

The Use of Country of Origin Stereotypes: The Role of Product Specificity and Consumer Motivation

원산지 평가성향의 활용: 제품특성과 소비자 동기의 역할을 중심으로

Lee, Han Joon(이 한 준)*
Park, Jong Chul(박 종 철)**
Oh, Hye Young(오 혜 영)***

Two experiments examined how product evaluations were affected by country-of-origin information presented with varying amounts of product-specific information. Consistent with social judgeability theory, participants were more likely to make COO-based judgments, once they felt like they had product-specific information and they were motivated to conform their judgments to socially shared standards of validity. The results of each experiment revealed that the presentation of COO information alone was not sufficient to draw judgments based on COO stereotypes. The findings were discussed within the framework of social-psychological models of impression formation.

Key words: Country of Origin(COO), COO Stereotype, Product Specificity, Product-specific Information, Consumer Motivation

In recent years, the United States and other countries have begun to remove barriers to international trade. As a result, the purchasing environment has become more complex, and consumers have become more familiar with foreign goods. Therefore, companies have increasingly begun to consider the effects of a product's coun-

try of origin (COO) on consumers' evaluations of products in their decisions about globalization, standardization and marketing strategies (e.g., Kim and Chung, 1997; Josiassen et al., 2008; Lampert and Jaffe, 1996; Mihailovich, 2006; Liu and Johnson, 2005; Inch and McBride, 2004). Marketing research suggests that COO infor-

* Professor of Marketing, School of Business, Hanyang University(hanjoon222@hanyang.ac.kr)

** Assistant Professor of Marketing, Division of Business, Chosun University(pjc4887@chosun.ac.kr)

*** Doctoral Student, Business School, Korea University(ohhy55@naver.com), corresponding author

mation does, indeed, affect product evaluation. However, research on COO effects is “fragmentary” lacking theoretical frameworks for interpreting existing findings and deriving new hypotheses (Laroche et al., 2005; Sin et al., 1999; Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999; Usunier, 2006). Consequently, the precise relationship between COO information and product evaluation remains complicated. For instance, there are conflicting findings about the strength of COO effects on product evaluation and the conditions necessary for their occurrence (Ahmed et al., 2002; Lin and Johnson, 2005; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995; Samiee et al., 2005; Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999; Usunier, 2006). In addition, question has been raised about the importance of specific operationalizations of COO information (Chao, 2001; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995).

Accordingly, in the present research, we considered the effects of COO information on product evaluations from the framework of social-psychological theories of impression formation more generally. We derived novel hypotheses from this theoretical work about conditions that moderate the effect of COO on product evaluations. Specifically, we investigated the effects of two variables on the use of COO information to evaluate a product: (a) the amount of product-specific information (“product specificity”) presented with COO cues, and (b) one’s motivation to conform product evaluations to socially shared standards of validity.

I. Theoretical Background

1.1 The Use of Stereotypes in Impression Formation

Social-psychological models of impression formation propose that when forming impressions of others, the perceiver relies on both categorical knowledge - stereotypes about the target’s social category, and “individuating” information - information gathered about the specific target (e.g., Brewer, 1988; Fiske and Neuberg, 1990; Kunda and Thagard, 1996). For instance, Fiske and Neuberg’s (1990) continuum model of impression formation suggests that upon encountering a new target person, the perceiver will recognize that the person belongs to a specific social category (e.g., the person is Asian or the person is female). This initial categorization activates generic expectancies or stereotypes that provide a basis for an initial impression of the target. Empirical research supports this notion showing that stereotypes often color or bias initial impressions of others (e.g., Sagar and Scholfield, 1980; Verlegh, 2002; Chattalas et al., 2008).

The COO of a product functions like a social category for a person, telling the consumer that the product belongs to a general, abstract, category associated with various stereotypes (Hong and Wyer, 1989; 1990; Nagashima, 1970; Hong and Dong, 2006). Indeed, Nagashima (1970)

defined COO as “the picture, the reputation, the stereotype that businessmen and consumers attached to products of a specific country” (p. 68). Accordingly, stereotypes associated with the COO of a product are likely to influence impressions or judgments of a product in much the same way that stereotypes associated with social categories influence judgments of a person (e.g., Barta et al., 2000; Han, 1989; Maheswaran, 1994; Hong and Wyer, 1989, 1990; Li and Wyer, 1994; Chattalas et al., 2008). Han (1989), for instance, suggested that COO information provides consumers a generic summary or profile to infer product quality. Furthermore, others have found that COO stereotypes function to color the consumer’s perceptions of specific product attributes (e.g., Hadjimarou and Hu, 1999; Hong and Wyer, 1989, 1990; Li and Wyer, 1994; Hong and Dong, 2006).

1.2 Social Rules About the Use of Stereotypes: Social Judgeability Theory

According to social judgeability theory, people try not only to match categorical and individuating information when forming impressions of target individuals (or products) but also to conform their impressions to socially shared standards or criteria of validity (e.g., Leyens et al., 1992; 1994; Yzerbyt et al., 1997). One such rule in our culture is that categorical knowledge - stereotypes - are not a valid basis for judging

a target. That is, people recognize that stereotypes are generic abstractions rather than “real” knowledge about an individual. Thus, it seems unfair and inappropriate to use stereotypes as a basis for judgments of that person (Leyens et al., 1994; Yzerbyt et al., 1994). Consequently, people may deliberately suppress the use of activated stereotypes during impression formation and judgment (e.g., Bodenhausen and Macrae, 1998; Devine, 1989; Yzerbyt et al., 1994; Verlegh, 2002; Chattalas et al., 2008).

Because it seems unfair to base impressions on category stereotypes, people are likely to make stereotype-based judgments insofar they believe stereotypes are not the primary basis for judgment (Darley and Gross, 1983; Leyens, et al., 1994; Yzerbyt et al., 1997). Darley and Gross (1983), for instance, asked participants to make judgments about a young girl, Hannah, who was depicted in a video as either high or low in socioeconomic status. Darley and Gross suggested that the depiction of Hannah as poor and underprivileged activated negative stereotypes about academic performance. However, participants did not make different judgments about the poor versus wealthy Hannah’s abilities when only information about her socioeconomic status was presented. Participants did not consider stereotypes a valid basis for making a judgment. In contrast, when additional ambiguous information about Hannah’s performance on an intelligence test was presented, participants judged the poor Hannah as less intelligent than

the wealthy Hannah. When they had person-specific information, participants felt they were informed enough about Hannah to make a judgment about her: that their judgments would not be derived simply from stereotypes about socioeconomic status. However, because the person-specific information was not inconsistent with activated stereotypes, participants' judgments corresponded to stereotypes associated with Hannah's socioeconomic status.

In accordance with social judgeability theory, a consumer is likely to recognize the inappropriateness of evaluating a product based merely on abstract COO stereotypes. Thus, the consumer should be most likely to make COO-based judgments of a product when he or she has enough product-specific information to feel entitled to judge, and when that product-specific information is not inconsistent with the general COO stereotype.

We propose that the COO of a product may be manipulated in varying degrees of "product specificity" and thus provide different amounts of information about the product that legitimizes and validates COO-based judgments. For instance, a product's COO can be manipulated by the presentation of only a super-ordinate category such as "a car made in Japan" or "a car made in the U.S.A." (e.g., Cattin et al., 1982; Nagashima, 1970; Narayana, 1981; Maheswaran and Chen, 2006). Judgments of a product based only on such super-ordinate COO labels are necessarily category-based. The consumer judges a broad category of products, not an actual or real

product. As a result, the consumer will likely feel he or she has no valid basis for making a judgment and thus suppress the use of activated COO stereotypes.

Alternatively, a product's COO can be manipulated by the presentation of the manufacturer of the product made in a given country such as "a Toyota," or "a Ford". Finally, COO has been manipulated by the presentation of the manufacturer and specific brand name of a product made in a given country such as "Toyota Camry," or "Ford Taurus" (Erickson et al., 1984; Johansson et al., 1985, 1994; Johansson and Thorelli, 1985; Hsieh, 2004). In each of these latter cases, the consumer may feel entitled to make judgments of the product because the primary basis of judgment is one's real experiences with or knowledge about actual products (i.e., one's experience with different Toyotas or Toyota Camrys in particular) not merely abstract, generic COO stereotypes. However, to the extent that the consumer's mental representation or knowledge of these more specific products is similar to his or her representation of the super-ordinate categories ("Japanese/American cars") the consumer's judgments of those products are likely to be consistent with general COO stereotypes (Kunda and Thagard, 1996).

1.3 The Role of Accountability

Social cognition theorists have identified two

broad categories of information-processing goals that influence social judgment: nondirectional goals, the desire to reach an accurate or expedient conclusion without concern for content, and directional goals, the desire to reach a conclusion of a particular type or content (e.g., Chaiken et al., 1989; Kruglanski, 1989; Kunda, 1990; Paolini et al., 2009; Sorrentino and Higgins, 1986). Our research concerns the role of non-directional goals (e.g., accuracy motivation, accountability) in moderating the use of COO stereotypes because product evaluations are likely to be influenced by such motivations.

Accountability induces people to think in a self-evaluative way (“how will others evaluate me?”). As a result, accountable social perceivers are likely to be more diligent about conforming their judgments to socially shared standards or criteria of validity (e.g., categorical knowledge - stereotypes - are not, in and of themselves, a valid basis for judging a target). Indeed, Tetlock and his colleagues found that when participants expected to account for their judgments (i.e. to justify them to another person) they paid closer attention to individuating information and formed more complex impressions (Tetlock, 1983; 1985; Tetlock and Kim, 1987; Tetlock et al., 1996).

Accordingly, we hypothesize that consumers will hesitate to make COO-based judgments when presented with only COO information (e.g., “a car made in Japan”). In contrast, the presentation of product-specific information should entitle the consumer to make a judgment. And

if the consumer’s knowledge of such specific, subordinate categories (e.g., a Toyota, a Toyota Camry) is similar to one’s representation of the super-ordinate category (“Japanese cars”), the consumer’s judgments should be consistent with general COO stereotypes. Further, because accountable consumers should more diligently think about such product information or knowledge as a basis for judgment, this effect should be greater insofar as consumers feel accountable for their judgments - accountable consumers will make judgments that are more consistent with COO stereotypes.

II. Experiment 1

Experiment 1 was designed to test the possibility that the manufacturer and brand name of a product provides product-specific information that makes one feel entitled to make product judgments consistent with general COO stereotypes. In addition, Experiment 1 investigated the role of accountability in moderating the effect of product specificity on the use of COO-stereotypes. Specifically, Experiment 1 examined the effects of COO stereotypes on students’ evaluations of automobiles made in Japan versus the U.S.A. Although the quality ratings of American automobiles are getting closer to those of Japanese cars due to the continuous efforts of the three American manufacturers,

Japanese automobiles are still rated by “objective” sources (e.g., Consumer Report, Consumer Guide) to be better built than American cars in general (e.g., Agbonifoh and Elimimian, 1999). Furthermore, the results of a pilot study conducted for measuring the cultural stereotypes (Devine, 1989; Devine and Elliot, 1995) of a Japanese car and a domestic car indicated that Japanese automobiles were stereotypically associated with higher quality ratings than American automobiles.¹⁾

The product specificity of the automobiles was manipulated by presenting COO only (“A car made in Japan,” “A car made in the U.S.A.”), or by presenting COO plus a manufacturer and brand name (“A Toyota Camry made in Japan,” “A Ford Taurus made in the U.S.A.”). Because the presentation of a brand name that is familiar to participants might, in and of itself, make them feel entitled to evaluate the automobile independent of product specificity per se, we

included a third condition in which we presented the COO plus a manufacturer and an unfamiliar brand name (“A Toyota Solara made in Japan,” “A Ford Focus made in the U.S.A.”: two cars were new brand in the experiment time).

Consistent with social judgeability theory, we predicted that participants would rely more on COO stereotypes and thus give the Japanese automobile higher quality ratings than the American automobile when COO information was presented with a manufacturer and brand name than when COO was presented alone. Furthermore, we predicted that this effect would be particularly evident among accountable (versus non-accountable) participants.

2.1 Method

2.1.1 Participants and Design

Three hundred and twenty four American

1) Devine and her colleagues (1989, 1995) proposed that people’s knowledge of stereotypes may or may not be same as their personal beliefs. Specifically, stereotypes and personal beliefs represent part of people’s entire knowledge base of a particular object. However, personal beliefs are propositions that are accepted as being true but have gone through a revision, while stereotypes remains stable once established. The distinction between stereotypes and beliefs is important for us to understand how stereotypes influence peoples’ impression formation and product evaluation. We conducted a pilot study with 120 business majors to explore whether their stereotypes are different between the Japanese car and the American car. The 10 items used for this study to examine the stereotypes were shown in Appendix. Each subject was asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that each of the 10 statements was part of the cultural stereotypes of either the Japanese car or the American car held by other people throughout all 50 states (1: strongly disagree, 7: strongly agree). It was emphasized that we are not interested in their personal beliefs. The t-test based on a composite measure using all 10 items showed that Japanese car ($M = 4.51$) was stereotypically perceived better than the American car ($M = 4.18$), $t(118) = 2.41$, $p < .05$. The 10 individual t-tests indicated that the Japanese car was rated better than the American car with respect to the six aspects: reliability, satisfaction, defects, resale value, gas mileage and maintenance cost (p ’s $< .05$), while the American automobile was recognized to be better than the Japanese automobile in the two aspects: power and safety (p ’s $< .05$). However, our subjects thought that two cars were same in terms of the two aspects: design and price.

undergraduate students in introductory marketing, sociology, and communication courses took part in the study in exchange for extra credit. Participants were randomly assigned to one of 12 experimental conditions in a 2 (COO of product: Japan versus United States) x 3 (product specificity: COO only, COO plus manufacturer and familiar brand name, COO plus manufacturer and unfamiliar brand name) x 2 (accountability: low versus high) between-subject design.

2.1.2 Procedure.

The experiment was conducted with participants as they were seated in their classrooms. The experimenter introduced the study as an investigation of how consumers evaluate a new car on various dimensions. The experimenter then distributed booklets containing the experimental manipulations and the dependent measures. The first page of the booklet contained the purpose of the study along with the accountability manipulation. Following Tetlock's (1983) procedure, participants in the high-accountability condition were given the following instructions:

We are interested in your evaluation and judgments based on deliberation. However, in a business setting, you must be able to account for your reasons for the evaluation. Thus, you will be asked later to discuss your views and justify the basis for your evaluations to a group of students who may have different views on

this subject. Therefore, while you make this evaluation, be prepared for this and carefully answer the question.

In contrast, participants in the low-accountability condition were given the following instructions:

We are interested in your evaluation and judgments based on your gut feeling. We are not interested in the accuracy of your evaluations; our objective is to understand possible perceptual differences among people when they make quick judgments. Since there is no right or wrong perception, don't worry about the accuracy of your responses; simply make quick guesses based on your gut feelings after reading each question.

The second page of the booklet introduced the manipulations of product COO and product specificity. Specifically, participants were asked to rate an automobile made either in Japan or the United States. The product specificity of the automobiles was manipulated at three levels: COO only, COO plus a familiar brand name and COO plus an unfamiliar brand name. In the *COO only* condition, participants were simply asked to evaluate either a "typical American car manufactured and designed by an American automobile company," or a "typical Japanese car manufactured and designed by a Japanese automobile company." In the *COO plus manufacturer and familiar brand name* condition, subjects were asked to evaluate either a "FORD Taurus manufactured and designed by an American automobile company" or a "TOYOTA

Camry manufactured and designed by a Japanese automobile company.”²⁾ In the *COO plus manufacturer and unfamiliar brand name* condition, subjects were asked to evaluate either a “FORD Focus manufactured and designed by a American automobile company” or a “TOYOTA Solara manufactured and designed by a Japanese automobile company.”³⁾

Participants evaluated the depicted automobile in terms of ten attributes derived from previous research (Roth and Romeo, 1992; Cattin et al., 1982) and consumer magazines. See Appendix A for the ten attributes. After rating the automobile, participants answered two questions designed to assess the effectiveness of the accountability manipulation (Tetlock, 1983; Tetlock & Kim, 1987).

The first item asked participants to “rate the extent to which you were concerned with making an error in your judgment.” The second items asked participants to “rate the extent to which you were concerned with the possibility that your evaluation would be judged by other people.”

Responses to each item were made on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (very concerned) to 9 (not at all concerned). Next, to assess the familiarity manipulation, we asked participants to indicate their familiarity with the Ford Taurus, Toyota Camry, Ford Focus, and the Toyota Solara using a 7-point rating scale ranging from 1 (very familiar) to 7 (very unfamiliar). Finally, participants were thanked, debriefed and released.

2.2 Results

2.2.1 Accountability manipulation check

We averaged responses to the two items used to assess the effectiveness of the accountability manipulation to form an accountability index (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .70$). We then performed a 2 (COO of product: Japan, United States) x 3 (product specificity: COO only, COO plus manufacturer and familiar brand name, COO plus manufacturer and unfamiliar brand

2) We tried to select two familiar cars from the United States and Japan, which are comparable in terms of size, price, and performance. First of all, a pilot test was conducted to learn which brand name would come to people’s minds as a typical Japanese and a typical American car. 65 undergraduates were asked to list the brand names of a typical American car and a typical Japanese car. For the American car, Ford Taurus was named most frequently (36 out of 65), while for the Japanese car, the HONDA Accord (24 out of 65) and TOYOTA Camry (21 out of 65) were mentioned most frequently. However, according to the Fuel Economy Guide published by the United States Department of Energy, the HONDA Accord was classified as a compact car based on the interior volume of the car, while the TOYOTA Camry was classified as a mid-size car along with the Ford Taurus. Thus, we chose TOYOTA Camry as the familiar Japanese car, while Ford Taurus was selected as the familiar American car.

3) FORD Focus and TOYOTA Solara were chosen as two unfamiliar brand names from the United States and Japan. Although TOYOTA Solara has been introduced as a sport coupe version of Camry, this car was never referred to in the pilot test. FORD Focus was a brand new car which had been introduced less than two months before we conducted the experiment.

name) x 2 (accountability: low, high) analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the accountability index. As expected, the main effect of accountability was significant, $F(1, 310) = 6.39, p = .01$. Participants in the high accountability condition reported feeling more concerned with the possibility of being judged by others ($M = 5.89$) than participants in the low accountability condition ($M = 6.38$). There were no other significant main effects or interaction effects.

2.2.2 Familiarity manipulation check

The mean familiarity rating for the FORD Taurus, TOYOYA Camry, FORD Focus, and TOYOTA Solara were 3.61, 4.50, 5.04 and 5.99 respectively. The average familiarity rating of the two familiar brands - the Ford Taurus and the Toyota Camry ($M = 4.11$) was significantly lower (indicating greater familiarity) than the average of the two unfamiliar brands - the Ford Focus and the Toyota Solara ($M = 5.51$), $t(276) = -15.46, p < .01$. These results suggest that participants were indeed more familiar with the "familiar" brands than the "unfamiliar" brands.

2.2.3 Evaluation of the Automobile

A factor analysis was first performed on responses to the ten items designed to assess evaluations of the depicted automobile. Item purification procedures were applied in order to

obtain a simple factor structure with reliable items (Bohrnstedt, 1983; Churchill, 1979). The process was based on an iterative procedure requiring the following steps: (1) the factor pattern and the reliabilities of the items tapping each factor were assessed, (2) unreliable items or those loading on multiple factors were deleted, and (3) the factor analysis and reliability analyses were conducted again without those items. Seven items "survived" this item purification process. The eigen-value criterion and scree test (Catell, 1966) suggested that the seven items loaded on a single factor that explained 61.5% of the total variance. These seven items were averaged to develop a composite rating of overall quality (see Appendix A). Cronbach's alpha for the composite measure was .90.

We performed a 2 (COO of product) x 3 (product specificity) x 2 (accountability) ANOVA on the overall quality ratings. There was a significant main effect of product specificity, $F(1, 310) = 8.33, p < .001$. Regardless of its COO, subjects rated the overall quality of the automobile in the *COO only* condition ($M = 4.50$) significantly less favorably than in the *COO plus manufacturer and familiar brand name* condition ($M = 3.84$) or the *COO plus manufacturer and unfamiliar brand name* condition ($M = 3.97$), $t(310) = 3.86, p < .01$ and $t(310) = 3.10, p < .01$, respectively. There was also a significant main effect of accountability, $F(1, 310) = 7.90, p < .01$. Overall, participants in the high accountability condition gave more

favorable ratings of the automobiles (M = 3.91) than those in the low accountability condition (M = 4.30).

In addition, there was a significant COO of product x accountability interaction effect, $F(1, 310) = 6.41, p = .01$. In the low accountability condition, subjects made similar quality evaluations of the Japanese automobiles (M = 4.37) and of the US automobiles (M = 4.23), $t(310) = .71, p = .24$. However, high accountability participants rated the Japanese automobiles (M = 3.63) more favorably than the US automobiles (M = 4.20), $t(310) = -2.89, p < .01$. Further analyses indicated that ratings of the US automobiles were the same in the low accountability condition (M = 4.23) and high accountability condition (M = 4.20),

$t(310) = .15, p = .44$. Ratings of the Japanese automobiles, however, were more positive in the high accountability condition (M = 3.63) than in the low accountability condition (M = 4.37), $t(310) = -3.76, p < .001$.

More relevant to our hypothesis, this two way interaction was qualified by the predicted 2 (COO of product) x 3 (product specificity) x 2 (accountability) interaction effect, $F(2, 310) = 3.13, p = .045$. The means for this interaction effect are depicted in Table 1.

As can be seen in Table 1, accountability moderated the effect of COO on the automobile quality ratings in the *COO plus manufacturer and familiar brand name* condition and in the *COO plus manufacturer and unfamiliar brand name* condition but not in the *COO only*

<Table 1> Experiment 1 Means (Standard Deviations) for Specificity of COO Information, Accountability and C.O.O.

Accountability	Specificity of COO Information		
	C.O.O. Manufacturer name Familiar brand name	C.O.O. Manufacturer name Unfamiliar brand name	C.O.O. Only
High Accountability			
Japan	3.37 (1.29)*	2.91 (1.13)	4.62 (0.95)
U.S.A	4.17 (0.82)	3.99 (1.38)	4.42 (1.29)
Low Accountability			
Japan	4.11 (1.09)	4.58 (1.34)	4.44 (1.25)
U.S.A.	3.71 (1.37)	4.46 (1.49)	4.52 (1.53)

* standard deviation

condition. Specifically, when the COO was the only information available for the participants, the overall quality ratings of the Japanese automobile were not different from those of the American automobile in either the high or low accountability conditions. However, in the *COO plus manufacturer and familiar brand name* condition, high accountability participants rated the Japanese automobile more favorably ($M = 3.37$) than the American one ($M = 4.17$), $t(310) = -2.35$, $p < .01$. Low accountability participants, however, did not rate the Japanese automobile significantly more favorably ($M = 4.11$) than the American automobile ($M = 3.71$), $t(310) = 1.16$, $p = .12$.

As expected, a similar pattern of results emerged in the *COO plus manufacturer and unfamiliar brand name* condition. Namely, high accountability participants rated the Japanese automobile significantly more favorably ($M = 2.91$) than the American automobile ($M = 3.99$), $t(310) = -2.84$, $p < .01$. In contrast, low accountability participants did not rate the Japanese automobile significantly more favorably ($M = 4.58$) than the American automobile ($M = 4.46$), $t(310) = .35$, $p = .36$.

2.3 Discussion

The results of Experiment 1 were consistent with our hypothesis. Participants made more stereotype-based judgments of Japanese and American automobiles when COO information

was presented with a manufacturer and brand name than when COO was presented alone. Furthermore, this effect was particularly evident among accountable (versus non-accountable) participants. Thus, the results suggest that COO information is likely to impact product judgments insofar as the consumer believes that COO stereotypes are not the primary basis for judgment and the consumer is motivated to conform his or her judgments to socially shared criteria of validity (e.g., COO stereotypes are not, in and of themselves, a valid basis for judging a product).

In accordance with social judgeability theory, we suggest that participants in the COO only condition recognized that their judgments would necessarily be based on COO stereotypes. And given the cultural rule that stereotypes are not a valid basis for judgment (e.g., Leyens, et al., 1994; Yzerbyt, et al., 1994) participants in the COO only condition suppressed the use of activated COO stereotypes in their judgments.

The presentation of the manufacturer and brand name, however, provided enough product-specific information for participants to feel entitled to make quality judgments of the depicted automobile. Since knowledge of such specific product categories presented (e.g., a Toyota Camry) is likely to be similar to participants' representation of the super-ordinate category ("Japanese cars"), judgments were largely consistent with general COO stereotypes. Importantly, it appears that the amount of product-

specific information, rather than familiarity with specific brand names, entitled participants to make COO-based judgments. Participants made more COO-consistent judgments when COO information was presented with the manufacturer and a familiar brand name and when COO information was presented with the manufacturer and an unfamiliar brand name. Finally, this effect was accentuated among accountable participants because they were presumably more diligent in considering activated product knowledge or information as a basis for judgment.

The results of Experiment 1 also indicated that, overall, participants rated the Japanese automobile more favorably in the high versus low accountability condition. However, ratings of the American automobiles did not vary as a function of accountability. This finding may reflect that participants had more positive stereotypes about Japanese versus American cars, but were also motivated to express favoritism for the home country product. In the low accountability condition this in-group favoritism was evident in the lower evaluations of the Japanese automobile. The devaluation of the Japanese automobile in the low accountability condition may have served an ego-protective function - allowing the participant to maintain a positive social identity as a U.S. citizen in the face of a negative social comparison. In the high accountability condition, however, this ethnocentric ego-protective goal appears to have given way to the goal form an accurate,

justifiable impression.

If the goal to form an accurate, justifiable impression overrides in-group bias in product evaluations, one might expect that corporate managers, who are accountable for their business decisions, would tend to not exhibit such in-group bias. Indeed, White (1979) found that American purchasing managers evaluated industrial products from their home country to be inferior to those made in Germany.

Although the results of Experiment 1 sustained our general hypothesis, an important interpretive issue still is needed to be answered. A possible question can be raised about whether the provision of the manufacturer name was good enough for participants to feel entitled to judge the automobiles or whether the provision of a brand name either familiar or unfamiliar was also required. It is possible that the presentation of a specific exemplar - the automobile brand name - was necessary to make participants feel entitled to make COO-consistent judgments. When asked to judge a particular brand name (e.g., Toyota Camry, Toyota Solara) they could base their judgments on first hand experience with the specific automobiles or exemplars presumed to be similar to that automobile. Consequently, judgments of the automobile would not seem as though they were unfairly based on abstract COO stereotypes.

Alternatively, it is possible that the presentation of a real (familiar) manufacturer (e.g., Toyota, Ford) provided enough "concrete"

information to make participants feel entitled to make product judgments. In accordance with associative network models of semantic memory developed by cognitive psychologists (e.g., Anderson, 1976; 1983; Collins & Loftus, 1975, Posner & Snyder, 1975), a category of objects (e.g., Automobiles made by Toyota) is represented in memory as a knowledge structure or node that is connected to other concepts (e.g., specific exemplars, attributes) through relational or associative links. Furthermore, the activation of a given concept or category in memory is thought to automatically (i.e., without awareness) activate connected concepts through spreading of activation along the associative links (Blair 2002; Collins & Loftus, 1975; Murray et al., 2005; Posner & Snyder, 1975). Thus, it is possible that the name of an automobile manufacturer (Toyota, Ford) is linked closely enough with specific exemplars and attributes relevant to quality judgments that the presentation of the manufacturer name activated those exemplars and attributes to serve as a basis for judgment.

III. Experiment 2

We designed Experiment 2 to replicate the findings of Experiment 1 that when motivated

by accountability, people make more COO-consistent judgments of a product when COO information is presented with the manufacturer and brand name than when COO information is presented alone. Furthermore, we designed Experiment 2 to test whether the presentation of a specific brand name of a product is necessary for people to feel entitled to make product judgments or whether the presentation of the manufacturer name is sufficient.

3.1 Method

3.1.1 Participants and Design⁴⁾

One hundred and sixty eight undergraduate students in introductory marketing and sociology courses participated in exchange for extra credit.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions in a 2 (COO of automobiles: Japan versus United States) x 4 (product specificity: COO only, COO plus manufacturer and an unfamiliar brand name, COO plus manufacturer, COO plus an unfamiliar brand name) between-subjects design.

3.1.2 Procedure

The procedure was almost identical to that of Experiment 1. The experiment was conducted

4) In experiment 2, all the subjects were under the high accuracy goal condition, because the results of experiment 1 indicated that there were no mean differences between the Japanese automobiles and the American automobiles under the low accuracy goal motivation.

with participants as they were seated in their classrooms. The experimenter introduced the study as an investigation of how consumers evaluate a new car on various dimensions. The experimenter then distributed booklets containing the experimental manipulations and the dependent measures. On the first page of the booklet all participants read the same instructions used in Experiment 1 to induce participants to feel accountable for their judgments. The next page presented an automobile to evaluate along with the manipulations of the automobile's COO and product specificity. As in Experiment 1, the depicted automobile was made in either the United States or Japan.

Regarding product specificity, participants in the *COO only* condition were asked to evaluate a "typical American/Japanese car manufactured and designed by a American/Japanese automobile company." Participants in the *COO plus manufacturer and an unfamiliar brand name* condition were asked to evaluate a "Neptune manufactured and designed by a American/Japanese automobile company, FORD/TOYOTA". Participants in the *COO plus manufacturer* condition were asked to evaluate a "FORD/TOYOTA manufactured and designed by an American/Japanese automobile company." Finally, in the *COO plus an unfamiliar brand name* condition, participants were asked to evaluate a "Neptune manufactured and designed by an American/Japanese automobile company."

Participants rated the quality of the depicted

automobile by responding to the same 10 items used in Experiment 1. After rating the automobile, participants responded to the two items used in Experiment 1 to assess the degree to which participants felt accountable for their product evaluations. Finally, participants were debriefed and dismissed.

3.2 Results

As in experiment 1, the two items measuring accountability were averaged to form an accountability index (Cronbach's $\alpha = .62$). The mean accountability index was 5.29. This is comparable to the mean accountability index for participants in the high accountability condition of Experiment 1 ($M = 5.89$). Thus, it appears that, in Experiment 2, the accountability instructions were effective.

The same item purification procedures described in Experiment 1 were applied to the ten items used to evaluate the automobile. The same seven items survived after the procedure. The eigen-value criterion and scree test (Catell, 1966) agreed on one factor structure, which explained 56.5% of the total variation. We developed a composite measure of overall quality by averaging responses to those seven items (See Appendix A). Cronbach's alpha for the aggregate quality rating was .87. The mean quality rating for each condition is presented in Table 2.

The overall quality ratings were subjected to

<Table 2> Experiment 2 Means(Standard Deviations) for Specificity of COO Information and C.O.O.

		Specificity of C.O.O. Information			
		C.O.O.	C.O.O.	C.O.O.	C.O.O.
		Manufacturer Name	Manufacturer Name		
C.O.O.	Model Name			Model Name	
Japan	3.05 (1.35)*	3.20 (1.28)	3.28 (1.39)	4.53 (0.96)	
U.S.A.	4.19 (1.43)	4.18 (1.06)	3.81 (1.24)	4.40 (1.16)	

* standard deviation

a 2 (COO of automobiles: Japan versus United States) x 4 (product specificity: COO only, COO plus a manufacturer name and an unfamiliar model name, COO plus a manufacturer name, COO plus an unfamiliar model name) ANOVA. The main effect of COO was significant, $F(1, 120) = 8.28, p < .01$, indicating that participants rated Japanese automobiles more positively ($M = 3.51$) than American Automobiles ($M = 4.15$). The main effect of product specificity was also significant, $F(1, 120) = 3.79, p < .01$. Post-hoc analyses revealed that, regardless of whether the depicted automobile was made in Japan or the United States, participants rated it less favorably when COO was presented alone ($M = 4.46$) than when COO was presented with either (a) the manufacturer name plus an unfamiliar brand name ($M = 3.62$), $t(120) = 2.71, p < .01$ (b) the manufacturer name ($M = 3.69$), $t(120) = 2.48, p < .01$, or (c) the unfamiliar brand

name ($M = 3.54$), $t(120) = 2.97, p < .01$. Finally, the COO x product specificity interaction effect failed to reach significance, $F(3, 120) = 1.66, p = .18$.

Although the interaction effect was not significant, we conducted a series of post-hoc comparisons to further test the moderating effect of product specificity on the use of COO stereotypes. First, participants in the COO only condition did not rate the Japanese automobile more favorably ($M = 4.53$) than the American automobile ($M = 4.40$), $t(120) = .30, p = .38$. Also, participants in the *COO plus manufacturer and unfamiliar brand name* condition did rate the Japanese automobile more favorably ($M = 3.05$) than the American automobile ($M = 4.19$), $t(120) = -2.60, p < .01$. Together, these results replicate the findings of Experiment 1 suggesting that participants made judgments of the automobiles based more on general COO stereotypes when they were given product-specific

information that validated and entitled such judgments.

Extending the findings of Experiment 1, we found that participants in the *COO plus manufacturer* condition rated the Japanese automobile more favorably ($M = 3.20$) than the American automobile ($M = 4.18$), $t(120) = -2.23$, $p < .05$. Finally, participants in the *COO plus unfamiliar brand name* condition did not rate the Japanese automobile more favorably ($M = 3.28$) than the American automobile ($M = 3.81$), $t(120) = -1.20$, $p = .12$. These findings suggest that the presentation of the manufacturer name was sufficient and necessary for participants to make judgments consistent with general COO stereotypes.

3.3 Discussion

The results of Experiment 2 replicated the findings of Experiment 1. Participants motivated by accountability made more stereotype-based judgments of Japanese and American automobiles when COO information was presented with a manufacturer and brand name than when COO was presented alone.

In addition, the results of Experiment 2 extended the findings of Experiment 1 by testing whether the presentation of a specific brand name of a product is necessary for people to feel entitled to make product judgments or whether the presentation of the manufacturer name is sufficient. The findings suggest that

the presentation of a manufacturer (e.g., Toyota, Ford) provided enough information to make participants feel entitled to make product judgments. Presumably, one's representation of an automobile manufacturer in memory is linked closely or strongly with specific exemplars and attributes relevant to quality judgments, and the presentation of the manufacturer name is sufficient to activate those exemplars and attributes to serve as a basis for judgment. As a result of this spreading of activation, the consumer does not perceive that his or her judgments are unfairly based on generic COO stereotypes.

IV. General Discussion

The findings of the present research contribute to a growing body of international marketing research on the importance of specific operationalizations of COO information such the use of manufacturer or brand names versus COO information only (e.g., Burning, 1997; Chao, 2001; Häubl, 1996; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995; Tse and Gordon 1992). Our research provides a theoretical framework for delineating the effects of COO information presented with different amounts of other product-specific information. Consistent with social judgeability theory, our research suggests that consumers are likely to make COO-based judgments of a product insofar as they feel they have product-specific

information that is not inconsistent with COO stereotypes, and they are motivated to conform their judgments to socially shared standards of judgment validity and thus diligently think about such product-specific information. This can be explained by research results on the cue consistency (Miyazaki et al., 2005). Miyazaki and his colleague found that inconsistent cue pairs between extrinsic cues such as country-of-origin, brand, and price resulted in insignificant effects on product evaluation, while influence of consistent cues was significant.

Specifically, Experiments 1 and 2 both revealed that when motivated by accountability, participants made more stereotype-based judgments of Japanese and American automobiles when COO information was presented with a manufacturer (e.g., TOYOTA, FORD, HONDA, G.M.) and brand name (e.g., Camry, Taurus, Accord, Impala) than when COO was presented alone. Thus, the presentation of COO information alone is likely to be insufficient to consistently elicit judgments of products based on COO stereotypes. Consumers are likely to recognize that when COO information is presented alone, (a) product judgments will necessarily be based on COO stereotypes and (b) that COO stereotypes, in and of themselves, are not a valid basis for making product evaluations. In contrast, the presentation of the manufacturer by itself or with a particular brand name entitles the consumer to make a judgment and thus elicits product evaluations

that are more consistent with general COO stereotypes.

The findings of the present research also contribute to the social-psychological literature on the effect of accuracy motivation on the use of stereotypes in impression formation. Historically, social psychologists have suggested that stereotypes simplify impression formation by providing a “ready-made” impression of a person based on his or her category membership. Stereotypes thus obviate the need to engage in effortful processing of individuating information (e.g., Allport, 1954; Fiske and Taylor, 1991; Hamilton and Troler, 1986). In a similar vein, Johansson (1989) suggested that consumers rely on COO stereotypes as a mental short-cut reducing the cognitive demand required for evaluating a product.

Accordingly, research has shown that when a perceiver is motivated by expediency or lacks cognitive resources to carefully process individuating information, he or she relies more on stereotypes in social judgment (e.g., Bodenhausen, 1990; Kruglanski and Freund, 1983). Conversely, accuracy motivation (e.g., induced through accountability) attenuates the effect of stereotypes on social judgment when individuating (target-specific) information that is inconsistent with the stereotype is available (e.g., Fiske and Neuberg, 1990; Kruglanski and Freund, 1983; Neuberg and Fiske, 1987; Tetlock, 1983; 1985). When motivated by accuracy, the perceiver deliberately avoids arriving at an impression

prematurely by relying on ready-made stereotypes (Kruglanski, 1989). Instead, the perceiver opts to engage in the more complex and effortful process of integrating available individuating information (Fiske and Neuberg, 1990; Tetolock and Kim, 1987).

In this context, our findings suggest that accuracy motivation induced by accountability can actually have the counter-intuitive effect of increasing the use of stereotypes in social judgment. Specifically, if the perceiver has target-specific information that is not inconsistent with activated stereotypes or simply provides the illusion that he or she is well-informed (e.g., Yzberyt et al., 1994), accuracy motivation may lead the perceiver to inadvertently rely more on activated stereotypes as a basis for social judgment.

The present research also contributes to marketing research on the effect of consumer motivation on product evaluation. Specifically, previous research has considered motivation to process product information in careful manner induced by increasing issue involvement - the personal relevance/importance of the decision task (Johnson and Eagle 1989, 1990; Maheswaran and Meyers-Levy 1990; Petty and Cacioppo, 1979, 1990). Like accountability manipulations, issue involvement manipulations induce the individual to process product (or person) information in a careful, deliberate manner (Petty and Cacioppo, 1979). Accordingly, under conditions of high issue involvement, people are

less likely to rely on COO stereotypes to evaluate a product in lieu of carefully processing product-specific information (Gürhan-Canli and Maheswaran 2000).

Accountability and issue involvement manipulations differ in the psychological mechanism through which they elicit the goal to process target information in a careful, effortful manner. Issue involvement manipulations increase the relevance of a judgment to the individual from his or her own private perspective. The person is made to believe that his or her judgment will have important consequences for the self. In contrast, accountability manipulations induce the person to consider an evaluative audience other than one's self. The person considers how others will evaluate him or her.

4.1 Limitations

Although the present research contributes to our understanding of COO effects, it is not without limitations. Experimental studies of the effects of COO on product evaluations have been criticized because, unlike situations in which consumers evaluate products in real life, the amount of information about a given product is limited. As a result, the effect of the product's COO on evaluations could be overestimated (Bilkey and Nes, 1982; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995; Pharr 2005; Usunier, 2006). The information presented about the automobiles was presented in our experiments was considerably

less complex than what the consumer is likely to encounter in a real-life. As with any experimental investigation it is difficult to know the relative magnitude of COO effects on product evaluations in more complex situations where other variables are not held constant. On a positive note, however, the highly controlled experimental setting affords the researcher control over extraneous variables and thus allows for an investigation of the processes underlying the effects of COO that would be more difficult or impossible to delineate in a more “natural” setting.

4.2 Summary and Conclusion

In the present research, we used social-psychological theories of impression formation to derive hypotheses about the conditions that moderate the effects of COO stereotypes on product evaluations. Our findings suggest that consumers are likely to make COO-based judgments of a product insofar as (a) they feel that COO stereotypes are not the primary basis for their judgments - that is, they have enough product-specific information to legitimize making a judgment, and (b) they are motivated to conform their judgments to socially shared standards of judgment validity (e.g., COO stereotypes are not a valid basis for product judgments).

〈논문 접수일: 2011. 09. 20〉

〈1차 수정일: 2011. 12. 30〉

〈게재 확정일: 2012. 01. 05〉

Reference

- Ahmed, Zafar U., James P. Johnson, Chew Pei Ling, Tan Wai Fang, and Ang Kah Hui, (2002), “Country-of-Origin and Brand Effects on Consumers’ Evaluations of Cruise Lines,” *International Marketing Review*, 19 (3), 279-302.
- Agbonifoh, Barnabas A. and Jonathan U. Elimimian (1999), “Attitudes of Developing Countries Towards ‘Country-of-Origin’ Products in an Era of Multiple Brands,” *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 11 (4), 97-116.
- Allport, Gordon W. (1954), *The Nature of Prejudice*. MA: Addison Wesley.
- Anderson, John R. (1976), *Language, Memory, and Thought*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- _____ (1983), *The Architecture of Cognition*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barta, Rajeev, Venkartram Ramaswamy, Dana L. Alden, Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp, and S. Ramachander (2000), “Effects of Brand Local and Nonlocal Origin on Consumer Attitudes in Developing Countries,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9(2), 83-95.
- Bilkey, Warren. J. and Erik Nes (1982), “Country-of-Origin Effects on Product Evaluations,” *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8 (Spring/Summer), 89-99.

- Blair, Irene V. (2002), "The Malleability of Automatic Stereotypes and Prejudice," *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6(3), 242-261.
- Bodenhausen, Galen V. (1990), "Stereotypes as Judgmental Heuristics: Evidence of Circadian Variations in Discrimination," *Psychological Science*, 4(5), 319-322.
- _____ and C. Neil Macrae (1998), "Stereotypes Activation and Inhibition," in *Stereotype Activation and Inhibition: Advances in Social Cognition*, ed. R.S. Wyer Jr., 11: Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1-52.
- Bohrnstedt, George W. (1983), "Measurement," in *Handbook of Survey Research*, ed. P. Rossi, J. Wright and A. Anderson, NY: Academic Press, 69-121.
- Brewer, Marilnn B. (1988), "A Dual Process Model of Impression Formation," in *A Dual Process of Impression Formation: Advances in Social Cognition*, ed. R.S. Wyer Jr., Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 11, 1-52.
- Bruning, E. R. (1997), "Country of Origin, National Loyalty and Product Choice: The Case of International Air Travel," *International Marketing Review*, 14, 59-74.
- Catell, Raymond B. (1966), "The Scree Test for the Number of Factors," *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 245-276.
- Cattin, Philippe J., Alain J.P. Jolibert A. and Colleen Lohens (1982), "A Cross-Cultural Study of 'Made In' Concepts," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 13(1): 131-141.
- Chattalas, Michael, Thomas Kramer, and Hirokazu Takada(2008), "The impact of national stereotypes on the country of origin effect: A conceptual framework," *International Marketing Review*, 25(1), 54-74.
- Chao, Paul (2001), "The Moderating Effects of Country of Assembly, Country of Parts, and Country of Design on Hybrid Product Evaluations," *Journal of Advertising*, 30(4), 67-81.
- Collins, Allan M. and Elizabeth F. Loftus (1975), "A Spreading Activation Theory of Semantic Processing," *Psychological Review*, 82, 407-428.
- Chaiken, Shelly, Akiva Lieberman, and Alice H. Eagly (1989), "Heuristic and Systematic Information Processing Within and Beyond the Persuasion Context," in *Understanding Thought*, ed. J.S. Uleman and J.A. Bargh, New York: Guilford, 212-252.
- Darley, John M. and Gross Paget H. (1983), "A Hypothesis-Confirming Bias in Labeling Effects," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 20-33
- Devine, Patricia G. (1989), "Stereotypes and Prejudice: their Automatic and Controlled Components," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 339-351.
- _____ and Andrew J. Elliot (1995) "Are Racial Stereotypes Really Fading? The Princeton Trilogy Revisited," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21,

1139-1150.

- Churchill, Gilbert A. Jr. (1979), "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures for Marketing Constructs," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 64-73.
- Erickson, Gary M., Johny K. Johansson and Paul Chao (1984), "Image Variables in Multi-Attribute Product Evaluations: Country of Origin Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11, 694-699.
- Fiske, Susan. T. and Steven L. Neuberg (1990), "A Continuum of Impression Formation, from Category Based to Individuating Processes: Influences of Information and Motivation on Attention and Interpretation," *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 23, 1-74.
- _____ and Shelly E. Taylor (1991), *Social Cognition*. NY: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Gürhan-Cali, Zeynep and Durairaj Maheswaran (2000), "Determinant of Country-of-Origin Evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(June), 96-108.
- Hadjimarcou, John and Michale Y. Hu (1999), "Global Product Stereotypes and Heuristic Processing: The impact of Ambient Task Complexity," *Psychology & Marketing*, 16(7), 583-612.
- Hamilton, David. L. and Tina K.Troler (1986), "Stereotypes and Stereotyping: An Overview of the Cognitive Approach," in *Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism*, ed. J.F. Dovidio and S. L. Gaertner, Orlando: Academic Press, 127-164.
- Han, C. Min (1989), "Country Image: Halo or Summary Construct?," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26, 222-229.
- Häuble, Gerald. (1996), "A Cross-National Investigation of the effects of Country of Origin and Brand Name on the Evaluation of a New Car," *International Marketing Review*, 13, 76-97.
- Hong, Sung-Tai and Robert S. Wyer Jr. (1989), "Effects of Country -of-Origin and Product-Attributes Information on Product evaluation: An Information Processing Perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, 175-187.
- _____ (1990), "Determinants of Product Evaluation: Effects of the Time Interval between Knowledge of a Product's Country of Origin and Information About its Specific Attributes." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17, 277-288.
- _____ and Kyoon Kang, Dong(2006), "'Country-of-Origin Influences on Product Evaluations: The Impact of Animosity and Perceptions of Industriousness Brutality on Judgments of Typical and Atypical Products," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(3), 232-239.
- Hsieh, Ming-Huei(2004), "An Investigation of Country-of-Origin Effect Using Correspondence Analysis: A Cross-National Context:" *International Journal of Market Research*, 46(3), 267-295.
- Insch, Gary S. and J. Brad McBride (2004).

- “The Impact of Country-of-Origin Cues on Consumer Perceptions of Product Quality: A Binational Test of the Decomposed Country-of-Origin Construct,” *Journal of Business Research*, 57(3), 256-265.
- Johansson, Johny. K., Susan. P. Douglas, and Ikura Nonaka (1985), “Assessing the Impact of Country of origin on Product Evaluations: A New Methodological Perspective,” *Journal of Marketing*, 22, 388-396.
- _____, Ronkainen Ilkka, A., and Czinkota Michael. R. (1994), “Negative Country-of-Origin Effects: The Case of the New Russia,” *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(1), 157-176.
- _____, and Hans Thorelli (1985), “International Product Positioning,” *Journal of International Business Studies*, 16(3), 57-74.
- _____, (1989), “Determinant and Effects of the Use of ‘Made-in’ Labels,” *International Marketing Review*, 6, 47-58.
- Johnson, Blair T. and Eagle Alice H. (1989), “Effects of Involvement on Persuasion: A Meta-Analysis,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 290-314.
- _____, (1990), “Involvement and Persuasion: Types, Traditions and the Evidence,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 375-384.
- Josiassen Alexander, Bryan A. Lukas and Gregory J. Whitwell (2008), “Country of Origin Contingencies: Competing Perspectives on Product Familiarity and Product Involvement,” *International Marketing Review*, 24(4), 423-440.
- Kim, Chung Koo and Jay Young Chung (1997), “Brand Popularity, Country Image and Market Share: An Empirical Study,” *International Marketing Review*, 28, 361-386.
- Kruglanski, Arie W. (1989), *Lay Epistemics and Human Knowledge: Cognitive and Motivational Bases*, NY: Plenum Press.
- _____, and Tallie Freund (1983), “The Freezing and Unfreezing of Lay Inferences: Effects on Impression Primacy, Ethnic Stereotyping, and Numerical Anchoring,” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 448-468.
- Kunda, Ziva (1990), “The Case for Motivated Reasoning,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 480-498.
- _____, and Paul Thagard (1996), “Forming Impressions from Stereotypes, Traits, and Behaviors: A Parallel-Constraint-Satisfaction Theory,” *Psychological Review*, 103, 284-308.
- Lampert, Shlomo I. and Eugene D. Jaffe (1996), “Country of Origin Effects on International Market Entry,” *Journal of Global Marketing*, 10, 27-52.
- Laroche, Michael, Nicholas Papadopoulos, Louise Helsop and Mahdi Mourali (2005), “The influence of country image structure on consumer evaluations of foreign products,” *International Marketing Review*, 22(1), 96-116.

- Leyens, Jacques-Philippe, Vincent Y. Yzerbyt and Georges Schadron (1992), "Stereotypes and Social Judgeability," in *European Review of Social Psychology*, ed. W. Stroebe and M. Hewstone, Chichester, UK: Wiley, 3, 91-120.
- _____ (1994), *Social Stereotypes and Social Cognition*, London: Sage.
- Li, Wai-Kwan and Robert S. Wyer, Jr. (1994), "The Role of Country of Origin in Product Evaluations: Informational and Standard-of-Comparison Effects," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 3(2), 187-212.
- Liu, Scott S. and Keith F. Johnson(2005), "The Automatic Country of Origin Effects on Brand Judgments," *Journal of Advertising*, 34(1), 87-98.
- Maheswaran, Durairaj and Meyers-Levy (1990), "The Influence of Message Framing and Issue Involvement," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27(3), 361-367.
- _____ and Cathy Yi Chen(2006), "Nation Equity: Incidental Emotions in Country-of-Origin Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33(3), 370-376.
- _____ (1994), "Country of Origin as a Stereotype: Effects of Consumer Expertise and Attribute Strength on Product Evaluations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 354-365.
- Mihailovich, Phillippe (2006), "Kinship branding: A Concept of Holism and Evolution for Nation Brand," *Place Branding*, 2, 229-247.
- Miyazaki, Anthony D., Dhruv Grewal and Ronald C. Goodstein (2005), "The Effect of Multiple Extrinsic Cues on Quality Perceptions: A Matter of Consistency," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32, 146-153.
- Murray, John D. Jo Ann Spadafore and William D. McIntosh (2005), "Belief in a Just World and Social Perception: Evidence for Automatic Activation," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(1), 35-47.
- Nagashima, Akira. (1970), "A Comparison of Japanese and U.S. Attitudes Towards Foreign Products," *Journal of Marketing*, 34, 68-74.
- Narayana, Chem L. (1981). "Aggregate Images of American and Japanese Products: Implications on International Marketing," *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 16, 31-35.
- Neuberg, Steven L. and Susan T. Fiske (1987), "Motivational Influences on Impression Formation: Outcome Dependency, Accuracy Driven Attention, and Individuating Processes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 431-444.
- Paolini, Stefania, Richard J. Crisp and Kylie McIntyre (2009), "Accountability Moderates Member-to-Group Generalization: Testing a Dual Process Model of Stereotype Change," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 679-685.
- Peterson, Robert A. and Alain J.P. Jolibert

- (1995), "A Meta-Analysis of Country - Of-Origin Effects," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26(4), 883-900.
- Petty, Richard E. and John T. Cacioppo (1979), "Issue Involvement can Increase or Decrease Persuasion by Enhancing Message-Relevant Cognitive Responses," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1915-1926.
- _____ (1990), "Involvement and Persuasion: Tradition Versus Integration," *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 367-374.
- Pharr, Julie M. (2005), "Synthesizing Country-of-Origin Research from The Last Decade: Is the Concept Still Salient in An Era of Global Brands?" *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 13(4), 34-44.
- Posner, Michael I. and Charles R. R. Snyder (1975), "Attention and Cognitive Control," In *Information Processing and Cognition: The Loyola Symposium*, ed. R.L. Solso, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. 55-85.
- Roth, Martin S., and Jean B. Romeo (1992) "Matching Product category and Country Image Perceptions: A Framework for Managing Country-Origin-Effects." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(3), 477-497.
- Sagar, H. Andrew. and Janet W. Scholfield (1980), "Racial and Behavioral Cues in Black and White Children's Perceptions of Ambiguously Aggressive Acts." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 590-598.
- Samiee, Saeed, Terence Shimp, and Subhash Sharma (2005), "Brand Origin Recognition Accuracy: its Antecedents and Consumers' Cognitive Limitations," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4), 379-398.
- Sin, Leo Y., Gordon W. Cheung and Ruby Lee (1999), "Methodology in Cross-Cultural Consumer Research: A Review and Critical Assessment." *Journal of International Consumer Research*, 11(4), 75-96.
- Sorrentino, Richard M. and E.Tory Higgins eds. (1986), "Handbook of Motivation and Cognition," (Vol. 1). New York: Guilford Press.
- Tetlock, Philip E. (1983), "Accountability and the Complexity of Thought," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 74-83.
- _____ (1985), "Accountability: A Social Check on the Fundamental Attribution Error," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48, 227-236.
- _____ and Jae Il Kim (1987), "Accountability and Judgment Processes in a Personality Prediction Task," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 700-709.
- _____, Jennifer S. Lerner and Richard Boettger (1996), "The Dilution Effect: Judgmental Bias, Conversational Convention, or Bit of Both," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 915-934.

- Tse, Davis K. and Gerald J. Gordon (1992), "An Experiment on the Saliency of Country-of-Origin in the Era of Global Brands," *Journal of International Marketing*, 1 (1), 57-75.
- Usunier, Jean-Claude (2006), "Relevance in Business Research: The Case of Country-of-Origin Research in Marketing," *European Management Review*, 3, 60-73.
- Verlegh, Peeter W. J. and Jan-Benedict E. M. Steenkamp (1999), "A Review of Meta-Analysis of Country-of-Origin Research," *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 20, 521-546.
- _____ (2002), "Country-of-Origin Stereotypes and the Processing of Ads: A Tomato-Field Experiment.," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 29(1), 166-167.
- White, Phillip D. (1979), "Attitudes of US Purchasing Managers Towards Industrial Products Manufactured in Selected European Nations," *Journal of International Business Studies*, 10, 81-90.
- Yzerbyt, Vincent Y., Georges Schadron, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, and S. Rocher (1994), "Social Judgeability: The Impact of Meta-Informational Cues on the Use of Stereotypes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 48-55
- _____, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, and Georges Schadron (1997), "Social Judgeability and Dilution of Stereotypes: The Impact of the Nature and Sequence of Information," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 611-619.

Appendix

The original ten attributes were:

1. (price) Very Inexpensive/Expensive. (1=very inexpensive; 9 =very expensive)
2. (reliability) *Very Reliable/Unreliable. (1 =very reliable; 9 = very unreliable)
3. (safety) *Very Safe/Unsafe in an accident. (1 =very safe ; 9 = very unsafe)
4. (power) *Very Powerful/Weak engine. (1 =very powerful; 9 = very weak)
5. (design) Designed more for Young/Old people. (1 =designed more for young people ; 9 = designed more for old people)
6. (maintenance cost) *Inexpensive/Expensive to maintain for five years. (1 =very inexpensive; 9 = very expensive)
7. (satisfaction) *Very Satisfied/Dissatisfied. (1 =very satisfied; 9 = very dissatisfied)
8. (gas mileage) Good/Poor gas mileage. (1 =good gas mileage; 9 = poor gas mileage)
9. (defects) *Little/A Lot of defects during the fifth year of ownership. (1 =very little defects problem ; 9 =a lot of defects problem)
10. (resale value) *Excellent/Poor resale value after the fifth year of ownership. (1 =excellent; 9 = poor)

* items used for the final analysis

원산지 평가성향의 활용: 제품특성과 소비자 동기의 역할을 중심으로

이 한 준*
박 중 철**
오 혜 영***

국문요약

과거 연구들은 원산지(COO)효과의 존재여부에 주목하였으나, 본 연구는 사회판단이론(social judgeability theory)을 적용하여, 어떤 상황에서 원산지(COO)가 소비자의 제품평가에 영향을 미치는지를 연구하였다. 두 개의 실험결과에 의하면, 단지 어느 나라에서 자동차가 만들어졌다는 정보(COO only information)만으로는 제품에 대한 평가에 영향을 미치지 않고, 그 차를 만든 나라와 그 차를 만든 기업의 이름(product-specific information)이 제시될 때, 응답자들은 원산지 효과를 활용할 수 있는 충분한 근거(단서)를 가졌다고 느끼고, 또한 응답자들이 사회의 공통적인 판단 기준(socially shared criteria of validity)에 부합하여 판단하여야 하는 동기를 부여 받았을 때, 원산지 효과가 제품 평가에 유의한 영향을 미치는 것으로 나타났다.

특히, 각 실험 결과는 단순히 원산지 평가성향으로만 소비자 평가가 이루어지는 것이 아니라 원산지 평가성향에 영향을 미치는 정보의 제시방법이 영향을 미친다는 사실을 보여주었다. 이러한 결과는 향후 인상형성 모델의 틀 안에서 좀 더 논의되어야 할 것이다.

핵심개념: 원산지효과, 원산지 평가성향, 제품특성, 제품특성 정보, 소비자 동기.

* 한양대학교 경영학과 교수(hanjoon222@hanyang.ac.kr)

** 조선대학교 경영학부 조교수(pjc4887@chosun.ac.kr)

*** 고려대학교 박사과정(ohhy55@naver.com), 교신저자