



Article Info/Makale Bilgisi

Received/Geliş: 01.02.2025 Accepted/Kabul: 01.05.2025

DOI:10.30794/pausbed.1631023

Research Article/Araştırma Makalesi

Yıldırım, Y. O. (2025). "Boycott Tendency vs Ethnocentrism Tendency: Comparison of Both in Terms of Religious Importance Value", *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, issue 69, pp. 341-351.

## BOYCOTT TENDENCY VS ETHNOCENTRISM TENDENCY: COMPARISON OF BOTH IN TERMS OF RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE VALUE

Yusuf Ozan YILDIRIM\*

### Abstract

This study examines ethnocentrism and boycott tendencies among Muslim consumers, focusing on how the level of religious importance shapes these behaviors. Using a quantitative approach with a non-random sampling method, a survey was conducted with 347 respondents. Collected data cleaned with filtration such as religion and total 294 responses left to use in the analysis. The results reveal that both ethnocentric and boycott tendencies increase as the importance of religion grows. Notably, while both tendencies are stronger at higher levels of religiosity, boycott tendencies are significantly higher than ethnocentrism tendencies. However, while boycotts are not permanent, ethnocentrism is, and from this perspective the research offers important marketing implications: marketers should develop strategies by emphasizing corporate social responsibility, transparency, and moral foundations which are compatible with the moral and ethical values of religious consumers and try to transform boycott behavior toward foreign products into ethnocentrism toward intentionally using domestic products.

**Keywords:** Religious importance, Boycott tendency, Ethnocentrism tenden.

## BOYKOT EĞİLİMİ VE ETNOCENTRİZM EĞİLİMİ: DİNİ ÖNEM DEĞERİ AÇISINDAN KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

### Öz

Bu çalışmada Müslüman tüketiciler arasındaki etnosentrizm ve boykot eğilimleri incelenmekte ve dini önem düzeyinin bu davranışları nasıl şekillendirdiği üzerinde durulmaktadır. Nicel yaklaşım belirlenen çalışmada 347 katılımcıya tesadüfi olmayan örnekleme yöntemi ile anket uygulanmıştır. Toplanan veriler din gibi filtrelerle temizlenerek elde kalan toplam 294 veri ile analizler gerçekleştirilmiştir. Sonuçlar, dinin önemi arttıkça hem etnosentrik hem de boykot eğilimlerinin arttığını ortaya koymaktadır. Dikkat çekici olan, her iki eğilimin de yüksek dindarlık düzeylerinde daha güçlü olmasıyla birlikte, boykot eğilimlerinin etnosentrizm eğilimlerine göre anlamlı derecede daha yüksek olmasıdır. Ancak boykotlar kalıcı olmasa da etnosentrizm kalıcıdır ve bu bakış açısından çalışma önemli pazarlama çıkarımları sunmaktadır: pazarlamacılar, dindar tüketicilerin ahlaki ve etik değerleriyle uyumlu kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk, şeffaflık ve ahlaki temelleri vurgulayan stratejiler geliştirmeli ve yabancı ürünlere yönelik boykot davranışını, yerli ürünleri kasıtlı olarak kullanmaya yönelik tüketici etnosentrizmi haline dönüştürmeye çalışmalıdır.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Dini önem, Boykot eğilimi, Etnosentrizm eğilimi.

\*Asst. Prof. Dr. , Dicle University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration, DIYARBAKIR.  
e-mail:yoyildirim@gmail.com, (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0346-2660>)

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

In recent years, the intersection of religion and consumer behavior has received increasing attention; however, there are limited resources to understand how religiosity influences consumer attitudes, particularly in the context of boycotts and consumer ethnocentrism. While much of the existing literature has explored the role of cultural and socio-economic factors in shaping consumer attitudes, the specific impact of religious values on behaviors such as boycotting and ethnocentrism has not yet been sufficiently explored. Research on consumer ethnocentrism and boycotts has been well established; there is a notable gap in literature regarding the role of religiosity level in shaping these behaviors. There are works that prove religion is important and affects both boycott and ethnocentrism in consumer behavior perspective (Al Ganideh & Awudu, 2021; Abdullah, Mohamed Anuar, & Mohd Noor, 2024). Additionally, a study was conducted comparing the religiosity of Muslims and non-Muslims and examining their tendencies towards boycott and ethnocentrism (Sari & Games, 2024). Other than that, specifically, not much attention has been given to how individuals with different levels of religious commitment engage with ethnocentric attitudes and boycott actions. This research aims to address this gap by examining how religious importance makes a difference between consumer ethnocentrism and boycott behavior. This research aims to fill this gap by examining the differences between individuals' tendency to participate in boycotts and their ethnocentric tendencies in consumption behavior in terms of perceiving religion as an important value. By examining this, the study provides new insights into the dynamics of consumer decision-making, particularly in the context of contemporary marketing practices. The aim of this research is not only to contribute to the academic understanding of religious importance in consumer behavior, but also to provide actionable implications for marketers attempting to navigate complex, religion-based consumer choices in increasingly diverse markets.

The global repercussions of the conflict between Palestine and Israel in recent years has caused protests across countries around the world. One of the protests, from a consumption perspective, in Türkiye is the boycott of Israeli-oriented (production, distribution, partisan, etc.) products and services. In this respect, the boycotts carried out seem to be successful, but as mentioned in Lee et al. (2017) study, this situation is not permanent and may change again in the future. From a marketing perspective, this is also an opportunity to direct consumers towards domestically produced products. Claiming the degree of importance given to religion is a factor that can shed light on this issue, some hypotheses are formulated to explore differences between boycott and ethnocentrism. Firstly, a comprehensive literature review was conducted to compare and explain tendencies towards boycott and ethnocentrism in accordance with religiosity. To understand changes in boycott and ethnocentrism tendency, research focused on three layers. The first layer focused on studies on boycott and religiosity, the second layer focused on ethnocentrism and religiosity, and finally the last layer of the literature examined the studies used to study boycott and ethnocentrism together.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2. 1. Boycott Tendency & Religiosity**

Boycott is defined as the tendency of individuals to decide not to consume products of a company or country, or not to purchase certain products at all, in direct or indirect response to policies that they consider excessive or intolerable (Abosag & F. Farah, 2014). In this context, the effectiveness of boycotts usually means a decrease in sales of the product, and therefore boycotts that achieve their goals and reduce sales are considered successful. This success may often require protests or other actions that prevent the distribution of the product (Klein et al., 2001). To briefly define it, a boycott is a protest that involves the action of refraining from doing something, withdrawing, not buying or not working with a person, organization or business (Lestari & Jazil, 2024: 135). The reasons that lead individuals to boycott are generally economic, religious, and political; therefore, boycotting is a situation that almost every business is exposed to today (Yener, 2023).

Among the various reasons that are generally effective in terms of boycott motivation, such as beliefs, needs, and attitudes, religious belief is seen to be highly effective on boycott motivation and contribute to boycott intention (Lestari & Jazil, 2024: 138). From this perspective, religion, which is seen as an important dimension in social culture, has a significant impact on the habits and attitudes of individuals in terms of their value systems.

It also has a significant impact on the lifestyle that directs purchasing decisions and behaviors in terms of consumption (Dekhil et al., 2017: 315). In short, religious beliefs define individuals' values regarding life and affect their behavior within society. Thus, even if consumers remain loyal to the product or service they choose in line with their religious beliefs, religion can act as a catalyst for customer loyalty and change their behavior from loyalty to boycott (Al-Hyari et al., 2012: 158). Therefore, there is a change in the tendency towards boycott participation depending on personal expectations and religious beliefs, independent of the consequences of boycott behavior (Abdullah et al., 2024).

The role of religion has been recognized in consumer behavior studies, and its effects on the decision to boycott a specific brand have been measured. According to Dekhil et al. (2017) study, religion is seen as a fundamental concept that exerts social, economic, moral, and cultural influence on the level of consumption behavior, and religious issues are seen as an important driving force in participation in foreign product boycotts. In short, it is seen that the increase in boycott tendency depends on the degree of religiosity (Dekhil et al., 2017: 315). Underlying a notion that boycotting does not only mean unwillingness to consume the products of the boycotted party but also disagreeing with that party, a study revealed that the tendency to boycott increases as religious tendency increases. It is concluded that those with a high level of religiosity are more positive towards boycotts related to religious issues (Awaludin & Al-Khaidar, 2023). The study, which found that there is a relationship between religious attitude and intention to participate in a boycott, states that the more positive the attitude towards the behavior, the stronger the individual's intention to perform a certain behavior. In short, when a boycott is centered on religious beliefs, a strong boycott decision will emerge (Roswinanto & Suwanda, 2021).

*H<sub>1</sub>: There is a statistically significant difference between the means of boycott tendency according to religious importance groups.*

## **2. 2. Ethnocentrism Tendency & Religiosity**

Ethnocentrism began to be researched in the 1970s and was initially defined as the tendency of an individual to see the group they belong to as the center of everything. Another definition is that an individual evaluates other cultures with prejudices stemming from their own culture's standards and traditions. Individuals with an ethnocentrism tendency prioritize their own values and are judgmental about other cultural values (Deb & Roy Chaudhuri, 2012). With the spread of ethnocentrism in the field of marketing, "consumer ethnocentrism" has been defined as rejecting foreign products and accepting domestic products and brands due to the belief that imported or foreign products will threaten personal and national competition (Das & Mukherjee, 2020: 32). Consumer ethnocentrism is a situation in which there is a general tendency to reject non-domestic products in which consumers may exhibit biased behaviors when purchasing non-domestic products based on their beliefs about the appropriateness and morality of these products (Wilkins et al., 2019). The reason for this situation is generally explained by the moral foundations of consumer ethnocentrism. Moral foundations that affect ethnocentric tendencies in consumers include values, virtues, norms, identities, institutions, psychological mechanisms, law, political institutions, and cultural factors such as religion. In short, consumer ethnocentric tendencies may vary depending on many factors such as acculturation levels, ethnic identity, religiosity, and patriotic feelings towards the homeland (Prince et al., 2019; Al Ganideh & Awudu, 2021).

In countries where the population is ethnically homogeneous, ethnocentric tendencies in consumers are likely to be stronger because ethnic identity overlaps with national identity. However, in countries where ethnic diversity is high, the basis for ethnocentrism is the moral foundations and other factors that hold different ethnic groups together and provide a common identity (Balabanis & Siamagka, 2022). In this context, in developing countries with high ethnic diversity, the orientation towards foreign brands is often associated with status symbols and quality. However, as discussed in the paragraph above, an attitude focused on religious belief, which can provide a common identity in terms of moral foundations, has been found to reduce the orientation towards foreign brands (Deb & Sinha, 2016: 58). As a result of ethnocentric consumption, changes are observed in the perception of value, loyalty, and quality towards foreign brands as consumers see global brands as religious ideological threats by making use of religious myths, local ideological tensions, global events, and historical conflicts (Abosag & F. Farah, 2014: 2266). According to an integrative theory of consumer behavior, religion

is explained as a personal value that can shape consumption motivations. In a study based on this view, it was tested and confirmed that individuals with high religious commitment in the ethnocentrism perspective are less likely to purchase foreign products (Haque et al., 2011: 100).

*H<sub>2</sub>: There is a statistically significant difference between the means of ethnocentrism tendency according to religious importance groups.*

### **2. 3. Boycott Tendency & Ethnocentrism Tendency**

In ethnocentric tendency, consumers become more concerned about whether a product is produced in their own country. In this respect, ethnocentric customers prefer local goods and feel a moral obligation to purchase them. In other words, ethnocentrism can be defined as a general tendency to avoid purchasing foreign products (Deb & Roy Chaudhuri, 2012). In a study on consumer ethnocentrism, which is defined as preferring domestically produced products over foreign products, it was determined that regarding boycotting foreign goods, a strong ethnocentrism influenced consumers' decisions not to purchase products that were perceived to be incompatible with cultural values (Lestari & Jazil, 2024). In a study examining the different reasons underlying boycott behavior, it was determined that consumer ethnocentrism had a negative effect on boycott behavior aimed at not purchasing domestic products (Ulker-Demirel et al., 2020). On the other hand, in a study that tried to determine whether the effect of consumer ethnocentrism on boycott behavior changed over time, it was determined that ethnocentric tendencies affected the judgment or purchase intention of foreign products. However, it was stated that the effect of boycott behavior decreased in the long run. In conclusion, with both approaches, the purchase of foreign products is reduced, but it is explained that the behavior will be more permanent with an ethnocentric approach (Lee et al., 2017).

In a study that concluded that consumer ethnocentrism and boycott behavior are similar to each other (one is willingness to buy, the other is willingness not to buy) and correlated, it was emphasized that the identified issues are particularly focused on country of origin, but they should be examined from different perspectives due to their importance in marketing literature (Abdelwahab et al., 2020). In another study supporting the same finding, a significant relationship was found between consumer ethnocentrism and boycott, and individuals without ethnocentric tendencies showed significantly more positive attitudes towards products from other countries. Accordingly, it was determined that ethnocentrism and boycott tendencies could produce the same results in the short term (Kusmayadi, 2024). Ethnocentrism studies can provide important insights from a consumer behavior perspective. Accordingly, a study conducted on a Muslim society found that especially young Muslims have a high level of ethnocentrism, which causes them to avoid buying foreign products and prefer to buy national brands (Sari et al., 2017). In addition, when it comes to boycotting for a religious reason, a study found that ethnocentrism significantly affects people's willingness and intention to boycott products, and the success of the boycott is positively affected by ethnocentrism and has a significant effect in determining consumers' attitudes towards the boycott (Lestari & Jazil, 2024: 136).

*H<sub>3</sub>: There isn't a statistically significant difference between the means of boycott tendency and ethnocentrism tendency. (Testing Null Hypothesis)*

Consumer boycotts have become a major driver in markets where they are used aggressively against governments, corporations, and individuals who engage in actions that are religiously motivated and considered offensive. Boycott behavior, which can vary based on religious sensitivity, is an issue that should be considered, especially in markets where religion heavily influences consumer choices, as it can create negative consumer attitudes (Kusmayadi, 2024). Despite the complex nature of boycotts, other variables that are often used when the topic is focused on religion are animosity, peer pressure, health consciousness, ethnocentrism, etc. In a study examining religious boycotts, the relationship between ethnocentrism and boycotts was examined among Muslim and non-Muslim groups, and no effect was found in the non-Muslim group. This was explained by the fact that ethnocentric consumers are more likely to perceive foreign goods and people as potential threats and view their own community as the best, most important, and vital for everything (Sari & Games, 2024).

*H<sub>4</sub>: There is a statistically significant difference between the means of boycott tendency and ethnocentrism tendency according to high religiosity.*

*H<sub>5</sub>: There is a statistically significant difference between the means of boycott tendency and ethnocentrism tendency according to low religiosity.*

### **3. RESEARCH DESIGN & FINDINGS**

#### **3. 1. Design**

One of the sub-dimensions of culture, which is among the factors affecting consumer behavior, is religion, which is associated with various topics in marketing research. It can be said that religious belief plays an important role, especially in terms of the fact that boycott campaigns are constantly on the agenda within the framework of the unfortunate events that have occurred in recent years. The Israeli-Palestinian war, which started in the last quarter of 2023, has resonated throughout the world, and many boycott campaigns have been launched on the subject. The boycott campaigns launched in Türkiye, the consumer-focused ones, are generally designed to explain what is on the boycott list. In this respect, it is possible to say that the boycott campaigns in question are generally successful. However, since this situation also provides consumers with the opportunity to recognize and use domestic products, determining the differences in boycott and ethnocentrism tendencies in terms of the degree of importance given to religion is important for both academic and marketing practices. From this perspective, this study is designed to answer the question of whether there would be a difference between ethnocentrism and boycott tendencies according to the degree of importance given to religion.

A quantitative study was designed with a non-random sampling method to understand whether religiosity creates a difference between boycott and ethnocentrism tendency. The research was conducted within the borders of Türkiye, where more than 90 percent of the population is Muslim; therefore, the first limitation and filtering of the study was determined to conduct the tests with only Muslim participants. Noting this situation is important in terms of the generalizability of the research results. After forming the hypotheses stated in the literature of the study, the necessary scales for measurement were determined, and an online survey was designed. Using convenient sampling, a total of 347 data were collected. In the first phase of the designed online survey, after the necessary explanations were made regarding both ethical aspects and the sensitivity of the issue, the participants were asked about their voluntary participation (The necessary ethics committee permission was obtained. Ethics committee date and number: 13.11.2024:810651). After the participants declared that they participated voluntarily, they were asked to answer questions about the importance of religion by stating their religious beliefs. Afterwards participants answered boycott tendency questions about product or brand preference focused on Israel (Production, Aid, Supporters, etc.). Finally, after answering the ethnocentrism tendency questions, participants answered short demographic questions. In the survey, three different measurements were used for religiosity, boycott, and ethnocentrism, and all were asked using a 7-point Likert scale. To measure boycott tendency, four items were obtained from the work of Abosag & Farah (2014). Since the survey asked about the boycott tendency towards the nation of Israel (Production, Aid, Supporters, etc.), the “national” dimension (Turkish products) was used in the ethnocentrism tendency. Therefore, four items measuring ethnocentrism tendencies were taken from Ouellet’s (2007) study. Finally, six items used in Leonidou et al. (2022)’s study to measure religious importance value were used in the research.

#### **3. 2. Findings**

In this stage of the study, the analysis findings performed on the remaining data after the necessary filtering are presented. In this context, the findings of the research are presented respectively as data cleaning, demographic distributions, factor & reliability, and hypothesis testing. Before analyzing the data in terms of the research question and the focus of the study, participants who did not want to participate due to the sensitive nature of the study, did not indicate a religious preference, or were not Muslim were excluded from the study. Participants were also asked whether they had voluntarily participated in any action against Israeli products or whether they had paid attention to boycott campaigns in Türkiye. However, this question was not used as a filter since it’s not considered as an eliminatory question in terms of boycott tendency.

**Table 1. Preliminary Conditions and Care for Boycott in Türkiye**

Approval	Frequency	Religion	Frequency	Care for Boycott	Frequency
Yes	312	Muslim	294	Yes	155
No	35	Other	18	No	139
Total	347	Total	312	Total	294

Above, table 1. shows the two-step filtration process for data and participants action or attention for boycott. In the survey, after being given the necessary explanation, participants were asked whether they would participate voluntarily. No research data was obtained from a total of 35 participants who stated that the subject was sensitive and that they did not want to express an opinion. After which participants were asked about their religion. Data from 18 participants who were not Muslim or did not provide information about their religion were not used in the study. Finally, participants were asked whether they took any action (not using any products, engaging in social media, sharing thoughts with others, etc..) or had paid attention to boycott campaigns in Türkiye, and as a result, a total of 155 participants took action or had paid attention.

The demographic questions asked at the end of the survey were not very detailed in order not to disturb the participants and prevent them from finishing the survey. In any case, simple descriptive demographics were requested to obtain a general profile of the participants. According to Table 2 below, the profile of the participants is closely distributed in terms of gender, with approximately 80 percent under the age of 35 (age was not asked as a nominal variable, and its range is from 18 to 51, with a mean of 26,41) and approximately 65 percent from the working class.

**Table 2. Demographic Distributions**

Variable	Groups	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>	Male	153	48,0
	Female	141	52,0
	<b>Total</b>	294	100
<b>Age</b> (Mean: 26,41) (Range: 18-51)	18-24	155	52,7
	25-34	90	30,6
	35-44	42	14,3
	45+	7	2,4
	<b>Total</b>	294	100
<b>Status</b>	Student	84	28,6
	Public Sector	71	24,1
	Private Sector	115	39,1
	Unemployed	24	8,2
	<b>Total</b>	294	100

In order to begin hypotheses testing, an exploratory factor analysis is conducted to maximize efficiency. A general rule of thumb for factor analysis is 300 data points, or 50 data points per factor. As VanVoorhis and Morgan (2007) noted in their study, sample sizes can be evaluated as follows: 50 is very poor; 100 is poor; 200 is fair; 300 is good; 500 is very good; and 1000 is excellent. The first thing to consider in exploratory factor analysis is whether the sampling is adequate and whether the items used really explain the factor. To check this, KMO values should be above 0.50, and the Bartlett Sphericity Test should be statistically meaningful (Field, 2013). Following this step, the total variance explained by factors should be above 0.60, and in the rotated component matrix, all item loadings should be above 0.50. After steps of data reduction, before composing any factors, item's reliability should be tested for internal consistency, and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value should be at least 0.70 (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010; Durmuş, Yurtkoru, & Çinko, 2013). Finally, in order to perform parametric tests, the factors should have a normal distribution. According to Tabachnick & Fidell (2018), in social sciences, a skewness and kurtosis value range of  $\pm 1.5$  is considered a normal distribution.



**Table 3. Factor, Reliability and Normality**

Scale	KMO / Bartlett	TVE	#	Loadings	$\alpha$	Mean	Skewness	Kurtosis
BT	,809/,000	75,894	4	,791-,909	,892	4,408	-0,257	-1,164
ET	,800/,000	70,451	4	,786-,880	,859	4,307	-0,137	-0,995
RI	,862/,000	60,232	6	,626-,882	,860	5,149	-0,650	-0,283
Boycott Tendency: BT, Ethnocentrism Tendency: ET, Religious Importance: RI								

Table 3 above shows the exploratory factor analysis, reliability and normality (skewness and kurtosis) for each scale used in this study. According to the previously given explanations table 3 shows that for each scale KMO values are above 0,50 and Bartlett's sphericity test results are statistically significant. It means that the selected sample is sufficient and suitable for factor analysis. In addition, no items were dropped from the scales during the data reduction process. After factor analysis was conducted for each scale, reliability tests were examined. Cronbach's alpha values for all scales were above 0,70. Finally, after composition of factors skewness and kurtosis values for each factor is examined. Since all skewness and kurtosis values are within the given range of  $\pm 1.5$ , it is assumed that each factor is normally distributed. After all necessary steps done before testing hypotheses "religious importance" scale needed to be converted into categorical variable. In studies where it is necessary to convert a metric variable into a non-metric variable, the splitting process for continuous variables is usually performed with mean, median or specific break points. Cause of neutral point on a 7-point Likert is 4, points of 5, 6, 7 represents the positive axis and the RI mean is close to 5, thus the "religious importance" scale was recoded as high for 5 points and above and low for below 5.

### 3. 3. Hypotheses Testing

To test research hypotheses, "independent samples t-test" and "paired samples t-test" are used. According to Durmuş et al. (2013), assumptions of the independent sample t-test are that the dependent variables are continuous and normally distributed, there are at least 30 data in the groups, and the variances between the groups are homogeneous. Kim (2015) states that for paired sample t-test, the samples should be different from each other, the correlation coefficient (r) is not equal to "0", the data should be normally distributed, and the sample sizes should be equal. Finally, according to Thompson (2007), Cohen's d (effect sizes) should be reported for t-tests. Cohen's benchmark values indicate "trivial effect" for  $d < 0.2$ ; "small effect" for  $0.2 < d < 0.5$ ; "medium effect" for  $0.5 < d < 0.8$ ; and "large effect" for  $d > 0.8$ .

Table 4 below summarizes the independent sample t-test results regarding boycott and ethnocentrism tendency according to the groups of religious importance. Considering the information given, it was seen that the continuous variables used are normally distributed (see Table 3), the data are over 30 in each group (High Importance of Religion: 182, Low: 112), and the variances between the groups are homogeneous (Levene Test Results:  $p > 0.05$ ). Thus, the t-test findings can be interpreted after the assumptions are verified in the performed test.

**Table 4. Independent Samples t-Test**

Religious Importance				N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Levene's Test	
							F	Sig
Boycott Tendency	High			182	5,1209	1,7858	0,148	0,701
	Low			112	3,2500	1,7321		
Ethnocentrism Tendency	High			182	4,8956	1,7746	3,669	0,056
	Low			112	3,3527	1,5073		
t				df	p	Mean Dif.	Cohen's d	95% CI for Cohen's d
								LowerUpper
H <sub>1(Accepted)</sub>	Boycott Tendency		8,823	292	,000	1,87088	1,060	0,8081,309
H <sub>2(Accepted)</sub>	Ethnocentrism Tendency		7,656	292	,000	1,54293	0,919	0,6721,166

According to Table 4, the mean of boycott tendency is 5.12 in the high religious importance group and 3.25 in the low religious importance group. The mean of ethnocentrism tendency is 4.89 in the high religious importance group and 3.35 in the low religious importance group. The difference between religious importance groups for boycott tendency is 1.87, and for ethnocentrism tendency is 1.54. In addition, the difference between means of boycott and ethnocentrism tendency according to religion groups is statistically significant for both at the level of  $p < 0.05$ . Cohen's  $d$  value is checked to understand whether this significant difference represents a small or large change in effect. Finally, for both boycott and ethnocentrism tendency, where the difference between religious groups is significant, it is determined that the differences observed have a large effect size since  $d$  values for both are above 0.80. As a result, developed hypotheses  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are accepted, and it's observed that the means of both boycott and ethnocentrism tendencies are higher in the group with a high level of religious importance compared to low level of religious importance.

**Table 5. Paired Sample Results for BT & ET**

Variables	Mean	N	BT-ET (Mean)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	r	p
BT	4,4082	294	0,10034	1,174	293	0,242	0,708	0,000
ET	4,3078	294						
Cohen's d: 0,068 and 95% CI for Cohen's d = Lower -0,046 - Upper 0,183, H <sub>3</sub> : Accepted								

As stated in the literature review, boycott and ethnocentrism are not very different from each other. Therefore, a paired sample t-test was conducted to determine if the mean difference between the two variables is insignificant. Considering the notation of the paired sample t-test conducted (Kim, 2015), that boycott and ethnocentrism tendency were separate variables, the correlation between them is 0.708 ( $p < 0.05$ ), and the sample size for both is 294. After notations are checked, the results show that the mean of boycott tendency is 4.40, ethnocentrism tendency is 4.30, and the mean difference between them is statistically insignificant ( $p = 0.242 > 0.05$ ). In short, it was seen that the difference between the means of boycott and ethnocentrism tendency is not statistically significant, and therefore the  $H_3$  hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 6. Paired Sample Results for BT & ET (Filter: High Religious Importance)**

Variables	Mean	N	BT-ET (Mean)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	r	p
BT	5,1209	182	0,22527	2,169	181	0,031	0,690	0,000
ET	4,8956	182						
Cohen's d: 0,161 and 95% CI for Cohen's d = Lower 0,014 - Upper 0,307, H <sub>a</sub> : Accepted								

Table 6 above shows the mean difference between boycott and ethnocentrism tendency in the high religious importance group. Accordingly, the correlation between them is 0.690 (small changes compared to the absence of filter in Table 5), and the sample size for both is 182. In the high religious importance group, the mean of boycott tendency is 5.12 and the mean of ethnocentrism tendency is 4.89. The mean difference between them is 0.22 and is statistically significant ( $p = 0.031 < 0.05$ ). In addition, when Cohen's  $d$  value is checked, the  $d$  value is 0.16, indicating that the difference has a trivial effect. In short, it is seen that the difference between the mean of boycott and ethnocentrism in the high religious importance group is statistically significant, but at a negligible effect level. Therefore, hypothesis  $H_4$  is accepted.

**Table 7. Paired Sample Results for BT & ET (Filter: Low Religious Importance)**

Variables	Mean	N	BT-ET (Mean)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	r	p
BT	3,2500	112	-0,10268	-0,701	111	0,485	0,549	0,000
ET	3,3527	112						
Cohen's d: -0,066 and 95% CI for Cohen's d = Lower -0,251- Upper 0,119, H <sub>c</sub> : Rejected								

Table 7 shows the result of paired samples for the group with low religious importance. The correlation between boycott and ethnocentrism tendency is 0.54 (decreased compared to high religious importance group), and the mean for boycott tendency is 3.25 and the mean for ethnocentrism tendency is 3.35. The mean difference



between boycott and ethnocentrism tendency is -0.10 and is statistically insignificant at  $p=0.485>0.05$  level. Therefore, the insignificance of the difference between the averages of boycott tendency and ethnocentrism tendency according to low religiosity rejects  $H_5$ .

#### **4.CONCLUSION**

In today's world, it could be said that we entered a period of instability in almost every field, including social, economic, religious, political, environmental, etc. Therefore, many dynamics of our paradigms are changing incrementally and more rapidly. Although religion, one of the dynamics, remains almost the same in essence, our comprehension and faith are changing our religiosity. Thus, even small, barely perceptible changes in our religiosity -directly or indirectly- can have a big, non-linear impact on a complex system such as our behavioral tendencies. Relying on that notion, this research is based on the question of whether religiosity makes a difference for ethnocentric tendencies and boycott tendencies. The research question was tried to be answered depending on the various limitations. The main reason for working with only Muslim participants, which is the main limitation in question, is due to the conflict between Israel and Palestine in recent years. On the other hand, since the research topic is a morally sensitive issue, lifestyle and habitual characteristics could not be requested from the participants. Finally, although the study was conducted within the borders of Türkiye, where ethnicity is diverse, the fact that an approach towards ethnicity was not adopted is seen as one of the main limitations of the research.

The results show that both ethnocentric and boycott tendencies are higher in individuals who attach more importance to religion, highlighting the significant role that religiosity plays in shaping consumer attitudes and decision-making processes. This result overlaps with some previous works defending "high religious commitment in the ethnocentrism perspective are less likely to purchase foreign products" and "there is a change in the tendency towards boycott participation depending on religious beliefs" (Dekhil, Jridi, & Farhat, 2017; Awaludin & Al-Khaidar, 2023; Roswinanto & Suwanda, 2021; Deb & Sinha, 2016; Haque, Rahman, & Haque, 2011). The difference caused by religiosity, this result emphasizes that religious values not only affect personal belief systems but also influence how individuals interact with countries, brands, products, and companies. Another finding of this research also shows that there isn't any significant difference between ethnocentrism and boycott tendency. As indicated by literature both variables are highly correlated because of their nature: one is willingness to buy, and one is not (Sari, Mizerski, & Liu, 2017; Kusmayadi, 2024; Lestari & Jazil, 2024). Last and seen as important for its contribution to literature, analysis shows that while at lower levels of religious importance there is no difference between ethnocentrism and boycott tendencies, at higher levels of religious importance individuals tend to exhibit stronger boycott behaviors compared to ethnocentrism. This finding indicates that religiously motivated consumers are more likely to take action against brands or companies perceived to violate their moral or ethical values, rather than simply exhibiting ethnocentric attitudes toward domestic products or brands.

*Theoretical Implications:* This study investigates differences according to religiosity on ethnocentrism and boycott tendencies and offers theoretical contributions. The findings confirm that higher levels of religious importance amplify both ethnocentric and boycott tendencies. Furthermore, research reveals that while both tendencies increase with religiosity, boycott tendencies are notably higher than ethnocentric tendencies. These findings reveal that religiosity is closely related to consumer behavior.

*Marketing Implications:* For marketers, this research highlights the importance of understanding consumer behavior based on religious values, which may be important for developing effective marketing campaigns, especially in markets with a high concentration of religious individuals. Marketers should acknowledge the diverse effects of religiosity on consumer behavior when designing campaigns. Religious consumers, especially those with strong religious values, are more likely to respond to messages that align with their moral and ethical standards. Marketers should proactively engage in practices that reflect the values of religious groups to avoid backlash. Strategies that emphasize corporate responsibility and ethical actions can help reduce the risk of consumer-driven boycotts. Although the events of recent years have been heartbreaking, this crisis creates an important opportunity in terms of marketing. Lee et al. (2017) mentioned that boycotting is a temporary situation; thus, in the current situation of ongoing boycott activities, it is an opportunity to highlight domestic products and create consumer ethnocentrism. In order for domestic consumption to become permanent, marketers are expected

to adopt ethnocentrism-focused approaches and transform boycott behavior into ethnocentric consumption. Rather than explicitly telling consumers what to boycott, marketers are advised to encourage ethnocentric consumption by emphasizing which products/companies are domestic.

*Further Research Suggestion:* This study provides valuable suggestions for future research in marketing. Understanding the specific triggers that cause religious consumers to participate in boycotts or adopt ethnocentric attitudes may allow marketers to design more targeted and effective campaigns. Additionally, by examining how various religious groups respond to ethnocentrism and boycotts, researchers can refine existing theories of consumer behavior and create more nuanced models that explain the various ways religious values influence purchasing decisions.

#### **Disclosure Statements (Beyan ve Açıklamalar)**

1. The author of this article confirm that their work complies with the principles of research and publication ethics (Bu çalışmanın yazarı, araştırma ve yayın etiği ilkelerine uyduklarını kabul etmektedirler).
2. No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author (Yazar tarafından herhangi bir çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir).
3. This article was screened for potential plagiarism using a plagiarism screening program (Bu çalışma, intihal tarama programı kullanılarak intihal taramasından geçirilmiştir).

#### **REFERENCES**

- Abdelwahab, D., Jiménez, N., San-Martín, S., & Prodanova, J. (2020). Between love and boycott: a story of dual origin brands. *Spanish journal of marketing-ESIC*, 24(3), pp. 377-402.
- Abdullah, Z., Mohamed Anuar, M., & Mohd Noor, N. A. (2024). Consumer Boycott: The Effect of Religiosity and Consumer Attitudes. *Global Journal Al-Thaqafah*, pp. 85-97.
- Abosag, I., & F. Farah, M. (2014). The influence of religiously motivated consumer boycotts on brand image, loyalty and product judgment. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(11/12), pp. 2262-2283.
- Al Ganideh, S. F., & Awudu, I. (2021). Arab-Muslim Americans' personality riddle and consumer ethnocentrism. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 34(2), pp. 110-130.
- Al-Hyari, K., Alnsour, M., Al-Weshah, G., & Haffar, M. (2012). Religious beliefs and consumer behaviour: from loyalty to boycotts. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 3(2), pp. 155-174.
- Awaludin, A. A., & Al-Khaidar, M. A. (2023). Opinion leaders and boycott intentions: Factors influencing consumer behavior in support of Israel Boycott. *Journal of Digital Marketing and Halal Industry*, 5(2), pp. 243-264.
- Balabanis, G., & Siamagka, N. T. (2022). A meta-analysis of consumer ethnocentrism across 57 countries. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 39(3), pp. 745-763.
- Das, M., & Mukherjee, D. (2020). Ethnic identity impact on consumers' ethnocentric tendencies: the moderating role of acculturation and materialism. *Management and Labour Studies*, 45(1), pp. 31-53.
- Deb, M., & Roy Chaudhuri, H. (2012). Assessing the ethnocentric tendencies of different age-cohorts in an emerging market. *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 4(4), pp. 244-268.
- Deb, M., & Sinha, G. (2016). Impact of culture on religiosity, cosmopolitanism and ethnocentrism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 28(1), pp. 56-72.
- Dekhil, F., Jridi, H., & Farhat, H. (2017). Effect of religiosity on the decision to participate in a boycott: The moderating effect of brand loyalty—the case of Coca-Cola. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 8(2), pp. 309-328.
- Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, E. S., & Çinko, M. (2013). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi*. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. UK: Sage: Newcastle Tyne.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis 7th Edition*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Haque, A., Rahman, S., & Haque, M. (2011). Religiosity, ethnocentrism and corporate image towards the perception of young Muslim consumers: Structural equation modeling approach. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(1), pp. 98-108.
- Kim, T. K. (2015). T test as a parametric statistic. *Korean journal of anesthesiology*, 68(6), pp. 540-546.
- Klein, J. G., John, A., & Smith, N. C. (2001). Exploring motivations for participation in a consumer boycott. *Center for Marketing Working Paper, No. 01-701*, pp. 1-22.
- Kusmayadi, S. (2024). The Power of Belief: How Ethnocentrism, Religion, and Brand Importance Shape Boycott Behavior and Brand Perceptions in Indonesia. *Journal of Enterprise and Development (JED)*, 6(3), pp. 741-755.
- Lee, R., Lee, K. T., & Li, J. (2017). A memory theory perspective of consumer ethnocentrism and animosity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(7/8), pp. 1266-1285.
- Leonidou, C. N., Gruber, V., & Schlegelmilch, B. B. (2022). Consumers' environmental sustainability beliefs and activism: A cross-cultural examination. *Journal of International Marketing*, 30(4), pp. 78-104.
- Lestari, P., & Jazil, T. (2024). The Role of Religiosity, Consumer Animosity, and Ethnocentrism in Explaining the Boycott Motivation. *Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance Studies*, 5(1), pp. 134-152.
- Ouellet, J. F. (2007). Consumer racism and its effects on domestic cross-ethnic product purchase: An empirical test in the United States, Canada, and France. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(1), pp. 113-128.
- Prince, M., Yaprak, A. N., & Palihawadana, D. (2019). The moral bases of consumer ethnocentrism and consumer cosmopolitanism as purchase dispositions. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 36(3), pp. 429-438.
- Roswinanto, W., & Suwanda, S. N. (2021). Religious boycott in Indonesia: investigation of antecedents and the effect of religiosity dimensions. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 14(1), pp. 174-195.
- Sari, D. K., & Games, D. (2024). Investigating young consumer's boycott behavior in an emerging market. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), p. 2362444.
- Sari, D. K., Mizerski, D., & Liu, F. (2017). Boycotting foreign products: a study of Indonesian Muslim consumers. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 8(1), pp. 16-34.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2018). *Using multivariate statistics. 7th edition*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Thompson, B. (2007). Effect sizes, confidence intervals, and confidence intervals for effect sizes. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44(5), pp. 423-432.
- Ulker-Demirel, E., Yuruk-Kayapinar, P., & Kayapinar, O. (2020). The role of consumer ethnocentrism on boycott behaviour: What if a domestic business behaves egregiously? *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 38(4), pp. 1-15.
- VanVoorhis, C. W., & Morgan, B. L. (2007). Understanding power and rules of thumb for determining sample sizes. *Tutorials in quantitative methods for psychology*, 3(2), pp. 43-50.
- Wilkins, S., Butt, M. M., Shams, F., & Pérez, A. (2019). The acceptance of halal food in non-Muslim countries: Effects of religious identity, national identification, consumer ethnocentrism and consumer cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 10(4), pp. 1308-1331.
- Yener, D. (2023). The Effect of Country of Origin and Brand Origin on Consumer Boycotts: The Mediating Effect of Product Evaluation. *Econharran*, 7(12), pp. 1-13.