Abstract

Consumers’ willingness to buy traditional textile made in China has lack of scholarly attention. This study aims to measure the impact of consumer animosity, consumer ethnocentrism, and product judgment on willingness to buy and unwillingness to buy in the case of Indonesian traditional textile made in China. The study included 200 participants who were approached accidentally at two international trade centres. Data were analysed using exploratory factor analysis and structural equation model. Based on the findings, consumer animosity significantly affected product judgment, consumer ethnocentrism, and unwillingness to buy. Consumer ethnocentrism significantly influenced product judgment, and willingness and unwillingness to buy. Lastly, product judgment significantly affected willingness and unwillingness to buy.
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Introduction

Batik is an authentic traditional textile of Indonesia is batik. On October 2, 2009, it received a recognition from UNESCO as a 'Masterpiece of the Oral and the Intangible Heritage of Humanity' on October 2, 2009 (Galih, 2017). Batik has also been adopted and adapted to be produced in countries other than Indonesia, including Malaysia, Australia, China, Japan, and countries in Africa like west Africa and Ghana (Ismail, Akhir, Kaliappan, & Said, 2019; Jorgensen, 2018; Keogh, 2017; Ming, 2007; Saddhono, Widodo, Al-Makmun, & Tozu, 2014; van Kessel, 2018). Batik-based clothing has been worn by the Indonesian people in various activities, both for celebrations and working.

Basically, batik is made from mori. In Indonesia, accordance with the times and creativity, batik is also done on materials like silk (Febrasari, 2018). According to Lestari (2012), a piece of cloth can be said to be 'batik' if it meets two criteria, namely the process of making it by drawing (written) by hand or stamping and with batik motifs like flora, fauna, or other objects unique to the area the batik was made.

However, as prices of the real batik are relatively expensive, a third type of batik has appeared. This type of batik is printed by local and national manufacturers. The printed batik is mass produced from synthetic fabric and varied coloured. It lasts a long time and is cheaper. This category is then redesigned and produced by Chinese manufactures before being exported to Indonesia. Batik made in China and sold in Indonesian textile markets makes some Indonesians uncomfortable.
Several studies focus on the topic of “made in China”. For example, Koopman, Wang, and Wei (2008) compared Chinese-made products exported by the country, before and after becoming WTO members. Kabadayi and Lerman (2011) examined factors that influence the intent to purchase made-in-China merchandise. Furthermore, Li (2018) studied a national project titled “Made in China 2025” in China. According to this scholar, the project continues to be promoted, especially regarding technological entrepreneurship. This project aims to: enhance industrial capability through innovation-driven manufacturing, optimize the structure of Chinese industry, emphasize quality over quantity, train and attract talent, and achieve green manufacturing and the environment” (Li, 2018, p. 66).

At the global level, imported Chinese products is a threat for many countries (Balsvik, Jensen, & Salvanes, 2015; Koopman et al., 2008). However, there is a paucity of studies measuring purchase willingness of foreign traditional textile made in China. This current study aims to examine influencing factors of willingness and unwillingness to purchase batik made in China. To predict these dependent variables, the authors employ consumer animosity, consumer ethnocentrism, and product judgment.

**Literature Review**

**Theoretical Background**

**Consumer animosity.** In their studies, Akdogan, Ozgener, Kaplan, and Coskun (2012), Cai, Fang, Yang, and Song (2012), Harmeling, Magnusson, and Singh (2015), Riefler and Diamantopoulos (2007), and Klein and Etenson (1999) referred to the definition of consumer animosity established by Klein, Etenson, and Morris (1998). According to these authors, consumer animosity is “the remnants of antipathy related to previous or ongoing military, political, or economic events” (Klein et al., 1998, p. 90).

Animosity is linked to consumer ethnocentrism, product judgment, product avoidance, boycott, willingness to buy, and purchase action (Abraham, 2013; Ahmed, Anang, Othman, & Sambasivan, 2013; Albayati, Mat, Musaibah, Aldhaafri, & Almatari, 2012; de Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2013b; Diamantopoulos, Gineikienė, & Urbonavičius, 2013; Eren, 2013; Leonidou, Kvasova, Christodoulides, & Tokar, 2019; Ungulaitė, 2015). In this current study, consumer animosity is used to predict other variables including product judgment, consumer ethnocentrism, unwillingness to buy, and willingness to buy.

Consumer animosity is caused by several factors including historical, economic, war, political, and implicit (Cai et al., 2012; de Nisco et al., 2013b; Eren, 2013; Sutikno & Ming-Sung Cheng, 2011). Shoham, Davidow, Klein, and Ruvio (2006) investigate the impact of the intifada movement towards Israeli and Palestinian consumers’ behaviour. According to them, animosity is formed by dogmatism, nationalism, and internationalism. According to Cheah, Phau, Kea, and Huang (2016), Chinese consumers have an animosity toward Japanese products and vice versa. This animosity is caused by war and economic reasons. Furthermore, demographic characteristics, including gender and age can affect animosity (Sutikno & Ming-Sung Cheng, 2011).

**Consumer ethnocentrism.** Shimp and Sharma (1987) described consumer ethnocentrism as “the beliefs held by American consumers about the appropriateness, indeed morality, or purchasing foreign made products.” Consumer ethnocentrism is not just an American affair. Ethnocentric consumer groups also exist in other countries. Furthermore: in functional terms, consumer ethnocentrism gives the individual a sense of identity, feelings of belongingness, and most important for our purposes, an understanding of what purchase behaviour is acceptable or unacceptable to the ingroup (Shimp & Sharma, 1987, p. 280).

Kucukemiroglu (1999) suggested that consumer ethnocentrism can be used to market segmentation particularly for foreign products. To do segmentation, Kavak and Gumusluoglu (2007, p. 71) introduced “the consumers' lifestyle, levels of ethnocentricity, and approach to the concept of 'made in'.”

Consumer ethnocentrism is employed to examine product judgment, boycott, and willingness to purchase and intention to purchase (Abraham, 2013; Albayati et al., 2012; Diamantopoulos et al., 2013;
Eren, 2013; Ungulaitytė, 2015). Consumer ethnocentrism can also be used to assess the foreign product country’s image (Jin et al., 2015). Furthermore, ethnocentrism can be affected by age and sex. Sutikno and Ming-Sung Cheng (2011, p. 17) stated that “female consumers showed higher ethnocentrism than male.”

**Product judgment.** Each product has a standard quality. Indicators of product quality differ. This difference can be seen in intrinsic characteristics, including the nature of the product, and extrinsic characteristics like socioeconomic factors and marketing activities (Schreiner, Korn, Stenger, Holzgreve, & Altmann, 2013). These characteristics will form and change consumers’ perceptions towards certain products.

Schlosser, Rikhi, and Dagogo-Jack (2016) claimed that product identity, such as logo design might affect one’s perception on product judgment. Product judgment is a subjective consumer judgment of the quality of a product. Just as with the quality of a product, this product judgment can be influenced by a variety of factors, both consumer intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors include your animosity and ethnocentrism. Meanwhile, extrinsic factors include, for example, promotional tools. Product judgment can predict boycott, willingness to buy, and purchase action (Ahmed et al., 2013; Albayati et al., 2012; Ćićić, Brkić, & Prašo-Krupalić, 2003; Shoham et al., 2006). In this current study, product judgment is linked to willingness to buy and unwillingness to buy.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Consumer animosity, ethnocentrism, product judgment, and (un)willingness to buy.** Abraham (2013) conducted a study involving Israeli and Germany consumers. In the past, their countries had experienced in a war. This scholar looked at factors that can affect purchase willingness by using animosity, ethnocentrism, and product judgment as predictor variables. He found that consumer animosity significantly affects consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to purchase.

Another study looked at the impact of consumer animosity on consumer ethnocentrism (De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2013a). The scholars invited Italian students to participate in the study. According to them, consumer animosity, particularly economic, has a significant positive influence on consumer ethnocentrism and product judgment. Peng Cui, Wajda, and Hu (2012) carried out a study in a Chinese city that the Japanese destroyed city during the World War II. They examined the impact of consumer animosity on consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy. As a result, they showed a significant influence of consumer animosity on consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy.

Furthermore, Unal (2017) measured factors that influence willingness of American consumers to purchase Turkish products. This scholar proved that consumer animosity negatively affected purchase willingness. In the study of Suhud (2018), consumer animosity is used to predict purchase willingness and purchase unwillingness in the context of a national a brand of bread. He indicated that consumer animosity has a significant impact on purchase willingness in a negative direction and on purchase unwillingness in a positive direction.

The hypotheses proposed to be measured based on previous studies are as follow:

\[ H_1 \] – Indonesian consumers’ animosity will have a significant positive impact on judgment of Indonesian traditional textile made in China.

\[ H_2 \] – Indonesian consumers’ animosity will have a significant positive impact on consumer ethnocentrism.

\[ H_3 \] – Indonesian consumers’ animosity will have a significant positive impact on willingness to buy Indonesian traditional textile made in China.

\[ H_4 \] – Indonesian consumers’ animosity will have a significant positive impact on unwillingness to buy Indonesian traditional textile made in China.

**Consumer ethnocentrism, product judgment, and (un)willingness to buy.** Ahmed et al. (2013) examine factors that affect purchase action by applying predictor variables like consumer
ethnocentrism and product judgment. They claimed that consumer ethnocentrism significantly influences product judgment. Cai et al. (2012) included Chinese students to be involved in their study. One of their hypotheses examined a path of consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy Japanese products. Through their study, they claimed that there is a significant impact of consumer ethnocentrism on willingness to buy Japanese products. A study conducted by Unal (2017) carried out a result that consumer ethnocentrism is a key to predict willingness to buy foreign products. Kuncharin and Mohamed (2014) invited Thai consumers to be involved in their study, which aimed to measure influencing factors of Malaysian product judgment. They mentioned that consumer ethnocentrism has a significant effect on Malaysian product judgment. Other studies also show a significant impact of consumer ethnocentrism on product judgment (Cheah et al., 2016; Giang & Khoi, 2015). Many studies measure the impact of consumer ethnocentrism on willingness to buy only. However, Suhud (2018) tested both willingness and unwillingness to buy. His study indicated a significant effect of consumer ethnocentrism on unwillingness to buy.

Based on the above studies, the following hypotheses are tested.

$H_5$ – Indonesian consumers’ ethnocentrism will have a significant positive impact on judgment towards Indonesian traditional textile made in China.

$H_6$ – Indonesian consumers’ ethnocentrism will have a significant negative impact on willingness to purchase Indonesia traditional textile made in China.

$H_7$ – Indonesian consumers’ ethnocentrism will have a significant positive impact on unwillingness to purchase Indonesian traditional textile made in China.

Product judgment and (un)willingness to buy. Cheah et al. (2016) were concerned on local brand but made in foreign country. Therefore, they examine influencing factors of purchase willingness on such products. Participants were consumers in China and Japan. Chinese consumers were asked to measure Japanese products and Japanese consumers were asked to measure Japanese brands but made in China. Both cases showed that product judgment has a significant effect on purchase willingness. Intifada among Israelis and Palestinians caused damage to many things, including trade between these countries. Further, the war changed their consumer behaviours. Shoham et al. (2006) studied how their product judgment can affect willingness to buy the “enemy’s” products. Based on the results, these scholars showed a significant influence of product judgment on willingness to buy. Furthermore, Suhud (2018) linked product judgment to purchase willingness and purchase unwillingness in the case of a boycott on a national brand of bread. Based on the structural model calculation, it is reported that product judgment significantly affects purchase willingness. Product judgment has an insignificant influence on purchase unwillingness.

The above studies are very relevant as the basis for the following hypotheses:

$H_8$ – Indonesian consumers’ product judgment will have a significant negative impact on willingness to purchase traditional textile made in China.

$H_9$ – Indonesian consumers’ product judgment will have a significant positive impact on unwillingness to purchase traditional textile made in China.

Based on these hypotheses, a proposed research model will be tested. In total, there are nine hypotheses with three predictor variables including consumer animosity, consumer ethnocentrism, and product judgment.
Methods

Participants

Participants of this current study were visitors of international trade centres, in Jakarta. They were approached and asked to complete a printed questionnaire. This study attracted 200 participants consisting of 144 females (72%) and 56 males (28%). In terms of age, 54 participants (27%) were over 34 years of age, 64 participants (32%) were aged between 25 and 29 years of age, and 48 participants (24%) were aged between 20 and 24 years of age. Furthermore, 32 participants were aged between 30 and 34 years of age, whereas there were only two participants (1%) who were less than 20 years old of age. Moreover, most participants had a high school certificate (86 participants, 43%) followed by participants who had an undergraduate certificate (46 participants, 23%). Additionally, most participants were employed (106 participants, 53%) and unmarried (104 participants, 52%). Furthermore, 160 participants (80%) domiciled in Jakarta.

Table 1: Profile of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 years of age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years of age</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years of age</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure

Indicators from previous studies were adapted to measure all variables employed in this study. Consumer animosity was examined using indicators taken and adapted from Cai et al. (2012) and Suhud (2018). Furthermore, consumer ethnocentrism was measured using indicators from Ahmed et al. (2013) even though the indicators were originally from Shimp and Sharma (1987). In addition, product judgment and purchase willingness were measured using indicators adapted from Quang, Dinh Chien, and Long (2017), and (Suhud, 2017, 2018).

Data Analysis Methods

For the data validation test, the authors conducted exploratory factor analysis with factor loadings of 0.4 and higher. As the factor loading scores at minimum 0.4 at, number of sample needed was a minimum of 200 participants (Hair Jr., Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). Furthermore, a reliability test was conducted with a minimum Cronbach’s alpha score of 0.7 to be included for future analysis (Hair Jr. et al., 2006).

The next phase measured the proposed research framework using a structural equation model. A fitted model would be considered if it had a probability of 0.05 (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003) and CMIN/DF of ≤ 2 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Additionally, the model should have a CFI score of ≥ 0.97 (Hu & Bentler, 1995) and RMSEA score of ≤ 0.05 (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table 2 presents the results of the exploratory factor analysis as a process to validate the data. This table also shows results of the reliability test. Consumer animosity retained six indicators with a Cronbach’s’ alpha score of 0.923. Consumer ethnocentrism had six indicators with a Cronbach’s’ alpha score of 0.856. Furthermore, product judgment had six indicators with a Cronbach’s’ alpha score of 0.835.
Willingness to buy formed two dimensions including “willingness to buy” and “unwillingness to buy.” These two dimensions were later treated as two different variables as suggested by Suhud (2018). Willingness to buy survived three indicators with a Cronbach’s alpha score of 0.902.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Results of exploratory factor analysis and reliability test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Animosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA1 China is not a reliable trading partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA4 China has too much economic influence in Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2 China wants to gain economic power over Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3 China takes advantage of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA5 I don’t like batik clothes made in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA6 I feel angry with batik clothes made in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Ethnocentrism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2 Only those batik clothes that are unavailable in Indonesia should be imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE6 We should only buy clothes from foreign countries if we cannot obtain them in our own country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE4 We should purchase batik clothes produced in Indonesia instead of letting other countries get rich off use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1 Indonesia consumers should always buy Indonesian made batik clothes instead of imports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE3 Buy Indonesian made batik. Keep Indonesians working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE5 Foreign products should be taxed heavily to reduce their entry to the Indonesian market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ2 I think that batik clothes made in China are usually quite reliable and seem to last the desired length of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ4 I think, batik clothes made in China are carefully produced and have fine workmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ3 I think that batik clothes made in China usually show a very clever use of colour and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ5 In my opinion, batik clothes made in China typically have a value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ6 In my opinion, batik clothes made in China usually show a clever use of raw materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness to Buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTB2 I would never buy batik clothes made in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTB3 Whenever possible, I avoid buying batik made in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTB1 I would feel guilty if I bought batik clothes made in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTB5 If it were available, I would prefer to buy batik clothes made in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTB6 I like the idea of having batik clothes made in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTB4 I intend to buy batik made clothes in China in the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypotheses Testing**

Figure 2 shows a structural model of the hypotheses testing. This model obtained a fitness with a probability score of 0.227, CMIN/DF score of 1.122, CFI score of 0.995, and RMSEA score of 0.025.

![Structural model of hypotheses testing](image)

Table 3 shows the results of the hypotheses testing. To be considered significant, a path should have a critical ratio (C.R.) value of 1.98 and higher (Hair Jr. et al., 2006). Based on the SEM calculation, eight paths had a C.R. score greater than 1.98, whereas a path of H4 had a score less than 1.98 indicating insignificance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 Consumer animosity</td>
<td>-4.331</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 Consumer animosity</td>
<td>4.794</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 Consumer animosity</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 Consumer animosity</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 Consumer ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-2.474</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 Consumer ethnocentrism</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7 Consumer ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-2.835</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8 Product judgment</td>
<td>6.084</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9 Product judgment</td>
<td>-4.878</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Hatred towards a country can affect consumer behaviour. However, this hatred can have different gradations from consumers. Consumer hatred, in this case, was termed as “animosity”. Some
Indonesian consumers have individual notes about China, primarily when it was related to their political choices. In the 2019 presidential election, the issue of anti-China was used to corner one of the candidates. In this current study, animosity is proven to affect product judgment, consumer ethnocentrism, and willingness and unwillingness to buy batik made in China.

Many variables can be influenced by animosity. Therefore, this variable is vital to determining consumer behaviour. As claimed by de Nisco et al. (2013b), consumer animosity has a significant effect on product judgment. A similar result occurred here. Furthermore, consumer animosity also affects consumer ethnocentrism. This is in line with existing studies (Huang, Phau, & Lin, 2010; Jiménez & Martín, 2010; Ungulaitytė, 2015).

Another result was the impact of consumer animosity on willingness to buy. This finding supports prior studies (Čičić et al., 2003; Fernández-Ferrín, Bande-Vilela, Klein, & del Río-Araújo, 2015; Mrad, Mangleburg, & Mullen, 2014; Ungulaitytė, 2015). Lastly, when consumer animosity influenced unwillingness to buy (Suhud, 2017, 2018).

Cai et al. (2012) failed to use consumer ethnocentrism in testing product judgment in the case of Chinese consumers. However, they succeeded to predict willingness to buy. Previous studies stated that ethnocentrism played an important role in determining consumer judgment of certain products (Ahmed et al., 2013; Čičić et al., 2003; Fernández-Ferrín et al., 2015; Mrad et al., 2014; Shah & Ibrahim, 2016).

Ethnocentrism is characterised by an excessive nationalism that is owned by a person. It considers that the nation and the products made by the nation are better than other people's nations and products made by the other nations (Ahmed et al., 2013). This belief not only affects product judgment. It also affects willingness and unwillingness to buy certain products (Čičić et al., 2003; Fernández-Ferrín et al., 2015; Mrad et al., 2014; Shah & Ibrahim, 2016; Suhud, 2017, 2018). In this case, the product was batik made in China. Other documents recorded that consumer ethnocentrism could also affect unwillingness to buy. Therefore, findings of this study support previous studies (Suhud, 2017, 2018).

A previous study indicated that product judgment was not a good predictor of willingness to buy, for example, studies conducted by Eren (2013). In the study of Suhud (2018), product judgment failed to predict purchase unwillingness. However, it successfully predicted purchase willingness. In this current study, product judgment significantly affected purchase willingness and purchase willingness.

Favourable indicators were used to measure product judgment. For example, batik made in China was very reliable. It was also carefully made by its makers and had value. If the participants have a less civil judgment on batik made in China, they will underestimate this imported product.

On the contrary, those who have a friendly judgment will give the product a high rating. This assumption is corroborated by the results which show that product judgment positively influences willingness to buy, and negatively influences unwillingness to buy. The influence of product judgment on willingness to buy has been explored by existing studies (Čičić et al., 2003; Mrad et al., 2014; Shah & Ibrahim, 2016; Suhud, 2017, 2018). However, there is limited studies examined the effect of product judgment on unwillingness to buy (Suhud, 2017, 2018).

Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the factors that can influence the willingness and unwillingness of consumers to buy textiles and traditional clothing, especially batik. For this reason, the authors chose three variables as predictors: (1) consumer animosity, (2) product judgment, and (3) consumer ethnocentrism. As a result, this study shows that consumer animosity and consumer ethnocentrism had a negative but significant effect on product judgment. Also, consumer ethnocentrism had a negative but significant influence on willingness to buy and product judgment on unwillingness to buy. Furthermore, consumer animosity gave a positive and significant effect to consumer ethnocentrism and unwillingness to buy. Consumer ethnocentrism had a positive and significant effect on unwillingness to buy, as well as product judgment on willingness to buy.
This research has some weaknesses, especially in the sample selection technique. The author uses the accidental sampling method. This method allows the writer to choose samples conveniently at a specific location. The authors are concerned that the participants completed the survey in a nonserious manner. In addition, this technique cannot generalise results. Future research can use the “made in China” topic for other imported products like electronic goods.
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