Activating different Stereotypes in the Country-of-Origin effect

Maaike C. Baks

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

The country-of-origin (CoO) effect states that consumers sometimes use a product's origin as a cue to infer information about its quality (e.g., French wine), which subsequently influences their evaluation and purchase intention of that product. Since the outcome of the CoO effect is partly determined by the cultural stereotype that people hold, we hypothesized that activating either a negative or positive stereotype of a country would influence the evaluation and purchase intention of a product from this country in the corresponding valence direction. This was tested by means of an experiment, in the form of a questionnaire, where participants were primed with either a positive ('Technologically advanced') or negative stereotype ('Counterfeit goods') regarding China's manufacturing reputation. The results of the experiment showed no support for our hypotheses. An explanation for this finding is that the manipulation tasks failed to activate the stereotypes. However, some, but limited, correlational support for the CoO effect occurring was found.

Keywords: China, Country-of-origin effect, Priming, Stereotype

Introduction

The once self-contained domestic markets from a few decades ago have slowly transformed into a more competitive international market where consumers are regularly exposed to various foreign brands and new products. An example of a novel good, that is becoming a trend and favorite among restaurant gurus in the European culinary world, is the highly expensive Wagyu beef (Clay, 2015). Fascinating stories circulate about the Wagyu meat's manufacturing process which in turn intensifies the interest of the market in the product. As a beef that originates from Japan, it is argued that its exquisite taste is acquired by the specific treatment that the cows receive in their lifetime: a 15-minute massage per day, classical music in the stalls for a low stress environment, and the cows drink beer to induce appetite and improve meat quality (WagyuKoe, 2016). This portrayal, mostly used for marketing purposes in the West, is however partly defined by the stereotypical view of Japan. According to the Dutch journalist TV-show '*Keuringsdienst van Waarde*' (KRO-NCRV, 2015), a program that explores various consumer questions, this initial image of how Wagyu cows are reared in Japan is exaggerated and was actually constructed in a documentary by an Italian director. Despite this reality behind the Wagyu myth, in Westerners' collective imagination the elaborative meat preparation fits with Japan's image as a peculiar (Hijiya-Kirschnereit, 2000) and industrious (Hong & Tsai, 2006) nation. This suggests that stereotypes of a country and its population can affect how appealing a certain product is for the product's target audience and how believable its accompanying marketing strategy is.

Decision making for consumers in the current age of globalism has arguably become an increasingly difficult process whereby the broad amount of choices in products can numb an individual when his or her expertise in the product of choice is lacking (Kalicharan, 2014; Maheswaran, 1994). In these cases, consumers have the tendency to consult and act on external superficial cues (e.g., price, brand name) surrounding the product in their final

purchase decision (Abraham & Patro, 2014; Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Like what was revealed in the Wagyu example, the stereotypical associations that a consumer has of a country can influence his or her opinion of products that originate from this place. Elliot and Cameron (1994) found that when products only differed in country of origin, consumers rated products as being of significantly different quality. Other elements that have been found to be influenced by a product's country of origin, albeit with a smaller effect, are attitude towards the product and purchase intention (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). In marketing and psychological literature, this phenomenon where product evaluation changes depending on the product place of manufacture, or more specifically the country mentioned on the product's attached label (i.e., 'Made in X'), is referred to as the Country-of-Origin (CoO) effect.

For many countries, individuals have a generalized idea about its characteristics from which they can deduce certain expectations about issues related to that nation. This image of a country is assembled by the sum of information residing in the consumers' mind about that given nation (Papp-Váry, 2005). According to the model developed by Janda and Rao (1997), the information about a country that influences consumers' product evaluation (i.e., the CoO effect) is constructed by: 1) cultural stereotypes that are obtained through socialization from an early age, and 2) personal beliefs that are shaped by previous experiences with both the country (and its population) and the product. This indicates that the direction of the CoO effect on product evaluation is dependent on the accumulated sum of the consumer's cultural stereotypes and the consumer's personal beliefs of that particular nation. A positive stereotype would for example imply that the likelihood of receiving a positive evaluation increases for products that are associated to that stereotype (Janda & Rao, 1997). Conversely, a negative country stereotype will have an adverse effect on the product's evaluation.

Countries may have a strong reputation for manufacturing certain type of products and have a weak or no reputation for other product categories (Abraham & Patro, 2014; Janda &

Rao, 1997). Marketers have recognized this aspect of the CoO effect and often use it as a technique in their product selling strategy. It is not uncommon as a consumer to encounter certain types of product mentioned together with a country that are stereotypically considered to be a good match (e.g., Swiss watch, French wine, Dutch cheese). To induce a positive CoO effect, marketers sometimes also make use of foreign branding, that is, the use of foreign country markers in the product's presentation. Leclerc, Schmitt and Dubé (1994) showed in their study that a French-sounding brand name increases the perceived hedonism of luxury products such as perfume and clothes. Companies like Häagen Dazs (American based ice cream chain that uses a Scandinavian-sounding brand name) or Superdry (British clothing store that trademarks itself with Japanese) are real life examples of this strategy. The CoO effect has therefore become quite a normal occurrence in marketing that influences the daily consumption choices of individuals in global society.

How exactly does the CoO affect the evaluation of a product? In the CoO literature, the country origin of a product is generally described as a cognitive cue that provides consumers information to which they can infer beliefs about a product's attributes, such as quality (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Li & Wyer (1994) formulated, and found support in their research for, three specific hypotheses in explaining the cognitive cue mechanism of the CoO effect. For the independent-attribute hypothesis, they found that the country-of-origin of a product can function as a separate attribute that is especially salient when it is mentioned as the first cue. Furthermore, they found evidence for a second hypothesis that proposed that a product's origin gives the consumer a signal. Specifically, when relatively little product attributes are known to the consumer and the product is familiar in connection with that nation, the product's origin functions as a signal which is used to infer information about other specific attributes of the product. Lastly, the place of manufacture can be used as a standard of comparison for product evaluations. In this explanation, the country-of-origin cue

creates a contrast effect by which the product is compared to the consumer's perception of what are common attributes for products of this country.

Next to the main postulation that the product's origin functions as a cognitive cue for consumers, an affective and normative mechanism have also been observed in the CoO effect (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). The affective aspect of the CoO effect shows that countries have a symbolic and emotional value (e.g., social status or national pride) to consumers. This means that positive emotional connotations to a country, acquired through direct or indirect experience with that nation (comparable to the personal beliefs component in Janda & Rao's model, 1997), influences product evaluation in a positive manner. On the other hand, negative emotional connotations to a country influences the product evaluation in an adverse manner. The symbolic value of a product affects people's purchase behavior in that consumers believe that these products will give them a form of social capital (Bourdieu, 1984). For example, Batra, Ramaswamy, Alden, Steenkamp and Ramachander (2000) found that in India, 'Western' products are more desirable because they represent status.

The last mechanism of the CoO effect states that the norms in a society direct consumer behavior. This aspect of the CoO effect can explain consumer ethnocentrism, whereby consumers prefer to buy domestic products over foreign products (Balabanis & Diamantopoulos, 2004). These tendencies are for example stimulated by countries' governments, labor unions or industry groups who start campaigns aimed at establishing a 'buy domestic' norm (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Purchasing domestic goods would then be a manner in which individuals can support their home country's economy. In sum, the CoO effect is often caused by an interplay of these three discussed aspects: cognitive, affective and normative.

Although the country of origin cue to some extent gives a useful hint about the product's quality, possibly intensified by strong connections to well-known brands from that nation (Papp-Váry, 2005), it can also stop an individual from taking a more critical view of a product. Manufacturing location is not a guarantee of the product's actual performance. For example, in 2015 the popular and trusted German car company Volkswagen, a brand that profits from its German stereotypical view of being efficient and reliable in international advertising (i.e., slogan '*Das Auto*'), was involved in the Diesel gate scandal (Langlois, 2015). Volkswagen cars passed a low emission output test by using secret software that deceives the measurement system, thereby betraying their promise to the customer of a vehicle that produces less pollution and uses less gasoline. This illustrates the point that cultural stereotypes are not always good advice givers about the quality of a product.

Liu and Johnson (2005) showed in their research that the CoO effect on brand judgement is automatic and involuntarily. That the effect is implicit suggests that it can occur in a lot of situations where the consumer is not aware of this bias. The unconscious presence of the CoO effect in a lot of purchase decisions signifies that companies or brands from certain countries have a competitive advantage over others (Agrawal & Kamakura, 1999). Surveys show that many consumers prefer products from more economically developed nations over products from less developed nations since they belief that these industries have a lot of experience in manufacturing and are constantly improving their product's quality as a side effect of intensive competition (Kalicharan, 2014). In the same line of reasoning, countries with a less economically developed background, or negative reputation, will have more difficulty in competing in the international market. Indeed, a meta-analysis by Verlegh and Steenkamp (1999) showed that in a situation of comparison, products from less developed countries are evaluated less positively than products from more developed countries.

However, a country is not tied to one type of reputation. Multiple, and even conflicting, stereotypes can exist of a country and its population in the minds of citizens from other nations. To illustrate, if Asians are considered to be good at mathematics and women in general are not, how well will an Asian woman score on a math test? Shih, Pittinsky, and Ambady (1999) investigated this question and primed Asian American women with either their Asian identity or female identity. Their results indicated that Asian-primed participants performed best on the math test, implying that the activation of the kind of stereotype matters in the final result. Although this research focused on an individual's self-identity beliefs, priming is known to also affect the perception people have of other groups (Power, Murphy, & Coover, 1996). Priming may therefore be a useful strategy for companies that are established in a country with a more ambiguous stereotype (i.e., the valence can be either positive or negative) in their target market. The question that this research therefore aims to answer is whether it is possible to change an individual's evaluation of a product from a country with an ambiguous stereotype, by activating a positive or negative stereotype of that same country.

In exploring this question, the focus of the current research will be on China. In the last decades, China has experienced an annual economic growth percentage of 10 percent and has therefore been labeled as a rising economy (Ruble & Zhang, 2013; Xiang, 2013). In Western markets, Chinese companies may face some issues in selling their products due to being negatively judged by the target audience about their homeland. A lot of the negativity in China's national image abroad is constructed by the conflict between them and some nations (e.g., U.S) regarding international issues such as defying the international law of human rights, the Tibetan independence conflict and extreme pollution. On the other hand, China has also received a lot of positive attention concerning its recent economic growth and is recognized as a culturally strong nation with beautiful landscapes. These mixed views indicate that China

has both positive and negative reputation. China is therefore a good example of a country whose reputation of product stereotypes can possibly be primed.

As was previously mentioned, both product stereotypes of a nation and previous experiences with the product or country influence the direction and strength of the CoO effect in product evaluation (Janda & Rao, 1999). Stereotypes of a nation can function on different levels, such as the individual (e.g., Chinese), the national (e.g., China) or the continental (e.g., Asia) level. In the case of China, and Asians in general as a population, the stereotypes are abundant and show traces of historical, cultural and political factors (Said, 1971). In a content analysis of English social media websites concerning user messages made about China in 2011, including reposts of news media messages, Xiang (2013) found that China has differently charged images per domain. Positive tones were found in messages concerning China's economic ('Rising Economy'), cultural ('Fascinating China') and technological ('Innovating China') image, and negative tones in China's political ('Authoritarian China') and Environmental ('Polluting China') image. Of all the reputations, the technological innovative image of China fits best in what stereotype could be activated in the CoO effect that influences the product evaluation. This particular image also provides a negative counterpart, which is China's reputation of manufacturing counterfeit goods of inferior quality. By activating either the positive stereotype or negative stereotype concerning the manufacturing process of Chinese products, we expect that the product evaluation of Chinese products will respectively be either more or less positive than in a situation where no stereotype has been activated. Which brings us to the following two hypotheses that will be examined in this study:

H1:   Activating a positive stereotype concerning Chinese products leads to a more positive evaluation of Chinese products, and a greater willingness to purchase those products, compared to a situation where no stereotype has been activated.

H2:   Activating a negative stereotype concerning Chinese products leads to a more negative evaluation of Chinese products, and a lower willingness to purchase those products, compared to a situation where no stereotype has been activated.

Method

Participants and Design

Participants were 119 students from Leiden University the Netherlands, who were approached at the Social and Behavioral Sciences Faculty building's canteen and study rooms. Most followed a course in a social science degree (e.g., pedagogy, psychology). The sample consisted of 37 men and 82 women. Participants' age ranged from 18 to 33 years, with a mean age of 21.23 ($SD = 2.49$). They were allocated randomly to one of the three conditions of a 3 (Stereotype activation: positive vs. negative vs. control) x 1 between subject factorial design.

Procedure

Students were asked, individually, to participate in a 10 to 15 minute paper and pencil test. They were told that the purpose of the questionnaire was a marketing research about Chinese products of the brand Xiaomi and Huawei, and that it consists of three parts. After filling in a consent form, participants started with the experiment.

Participants read that in the first part of the experiment they would be presented with two tasks as to activate their knowledge of China, because research has shown that active information processing is more efficient than passive information processing. But in fact, this section of the experiment was meant to activate the type of stereotype (negative, positive or control) (See Appendix A) related to the manufacturing of Chinese products. In the first assignment, participants completed a sentence scramble task (see Bargh, Chen, & Burrows,

1996; Srull & Wyer, 1979). They were instructed, with an example, to number the correct order of a sentence that was randomly divided into four pieces. All seven sentences in the task were about China. The majority of these sentences (6 out of 7) were identical in every experimental condition and their content represented neutral trivia about China (for example: in the world__ China has__ the largest population__ with 1,36 billion inhabitants __). The last sentence in this task differed between experimental conditions as to manipulate which stereotype about Chinese products would be activated. In the negative stereotype condition, participants were presented with the following sentence: 'counterfeit goods __ produces__ China__ a lot__'. In the positive stereotype condition, this sentence was replaced by: 'a technological __ China __ advanced country __ is __'. In the control condition, the sentence was neutral: 'descent__ believed that they__ many emperors from China__ from dragons__'.

In the follow-up task, participants were asked to share their knowledge and impressions about China (Appendix A). To allegedly help them with a topic to write about, they were shown three pictures in a row which each presented a picture of a Chinese related subject. In every condition, the first picture featured dim sum (i.e., Chinese steamed food) and the third picture showed a panda eating bamboo. Only the second picture depended on experimental condition, and was used to activate the stereotype. To activate the positive stereotype of 'China is a technologically advanced country', a picture of Chinese admiring a small robot was used in the positive priming condition. A picture of a shop selling 'Pmua' shoes (i.e., counterfeit Puma shoes) was presented in the negative priming condition as to activate the stereotype of 'China producing a lot of counterfeit goods'. In the control condition, a picture of the Great Wall of China was shown. Participants were instructed to write down in a few lines for every picture about what they knew about the presented subject.

In the next part of the questionnaire (see Appendix B), participants were presented with products from two Chinese brands, Huawei and Xiaomi (two products each), and were

asked to evaluate them. These two brands were chosen since they were relatively unfamiliar on the Dutch market, especially compared to popular non-Chinese brands such as Apple and Samsung. Huawei entered the smartphone market in the Netherlands a few years ago and is doing relatively well. Xiaomi has not yet started to sell its products in Dutch stores. The product stimuli that the participants evaluated were presented as advertisements. All the ads were photoshopped with a white background and provided the following information: a picture of the product, the brand logo, the name of the product, four general attributes of the product and the average selling price of the product. The products that were shown to the participants, and in this exact order, were the Xiaomi Mi 4 (a smartphone), the Xiaomi TV 2 (a television) the Huawei Ascend G7 (a smartphone), and the Huawei Watch (a smartwatch). For each product the participants were asked to evaluate how they perceived the quality of the product, whether they liked the product, and whether they would like to buy the product (see measures section).

In the last part of the experiment, participants were asked to answer to what extent they agreed with a number of statements about the brand Huawei and Xiaomi, Chinese products and China (see Appendix B). Finally, they were thanked for their participation in the questionnaire and were offered a piece of candy as thanks. After being debriefed about the experiment's real content, participants were given the opportunity to write down their email address so we could send them the final results and/or notify them whether they won one of the two 10 euro VVV coupon that were raffled later on in time.

Measures

Product evaluation. Product evaluation was measured separately for all Huawei and Xiaomi products with four statements, of which three were based on Verlegh, Steenkamp and Meulenberg (2005). The following statements were used: '[product name] is of good quality',

'[product name] is an advanced product', 'I like [product name]' and 'I have a positive image of [product name]' (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) ($\alpha_{\text{Xiaomi Mi4}}$ = .72, $\alpha_{\text{Xiaomi TV2}}$ = .77, $\alpha_{\text{Huawei Ascend G7}}$ = .85, $\alpha_{\text{Huawei Watch}}$ = .83).

Purchase intention. Purchase intention was measured with two statements based on Verlegh et al. (2005), namely 'If I came across [product name] in my store, I would definitely buy it' and 'I would rather buy [product name] than a similar sort of product from a different brand' (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) ($r_{\text{Xiaomi Mi4}}$ = .58, $p < .001$, $r_{\text{Xiaomi TV2}}$ = .51, $p < .001$, $r_{\text{Huawei Ascend G7}}$ = .66, $p < .001$, $r_{\text{Huawei Watch}}$ = .76, $p < .001$).

Brand familiarity. One statement ('I am very familiar with products from [brand]') was used to measure familiarity with the brands Huawei and Xiaomi (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*).

Brand evaluation. Brand evaluation was measured separately for Huawei and Xiaomi. The following statements were used: '[brand] manufactures products of high quality', '[brand] products are innovative', 'I trust [brand] more than other brands', '[brand] products are of low status' (reverse-coded) and 'I think [brand] is a good brand' (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) ($\alpha_{\text{Huawei brand evaluation}}$ = .76, $\alpha_{\text{Xiaomi brand evaluation}}$ = .69).

Chinese products perception. The perception that participants have of Chinese products in general was measured by eight items that were based on Reierson's (1967) product questionnaire scale. The following items were used in the measurement, 'Chinese products …': '.. are of good quality', '.. are combined with cheap material' (reverse coded), '.. are of low prestige' (reverse coded), '.. are of lasting quality', '.. are poor imitations of other products' (reverse coded), '.. are items of real craftsmanship', '.. are a disappointment' (reverse coded) and '.. meet high quality standards' (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) ($\alpha_{\text{Chinese products evaluation}}$ = .83).

Manipulation checks. We used the following two statements to check whether the stereotype manipulation succeeded in activating our experiment's chosen positive or negative stereotype: 'China is a technologically advanced country' and 'China manufactures a lot of counterfeit goods' (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). In addition, we assessed the valence of China's image with the statement 'I have a positive image of China' (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*).

Results

Preliminary analyses

The data of two participants were excluded from the analysis because they had several missing values on the main dependent variables. Six other individuals who had only one missing value on the main dependent variables were retained in the dataset and their respective answers were changed to the sample mean for that particular question. The final sample consisted of 117 participants (80 female, 37 male). The sample group's age ranged from 18 to 33 years (M_{age} = 21.22, SD_{age} = 2.51).

Manipulation Checks

All the questions in the sentence scramble task were filled in correctly by all participants. And all participants wrote an answer for every photo in the photo task. For the manipulation photo in the negative prime condition (the 'Pmua' shoes), most participants stated that counterfeit goods in China are manufactured under poor working conditions (e.g., low salary, child labor, sweatshops). Almost no statements were made about the quality of the counterfeit goods, except one, who stated that they were often of good quality. Participants in the positive prime condition (the robot) focused more on the robot technology, such as artificial intelligence, in their answer. In the control condition (Great Wall of China), most participants recognized the Great Wall of China in the photo. The detailed answers (e.g.,

dynasty, length) of a few participants made us speculate that some may have consulted the internet.

To assess whether the sentence scramble task and the photo task had any success in priming the stereotype, we performed an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), with condition as independent variable and the three manipulation check questions as dependent variable (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations per experimental condition). If the stereotype manipulation had succeeded, we expected to find that participants in the positive condition would agree more with the statements 'China is a technologically advanced country' and 'I have a positive image of China' compared to participants in the control or negative condition. We further expected that participants in the negative condition would agree more with the statement 'China manufactures a lot of counterfeit goods' than participants in the control and negative condition.

Results showed that mean scores on the first question ('China is a technologically advanced country') did not differ significantly between experimental conditions, $F(2, 114) < 1$, $p = .976$, $\eta^2 < .01$. Participants in the negative, positive and control condition all agreed with the same amount that China is a technologically advanced country.

A main effect was found for the second question ('China manufactures a lot of counterfeit goods'), $F(2, 114) = 5.36$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .09$. Posthoc analyses using Tukey's HSD indicated that participants in the control condition agreed more with the statement that China manufactures a lot of counterfeit goods than participants in either the negative ($p = .007$) or positive condition ($p = .042$), but the average level of agreement with the statement did not differ significantly between the participants in the positive and negative condition ($p = .827$).

Lastly, the level of agreement for the third question ('I have a positive image of China'), $F(2, 114) = 2.30$, $p = .105$, $\eta^2 = .04$, did not differ significantly per condition. All

three conditions equally agreed to the statement that they had a positive image of China. Thus, no support was found for our expectations, indicating that the stereotype manipulation may not have succeeded in activating our positive and negative stereotype, respectively.

Table 1. Means (standard deviations) of the three manipulation check questions as a function of experimental condition.

	Type of stereotype		
	Negative ($N = 40$)	Positive ($N = 37$)	Control ($N = 40$)
1. China: technologically advanced	5.30 (1.14)	5.29 (1.18)	5.35 (1.25)
2. China: counterfeit goods	5.40 (1.10)	5.54 (1.17)	6.13 (0.85)
3. China: positive image	4.03 (1.05)	4.19 (1.15)	4.55 (1.15)

Main analyses

We performed one-way ANOVAs on the dependent variables product evaluation and purchase intention with experimental condition (negative prime vs. positive prime vs. control) as independent variable to test our hypotheses. Table 2 displays the results of the analyses and Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of the dependent variables per experimental condition.

We expected to find on basis of our first hypothesis that participants in the positive condition would have a more positive evaluation of Chinese products, and a greater willingness to purchase those products, compared to participants in the negative and the control condition. Vice versa, based on our second hypothesis, we expected to find that participants in the negative condition, would have a more negative evaluation of Chinese products, and a lower willingness to purchase those products, compared to participants in the negative and the control condition. Results of the ANOVA showed no significant effects of

the stereotype manipulation (i.e., differences between experimental conditions) on product evaluation or purchase intention (see Table 2), which means that we did not find support for H1 and H2 on these measures.

We also measured brand evaluation and Chinese products perception in the study, and tested by means of ANOVAs whether brand evaluation and Chinese product perception differed between experimental conditions. Results showed that brand evaluation of Huawei did not differ between experimental conditions, $F(2, 114) = 0.25$, $p = .783$, $\eta^2 < .01$, and this was also the case for brand evaluation of Xiaomi, $F(2, 112)^1 = 0.76$, $p = .472$, $\eta^2 = .01^2$. The scores on the Chinese product perception scale did not significantly differ between conditions either, $F(2,114) = 0.36$, $p = .699$, $\eta^2 = .01$. This suggests that the stereotype manipulation did not affect the brand evaluation of people or their perception of Chinese products in the negative, positive and control condition. Again, these results do not support H1 and H2.

Table 2. Results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on product evaluation and purchase intention.

	Product Evaluation			Purchase Intention		
	F*	*p*	η^2	*F**	*p*	η^2
Xiaomi Mi 4	0.45	.630	.01	0.04	.960	< .01
Xiaomi TV 2	1.44	.241	.02	2.33	.102	.04
Huawei Ascend G7	0.68	.508	.01	2.57	.081	.04
Huawei Watch	1.51	.225	.03	0.50	.606	.01

*df = 2, 114

---

[1] Two more participants (both in the control condition) had missing values on the Xiaomi brand evaluation variable, which means they were excluded from this analysis ($df = 2, 112$).

[2] A paired sample t-test on brand familiarity showed that participants were significantly more familiar with Huawei ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 2.00$) than with Xiaomi ($M = 1.40$, $SD = 1.03$), $t(1, 116) = 14.36$, $p < .001$.

Table 3. Means (standard deviations) per condition of product evaluation and purchase intention for the four products.

		Type of stereotype		
		Negative ($N = 40$)	Positive ($N = 37$)	Control ($N = 40$)
Product evaluation	Xiaomi Mi 4	4.44 (0.76)	4.59 (0.88)	4.61 (0.92)
	Xiaomi TV 2	4.65 (0.72)	4.95 (0.84)	4.86 (0.84)
	Huawei Ascend G7	4.83 (0.73)	4.57 (0.90)	4.66 (1.26)
	Huawei Watch	4.19 (0.98)	4.23 (1.09)	4.58 (1.21)
Purchase intention	Xiaomi Mi 4	2.78 (0.99)	2.85 (1.33)	2.78 (1.39)
	Xiaomi TV 2	3.08 (1.12)	3.66 (1.07)	3.35 (1.35)
	Huawei Ascend G7	3.66 (1.12)	2.99 (1.20)	3.28 (1.57)
	Huawei Watch	2.57 (1.48)	2.70 (1.45)	2.90 (1.45)

Correlation Analysis

Although no significant differences were found between the conditions in our main analysis, correlations between the dependent variables may still show some evidence of the CoO effect occurring (see Table 4 for a correlation matrix between all the dependent measures). In the literature it is described that the CoO effect is caused by the perception one has of a country (Abraham & Patro, 2014), which is partly defined by cultural stereotypes (Janda & Rao, 1997). As such, we excepted to find correlations between our manipulation check questions (which assessed cultural stereotypes) with any of the dependent variables, especially product evaluation and purchase intention and Chinese product perception, as an indication of the possible presence of the CoO effect in this study.

Agreement with the positive stereotype statement 'China is a technologically advanced country' was found to be significantly and positively related to Chinese products perception ($r = .39$, $p < .001$), with a medium to large effect size according to Cohen's (1992) benchmark (that being: .10 = small, .30 = medium and .50 = large). Participants who agreed with the

statement that China is a technologically advanced country, also perceived Chinese products more positively. We found no significant correlations between agreement with the positive stereotype statement and either product evaluation or purchase intention of any of the products, however.

We found similar findings for the negative stereotype statement 'China manufactures a lot of counterfeit goods'. Agreement with this statement was found to be significantly and negatively related to Chinese products perception ($r = -.38$, $p < .001$), with a medium to large effect size (Cohen, 1992). Participants that agreed with the statement that China manufactures a lot of counterfeit goods, perceived Chinese products more negatively. However, we found no significant correlations between agreement with the negative stereotype statement and either product evaluation or purchase intention of any of the products.

Finally, we found a significant and positive relation between agreement with the statement 'I have a positive image of China' and Chinese products perception ($r = .34$, $p < .001$), with a medium to large effect size (Cohen, 1992). The more participants agreed with the statement that they had a positive image of China, the more they positively perceived Chinese products. We also found significant and positive relationships with product evaluation for Xiaomi Mi 4 ($r = .28$, $p = .003$) and Xiaomi TV 2 ($r = .25$, $p = .008$), and the purchase intention of Xiaomi Mi 4 ($r = .23$, $p = .014$). According to Cohen's (1992) benchmark, these three correlations had an effect size of small to medium. The more participants had a positive image of China, the more they evaluated products like the Xiaomi Mi 4 and the Xiaomi TV 2 in a positive manner, and the more they expressed willingness to buy the Xiaomi Mi 4.

Besides the stereotype prime questions, the Chinese products perception variable could signify whether the CoO effect pertains in the participants evaluation of the products

and their purchase intention of them. Considering that this measure, which indicates the general perception participants have of Chinese products, has overlaps with country perception that again generates the CoO effect (Janda & Rao, 1997; Roth & Diamantopolous, 2009). Significant positive correlations, with a small to medium effect size (Cohen, 1992), were found for between Chinese products perception and Xiaomi products' product evaluation and purchase intention (see Table 4). The more positively participants perceived Chinese products, the more positively they evaluated Xiaomi Mi 4 ($r = .32$, $p = .001$) and Xiaomi TV 2 ($r = .32$, $p = .001$) (including a greater willingness to buy the Xiaomi Mi 4, $r = .19$, $p = .044$, and Xiaomi TV 2, $r = .28$, $p = .003$). This may suggest that the CoO effect was present for products from the brand Xiaomi but not for products from the brand Huawei. In sum, the results of the correlational analyses provide some small indications of the CoO effect occurring in our study.

Table 4. Correlations between the three manipulation check question, Chinese products perception, Huawei and Xiaomi brand evaluation, product evaluation (P.E.) and purchase intention (P.I.), including the means and standard deviations of all the variables.

	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. China: Technological	5.31 (1.18)	1													
2. China: Counterfeit	5.69 (1.09)	.09	1												
3. China: Positive Image	4.26 (1.13)	.28**	.04	1											
4. Chinese Products Perception	3.28 (0.84)	.39**	-.38**	.34**	1										
5. Huawei Brand Evaluation	3.61 (0.83)	-.03	-.17	-.01	.28**	1									
6. Xiaomi Brand Evaluation	3.35 (0.75)	.14	-.09	.17	.27**	.43**	1								
7. P.E. Xiaomi Mi 4	4.55 (0.85)	.06	-.05	.28**	.32**	.44**	.50**	1							
8. P.E. Xiaomi TV 2	4.82 (0.80)	.15	-.08	.25**	.32**	.30**	.39**	.55**	1						
9. P.E. Huawei Ascend G7	4.69 (0.99)	-.02	-.06	.01	.05	.68**	.41**	.51**	.31**	1					
10. P.E. Huawei Watch	4.34 (1.10)	-.04	-.09	.17	.14	.43**	.34*	.31**	.48**	.39**	1				
11. P.I. Xiaomi Mi 4	2.80 (1.24)	.12	.04	.23*	.19*	.36**	.52**	.69**	.38**	.39**	.20*	1			
12. P.I. Xiaomi TV 2	3.35 (1.21)	.07	-.04	.13	.28**	.33**	.45**	.38**	.64**	.22*	.46**	.50**	1		
13. P.I. Huawei Ascend G7	3.32 (1.33)	-.07	-.00	-.02	.01	.70**	.36**	.47**	.20*	.70**	.27**	.56**	.36**	1	
14. P.I. Huawei Watch	2.73 (1.45)	-.19*	.07	.00	.02	.36**	.25*	.22*	.24**	.26**	.62**	.39**	.52**	.40**	1

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Discussion

The present study focused on the country-of-origin (CoO) effect: an external cue that consumers use to infer a particular country's reputation of manufacturing a specific type of product, which consequently influences their perception of that product's quality. If the consumer's attitude of a country is positive, then they may transfer such an attitude to the product (Abraham & Patro, 2015). However, this means that some nations are at a disadvantage since not all countries are equal in their reputation towards manufacturing certain products (Tse & Lee, 1993). From this point of view, we questioned whether it is possible to diminish the disadvantage by changing the perception people have of a country regarding its manufacturing skills. More specifically, drawing on the model of Janda and Rao (1997) and the importance of stereotypes in determining the direction of the CoO effect, the question the current study addressed was whether the direction of the CoO effect, for a country with an ambiguous reputation (e.g., China), can be changed by activating either a positive or a negative associated stereotype. We examined this by means of an experimental study in which we primed participants with different stereotype beliefs (negative, positive and control) concerning China's reputation as a manufacturer, and examined how this affected people's evaluation and purchase intention of Chinese products from the brands Xiaomi and Huawei.

Through a sentence scramble task (i.e., number the correct order of a scrambled sentence) (Bargh, Chen, & Burrows, 1996; Srull & Wyer, 1979) and a photo task (i.e., write about the matter displayed on the photo), participants were primed to either think that 'China is a technologically advanced country' (i.e., positive stereotype) (Xiang, 2013), or that 'China produces a lot of counterfeit goods' (i.e., negative stereotype), that are of inferior quality. A control condition was also added, where no particular stereotype was activated, as to assess what the baseline attitude of the sample population – Western university students – was

towards Chinese products. Participants then evaluated and provided what their purchase intention was for four Chinese products presented in similar stylized ads: the Xiaomi Mi 4 (a smartphone), the Xiaomi TV 2 (a television) the Huawei Ascend G7 (a smartphone), and the Huawei Watch (a smartwatch). Lastly, they evaluated the two brands separately and indicated what their general perception was of Chinese products. We expected to find, as expressed in our two hypotheses, that priming people with a negative country stereotype, would lead to a more negative evaluation of Chinese products, and a lower willingness to purchase those products, compared to a situation where no negative stereotype has been activated. Whereas activating a positive country stereotype would lead to a more positive evaluation of Chinese products, and a greater willingness to purchase those products, compared to a situation where no positive stereotype has been activated. We found that the three different conditions did not significantly differ from one another in their evaluation and purchase intention for the four products. This means that the results of the current study do not support our hypotheses.

Although the experiment did not confirm our two hypotheses, some (but limited) correlational evidence for the CoO effect occurring was found. Staying in the line of reasoning that the outcome of the CoO effect is partially determined by the cultural stereotypes an individual has of a country's manufacturing reputation (Janda and Rao, 1997), we found that the responses to the questions that represented the current study's positive ('China is a technology advanced country') and negative stereotype ('China produces a lot of counterfeit goods'), correlated – positive and negative respectively – to the general perception people have of Chinese products. This suggests that both stereotypes influence people's general perception of Chinese products, or have some relation at least. No correlation was found between the stereotypes and people's evaluation of the products, which indicates, fitting to the main findings in this study, that the stereotypes in this experiment did not affect people's quality perception of the evaluated Chinese products (e.g., Huawei Watch).

Yet, cultural stereotypes are theorized to be but one component in the general perception one has of a country that produces the CoO effect (Janda & Rao, 1997; Roth & Diamantopoulos, 2009). Another construct that is built-in to an individual's perception of a country, and is thus another important predictor of the CoO effect, is the perception of Chinese products (Janda & Rao, 1997). Interestingly, we found that the perception of Chinese products was positively correlated with product evaluation and purchase intention for all four Xiaomi products, but not with the Huawei products. Additionally, we found, in line with the affective mechanism of the CoO effect (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999), that having a positive image of China – indicating the valence of a country perception – also positively correlated with the product evaluation and purchase intention of a few Xiaomi products. Both findings match with the literature that people depend more on the country of origin cue when the product or brand is unfamiliar (Abraham & Patro, 2013; Li & Wyer, 1994). However, this outcome could also be accounted due to participants losing incentive to seriously evaluate the last two products in the questionnaire, that were both Huawei, after evaluating the first two Xiaomi products. In short, the present study found partial correlational evidence for the CoO effect occurring.

Thus, in this study we did not find an effect of our stereotype activation manipulation on product evaluation and purchase intention. In relation to the model developed by Janda and Rao (1997), a possible explanation for this result is that the existing cultural stereotype functions as an strong anchor that determines the standard direction of the CoO effect (Tse & Lee, 1993). This default may be robust, in that it cannot be easily changed, due to people familiarizing themselves with these stereotypes through socialization from an early age (Janda & Rao, 1997). Lotz and Hu's (2001) research found that the best approach in changing the stereotype in the CoO effect is the subtyping theory: a method whereby the presented products contain moderately-deviating information (i.e., atypical for that country) and are

shown to be representative. In the case of the CoO effect, this may suggest that to change the stereotype, it may be more effective to show a person deviating product information that seems to be representative rather than to prime them with a different stereotype.

Furthermore, according to the literature, the effect sizes found for the CoO effect in multi-cue studies are smaller than in single cue studies (Agrawal & Kamakura, 1999; Peterson & Jolibert, 1995; Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Other external cues, like brand and price, are quite possibly stronger cues in influencing consumers' product evaluation than the country of origin attribute. Therefore, the product information provided in the current experiment (such as brand, price, product picture, and four product attributes), may have diluted the strength of the CoO effect. In an actual purchase situation, the cumulative weight of all the external cues may interfere with the impact of the CoO effect, both in a positive and negative manner.

The current findings can however also be explained by the design of the experiment. Between our three conditions (negative, positive and control), no differences were found in the manipulation check. This indicates that the experimental manipulation was unsuccessful in activating the intended stereotypes of a 'technologically advanced' China (positive) or a 'producer of counterfeit goods' China (negative), and was therefore not able to subsequently change the CoO effect in consumers' product evaluation and purchase intention. In hindsight of how the stereotype activation tasks were constructed, there are a few potential explanations as to why our stereotype manipulation did not do well. For the sentence scramble task we initially presumed that using seven sentences with only one sentence expressing the stereotype was enough to activate it, considering that if the manipulation was too obvious it could provoke reactance (Bargh, Chen, & Burrows, 1996). However, this is a contrast to other sentence scramble tasks that typically use about 30 sentences all containing a hint about the stereotype (Bargh, Chen, & Burrows, 1996; Srull & Wyer, 1979). Therefore, the sentence

scramble task may have been too short for the stereotype to be activated, and the subsequent photo task might not have been enough to balance that out.

To compensate for the brief sentence scramble task, an photo task was added to the experiment since it would demand from the participants a deeper level of processing of the stereotype information. However, the pictures chosen to represent the stereotype in the photo task might have not been clearly connected to the positive ('China is a technologically advanced country') and negative stereotype ('China produces a lot of counterfeit goods'). The robot presented on the manipulation photo in the positive stereotype condition – a product that is not very familiar to most consumers – may have led participants to focus on a more general subject like artificial intelligence (a number of participants indicated this) instead of seeing it as a consumer good. In addition, the robot was not entirely similar to the products (e.g., mobile phone) that the participants had to evaluate. Likewise, in the negative stereotype condition, participants were focused more on bad working conditions in China (e.g., sweatshops), and the 'Pmua' shoes presented in the manipulation picture did not belong to the same product category as the products the participants had to evaluate in the experiment. Thus, it is possible that both pictures could have been interpreted to be about something other than our presumed stereotypes. This has some implications about how the stereotype in the CoO effect works, in that the activated stereotype, and its accompanying CoO effect, do not necessarily transfer to the product evaluation when the connection between them is too vague.

Another explanation as to why no effect was found of the experimental manipulation on product evaluation and purchase intention is our choice of stereotypes. More specifically, the positive stereotype of China being technologically advanced and the negative stereotype of China being a producer of counterfeit goods are possibly not mutually exclusive; China has multiple reputations and can be perceived as having both aspects at the same time. Thus, it is possible that the two stereotypes were formulated too generically in what type of products are

counterfeit or advanced. The CoO literature states that stereotypes that usually generate the CoO effect are focused on a specific product category (e.g., French wine), and that that country will have a strong reputation for producing that particular good (Abraham & Patro, 2014; Janda & Rao, 1997). The findings in this experiment could then be explained by the selected stereotypes, that may have been too general in description (i.e., 'technologically advanced' and 'counterfeit goods') and do not include or exclude any specific product type.

Lastly, the chosen population in the present experiment – Western university students – may clarify some of the study's findings. Results showed that the group's evaluation of the four Chinese products was generally positive, suggesting that the baseline attitude of Western university students towards Chinese technological products (e.g., mobile phone) is quite optimistic. Furthermore, we found that the students' willingness to buy the product was lower than its evaluation. An outcome that matches earlier findings in the CoO literature that a positive perception of a product's quality does not necessarily lead to an intention to purchase (Verlegh and Steenkamp, 1999; Agrawal & Kamakura, 1999). In the case of university students, the difference could however also be caused by the limited budget that they usually have. This characteristic may suggest that students are likely more susceptible to be influenced by other product attributes (e.g., price), besides the country of origin cue, in their purchase intention of the technological products (prices were about 200 euro in the present study).

The current generation of university students (i.e., generation Y), that grew up familiarizing themselves with the huge information source called the internet, are less brand loyal and less risk averse than older generations since they are fairly adjusted to inform themselves using the internet in most consumer decisions (Reisenwitz & Iyer, 2009). Being confronted with a multitude of diverse products, the internet provides a guide in the form of reviews (e.g., electronic word of mouth) to which products are the best option. This suggests

that the younger generation may have developed a different evaluation method in decision making for products than older generations. Students could therefore be both more critical and more open towards a broad range of products (e.g., counterfeit goods) that could be considered of good quality (Kreppel & Holtbrügge, 2012). Indeed, Swami, Chamorro-Premuzicc and Furnhamd (2009) found that younger people had a higher willingness to buy counterfeit goods, mediated by material values and attitude towards counterfeit products, than older people. However, this may only account for some type of products. Thus, for the experimental manipulation, where no one in the photo task mentioned that counterfeit goods are of bad quality (one participant even stated that counterfeit goods are 'often of good quality'), we may have wrongly presumed that students would associate counterfeit goods with inferior quality. Yet, personal characteristics are not the only explanation of why students have a more positive attitude towards counterfeit goods. Societal factors, such as the rise of cheap consumerism (e.g., Fast Fashion), may also account as to why products of cheap quality that represent a good bargain are more acceptable at least for some product categories. This would suggest that the strength of the CoO effect changes as the attitudes in society changes. Although this is all assumption, it may be interesting to study whether there are any differences between younger and older generations in how influential the country of origin cue is in product evaluation.

To conclude, the current study researched whether the CoO effect for products from a country with an ambiguous reputation can be changed by activating either a positive or negative stereotype concerning that country's manufacturing capabilities. Results indicated that there was no effect of the stereotype manipulation on product evaluation and purchase intention. Possible explanations for this finding have to do with the design of the study (e.g., manipulation tasks, stereotypes) and the sample group of university students. Although the current experiment was centered on one country, compared to earlier studies that varied

between products and countries to deduce the CoO effect, a limited and most indirect effect for the CoO effect occurring was found. The outcome of this study recommends countries, that are at a disadvantage on the international market regarding their reputation towards producing certain products, to not make use of stereotypes or cues in their marketing strategy that clearly signify their origin. Companies that still want to make use of the CoO effect for countries with an ambiguous stereotype, by using stereotypes in their advertising, may be better off not implementing this strategy before considering all the factors.

References

Abraham, A. & Patro, S. (2014). 'Country-of-origin' effect and consumer decision-making. *Management and Labour Studies*, *39*, 309-318.

Agrawal, J. & Kamakura, W. A. (1999). Country of origin: A competitive advantage? International *Journal of Research in Marketing, 16*, 255-267.

Clay, X. (2015). What's all the fuss about Wagyu beef? *The Telegraph.* Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/foodanddrink/11406635/Whats-all-the-fuss-about-Wagyu-beef.html

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 1, 155-159.

Balabanis, G. & Diamantopoulos, A. (2004). Domestic country bias, country-of-origin effects, and consumer ethnocentrism: A multidimensional unfolding approach. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *32*, 80-95.

Bargh, J. A., Chen, M. & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 230-244.

Batra, R., Ramaswamy, V., Alden, D. L., Steenkamp, J.- B. E. M. & Ramachander, S. (2000). Effects of brand local/non-local origin on consumer attitudes in developing countries. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *9*, 83-95.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of Taste.* London: Routledge

Elliott, G. R. & Cameron, R. C. (1994). Consumer perception of product quality and the country-of-origin effect. *Journal of International Marketing*, *2*, 49-62.

Hijiya-Kirschnereit, I. (2000). Introduction: Japan and Europe – some new perspectives. *European Review*, *8*, 503-509.

Janda, S. & Rao, C. P. (1997).The effect of country-of-origin related stereotypes and personal beliefs on product evaluation. *Psychology & Marketing, 14*, 689-702.

Kalicharan, H. D. (2014). The effect and influence of country-of-origin on consumers' perception of product quality and purchasing intentions. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, *13*, 897-902.

Kreppel, H. & Holtbrügge, D. (2012). The perceived attractiveness of Chinese products by German consumers - A sociopsychological approach. *Journal of Global Marketing*, *25*, 79-99.

KRO-NCRV (broadcaster) (2015). Wagyu [Television series episode]. In Dahl TV | BlazHoffski (Producers), *Keuringsdienst van Waarde* [Streaming video]. Available from http://www.npo.nl/keuringsdienst-van-waarde/15-10-2015/KN_1673125

Langlois, S. (2015).Why some Volkswagen fans are shrugging off 'dieselgate'. *Marketwatch.* Retrieved from http://www.marketwatch.com/story/why-some-volkswagen-fans-are-shrugging-off-dieselgate-2015-11-23

Leclerc, F., Schmitt, B. H. & Dubé, L. (1994). Foreign branding and its effects on product perceptions and attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *31*, 263-270.

Li, W. K. & Wyer, R. S. (1994). The role of country of origin in product evaluations: Informational and standard-of-comparison Effects. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *3*, 187-212.

Liu, S. S. & Johnson, K. F. (2005). The automatic country-of-origin effects on brand

    Judgments. *Journal of advertising*, *34*, 87-97.

Lotz, S.L. & Hu, M.Y. (2001). Diluting negative country of origin stereotypes: A social

    stereotype approach. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *17*, 105-135.

Maheswaran, D. (1994). Country of origin as a stereotype: Effects of consumer expertise and

    attribute strength on product evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *21*, 354-365.

Papp-Váry, Á. F. (2005). Sell the country, sell the product! (The role of country of origin

    effect in the global competition). *IDEAS*. Retrieved from http://kgk.uni-

    obuda.hu/sites/default/files/PappVary.pdf

Peterson, R. A. & Jolibert, A. J. P. (1995). A meta-analysis of country-of-origin effects.

    Journal of International Business Studies, *26*, 883-900.

Power, J. G., Murphy, S. T. & Coover, G. (1996). Priming prejudice: How stereotypes and

    counter-stereotypes influence attribution of responsibility and credibility among

    ingroups and outgroups. *Human Communication Research*, *23*, 36-58.

Reierson, C. C. (1967). Attitude changes toward foreign products. *Journal of Marketing*

    Research, 4, 385-387.

Reisenwitz, T. H. & Iyer, R. (2009). Differences in generation X and generation Y:

    Implications for the organization and marketers. *The Marketing Management Journal*,

    19, 91-103.

Roth, K. P. & Diamantopoulos, A. (2009). Advancing the country image construct. *Journal of*

    Business Research, *62*, 726-740.

Ruble, R. A. & Zhang, J. B. (2013). Stereotypes of Chinese international students held by Americans. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *37*, 202-211.

Said, E. (1971). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage.

Shih, M., Pittinsky, T. L. & Ambady, N. (1999). Identity adaptiveness: Affect across multiple identities. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55,* 503-518.

Srull, T. K. & Wyer, R. S. W (1979). The role of category accessibility in the interpretation of information about persons: Some determinants and implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1660-1672.

Swami, V., Chamorro-Premuzicc, T. & Furnhamd, A. (2009). Faking it: Personality and individual difference predictors of willingness to buy counterfeit goods. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, *38*, 820-825.

Tse, D. K. & Lee, W. (1993). Removing negative country images: Effects of decomposition, branding, and product experience. *Journal of International Marketing*, *1*, 25-48.

Verlegh, P. W. J. & Steenkamp, J.- B. E. M. (1999). A review and meta-analysis of country-of-origin research. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *20*, 521-546.

Verlegh, P. W. J., Steenkamp, J.- B. E. M. & Meulenberg, M. T. G. (2005). Country-of-origin effects in consumer processing of advertising claims. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *22*, 127-139.

WagyuKoe (2015). Wagyu vlees - onvoorstelbaar rijk gemarmerd. *WagyKoe.* Retrieved from http://www.wagyukoe.nl/Over-Wagyu

Xiang, D. (2013). China's image on international English language social media. *The Journal of International Communication*, *19*, 252-271.

Zhang, Q. (2010). Asian Americans beyond the model minority stereotype: The nerdy and the

left out. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *3*, 20-37.

Appendix A – Experimental Manipulation

[Negative condition]

Fijn dat je meedoet aan dit onderzoek!

In dit marketing onderzoek willen wij graag van je weten wat je denkt over producten van het Chinese merk Huawei en Xiaomi. Deze vragenlijst bestaat uit 3 onderdelen en duurt ongeveer 10 minuten. *Lees alles goed door!*

Onderdeel 1

Voordat je de producten gaat beoordelen, willen wij eerst weten wat jouw algemene kennis over China is. Omdat onderzoek heeft aangetoond dat actief met informatie bezig te zijn effectiever is dan passief bezig zijn met informatie, willen we je eerst vragen om een taak te doen die jouw kennis over China activeert.

Uitleg: In deze korte taak is het de bedoeling dat je met nummers de correcte volgorde aangeeft van een zin die in vier stukjes verdeeld is. Het getal 1 geeft altijd aan het gedeelte waarmee de zin begint, oplopend tot het laatste gedeelte van de zin wat met het getal 4 wordt aangegeven. De genummerde zin moet een goed te lezen Nederlandse zin zijn. Meerdere antwoorden zijn in sommige gevallen dus mogelijk. Zie hieronder voor een voorbeeld vraag:

- als de hoogste berg __wordt de Mount Everest gezien __ op aarde __in het algemeen __
Antwoord:

- als de hoogste berg _3_wordt de Mount Everest gezien _2_ op aarde _4_in het algemeen _1_

De complete zin is "In het algemeen wordt de Mount Everest gezien als de hoogste berg op aarde."

Als het doel van de taak duidelijk is, dan kun je aan taak 1 beginnen.

 Taak 1: Geef voor elke zin de juiste volgorde aan:

1. in de wereld__ China heeft __ de grootste populatie __ met 1,36 miljard inwoners __

2. Xi Jinping __ de huidige partijleider __ is __ van de Communistische Partij van China__

3. 45 biljoen eetstokjes __ China __ per jaar __gebruikt ongeveer __

4. zijn door China __ alle panda's __ uitgeleend __ in de wereld __

5. te laten dalen__ om het bevolkingsaantal __ het eenkindbeleid was __het doel van__

6. is een paleizencomplex __ meer dan 9000 kamers __in Beijing met __ de verboden stad in China __

7. Namaak-producten __ produceert __ China __ veel__

Je hebt het einde van deze taak bereikt. Ga nu door naar Taak 2 op de volgende bladzijde.

Taak 2

In deze taak willen we jouw geactiveerde kennis over China meten door je te laten opschrijven wat je weet en welke impressies je hebt over het land. Om je op weg te helpen presenteren wij drie foto's met drie verschillende onderwerpen. Het is hierbij de bedoeling dat je bij elke foto schrijft wat je weet over het onderwerp.

| Foto 1 | Foto 2 | Foto 3 |

Taak 2. Beschrijf per foto in een aantal regels wat je weet over het onderwerp op de foto.

Foto 1:

Foto 2:

Foto 3:

Je hebt het einde van onderdeel 1 van de vragenlijst bereikt. Ga nu door naar onderdeel 2 op de volgende bladzijde.

[Positive condition]

Fijn dat je meedoet aan dit onderzoek!

In dit marketing onderzoek willen wij graag van je weten wat je denkt over producten van het Chinese merk Huawei en Xiaomi. Deze vragenlijst bestaat uit 3 onderdelen en duurt ongeveer 10 minuten. *Lees alles goed door!*

<u>Onderdeel 1</u>

Voordat je de producten gaat beoordelen, willen wij eerst weten wat jouw algemene kennis over China is. Omdat onderzoek heeft aangetoond dat actief met informatie bezig te zijn effectiever is dan passief bezig zijn met informatie, willen we je eerst vragen om een taak te doen die jouw kennis over China activeert.

Uitleg: In deze korte taak is het de bedoeling dat je met nummers de correcte volgorde aangeeft van een zin die in vier stukjes verdeeld is. Het getal 1 geeft altijd aan het gedeelte waarmee de zin begint, oplopend tot het laatste gedeelte van de zin wat met het getal 4 wordt aangegeven. De genummerde zin moet een goed te lezen Nederlandse zin zijn. Meerdere antwoorden zijn in sommige gevallen dus mogelijk. Zie hieronder voor een voorbeeld vraag:

- als de hoogste berg __wordt de Mount Everest gezien __ op aarde __in het algemeen __
Antwoord:

- als de hoogste berg _3_wordt de Mount Everest gezien _2_ op aarde _4_in het algemeen _1_

De complete zin is "In het algemeen wordt de Mount Everest gezien als de hoogste berg op aarde."

Als het doel van de taak duidelijk is, dan kun je aan taak 1 beginnen.

Taak 1: Geef voor elke zin de juiste volgorde aan:

1. in de wereld__ China heeft __ de grootste populatie __ met 1,36 miljard inwoners __

2. Xi Jinping __ de huidige partijleider __ is __ van de Communistische Partij van China__

3. 45 biljoen eetstokjes __ China __ per jaar __gebruikt ongeveer __

4. zijn door China __ alle panda's __ uitgeleend __ in de wereld __

5. te laten dalen__ om het bevolkingsaantal __ het eenkindbeleid was __het doel van__

6. is een paleizencomplex __ meer dan 9000 kamers __in Beijing met __ de verboden stad in China __

7. een technologisch __ China __ geavanceerd land __ is __

Je hebt het einde van deze taak bereikt. Ga nu door naar Taak 2 op de volgende bladzijde.

Taak 2

In deze taak willen we jouw geactiveerde kennis over China meten door je te laten opschrijven wat je weet en welke impressies je hebt over het land. Om je op weg te helpen presenteren wij drie foto's met drie verschillende onderwerpen. Het is hierbij de bedoeling dat je bij elke foto schrijft wat je weet over het onderwerp.

| Foto 1 | Foto 2 | Foto 3 |

Taak 2. Beschrijf per foto in een aantal regels wat je weet over het onderwerp op de foto.

Foto 1:

Foto 2:

Foto 3:

Je hebt het einde van onderdeel 1 van de vragenlijst bereikt. Ga nu door naar onderdeel 2 op de volgende bladzijde.

[Control condition]

Fijn dat je meedoet aan dit onderzoek!

In dit marketing onderzoek willen wij graag van je weten wat je denkt over producten van het Chinese merk Huawei en Xiaomi. Deze vragenlijst bestaat uit 3 onderdelen en duurt ongeveer 10 minuten. *Lees alles goed door!*

Onderdeel 1

Voordat je de producten gaat beoordelen, willen wij eerst weten wat jouw algemene kennis over China is. Omdat onderzoek heeft aangetoond dat actief met informatie bezig te zijn effectiever is dan passief bezig zijn met informatie, willen we je eerst vragen om een taak te doen die jouw kennis over China activeert.

Uitleg: In deze korte taak is het de bedoeling dat je met nummers de correcte volgorde aangeeft van een zin die in vier stukjes verdeeld is. Het getal 1 geeft altijd aan het gedeelte waarmee de zin begint, oplopend tot het laatste gedeelte van de zin wat met het getal 4 wordt aangegeven. De genummerde zin moet een goed te lezen Nederlandse zin zijn. Meerdere antwoorden zijn in sommige gevallen dus mogelijk. Zie hieronder voor een voorbeeld vraag:

- als de hoogste berg __wordt de Mount Everest gezien __ op aarde __in het algemeen __
Antwoord:

- als de hoogste berg _**3**_wordt de Mount Everest gezien _**2**_ op aarde _**4**_in het algemeen _**1**_

De complete zin is "In het algemeen wordt de Mount Everest gezien als de hoogste berg op aarde."

Als het doel van de taak duidelijk is, dan kun je aan taak 1 beginnen.

Taak 1: Geef voor elke zin de juiste volgorde aan:

1. in de wereld__ China heeft __ de grootste populatie __ met 1,36 miljard inwoners __

2. Xi Jinping __ de huidige partijleider __ is __ van de Communistische Partij van China__

3. 45 biljoen eetstokjes __ China __ per jaar __gebruikt ongeveer __

4. zijn door China __ alle panda's __ uitgeleend __ in de wereld __

5. te laten dalen__ om het bevolkingsaantal __ het eenkindbeleid was __het doel van__

6. is een paleizencomplex __ meer dan 9000 kamers __in Beijing met __ de verboden stad in China __

7. afstammen __ geloofden dat zij __ veel keizers in China __ van draken__

Je hebt het einde van deze taak bereikt. Ga nu door naar Taak 2 op de volgende bladzijde.

Taak 2

In deze taak willen we jouw geactiveerde kennis over China meten door je te laten opschrijven wat je weet en welke impressies je hebt over het land. Om je op weg te helpen presenteren wij drie foto's met drie verschillende onderwerpen. Het is hierbij de bedoeling dat je bij elke foto schrijft wat je weet over het onderwerp.

| Foto 1 | Foto 2 | Foto 3 |

Taak 2. Beschrijf per foto in een aantal regels wat je weet over het onderwerp op de foto.

Foto 1:

Foto 2:

Foto 3:

Je hebt het einde van onderdeel 1 van de vragenlijst bereikt. Ga nu door naar onderdeel 2 op de volgende bladzijde.

Appendix B – Questionnaire

<u>**Onderdeel 2**</u>

In het volgende gedeelte van de vragenlijst zijn we benieuwd naar jouw mening over vier producten van de merken Xiaomi en Huawei.

Product 1

Het eerste Chinese product is de onderstaande smartphone Xiaomi Mi 4. We zijn benieuwd naar jouw mening over dit product. Geef alsjeblieft aan (door een getal te omcirkelen) in hoeverre je het oneens of eens bent met onderstaande stellingen.

Xiaomi Mi 4
* MIUI 5.0
* 13 megapixel camera, 8 megapixel frontcamera
* 5.0 inch scherm
* 16 GB opslaggeheugen

€ 289.95

	Helemaal mee oneens ↓				Helemaal mee eens		↓
1. De Xiaomi Mi 4 is van goede kwaliteit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. De Xiaomi Mi 4 is een geavanceerd product.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Ik vind de Xiaomi Mi 4 leuk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Ik heb een positief beeld van de Xiaomi Mi 4.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Als ik de Xiaomi Mi 4 in de winkel zou tegen komen dan zou ik deze graag kopen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Ik koop liever de Xiaomi Mi 4 dan een soortgelijk product van een ander merk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Product 2

Het tweede Chinese product is de onderstaande televisie Xiaomi Mi TV 2. We zijn benieuwd naar jouw mening over dit product. Geef alsjeblieft aan (door een getal te omcirkelen) in hoeverre je het oneens of eens bent met onderstaande stellingen.

Xiaomi Mi TV 2
* 40 inch Full HD LED Sharp SDP X-GEN panel
* MStar 6A908 Cortex-A9 quad-core 1.45GHz CPU
* MIUI TV Android-based OS

€ 399,99

	Helemaal mee oneens ↓				Helemaal mee eens		↓
1. De Xiaomi Mi TV 2 is van goede kwaliteit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. De Xiaomi Mi TV 2 is een geavanceerd product.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Ik vind de Xiaomi Mi TV 2 leuk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Ik heb een positief beeld van de Xiaomi Mi TV 2.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Als ik de Xiaomi Mi TV 2 in de winkel zou tegen komen dan zou ik deze graag kopen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Ik koop liever de Xiaomi Mi TV 2 dan een soortgelijk product van een ander merk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Product 3

Het derde Chinese product is de onderstaande smartphone Huawei Ascend G7. We zijn benieuwd naar jouw mening over dit product. Geef alsjeblieft aan (door een getal te omcirkelen) in hoeverre je het oneens of eens bent met onderstaande stellingen.

HUAWEI Ascend G7
* Android 4.4
* 13 megapixel camera, 5 megapixel frontcamera
* 5.5 inch scherm
* 16 GB opslaggeheugen

€ 269,99

	Helemaal mee oneens				Helemaal mee eens		
	↓						↓
1. De Huawei Ascend G7 is van goede kwaliteit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. De Huawei Ascend G7 is een geavanceerd product.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Ik vind de Huawei Ascend G7 leuk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Ik heb een positief beeld van de Huawei Ascend G7.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Als ik de Huawei Ascend G7 in de winkel zou tegen komen dan zou ik deze graag kopen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Ik koop liever de Huawei Ascend G7 dan een soortgelijk product van een ander merk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Product 4

Het vierde Chinese product is de onderstaande smartwatch Huawei Watch. We zijn benieuwd naar jouw mening over dit product. Geef alsjeblieft aan (door een getal te omcirkelen) in hoeverre je het oneens of eens bent met onderstaande stellingen.

HUAWEI

HUAWEI WATCH
* Smartwatch
* Compatibel met Android
* Opslagcapaciteit 4 GB
* Resolutie 400 x 400

€ 399,99

	Helemaal mee oneens ↓						Helemaal mee eens ↓
1. De Huawei Watch is van goede kwaliteit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. De Huawei Watch is een geavanceerd product.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Ik vind de Huawei Watch leuk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Ik heb een positief beeld van de Huawei Watch.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Als ik de Huawei Watch in de winkel zou tegen komen dan zou ik deze graag kopen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Ik koop liever de Huawei Watch dan een soortgelijk product van een ander merk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Je hebt het einde van onderdeel 2 van de vragenlijst bereikt. Ga nu door naar onderdeel 3 op de volgende bladzijde.

Onderdeel 3

In het laatste gedeelte van de vragenlijst willen wij nog graag wat algemene vragen stellen over de merken Huawei en Xiaomi, Chinese producten en het land China.

De volgende stellingen gaan over het merk Huawei. Geef voor elke stelling aan in hoeverre je het er mee oneens of oneens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens				Helemaal mee eens		
	↓						↓
1. Ik ben bekend met Huawei producten.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Huawei produceert producten die van hoge kwaliteit zijn.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Huawei producten zijn vernieuwend.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Ik vertrouw Huawei meer dan andere merken.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Huawei producten hebben een lage status.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Ik vind Huawei een goed merk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

De volgende stellingen gaan over het merk Xiaomi. Geef voor elke stelling aan in hoeverre je het er mee oneens of oneens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens				Helemaal mee eens		
	↓						↓
1. Ik ben bekend met Xiaomi producten.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Xiaomi produceert producten die van hoge kwaliteit zijn.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Xiaomi producten zijn vernieuwend.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Ik vertrouw Xiaomi meer dan andere merken.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Xiaomi producten hebben een lage status.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Ik vind Xiaomi een goed merk.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

De volgende stellingen gaan over China en Chinese producten in het algemeen. Geef voor elke stelling aan in hoeverre je het er mee oneens of oneens bent.

	Helemaal mee oneens				Helemaal mee eens		
	↓						↓
Chinese producten….							
1. .. zijn van goede kwaliteit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. ..worden gemaakt van goedkoop materiaal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. .. hebben een lage status.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. .. gaan langdurig mee.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. .. zijn slechte imitaties van andere producten.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. .. tonen vakmanschap.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. .. zijn een teleurstelling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. ..voldoen aan een hoge kwaliteit standaard.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

China….

9. .. is een technologisch geavanceerd land.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. .. produceert veel namaak-producten.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. ..is een land waar ik een positief beeld van heb.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Tenslotte nog een aantal vragen over jezelf:

1. Ik ben een:
   Kruis aan wat van toepassing is.
   o man
   o vrouw

2. Wat is je leeftijd? _____

3. Wat is je huidige opleiding? Bachelor / Master / Phd : _____

Dit is het einde van de vragenlijst. Hartelijk bedankt voor je tijd en medewerking!
Je kunt de ingevulde vragenlijst inleveren bij degene van wie je de vragenlijst ontvangen heeft.

Eventuele opmerkingen kun je hier kwijt :

……………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………..