Critical perspective on consumer animosity amid Russia-Ukraine war

Abstract

Purpose: Consumer animosity in the wake of Russia-Ukraine war has gained significance in consumer behavior research. In this line, this study aimed at examining (1) the critical influence of consumer animosity in developing brand attitude and its ensuing outcomes—brand boycott behavior and brand-country image, (2) the moderating role of perceived intrusiveness on the relationship between consumer animosity and brand attitude, and (3) the moderating role of altruism between brand attitude and behavioral outcomes.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Using the data obtained from 411 European consumers, data analysis was performed using structural equation modeling (SEM) to examine the proposed relationships.

Findings: The findings revealed a strong negative influence of consumer animosity on brand attitude, which eventually leads to brand boycott behavior and a negative brand-country image. This work also confirmed the boundary condition of perceived intrusiveness on the effect of consumers’ animosity on brand attitude. Further, we validated the moderating effects of altruistic behavior on the relationships between brand attitude and boycott behavior and brand country image.

Limitations and Implications: This study offers theoretical, practical and policy implications in international marketing domain. We acknowledged a few shortcomings and made some recommendations for future research.

Originality: In the context of the Russian-Ukraine War, we provide critical perspective on how novel conceptual framework based on consumer animosity. In the current scenario, we investigated how European customers’ animosity to Russian brands develops their adverse attitudes. We also highlighted the alternatives to Russian brands when they were boycotted during the Russia-Ukraine war.
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1. Introduction

The Russo-Ukrainian War, a geopolitical tension between the Russia and Ukraine, erupted after the Ukrainian revolution for dignity in February 2014 (Alyukov, 2022). The conflicts in Ukraine escalated, culminating in Russia's invasion on February 24, 2022, after Russian forces had amassed near Ukraine's borders in 2021-2022 (Suliman and Pannett, 2022). The Russian invasion of Ukrainian territory has angered the international community for violating international law and attempting to undermine Ukraine's sovereignty (McKee and Murphy, 2022). Since Russia violated international peace laws by invading, numerous countries sanctioned its government, people, and businesses (Goldenberg, 2022). More recently, Farmaki, (2023) highlighted that the Russia-Ukraine conflict and sanctions cause intense animosity against Russian tourists when they travel abroad. Due to these issues, European countries are developing international strategies for the social, economic, and political repercussions of Russia, notably the German Eastern policy (Ostpolitik), which also addresses Russia’s current situation (Luo and Van Assche, 2023; Umland, 2022). The Russian invasion has incited global antipathy, which has adversely affected Russia (Suliman and Pannett, 2022).

Western brands like Apple, IKEA, and McDonald's suspended operations in Russia, and the EU and USA closed Russian airspace to airplanes (Farmaki, 2023; Luo and Van Assche, 2023), emphasizing that Russia's decision isolated and tarnished its political and economic image. International support for Ukraine surged rapidly due to Russian actions, and animosity toward Russia reached new heights. Mrad et al., (2013) and Ali, (2021) explored boycotting products from hostile nations during wartime. However, global pressure to boycott Russian individuals in science, arts, research, and sports has increased. Scholars have noted that when a country, corporation, or band violates societal norms, consumers tend to become angry and penalize them socially, economically, or politically (Leonidou et al., 2019). Al-Jazeera, (2022) reports on the Russia-Ukraine war from an invasive perspective. Advertisements are perceived as intrusive and may indicate a negative brand attitude (Tan et al., 2019). Studies suggest that enmity causes customers to experience negative emotions (Ali, 2021; Barutçu et al., 2016; Hong, 2007). Hence, it can be inferred that the feelings of animosity of European consumers towards Russia will result in various adverse emotional consequences for Russian brands.

The existing literature has sufficiently examined consumer animosity in various contexts, including Chinese customers' anti-Japanese sentiment (Antonetti et al., 2019; Hong, 2007),
Kurdish consumers animosity toward Turkey (Ali, 2021), and Indonesian customers’ animosity toward made-in-China products (Suhud and Allan, 2021), indicating a country or brand violates social norms, consumers perceive betrayal and exhibit intentions to boycott or display negative emotional reactions. The preceding research looked at consumer animosity in a variety of situations and discovered that when consumers feel hatred and negative sentiments toward a country, they are more likely to engage in boycott and regret behavior. Consequently, the aforementioned issues naturally generate a scholarly curiosity to explore how the European consumers’ animosity develop their attitude towards Russian brands, what is the role of media intrusiveness and individual’s altruistic behavior, and what is the alternative of Russian brands when boycotted during the Russia-Ukraine war. This research provides answers to these critical international marketing challenges.

Scholars argued that when a country infringes on a country's sovereignty or disrupts any of its social, economic, or political standards, individuals develop animosity, which they employ as a way of protesting (Koh, 2014; Lee et al., 2021). However, there is a void in the research studying consumer hatred in the context of the Russia-Ukraine war, as well as European consumers' animosity toward Russia, which influences their opinions toward Russian brands and leads to boycotts and a bad brand-country image. Meanwhile, consumers’ frustration and anxiety and the intrusiveness of information indirectly cause their boycott and brand image, and altruistic behavior directly influences them to warn others of their adverse experiences. Scholars affirm that consumers’ avoidance behavior encourages them to save others from adverse effects because pro-social behavior helps them to protect their peers from selfish motives and risks (Siddiqi et al., 2020). It could be inferred that consumers prefer to help and warn individuals, social groups, and other colleagues to encourage boycotts and discourage the use of Russian brands. To fill these voids, this research follows the calls (Leonidou et al., 2019; Makarem and Jae, 2016) and develops a research framework (Figure I) by examining the consumers’ animosity and related outcomes in the context of the Russia-Ukraine war. First, this study checks the relationship between consumer animosity and brand attitude in the setting of the Russia-Ukraine war, expanding on the work of Han et al. (2021) by investigating the effect of consumer animosity on brand attitude in the current context. Second, in response to Nebenzahl and Jaffe (1996), the study assesses the brand image relationships with boycott behavior and brand-country image during the Russia-Ukraine war. Third, this study examines the moderating influence of perceived intrusiveness on the connection between consumers’ animosity and their attitudes toward Russian brands. Fourth,
the study applies altruism as a moderator in the relationship between (a) brand attitude and  
brand boycott behavior and (b) brand attitude and brand-country image, which had previously  
been overlooked. People tend to think that a brand’s bad reputation is linked to its country of  
origin; therefore, they have bad feelings about it and wants to protect society and humanity  
(Klein et al., 2004; Lee and Mazodier, 2015). Therefore, altruistic behavior, or acts of  
protection for society or humanity, lead European consumers to form a bad brand-country  
image for Russian brands.

Our findings contribute to a variety of literature streams. The findings of this study primarily  
contribute to the literature on customer animosity, which is a significant issue in international  
consumer well-being. In the realm of the Russia-Ukraine war, this study adds to the existing  
brand and psychology literature by offering and validating a conceptual framework of  
animosity to include outcomes—brand boycott behavior and brand-country image. This study  
mainly contributes to the literature on international business and altruism by validating its  
boundary conditions, which existing literature has ignored. During the Russian-Ukrainian  
war, our study also has several practical implications for consumers in Europe, international  
business policymakers, and Russian brands.

2. Theoretical foundation and hypotheses development

2.1 Protection motivation theory

Protection motive theory has been used in various research of consumer behavior (Cismaru  
and Lavack, 2006; Pang et al., 2021; Youn et al., 2021). The protection motive theory (PMT)  
was developed in 1975 and initially focused on the health belief model. This theory states that  
past incidents and behaviors directly affect the process of evaluating threats and an  
individual’s ability to cope with them. Initially PMT included two cognitive processes  
namely cognitive mediating processes and coping mode and later it was expanded to include  
sources of information (Soediono, 1989). Cognitive mediating processes include threat  
appraisals and coping appraisals. In the present model, cognitive mediating processes employ  
consumers’ brand attitude, which consumers associate with a certain threat (Russian-  
Ukrainian war). After interacting with cognitive mediating processes, individuals adopt  
protective behavior in terms of coping with direct action or preventing action. In the current  
context, during Russian-Ukrainian war consumers adopt attitude against Russian brands and  
result in brand boycott and altruistic behavior towards the hostile country in developing  
country image. Originally, PMT focused on threats and fear appeals, which were associated
with informative communications about threats and coping appraisals. However, the revised version of PMT included extra or additional sources of information, referred to as environmental and intrapersonal sources. Environmental sources are associated with observational learning and verbal persuasion, and intrapersonal sources are linked with prior experience of threats and personality attributes. In the present context, information about the Russian-Ukrainian war and threats from the perceived intrusiveness of war-related information serve as sources of information. It refers to the fact that information about the threats causes a cognitive mediating process in consumers that appraises both positive and negative coping behavior.

Despite the fact that PMT has three cognitive processes, many researchers have focused on a single component of the theory (Prentice-Dunn and Rogers, 1986). Consumer behavior researchers have employed the protection motivation theory in a variety of studies (Bolkan, 2018; Byrd et al., 2023; Cismaru and Lavack, 2006; Harris et al., 2020; Kuppusamy et al., 2020; Youn et al., 2021).

Rogers defined the protection motivation theory in 1975 as a cognitive process of consumers’ motivation to participate in protective behaviors (Rogers, 1975). The PMT is related to decision making for protective behavior, which is influenced by threat appraisal and coping appraisal (Rippetoe and Rogers, 1987). Kim et al. (2021) used protective motive theory to investigate consumers’ cognitions connected to the COVID-19 pandemic, which included hopes, fears, and consumer changes in behavior. Similarly, Cismaru and Lavack (2006) used protective motivation theory to investigate consumer decision-making. Scholars refer to the fact that consumers’ cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral responses are usually associated with advertisements or information, which they might perceive as irrelevant or intrusive. PMT cognitive component of information source arouses individuals’ attitude to cope with media intrusiveness. Threat, coping, and cost, which are fundamental components of protective motivation theory, are all significantly associated with consumer complaints (Bolkan, 2018). In a seminal study, Fan et al., (2022) found that consumers are willing to pay more to protect the environment. Based on these arguments, we contend that PMT encourages Europeans who feel animosity towards Russia and exhibit altruistic behavior to boycott Russian brands and link negative attributes to Russian brands because of their concern for the people of Ukraine. Additionally, we argue that perceived advertisement intrusiveness is consumer’s cognitive assessment about the degree of interference of information with his or her cognitive processes that might interrupt their goals. During the
COVID-19 pandemic, Youn et al. (2021) discovered that fashion brands shifted due to considering the protection motivation theory by analyzing consumers' protective behaviors. In the present study context, the Russian-Ukrainian war created animosity and informational intrusiveness affected European customers' attitudes towards Russian brands, resulting in boycott behavior and a negative brand-country image.

The recent work of Byrd et al. (2021) examined restaurant consumers’ patronage behavior while exhibiting protective behavior against the COVID-19 virus when they perceive the COVID-19 virus as a threat. In response, we applied PMT as a theoretical foundation and believe that European consumers perceive the Russia-Ukraine war as a threat to Ukraine's sovereignty and acquire consumer animosity as a result, leading them to cope with the threat and create negative brand attitudes, resulting in brand boycott behavior and affecting the country's image. This is done when a customer engages in altruistic conduct, which is society-protective behavior. Perceived intrusiveness also contributes to the conversion of customer aversion into negative brand attitude. Thus, consumers' animosity against Russian brands relates to intrusiveness and altruism, which contribute to the development of adverse behaviors, and we argue that utilizing Rogers, (1975) PTM bolsters our findings.

### 2.2 Consumer animosity and brand attitude

Consumer animosity is well argued in the literature of international marketing and consumer behavior. The term "animosity" refers to antagonistic feelings towards a hostile country for the past or present happenings that are provoked by factors related to the economy, society, religion, and government (Suhud and Allan, 2021; Westjohn et al., 2021). Animosity results in an intense feeling of dislike and hatred towards the hostile country because of any military, economic, or political conduct that negatively alters consumer buying behavior (Lee et al., 2021; Zdravkovic et al., 2021). Researchers have classified animosity into two types: first, situational animosity related to hatred because of a violation of social norms; and second, stable animosity, including extreme hostility as a result of war (Koh, 2014). Scholars suggested that customer animosity frequently adopts an attitude that establishes a negative or positive perception of a brand (Antonetti et al., 2019; Muklas and Ma’ruf, 2020). Ali’s study (2021) established that consumer enmity results in feelings of hatred and hostility, which have a detrimental effect on brand attitude. These arguments lead us to believe that European consumers have a negative attitude towards Russian brands because of their animosity.
In a similar vein, Cui and Choo (2013) found that Chinese consumers' animosity toward Japan results in negative brand sentiments toward Japanese brands. Anger, hostility, and unpleasant emotions are produced in Turkish customers by the animosity, which leads to a negative brand attitude toward multinational brands (Barutçu et al., 2016). Customer animosity caused by the war between the two countries has a negative impact on the consumer's attitude toward brands (Leonidou et al., 2019; Magnusson et al., 2022). Based on the literature reviewed thus far, it could be inferred that unpleasant emotions, situational abnormality, and hostility trigger adverse attitude towards firms, products, or brands. In the present study context, we contend that consumer animosity toward Russian brands among European consumers resulted in a negative brand attitude during the Russia-Ukraine war. From these arguments, we derived the following hypothesis:

**H1:** Consumers’ animosity is negatively related to brand attitude.

### 2.3 Brand attitude and brand boycott behavior

The phrase "brand attitude" refers to the degree to which a consumer considers a brand positively or negatively (Muklas and Ma’ruf, 2020). Unpleasant, discomfort, and ambivalent attitudes are more likely to result in adverse behavioral responses (Akhtar et al., 2020). Brand boycott behavior is studied by many researchers as a critical issue when a consumer experiences animosity, especially during war. In general, a boycott refers to the termination of business or social ties with any organization or country to register protest, punish, or indicate opposition to any hostile action taken by them (Chiu, 2016; Harmeling et al., 2015). Customers’ attitudes are directly linked to situational abnormality and expectation disconfirmation, which causes consumers’ negative reactions to a brand to cause them to abandon their relationship with the brand or its offers (Makarem and Jae, 2016; Park and Jeon, 2018). Adverse attitudes toward the offending country lead to a negative attitude toward that country's brands, which eventually leads to brand boycott behavior (Alden et al., 2013; Kim, Yan, et al., 2022). Consumers boycott a brand if it is associated with a country that is hostile to a country in any way (Mrad et al., 2013). Based on this discussion, we assume that the unfriendly country's (e.g., Russia) brands have a negative brand mindset, which leads to people boycotting brands from that country.

Suhud and Allan, (2021) note that the negative brand attitude of Kurdish consumers towards Turkish brands, which affects their willingness to buy and ultimately results in brand boycott behavior. Consumers engage in brand boycott behavior when brands from hostile countries
establish negative brand attitudes because of animosity (Nisco et al., 2012). German consumers are boycotting American brands as a result of the Iraq war, while McDonald's is boycotting as a result of the United States' support for Israel (Barutçu et al., 2016). According to Bahaee and Pisani (2009) study, Chinese consumers boycott Japanese brands due to negative attitudes towards hostile country companies. We infer from the above evidence that hostile situations and hatred feelings are more likely to cause negative attitude, results in boycott or refusal behavior. In the current context, European consumers' negative brand attitudes toward Russian brands result in brand boycott behavior during the Russia-Ukraine war. Thus, the following hypothesis is put forth:

**H2:** Consumers’ brand attitude is positively related to their boycott behavior.

### 2.4 Brand attitude and brand-country image

The term "brand-country image" refers to a country's impression of its own brand, regardless of the brand's personal attributes (Magnusson et al., 2015; Pappu et al., 2007). The brand-country image has a direct impact on the image of a brand, which has negative consequences in international markets (Kim and Chung, 1997). The same brand is perceived differently in different nations due to brand attitudes connected with the brand's country of origin, which undermines the brand's true personality (Koubaa, 2008; Park and Jeon, 2018). We contend that having a negative brand attitude toward a hostile country brand leads to a negative brand-country image.

In the present scenario, the negative attitude toward the offending country's brand associates some of the hostile country's traits with that country's brand, resulting in a negative brand-country image of Russian brands. Nebenzahl and Jaffe (1996) investigated the impact of Japanese customers' brand attitudes toward American brands and highlighted the consumers' animosity toward these brands. Animosity leads to a negative brand attitude toward the hostile country, which encourages customers to link the country's traits to the brand (Magnusson et al., 2022; Papadopoulos et al., 2017). Considering the above, we propose that European consumers develop a negative brand attitude toward Russian brands, which negatively affects the brand-country image because they associate negative traits with Russian brands during the Russia-Ukraine war. Hence, the following hypothesis is postulated:

**H3:** Consumers' brand attitude is positively related to their brand-country image.
2.5 Moderating role of perceived intrusiveness

Perceived intrusiveness refers to the degree to which a customer perceives that a specific advertisement in a specific medium is interfering with their cognitive processes (Li et al., 2002). It is also stated as a disruption of a consumer's mental process by the media or advertising that causes anger or irritation (Smink et al., 2020). The main reason behind the intrusive ads is to get the attention of the target consumers by stopping them from doing what they were doing. This results in a cognitive reaction of anger and irritation (Morris et al., 2016). Consumers’ perceived intrusiveness from offensive country brands trigger anger and hatred due to violation of economic, political, religious, or social norms by the origin country, developing an adverse attitude (Lee and Mazodier, 2015). Perceived intrusiveness of a hostile country's brand causes an increase in animosity, which leads to an adverse brand attitude (Lwin et al., 2010). We argue that the perceived intrusiveness of antagonistic country brands increases consumers' anger and contempt for the brand, which subsequently results in a negative brand attitude toward the brand.

Perceived intrusiveness of the advertisement results in irritation and negative feelings, which contribute in developing hatred attitude towards brands (Han et al., 2021). Intrusiveness also increases negative cognitions, which has a detrimental impact on the consumer's attitude toward the brand (McCoy et al., 2008). Perceived intrusiveness of online advertisements positively interact with animosity, which has a detrimental impact on customer brand attitude and motivates cognitive reactions such as anger and frustration (Rejón-Guardia and Martínez-López, 2014). Lwin et al. (2010) assessed the American-focused animosity and confirmed that advertisements by American brands create a high impression of intrusiveness and a negative attitude toward the brand. Applying PMT in the current setting, consumers perceive that advertisement intrusiveness directly affects their cognitive evaluation of information sources, resulting in less coping or protecting behavior. In the present context, consumers are more concerned about the Russian brand's information, and they perceive more animosity when they find the advertisement intrusive, which restricts their protective. Therefore, it can be inferred that the perceived intrusiveness of Russian brand online advertisements during the Russia-Ukraine war enhances the influence of animosity among European customers on their negative brand perception toward Russian brands. Thus, the following hypothesis is produced:
H4: Perceived intrusiveness positively moderates the effects of consumer animosity on brand attitude, which is strong (weak) when perceived intrusiveness is high (low).

2.6 Moderating role of altruistic behavior

The concept of altruism is well established in the fields of sociology and psychology, and it is spreading in the literature. Altruism is a protective behavior that consists of a series of voluntary actions taken to protect others from external threats without concern for reward (Powers and Hopkins, 2006). Altruism has been extensively investigated in the literature to determine its impact on customers' decision-making processes and has been shown to have a significant impact on consumers' decision-making (Halimi et al., 2017; Joo et al., 2016).

When a consumer compares a brand to another similar brand, altruism influences the consumer's attitude toward the brand that has a positive concern—brand image—for society as opposed—boycott—to the brand that is not in the benefit of society (Muklas and Ma’ruf, 2020). Likewise, hotel consumers in Taiwan prefer hotels that promise to protect the environment, proving that altruism influences brand attitudes in developing brand boycott and brand-country image (Teng et al., 2015). The brand attitude influenced by altruism results in a variety of behavioral effects, including brand boycott behavior to promote social causes (Chiu, 2016). Research by Paek and Nelson (2009) revealed that brand boycotters are concerned about the welfare of society or other individuals with their altruistic behavior. We conclude that European consumers' altruism is negatively connected to their brand attitude toward Russian brands, resulting in greater brand boycott behavior.

Literature suggests that altruism is directed towards social issues and a negative attitude towards the brand of an aggressive country. For instance, Ryan (2014) discussed that customers who support social and environmental causes have a negative attitude toward foreign brands in term of boycott and negative image. When people start to have bad feelings about a brand because of animosity and concerns about society and humanity, they turn to think that the brand's country of origin is linked to its bad image (Kim and Chung, 1997). Moreover, a person with protective behavior develops negative attitudes towards a brand because of the country's offensive behavior (Nebenzahl and Jaffe, 1996). Based on these considerations, we can conclude that altruistic behavior, or protective action toward society or humanity, causes European consumers to create a negative brand-country image for Russian brands. In the current setting, consumers are more likely to protect other individuals
from Russian brands, result in boycott behavior and negative brand-country image for Russian brands. Accordingly, we formulated the following hypothesis:

**H5:** Altruistic behavior negatively moderates the relationships between (a) brand attitude and brand boycott behavior and, (b) brand attitude and brand-country image, which are strong (weak) when altruistic behavior is high (low).

**Figure I**

Conceptual framework

### 3. Research methods

#### 3.1 Development of survey questionnaire

This study operationalized scales developed in prior literature for use in present research. We developed a survey with three sections: a description of the study, items pertaining to variables, and demographic questions. All the variables were measured using a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 and 5 corresponding to “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree”. The nine items measuring consumer animosity were adapted from Han, (2017) study and operationalized in the context of the Russia-Ukraine war. We operationalized consumer animosity toward Russian brands based on their perceived threat, political opinions, personal experience, anger, and negative feelings. Kim *et al.*, (2007) four-item measures were used to assess brand attitude regarding Russian brands. We slightly changed the measure of brand attitude to investigate European consumers' interest in and feelings toward Russian brands. This study employed a well-established and valid scale of boycott behavior from Palacios-florencio and Benítez, (2019). We made some changes to the four items to make them more appropriate for the current scenario. Three-item scales from Islam and Hussain, (2021) were used to measure the country image of brands. We altered the scale slightly to reflect the present situation. Seven items from Li *et al.*, (2002) were adapted to capture the perceived intrusiveness of Russian brands during the Russia-Ukrainian War. Measurement items were slightly modified to better fit the current condition. Finally, the scale established by Akhtar *et al.*, (2022) is used to assess altruistic behavior. The scale is composed of five items and measures construct such as happy to share, help others, save others, strength, and weak points, and satisfied.

Finally, we asked demographic questions in the third section of our survey. Gender, age, profession, brand type, frequency of use, and nationality were used as control variables. Previous research has found that the current demographic has an impact on negative behavioral outcomes (Baldauf *et al.*, 2009; Lee and Mazodier, 2015; Truong and Simmons,
In order to detect any difficulties with survey flow, ambiguity, and the readability and visibility of the questionnaire design, the survey was sent to 35 initial participants via online social media platforms. The pilot test was a preliminary validation and reliability test for our construct measurements. The pilot study's results were all within the acceptable range of Cronbach's alpha (α) >0.70.

3.2 Sampling and data collection

Since 2021, the Russians have been moving into their army settlements around the border of Ukraine. This was a step forward in the Russia-Ukraine conflict that started in 2014 after the Ukrainian revolution of dignity in February of that year, which led to war (Tamilina, 2022). On February 24, 2022, Russia launched an attack on Ukraine, resulting in thousands of deaths, several wounded, and a massive loss of property (McKee and Murphy, 2022). Ukraine's position as Europe's second-largest country by land has been threatened by the Russia-Ukraine conflict and the subsequent European boycott of Russian goods, services, and politics (Alyukov, 2022). Germany has boycotted Russian products and presented an Eastern policy (Ostpolitik) that is being debated around the world and consists of policies to deal with Russia in the present situation (Umland, 2022). European consumers are against the invasion of Ukraine by Russia and are encouraged to record social, economic, and political protests against Russian brands (Timmer et al., 2023). These are the reasons that led us to choose European consumers as the subjects of our study to examine their brand boycotts and negative brand-country image towards Russian brands.

We conducted research using convenience sampling and following Ferber (1977) guidelines for measurement items. These guidelines include the relevance and appropriation of items by respondents. The sample must be representative of the population, and the sample size must be suitable for the research. Using current sampling and data collection techniques, we explored the effect of European consumer animosity against Russian brands on their brand boycott behavior and how it affects the brand-country image. The survey was designed to collect factual and real-time data on the constructs of the present study. Therefore, we used an online web-based questionnaire for data collection due to its low cost, easy accessibility, and efficiency (Kim, Yan, et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2017). We recruited respondents by sending invitations on various social networking sites (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn, and Instagram), digital forums, and online communities. Before starting the survey, we used two screening questions to determine the eligibility of respondents. We asked the following screening questions: (1) "Have you ever experienced Russian brands?" and (2) "Have you
boycotted Russian brands during the Russia-Ukraine war?" Respondents who answered yes to the screening questions proceeded with the survey. We used the Kline, (2005) approach to calculate the minimum acceptable sample size, which is simply multiplying the number of items by 10. Our study included a total of 33 items, and a minimum sample size of 330 was determined. We collected data via an online survey as a preventative measure against a COVID-19 pandemic (Ibrahim, 2021). The questionnaire was distributed in early March 2022. A total of 469 participants took part in the survey. Finally, we have 411 qualified responses after excluding 58 surveys because they were filled out incorrectly or were not filled out at all.

4. Data analysis and Results

4.1 Demographics of respondents

The survey's 411 participants were divided into 57.4% male and 42.6% female. The age range of most participants was 36–35 years (34.8%), followed by 36–45 years (30.4%). More than 58% of respondents surveyed reported having a university education. In terms of occupation, 20.4% worked for the government, while 44.5% engaged in business. We asked about Russian brands' experience and made sure everyone had at least once experienced in a month. Over half the participants (61.3%) stated that they were unmarried.

Table I

European respondents' characteristics (n = 411)

4.2 Measurement model assessment

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 24 was used to assess the measurement model. We employed Anderson et al. (1988) two-stage approach, performing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in the first step and then assessing composite reliability (CR), convergent and discriminant validity in the second step. The CFA results validated the measurement model goodness-of-fit indices because all of the values were within the threshold values ($\chi^2 = 624.684$, df = 449, $\chi^2$/df = 1.391, GFI = 0.914, AGFI = 0.900, TLI = 0.971, CFI = 0.974, RFI = 0.905, NFI = 0.914, IFI = 0.973, PGFI = 0.778, PCFI = 0.882, PNFI = 0.827, RMSEA = 0.031) (Hu and Bentler, 1999). The factor loadings were presented in Table 2, with all values ranging between 0.70 and 0.88 (i.e. above the threshold 0.70) except BA4= 0.33, BCI3= 0.41 and BCI5= 0.39, thus dropped for further analysis. We calculated the CR and found that all values were within the acceptable range of 0.77 to 0.93, which was higher than the threshold value of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2011). Cronbach's alpha values
ranged from 0.74 to 0.92, indicating strong internal consistency for our measurement items (Nunnally, 1978). Further, we assessed the discriminant and convergent validity by following (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). We first used factor loadings to check the convergent validity. Table 2 demonstrated that average variance extracted (AVE) values for all variables ranged from 0.54 to 0.65, exceeding the 0.50 indicated by Fornell and Larcker, (1981), suggesting that convergent validity was successfully accomplished. According to Fornell and Larcker, (1981), Table 3 shows that all constructs' discriminant validity was achieved because the AVE values are greater than the squares of correlation of paired variables (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Thus, our results show that we have confirmed convergent and discriminant validity.

Table II
Measurement items, factor loadings, and results of validity and reliability

4.3 Common method bias
Our study collected data at a single point in time, and we used common method bias (CMB) to confirm that our data were not biased. Consequently, we followed Podsakoff et al. (2003) and performed Harman single-factor analysis to determine the common method bias. Our results of exploratory factor analysis demonstrate that there are four factors with eigenvalues higher than 1, and the largest variance represented by a single factor is 21.95%, which is less than the suggested 50% (Podsakoff et al., 2012). Thereby, it was found that the present data were free of any substantial issue of common method bias. Further, Hair et al., (2019) recommended that common method bias is unlikely to arise if correlations are less than 0.9. The correlation matrix demonstrated that our data were free of common technique bias (Table 3).

Table III
Correlations and discriminant validity

4.4 Structural model assessment
Following the validation of the measurement model, structured equation modelling (SEM) was used to test the postulated framework and hypotheses. Analysis of moment structures (AMOS) revealed that the structural model's goodness-of-fit indices were adequate: ($\chi^2 = 192.957$, $df = 132$, $\chi^2/df = 1.391$, GFI = 0.951, AGFI = 0.937, TLI = 0.981, CFI = 0.983, RFI = 0.941, NFI = 0.949, IFI = 0.983, PGFI = 0.734, PCFI = 0.848, PNFI = 0.819, RMSEA = 0.034) (Hu and Bentler, 1999). Goodness-of-fit indices show that the variables in the study
have a good structural relationship and the model is aligned structurally with the data obtained (Hair et al., 2011).

### 4.5 Hypotheses results

Before applying SEM to test the hypotheses, we checked variation inflation factors (VIF) to ensure that none of the model’s variables were multicollinear. Hair et al., (1998) advised a VIF threshold of 10, and our results for all variables were less than 2, indicating that these variables could be included in the SEM analysis. The results in the proposed model supported the hypotheses (H1–H6) as shown in Table 4 and Fig. II. First, we hypothesized a negative relationship between consumers’ animosity and brand attitude. The results confirmed that consumers’ animosity had a negative association with brand attitude ($H1_{CA \rightarrow BA} = -0.335, t= -3.896, p<0.001$). Thus, H1 was supported. Second, we proposed a positive relationship between brand attitude and boycott behavior. Our results confirmed the positive relationship of brand attitude with brand boycott behavior ($H2_{BA \rightarrow BB} = 0.412, t= 5.842, p<0.001$), supporting H2. Third, we predicted a negative relationship between brand attitude and brand-country image, and the results indicated that brand attitude influenced brand-country image negatively ($H3_{BA \rightarrow BCI} = -0.327, t= -4.868, p<0.001$). Hence, Hypothesis 3 was also supported.

#### Table IV

Results of hypotheses

Additionally, we investigated the predicting variance ($R^2$) for the dependent variables, which describes the cumulative variance of the outcome variables engendered by predicting variables. We confirmed the predicting variance as the lowest acceptable value of $R^2$ proposed by Falk and Miller (1992) is 10%, and our results reveal that the overall variance for brand attitude was 11.2%, brand boycott behavior was 10.7%, and brand-country image was 17%. Additionally, we also calculated the effect size ($f^2$) for subsequent effects in our model by comparing the results to the threshold values of small effect size of 0.02, medium effect size of 0.15, and large effect size of 0.35 (Cohen, 2013). Brand attitude and boycott behavior had small sizes ($f^2 = 0.1261, f^2 = 0.1198$), and brand-country image had a medium size ($f^2 = 0.2048$).

IBM SPSS 25.0 was used to examine the moderating effects of our investigation. On a sample of 411, we used Hayes, (2013) PROCESS model 1 with 10,000 bootstrap samples (p = 95 % confidence interval) to estimate the parameters. Firstly, we tested the moderating effect of perceived intrusiveness on the relationship of consumer animosity and brand attitude.
and found that it had a positive moderating effect ($H4\beta_{PICA \rightarrow BA} = 0.200, F = 7.019, p = 0.001, CI = 0.188, 0.211$). Hence, $H4$ was supported. Then, we proceeded to the study’s second moderating effects of altruistic behavior on the relationships between (a) brand attitude and brand boycott behavior and (b) brand attitude and brand-country image. The results showed that altruism has a significant negative moderating influence on the association between brand attitude and brand boycott behavior ($H5(a)\beta_{AB \times BA \rightarrow BB} = -0.293, F = 15.948, p = 0.001, CI = -0.273, -0.312$), and a significant positive moderating effect on the relationship between brand attitude and brand-country image ($H5(b)\beta_{AB \times BA \rightarrow BCI} = -0.187, F = 7.877, p = 0.001, CI = -0.161, -0.212$). Therefore, our results supported hypotheses 5(a) and 5(b).

### Table V

Results of boundary conditions

#### Figure II

Results of hypotheses

### 5. Discussion and implications

The conflict between Russia and Ukraine erupted, causing anxiety in Europe and around the world, and Russia's invasion of Ukraine aroused feelings of hatred and anger in Europeans. This Russia-Ukraine war elicited a wide range of social, economic, and political restrictions throughout Europe. This study examines European consumers' animosity against Russia in the wake of the Russia-Ukraine war, which affects their brand attitude toward Russian brands and their impact on brand boycott behavior and brand-country image. We used protective motivation theory as a theoretical foundation to examine consumer animosity toward Russia in Europe. The current conceptual framework investigates the effect of customer animosity on brand attitude and related outcomes—brand boycott behavior and brand-country image. We also assessed the boundary conditions of perceived intrusiveness and altruism. Furthermore, this work also provides theoretical and practical implications, as well as some limitations and directions for future studies.

#### 5.1 Theoretical implications

This study contributes to the theory of international business in the following ways: First, this study expands on recent work that examined the residents perceived animosity towards Russian tourists (Farmaki, 2023). Although a few studies examined the effects of animosity on product judgement and attitude towards products ((Westjohn et al., 2021; Zdravkovic et
al., 2021), our findings confirmed that European customers' have animosity towards Russian brands due to anger and hate, which resulted in the Russia-Ukraine war. We advance the literature by arguing that consumers react more offendedly when they have animosity beliefs. Because when consumers face geopolitical tension, they feel frustration and anger, which evoke the desire to retaliate against the offended country in a personal capacity. In this way, this research adds to the research on international business and animosity when consumers have negative emotional reactions to an offending country. Scholars contended that consumer animosity arose from hatred or social, economic, or political competition (Ali, 2021; Leonidou et al., 2019; Suhud and Allan, 2021). There is a dearth of research on consumer animosity in a country-specific context (Farmaki, 2023; Koh, 2014), which we studied, and our findings confirm the connection between consumers' animosity towards Russian brands and their negative attitude. This supports the findings of Han et al. (2021), who found that consumer animosity has a negative effect on brand attitude.

Secondly, recent studies in international business have confirmed that hostile events and situational abnormalities trigger intense emotions and contradictory attitudes, leading to the development of boycott behavior (Antonetti et al., 2019; Leong et al., 2008). Similarly, previous research has shown that customers' negative attitudes play a significant role in their boycott behavior (Ali, 2021; Chiu, 2016; Suhud and Allan, 2021). However, these studies have not addressed the existing gap in literature. Consequently, our current findings reveal a positive connection between European consumers' brand attitudes and their boycott behavior towards Russian brands, influenced by the current geopolitical situation that elicits altruistic behavior towards Ukraine and enhances individuals' attitudinal and psychological capacity to respond to threats. By adding to the literature on consumer psychology and international business, we confirm that consumers’ anger, fear, and sadness overshadow their hope and happiness. Consequently, they seek to restore their positive feelings by boycotting the causes of their sadness.

Third, consumers are negatively associated with hostile country brands because they hold pacifist beliefs or strong anti-war emotions such as anger, resentment, and aggrievement. Therefore, they usually show patriotism for the defensive country, attribute all negative aspects of war to the brands, and express anger through the negative effect on the brand-country image. Similar to previous studies, it has been found that adverse brand image as a result of situational abnormality is negatively associated with product-country image (Kim and Chung, 2019; Koubaa, 2008; Pappu et al., 2007). Our study reveals the importance of
brand attitude on brand-country image during the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, which has not been studied in the literature. This research advances past international marketing studies by examining the effect of brand attitude on brand-country image in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war.

Fourth, the media is playing a vital role in keeping people informed about the situation in Ukraine; however, perceived intrusiveness considerably enhances the threats, fear, and animosity. The empirical literature demonstrates that the perceived intrusiveness of online advertisements has a negative effect on consumer brand intentions and triggers cognitive responses such as anger and disappointment (Lwin et al., 2010; Rejón-Guardia and Martínez-López, 2014). Our findings revealed that perceived intrusiveness had a moderating effect on the connection between consumer animosity and brand attitude. The current moderation findings are in line with the results of the study (Youn and Kim, 2019). Hence, this work contributes to the body of knowledge on information processing by confirming that consumers feel media is intrusive, extraordinarily involving their lives through manipulation and violation of transparency. Therefore, we contribute that during the Russia-Ukraine conflict, consumers perceived that media and information intrusively produced animosity and an adverse attitude.

Lastly, we established altruism as a moderator for the association between brand boycott behavior and then the brand-country image relationship. The existing literature has largely neglected the influence of altruistic behavior on consumer attitudes and the associated avoidance motives (Chiu, 2016; Teng et al., 2015). We took the initiative and used altruism as a boundary condition on the relationship between brand attitude and boycott behavior and brand-country image. The findings are consistent with the work of Muklas and Ma’ruf, 2020; Paek and Nelson (2009), indicating that brand boycotters are interested in the welfare of society or other individuals through their altruistic behavior. Our findings improve the literature on altruism and sociology by demonstrating behavioral consequences in a complex international issue, such as brand boycott behavior to promote social well-being amid war.

5.2 Practical and policy implications

Examining European consumers’ animosity towards the Russia-Ukraine war revealed various practical implications for consumers and policymakers.

First, animosity is the feeling of anger and other negative emotions toward a hostile country, which always leads to unpleasant reactions and boycott behaviors (Ali, 2021), and
international brands need to take more care when importing goods to such countries (Han et al., 2021). Therefore, the current findings recommend that firms associated with Russian brands consider consumer animosity before operating in Europe and strive to reduce the influence of animosity on brand in some ways including "temporary down-play" of the "made-in" tag in promotions and joining home-country brands for co-branding.

Second, European consumers’ animosity resulted in a negative attitude toward Russian brands, which in turn led to a boycott of those brands. In response, the brands that are suffering animosity must attempt to change consumer views toward their brand through marketing, positive messages, and disconnection from the war. Our findings indicate that the perceived intrusiveness of social media marketing results in a lower benefit when consumers have a negative attitude toward hostile country brands. During the Russian-Ukrainian war, Russian brands' advertisements irritated or annoyed consumer and caused them to behave negatively. We advise Russian brands operating in Europe to avoid pop-up ads and social media marketing, which may be regarded as intrusive.

Third, consumer behavior experts can better understand and use the findings of this study as how people behave during critical times like the Russia-Ukraine war. It is possible that Russia will face long-term animosity, similar to the animosity that Chinese customers have towards Japanese bands (Han et al., 2021). Hence, policymakers can get people to stop buying products from a certain country. Marketers on both sides of the Russia-Ukraine war can use these findings as well.

5.3 Limitations and future directions

Our study on consumer animosity during the Russia-Ukraine war has several limitations that can be addressed in future research. Our study focused on collectivism, where individuals make judgments in the best interests of all people, but for some decades, researchers have noticed a shift toward individualism in the decision-making process of consumers (Han et al., 2021). Future scholars should study this conceptual framework by examining individualism and how it influences consumer values in this context. Further, we conducted this study after Russia's invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 2022, and future studies can use the same conceptual framework to investigate consumer animosity in the post-war context. We believe that our study's convenience sampling will restrict the generalizability of the findings. Therefore, we advise future research to employ a survey technique that is more generalizable. The present study used customer animosity as a unidimensional construct; however, future
studies can consider animosity as a multidimensional (Jung et al., 2002; Lee and Lee, 2013) construct in the conceptual model. In line with this, future research should consider the control variables in the model, including ethnocentrism (Klein et al., 1998; Lee et al., 2017), country-of-origin effects (Lee et al., 2016; De Nisco et al., 2016), and certain product characteristics (Cakici and Shukla, 2017).
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Conceptual Model
Figure. II
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Note: *** p≤0.001 ** p≤0.01, * p≤0.05.
### Table I

European respondents’ characteristics ($n = 411$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years) category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school education</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession of respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. official</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesspersons</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian brand users’ experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in 6 months</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in 2 years</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** $n =$ Frequency, $% =$ Percentage
### Table II
Measurement items, factor loadings, and results of validity and reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SFL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumers’ animosity</td>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>I feel threatened by Russia.</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>I feel that Russia has too strong an influence on Ukraine.</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA3</td>
<td>I believe that Russia intends to dominate Ukraine economically.</td>
<td>0.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA4</td>
<td>I disapprove of the politics of Russia.</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA5</td>
<td>I often disagree with the political policies of Russia.</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA6</td>
<td>Personally, I have had bad experiences with Russia.</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA7</td>
<td>So far, I have met only a few Russians who are sympathetic toward Ukraine.</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA8</td>
<td>I feel angry about Russia.</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA9</td>
<td>I dislike Russia as a country.</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand attitude (BA)</strong></td>
<td>BA1</td>
<td>Unfavorable - Favorable</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA2</td>
<td>Bad - Good</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA3</td>
<td>Dislike - Like</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When I saw the information about Russian-Ukraine war on media, I thought it was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intrusiveness</td>
<td>PI1</td>
<td>Distracting</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI2</td>
<td>Disturbing</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI3</td>
<td>Forced</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI4</td>
<td>Interfering</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI5</td>
<td>Intrusive</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI6</td>
<td>Invasive</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI7</td>
<td>Obtrusive</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>I have stopped buying Russian brands.</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB2</td>
<td>I don’t look where brands are from when buying, but I don’t buy brands I think are Russians.</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB3</td>
<td>Whenever there’s an alternative, I buy a product that isn’t Russians.</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intrusiveness</td>
<td>(PI)</td>
<td>(CR= 0.91, AVE= 0.61, α = 0.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott behavior (BB)</td>
<td>(CR= 0.78, AVE= 0.54, α = 0.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-country image (BCI)</td>
<td>Russia is known for high quality of its high-tech brands.</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCI2</td>
<td>Russia has high tech brands that are modern and innovative.</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCI3</td>
<td>Russia high-tech brands are superior to their competitors from other countries.</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCI4</td>
<td>I am happy to share with others my experience of the Russian brands.</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>My experience of Russian brands can help other people to make better decisions.</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2</td>
<td>I want to save others from having the same negative Russian brands experience as me.</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB3</td>
<td>I can help the Russian brands to understand its strength and weak points.</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB4</td>
<td>If I am satisfied with Russian brands, I want to help it be successful.</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SFL = Standardized factor loadings, CR = Composite reliability, AVE = Average variance extracted, $\alpha = $ Cronbach's alpha.
# Table III

Correlations and discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumers’ Animosity</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand attitude</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived intrusiveness</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycott behavior</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-brand image</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The diagonal bold values represent discriminant validity and non-bold values represent correlations.
Table IV

Results of hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural paths</th>
<th>Coefficient estimates</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Confidence interval, 95%</th>
<th>Path results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA→BA</td>
<td>-0.335***</td>
<td>-3.896</td>
<td>[-0.168, -0.501]</td>
<td>H1: supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA→BB</td>
<td>0.412***</td>
<td>5.842</td>
<td>[0.317, 0.739]</td>
<td>H2: supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA→BCI</td>
<td>-0.327***</td>
<td>-4.868</td>
<td>[-0.279, 0.791]</td>
<td>H3: supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: level of significant ***$p<0.001$
# Table V

Results of boundary conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural paths</th>
<th>Coefficient estimates</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>F statistics</th>
<th>Confidence interval 95%</th>
<th>Path results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI×CA→BA</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>7.019</td>
<td>[0.188, 0.211]</td>
<td>H4: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB×BA→BB</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>15.948</td>
<td>[-0.273, -0.312]</td>
<td>H5(a): Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB×BA→BCI</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>7.877</td>
<td>[-0.161, -0.212]</td>
<td>H5(b): Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>