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INTRODUCTION
A number of investigates shows the impacts of consumer ethnocentrism and cultural sensitivity on both imported product judgment and intention to purchase local products (Tho D. Nguyen et.al., 2008). Consumers believes that domestic product are better and consumer should be encouraging for domestic producer. Are constantly unequivocal evidence for consumer to choose none but the best? This question is pressing not only in Latvia (Bartkevičs V., 2008), but also worldwide (Terpstra P.M.J., 2003). To run its course globalization for consumer problem is to distinguish domestic and non-domestic products (Shiv Ch., 2005). Consumers demand is not only for safe product, but also for ethical produced products (Nina Michaelidou, 2008).
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METHODOLOGY
What is the motivation to choose domestic products? Are domestic entreprenuers and processing managers more ethic than other producers. To find answers to questions content analysis (Aitken J.E., 2008) of public relations (PR) and content analysis of non-PR expressions was analyzed as well as conclusions from expressions are compared with laboratory results from recent research (Bartkevičs V., 2008).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Although interest has been growing in recent years, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is not a new concept. The idea that business has a social role can be traced back for centuries (Carroll 1999, Smith 2003). The first modern definition of social responsibility was provided by Bowen (1953). In his opinion, businesspersons are responsible for the consequences of their actions in a sphere wider than that covered by their profit and loss statements.

Results shows that Latvian case is not different from world know cases; especially in cases with organic farming, where consumers trust is higher (Sergio Pivato, 2008) but producers attitude can be depressed. For instance, banned antibiotic chloramfenicol most frequently is finds in organic farming products (Joffe A., 2007). There are cases when banned stuffs are funded in foreign laboratories and therefore problems with export of Latvian products. Now are problems with prices and expenses in milk sectors. But economists say,- one of expenses item is chloramphenicol control (Miglavs A., 2008). Other item of expenses is bureaucratic documentation in farms (Dumiņa Z., 2008), e.g. HACCP, TQM system etc., inspection and quality control.

The above mentioned requirements are for producers monitoring and control. Unfortunately yesterday shows that lack of bureaucratic measures (e.g. HACCP, TQM system etc., inspection and quality control) are entailed with lack of quality and safety of end product.

The other term - Corporate Social Performance (CSP) – shows public relations and companies environment for consumers. It should be CSR=CSP (in this context), but there is not only lack of social performance of separate companies, but also stark unethical performances in advertiseent – promotion – publicity field. For example: milk without preservative and whiteners (Urtāns P., 2007) or milk with methionine (Varika A., 2004) or vegetable oil without cholesterol (Girgensons V., 2007), yogurt without ‘chemical additives’ (Ēvelis K., 2007).
Beyond companies PR and government supported PR e.g. „Made in Latvia” are others opinions about ours domestic products, e.g., ice-cream: modern ice-cream made from vegetable fat, E-stuffs and air (Šteinfelde I., 2008).

CONCLUSION

There exist nonethical methods in producing and promotion praxis what non managed in corporative, entrepreneurship, branch or associations frame, promote bureaucracy upkeep, outward monitoring, control and inspection, consequently are rising prime cost for production of each solitary enterprise.
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