency to boycott US food brands increases as their ethnocentrism also increases. However, the result for the difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ ethnocentrism to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 1.020$, df = 1, p=0.31). An insignificant chi-square shows that the path constraint is equal between the groups. This means the effect of ethnocentrism on reported boycott of US food brands is equal for extrinsically and intrinsically motivated groups. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was only partially supported.

**Boycotting Chinese food brands-Students**

Figure 6.20 shows a positive effect of ethnocentrism on boycotting Chinese brands for intrinsically and extrinsically motivated respondents. The effect was stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents. Further, the result for the difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ ethnocentrism to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 6.051$, df = 1, p<0.05). Thus, Hypothesis 7 was supported in the students’ reported boycotting of Chinese brands.

**Figure 6.20 Result for Hypothesis 7 for Student Respondent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US food brands</th>
<th>Chinese food brands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Non-Students-Ethnocentrism

Boycotting US food brands (non-students)

Figure 6.21 show that respondents’ ethnocentrism has a positive effect in non-students’ reported of boycotting of US food brands. The respondents’ tendency to boycott US food brands increases as their ethnocentrism also increases. The intrinsically motivated plot was slightly higher than extrinsically motivated plot. The result for the difference testing was significant for the path from consumers’ ethnocentrism to reported boycotting of US food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 3.315$, df = 1, p<0.05). Thus, Hypothesis 7 was supported.

Boycotting Chinese food brands (non-student)

Figure 6.21 shows that respondents’ health consciousness has a positive effect on non-students’ reported boycotting of Chinese food brands. The respondents’ tendency to boycott Chinese food brands increases as their ethnocentrism also increases. The effect was positive for both extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated non-students. The result for the difference testing was not significant for the path from consumers’ ethnocentrism to reported boycotting of Chinese food brands ($\Delta \chi^2 = 4.278$, df = 1,
p<0.05). However, the extrinsically motivated plot was higher than intrinsically motivated plot. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was partially supported.

**Figure 6.21 Result for Hypothesis 7 for Non-student Respondents**

**US food brands**

**Chinese food brands**

6.5 Summary of Hypotheses Testing

The present study investigated the foundations of Muslim customers’ boycotts of foreign brands that go beyond religion. The hypotheses of this study tested respondents’ religiosity, respondents’ ethnocentrism, respondents’ animosity, respondents’ experiences of peer pressure, respondents’ perceived validity of the halal labelling of a brand, respondents’ awareness of a boycott fatwa as the possible reasons for reported boycotting of foreign brands. The quantitative approach in this study quantifies previous findings from the qualitative phase of this study. A summary of the hypothesis testing results of this study are as follows:

**Table 6.16 Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US food brands</td>
<td>Chinese food</td>
<td>US food brands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2a: Respondents’ religiosity will have a positive (direct) effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b: Religiosity will mediate the effect of independent and dependent variables of Muslim consumers’ boycotting of foreign brands.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c: Religiosity will moderate the effect of independent and dependent variables of Muslim consumers’ boycotting of foreign brands.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model of the moderating effect of religiosity shows good indices of model fit, therefore hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 will evaluate the moderating effect of religiosity in the relationship between independent (such as animosity, ethnocentrism, health consciousness, etc) and dependent variables (boycotting of foreign brands).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3: Respondents’ awareness of a boycotting fatwa will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effect of a boycotting fatwa is stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Respondents’ uncertainty of the validity of the Halal approval for a brand will have a positive effect to their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effect of consumers’ uncertainty about halal validity is stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Respondents’ experiences of peer pressure will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
foreign brands. The effect of peer pressure is stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H5: Respondents’ animosity will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effect of animosity is stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Partially Supported</th>
<th>Partially Supported</th>
<th>Partially Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H6: Respondents’ health consciousness will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effect of health consciousness is stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Partially Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H7: Respondents’ ethnocentrism will have a positive effect on their reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effect of ethnocentrism is stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically motivated respondents.</th>
<th>Partially Supported</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Partially Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US food brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US food brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

7.1 SUMMARY

The present study offers a significant contribution, not only to Muslim consumer’s boycott literature but also in terms of general perspectives on Muslim consumers’ behaviour as a whole. The present study provides a comprehensive insight into an aspect of boycotting behaviour that has remained unexplored in previous studies. Religious and secular reasons are both considered as important factors in Muslim consumers’ boycotting behaviour and the research findings did not support the claim that Muslim consumers were only affected by religious related reasons.

US and Chinese food brands and some boycott factors were chosen based on the qualitative phase of this study. The effects of religiosity together with the six other boycott factors: respondents’ health consciousness, animosity, ethnocentrism, awareness about a boycott fatwa, uncertainty of halal validity and experience of peer pressure were investigated. Four models were prepared to show the effect of those six factors on the respondents’ boycotting behaviours of the two foreign brands (US and Chinese food brands) and two different samples (students and non-students) as shown in Figure 7.1.

This study found that none of the four models that specified direct effects for religiosity and the other six factors fit the data. Religiosity was not a significant direct effect for
respondents’ boycotting of US and Chinese food brands. On the other hand, all four models that specified religiosity as a moderator fit the data. The two models of the non-student sample’s boycotting behaviour provide a better explanation (71% US brands and 58% Chinese brands) than the two models for the student sample (31% and 34% respectively). This means that more than half of the boycotting effects in non-student sample and almost one third in the student sample can be explained in this study. Four models were designed to illustrate the effect of each factor in reported boycotting of the two foreign brands and two samples.

As shown in Figure 7.1, there are some similar patterns across four boycotting behaviour models of the respondents in this study. The results show that the effect of health consciousness is one of the most consistent effects in reported boycotting of foreign brands. The effect of health consciousness is relatively strong and is moderated by the respondent’s religiosity in all four boycotting behaviour models.

The next most important factor found in this study is the experience of peer pressure. The effects of the experience of peer pressure were also relatively strong and modified by the respondents’ religiosity in reported boycotting of Chinese food brands (see Chinese brands models of the student and non-student samples in Figure 7.1). For both samples, the experience of peer pressure had a direct positive effect on their reported boycotting of US brands.
Figure 7.1 Boycott Behaviour Models in the Present Study

STUDENTS

US BRANDS

Religiosity
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Ethnocentrism

Health Consciousness

Uncertainty of Halal Validity

Awareness of Boycott Fatwa

Experience of Peer Pressure

0.63*

0.47**

0.51*

This model represents 37% of reasons to boycott US brands (students)

Reported Boycott of US brands

CHINESE BRANDS

Religiosity

Animosity

Ethnocentrism

Health Consciousness

Uncertainty of Halal Validity

Awareness of Boycott Fatwa

Experience of Peer Pressure
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This model represents 34% of reasons to boycott Chinese brands (students)

Reported Boycott of Chinese Brands

NON STUDENTS

US BRANDS

Religiosity

Animosity

Ethnocentrism

Health Consciousness

Uncertainty of Halal

Awareness of Boycott Fatwa

Experience of Peer Pressure

0.73**

0.62*
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This model represents 71% of reasons to boycott US brands (non-students)

Reported Boycott of US brands

CHINESE BRANDS

Religiosity

Animosity

Ethnocentrism

Health Consciousness

Uncertainty of Halal

Awareness of Boycott Fatwa

Experience of Peer Pressure

0.35***

0.62*

0.84* 0.43**

This model represents 58% of reasons to boycott Chinese brands (non-students)

Reported Boycott of Chinese Brands
Positive effects for ethnocentrism were found to be moderated by religiosity in three of the four models. Ethnocentrism had no effect on one model of boycotting behaviour (US brands in the student sample). In contrast, among the three boycotting behaviour models, ethnocentrism had the strongest effect in reported boycotting of US brands (non-student sample). The effect was significantly different between intrinsic and extrinsic respondents across the three boycott models.

Further, the effect of the respondents’ “animosity” and their “uncertainty of halal validity” were significant when moderated by their religiosity only once in two different models. Animosity had a significant effect on respondents’ reported boycotting of US brands (student sample) boycott behaviour model while “uncertainty of halal validity” had as a significant effect on the respondents’ reported boycotting of Chinese brands (non-student sample) boycotting behaviour model.

In general, religious related reasons (such as uncertainty of halal validity) only had an effect on reported boycotting of Chinese brands for the non-student sample. None of the religious related reasons (either uncertainty of halal validity or awareness of a boycott fatwas) had an effect on reported boycotting of US brands. However, the effects of uncertainty of halal validity were relatively strong and moderated by the respondents’ religiosity in reported boycotting of Chinese brands for the non-student sample. Awareness of boycott fatwas had no effect on the reported boycotting behaviour of foreign food brands. The present study supports the notion that the effects of secular boycotting factors such as peer pressure and health consciousness are significant for
Muslim consumers in the student and non-student samples in regard to both US and Chinese food brands.

This study also found that more female respondents (75 out of 400 respondents) joined a boycott of Chinese food brands compared to male respondents (55 out of 400 respondents). More specifically, in the non-student group, 74% of people who boycott Chinese brands are female. This is in line with a study by Lyons and Pollay (1990) that found female are more critical and conscious than male and also have a higher degree of boycott intention. However, the present study found no significant different in terms of number for male and female respondents who boycott US brands.

7.2 SOME INSIGHTS FROM THIS RESEARCH

The present study contributes to the Muslim consumers’ boycott research by adding some reasons to boycott from Indonesia’s respondents. It was found that health consciousness, ethnocentrism, and peer pressure have greater roles in reported boycotting of foreign brands. Some explanations are needed mainly by linking these factors to relevant previous studies.

7.2.1 Health Consciousness as the Main Reason to Boycott Foreign Brands

One major finding of the present study is that health consciousness is an important factor in reported boycotting of foreign brands in all four boycott behaviour models. The result shows that the effect of health consciousness is moderated by the respondents’ religiosity in the four models. The effects of health consciousness are significant for both student and non-student sample.
This finding is consistent with findings of previous research that consumers are becoming more aware about their diet and ingredients in the products they eat and this also influences their purchase decisions (Gelperowic & Beharrell, 1994). This also supports another study that found consumers are becoming more suspicious about undisclosed ingredients that may be harmful to their health (Steinemann, 2009).

The present study found that respondents’ concern regarding the healthiness of foreign brands is one of the most influential factors in boycotting foreign brands from the US and China. This finding is also in line with Luomala (2007) who found that consumers have some perceptions as to whether some products are healthy or not based on the country of origin of the products. For example, in Europe, people consider German food to be unhealthy food, therefore, customers that are concerned with health issues try to avoid foods made in Germany (Luomala, 2007). The present study found that the respondents’ negative judgement about healthiness of US and Chinese brands led them to boycott those brands as shown in all four boycott behaviour models (Figure 7.1).

The qualitative phase of this study provided some insights from participants about their perceptions of brands coming from foreign countries such as China. For example, most participants perceived Chinese food brands as “unhealthy brands” and as containing “suspicious ingredients”. These perceptions may be related to some rumours and facts that have been reported about Chinese brands in the Indonesian media. For example, some candy and noodle products from China were found to contain a dangerous substance called formalin (liputan6.com. 25 July 2007). At least 48 foreign cosmetics
products in the Indonesia market were found to have dangerous materials that may cause skin cancer and most of those products are from China (Purwanto, 2009). The Indonesian media also reported that China produces toys with materials which are harmful for children (Nasution, 2014). These facts may contribute to the negative perception that Chinese brands are unhealthy and harmful brands. The present research confirmed that there are strong effects of the health consciousness factor in reported boycotting of Chinese brands. This is in line with research by Cho and Krasser (2011) who found that consumers avoid buying some brands because they believe those brands are unhealthy.

Many consumers have a negative attitude toward perceived unhealthy brands for several reasons. It could be because of their personal choice as a ‘health conscious’ person, but it could also be for broader reasons such as their general views about consumerism, and that some companies need to be punished. Consumer responses toward foreign brands may vary from simply avoiding the brands to boycotting them (Luomala, 2007). Once consumers decide to boycott some brands, they usually recommend to others to also boycott the brands (Klein, 2004).

However, this finding is in contrast with another view that Muslim consumer do not pay attention to the healthy aspect of products, for example, that they do not read the labels of the products that they buy (Noussair, Robin, & Ruffieux, 2002). Some Muslim consumers do not pay attention to healthy ingredients in their food consumption because they focus on halal validity issue (Bonne & Verbeke, 2007). However, a study by Jusoh, Teng and Siong (2013) in Malaysian context found that non-Muslims purchase halal labelled food brands because they associate them with some factors such
as food safety and health and fair trade. This is a concept of *halalan* (permissible) *toyyiba* (healthy). Because the respondents in the present study emphasized the importance of healthy foods, this may indicate that they do not see halal label is enough to encourage them to buy or not to buy something. They will consider whether their consumption is in line with their healthy lifestyle. Iversen and Kraft (2006) found that health consciousness and socio-economic have a strong link with healthy behaviours, suggesting that an increase of income and educational level of Muslim consumers in Indonesia may contribute to their preference to consume healthy products.

### 7.2.2 Peer Pressure as Reasons to Boycott Foreign Food Brands

The present study found that peer pressure is one of the strongest reasons in respondents’ boycotting behaviour. The qualitative phase found some explanations about the effect of peer pressure on participants are boycotting US and Chinese brands. The findings show that participants follow what they friends are doing in order to be accepted in their group. This is in line with Klein (2004) who found that boycotters are usually influenced by someone close to them such as their family or friends, and once they boycott a brand they will also influence other people who are close to them to do a similar thing.

The present study shows that peer pressure is important for both the student and non-student samples. This is in contrast to previous studies that found peer pressure mostly influences young people only because they communicate with peers more frequently about consumption matters compared to elderly groups (Churchill & Moschis, 1979).
The finding of this study show that peer pressure is an important aspect for Muslim consumer behaviour including in terms of boycotting products. However, this study found that the effect of the experience of peer pressure was not moderated by religiosity in the US brands boycotting behaviour models. This is in contrast to a study by Shah and Alam (2011) who identified that Muslims regard peer pressure as a crucial element in their decision making process as a result of their regular interaction with others from the same religious organization.

This research found that although the effect of peer pressure was positive and relatively strong for both extrinsic and intrinsic respondents in reported boycotting of US brands, there were no significant differences between extrinsic and intrinsic respondents. The finding of this study support previous research which found peer pressure to be the most important factor in consumer behaviour as a whole. The approval of reference group is important for consumers, particularly for those who want to gain some recognition from their in-group (Arkin et al., 1986). This study confirmed the importance of peer pressure in consumer behaviour, more specifically in a Muslim country.

7.2.3 Ethnocentrism and Boycotting of Foreign Food Brands

This study found that ethnocentrism has a significant effect in the respondents boycotting behaviour in three out of four models in this study. Previous studies have highlighted a feeling of in-groups and out-groups in regard to consumer ethnocentrism in some cultures in different contexts. For example, previous studies found consumer ethnocentrism also existed between followers of different religions, such as Hindus
toward Muslims (Hassan, 1978; Taylor & Jaggi, 1974), from Christians toward Muslims (Rowatt et al., 2005), from female westerners toward female Muslims (Ahmed, 1982). In some Asian culture, the in-group favouritism is typical (Games et al., 2013). In this study, the respondents seem to have a feeling an in-group with their fellow Indonesians that increases their ethnocentrism resulting in their tendency to boycott foreign brands. The in-group feeling with other Muslim countries may also result in increasing respondents’ ethnocentrism and reported boycotting of foreign food brands. Interestingly, the present study found that the effect ethnocentrism had on the reported boycotting of Chinese and US brands was stronger for intrinsically than extrinsically religious young respondents (students). This means that young people are more likely to have high ethnocentrism levels as they may be more affected by some issues such as nationalism, religiosity, and social change. This is consistent with Altemeyer’s (2003) study that identified there is a strong link between ethnocentrism and religiosity. However, this finding is not in line with a study by Willer (2006) that identified Indonesian consumers perceived that they increase their prestige when they consume brands and products from Western countries.

The present study found consistent effect of ethnocentrism in reported boycotting of foreign brands. Ethnocentrism has a strong effect on reported boycotting of Chinese brands in both samples. Previous studies (e.g., Kaynak & Eksi, 2011) also found significant effect of ethnocentrism on anti-consumption behaviour. Ethnocentric consumers have a stronger tendency to be anti-consumer. The present study found the effects of ethnocentrism on reported boycotting of foreign brands are stronger when this link is moderated by religiosity. As was noted in section 2.4.7, not many of the studies on consumer ethnocentrism were conducted in Muslim countries, particularly in
Southeast Asia. Future researchers can examine the relationship between religiosity, ethnocentrism, religious ethnocentrism and reported boycotting of Muslim consumers.

To some extent, religiosity is seen as the precursor of Muslim consumer behaviour. However, a study by Abdul-Talib and Abdul-Latif (2014) confirms that Islamic religiosity has no link with the willingness to boycott among Malaysian Muslim customers, suggesting that other factors such as country image and self-enhancement values are more influential. While Muslims are regarded as one ummah and this has influenced Islamic marketing perspectives (Wilson et al., 2013), the present study found that ethnocentrism and economic well-being may provide better explanations regarding the reported boycotting of foreign brands. Accordingly, despite its importance, religiosity alone may not able to be responsible for the behavioural condition of Muslims.

Ricklefs (2001) argues that Islam in Indonesia is a product of cultural assimilation. In fact, customary regulations (adat) are significant in Indonesian regional cultures (Federspiel, 2004; Games et al., 2013). In line with these previous studies, the respondents in this study also considered the ethnocentrism aspect of being Indonesian instead of being Muslim (alone) as representing their tendency to boycott foreign brands that they consider harmful to their country such as US and Chinese brands.

7.2.4 Scepticism on Halal Validity of Foreign Brands

This study found that the effects of uncertainty about the halal validity of Chinese brands in reported boycotting of foreign brands was relatively strong for the non-student
respondents. This maybe because Muslim consumers have a negative attitude toward brands that originate from non-Muslim countries, as found in previous studies. Muslim consumers are usually more suspicious if foreign food bands come from non-Muslim countries (Kamaruzaman, 2007; Mukhtar & Butt, 2012). No empirical studies, however, have tested the effect of the uncertainty of halal validity on the reported boycotting of foreign brands.

Previous research found that Muslim consumers have strong intentions to choose halal products, especially those who live in multi-religious societies (Mukhtar & Butt, 2012). However, this is the first study which found that “the concept of Halal” has a strong effect on the reported boycotting of foreign (Chinese) food brands. However, this issue only had an effect in the model of reported boycotting of Chinese brands in the non-student sample but not in the student sample. This may indicate that more mature respondents are more concerned about the halal validity of Chinese food brands in the Indonesian market.

The uncertainty about halal certification from particular countries may be related to the conditions where the halal certification was made. For example, in deciding whether some products are halal or not there are some criteria that are important for customers. The equipment that is used has to be in a certain condition, such as separated from non-halal products. Not only that, the way the animal is slaughtered, the level of additives that are used in the product cannot exceed the standard and many other criteria are deemed important for some Muslims groups (Borzooi & Asgari, 2013). The fact that Chinese food brands are perceived as brands that come from a non-Muslim country
might explain why the non-student respondents found to have strong feelings of uncertainty about the halalness of Chinese food brands.

The most common idea mentioned by respondents in this study is that Halal products from Muslim countries are more trustworthy compared to those that are not because those countries should be more familiar with Islamic rules about Halal certification. Kamaruzaman (2007) and Mukhtar and Butt (2012) found that Muslim consumers’ negative perceptions about non-Muslim products mostly targeted low to medium involvement brands such as food, cosmetics and pharmaceutical brands. This may be the case with boycotting Chinese brands. The findings of the qualitative phase of the study provided some possible explanations about why most of the participants had some negative perceptions about Chinese food brands as being “not halal” and “unhealthy” brands.

Previous studies have found that religions can have a significant influence upon the decision-making processes of their followers (Bailey & Sood, 1993; Mokhlis, 2009; Wilkes et al., 1986). In line with those studies, this study also found that religion is considered an important factor for people in this era of globalization as it has been in the past.

Uncertainty about the halalness of food brands is an important issue for Muslim consumers. In line with a study by Borzooei and Asgari (2015), there are different opinions among Muslim consumers about how the county of origin affects their trust of the halalness of the brands. Further, Wilson and Liu (2011) found that there were two
significant factors which strongly influence halal brands’ veracity, namely, the faith of the corporate owner and employee practices. In addition to the findings of these previous studies, this study found that there were different behaviours toward the level of uncertainty of halalness of foreign brands. As mentioned earlier, no “uncertainty” of halalness of the US food brands was found in either sample in this study. The only effect of the uncertainty of the halalness of Chinese brands in reported boycotting of the Chinese brands was in the non-student sample. This may happen because Chinese brands have been regarded as brands that have suspicious ingredients.

7.2.5 Animosity as a Boycott Factor for US brands

Abd Razak and Abdul-Talib (2012) describe the importance of evaluating animosity in the boycotting campaigns in the Muslim world because there is a lack of research related to this issue. Jaffe and Nebenzahl (2001) describe animosity as being related to a very negative form of attitude toward particular countries. This animosity is an effect in the consumers’ negative attitude toward brands from those countries.

Animosity has a significant effect on the respondents’ reported boycotting of US food brands such as KFC. In line with previous research by Klein et al. (1998), that found a buyer’s animosity toward a country will affect their willingness to buy a product from that country, this study also found that there was an effect of animosity in reported boycotting of US food brands in the student sample. However, the effect of animosity is not significant in the other three models in this study. The findings related to the effect of animosity may play a part in the boycotting of US brands, but not Chinese brands. This is in line with previous studies that identified some America foreign policies may
be viewed with hostility by some countries, and can accumulate over time into stable animosity (e.g. Leong et al., 2008).

### 7.2.6 Boycott fatwa

Contradictory to previous studies that found a strong effect of fatwas on reported boycotting of foreign brands (Bibbo’, 2008; Long, 2005; Fattah, 2006), this study found that awareness of boycott fatwas had no effect in any of the boycott models. Thus, the findings of this study show that Muslim respondents have various responses toward fatwas regarding boycotts. While some fatwas have a strong effect on reported boycotting of brands in the Middle East, the effects may be different for Muslim consumers in Southeast Asia, particularly Indonesia.

### 7.2.7 Other Aspect on Findings

The present study found that religiosity has no direct link with reported boycotting of foreign brands in Indonesian Muslim consumers. This does not mean that religiosity is not important as this factor may still have a greater role in the future. In the focus group discussions in this study, a few participants insisted that the boycotting of foreign brands is part of their expression as Muslims. While they were not the majority, they speak louder and more often and it seems that they created doubt about boycotting behaviour in the other participants. This shows the potential influence of reference groups. This maybe because they can influence uninformed customers or those who previously saw no link between the boycotting of foreign brands and religious expression, but were not really sure about it. As a result, it is important to be cautious and not to underestimate this minority in Indonesia.
The present study also found the importance of peer pressure as a driver of boycotting activities. In Indonesia, more and more, people can see the power of individuals starting petitions as a way to express their opinion. This is not as frequent as in Western countries, but this trend may affect customer responses to boycott requests in the future. The present study also noted some negative feedback on Chinese brands.

Although there are many leading brands which come from China, the consumers in this study are still uncertain about the healthiness and halalness of the Chinese brands. This may also happen because of the power of rumours and word-of-mouth. This also should be a lesson for other brands. In Indonesia, some customers are influenced by some bad news about Chinese brands. They are not sure about the halal validity of Chinese food brands. They are also not sure about some rumours about healthy ingredients and processing of Chinese brands. Five interviewees in this study said that they were not sure about a Chinese brand of instant noodle. However, it was found that the brand they mentioned originally came from South Korea, it was not a Chinese brand. Therefore, marketers of foreign brands should be aware of this issue, and clearly let consumers know about the origin of their brands. Anticipating this issue in advance of entering a market would be even better.

7.3 LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

- Choice of Brands

This study focused on US and Chinese food brands. The choice of the brands in the quantitative phase of this study was based on the finding of its qualitative phase. The choice of other type of brands from different countries may result in different
boycotting factors. While this study only evaluates Chinese food brands, future researchers have the opportunity to include other products from China in Indonesia.

While this study only focussed on US and Chinese food brands, future studies have the opportunity to explore other brands that are boycotted by Muslim consumers in Indonesia. For example, the present study did not elaborate on the reported boycotting of Malaysian brands in the larger sample of the quantitative phase as this was a minority viewpoint and should be specifically studied. The boycotting of Malaysian brands by some of the participants, found in the qualitative phase of this study, captures that cases between neighbouring countries require special attention from marketers because it can also lead to the boycotting of foreign brands. This is another option for future research.

- Location

The present study focuses on respondents from West Sumatra in Indonesia and their boycotting of foreign brands. The result may be different in a sample from another location such as the Middle East. Future research could evaluate whether Muslim consumers in different locations boycott different brands for different reasons. Comparing the results with other Muslim countries in Southeast Asia or the Middle East would also be useful in designing the right marketing strategy to counter those boycotts.

- Sample

This study divided the respondents in to student and non-student samples. The student sample in this study was chosen from some universities in West Sumatra who were studying Business. Future studies could investigate boycott factors if the
student sample comes from different universities or study different subjects. For example, the sampling of fundamental Muslims could have different factors in their reported boycotting behaviour that need to be specifically studied in future research because this could require different marketing strategies to overcome this issue.

Future research may also need to see whether both young and old generation have different reasons to boycott foreign brands and what brands that they have been boycotted. The effect of age related to some secular reasons such the effects of uncertainty of halal validity, which have been identified as strong reasons to boycott foreign brands in non-student groups but not in student groups, may need a closer look in future research. The age difference may have potential effects in reported boycott of foreign brands. Consequently, it might also need a different approach from marketer.

- Research Focus

The present study offers three important concepts from the reported boycott of foreign brands among Muslim consumers in Indonesia. These are ethnocentrism, health consciousness, and peer pressure. In Islamic marketing research, some researchers have already focused on halalan toyyiba (permissible and good) (e.g., Kamaruddin et al., 2012). However, there is little research about health consciousness as a new way of lifestyle among Muslim consumers. Peer pressure has been seen as an important concept to explain Muslim consumers’ behavior in as they mostly come from a collectivist culture, but more studies are needed to analyze the effect of peer pressure and social pressure among Muslim consumers. Future researchers can focus on, for example, how social media influence the effect of peer pressure on a boycott.
Additionally, the present study found that there is a link between intrinsically religious young respondent and a boycott of foreign brands. This may indicate the importance of religious ethnocentrism studies in the near future. Previous studies identify ummah as a way to describe Muslim solidarity (e.g., Wilson et al., 2013), but the present study found that ethnocentrism and more specifically economic issues such as they dislike the fact that there are many Chinese products in Indonesia’s markets. Future researchers can investigate ethnocentrism levels in different generations of Muslim consumers and link them to boycott participation (see Appendix D). Overall, ethnocentrism in Muslim consumers and its link to peer pressure and reported boycott of foreign brands in different contexts will be worthwhile. Future researchers can explore these issues and it is possible that these concepts are interrelated in particular Muslim consumers which can lead to the reported boycott of foreign brand or other issues in Muslim consumer behavior.

7.4 IMPLICATIONS

Overall, the message from the findings of this study is clear, that marketers need to consider possible reasons for boycott activities. Marketers need to understand that they must seek consumer feedback; they have to conduct and analyse proper and thorough marketing research that may result in surprising consumer facts. Twenty percent of the respondents admitted that they are boycotters. This is a warning to marketers, that Indonesian customers are somewhat more vocal and direct in expressing their viewpoints. In today’s free market and competition, having knowledge and understanding about Indonesia’s big population and growing affluence and
conservatism would be crucial for marketers of foreign brands. It is not sufficient to know general knowledge about Indonesian Muslim consumers.

Many marketers may see that it is enough to know that Indonesian Muslim customers are the biggest group of Muslim consumers in the world, and what they seek only certain aspects such as the halal validity aspects. The present study provides some evidence that Muslim consumers are not easy to stereotype. The origin of food products is an important attribute for people in making their food choices. The findings of the study are related the effect of unhealthy perceptions in reported boycotting of foreign food brands may offer insights to marketers that being halal only is not enough; marketers also need to convince Muslim markets that their products are also healthy.

7.4.1 Ensure the healthiness of the brands

This study found that once respondents have a perception that some brands are not healthy, there is a greater tendency that they will boycott those brands. The four models in this study showed that uncertainties about the healthiness of the brands have a strong effect on the reported boycotting of US and Chinese brands for both students and non-student sample. Therefore, marketers need to regularly advise consumers that their products are healthy and the ingredients can be accepted in the Muslim consumers market without causing a backlash by non-Muslims. For example, foreign brands need to clearly list the ingredients in their products in the Indonesian language (bahasa Indonesia) so that it can be understood by consumers.

The findings of this study may offer insights to marketers that target Muslim consumers. The perceived uncertainty of the healthy aspects of foreign food brands was
found to be one of the key findings that can explain Muslims’ reasons to boycott US and Chinese food brands in the present study. Muslim consumers were found to have some similarities with other consumers in the market place. They also put a strong emphasis on the importance of the healthy aspect of the products, for example they boycott foreign brands that have suspicious ingredients and brands which might be harmful to their health. Therefore, foreign brands need to pay strong attention to the healthy aspect of their products due to the growing number of health conscious consumers including in Muslim countries such as Indonesia.

Ajinomoto, a foreign company from Japan that targeted Indonesian market shows that expressing concern about healthiness of their product that may a good strategy to reach the Indonesian market. As shown in Figure 7.2, Ajinomoto has “Eat well-Live well” as their slogan to show their concern for the healthy aspects of their brand. At the same time they also offer full-scholarship awards for Indonesian students who want to study in Japan as a strategy to convince Indonesians that their company pay strong attention to them.

Figure 7.2 Ajinomoto Advertising
7.4.2 Understanding Consumers' Peer Pressure to Boycott Foreign Brands

Peer pressure has a significant role in many societies, in particular, collectivistic societies (e.g. Games et al., 2013). This study found this effect to be consistent as all respondents, among students and non-students, and those who boycott US and Chinese brands report peer pressure as a major reason they were boycotting. Marketers need to see that, in this case, boycotting may be temporal, non-ideological, and changeable. Marketers need to have a marketing campaign that focuses on the positioning of their products. Indonesian consumers may have a particular perception, a heuristic, that all Chinese brands are representative of cheap and low quality (murah meriah) products. By ensuring that Chinese brands are perceived as inexpensive, but not necessarily low quality, they can create an opportunity to change customers’ mindset. Coca Cola has relatively succeeded to implement this strategy.

Marketers also need to consider the importance of social media in Indonesia. With 64 million Facebook users (Grazella, 2013) and 20 million twitter active users (Lukman, 2014), Indonesian middle class can have a greater role as reference groups. Most of the participants of the qualitative study were aware of boycott issue, its importance and its consequences. Some of them are aware of boycott fatwa. They may speak louder and they can aggressively promote their viewpoints to other Muslim customers. This is in line with a study by Lim (2013) that identified nationalism and religiosity, have a much higher chance to go viral and cause massive social action. It is expected peer pressure and perhaps social pressure will be even more important issue in the future as
Indonesian middle-class professionals and activists will play a greater role as agents of changes. Marketers need to understand this situation. They need to be more aware of this issue and by analysing relevant issues in social media can help to understand how Muslim consumers in Indonesia join a boycott of foreign brands

7.4.3 Convince Consumers about the halal validity of foreign brands

Some religious concepts such as halal validity of the products have been considered as important as well. Failure to convince Muslim consumers regarding the halal factor will make them more likely to boycott foreign products. Marketers can overcome this problem by providing information about the halal validity of their product regularly to remind their customers. It is important especially for brands/products that originally come from non-Muslims countries to keep the ‘trust’ of some Muslims customers and to keep letting them know that the products are “still” and “always” meet the halal requirements.

There was some past experience of other brands that were facing almost similar situation with the case of the US and Chinese food brands in this study. For example, some brands were also facing issues that consumers were uncertainty about the brands’ halal validity although it was labelled halal. There were some cases that cause strong boycotts toward the brands while in other cases some brands were accepted in Indonesian Muslim consumers following some right strategy that they were adopted. The US and Chinese food brands that were found to be boycotted due to uncertainty of Muslims’ consumers about halal validity of the brands can learn from the strategy that was successfully performed by other foreign brands for Indonesian Muslim market.
7.4.4 Overcoming Ethnocentric Consumers

It is a bit surprising that the respondents of this study, including younger generations, related their boycott activities especially to Chinese food brands, with ethnocentrism. Some of the younger participants in the qualitative phase of this study clearly stated that while they cannot avoid buying some foreign brands, they tried to restrict their consumption of foreign brands as they see this can harm local products. They believed that local products can be better off if they support by them as consumers. Nowadays, in an era of free trade agreements, this perspective is still exists. Marketers need to consider this issue.

Among the US brands available in Indonesia, KFC was found to be the most boycotted brand by participants that was specifically mentioned in the qualitative phase. Participants recognise KFC as a representative of the US in Indonesia that implies western culture and could be harmful to local people. In terms of ethnocentrism, respondents were found to worry about the possibility that foreign brands such as US and Chinese food brands would have an impact by reducing sales of local brands and consequently reduce the income of local people.

Marketers can let consumers know that they are working together with local business owners or local investors. They may also need to make specific contributions to local people, so that customers felt appreciated. Marketers need to advise this group that their products also contribute to the Indonesian local economy. Recruiting local people and helping the local community may be helpful in increasing public sympathy which in
return reduces their anxiety about foreign brands. By doing so, consumers will not see the foreign brands as the ‘enemy’.

7.5 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This research may indicate that there are more reasons for Muslim consumers to boycott foreign brands. Muslim consumers, as with other consumers, are part of a dynamic market. They are attached to their country and they want to be part of their in-group. However, they also pay more attention to themselves. While Muslim consumers may still see halal validity as an important concept, they are now more demanding as they also consider other aspects such as the health aspects as a need. Pressure from people close to Muslim consumers could also make them have a different view about foreign brands. Marketers need to pay attention to the specific need of Muslim markets. It is expected that in the future, Muslim consumers will see a healthy lifestyle as a way of life as it is in line with their better income and educational level. They may also see themselves as customers who see Islam as their identity, and simultaneously are pragmatic consumers. Research in Islamic marketing needs to pay attention to this change as it may represent bigger issues in Muslim market in the future.
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APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A Foreign Brands Survey (English version)

A Survey on Customers Responses of Foreign Brands

Directions:
You will be asked questions about your views toward foreign brands, foreign countries, and some questions about you. Here, foreign brands are defined as brands that originate and are manufactured in foreign countries. For example, the brand may originate or be manufactured in the US or China. Please tick (v) the right number to represent the degree of agreement of each statement. Please tick (v) number 1 if you strongly disagree, tick (v) number 2 if you disagree, tick (v) number 3 if you neither agree nor disagree, number 4 if you agree, number 5 if you strongly agree.

Part 1. Questions that ask your opinion about foreign brands and your beliefs

Please tick number 1,2,3,4 or 5 that represent your opinion about the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing foreign brands is un-Indonesian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians out of jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A real Indonesian should always buy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian-made products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should always purchase products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufactured in Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should buy from foreign countries only those products that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we cannot obtain within our own country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US is taking advantage of Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US wants to gain economic power over Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the fact that there are too many US products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everywhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US has too much economic influence in Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US is doing business unfairly with Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US food brands (such as KFC) are unhealthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US food brands (such as KFC) are bad for my diet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US food brands (such as KFC) have suspicious ingredients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US food brands represent an unhealthy lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuming US food brands means I do not care about healthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim scholars (ulama) think that I should boycott US brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from well-known muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott US brands (such as KFC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott US brands (such as KFC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwas on boycotting US brands is in line with my views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very common to hear people discuss fatwas on boycotting foreign brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends are encouraging me to boycott US brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends keep reminding me of reasons not to buy US brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel uncomfortable if my friends, who boycott US brands, saw me buying those brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure about the halal validity of US food brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure the ingredients in US brands are halal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I distrust the halal validity of US food brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indonesian businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners should not be allowed to sell their products in our markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian consumers who purchase products made in other countries are responsible for putting their fellow Indonesians out of work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should buy Indonesian products and keep Indonesia working</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indonesian businesses</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim scholars (ulama) think that I should boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from well-known muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (ulama) to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwas on boycotting Chinese brands are in line with my view</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very common to hear people discuss fatwas on boycotting Chinese brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure about the halal validity of Chinese food brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure the ingredients in Chinese food brands are halal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I distrust the halal validity of Chinese food brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends are encouraging me to boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends keep reminding me of reasons not to buy Chinese brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel uncomfortable if my friends, who boycott Chinese brands, saw me buying those brands</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands are unhealthy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands are bad for my diet</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food brands have suspicious ingredients</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuming Chinese food brands represents an unhealthy lifestyle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuming Chinese food brands means I do not care about healthiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China is taking advantage of Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China wants to gain economic power over Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the fact that there are too many Chinese products everywhere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US has too much economic influence in Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese are doing business unfairly with Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mosque is the most important place to formulate good social relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and mediation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try hard to carry my religion into all my other dealings in life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of Allah, the Divine Being</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read literature about my faith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many different brands have you boycotted in the last 12 months (For example, if you boycotted brands from Norway, you may count it as one, if you also boycotted brands from Sweden you may count them as “two”, etc), Please tick (v) next to the number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>More than 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please tick Yes or No of the following boxes that represent your opinion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I boycott US brands (such as KFC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I boycott Chinese brands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 2: About Yourself**

In this section, we would like you to share some of your details. Please tick (V) in the relevant boxes that represent you and fill in the blank.

a) **Gender**
   - [ ] Female
   - [ ] Male

b) **Your age**
   ............... years

c) **Your education level (please choose one):**
   1. Less than elementary school
   2. Elementary school
   3. Junior high school
   4. Senior high school
   5. Diploma
   6. Bachelor’s degree
   7. Postgraduate

d) **Your Occupation (please choose one):**
   1. Civil servant
   2. Business owner
   3. Housewife
   4. Student
   5. Farmer/worker
   6. Job seeker
   7. Other (please specify)............................

e) **Your monthly income (please choose one):**
   1. Less than Rp. 1,500,000
   2. Rp. 1,500,000 – Rp. 2,999,999
   3. Rp. 3,000,000 – Rp. 4,499,999
   4. Rp. 4,500,000 – Rp. 5,999,999
   5. Above Rp. 6,000,000

**Thank You**
APPENDIX B Foreign brands Survey (bahasa Indonesia version)

Indonesian language version (bahasa Indonesia)

**Survei tentang Respon Konsumen terhadap Merek Luar Negeri**

*Petunjuk:* Anda akan ditanyai tentang pandangan Anda mengenai merek luar negeri, pandangan Anda tentang negara lain dan beberapa pertanyaan tentang diri Anda. Merek luar negeri yang dimaksud di sini adalah merek-merek yang dibuat atau berasal dari luar negeri. Contohnya, sebuah merek yang dibuat atau berasal dari Amerika atau Cina. Silahkan beri tanda (v) pada nomer yang sesuai berdasarkan tingkat setuju ata tidaknya pada pernyataan yang diberikan. Misalnya, silahkan tandai (v) nomer 1 jika Anda sangat tidak setuju, tandai (v) nomer 2 jika Anda setuju, tandai (v) nomer 3 jika Anda ragu/mentiaskan/ragu apakah Anda setuju atau tidak setuju, nomer 4 jika Anda setuju, nomer 5 jika Anda sangat setuju.

**Bagian 1. Pertanyaan tentang Pendapat Anda mengenai Merek Luar Negeri dan beberapa hal lain dalam hidup**

Pilih nomer yang sesuai dengan pendapat Anda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Netral</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orang Indonesia harus selalu mementingkan membeli produk Indonesia dari produk impor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membeli produk asing berarti tidak berjiwa Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orang Indonesia sejati harus selalu membeli produk buatan Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kita harus selalu membeli produk yang dibuat di Indonesia dari pada membiarkan negara lain memiskinkan kita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kita seharusnya hanya membeli produk yang tidak bisa kita produksi sendiri di dalam negeri.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerika mengambil keuntungan dari Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerika ingin meguasai perekonomian Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak suka melihat terlalu banyak barang Amerika beredar di Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerika terlalu banyak mempengaruhi perekonomian Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerika bukan partner berdagang yang dapat dipercaya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menurut saya, makanan dari Amerika seperti KFC itu tidak sehat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topik</td>
<td>Sangat Setuju</td>
<td>Tidak Setuju</td>
<td>Netral</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat Setuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanan Amerika seperti KFC tidak baik untuk kesehatan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanan dari Amerika seperti KFC mengandung bahan tidak jelas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanan Amerika mencerminkan gaya hidup yang tidak sehat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengkonsumsi makanan Amerika berarti saya tidak peduli kesehatan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para ulama menyarankan saya memboikot barang merek Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya mengetahui fatwa ulama terkenal untuk memboikot barang-barang Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya mengetahui fatwa ulama lokal untuk memboikot barang-barang Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwa untuk memboikot merek Amerika sesuai dengan pandangan saya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sering mendengar pembicaraan tentang memboikot merek-merek Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teman-teman saya mendorong saya memboikot merek-merek Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teman saya selalu mengingatkan alasan pentingnya memboikot merek Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya merasa tidak nyaman jika orang-orang yang memboikot melihat saya membeli atau mengkonsumsi merek-merek Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak yakin dengan kehalalalalan makanan merek Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak yakin bahan yang terkandung dalam makanan merek Amerika benar-benar halal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak mempercayai kehalalan makanan Amerika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orang-orang Indonesia seharusnya tidak membeli produk asing karena hal ini akan menghancurkan bisnis di Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orang-orang asing seharusnya tidak diperbolehkan menjual barang mereka di pasar kita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konten</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Tidak Setuju</td>
<td>Netral</td>
<td>Sangat Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat Tidak Setuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konsumen Indonesia yang membeli produk yang dibuat di negara lain bertanggung jawab telah membuat rekan-rekan mereka di Indonesia menjadi penangguran.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kita harus selalu membeli produk yang dibuat di Indonesia dari pada membiarkan negara lain memiskinkan kita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orang Indonesia seharusnya tidak membeli produk asing karena hal ini akan menghancurkan bisnis di Indonesia dan mengakibatkan pengangguran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya mengetahui Fatwa ulama untuk memboikot Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulama menghendaki saya memboikot merek merek Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya mengetahui fatwa ulama terkenal untuk memboikot barang Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya mengetahui fatwa dari ulama lokal untuk memboikot merek Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatwas memboikot merek Cina seseai dengan pandangan saya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sering mendengar orang orang membicarakan tentang fatwa memboikot Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak yakin dengan kehalalan produk Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak yakin kandungan bahan dalam makanan Cina layak dikonsumsi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tidak mempercayai kehalalan produk Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teman-teman saya mendorong saya memboikot merek Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teman-teman saya selalu mengingatkan alasan pentingnya memboikot merek Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya merasa tidak nyaman jika orang-orang yang memboikot melihat saya membeli atau mengkonsumsi merek-merek Cina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanan merek Cina tidak sehat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanan merek Cina tidak baik untuk diet saya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanan merek Cina mengandung bahan yang mencurigakan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masyarakat makanan merek Cina artinya tidak peduli kesehatan</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masyarakat makanan merek Cina menunjukkan saya tak peduli kesehatan</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cina mengambil keuntungan dari Indonesia</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cina ingin menguasai perekonomian Indonesia</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya tak suka melihat terlalu banyak merek Cina dimana-mana</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cina terlalu banyak mempengaruhi perekonomian Indonesia</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cina bukanlah partner berdagang yang dapat dipercaya</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walaupun saya seorang yang berpegang kuat pada agama, saya tidak ingin membiarkan persoalan agama mempengaruhi urusan harian saya</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesjid adalah tempat paling penting untuk membina hubungan sosial yang baik</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tujuan shalat untuk menjamin kehiduan yang aman dan bahagia</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya shalat karena saya telah diajarkan untuk melakukannya</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agama memberikan saya ketenangan saat tertimpal musibah</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meluangkan waktu untuk bertafakur dan merenung penting bagi saya</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya berusaha keras menerapkan semua ajaran agama dalam kehidupan saya</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sering merasakan kehadiran Allah</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya sering membaca buku-buku agama</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegangan saya pada agama yang menjadi dasar kehidupan saya</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agama amat penting bagi saya karena ia menjawab pertanyaan-pertanyaan dalam hidup</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Berapa banyak merek yang Anda boikot dalam 12 bulan terakhir (Contoh, Jika Anda memboikot merek dari Perancis, bisa dihitung satu, jika Anda memboikot merek dari Swedia, boleh dihitung dua, dst. Silahkan tandai (v) di dekat nomer yang sesuai) :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lebih dari 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilih Ya atau Tidak pada kotak dan beri tanda (v) pada kotak yang sesuai

| | Ya | Tidak |
Bagian 2. Pertanyaan tentang diri Anda

Pada bagian ini, kami ingin Anda menceritakan sedikit tentang diri Anda. Berikan tanda ceklist (v) pada kotak yang Anda anggap paling sesuai

f) Jenis kelamin : [ ] Perempuan [ ] Laki-laki

g) Umur ................... tahun

h) Pendidikan terakhir (pilih salah satu):
   1. Tidak tamat SD
   2. Sekolah Dasar (SD)
   3. Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP)
   4. Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA)
   5. Diploma
   6. Sarjana
   7. Pasca Sarjana

2. Pekerjaan (pilih salah satu): 
   1. Pegawai Negeri
   2. Pengusaha
   3. Ibu rumah tangga
   4. Pelajar/Mahasiswa
   5. Petani/Pekerja
   6. Masih mencari kerja
   7. Lainnya (sebutkan)..............................

3. Pendapatan Anda per bulan (pilih salah satu):
   1. Kurang dari Rp. 1.500.000
   2. Rp. 1.500.000 – Rp. 2.999.999
   3. Rp. 3.000.000 – Rp. 4.499.999
   4. Rp. 4.500.000 – Rp. 5.999.999
   5. Di atas Rp. 6.000.000

Terima Kasih

APPENDIX C Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) were conducted for the six individual latent constructs in SPSS for US and Chinese brands boycott behaviour models
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>KMO</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boycott of US brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>Purchasing foreign brands is un-Indonesian</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not right to purchase foreign products, because it puts</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesians out of jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A real Indonesian should always buy Indonesian-made products</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We should always purchase products manufactured in Indonesia</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We should buy from foreign countries only those products that we</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cannot obtain within our own country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing foreign brands is un-Indonesian</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animosity</td>
<td>The US is taking advantage of Indonesia</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The US wants to gain Economic power over Indonesia</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't like the fact that there are too many US products</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>everywhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The US has too much economic</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>influence in Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The US is doing business</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfairly with Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Consciousness</td>
<td>US food brands are unhealthy</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US food brands are bad for my diet</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US food brands have suspicious</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Factor loadings</td>
<td>KMO</td>
<td>Variance Explained</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chinese brands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ethnocentrism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesians should not buy foreign products, because this hurts Indonesian businesses</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products in our markets</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian consumer who purchase products made in other countries are responsible</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Uncertainty on halal validity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not sure about the halal validity of US food brands</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not sure ingredients in US brands are halal</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I distrust the halal validity of the US food brands</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Familiarity of boycott fatwa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim scholars (<em>ulama</em>) think that I should boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from well-known muslim scholars (<em>ulama</em>) to boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am familiar with fatwas from local muslim scholars (<em>ulama</em>) to boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatwas on boycotting US brands is in line with my views</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is very common to hear discuss fatwas on boycotting foreign brands</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Peer Pressure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My friends are encouraging me to boycott US brands</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My friends keep reminding me of reasons not to buy US brands</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would feel uncomfortable if my friends, who boycott US brands, saw me buying those brands</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ingredients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US food brands represent unhealthy lifestyle</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consuming US food brands means I do not care about healthiness</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>KMO</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health consciousness</td>
<td>Chinese food brands are unhealthy</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese food brands are bad for my health</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese food brands have unhealthy ingredients</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animosity</td>
<td>China is taking advantage of</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the fact that there are too many Chinese products everywhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China wants to gain Economic power over Indonesia</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t like the fact that there are too many Chinese products everywhere</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China has too much economic influence in Indonesia</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese are doing business unfairly with Indonesian</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX D Examples of Campaigns to Boycott US and Chinese Brands**
These pictures represent customers’ boycott of US and Chinese food brands in Indonesia.

An example of fatwa and ulama justification for boycotting Chinese products
Muslim cleric issues fatwa against Chinese product

Renowned Muslim cleric and Shahr Quazi Maulana Khalid Rasheed Farangi Mahali today called on the people to boycott the use of Chinese products.

“You all should boycott Chinese products to save the country’s cottage industry besides give a befitting reply to the frequent intrusion of China in Indian borders,” the Maulana said during his ritual sermon after the Eid prayers at the Eidgah here.

He said people, particularly, Muslims should boycott the Chinese products to teach them a lesson and save the country’s cottage industries.

The cleric said Muslims, particularly youths who spend a considerable amount of time on social media should use the platform to remove all the misconceptions about Islam.

He said Islam gives a strong message of brotherhood and it should be promoted through social media besides the religion has always patronised humanity. UNI MB PR AS1641 NNNN

-- (UNI) -- 06DR41.xml

Watch News Video

An example of a fatwa and ulama justification for boycotting American products
Ayatullah Sayyid Muhammad Husayn Fadhlullah (Lebanon)

"The least effort we could make ... is to boycott all those who support the enemy ... We should boycott American goods whenever possible, and you should boycott all Israeli goods as well as all the companies that help Israeli companies financially"

In the name of Allah the Compassionate the Merciful

Ramadan 2 1421H /November 28, 2000 CE

In his fatwa to all the Muslims of the world, Sayyid Mohammad Husayn Fadhlullah calls for a boycott of all Israeli & American companies.

Allah The Most Exalted has ordained that every Muslim should care about the affairs of all other Muslims and defend their causes by all possible means in order to preserve their strength and dignity. The Prophet Mohammad (P) says:

"Whosoever does not care about Muslims' affairs is not a Muslim"

Thus Islam is an intellectual, emotional and practical state in the Muslim's personality that interacts with Muslims' affairs at all levels and therefore we cannot be indifferent to their causes. The Prophet (P) also said:

"Whosoever hears Muslims calling for help without answering that call is not a Muslim."

And this implies that answering a Muslims' calls for help, either as an individual or as a community, is an integral part of Islam, an Islam that would be lost to any Muslim who did not answer such a call.

The Prophet Mohammad (P) also said:

"Whoever sees a wrong he should change it with his hand but if he can't with his tongue and if he can't then in his heart which is the weakest sign of faith."

You all know what happened to our brothers in Palestine. Their lands were occupied, they were thrown out of their country, their women, children and elderly were killed, their homes were destroyed and bombed and the Aqsa Mosque has been profaned and there are plans to destroy it. They are fighting the enemy and confronting it with nothing but their bare flesh, stones and light arms. They are defending themselves, their families, their livelihood, their land and their independence and they have been crying out for international protection and support from the Muslim states and peoples to no avail. Some of these states that reconciled with the enemy